

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Friday, May 18, 1984, 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a. m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, it is an extreme pleasure for me today to introduce to you and to all members in the Assembly Mr. Roy Watson, seated in your gallery. Mr. Watson is here as a special guest in his capacity as president of the Alberta Papal Visit Secretariat. Mr. Watson's committee is preparing feverishly for the historic visit of Pope John Paul II to Edmonton on September 16 and 17. The highlight of the Pope's stay in our provincial capital will be a Mass celebration at Namao on the morning of September 17, at which the committee expects up to 350,000 participants, making it the largest single event in the history of western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of our very special guest from the Vatican, today was recognized as a day of official welcome throughout the province. To mark this occasion which incidentally, is the Pope's birthday as well, the official Vatican papal flag is being raised throughout the province over public and private buildings, a ceremony completed in front of the Legislature moments ago with the assistance of Mr. Watson. Also, members of the Assembly have inquired as to when they will receive their tabletop versions of the flag. I anticipated we would receive those today, but unfortunately they did not arrive. I hope to have these for all members early next week.

Mr. Speaker, could I ask Mr. Watson to rise at this time to receive the warm accord of the Assembly.

head: **NOTICES OF MOTIONS**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to give notice that next Tuesday on Orders of the Day, we propose designating government business for the first hour. The nature of the business will be second reading of Bills on the Order Paper.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 50****Law of Property Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce Bill No. 50, the Law of Property Amendment Act.

The principles of the Bill would be to provide for an adjusted procedure, one might say, in respect of certain types of foreclosures. In cases where property is transferred when the mortgage or agreement for sale registered against it would be in arrears, the opportunity would be available to the creditor to apply for a merged nisi order and vesting order. As well, there would be a provision that if a mortgage or agreement for sale falls into arrears within the first four months after a transfer,

a similar order or an order for receivership of rents could be sought.

[Leave granted; Bill 50 read a first time]

Bill 54**Chiropractic Profession Act**

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 54, the Chiropractic Profession Act.

The purpose of the Bill is to bring legislation governing the practice of the profession of chiropractic into conformity with the government's policy on professions and occupations. In that regard, members' attention is drawn particularly to the exclusive scope of practice contained within the Bill, which permits chiropractors to employ new technology in the treatment of Albertans and to reflect changes in the educational preparation of chiropractors. The discipline process is improved. The Universities Co-ordinating Council is given control over education, to improve the public's input and control of the educational standards required to practise.

I'd like to acknowledge very much the co-operation of the association as well as the co-operation of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. It is clear that in all these pieces of health care professional legislation, interested practitioners are adopting a model of co-operation. A member of the staff of the association, Miss Phyllis Dickens, is in the gallery this morning. I'd like to express my appreciation as well to Mr. Don Smith of Medicine Hat, who is the chairman of the legislation committee, and to Dr. Don Wood of Grande Prairie, who is the president of the association.

Mr. Speaker, I am advised that Billy Smith's nose is out of joint this morning. I am afraid that even with the new definition of scope of practice, there's not a chiropractor in the province who can do anything for him. [laughter]

[Leave granted; Bill 54 read a first time]

Bill 29**Exemptions Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 29, Exemptions Amendment Act, 1984.

The Bill will amend the Exemptions Act by increasing the value levels of certain real and personal property — such as furniture, an automobile, tools used for employment, a house, and a mobile home — of an execution debtor that is exempt from seizure under a writ of execution. Subject to the approval of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, the new levels would come into force as of July 1, 1984.

[Leave granted; Bill 29 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 29 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, this morning I have the pleasure of introducing 44 students from Bertha Kennedy school in the city of St. Albert, in the constituency of St. Albert. They are accompanied by teachers Mrs. Sandy Vanoni and Mrs. Maria Takacs, and by parents Mrs. Shea and Mrs. Wittenberg. They're seated in the members gallery, and I ask them to receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me today to introduce to you and to hon. members 42 grade 6 students from Annie L. Gaetz school in the constituency of Red Deer. Our students are accompanied by the principal, Ron Hitchings, and by teachers Karen McBean and Marilyn Ganger. They are seated in both the members and public galleries, and I ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this morning to introduce 55 energetic grade 6 students from Brookwood school, located in the town of Spruce Grove. They are accompanied by teachers Mrs. Arnold and Mr. Broda, by bus driver Mrs. Gainer, and by parents Jane Karle, Robin Schurek, Carol Knechtel, and Valerie Formaniuk. They are seated in the public gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, seated in your gallery this morning are two special guests I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly. First of all, I'm pleased to introduce two constituents. The first is the mother of one of our great and intelligent pages, Don Padget. Mrs. Elizabeth Padget is in your gallery.

In addition, seated in your gallery is Mr. Grant Smith. Mr. Smith is a student at Ross Sheppard Composite high school and a debating partner of our page Don Padget. They have participated in a number of debates throughout Canada and have been extremely successful. As a matter of fact, Grant Smith won first place in the original oratory category of the Alberta Debate and Speech Association provincial speech finals. Due to this success, this evening Grant is winging away to London, England, to represent the province of Alberta in debates there.

Mr. Speaker, last night Don Padget and Grant Smith received the Basil Dean trophy, medals, and a cash prize, for their debating skills, at the 20th anniversary banquet of the Sir Winston Churchill Society. These awards were due to their success in the Sir Winston Churchill debates. I ask my guests to please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Throughout a number of years, ever since Alberta has had its own Legislature, we have developed a number of traditions and customs and precedents which I know all hon. members cherish very greatly. Perhaps at some times we take for granted something that is happening here and helping us in so many ways to carry out our duties and responsibilities in the efficient manner in which we are able to. I refer, of course, to the group of young people, ladies and gentlemen, who are the pages in this Assembly and who have given us very devoted service.

I think the introduction by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway simply underlines the fact that we have here a group of young people who are very intelligent, have a great deal of ability, and have a remarkable aptitude for coping with situations as they develop. When we have a new group of pages, I'm always amazed at how they so quickly learn not only the names of all hon. members but where they're located in the Assembly: also staff members in the building, the offices in the building, and the routine we go through.

In congratulating page Don Padget this morning, perhaps we should also show our appreciation and tribute to all the pages for the service they provide. [applause]

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Hazardous Waste Disposal

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my first question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. It's a follow-up to questions raised a few days ago concerning Chem-Security and Waste Management. I file with the Legislature Library three copies of the latest updated horror stories of the practices of Waste Management in the United States.

In posing my question to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker, he indicated that Chem-Security was being restructured under Canadian ownership. Could the minister tell the House whether or not the government has any written contract or written agreement with Chem-Security which requires them to achieve majority Canadian ownership by a certain specified date?

MR. BRADLEY: No. Mr. Speaker, we do not.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister telling the House that what the government has is a hope or a gentleman's agreement, or what?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader asked if we had a written contract. No. We've had an exchange of letters, which indicated that Chem-Security would be undergoing this restructuring and that that would be taking place as soon as they concluded their negotiations with their Canadian partners.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. What guarantee does the government have, given the fact that last year the minister indicated there would be a suspension of negotiations until the A.G. had completed an investigation of the parent company's practice? As I recall the last question period when this was discussed, the minister indicated that wasn't necessary because of the restructuring of the company. What guarantee does the government have in place that such a restructuring will in fact occur?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, last week we authorized the Special Waste Management Corporation to enter negotiations with the proponent, Chem-Security. Surely the safeguard is with regard to the negotiations, which will take place. Prior to concluding any contract or memorandum of agreement, we would ensure that that was in place.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question. In the minister's exchange of letters, what guarantees did the government obtain from Chem-Security with respect to the relationship with Waste Management, which would still be a significant player in this project? What role would they play in providing to Chem-Security management advice or consulting services or background information?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, obviously that would be the nature of contractual arrangements between Chem-Security and Waste Management Inc.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Then the government has no written assurance, in the exchange of letters, that a company which has really quite an unbelievable record south of the border — and some other examples I have filed with the Legislature Library are Alabama, Illinois, and Vickery, Ohio: all since we last discussed this a year ago. But the question I want to pose to the minister is: has the government no assurance, at this stage, and no guarantee, that the interna-

tional company with this kind of record will not be supplying services to Chem-Security?

MR. BRADLEY: As I said, Mr. Speaker, that would obviously be the nature of the contract between Chem-Security and Waste Management. I think what is important for the House to know is that negotiations will take place with the Alberta Special Waste Management Corporation. The guarantees we would wish to have, in terms of any contract which would eventually be arranged, would be through the Special Waste Management Corporation. The negotiations which will take place between them and Chem-Security will be finalized in the contract, which I will endeavor to make public to the people of Alberta and to this Assembly when it's concluded.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. A year ago, however, on the 29th, the minister indicated that negotiations had been suspended prior to this report by the Attorney General. Could the Minister of the Environment indicate whether or not he received any report from the Attorney General on the activities of Waste Management Inc.?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think this was dealt with in an earlier question period. If one checks the record, the Attorney General was to undertake a review and report to me. The Attorney General and I did have discussions, and the Attorney General did report to me.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the minister. Was that a written report?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, there were several verbal conversations and communications, and I believe there was one memo from the Attorney General to me.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question. Was the minister then satisfied that the record of violations of Waste Management Inc., an international company, was not a cause of concern for the Department of the Environment, in terms of choosing a proponent for the Swan Hills site?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I've already responded that Chem-Security itself has had an excellent record with regard to regulatory compliance in our country and that we felt any concern we had would be taken care of by the fact that a restructuring proposal had come to us which would end up with Chem-Security ending up with majority Canadian ownership.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Given the minister's statement that discussions had been suspended, when did the discussions recommence?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's hard to say what the hon. leader is getting at. Any negotiations with Chem-Security in terms of moving forward with them as a proponent for the special waste facility at Swan Hills had not commenced until the news release that went out last week, advising that we were recommencing negotiations with them. In terms of a restructuring proposal, that obviously came to us at some earlier time, for us to be able to draw some conclusions. I believe those discussions took place in the period late last fall, December, and January of this year.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question. What role, if any, did the minister play in either directing his department or per-

sonally participating in negotiations with Chem-Security re their restructuring?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I received advice from the department that a restructuring proposal was coming forward. I obviously looked at it. I personally did not have any discussions with Chem-Security with regard to this matter.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Given the track record of Waste Management Inc., what other options did the government review for a proponent, apart from the restructured Chem-Security proposal?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, there was obviously a lengthy process which started in January 1982, with a request for proposals from the private sector. We received a number of proposals, a short list was drawn up, and Chem-Security was the successful applicant.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Attorney General in a position to summarize for the Assembly the information uncovered regarding the illegal disposal of toxic chemicals in Illinois, violations of federal statutes in Colorado, illegal political donations, and attempts to influence the Teamsters Union, by Waste Management Inc.?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, not in any detail at the moment. The inquiries that I asked be undertaken through the department were undertaken last summer. The result of them was that the RCMP, who provided us with the information, didn't purport to give an opinion on any legal liabilities that might be involved in United States jurisdictions. In the result, the report was not one which left us with the conclusion that there would be any particular problem in any Canadian operation if Waste Management were in a minority position.

MR. NOTLEY: Just without any guarantees and without any written contract. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure we will come back to that on other occasions.

Coal Marketing

MR. NOTLEY: I'd like to pose my second question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It is with respect to Grande Cache. Several years ago we had a major problem in that community, and I gather there will be a layoff later this year for five weeks, I think, if my information is correct. Could the minister advise the Assembly what contact the government has had with the management of McIntyre Porcupine, to evaluate the prospects of that concern for renewing contracts?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, our communications with the operators of that particular facility have really been ongoing now for a period of time, certainly during the currency of my tenure as Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. The approach the government has taken to developments of this nature is that we believe the private sector, the company itself, is best positioned to seek out and maximize marketing opportunities, while at the same time trying to ensure that when some assistance from government is requested, we are standing ready and willing to assist. That was very much the case, of course, with the renewal of the Japanese contract and the involvement, the help, rendered by this government by my predecessor in office. So we are acquainted with the circumstances of the mine. We are communicating with them on an ongoing basis as they endeavour to both renew and obtain new contract arrangements.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In the absence of the Minister of International Trade, could either the hon. minister of energy or perhaps the Minister of Economic Development advise what specialized assistance has been provided by the department with responsibility for international trade, especially as it relates to the Japanese market and particularly as it relates to the Grande Cache situation?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take as notice any request for information pertaining to involvement of a colleague of mine in that respect. I can advise the Assembly that it is my information that the management of McIntyre Mines have made a number of journeys into the Pacific Rim area, seeking to maintain existing contract arrangements and to obtain new ones not only in Japan but in other countries of the Pacific Rim. That of course fits very much with the initiatives that have been taken by this government and by travel by members of this government in that very important market area of the world.

Public Health Legislation

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health is with regard to Bill 25. I am wondering if the minister, after review and submissions from the Health Unit Association of Alberta, has decided to delay the passage of second reading and possibly hold Bill 25 in Committee of the Whole until the fall session of the Legislature.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the Health Unit Association of Alberta did issue a press release last week, indicating their general support for the principles in the new Public Health Act. They had several concerns about two issues, one being whether or not the Crown is bound by the Act and the other with respect to pasteurization.

In terms of the progress, they indicated that they thought the Bill should be held until the fall. However, upon meeting with the Health Unit Association last week, we did clear up a number of questions and concerns they had. In turn, the Health Unit Association executive met this week in Calgary with representatives from the health units across the province. I haven't heard the results of that particular meeting yet.

It was pointed out to the Health Unit Association, as well as to members from the health units at Jasper earlier this year, that we wanted their involvement in the process of reviewing the regulations to the Public Health Act and that if we were going to be able to carry out that process and have the Bill proclaimed by July 1, 1985, it was very, very important that we pass the Bill this spring. Hon. members will remember that Bill 30, which was a revised Public Health Act, was in this Legislature several years ago. There were responses to that Bill from health units and from the Health Unit Association of Alberta. I think there has been excellent input from not only the Health Unit Association but the health units across this province.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. My understanding is that in the meeting last week, the provincial associations did not agree with the recommendation that the Bill proceed during this spring session. In light of that recommendation from the provincial body, is the minister willing to reconsider his position and not only present the legislation but also make the regulations available to these various associations over the summer for their consideration,

with possible passage of the Bill in the fall session? That can be done.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, one of the difficulties of not passing the legislation is that we would not be in a position to be able to proceed with regulations because of the legislation not being passed. We would therefore be unable to meet the deadline of July 1, 1985. I believe a number of the members of the Health Unit Association executive, as well as health unit people, want to be able to participate in the revision of the regulations, so I think that process is important. It's also important to be able to have the Act proclaimed by July 1, 1985, so we can proceed with both the new Bill and the regulations.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the minister be very clear as to what impediments there are to his submitting a proposed set of regulations that could be considered along with the legislation that is being held over during this summer? What are the impediments preventing those regulations from being made public and presented to the associations during this summer? We don't need legal legislation on the books just to write regulations proposed as such.

MR. WEBBER: As I've already said, Mr. Speaker, certainly we intend to have the involvement of health unit associations and the Health Unit Association of Alberta in the review process. We have discussed this with them, and they're satisfied with that process. In meeting with the association last week and reviewing the concerns they had, we are also considering as possible amendments at the committee stage, some of the recommendations they made with respect to changes to the legislation. I've yet to finish discussions with them on that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In terms of submitting amendments to this Legislature, will the minister allow time for discussion by not only the provincial association but some of the regional associations in this province? In terms of the timing in this Legislature, it looks to me like it's impossible, unless the introduction of all those Bills today is going to prolong this session for longer than it should be.

DR. WEBBER: Again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member ignored the fact that for a number of years there has been consultation and discussions with not only the Health Unit Association but the health units across this province, including Bill 30, which was introduced in this Legislature several years ago. How much more consultation does the hon. member want?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The people in Alberta want a lot of discussion with this government, and it should not be curtailed. Will the minister allow time for full discussion of the Act? Let the people decide when they're ready. Is the minister prepared to take all steps necessary to provide for all discussion necessary?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, we have taken many, many steps in terms of preparation of this legislation and meeting with these groups. We met with them last week. The Health Unit Association met with their people this week. I have yet to talk to them about that particular meeting, but I'm confident we will get excellent support from the health units across the province if we pass the legislation this spring and then proceed with the drafting of the regulations for proclamation next year.

English as a Second Language Program

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for our hon. Minister of Advanced Education. In Calgary some of our new Canadians, namely our Vietnamese Canadians, are experiencing some hardships in gaining employment and joining the mainstream of our society. I guess one of the reasons is that they do not speak English. I wonder if the minister could advise me if he is aware that in Calgary we have a list of 250 people waiting to get into the English as a Second Language course, or at least that there is a waiting list.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the province of Alberta has several programs which are extending English as a second language to new immigrants and others within our province. We were prompted, of course, by the substantial influx of population over the past four or five years, to accommodate and provide the English instruction, as the member pointed out.

Currently several programs, including both cost-sharing programs and programs funded by the federal government, are operated and are managed or delivered by a group of departments including Advanced Education, Manpower, and to some extent the Department of Education, I believe. However, the problem the member raised deals with the question of access to the system. I have not had the information that there's any problem in accessing the system to be able to learn English, and I agree with the point he made. However, it will be my intention to take as notice the hon. Member for Calgary Millikan's question and do some checking to see if we in government can't collectively muster funds to remedy that problem.

Hospital Management

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to my very good friend the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. In his discussions with the Grey Nuns of Alberta prior to the decision to go ahead with the new Mill Woods hospital, did the minister explore the possibility that the hospital might be administered by a private management firm?

MR. RUSSELL: Certainly not, Mr. Speaker. That idea is one that's been floated in the public from time to time at regular intervals for at least the last two or three years. As I mentioned in the House earlier this week, it's a tactic that might be tried at any time by any particular hospital board, if the board agrees. Certainly I recently met with the chairman of the board, Judge Wachowich, and made that very clear to him. As far as I know, there's no more concern about whatever confusion that issue may have placed in some people's minds.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It would seem that if the minister were considering private management for that particular hospital, he probably would have raised it with the Grey Nuns. Has the minister then ruled out the possibility of the new Mill Woods hospital being administered by a private management firm?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I really find it difficult to answer that kind of question. I have said so very many times that the possibility exists that at some given time, any hospital in Alberta, with the agreement of the board, may try the private management firm for some time. They're doing it in other provinces, and I know of no reason they wouldn't want to try it here. I can't understand why the hon. member is concerned about that.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. A lot of times the minister was specifically talking about the new hospitals, and that's why we're asking that.

My other question has to do with the General itself, though. What study has the minister in place regarding the effect of the closure of the General hospital as an active treatment facility on the health of inner-city Edmontonians? Specifically, do any studies the minister may have, indicate whether or not the closure will place undue strain on the Royal Alexandra hospital in particular?

MR. RUSSELL: Again, Mr. Speaker, I would not have used the term "closure" if I had been describing what is on the books for the General. We're still working out with the General what aspects of their active care programs, including emergency services, may be kept at the existing hospital. The objective, which they've agreed to, is to enhance the extended care facilities that are so well established there and give them a chance to pioneer, to use their words, in the new areas where the younger families are and where the predominantly active care programs are needed. So I believe the board and the government are on the same wavelength insofar as that is concerned.

With respect to the availability of active care facilities for the central part of Edmonton, they are numerous. They're there in abundance, probably at a level unmatched in any other metropolitan centre. I refer the hon. member to the services that would be available within a few minutes at the Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre, the Royal Alex, the Charles Camshell, and the soon to be upgraded Misericordia hospital. There are many Canadian cities that would be envious of an array of active care facilities like I've just mentioned. [some applause]

MR. MARTIN: He even got hon. members to pound their desks. That's great.

Just on a point of clarification, my question comes back to the emergency wards. If I understood his previous answer, the minister has not yet made a decision on whether the emergency ward at the General will remain open at this particular time.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will refer to the ministerial statement I made following the day my colleague brought down the provincial budget, there was specific reference to that very service in the statement. With respect to the Holy Cross hospital in Calgary and the General hospital in Edmonton, I believe the government has made it very clear that that is the one service that was given specific mention as deserving special attention. Work is under way to see how that can best be maintained.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As the minister is well aware, the General has a reputation as a specialist hospital. Has he held any meetings with the medical staff of the General to ascertain to what degree specialists will re-establish their practices in Mill Woods?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. member is aware that the medical staff of the hospital is comprised of appointments made by the board and, as such, are responsible to the board. I meet with the board. If they wish to bring their medical chief of staff into the meeting, that is their decision. No, I have not met specifically with the medical staff.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister then aware of any complaints by some of the specialists about moving their practices from the inner city to Mill Woods?

MR. RUSSELL: As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, I have received no complaint.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary on this topic at this time.

MR. MARTIN: Has the minister made any decisions on whether the psychiatric facilities at the General will be maintained for residents in the heart of the city? Will they remain at the General?

MR. RUSSELL: That matter is currently under discussion; at least it was earlier this week. As the hon. member may be aware, a large, new psychiatric unit is attached to the new hospital in Mill Woods. The idea is to leave some of the psychiatric services available in the existing General hospital. The board and the department are jointly working on a plan to develop such a program.

MR. ALEXANDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Speaking of private management in the interest of effective cost control, would it be within the scope of the minister's department to in fact suggest to some of the hospital boards that they consider private management as a way of improving cost control in Alberta hospitals? [interjections]

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, and we have done that.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear what this issue is all about. Some members in this Assembly have a pretty short memory. It's only about three years ago that we explored with district board no. 93 in the city of Calgary the possibility of private management for the Colonel Belcher hospital, at the time the federal government turned that facility over to us. Our objective, of course, is to improve the standard of care and economic efficiencies. For the life of me, I can't understand why anybody would object to our having those objectives in mind.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Clover Bar is next to be recognized for a question, but a number of hon. members have requested that they might revert to Introduction of Special Guests. I'm keeping in mind that it is Friday morning, and it's difficult for people to come long distances and arrive and be here while the question period is on. If the hon. member and the other members agree, perhaps we could revert to Introduction of Special Guests.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**
(reversion)

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and to Members of the Legislative Assembly, a group of 31 grade 6 students from the J.E. Lapointe school in the town of Beaumont, located in the Wetaskiwin-Leduc constituency. They are accompanied by their group leader, Pam Yearwood. They are located in the members gallery, and I wish they would rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's indeed my pleasure today to introduce 23 students who are in grades 5 and 6 at

the Dr. Elliott school in Linden, Alberta, which is dead centre in the heart of the Three Hills constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher Herb Heidebrecht, and by parents Mrs. Linda Heidebrecht, Mrs. Marie Johnson, Mrs. Anita Clare, and Mrs. Rita Harvey. I ask that they all rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, this morning we have in our gallery a gentleman who is here not only to watch the greatest hockey team in the world but to see the Stanley Cup being presented to the Edmonton Oilers tomorrow night. The gentleman I refer to is Brian O'Neill, the vice president of the National Hockey League. He's seated in the members gallery with his brother Jack O'Neill, a Deputy Minister of Culture. I ask both gentlemen to rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure glad the Premier stayed away from the last two hockey games, because they didn't do very well in New York.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**
(continued)

Mount Allan Olympic Ski Site

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Tourism and Small Business, and it has to do with Mount Allan. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he's had any consultation with his hon. colleague the Member for Banff-Cochrane on doing an impact study as to what effect the facilities going into Kananaskis Country will have on the businesses in Banff, Canmore, and the surrounding areas.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, we've had a number of discussions with my hon. colleague the Member for Banff-Cochrane relative to both the impact of the Olympics and the aftereffect of the Olympics on the Banff area, as well as discussions, at his initiation, with private-sector operators in the ski industry and businesses in the community.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in these studies the minister had in consultation with the people in Banff, Canmore, and Lake Louise, can he indicate what effects there will be? I know the vacancy rates are now quite high in Banff and those facilities in the winter.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that specific information with me. But we do have information related to the impact of the Olympics, and I'd be quite willing to provide that once I obtain it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in the figures the minister has used for the operating costs of the snowmaking equipment, how firm are the projections the department has had? Will we still be able to ski at these facilities at a reasonable rate, or will the government have to keep subsidizing them forever?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the projections — and they're just that — by the management team that put the master plan together for us identify the North American average, which we think can be attained at that particular site. They also identify what the worst scenario could be if, in essence, nothing worked right. The basic figure we have been using is the fact that the North American average is around \$200,000 per annum.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate what the future of Fortress will be, in light of the fact that this new facility is going in?

MR. ADAIR: I can't, Mr. Speaker. But I should inform the Assembly that we have had discussions, and we are concerned for all the private-sector operators. They are working together relative to what might be a presentation by them as a consortium relative to the operation of the hill. I say that in the sense that that is basically a decision of the private sector — how they adjust their marketing plans and things like that. Obviously there are both up and down sides to a major facility like the Mount Allan project, the international attraction that can provide to the skiing world, and the spin-off effects for any of the resort areas very close to it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Indications are that the figure of \$200,000 for operating cost is certainly a North American average and a goal for which the organization will shoot, but I understand that indications are that costs could rise to \$.75 million or \$1 million a year, according to some of the statements of your own deputy minister. Can the minister clarify the government's position on that at this time?

MR. ADAIR: I did just a moment ago, but I'll go over it in case the hon. member wasn't listening. What we said was that the consultants identified . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The minister did not relate to the total potential operating cost of this facility. He said it in general, but not in figures. I think it's up to the minister to explain his own statements.

MR. ADAIR: My enthusiasm might get the best of me.

Mr. Speaker, I identified the worst possible scenario, which is identified in writing in the master plan and which states that if all other things did not work out, the worst scenario would be a possible \$.75 million cost. In other words, what they were talking about — and they were not trying to pull any wool over anybody's eyes — was identifying the fact that if they had to make snow at the high peak demand areas, if they had a number of other factors, if they had the kinds of snowfalls of the last couple of years: put them all together, and that would be the worst scenario.

Taking the other side of that into consideration, Mr. Speaker, the \$200,000 figure we used is the North American average and is also the latest figure we have received from some of the Canadian operations.

MR. NOTLEY: Panorama?

MR. ADAIR: Just a minute, please.

The consultants are working together with the firms, for example TransAlta, to find out the best possible ways to make snow at other than peak demand times.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, just to clarify a point. I still have a little problem. In light of the fact that the facilities we presently have in place — Lake Louise, Norquay, Sunshine — were not used to capacity last winter, how many new skiers a day will we have to bring into that area so that all the facilities can try to make some kind of profit?

MR. ADAIR: Just to sort of set it in perspective, Mr. Speaker, one of the things is that we hope a facility of this nature would

attract back to Alberta the Alberta skiers that are presently going to British Columbia and Whitefish, Montana, where they are in essence skiing on facilities that have snowmaking equipment. In fact they are skiing on facilities that have been complemented, I would say, by the tourism subagreements that were signed by other provinces with the federal government relative to improving or upgrading Whistler, Big White, Vernon, Kimberley, Panorama, the likes of that. It's not just Mount Allan that should be taken into consideration. The snow conditions of the past couple of years plus the improvement of facilities outside the province have been our major competitors.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order as the minister of tourism. Recognizing the fact that the Edmonton Oilers have placed Edmonton and Alberta at the top of sports world, and in light of the fact that a win on Saturday night in Edmonton would create NHL history by having the Stanley Cup presented to the "winner on Alberta soil for the first time in history, I suggest we re-emphasize our unanimous support for the Edmonton Oilers in their quest for the first ever Stanley Cup by winning that game on Saturday night. [applause]

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have received certain messages from His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, which I now transmit to you.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

[Members of the House stood]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Lieutenant Governor transmits an estimate of an additional sum, not otherwise provided for, required from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund for the 12 months ending March 31, 1985, for the purpose of making investments pursuant to section 6(1)(a) of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act in projects which will provide long-term economic or social benefits to the people of Alberta but which may not necessarily by their nature yield a return to the trust fund, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Please be seated.

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

9. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:
Be it resolved that the Assembly do resolve itself into Committee of Supply, when called, to consider the 1984-85 estimates of proposed investments, No. 2, of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, capital projects division.

[Motion carried]

10. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:
Be it resolved that the messages of His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, the supplementary estimates of expenditure, 1984-85, and all matters connected therewith, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

[Motion carried]

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee of Supply please come to order for consideration of estimates.

Department of Municipal Affairs

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the minister any opening comments?

MR. KOZIAK: Yes I do, Mr. Chairman. Following the theme set forth in the Speech from the Throne, the major thrust in the Department of Municipal Affairs for the 1984-85 fiscal year and following years will be privatization.

I used the word "privatization". I thought that maybe ears would perk up, but conversations kept going on. [interjections]

Privatization in Municipal Affairs is somewhat different than what hon. members might expect. We're not looking at setting local government out to tender, but what we are looking at is having local residents assume responsibility for making their own decisions on a greater and greater basis. I'm talking about the incorporation of improvement districts into organized, incorporated municipalities in this province. We have done studies and made certain moves already, and we expect further moves to be made in the near future.

With respect to improvement district No. 7, which is in the Drumheller valley area of the province and surrounding the city of Drumheller, parts of the improvement district have been carved off and taken into the municipal districts of Kneehill and Starland and the county of Wheatland. Decisions will be made later this year with respect to the remaining portion of the improvement district, which lies in the Drumheller valley. The advisory council for ID 7 is looking at alternatives for that improvement district, and they expect to have their recommendations to me in the course of the next couple of weeks. Those will then be reviewed and a decision made as to the future of ID No. 7.

With respect to improvement district No. 10, we had a series of informative meetings throughout the improvement district earlier this year. I attended a large meeting myself, during which the whole matter of incorporation was discussed. The vast majority of residents in improvement district No. 10 favour assuming responsibility for their own municipal affairs. I understand they've even had a contest and chosen the name Clearwater as the name they would like to identify their new municipal district.

Mr. Chairman, it is our expectation that we can move toward privatization in improvement district No. 10 by legislation in the fall session, with the effective date being January 1, 1985. I say "legislation" because certain circumstances in improvement district No. 10 will require legislation. The fact that a substantial portion of the improvement district is Crown land, which will require provincial involvement in forest fire prevention and control, and other matters, will necessitate legislation to attend to that process.

I have met with the advisory council for improvement district No. 1, and meetings have taken place there as well. Our expectation is that we'll also be able to conclude with incorporation of improvement district No. 1 on January 1, 1985. As members are aware, improvement district No. 1 is in the southeast corner of the province. So those are the moves taking place in that particular area.

We also have some expectations that in the Special Areas of the province we will be able, by legislation, to take some

moves this fall which will shift greater responsibility for local government to the Special Areas. Of course the whole matter of employment will be by the local government rather than by the Department of Municipal Affairs, as provided for in the budget.

We had a discussion during the course of the question period a couple of days ago on the matter of machinery and equipment assessment. That is one of the areas, Mr. Chairman, that . . . I see that the hon. Member for Clover Bar just about lost his seat.

DR. BUCK: I'm overwhelmed.

MR. KOZIAK: That is one of the areas that has to be looked at, Mr. Chairman. During the course of my remarks to the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties this year, and even last fall, I alluded to the fact that we must look at the competitive nature of our industry relative to those they compete with in other areas of the nation and other areas of the world.

Property taxation is one of the areas we must view. In our own studies, we have reached the conclusion that the level of property taxation for petrochemical plants in Alberta would be about three times as high as for comparable plants in Ontario. The reason is simply that in Ontario, machinery and equipment are not assessed, whereas machinery and equipment are assessed in the province of Alberta. I shouldn't say exclusively because, for example, machinery and equipment in the city of Edmonton are not assessed for taxation purposes. So in that particular respect, petrochemical capacity within the city of Edmonton enjoys an advantage it wouldn't in surrounding municipalities.

I have written specifically to 39 municipalities in the province. The 39 were identified by the proportion of machinery and equipment assessment they had in their total assessable package. We found that these 39 had about 10 percent of their total assessment in machinery and equipment, so we specifically wrote to them for their views on what could be done in this whole particular area.

I identified some suggestions in my letter. One would be a return to the historical level of assessment of machinery and equipment. Historically, machinery and equipment were assessed at half of what land and buildings were assessed. In 1980 a shift was made, effective for the 1981 calendar year, which brought the level of machinery and equipment assessment to the same level as land and buildings. So that is one concept we can look at. Another is to exempt from machinery and equipment assessment pollution control equipment and such machinery and equipment that are incorporated within plant structure to accommodate what might otherwise be services provided in a municipality — water, sewer, that type of thing. A third was the matter of adjustments, having regard to the levels of production and the profitability of production. Those are three possibilities I included in my letter to the municipalities, and I invited them to respond with their comments on those and any other suggestions they might have.

Of course when we're talking about assessment, the outstanding issue of assessment of farm residences is one we will have to analyze and deal with over the course of the next number of years. In some cases there may be moves that can be taken earlier. We have to recognize that the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties, in their fall convention last year, had five of their 21 resolutions dealing with this specific issue. They thought it significant enough that in some cases secret ballots were held. It's a very, very contentious issue in some parts of the province, one that we'll have to approach

with a great deal of sympathy for the concerns of the municipalities and for the concerns of the taxpayers in rural Alberta.

This year we introduced a new grant formula, which will be effective for the budget we're reviewing today. The grant formula reflects the wealth of municipalities. While the dollars are unconditional, the number of dollars is calculated on the basis of the number of people living in the municipality and the value of assessment per capita in the municipality. If a particular municipality has an assessment per capita that is less than the provincial average, their grant would be adjusted accordingly and they would receive more. If the assessment per capita were greater than the provincial average, the grant would be adjusted and they would receive less. That is one aspect of the formula which would apply strictly to urban Alberta.

In rural Alberta, the municipal districts and counties, there is another element, and that's roads. That's one of the significant expenditures municipal districts and counties have, so we also take into account the kilometres of road the municipal government has to service. So there's a combination of not only the assessment per capita but also kilometres of road per capita in determining the unconditional grants the municipality will receive.

What we did was provide municipalities with the same basic, basic grant as they had received in the previous year. Then the additional 2 percent provided for in the budget was used to address inequities that had developed in the system over the years. So some municipalities got fairly substantial increases, others moderate increases, and many no increases. Over time we will have to address how we accommodate the shifts. Do we take money away from municipalities that are now receiving more than their fair share based on the formula, to address the needs of those municipalities that are receiving less than their fair share under the formula? Our goal in this year, with the 2 percent increase provided, was to bring everybody to at least 75 percent of their entitlement under the new formula. We achieved that goal, but in the future we would like to be able to shave that down so municipalities are in fact getting closer to 100 percent on both sides of the scale.

The other very significant grant program in the department is the municipal debenture interest rebate program, for which we have \$115 million. The item of information I would like to share with members of the committee is the change in policy — perhaps not a change in policy but an accommodation of new events. We found that municipalities, by circumstances of cash in their hands and interest rates and things like that, were being encouraged to prepay their outstanding debts. In their arrangements with the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation, they didn't have the privilege of prepayment, and the corporation, rightly so, demanded a prepayment penalty. The reason is strictly that the Municipal Financing Corporation did not have prepayment privileges on the money it had borrowed. As a vehicle not having its own funds but just borrowing from another source for relending to the municipalities, it couldn't be put in the position of accepting prepayments and not being able to prepay its own obligations. Because it would have to prepay its own obligations with a penalty, it demanded the same penalty from the municipalities.

We looked at this quite carefully and concluded that it would be beneficial to all concerned if we took the penalty and calculated the entitlement of the municipality pursuant to our municipal debenture interest rebate program. If we used that entitlement to assist the municipality in the prepayment penalty, everybody in the program would benefit. What we would do is calculate the present value of their outstanding entitlements, and if the prepayment penalty was the same or less than that

calculation, we would provide them with a grant to cover their prepayment penalties. In many cases, the examples we've seen to date, the prepayment penalty is less than the present value of outstanding entitlements. So the municipality benefits, and the province benefits in terms of its outstanding obligations for debenture shielding.

In the area of planning, Mr. Chairman, as all members are aware, the feverish level of activity in the province with respect to subdivision and development has mellowed. The level of activity in the planning field has dropped from boom levels to more normal types of responsibilities. We are seeing as well the completion of regional plans. Three out of 10 regional plans have now been approved. First was the Battle River Regional Planning Commission; second, the Southeast Alberta Regional Planning Commission; and just very recently, the Calgary Regional Planning Commission. Once those plans have been approved, of course the level of activity within the regional planning commissions is reduced, so the level of funding for the budgets of regional planning commissions is being adjusted accordingly.

Overall, Mr. Chairman, the department has requested \$370,481,780, which is a .3 percent drop from the previous year; and a manpower reduction of about 2.3 percent, which follows a manpower reduction in the previous year of 2.5 percent, down 19 positions and 21.5 man-years. I expect that if we are successful in our goal of privatization, there will be further, even larger decreases in our manpower requirements in this department over the course of the next year or two. It is my hope that those expectations will be realized.

With those few brief opening comments, Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to entertain the questions, comments, and advice of my colleagues in this committee.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Chairman, first off I would like to commend the minister on his following the provincial policy of privatization. I would like to make a few comments, though, about improvement district No. 1 becoming a municipality. I think it is generally accepted by the people in the municipality that they do have the assessment base and the expertise to form their own government and become their own rulers. As a general rule, they also agree that they are now not entitled to the benefits that improvement districts receive from Municipal Affairs as compared to municipalities.

However, there are some concerns with tax recovery land, and on behalf of my colleague from Cypress, I would like to make you aware of the concerns. It is granted that when the municipality is formed, the tax recovery land becomes the property of the municipality. It is their challenge to handle the tax recovery lands in the best interests of all taxpayers in the county. There are some concerns, though, particularly by large leaseholders, that quarter or half sections of tax recovery land within large tracts of grazing land will be sold to people who wish to cultivate it. It is then the responsibility of the leaseholder to fence that land out of his lease, because of our Stray Animals Act, and it will cause economic ranch units to become less than economic.

I had a ratepayer from the ID, who lives in my constituency, up on Tuesday with these concerns. He was representing approximately 14 leaseholders in that area. He had some alternatives, and one of them was that tax recovery land be purchased by the Crown and be left as Crown grazing land. I understand that this possibility is not well accepted by the Department of Municipal Affairs — only on environmentally sensitive land that shouldn't be cultivated at any time. Of course this particular delegate accepted that as probably the rationale they would be looking at.

His second alternative was that they trade the tax recovery land that is held within large tracts of grazing land, for Crown land that people wish to buy. A trade could be made in that respect. I feel that is quite possible in some cases. It would relieve some of the concerns of those people.

The third proposal he had was that they place a price on tax recovery land for land that would be cultivated and a different price for land that would be used for grazing. If that were possible, they were suggesting that a caveat be put on land that was priced as grazing land. If this land were ever cultivated, the buyer would have to pay the difference in price. The real concern in that respect is that land used for grazing makes it uneconomical for land that is cultivated. If the new council of the MD takes into consideration the cost of municipal services to native grassland used strictly for grazing and to land used for cultivation, I believe the difference in price is something that should be acceptable.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few comments on the assessment of machinery and equipment, particularly on behalf of the municipal councils in my constituency. They certainly agree that we don't want to make an assessment on machinery and equipment that makes it a disadvantage for oil companies to work in Alberta. In one county I'm quite aware of, the assessment for pipe and power line in particular, but also for machinery and equipment, makes up quite a large portion of the total assessment. To put an assessment on machinery and equipment that is not acceptable to the oil companies would be like killing the goose that laid the golden egg, and they recognize that. I believe they would find it quite acceptable to go back to 50 percent of the percentage of assessment on all other kinds of assessment. In other words, if it's 65 percent on land and pipelines, for instance, they would go back to 32.5 percent on machinery and equipment. They would find that quite [acceptable].

Mr. Chairman, I'm certainly looking forward to the debate concerning assessment on farm homes. Because of the large variety of types of assessment in Alberta, farm home assessment would have a different effect on particular municipalities. In particular, in a municipality that has probably 85 percent of its assessment in farmland, assessing farm homes would make very little difference in the bottom-line tax dollar; whereas in a municipality that has perhaps 60 percent of its assessment in industry, in pipe and power lines, putting the total farm assessment on farm homes would probably make the farm people at that time subsidize industry, in the total revenue of the municipality.

With those few comments, Mr. Chairman, I would again like to commend the minister on his way of handling the Department of Municipal Affairs. I think we should approve his budget.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, the opportunity to make a few comments with respect to the estimates of the Minister of Municipal Affairs is always a welcome high point of the spring estimate season. I must say at the outset that I've always found the Minister of Municipal Affairs to be a rather open-minded fellow, albeit one who perhaps sometimes wants to give you an answer when you don't necessarily want the kind of answer he wants to give you at a particular time. So what I'm inviting him to do this morning is listen to several comments I want to make on a couple of issues and get back to me at a later date. I'm not looking for a definitive answer this morning. I'm giving him a couple of challenges and asking him to think about them and see how he might get back to me later with some solutions to two particular problems.

The first deals with the disfranchisement of a certain group of Alberta property owners — and I repeat that, the disfranchisement of a certain group of Alberta property owners — particularly those who live in summer villages, which are a kind of unique creation in our province. Within the constituency I represent, we have perhaps a half dozen summer villages. Recently I've had an opportunity to meet with some of the permanent residents who live in the summer villages of Yellowstone and Ross Haven.

I guess the scenario in the operational procedures we have in our province for dealing with summer villages is that in midsummer, usually the residents, both permanent and unpermanent, get together and elect a summer village council. That usually becomes their one mandated election that goes on. However, there is a difficulty, because it's my understanding that when it comes to municipal elections in the larger municipality within which the summer village tends to be located — the ones that are held every three years and mandated by statute — all residents of that municipality have an opportunity to vote for a councillor. When you exist and have summer villagers living in a county area, those residents are voting for a councillor who will serve not only on the municipal board but also on the county board of education. In the case of permanent residents who live within a summer village, they unfortunately do not seem to have an opportunity to exercise a ballot, because their elected group is elected in midsummer. Of course these permanent residents pay school supplementary tax and are rather concerned that they do not have a franchise.

I'm not sure what the history of all of this is and how we got to a situation where permanent residents who live within a summer village environment do not have an opportunity to vote and exercise a ballot in a municipal election — how this has all come about. I can appreciate that those permanent residents should not really have an opportunity to exercise two ballots, one for their summer village council and also one for the municipal representative that would represent a larger division. The difficulty in the county environment is that if they don't have a chance and an opportunity to exercise their ballot in these elections every three years in October, they also don't have a chance to vote for a school board representative.

I'm not sure how we come about resolving this problem. But this morning we'll be asked to take a look at the estimates of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and they'll be a rather large amount of money. What I'd like to do this morning is highlight this concern, bring it to the attention of the minister, and ask him to use some of the dollars he has within the large portfolio we're going to be approving this morning, to take a look at that concern and certainly by the spring of 1985 come back here with a definitive answer of the procedures we can take in resolving this concern. Essentially I recognize — and repeat again, not to be too redundant, recognize — that a permanent resident of a summer village should not have the opportunity to exercise a ballot for two municipal representatives. The difficulty is, how does that permanent resident exercise a ballot for the election of a school board representative?

In the case of Ross Haven and Yellowstone, two summer villages I've been dealing with, the school supplementary requisition is rather significant in terms of dollars. In fact it is probably more than 50 percent of their total municipal tax bill, and it becomes a rather acute concern. These people are very interested in education, don't have an opportunity to voice their concern, and want an opportunity. We need to find a very definitive answer. I'm sure the Minister of Municipal Affairs would agree that while we may have the responsibility and the right to pay taxes in this province, certainly we must also have the responsibility and the right to exercise a ballot in terms of

approval or disapproval of the representatives who are raising those taxes.

The second item deals with the operation of the Alberta Planning Board. I think it goes without saying that every MLA in this Legislature gets a number of opportunities each year to meet with constituents who have made subdivision applications to the local governing authority and had that application perhaps disagreed with. They have appealed it to the Alberta Planning Board, and they may or may not have had an opportunity to go and present something. But the gist of it all is that at the conclusion of it, when a decision is made by the Alberta Planning Board, where do they go if they are still in disagreement?

In particular I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Municipal Affairs one particular order. It's Alberta Planning Board order 250-S-84 and Alberta Planning Board file 83-YH-130. I appreciate that the minister will not be in a position to get back to me this morning. But I am going to give him fair warning that I expect an answer sometime in the next month or two, because I think it's a matter of some considerable importance. Essentially the situation is that there was a death in the family of a constituent of mine. Part of the will was a decision that a block of land 160 acres in area was to be sold and cash was to accrue to the estate. Members of the same family, long established in agriculture on the quarter section of land adjoining both these families, exercised the option of purchasing the land. So what you had was two adjoining families, all relatives, purchasing a parcel of land, whose decision was dictated by an estate, a will, a deceased person. They purchased 160 acres.

Two very good families, each with their own families in turn, then decided that what they would really like to do is take that 160 acres and have it subdivided into two 80-acre parcels so each of the two families and their children would then have that as part of their holdings. So in the event that there was another death someplace down the line, they would have their wills in order and everything in place. They made an application to the local county of Lac Ste. Anne, who basically decided that because of one of their bylaws — which I think is kind of a weak bylaw, and they now tell me they are going to look at changing it — with respect to usage of agricultural land and subdivision, they couldn't recommend in favour of it. It went to the Yellowhead regional planning board, who in turn simply echoed the views of the county of Lac Ste. Anne. On my advice it eventually went to the Alberta Planning Board for final appeal.

The appeal was held a couple of months ago, and a number of exhibits were read and dealt with by the Alberta appeal board. Unfortunately, the Alberta appeal board ignored one very important exhibit. That exhibit was a letter from the Member of the Legislative Assembly for the constituency of Barrhead, who took a considerable amount of time in ascertaining all the facts in this matter, recognizing that there are people concerns that we as elected people must be very much aware of. To repeat, I took a considerable amount of time to write a very informative, factual, to-the-point letter. When my constituents arrived at the meeting before the Alberta Planning Board, they noted during the discussion that there were a number of exhibits entered into the case. There was no letter written by the MLA for Barrhead.

The Alberta Planning Board then ruled on the matter, upheld the other groups, and basically said, you cannot get the subdivision. So here is the situation now. Because of a death in a family, a parcel of land is willed to be dealt with in a certain way. Other members of the family have retained that parcel of agricultural land within all their holdings and are very concerned about their own estate planning. They are people in their

late 50s or early 60s. They are family farms. They simply want to have the 160-acre parcel divided between the two families — all used for agricultural purposes, absolutely no other change in anything else — as part of their own individual portfolios.

My concern to the minister is, number one, I would like the minister to get back to me with an explanation as to why the letter from the MLA for the constituency of Barrhead, a very important piece of information in this whole matter, was not entered into the appeal board hearing, why this piece of information was ignored. Secondly, I would like the Minister of Municipal Affairs to inform me — and again, it doesn't have to be this morning — what the next step is in terms of our appeal with respect to this whole matter. I daresay I think it would be absolutely costly and absolutely foolish from a bureaucratic point of view for me to be told by the Minister of Municipal Affairs that I now have to go back to my constituents who, in the tragedy of a death and the requirements of good estate planning and everything else, are then told that they have to go all the way back and begin the whole process of implementation again. It would require a meeting with the local county of Lac Ste. Anne, a meeting with the Yellowhead Regional Planning Commission, and finally a meeting with the Alberta Planning Board.

Surely there has to be another appeal mechanism or a higher court. If that higher court is the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I daresay I would trust his judgment. I think he has tended to be a fair-minded individual who is very empathetic with the concerns of people. I am sure he would recognize that the existing law is a guide to all of us, but knows full well and recognizes that there are certain situations where the law can be a quote that I can't use in this particular Assembly. It's a matter that I would like the minister to look at. Just so he doesn't forget, I'll repeat once again. It's Alberta Planning Board order 250-S-84, dated April 9, 1984.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, my colleague will be dealing with other aspects of Municipal Affairs, but I want to deal specifically with the land tenure program, in particular as it applies to Little Buffalo, in the northern part of the province. During the course of the estimates of Executive Council, the Premier filed with the library a petition from people who were not happy with the concerns of the Lubicon for a reserve and people who apparently supported the government's land tenure program. In fairness I think it would be appropriate, as we deal with the land tenure program, to read into the record the letter that was filed the other day in the House. It was a letter to me, and it says as follows:

On April 16 . . . Premier Lougheed tabled a letter in the Provincial Legislature, supposedly on behalf of the non-status people of Little Buffalo Lake. This letter was neither factual nor did it truly represent the non-status people of Little Buffalo Lake.

I therefore wrote the Premier a letter, dated April 26, 1984, in which I advised the Premier of the real situation, and the non-status people of Little Buffalo Lake sent him a petition advising him that the letter which he had tabled did not represent them, nor their position nor their views.

We presumed that the Premier would want to correct the misinformation which he'd provided the Provincial Legislature, as soon as possible. However the Premier is apparently not as concerned as we thought he would be, since he has taken no action to table either my letter or the petition of the non-status people of Little Buffalo Lake.

even though the non-status people specifically requested that he table their petition, in order to set the record straight.

We are concerned that the members of the Legislative Assembly are provided with the facts, so that their deliberations will be guided by the truth, instead of by the misinformation which was tabled and circulated by the Premier.

We would therefore like to request that you table my letter and the petition of the non-status people, on our behalf, as soon as possible.

Thank you.

That's signed by the chief of the Lubicon Lake Band.

Mr. Chairman, I think the April 20 statement of the nonstatus people of the Cree community of Little Buffalo might well be read into the record too.

The attached letter to the Honourable Julian Koziak, dated April 12, 1984, does not represent our views, our position or the facts as we know them, even though it includes our names and was supposedly written on our behalf.

Our real position is that we claim aboriginal rights to our traditional area, along with the members of the Lubicon Lake Indian Band, and we strongly support Chief Bernard Ominayak and our other community leaders in their efforts to have our legitimate land rights recognized.

The attached letter represents only the political position of three or four families in our community who, for whatever reasons, have agreed to work with Provincial officials trying to undermine and subvert our legitimate land rights. These people ... have no regard for the truth. They do not represent us. They do not represent anyone but themselves.

Mr. Chairman, this particular petition is signed by a number of people. I have filed it with the Assembly. But I read it into the record at this time because it seems to me that if we are going to address the question of the land tenure program — and that is something which has been the subject of a good deal of controversy — it's perhaps only correct, Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman, that we have as much factual information as possible.

I regret that we are in this unfortunate controversy. I regret that very much, because I believe the people of the Lubicon Lake reserve have made a plea, that in some respect has echoed through the generations, for simple justice. Members may have had an opportunity to watch part or all of the *CBC Journal* program on the Lubicon people.

Mr. Chairman, we've had all kinds of stickhandling in this House on the Lubicon matter. But as we consider the estimates of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the basic question we have to ask ourselves is: is it fair to move ahead with the creation of a hamlet and with a tenure program where two-acre lots are provided to individuals, when these individuals have been advised through their legal counsel that the acceptance of those two-acre lots could prejudice their aboriginal claims? Mr. Chairman, neither the minister, nor I, nor you, nor members of the Assembly, nor other people who might be interested — the World Council of Churches to name one organization that has received a good deal of the publicity on this issue — are perhaps in a position to be completely definitive on what the ultimate legal implications of the land tenure program may be.

Because there is a good deal of doubt, and because there was doubt several years ago before this minister took over the Department of Municipal Affairs, when the government proceeded with the decision to go ahead with the hamlet and undertake the land tenure program despite the opposition of the

band, what we have is just another source of irritation as it applies to that area of the province. I'm not surprised that when the tax notices were sent out, as I understand it as I look over the correspondence I have here in my file, the government received back the bulk of the tax notices. Both the status people — that is, those people who eventually would be counted as part of the Lubicon Band — as well as a significant majority of the nonstatus people would like to see a resolution of this issue.

Mr. Chairman, we had a debate over the question when the Premier appeared before the committee a few weeks ago. I have yet to see any evidence that this government has done anything to follow through on its responsibilities, other than to take an extremely narrow, legalistic approach to the entire issue. We know there's a lot of money at stake. We know we're talking about certainly tens of millions of dollars in royalties, perhaps even more than that. But we have a government that likes to tell us there are principles which are more important than money. The other day we had the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care talk about principles, and we've had other ministers across the way talk about principles. I think there's a principle at stake here in the way we handle the claims of the Lubicon. The principle is that we should act in a generous way, despite the fact that there are perhaps many millions of dollars at stake. I think the principle of equity and fairness that I raised when we debated the issue before is as relevant this morning as it was a few weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman, I know that some of the government members became a bit exercised when the World Council of Churches came out with their report and suggested that genocide was taking place — obviously not genocide in the Keegstra holocaust sense. No one is suggesting that. Not for an anthropologist, but for some of the people in that field, their definition of genocide is the extinguishing of a people not in the physical sense but in a cultural sense. For a band who have traditionally earned their livelihood by hunting, trapping, and fishing, who have lived in a remote part of the province for generations, there is that concern that their way of life will be extinguished. Call it anything you want.

One of the moments I think I will remember — probably long after I've forgotten many of the cuts and thrusts or whatever we have in this House — will be an observation by the young chief of the Lubicons who, if any of the members have met him, is an extremely able person and a tough defender of his people. Let me tell you, I wish he were negotiating with Chem-Security instead of the Minister of the Environment. Nevertheless, he made an observation I thought was both poignant and correct when he said: if we end up with this so-called development and we all get our two-acre lots, then we sell them and end up moving to High Prairie or Edmonton, and my family ends up on welfare, you might just as well take a gun and shoot me. Because I will have lost all dignity; I will have lost all pride; I will have lost what it is that makes me a man.

Mr. Chairman, I think one has to respect the differences in the cultural mosaic we see in this nation. This Minister of Municipal Affairs probably has a better grasp of the cultural mosaic than most members of the government. I think one of the things this government has done well is to pay more recognition to the cultural mosaic of this province than was the case in the past. I support moves in that direction. But just as we must recognize the contribution of cultures as people came from parts of eastern Europe or other parts of the world and have enriched the mosaic that is Alberta in 1984, for those people who still have distinctive cultural traditions that are related to a life-style they wish to retain, it seems to me that we must not only go the first mile but we must be prepared to go some-

what further than that in order to accommodate people who wish to preserve a way of life.

I have attempted not to be partisan about this, Mr. Chairman. Frankly, I know enough about the politics of this province to be able to tell the members of the committee that there are very few votes in a just settlement for the Lubicon people. But that's not the issue. The question is not whether or not there are votes in it, whether or not it's popular, or whether or not every statement made by every person who has been part of this debate is totally defensible. It is whether what we are doing is fair and reasonable. I've stayed away from some of the accusations the WCC has made about the land tenure program, because I understand that is now under investigation by the Ombudsman. I think that's where it should stay — under investigation by the Ombudsman until he has made a report — and a debate on that in the committee would probably not be useful.

My appeal to the minister, and through the minister to the members of the committee and especially to the government, is for us to step aside from the mind-set that has locked us into a narrow, legalistic approach to dealing with what I think is an issue that should be handled on the basis of compassion, concern for life-style, and the pursuit of an equitable and fair settlement. Mr. Chairman, I offer those comments to the minister in that vein. Regrettably I'm not going to be able to stay until he perhaps has an opportunity at the end of session this morning to respond to the many points that were made. But I want to leave those observations with the government.

There are many other aspects of Municipal Affairs. On the question of moving towards more effective autonomy for improvement districts, I would certainly welcome any move in that direction. I think improvement district representatives have a lot of problems to deal with that sometimes people in the more settled areas — that is, municipal and county councillors — don't have. At least in the north, they have the added problems of having to put in roads where there have never been roads and this kind of demand — I know the road programs that improvement districts such as 19, 20, or 21 have to deal with. Where do you draw the line between who gets a road and who doesn't? It's one thing when you can follow school bus objectives, but when you get beyond that, there are some difficult decisions that have to be made.

I know the local representatives elected in 19, 20, and 21, the three improvement districts I have the pleasure of working with and representing in this House, do an excellent job. I think I would be less than fulfilling my responsibility if I didn't acknowledge the work they do, as of course do all other local elected people. But perhaps there is an added role for improvement district representatives. If we can move towards a little more autonomy that gives them that additional status, I for one would like to see us press on in that direction. It was certainly an improvement. I forget the election — I think it was 1974, and the minister can correct me if I'm wrong — when we moved away from the appointment of ID representatives to their actual election, district by district. That was certainly a step in the right direction. I think it gave the improvement district representative more satisfaction in knowing that he or she was actually chosen by constituents to represent them on the local improvement district board.

Having made those comments, Mr. Chairman, I must express my regrets in advance that I won't be able to be here for the minister's scintillating response, but I know I have some opposition colleagues who will have equally scintillating observations that they will want to make, to keep the minister absolutely on the edge of his chair, waiting for every word and paying full attention.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I would first like to compliment the minister on the way he's handled his department. In the dealings we've had in doing away with ID 7, he's been very straightforward and honest with the people. Although some people don't agree with doing away with the ID, they respect the way he's handled it, aboveboard and honestly.

I have some concerns, Mr. Minister, about the assessment of industrial machinery. I'd just like to bring to your attention, and I'm sure you probably know about it at this time, the effect that will be felt in one of the municipalities I represent. Just looking at the 1983 figures for the assessment in the municipal district of Rocky View, if the machinery and industrial assessment is done away with 100 per cent, it will mean a loss in revenue of \$3,254,000 to that municipality. In order to bring that back to where it was, there will be an increase of 32 percent in the taxes on residential farms and nonresidential property. In this day and age on the farm, and even on the residence, that's quite a large increase unless we have some way of counteracting it.

I know that's not the only proposal the minister has out. He has sent out three to the municipalities. One is a 50 percent reduction, and that would bring about a decrease of \$1.628 million in revenue to the MD of Rocky View and an increase of 13.6 percent in the residential farm and nonresidential taxes, which is still fairly high. At the present time within the MD, the mill rate for residential is 12.5 mills, farm is 14.3, nonresidential is 16.6, and machinery and equipment is 16.6. If we go to 100 percent reduction, to bring in the same amount of revenue the mill rates for residential will change from 12.5 to 16.5, the farm from 14.3 to 18.8, and nonresidential from 16.6 to 21.9.

One of the other municipalities I represent is the county of Wheatland. I don't have the corresponding figures on how this will affect them, but they have some concern over it. I've had a meeting with them and, in talking to them, industrial assessment in the county of Wheatland makes up approximately 50 percent of their total tax revenue. Sixty-five percent of that 50 percent is on machinery and equipment. So I have to think that the effect in the county of Wheatland would be even greater than it is in the MD of Rocky View. They have some concerns. It's like the province all of a sudden losing its revenue from the oil industry. It's going to make quite a difference in the services they can supply or the taxes that will have to be placed on the municipalities.

If I could see where farmers could benefit with cheaper fertilizer, say, from the Cominco plant in the county of Wheatland, I would be all for this. I had a meeting with the Cominco people early last fall before the session started and asked them about the new assessment. They were concerned because the new assessment was going to affect them to a certain extent. They said, however, that because of the cheap gas here in Alberta, they could compete as far as they could transport it, and it was only the transportation that kept them from competing in the States in fertilizer and other products they sell from that plant. At the present time, they say they can compete as far as northern California, so I didn't think that was too bad. Not only can they compete but they said they are pushing their opposition. I wonder whether this relief in taxation to these people would result in lower fertilizer costs and product costs to our own people here, where we sometimes pay even more than they sell it for in the States, and if the minister has any other plans or any other way we could look at this situation.

One of the reasons their tax is high is because they pay the foundation school tax, where residential and farm property is exempt. Maybe we could look at taking the foundation tax off the machinery assessment as well as their buildings and land.

That might make some relief for them, if we want to encourage industry in Alberta, and I'm all for that. Although I'm for encouraging industry in Alberta, I would like to say that I'm not for rural people paying the shot all by themselves to encourage this. If the minister could address that in his remarks, I will be waiting with interest.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make one or two comments this morning. It's certainly a move in the right direction to give the IDs some or all of their autonomy. I would like to say to the minister that I'm quite familiar with the little community of La Crete, which I believe is served by an ID. Of course their complaints are always: we have to check with High Level, and High Level has to check with someone else. I was there when they were putting in their water and sewer. They seemed to feel that whoever was responsible for the program was not really looking after their best interests, because somebody up there was looking after what was going on down in La Crete. I guess it just brings home to the minister why people at the local level should be looking after things.

I know there were a lot of complaints from local citizens about the way that system was put in place. When the local people start seeing some of these engineers trying to make water run uphill that's traditionally been running downhill, and still runs downhill, they're a little concerned about the engineering and the supervision of that facility. That's certainly a move in the right direction, but I have to smile when we talk about that being privatization. My understanding of privatization is that I compete against you as a private entrepreneur, not that we have a government agency. I really have a little trouble with the Tory understanding of privatization.

I would also like to . . . [interjection] No, that's right, Stan. I still can't understand how Calgary survived with the high quality of aldermen it's had the last couple of terms. I guess they were smart enough to move some of those people to the Legislature, and they have some new ones in place. Anyway, that's another story.

The situation with the water commissions, Mr. Minister. I know that the Vegreville water pipeline — I'd like to know what assistance there will be to a community such as Bruderheim, that has had water problems for many, many years. They went about three miles west, I believe, and hit an underground river and had a water supply like they never had. That cost them a lot of money. Now they have to hook into the new pipeline. That community is always struggling, trying to make ends meet. I'd just like to know how the Department of Municipal Affairs will be able to amortize the debt load they have. I'm not sure — I know that applied in a small way to the town of Lamont as well. I'd just like to know how it's going to affect some of these other communities.

In question period. Mr. Chairman, I also raised the fears the town of Vegreville has. If it's going to have to amortize the \$27 million the pipeline cost, water is going to be \$10 per 1,000 gallons. That's almost as expensive as soda water or beer. It's certainly of concern to the people along that pipeline. Of course the minister is well aware of the concerns that have been expressed as far as the regional system of treating sewage. Those small municipalities are worried about — will they be able to handle the costs. Those are areas the minister is certainly going to have to look into.

I think we have to look back a little in the history of the evolution of the counties and municipalities. We went from the municipal structure to the county structure. I well remember when my father, who was on municipal council at that time, came home and said: it looks like we won't have any money

for roads this year, because the school board came in with their requisition and said here it is; that's how much you have to give us; if you have any money left over, do what you have to do. Of course once we went to the county system, the school board and the municipal board got together under the county system to try to make the most effective use of the dollars they had. I so well remember my father also saying: we're hoping to get a grant for this road, or we're hoping to get a grant for that road. So it wasn't just this government that had these conditional grants; it was the previous government too.

The councillors at the local level used to always think it was sort of [manna] coming down from heaven, because you got a grant to do a local road. It seems that councillors forget that that was their money, even though it came from the provincial government. When local councillors are standing there bowing when we open a new hospital or when we do something about thanking the government for doing such and such, I always remind them: don't thank the government, because we are the government, at the municipal or provincial level; it is our money; it is not the government's money. Of course the longer the government stays in, they start thinking it is their money. Little by little the municipalities in this province are finding out that you don't go cap in hand to this government. They're starting to understand a little more about the power politics this government practises. They're now starting to operate that way, so they don't come cap in hand quite as much as they did from '71 until now.

The situation of the assessment of machinery and equipment is of course a two-edged sword, especially in municipalities such as mine, where so much of the income to the town of Fort Saskatchewan comes from the industries that are within that jurisdiction. With the recession being what it is, the corporations that have to pay the taxes are looking at their balance ledgers and having quite a time making ends meet. It's one of those situations where no one wants to pay and the other one doesn't want to give up the revenue. Of course the same thing applies to the county of Strathcona and all the other counties that have large industrial assessments.

The situation of keeping assessment current. I would like to know from the minister what has been done in the last three, four, or five years. I know that when you speak to constituents and to taxpayers, when they go for many, many years and their assessment has not been made current and then they have a new assessment, they get a gigantic increase in their taxes. Maybe you went along in years one, two, three, four, or five on the old assessment, and then, bingo, they catch up to you. It's always much more difficult, as a taxpayer, to pay that after the new assessment comes in. I would like to know from the minister, in this day of computers, how current our assessments are kept. From what I understand, speaking to other jurisdictions, I believe British Columbia has gone a long way in keeping their assessments current.

Another area is, what is the department going to do about towns that are literally broke? We saw the plea made by the town of Stony Plain, that got involved in the development of light industrial parks. The recommendation by the convention — I forget the abbreviation, but the minister knows the one where the recommendation was made — was to help the town of Stony Plain. I'm sure the government can't go around bailing out every municipality. Most of the time, municipal and town councils make decisions in good faith, on the information that is available to them at the time. I don't think we in this Assembly are any more brilliant than the people at the local level; it's just that we have the heritage trust fund. If we make a few boondoggles, we just crank another \$25 million out of the fund. If we want to build Mount Allan or Kananaskis, we just take

another couple of hundred million. We're big operators. But the people at the local level just can't operate that way, so some of these towns and villages are in bad financial shape. I'd like to know how many communities are in situations similar to Stony Plain's, where they went ahead with these projects and got into financial difficulties.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

I'd also like to know what is going to be done for Grand Centre, a community that was told: go, boys, because there's going to be a big \$10 billion project up there. Those municipalities took the advice of the government and went ahead and started putting in some of the infrastructure. The government helped and encouraged them. It will also be interesting to see what happens with the private Bill on the Grand Centre expropriation situation, where the municipality expropriated the land and the judgment went against the town when it went to court. They have to pick up the interest plus pay for the land that was expropriated.

If the government, in its wisdom, goes ahead with the private Bill, then again someone is going to be hurt. Bringing in retroactive legislation is not the way for a government to get rid of a problem. That has been brought to my attention, and I know it's a situation the government will have to deal with. So possibly the minister can find out how many towns in this province are in bad financial shape.

When we talked about privatization, I found it very interesting when the Minister of Transportation told us that in this new program for sidewalks, streets, and so on, the minister was going to decide which municipality could proceed and which couldn't. I don't think that's privatization, even the way the Tories call privatization. If we've given the municipalities the authority to go ahead and make applications, if they fit within the purview of the rules, then that municipality should be able to go ahead. Of course some of these smaller municipalities have equipment that can do some of these programs. So the taxpayers' equipment is going to be sitting there and we're playing these games, saying, you must use the private sector. Certainly we should use the private sector. But if the equipment is sitting there and the staff is there, I find it really quite amusing to say, you must do such and such, if we believe in local autonomy.

Mr. Chairman, the suggestion the minister made about the exemption of pollution control equipment and some of these situations is certainly a move in the right direction. If we're going to keep encouraging industry not to violate the environment, that's certainly a move in the right direction. The minister said it's one area they're looking at, and it certainly has merit.

The situation in the county of Strathcona, where a certain portion of the assessment base was taken away because of the annexation order. I would like to know from the minister how the humps and bumps are being smoothed out in the transition from that being part of the county of Strathcona and of some of the surrounding counties, and what is being done to make sure that transition is made as smoothly as possible.

I would also like to find out — and I raised this question in question period also — what is being done for the small businesses and people that have been assessed city of Edmonton rates. Some of these small businesses have suffered greatly. I can tell you that I'm really glad I'm half a mile from the new city limits, Mr. Minister. I certainly wouldn't be thinking about building a golf course if I were in the confines of the city of Edmonton, because the taxes would kill me. That's one time it's a great advantage to be outside the city limits. I've had many people call me on what is going to happen after a certain

transition period. These people have said, am I going to be hurt? Of course in the annexation discussion we were promised that we would have the same level of service; it would not deteriorate. I would like to know what concerns have been expressed to the minister by the people who have been affected by the annexation order.

With those few words, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the minister that it's a department that should be higher profile, and we should pay more attention to it than we seem to. I know that when I was a member of government caucus, Municipal Affairs was a very high priority department. Maybe that's why they've given the new minister that job, trying to raise the profile of the department. Or maybe the minister is still shell shocked from being Minister of Education, and they thought they'd like to give him something a little less controversial than the Department of Education. But it is a department that affects every person in the province, and it's a department that requires a lot of work. There are areas where you can't win. The person who pays the taxes always thinks they're too high, and the municipality that gets the taxes always thinks they haven't got enough money. We're so used to going to big brother under the dome here and saying, we want some more grants.

Of course the situation with grants — I don't think we will ever get to the stage, unless we change governments, where we get rid of the conditional grants and go almost exclusively to unconditional grants. I remember a talk given one time by the good Tory supporter of this government, Dr. Richard Plain: we could get rid of about 40 percent of the people in the minister's department if we went to unconditional grants, because we wouldn't have to run around policing to make sure the grants got into the right slot for the right usage. So if we want to really do some privatization, Mr. Minister, we can go into revenue sharing and into unconditional grants. Then we could certainly save a lot of paper shuffling and a lot of policing.

Mr. Chairman, we have come a long, long way from the times of the little municipalities evolving into the county system. Another question: can the minister find out and indicate how many counties, as opposed to MDs, we have in our rural areas?

AN HON. MEMBER: Thirty.

DR. BUCK: Thirty counties. How many MDs? [interjection] Eighteen MDs. The municipality I live in right now, Sturgeon, is a municipal district. I'd just like to know if the MDs are looking at moving into the county system, or are some of the counties looking at going back to the municipal district system? When we first went into the county system, we thought that was going to solve all the problems.

Mr. Chairman, that's a rather rambling discourse on the Department of Municipal Affairs. Some of these things are areas I've been concerned with, so I look forward to the minister making some comments on some of these.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go into three general areas. It's always good to talk to my old friend from university days, have a nice little discussion with him in the Legislature. I'd like to go into three general areas to begin with, if I may: general government relationships with municipalities, jobs, and financial relationships of the provincial government with municipalities; and then come to some general questions.

To deal with relationships, Mr. Chairman, it seems not only to me but to many people in the province that we've had some difficulties in terms of the perception about the relationship between the two levels of government. I could go back to a

very famous statement made by a former cabinet minister, that basically local governments are the children, if you like, of the province — perhaps an unfortunate statement, but it was made. I think many people I talk to, especially at the local government level, still feel that perhaps they are treated as children by the government.

Mr. Chairman, I also recognize that there is not just one government minister in charge of this, because of course municipalities deal with many, many different departments. I'm well aware of that. But as the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I think this particular minister is on the cutting edge, if you like, and is a big indicator of how well governments are working together. I think the minister would agree that it's to the advantage of all Albertans if our levels of government work together and co-operate and are generally on the same wavelength.

Obviously there are going to be differences from time to time; there's no doubt about that. I suppose we could say the same at the federal and provincial levels, but in this capacity I'm talking about local government along with provincial government. There seems to be an attitude, and I want to come to this, that the provincial government, whether it's fair or unfair — I'm sure the minister is aware of it. Often they feel they are treated at best, if you like, as junior partners and that the directives come down from the provincial government and that's the way it is. I know that's perhaps not always the case, but I know it's a perception.

It's not only mine, Mr. Chairman; I'm sure the minister is aware of it. I recall the president of the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association dealing with a press release earlier in the spring, and I have it here. Mr. Hayter had just come back from Saskatchewan. He'd been viewing the proceedings there, and there are various things he said. I think it's important, because if this is a perception of the president, then I suggest we're in some difficulty.

Basically, the start of it was that he said the Lougheed government should follow the lead of its Saskatchewan counterpart — I know this government doesn't like to follow the lead of anybody — in its dealings with municipalities. Then he goes on to say that he'd been attending the annual convention of the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association; this is why the president came back and made this statement. I think this quote is significant. Again, maybe the minister will say that it's his perception and that the minister's perception is different. But I remind the minister that this is the president of the Alberta Urban Municipalities and obviously a person that has some clout and is taking some direction from members of the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association. I quote from this press release. Mr. Chairman:

"There's a far more positive attitude toward municipal government in Saskatchewan," he stated. "The Saskatchewan government treats SUMA as a partner in the development and consideration of policy and legislation. No legislation affecting municipalities is introduced by the government until it has been reviewed on a confidential basis by SUMA ..."

which is the Saskatchewan model shortened.

"The government also involves SUMA in major economic strategy sessions."

Mr. Chairman, this is after the president came back from a Saskatchewan convention. He goes on to say: "Consultation should be an ongoing joint process, not just when the province thinks it's necessary". He goes on to talk about the Saskatchewan government's respect. He talks about the fact that Premier Devine spoke at the convention. It seemed to him, at least, observing it, that there was much more of a partnership.

But he goes on to say — and I think this is the nub of what we're talking about. Again I'm quoting the president; I'm not making this up:

"That kind of attitude has been missing in Alberta. The Province seems to 'tolerate' municipal government rather than give it the kind of respect and consideration essential to an effective and productive relationship."

The president goes on to say that SUMA directors were astonished to learn that in recent years the Alberta association has been deprived of the opportunity to meet annually with the Premier and the cabinet. He says, and I quote, because it's a good quote:

If that occurred in Saskatchewan, there would be a riot.

It would be considered the ultimate insult, and that's the way we should look upon it too.

He's asking is that they meet with the shakers, if you like — the Premier and the cabinet, including the minister — rather than with a caucus committee. Mr. Hayter goes on to say their group represents some 81 percent of the population of Alberta, representing the grass roots. They think they at least deserve the respect of talking to the Premier about major things.

My general question flowing from this, to make this at least a step in the right direction — and I know, Mr. Chairman, that it's perhaps a perception — will this minister make representation to the cabinet so they can go back to the old ways, that municipal government, the AUMA, if you like, be given the opportunity to make its annual presentation to the Premier and cabinet, rather than to the caucus committee? This is something they want. I know the minister can't make a suggestion here for the whole cabinet; he has to go to the cabinet. But I'm asking if he will make representation to his cabinet colleagues to bring this back. It seems to me that that would be a good way to start. As I understand it, going from the press release and what you see in the media, the AUMA wants to make it abundantly clear that they are ready and willing to actively participate in the discussion and review of legislation and provincial strategy.

As we've said, if they make decisions in a unilateral way at the federal level, without consultation with the province, especially, say, in economic development, we know it's not going to be as successful. If we have all partners, if you like, at the federal/provincial level going in the same direction and at least discussing goals, it's going to be more effective in an economic strategy. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the same thing would be clear if we have municipal governments and our provincial government going in the same direction — I suppose all three levels going in the same direction, or at least discussing when we can't agree.

So I think that's a very important thing. I raise it with the minister not in a malicious way. But when the president is saying this, I'm sure the minister would agree that it's serious if they feel that. I hope the minister will take that somewhat under advisement and see what we as a government can do to improve that relationship, so all Albertans are better; in other words, a need for more consultation, more input, and more respect, that they say they're not given.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go into the second area, if I may, and that is to deal generally with jobs. I do not need to tell the minister — he knows I've said it many times in the House, and I do not need to say it to him — what we do to people in a psychological and social sense, in an economic sense. I do not need to go through all the arguments. But I remind the minister that in two of our major cities right now the official unemployment rate, not including the hidden unemployed — we don't know how many they are. The minister and I represent seats in this city, and I know he's concerned

that we have a 14.3 percent unemployment rate. Our neighbour to the south, as the minister is well aware, is not quite as high, but it's rising. It was up to 13.1 percent. The province as a whole is a little over 12 percent.

So it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that one of the priorities we as government should be looking at is how best the two levels of government can work together, if you'd like, to see what we can do to put people back to work and to create jobs. I suggest to the minister that our municipal partners are crucial to creating jobs and economic growth, and I don't think the minister would disagree with that. So it comes back to that need for a working partnership; not a junior partner, but equal partners working together to solve some of the severe economic problems we face at this particular time.

I would like to look at two areas that again I want to suggest — and we take every opportunity we can, Mr. Chairman, to talk to various departments of government. That has to do not specifically with this minister's jurisdiction, but since he's the Minister of Municipal Affairs — his far-reaching concern and importance to this overall government — I think we should raise it. First, we've had some discussion with the Minister of Transportation about LRT funding. I could go into roads, but I want to talk a little more about LRT funding. I think the arguments are clear; we've made them before. But it has to do with financial relationships. Basically if we know we're going to need more LRT in our two major cities in the future, especially with the Olympics coming up in the city of Calgary, we suggest that now is the best time to do it, if at all possible. If the minister has any influence, we encourage him to push ahead.

I don't need to tell you that it's cheaper now, and it would create the necessary jobs that we're crying out in need of right now. I am told, for example, that the construction cost of the Calgary leg from the Bow River to 36th Street, would now be 15 to 30 percent below anticipated. The minister is well aware that we have construction companies almost bankrupt, and their bids are coming in extremely low. So certainly we suggest it would be a good bargain for us. I guess we're asking that we push ahead with that. I know the Minister of Transportation said that a decision will be made. I guess I have some general questions to this minister about that.

The first question is: is there close consultation between the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Transportation about this matter? I hope there is. If there is, my questions would flow. When will the government be making a decision on the extension of the program, and when will the government be giving a commitment to Calgary on initial design funding for their northwest LRT leg? As I understand it, and the minister is well aware of this, the land purchases must be made this year if they want to go ahead and possibly have it ready for the Olympics.

The other area that I want to talk about is specifically jobs. We could go into many other areas. It has to do with the Genesee plant. I know this is under the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications, but again it's an important relationship we're talking about here in Municipal Affairs; that is, the relationship between the city of Edmonton and the provincial government. This minister is chief liaison of that particular group. Let me throw out some facts and figures. I'd like the minister to respond to them, because I think they're important. This would be job creation and, I believe, useful job creation. I would like to make the case to the minister that in terms of power this would be cheaper in the long run. So I'd like him to bear with me.

According to our figures — and maybe the minister will dispute this — Edmonton Power's bid to build Genesee would cost the electric utility consumer 3 percent more to all people

for 1986, '87, and '88. The main argument has been that it would cost all people in Alberta too much. Our figures indicate that it would be approximately 3 percent. What I'm saying is that the consumers of Alberta would pay an additional 3 percent on their electric utility bills in 1986, 1987, and 1988. From 1989 on, the contribution of low-cost coal power by Edmonton Power would begin to lower the cost of electric power overall in the next few years.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Chair has some trouble with the hon. member's presentation at the present time. It should have been brought out last night under Utilities and Telecommunications.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I tried to explain that this minister is involved in making that decision. This is the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It's clearly an agreement or lack of agreement between the city of Edmonton, which would be part of Municipal Affairs, and the provincial government. I think it's appropriate to bring it up in either matter, if you like.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. In fact, the responsibility for the decision-making is not mine. I share the interest of the Member for Edmonton Norwood in the growth and development of our metropolitan areas, including the city of Edmonton of course, in my capacity as Minister of Municipal Affairs and as MLA for Edmonton Strathcona. I was strictly listening to the representations the hon. member was making, which I'm sure he wanted to place on the record. But I think both of us realize that the responsibility for those decisions rests with other departments.

MR. MARTIN: On the point of order. I'm well aware of that. I mentioned in the beginning that ultimately that decision has to rest with the total government, but through the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications. What I was trying to set, though, was that the relationship between the governments in this is very important.

But I will shorten it and come back and just say then — and I would like the minister to refer this; I'm sure he has discussions with his hon. colleague. Over the long run, it seems to me — and this is why I'm pushing for jobs and asking for money for jobs at the municipal level. That was my point. We wish that the Genesee program would go on, that the provincial government would have allowed them to do that. Mr. Chairman, I was asking this minister to make that representation as the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Two major points there. Basically, over the long haul, over the next 15 or 20 years, we think this would help make power even cheaper for Albertans. Secondly, in this city — the city that both the minister and I represent — there is now a crying need for jobs, especially in the construction area. Mr. Chairman, this would have a significant impact on the Edmonton area. So I will leave those suggestions with the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I would like him to comment on them. I guess my question specifically in this area would be: would the minister make some representation to the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications on this, in his role as an Edmonton MLA and in his role as Minister of Municipal Affairs.

There are many areas about jobs that we could talk about that would fall into his department. Let me go into the third area that I talked about, Mr. Chairman, and that has to do with the financial relationships, if you like, between the provincial government and their equal partners, the municipal governments. I would again like to make the case for revenue sharing. I know if we say it enough times, maybe it will sink

through. As the minister is well aware, I just went through the general relationships and the fact that the president of AUMA has talked about there being a much more positive attitude in Saskatchewan. I believe one of the reasons is that they've had a revenue-sharing program.

I think what we should be doing is treating our local governments — again, it ties into the financial, because it's hard to be equal if you aren't allowed to make decisions at the local level. As the Member for Clover Bar said, I believe government people at the local level are just as able to make their own decisions as they are in this Legislature. It seems to me that revenue sharing — that means sharing in the good and the bad, I expect, because it has to do with provincial government money coming in — would allow the local government to make their own decisions, rather than to be tied to grants from the government and capping. Then if they make decisions that aren't wise, they are the ones responsible for it, rather than us as big brothers saying: here are the grants; we in our all-seeing wisdom know precisely what you local governments can do.

I really suggest to the minister that we take a serious look at revenue sharing. I know it's not going to happen in this budget year; I recognize that it's not an easy matter. But if we went back to that equal partnership, if we were willing to sit down with local governments, we could come up with a revenue-sharing plan that would be beneficial to both groups. I'm sure it could be worked out.

I would suggest again — I make this as clear as I can — that revenue sharing is one of the key reasons there seems to be a better relationship between, say, SUMA and the provincial government in Saskatchewan. They are treated, if you like, through their financial means in a more equal way. Again, I make the case to the minister that he take a look at it and have some discussions with AUMA, local school boards, and whatever other people are involved.

Dealing with relationships, I have some questions I would like to talk about, having to do with financial relationships. It has to do with Bill 11. It may be precisely what I'm talking about — the amendment to section 27 of the Local Authorities Board. The question that I hope the minister will answer is simply: why has the government introduced legislation that allows the Local Authorities Board the power and jurisdiction to establish limits for borrowing by local authorities? Mr. Chairman, to the minister, this again seems like big brother telling little brother what he can and can't do. That's part of the problem the president has been talking about, that idea that they're treated basically like kids, that they can't look after our own resources. Is this a response to the municipalities making decisions that are contrary to the government's will? Is the reason we're bringing it in that the government didn't like some of the local decisions? Again I make the plea: give local governments more autonomy and allow them to govern their own affairs.

The other area that I want to talk briefly about and then ask some specific questions on, because we've been asked to, has to do with the Alberta municipal assistance grant. My understanding of this — and I'm sure the minister will correct me if I'm wrong; he's prone to do that from time to time — is that the formula for this year is based on the assurance that no municipality will receive less than was received in the previous year. That's my understanding of the grant. It seems to me there are some problems. I think the minister alluded to it, and I would like to give him a specific answer. I think the minister is aware of this. The formula means that the larger number of municipalities will receive their present grant with no increase. Those at the top of the scale will not be reduced from their

already high status; those lower down the scale will suffer. I believe the minister was talking about this being a bit of a problem.

I would like to give a specific example; I am sure the minister is aware of it. We had a letter from the town of Bashaw. I believe the local MLA has made recommendations on this matter to the minister, but they have since sent a letter to the Official Opposition asking if we would raise this. It is my understanding that Bashaw has asked for \$40,000, to bring them to the same level as other towns' grants. It is my understanding from the letter that they were given only \$20,000. They are making the point, perhaps correctly, Mr. Minister, that small towns must carry the same expensive services as larger villages. They are asking for a more equitable distribution of grants and pointing out that they have been hard hit by the recession, as have all other Albertans. I raise that not knowing much about it. I know the grant system may be unfair because of what we've already talked about. I raise the specific case of Bashaw with the minister because we were asked to; we had a letter. I know the minister is aware of it. I am doing that, and I await the minister's answer in that specific area.

In conclusion then, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, we are making the case for AUMA — asking for some of the things they're asking, asking the government to look at a more equal partnership, asking the government to look at revenue sharing — because I believe this is what the people of Alberta want. I remind the minister again that local government represents the Alberta taxpayers just as much as we in the provincial government do. I think the minister would agree that when the president says — if the perception is wrong, I'm sure the minister will tell us that. But certainly the perception is there that they're not being treated equally — financially or in another way.

At around the same time, they pointed out that just to maintain their services so they don't have to increase their taxes and put up the property level — because it all comes from one taxpayer; whether it's on property or wherever it comes from, it's still going to hit hard — they needed the 5 percent grant. That was the figure they put out. Of course we know it's not going to be that high, so they have two alternatives: either cut back on services or place more on the property tax payer. I make the plea to the minister that the property tax is as high as it should be. It's not the place, at this time in a recession, to be adding more taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude with those remarks and look forward to the minister's answer on what I believe is a very important relationship between two levels of government in this province. Thank you.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, just very briefly for about one minute; the time is getting a little light here. First of all, I would just like to say that the various municipalities and cities certainly look to us for assistance with funding and various other expertise. I'm not going to speak on behalf of other members and their constituencies. I know the Member for Edmonton Norwood likes to get into all the constituencies of the province — for whatever reason, I don't know.

MR. MARTIN: We're asked to, Stan.

MR. NELSON: We have an extremely capable bunch of MLAs in Calgary. In fact I'm sure the efforts in the city of Calgary by the 16 members will be somewhat more fruitful in dealing with LRT and whatever, than the member opposite trying to get his nose bent out of shape through his participation. I'm sure the members in the government are working very closely

with the ministers concerned — the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of Transportation, and others — to achieve the goals of the citizens of Calgary. I'm sure they will be achieved with the continuing working relationship the local MLAs have with their ministers and the government. I'm sure again that the citizens of Calgary will continue to be well looked after in the future as well as in the present.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARTIN: I just have to rise again. As usual, the member from wherever doesn't know what he is talking about. We in the Official Opposition are part of government too, and many Albertans bring their concerns to us. If the hon. member was doing such a great job, we wouldn't get so many concerns from his riding. It's our job in the opposition — I think the minister is well aware of this — to raise concerns Albertans are asking us to raise, and we get many representations from government, as the minister does. That's called the democratic process, which the hon. member may not be aware of. It's called democracy. This is the place where issues should be debated. The Official Opposition is an alternate government raising issues with the government. Maybe he should take a lesson in British parliamentary democracy so he would know what government is all about. I know the minister is well aware of it. Thank God he is, not like some of the backbenchers we have here that know nothing about British parliamentary democracy. I'll leave it with that.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise again to speak to this issue. Certainly the member opposite, with his socialist attitude and ideals, can do whatever and say whatever he wishes within these walls. The fact of the matter is that whether he feels members on this side don't know what they're talking about or whatever, I'm sure that with our large representation here and a closeness to the issues in the various communities, we certainly are able to address the needs and issues in the communities somewhat better than he is, considering that the only research he does is from the press. It just shows you how well the press is attuned to the issues rather than the party opposite. I suggest that if the member wants to get into debate about the issues of the local communities which some of us represent and which he represents, fine; we'd encourage that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. I think this debate can be carried on in some other area than in the estimates of Municipal Affairs.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude by suggesting that if the member wants to suggest that some members don't know what they're talking about and don't know about democracy ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. NELSON: ... the Department of Municipal Affairs and the members here are able to handle themselves just fine in that area.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the minister like to respond?

MR. KOZIAK: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, as quickly as I possibly can. First of all, I'd like to thank all hon. members for their contributions to an important area of government involvement in the democratic process. It's one I've enjoyed. I've enjoyed

working with locally elected governments, with the improvement district advisory councils, and with the associations representing local governments in this province. We have many, many hundreds of very, very committed people, and we've always treated each other as partners in the process. I expect we will continue to do just that.

I appreciate the remarks of members who assisted me today in terms of their comments on the level of assessment on machinery and equipment. That's a process we're going through now, as I identified in my remarks. And the comments members made during the course of their discussions on these estimates will be beneficial in arriving at a conclusion, over the course of the summer, as to how best we can approach machinery and equipment assessment in this province.

The matter of improvement district No. 1 raised by the Member for Bow Valley. Of course the tax recovery lands are one of the significant areas that may require us to use some unique approaches, perhaps legislation as in the case of ID 10. I'm not sure yet, Mr. Chairman. However, we will be discussing that and reaching a conclusion during the course of a meeting which I expect to have with that council in the early part of June. Hopefully that will lead in a direction that will be able to accommodate and balance the needs of the farmer, the rancher, who needs an economic unit to be able to provide for the production he's so capable of, and at the same time the needs of the elected and the whole, the newly formed municipal government.

I enjoyed the challenges the Member for Barrhead threw at me. As he pointed out, some of those aren't easily answered today. However, on the matter of the summer village disfranchisement that he identified, perhaps I could indicate that a review of the County Act is in process and that is one of the matters being considered. I don't know if there's a solution, but at least the problem has been identified and people's attentions are drawn to it.

With respect to the Alberta Planning Board comments. I'll review the file. The hon. member has provided me with details as to the numbers of the decision, and I'll be back to him once I've had an opportunity to do just that.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke on the matter of land tenure, which is a responsibility of this department. I have to reiterate that the whole purpose of land tenure was and is to provide people living in the green zone with title to land. There are no ulterior motives; there are no other purposes. Nobody suggests, nor would in any way indicate, that the purpose of the land tenure program is to subvert the legitimate claims for entitlement that somebody may have in the green zones of the province. This is not the case. The provision of title under the land tenure program was strictly in response to a need that was identified and, as a government wanting to respond to needs, such a program was developed.

The Member for Clover Bar also identified some views with respect to machinery and equipment that I've already dealt with. Transition grants are of course dealt with in the budget, with respect to those areas of rural Alberta that lost land, so to speak, to the city of Edmonton in the annexation process. I want to identify and put on record that in the course of moving towards equitable, unconditional municipal grants, the county of Strathcona received a fairly substantial increase of 20 percent, reflecting the nature of the population and assessment changes within that county.

The other matter — and more than one member has raised this — is the question of grants to municipalities that are provided by this Assembly through the various votes that we deal with during the course of committee study of estimates. Recommendations have been made that there are just too many

forms, too many grants. Municipalities are put through unnecessary paperwork. Could we look at this? That's one of the recommendations that came my way from the Minister's Advisory Committee on Municipal Finance. A committee was recently set up with representation from municipal organizations in the province for the purpose of looking at the pigeon-holes of funding that we provide to municipalities, to see if there is some way that we can reduce the paperwork and provide more ... [interjection]

I see that there's some interest in my estimates from the other end of the front bench. I don't know if the hon. member wishes to ask a question or speak to the time. I presume it's to the time.

MR. KING: I was hoping I could let the hon. minister finish his thought, but his thoughts go on for almost as long as mine. I regret that I'm obliged to interrupt him.

I move that the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, hon. members are aware that the House will not sit on Monday. The House will sit on Tuesday afternoon. Notice has been given that one hour of government business will be called on Tuesday afternoon for the consideration of Bills at second reading. The House will sit on Tuesday evening in Committee of Supply, at which time consideration will be given to the estimates of the Department of the Solicitor General.

[At 1 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 4, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]