

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Friday, March 29, 1985 10:00 a.m.

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

## head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me today to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, a number of visitors from Hokkaido, Japan. They are in the Speaker's gallery, and I would like to introduce them and have them stand. Mr. Shinichi Nishida, the head of the delegation, is 82 years of age and was a member of the Japanese Parliament for some 18 years. He was chief secretary of science and technology in Hokkaido. He was the executive task minister of the Sapporo Olympics in 1972, and he has promised me that he will be back in Canada for the 1988 Winter Olympics. Accompanying Mr. Nishida are the head coach of the hockey exchange group, Mr. Masamitsu Yaguchi; the manager, Mr. Kaoru Osanai; and the inspector with the club, Mr. Yoshinobu Katoh. Accompanying them is Mr. Doug McKenzie, a former president of the Alberta Amateur Hockey Association and now with the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association.

These gentlemen have been touring the province of Alberta. Their hockey club played their first game in Stony Plain and lost 8 to 4. Then they got their legs back: they travelled to Grimshaw and defeated the Grimshaw Huskies in the all-star club 6 to 3; defeated High Prairie, where my colleague the hon. Minister of Housing greeted them, 7 to 2. They moved over to Falher — and my colleague the Minister of Transportation was involved in that one — and defeated Falher 9 to 3. Last night they defeated Mundare 7 to 4 and, to the hon. Member for Barrhead, they're in Barrhead tonight. Before they return to Hokkaido, they hope to complete their tour in Alberta with a complete sweep after the game played in Stony Plain. Would you join me in a very warm welcome to our visitors from Japan.

## head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

## Bill 32

**Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation  
Amendment Act, 1985**

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 32, the Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation Amendment Act, 1985.

This Bill results from consultation with the Provincial Treasurer and the Minister of Housing and the Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation. It proposes changes to the accounting relationships between the corporation and the Provincial Treasurer and results from a change in policy of the corporation.

[Leave granted; Bill 32 read a first time]

**Bill 233  
An Act to Amend the  
Local Authorities Election Act**

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 233, An Act to Amend the Local Authorities Election Act.

This Bill would give local municipalities authority to limit election expenses and require disclosure.

[Leave granted; Bill 233 read a first time]

**Bill 243  
Alberta Personal Income Tax Increase  
Repeal Act**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 243, the Alberta Personal Income Tax Increase Repeal Act.

Bill 243 would have the effect of returning Alberta's personal income tax rate to the 38.5 percent of federal tax payable, prior to the 13 percent increase effective January 1, 1984. At that time we were told we needed the increase to help check the deficit. As it turned out, there was no deficit; there was a surplus. So the need . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. leader will have ample opportunity to debate the Bill when it reaches its proper place in the House.

[Leave granted; Bill 243 read a first time]

**Bill 220  
An Act to Amend the  
Municipal Government Act**

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 220, An Act to Amend the Municipal Government Act.

The principle of this Bill would be to amend section 119 regarding plebiscites. No plebiscite pursuant to this section would be valid unless the number of votes cast in the plebiscite were greater than 66 and two-thirds [percent] of the total votes cast in the preceding general election.

[Leave granted; Bill 220 read a first time]

## head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report of the Surface Reclamation Fund for the year ended March 31, 1984.

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices, I wish to table the report of the Auditor General for the year ended March 31, 1984.

## head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to take a chance that my group is in the gallery. I'm going to introduce them; if they're not there, we'll get them when they come in. It's a grade 6 class from Lamont elementary school in the town of Lamont. They are accompanied by their teachers Clarence Kitura, Berni Letwin, and Donna Kliachuk, and bus drivers John Danyluk and Roy Hackett. I hope they

are seated in the members' gallery. If they are, I'd like them to stand and receive the introduction to the Legislature.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to members of the Assembly, through you, a gentleman who is known by many of us. He has been an extremely organized community worker in the city of Calgary, especially in the northeast end of the city. He is in the public gallery, and he's here occasionally. I would like to ask Mr. Verne Lunan to stand and receive the accord of the House.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege today of introducing to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, some special guests in the members' gallery. On October 5, 1982, the Lieutenant Governor issued a writ dissolving the Assembly, which led to the 1982 election in this province. On that same day, halfway around the world, the Canadian Mount Everest expedition succeeded in having members from Alberta and Canada successfully assault that peak. In the gallery today is Mr. John Amatt, business manager and team member of that expedition, his wife, Peggy Amatt, and their good friend and neighbour Mrs. Judy Burroughs. I wonder if John would stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

#### head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

##### Department of Education

MR. KING: Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to advise this Assembly further about the establishment of an advisory Council on Alberta Teaching Standards, as announced in the Speech from the Throne on March 14.

According to Alberta law, the Minister of Education has exclusive authority for the certification and decertification of teachers. For many years this responsibility was shared, on the initiative of the minister, with the Board of Teacher Education and Certification. In 1983 the Board of Teacher Education and Certification was dissolved, because in my judgment educational circumstances and needs had passed it by. At that time I stated that I would shortly establish a successor to the Board of Teacher Education and Certification, with a somewhat different role, structure, and composition. In the intervening months educational groups have more than once suggested the establishment of a successor to the Board of Teacher Education and Certification.

Mr. Speaker, this council announced today, which will be advisory to the Minister of Education, is designed to fulfill the successor role. The council will be an important element in our plans to ensure that Alberta's teachers are of the highest calibre in terms of their professional training and their professional practice. The successful implementation of its mandate will lead to notable improvements in what is already a first-rate educational system.

The council will advise the minister on a number of areas, including the following:

1. programs for the preparation of teachers, and the requirements for Alberta teaching certificates;
2. conditions under which suspension or cancellation of certificates is justified;
3. certain specific short-term projects, including providing direction for implementation and evaluation of the ini-

tiation to teaching project, which some may recognize as being very much like an internship;

4. policy, practice, and outcomes in the area of teacher evaluation.

From the perspective of the educational system, this council has an important role to play in setting direction in these areas. From a teacher's perspective this council will have a significant impact on training, certification, and evaluation. This impact will be achieved by having the council oversee practice reviews and hear appeals therefrom in cases of alleged incompetent practice or misconduct in the practice of the profession. The council will also make recommendations to the minister with respect to the suspension or cancellation of a teacher's certificate.

Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of Alberta's teachers are competent and concerned that children should benefit from good educational practice. These competent teachers deserve our best efforts to maintain the high standards of professional practice that our community expects.

That is why currently certificated Alberta teachers will make up the majority of the 11 members of this council: six of the 11 members. That is how it should be, Mr. Speaker. The advice to the Minister of Education, especially on the practice of teaching, should be strongly influenced by the people who must abide by the standards of the practice: the teachers.

Four other members will come from the Alberta School Trustees' Association, the government of Alberta, the faculties of education, and the Conference of Alberta School Superintendents. The 11th member will be selected from the public at large.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this council will be an important, positive step in ensuring that our children will get what they deserve: excellent teachers and excellent education.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to reply to the ministerial statement, I thank the minister for our previously getting a copy of this. It makes our job somewhat easier.

In saying that, Mr. Speaker, I have some real problems with the ministerial announcement. In looking through it quickly — and I'm sure some of this will come up in questions, so it will be clarified somewhat more. It seems somewhat out of sync with the government's own policy on professionals governing themselves. When we look at who is on there, the minister will appoint six currently certified teachers, but the ATA can only nominate one — it doesn't even say they would get one — and four other members will be appointed, but they'll be nominated from the other groups. It seems to me that the potential is there for the minister to control the whole group, because he is the one who ultimately has the say on who is going to be on this committee.

It seems to be moving away from what the government talks about, in the fact that this is government intervention, I suggest — a move away from deregulation, but in regulation with the government being all-powerful and controlling teacher certification. It looks to me as if this is going to be a very powerful group when they are nominated, because they seem to have wide-ranging scope into almost all areas of the teaching profession. I think the minister would agree that who chooses these members becomes very critical.

We will follow up, but I ask: is the minister not satisfied with what the ATA was doing? Is it an attempt to take power away from the ATA? I think these are questions people will be asking in the next little while.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it has raised many, many questions, and I think we're going to be looking for many, many answers in the time coming up.

#### head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Energy Pricing Agreement

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to come back to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Now that the glow is off a bit, I'm sure the minister wants to discuss in more detail the agreement that was reached this week. In answering my questions yesterday on Alberta's ownership and control of its resources, the minister seemed to indicate that this new agreement ties the province's hands regarding how it may set its royalties, so I'm going to give the minister a chance to clarify that. Do fiscal clauses 9 and 10 mean that Alberta may not increase its royalty rates during the time this agreement is in effect? If possible, I want a yes or no to that question.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: No.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If it doesn't, then let's move. Has the government reviewed the option of asking the Public Affairs Committee of this Assembly to meet again, as it did in 1972, to review our royalty system and recommend ways in which we might prevent massive windfalls for those who hold old oil, while encouraging continuing exploration for new oil, or has this option been removed by virtue of this new deal?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the answer to both questions is no.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Going back to clauses 9 and 10, he said we could increase our royalty rate, if I understand his answers to the question. Can he say how this flows from:

The parties also agree that any net benefits resulting from crude oil price decontrol ... shall flow through to the industry.

Can the minister clarify how we can raise our royalties, when all those things have to "flow through to the industry"?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should elaborate a little more. As I believe was outlined to the Assembly yesterday, the first thing that should be noted is that this agreement does not have a specific time frame, which, frankly, is one of the real benefits of the agreement. What it means is that we don't have the prospect of some need to renegotiate at a future date the commitments to fiscal arrangements that have been entered into here.

With respect, I don't think the hon. member fully understands the provisions on flow-through. The concern the federal government had was simply this: they are making a very significant move in moving away from these various taxes that have been in place, very much including the petroleum and gas revenue tax. That is going to result in certain dollars, a very large number of dollars, flowing to the industry for reinvestment. They naturally wanted some indication from the three western provinces that we would not move in and try to capture those dollars by way of an increase in royalties. That is exactly what we have agreed to.

Yesterday the hon. member said, "Gee, what happens if oil prices go up, for example, and we want to receive more revenue?" What I should have indicated yesterday, I suppose, although I think it's quite obvious, is that if oil prices go up, so do our revenues. If you look at the way the royalties regime is established, we receive more and more revenue if and when prices do go up. By the same token, to the extent that prices might go up in a significant way over a period of years, provided we haven't taken away the dollars that have flowed from the federal government to the industry by way of their tax relief, it doesn't limit our hands in terms of what we might do with our own royalty rates. I think that's a fairly simple concept to understand, and that was the clear intent and specific wording employed in terms of the agreement here.

I simply underline once again — and I invite the hon. member to have his counterpart Mr. Broadbent in Ottawa ask Miss Carney about it if he has any further doubt in his mind — that it was made abundantly clear to the federal minister that the provinces reserve the right to set their own royalties, and that was completely accepted by the federal government, [interjection]

MR. MARTIN: If the hon. Minister of Advanced Education wants to ask him some questions, go ahead.

Mr. Speaker, there is some confusion here, [interjections]

AN HON. MEMBER: Only in your mind.

MR. MARTIN: No, in people's minds. They can hoot or holler, but we want to get to the bottom of what it means. That's what the people of Alberta want, and I'm sure the minister of energy does.

The minister said we clearly have the right to raise royalty rates. I think he's made that clear. My question, then, is: what is the purpose of 9? Why was it even put in there if it doesn't mean anything? It says:

The parties also agree that any net benefits resulting ... as determined by their respective jurisdictions, shall flow ... to the industry.

I ask the minister: what's the point of putting it in there if it doesn't mean anything?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member doesn't understand or chooses not to understand the answer I've given on more than one occasion now. There was a purpose to having those two provisions in the agreement; namely, an affirmation to the federal government that the province does not intend to move in and capture the clearly defined benefits that are going to accrue to the industry as a result of the federal withdrawal from the PGRT, in particular, and the other taxes they're moving out and away from. That is the commitment we have made, and we stand by it, as we ought to. Above and beyond that, however, in terms of what may happen down the road and world oil prices, quite apart from the fact that our revenues go up automatically by virtue of the royalty system, our hands are not tied.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. From the minister's answer, it seems that for the time being, at least for the immediate present since this was brought in, provincial governments wouldn't move in right away. That seems to be the answer I'm getting.

The question I have for the minister: was any length of time before the provincial government could move on increases in royalties discussed between the ministers?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear on one matter: the province has no intention of raising royalties. We recognize the importance of this industry in creating jobs for Albertans, and I'm very puzzled by the hon. Leader of the Opposition's insistence that we should be looking at raising royalties. That flies in the face of all the recommendations they've been making to us on expanding royalty holidays. You can't have it both ways.

MR. MARTIN: As the minister is well aware, Mr. Speaker, we were talking about success payout rather than the other, and he said he was looking into it. It's a very different point, and the minister is well aware of that. It seems to be very vague, that nobody knows the answers to it, and I suggest 9 and 10 don't make much sense.

A question for the hon. minister. It also was left very vague yesterday, and I'm trying to find out specifically what it means. I think people want to know what it means. There didn't seem to be any concrete floor-and-ceiling mechanism to protect our industry, but the minister said that they would be looking at it. Rather than just general, vague terms, could the minister be a little more specific and indicate precisely what would happen if there were a rapid decline in world oil prices, which is probably more relevant — it could happen, with the spot market — or a rapid increase? I think the people of Alberta and Canada want to know this.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, we seem to be having a reiteration of the questions and answers yesterday. I'm happy to engage in the exercise, if the hon. member has no other questions to ask of other members of the Assembly.

The fact of the matter is that we think it's very much the wish of the industry, who would be affected, of course, as would Albertans generally in an indirect way by any slippage in world oil prices, that there not be government intervention and that only under the most extreme sort of circumstances might that be considered. That being the case, and given our determination to achieve a market pricing system here in Canada, we didn't want to have any specific mechanism whereby there could be some opportunity for a bureaucrat in Ottawa to say, "You've hit a certain price circumstance, and now Ottawa should be moving in and imposing some sort of price control system." The agreement was very specifically left general in that regard for that reason, the clear intention being that we wanted to let the market system operate. At the same time, if there were extreme circumstances — and I'm not able to be specific about that, nor should I be — obviously, the governments would address that situation.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It would be nice to know what's going on. We're not getting many answers here. It seems to be a lot of hope in this agreement.

Yesterday, on television, I saw the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources say they would be monitoring the performance of the oil companies to see that they are actually reinvesting in the oil industry here in Canada. She didn't say what they would do if they didn't. My question to the minister is: what steps is the Alberta government taking to make sure this extra money the industry is getting will be reinvested here in Alberta, in the drilling industry?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in the Assembly yesterday, this government believes very strongly

that one only has to look at the historical record of the oil and gas industry to see that they have the finest reinvestment record of any industry in the country. In terms of monitoring, if you look at the oil and gas activity plans, the results that flowed from them are very self-evident. I don't think there is an industry in Canada that is more in the public eye than the oil and gas industry. We have lots of staff on hand to evaluate reinvestment. We're very confident that it is going to continue to occur as it has in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary on this question.

MR. MARTIN: Well it's nice to have rhetoric and be hopeful, but I was asking what you were going to do. Obviously nothing.

My supplementary question is to the Provincial Treasurer, following this agreement. Does the Treasurer have any ballpark estimate of how much this agreement will benefit or cost our treasury at this time?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, there hasn't been time to do detailed calculations yet. With respect to the immediate fiscal year, I would think there would be no substantive change in the revenue or expenditure projection. Certainly, in the next fiscal year there would be an impact, clearly positive, with respect to this agreement. However, there's no question that, as the budget talks about broadening the recovery, this agreement will do that. As the budget talks about expanding confidence, this agreement will underscore that. Insofar as the budget talks about underscoring durable growth in Alberta as a goal, this agreement will lead toward that.

#### Edmonton General Hospital

MR. MARTIN: I'd like to address the second question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, and it has to do with a follow-up on the General hospital. Will the minister outline the government's current position on what size the emergency service at the General hospital ought to be after completion of the Mill Woods hospital? How many acute-care beds should be available at the General hospital?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, today I'm unable to say whether or not there will be emergency services at the present General hospital site. That is still a matter of ongoing discussion with the board.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. I believe the minister contemplated a 25-bed emergency service in the past. There's been some dispute over that. Is it still the government's position that they would look at a 25-bed emergency hospital?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, ongoing discussions with respect to that proposal or some alternative version of it are presently under way with the board.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Apparently, there's a petition with some 62,000 Edmontonians' names on it. Would the minister indicate how many signatures on a petition opposing the severe downsizing of the General hospital it would take to make the government reconsider the issue and accept the recommendations put forth by the Edmonton General hospital board?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, in the case of a legitimate review of an issue, whether it's in my department or others, it just takes one signature. If the case is not legitimate or based on misinformation, of course, the numbers become meaningless.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Is the minister suggesting that the people presenting the petition have misleading information and have misled the 62,000 people on that petition?

MR. RUSSELL: What I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that in issues governments face, persons expressing concern about a matter don't necessarily influence government by sheer numbers alone. It is the issue and the merit of the case and the argument that are important.

More specifically, however, in the case of the Edmonton General hospital I know there is an incredible amount of misunderstanding out there in the community. In responding and talking to people who have signed the petitions, it's apparent that many, many of them have no idea what it is they signed, what is going on, or what they're in favour of saving.

MR. MARTIN: Well, I guess that's from the minister's perspective, maybe not from the board's perspective.

My question is: has the minister asked his officials for a study of the effect of the proposed change on the large number of senior citizens who moved into the dense downtown core near the General hospital so they have quick access to a full emergency service?

MR. RUSSELL: Of all areas in the city, Mr. Speaker, the downtown core is going to be by far the best served with emergency services. They're going to be surrounded by them. Moreover, they're probably going to have the best auxiliary and extended-care centre for senior citizens of any place in the province. It is that message that is not being understood. For example, I'm getting phone calls from concerned senior citizens saying, "Please don't tear down the Youville pavilion." There's no intention of doing that. We're enhancing it and expanding the services to it. That's what I mean about the misunderstanding that's out there.

MR. MARTIN: It's all right to talk about Youville. We were talking about emergency.

A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary on this question.

MR. MARTIN: Upon what studies has the minister based his assessment that the General hospital will be able to handle any kind of emergency after it has been downsized to a 25-bed, medicentre type of emergency unit? That's a figure the minister has talked about before.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'm a bit puzzled by the direction of the hon. member's questions. The understanding, the original proposal was that there would be no emergency services. The entire acute-care hospital would be relocated in a brand-new, fully equipped building in Mill Woods, and the Jasper Avenue site would become an auxiliary and chronic-care centre. Through the intervening months of discussion, there was some concern raised about emergency services being available very quickly in that very specific

part of the city. It was at that time that we proposed the equivalent of a 25-bed hospital, which serves many communities throughout Alberta, be incorporated within the redevelopment that was going on there. It was never sold as a full acute-care hospital or a full third-level emergency service, and that is the misunderstanding that is out there in the public and to which the government is trying to respond.

MR. ALEXANDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In order that the House and the people not be misled, can the minister tell us what question or questions were in fact posed on these petitions to which 60,000-odd signatures are supposed to have responded? Are you aware of the questions that were on those petitions and how clear they were?

MR. RUSSELL: I have not yet had a petition submitted to me or given to me, but we have been approached by people either organizing the petition's signatures or people who have signed the petition. It's obvious there's a great misunderstanding out there, that something is being done to destroy the General hospital, when probably one of the most incredible, up-to-date, modern, best-equipped health care facilities is being developed for them on two sites. It's that message that people are not fully understanding.

MR. ALEXANDER: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I might. I think this is an important point. I wonder if the minister could undertake to ask someone to accumulate those petitions so that he can consider them. In a doctor's office I was in last week, I saw a petition on the desk which said: are you in favour of saving the General hospital? I think that's the kind of confusion that ought to be settled for the benefit of the citizens of Edmonton and for this House. I simply ask the minister if he could ask for samples of the petitions that have raised all these signatures.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the organizer of the petitioning group, Judge Lucien Maynard, will be approaching the government with his petitions and the signatures. Perhaps at that time we can discuss with them what their concerns are.

#### **Pediatric Hospital Services**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care as well, seeing that he's in a good mood this morning and solving problems — giving things away. It's with regard to an event that is taking place this weekend in Edmonton. [interjection] Not the convention. That's not an event.

The Northern Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation is raising money through a telethon. As well, the *Edmonton Sun* is putting out a special edition with regard to the need for a northern Alberta children's hospital. I am wondering if the minister could indicate the status of the government's position on that matter at this time?

MR. RUSSELL: It remains the same, Mr. Speaker. We have said that if and when a children's hospital is required in the city of Edmonton, we would proceed with it. We've pointed out, however, that there are far more pressing hospital priorities at the present time, primarily related to the matter of facilities for the aged and the chronically ill. The situation we were discussing, the General hospital, is an attempt to make a real bite into that problem.

I've met with officials of the Northern Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation, and they understand that. They know the vacancy rates that exist now in pediatric wards within the city of Edmonton. It's their objective to get everything gathered together under one roof. As a matter of fact, we're continuing our liaison and communications with them. I held my last meeting with them on the matter just two days ago.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I understand there was just about a commitment to the children's hospital in the 1982 campaign. I would like to ask how the minister and the government reconcile the position of the desire of the people in Edmonton to have a children's hospital and the desire of the minister to delay the actions on a children's hospital at this time.

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's an incredible question to come from the dean of the Legislature, a former cabinet minister. Did you have the ability to just sign cheques and ...

DR. BUCK: Misleading promises.

MR. RUSSELL: Oh, look who's here. The curling season must be over, eh? He's just passing through until golf starts. [interjections]

The hon. Member for Little Bow knows that no minister in any government has the ability to just write cheques to respond to the wishes and desires of any or all groups, no matter what their objectives would be. I'm amazed he'd even put the question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker ... [interjections] How can the minister even turn his mind and reject the people of this province? The people of Edmonton and district are saying there's need for a children's hospital in the north. That's the question I'm raising. They say there is a need. The minister says there is not a need. The urgency of it is that they are out raising private funds, because the government isn't meeting the commitment. My question was: how does the minister reconcile those two differences in attitude? I think it's incumbent upon the minister to answer that question.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, there are really three points of view with respect to the provision of pediatric services in any city. You can have it as it is now and has long been the way in the city of Edmonton, in that there are pediatric wards contained within each general hospital. You can have a pediatric pavilion attached to a general hospital, with a joint board looking after it. Or you can have a freestanding, independent, autonomous children's hospital. Now, at the moment the children of northern Alberta are receiving excellent pediatric services through pediatric wards that are occupied barely at 50 percent most of the time. There is a surplus of beds, and no child is being deprived of excellent health care services.

An opinion by the group of people heading the Northern Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation is that they would like to see a freestanding children's hospital instead. We have said, "If and when it's needed, we will build it, and we will pay for it." It's that simple and that clear. They don't accept that answer, and they're out on their own fund-raising drive. But I think we clearly understand each other's positions.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in the considerations by the minister and the government, is there any consideration of a dollar-for-dollar matching of the funds raised privately and the government funds put into the project at a point in time when there's agreement? I'm talking about a point in time when there's agreement between the department and the private group on establishing and building this hospital.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that is the very point. There would be no need for matching funds. The government would cover 100 percent of the capital costs of a children's hospital if it is needed and if a decision is made to proceed with it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Could this be the final supplementary on this.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Is the minister saying that in terms of building capital facilities, whether for health care or other social purposes such as a senior citizens' facility, there's no place in government programming for cost-shared programs between the private and public sectors? Is that what the minister is saying to me?

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Speaker, that's not what I said at all. I believe the member was in the House last week, for example, when I spoke of the Ronald McDonald House completed in Calgary and the one that's under way in Edmonton now. Those are 100 percent contributions by the private sector and the result of a 100 percent voluntary effort, and I went on to explain how commendable that was.

For many, many years the practice in Alberta has been that with respect to hospital capital construction the community involved provides the site and the services thereto. The capital costs of the building and the operating funds to support it after it's opened are picked up by the provincial government.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a supplementary on this subject. Has the minister had any further submissions from the Edmonton regional hospital planning board that would give the minister some direction regarding the children's hospital for the Edmonton area?

MR. RUSSELL: No I haven't, Mr. Speaker, not since they last reported.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Can the minister indicate when he last had communication or a meeting with the Northern Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation?

MR. RUSSELL: I believe it was Thursday of this week, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in those discussions can the minister indicate if the foundation gave him some indication of how many dollars they've already raised toward a northern Alberta children's hospital?

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Speaker, that wasn't on the agenda.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to indicate if he has any idea how many dollars the foundation has raised?

MR. RUSSELL: No I don't, Mr. Speaker.

## Native Self-Government

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for Native Affairs. I ask the minister to outline briefly for us the position this province will be taking to next week's First Ministers' Conference in Ottawa on the fundamental issue of self-government for native peoples in this province.

MR. PAHL: As background, Mr. Speaker, I refer the hon. member to *Hansard* of June 3, 1983, in which this House was among the first of the provinces and the federal government to pass the accord agreeing to the process we're now in. He will find Alberta's position reasonably well outlined in those remarks.

Basically, we support the legitimate aspirations of native people for more autonomy over their own affairs. We're not completely convinced, Mr. Speaker, that there is a need to establish what amounts to a third order of government to meet those legitimate aspirations. However, as we indicated on June 3, 1983, we will commit ourselves to the process, and we are indeed supporting the native people of Alberta in being at the table and making the points. But we are still not of the view that we should entrench into the Constitution of Canada something of which we don't have a full understanding of the import or how it relates to the grass-roots needs of native people across our province.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I think the willingness to be involved in the process is a small beginning, but the concerns being expressed are very clear and straightforward as far as native people are concerned. I'd like to ask the minister if it's the view or the policy of this government that native people do have unique and special rights that flow from their status as original inhabitants in the country and, if so, the government's position on the limits of those rights.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I guess the best way to answer that is to say that those rights are in effect defined in existing treaties and land claims agreements, and the purpose of the whole exercise is to go through and see if there is an opportunity to further define those rights. If there is a definition and if there is an agreement, it is the intention of the governments of Canada to entrench those into the Constitution of Canada.

Certainly, I agree with the first part of the statement, that there is a clear definition of the needs of native people. As I and my colleagues travel across this province, the needs relate to some of the very concrete things we're doing with respect to institutions of self-government, such as schooling, housing, and the land tenure program. Those are the needs that appear to be articulated to us. As I said on June 3, 1983, we should not look to the stroke of a constitutional pen to resolve those problems but, clearly, to grass-roots activity with policies and programs here in Alberta. There is some consensus over the need to address the issues besetting native people in Alberta, and indeed across Canada, but they tend to be more of the concrete variety than of a constitutional nature.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister talked about needs, and I point out that I asked about rights in my question. I take it that's a suggestion that there is a significant difference, of course, between talking about needs and rights.

My question to the minister is: what is the position of this government with regard to the issues of both the right to entrenched self-government and a permanent land base for the Metis people in this province?

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, as a signatory to the constitutional accord of 1983, when the Constitution of Canada was repatriated, the government of Alberta clearly made reference to the acknowledgment of the aboriginal peoples and their existing rights. The other part of the question . . . I suppose it creates some difficulty for Alberta, going into the constitutional talks on a national level, because we are indeed so far ahead of the rest of the country, not in rhetoric, as some provinces; not one over, but one after the next one would like to . . . [interjection] Oh, Manitoba; it escaped me. They're great on rhetoric, but they're short on facts.

The hon. member would know from his constituency — and I am sure he will have it pointed out to him on his trips — that he will pass one Metis settlement, one of eight, which establishes a land base of a million and a quarter acres here in Alberta. That is a fact. It is the only one in Canada. Our determination as a government is indeed to recognize and protect that land base.

I refer the hon. member to the work of the MacEwan committee, which provided a discussion paper on the possible means to advance the governance of the Metis settlements across Alberta. In that, of course, would be to respond to their concern that their settlements be protected beyond what exists for them now, and certainly we're very receptive to their wishes in that regard.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary, followed by the hon. Member for Cardston.

MR. GURNETT: We've heard lots of good rhetoric but still no specific promises about legislation or policy that would protect these important issues of self-government and permanent land base. My question to the minister is whether or not the action of his colleague the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife with regard to the Metis in the Grande Cache area late last year can be taken as a signal of the manner in which the government of Alberta intends to proceed on Metis rights so long as they are not legally entrenched.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, my colleague may wish to supplement my answer, but I think it relates to the fundamental misunderstanding of the member, perhaps, and indeed some of the people of Alberta, if that is not understood. The fact is that with the exception of those people who live on the settlements, the Metis people of Alberta do not now enjoy nor ever have enjoyed the aboriginal right to hunt and fish. We have always strenuously protected and supported the rights that accrued to the treaty Indian people as a result of their aboriginal status, with respect to hunting and fishing in Alberta. The fact is that the Metis people are not imbued with that right, nor is there any clear understanding, I suppose, of what the right to self-government means. We have been very hopeful that the process of the constitutional talks will establish what those rights are. I'm sure the hon. member would share my concern if we somehow established a right to self-government for one of his constituents that was not shared or understood by others.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we certainly do respect, protect, and support the rights of aboriginal people, who in this case are basically treaty Indians and Inuit. We are engaged in the process, through the constitutional discussions, to establish what additional rights, if any, there might be and whether they would be entrenched.

I guess I need to respond to the Grande Cache situation specifically. The Metis people do not have and never did have any rights accruing to them with respect to the aboriginal rights of hunting and fishing.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that Alberta has had a Metis Betterment Act for many years and has recognized the Metis, could the minister give us an update on the recommendations of the MacEwan report, which was made public last July?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm just wondering how we deal with an update of something that is already public knowledge, unless there was a supplementary report.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, then could the minister tell us how the government has responded to the recommendations of the MacEwan report?

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I suppose this question might more properly be addressed to my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs, as he received the report. However, it's fair to say that the report has been under discussion within the departments of government and indeed within caucus and cabinet.

I would also like to report that the Premier and I met with the president of the settlement associations. Since the MacEwan report was published the settlements have advanced a number of other positions with respect to how they would like to have us respond not to the MacEwan report specifically, Mr. Speaker, but to the issues addressed by the MacEwan report. I would simply say that because the issue of self-governance and more local autonomy is a bit of a moving target because some things are happening right now, the MacEwan report will require more discussion before it's responded to in any formal way.

MR. KOZIAK: Perhaps I should supplement the question posed by the hon. Member for Cardston by indicating that I had the pleasant opportunity of addressing the all-settlements council of the Metis federation back in December, at which time I outlined a program with respect to government response to the MacEwan report. That program was quite detailed in terms of suggested time lines for approaches that might be taken.

With respect to the report prepared by the former Lieutenant Governor and his committee, there is no doubt that substantial efforts have to be undertaken by the Metis settlements themselves with respect to a move toward greater assumption of local government by the Metis people on the settlements. We've identified some of those and are working with the Metis people in improving and developing the administrative characteristics of settlement counsellors and clerks. That's under way quite nicely.

Mr. Speaker, we're moving toward a shift from a directly hands-on vote in the Municipal Affairs department to a grant structure whereby decisions as to the allocation of funds are made closer to where they're spent, right on the settlements. There are a number of important steps that are being undertaken, but as I pointed out in my remarks to

the Metis people, some very important discussions will have to be taken at the settlement level and at the federation level as to the assumption of responsibilities for local government.

#### Water Quality — Edmonton

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. It deals with water quality in the city of Edmonton. As the minister is aware, there have been questions raised by the public and the media in the past week concerning the safety of drinking water in Edmonton. Can the minister assure this Assembly that the water quality in Edmonton meets provincial guidelines?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, on an annual basis when we have the spring runoff in the North Saskatchewan River, concerns come forward with regard to water quality in the treated drinking water in the city of Edmonton. Basically, the concern has to do with odour which is caused by the spring runoff and the organic material, leaves, which get into the North Saskatchewan River system. I should advise the Assembly that the city of Edmonton has one of the most comprehensive water treatment processes in North America.

With regard to standards, our department does a monthly sampling of Edmonton water for over 200 parameters, which include a number of inorganic and organic materials. In regard to 1984, the results of our surveys show they have met the parameters in a satisfactory manner with the exception of pH, which is due to the water softening by the city of Edmonton. There's been a slight exceedance in the pH area. With regard to the monitoring which is done by the city of Edmonton on a daily, weekly, and monthly basis, and the subsequent monitoring done by our department, I can assure the member that Edmonton city water is safe to drink, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. In the Monday edition of the *Edmonton Journal* there was a claim that his department's lab which tests water samples is so backlogged that the latest available results for certain water quality tests date back to November 1984. Can the minister confirm this, and if so, what measures is his department taking to alleviate this backlog?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, at the Alberta environmental centre in Vegreville we have some very sophisticated equipment in terms of gas chromatography and mass spectroscopy technology. We've had some new instrumentation at the lab in Vegreville. There have been some start-up problems with that instrumentation. I've been advised that the backlog will be caught up shortly, if that has not already occurred.

MR. PAPROSKI: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister satisfied that the water testing undertaken by both his department and the city of Edmonton is, one, comprehensive enough and, two, conducted on a frequent enough basis?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, the city does sampling on a daily basis for routine areas and on a weekly and monthly basis for other parameters. Our department does a monthly survey of treated water in all the major cities in Alberta for over 200 parameters. The

major parameters include heavy metals, an area called priority pollutants, pesticides, chlorinated herbicide acids, polychlorinated biphenyls, and a number of different parameters.

This is probably one of the most comprehensive routine monitoring programs that I'm aware of by any regulatory agency in North America. It's certainly the most extensive in Canada. In addition, with the type of technology I indicated earlier, the gas chromatography and mass spectroscopy technology, we are able to scan for other organic compounds, beyond these 200 parameters, which would show up in this treated water. If there were an indication that there was something else we could look for because of the result of this type of technology, we would look for that also. I can only say that we have one of the most comprehensive monitoring programs I'm aware of.

### Beef Exports

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Agriculture is with respect to this week's announcement by the European Economic Community to place additional quotas on Canadian agricultural products, particularly beef. Could the minister advise the Assembly what impact this action will have on Alberta's beef exports to those countries?

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that federal officials from Canada as well as officials from the European community have arrived at an agreement with respect to beef, and at this point they are awaiting ratification by their respective cabinets. It's my understanding that the import level will allow 10,600 tonnes of beef in, which is really higher than we would like it to be but about half what it was last year. I think the one positive area, if the agreement can finally be ratified by the cabinets, is that there is an undertaking that export restitution will be made in areas, so they won't allow beef to come in and undercut the wholesale prices of beef in Canada. Even though the agreement is higher than we'd like it to be with respect to beef, it's still better than we had last year.

MR. SZWENDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate whether the beef imported into Canada from these European Economic Community countries, particularly beef from Ireland, must pass the same quality control standards expected of Canadian beef? There are reports that these standards are lower with regard to inspection of meats, particularly beef.

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, each and every country that ships beef into this country must meet our high standards. The federal meat inspectors inspect and then make decisions with regard to what plants outside Canada can ship products into this country. So I'm assured that when meat enters this country, it arrives after the inspection is done, and there is no danger whatsoever.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I might say that we also have inspections done in this country by European inspectors who inspect plants here. They have been here over the last number of weeks to make approvals on what plants will be allowed to export products into the European community. It's my understanding that only one plant is approved so far, but we expect further approvals.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary from the hon. member.

MR. SZWENDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise whether any other agricultural products of this province will be affected by this agreement?

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, retaliatory action was planned by the European community with respect to this agreement in other areas, examples of which I think were honey and mustard. If this agreement is ratified by the respective cabinets, that retaliatory action on those products will be removed. If the agreement is ratified, we have no concern about the other products.

MR. SPEAKER: We've run out of time, and perhaps we could come back to this important topic on Monday. Perhaps we could deal briefly with the question of the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

### Container Shipping

MR. MUSGROVE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question concerning shipping containers is to the Minister of Transportation. Given the fact that shipping containers have to be trucked to the railroad, given the fact that in order for the shipper to get the best value from his shipping costs they have to be filled to capacity, given the fact that it's very difficult to get an overload permit even on most of our numbered highways, particularly now when road bans are on, and given the fact that there is now a container that has an additional set of wheels that you can let down on the highway by hydraulics, giving you another axle on the road, is the Alberta government looking at allowing these containers with the extra set of wheels to be used on our provincial highways?

MR. M. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we're considering that. We presently allow triple axles to be used on Alberta highways, but the particular system the hon. member is referring to involves an extra set of wheels that are operated independently from two other axles. Tests thus far have indicated that they're not adequately designed to ensure an even distribution of weight amongst all three axles. Because of that, we've had some reports of extreme road damage resulting from that type of system. However, we are working with the Alberta Research Council, which does most of the work in Alberta and much of it across Canada, in testing such transportation facilities to see if there is some way there can be alterations to the design to allow it to accommodate conditions that would be suitable for the flexible pavements we have in western Canada.

I should suggest to the hon. member that anyone who is interested in working on other systems of transporting containers would be well advised to consult the motor transport branch in Red Deer, where there is a lot of technical help available to them.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: It seems to be peculiar to the spring sittings this year that we have difficulty reaching all members who wish to ask questions. I accept responsibility for that, and as a result of what has happened on a number of days, I would propose that there must be a much more drastic limitation of the number of supplementaries. We had a

fairly average list today, yet I wasn't able to recognize two members who wished to ask questions.

Might we revert briefly to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

*(reversion)*

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce two gentlemen in the public gallery. They are members of the St. Mary River Irrigation District board: Mr. Jack Brewin, who has been on the board for about 30 years and has been chairman for most of that time, and Mr. Don Campbell. I wonder if the Legislature would welcome them.

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

8. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that the report of the special committee appointed March 14, 1985, under Standing Order 49 be now received and concurred in and that the committees recommended therein be hereby appointed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the effect of the motion, of course, is to establish the committees for this session and is based on the report presented recently by the special committee that was established opening day in order to recommend to the Assembly the membership of the various committees.

Mr. Speaker, in proposing and passing this motion today, it's necessary to move an amendment in respect to it. The situation is that by statute the Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act is limited to 15 members. The recommendation provides for 15 members in addition to a chairman. The advice of Parliamentary Counsel is that under statute 15 includes the chairman. Therefore, one member, upon learning this, volunteered to withdraw from that committee. So I recommend that the hon. Member for Highwood be allowed to withdraw.

The amendment then is that the members recommended be appointed in accordance with the wording of the resolution, except that the name of Mr. Alger be removed from the list of members proposed for the Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act.

MR. SPEAKER: I have a little difficulty with a member moving an amendment to his own motion, but perhaps we could get around that difficulty if the House were to agree unanimously that instead of dealing with the additional item as an amendment, we might deem it to have been incorporated into the original motion.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: With that change from what appears on the Order Paper, would those in favour of Motion 8 on this morning's Order Paper, moved by the hon. Government House Leader, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

The motion is adopted.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**

**(Third Reading)**

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Title	Moved by
31	Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1985	Hyndman
16	Small Business Equity Corporations Amendment Act, 1985	Adair
18	Natural Gas Rebates Amendment Act, 1985	Bogle

**Bill 21**

**Hospitals and Medical Care Statutes Amendment Act, 1985**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 21, the Hospitals and Medical Care Statutes Amendment Act, 1985.

I would just like to respond to the question raised last night by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, which I was unable to answer at that time. If the hon. member refers to the original Act which is being amended, the Hospitals Act, he will see in section 40(6) that there is specific authority for this information to be released without the consent or knowledge of the person involved. That has been the situation for several years, and as I indicated, to my knowledge it has never been an issue.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Speaker, if I could just make one further comment on the issue of the amendment to section 13. My comments last night were basically to indicate that there should be a provision. I hope we could see an amendment to this Act in the future that would build in that provision. My concern is that in addition to the kind of medical research use of this information that was detailed last night, Mr. Speaker, an added part of the amendment also specifies that this information will be available in connection with Criminal Code investigations. As I indicated earlier, I still think that's important information that both the doctors and the patients who might be involved in it should be notified is being made available in connection with those kinds of investigations.

I'd also like to express some continuing concern about another part of the Act that was not addressed last night. That's the amendment that changes section 31(4)(c) and, as we talked about, indicates that there will no longer be a guarantee that the cost of insured services provided by a hospital outside Alberta will be covered. We now have a much more general wording in the Bill that we have before us that only indicates that "the costs of goods and services payable pursuant to section 62(b.2) of the Hospitals Act" will be covered. Of course, that does not specifically cover the cost of hospitalization outside Alberta. It certainly may be covered, but the amendment we're looking at in this Bill does not require that the cost of hospitalization outside Alberta be covered, as has previously been the case.

[Motion carried; Bill 21 read a third time]

**Bill 27**  
**Credit Union Amendment Act, 1985**

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 27, the Credit Union Amendment Act, 1985.

[Motion carried; Bill 27 read a third time]

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

3. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:  
Be it resolved that the Assembly approve in general the fiscal policies of the government.

[Adjourned debate March 28: Mr. Lysons]

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on this occasion to go over the budget and speak to the Budget Address. First, I would like to congratulate Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor on her appointment to such a valued post. I know she will be strong and dutiful in her years in office.

I'd like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer for this year's budget. I think it's one that gives confidence, strength, and a sense of realism to our province and country. It was just about a year ago that we looked at a similar budget but without the same opportunity to be as optimistic. We had staring at us the energy deal Ottawa put on us a few years ago. We had high interest rates and inflation. We didn't really know what would happen to that. In the country now, even though we have our share of problems and difficulties, we have a group of people who are looking at 1985 with much more optimism. We've got a new federal government in the last year, and there's certainly a change of attitude in the country that I have never seen before.

There's a feeling of worth out there, in spite of the fact that we didn't take off as good a crop last year as we have in past years. It affected the larger farmers much more than the smaller ones. The larger farmers usually have very high capital-intensive operations, and with the high interest rates, a lot of those people went down or are in danger of going down. I guess that's the nature of farming; you're up one day and down the next. Farming is a very resilient business, and I suspect we will come out of 1985 pretty well, providing we have any luck with weather conditions. Unfortunately, government doesn't control the weather. We'll just have to leave Mother Nature to look after us that way.

In 1985 we have an awful lot to look forward to in our constituency. In going over the budget, I notice that we are going to have a large expansion at Lakeland College: the renovation of the old dorm. This will largely complete the building component at the Vermilion campus of Lakeland College. We have some work to do on the farm yet, and there will be \$750,000 there, plus some matching funds coming from the endowment fund. That will help the farm considerably. If there is anything I want to see happen in my term of office in the Legislature, it is to see that farm really producing. If we look around the country, wherever we see good, active college farms and experimental farms, we generally see good farmers. They can work much closer and much better with people who are more able to get information and do some experimentation.

Our farm input costs, Mr. Speaker, are the most serious problem we have in our constituency. As goes agriculture, so goes our whole economy. In spite of some of the other

good things that are going on, if agriculture is down, everything is down, particularly attitude. With the federal government now looking at our dollar as a world commodity, as it should have been looked at, and not trying to prop it up, and with our 73-cent dollar as of last night, the value of our grain exports is up anywhere from 10 to 25 percent. Oilseeds are certainly a big crop in our area, and their value has increased dramatically. As mentioned earlier, we have problems with cattle and hogs, but generally speaking I think we're going to have a much better year pricewise, except to say this: even if we get a crop, to suggest that there's going to be lots of money in the country would be telling a falsehood.

In the last few years we have been able to sell off our stored grain and surplus cattle, and this has brought down our reserves, if you like, of cash. To a farmer, cattle on the hoof are similar to a businessman's money in the bank. When a businessman has no money in the bank, he feels very vulnerable, and the farmer is much the same way. If his granaries and feedlot are empty, there's not much left. So we have to build up those stocks and those reserves, and it's going to take at least two or three years. I know the Minister of Agriculture is very aware of some things the rural members have been pressing for to help agriculture in rural Alberta, particularly input costs.

Mr. Speaker, we had a very dramatic teachers' strike in the Elk Island region, which takes in most of our constituency. It was heartbreaking to see the real hurt that was going on in our constituency. I felt very badly that we had to see children out of school and that we had to have the bitterness that went on. But, fortunately, through the strong help of our Minister of Labour and strong support from the Minister of Education, the people involved in the strike worked it out at the bargaining table. To me, that was the most rewarding thing. If there was anything rewarding in that strike, it was the fact that the local people were able to work out their local problems without government coming in and saying, you're going to do this or that. In the country we have a much stronger feel toward our local government and local officials, and I would have been really hurt if we had had to ask the minister to go in, had had to say: "Come on. We can't handle this any more. You've got to help us out." It was so good to see that he was able to keep his composure, stand back, and make the system work.

Mr. Speaker, last year we had an opportunity to get a grant from the Minister of Recreation and Parks, and I was asked to pick a spot in my constituency where this grant may be best utilized, considering all people involved. I selected a spot just north of Sedgewick called Sedgewick Lake. I have never in my entire life seen people, such as Ray Pottage and all the other good people who are working on his committee in Sedgewick, get so enthused and so involved and do so much with this funding. I was speaking to Ray the other day, and he said that they've got most of their furniture and stoves built, and by the middle of the summer it looks like they're going to have a minipark that will be a real beauty. It's one I know they will really appreciate, because it's been done completely by the local people, with no hands-on by other people. It's a park they're building all by themselves, if you like. The different things they have done to get people to help them and cut costs and so on — it's really rewarding.

Last summer my two sons, who are pretty fair golfers, said: "Dad, you've been taking a lot of heat about Kanaskis Country. We're going to go down and critique that

place, at least the golf course." So away we went. We drove down there. These guys are pretty fair golfers. When we got to the clubhouse and looked over the hill and saw Kananaskis golf course and after listening to all the nonsense we heard about the sand and all these other things and then going out and trying to golf on that thing ... [interjection] The boys did fine, but poor old dad is not much for golf. I don't get an opportunity like the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say how I appreciate having three opposition members in the House this morning. That's really great.

DR. BUCK: Why don't you go ask the Premier how he's making out with his speech? We never see him. Shape up.

MR. LYSONS: Look who's talking.

DR. CARTER: Why are you standing? On a point of privilege? A point of order?

AN HON. MEMBER: Struck a nerve, hey, Walty?

AN HON. MEMBER: Order.

MR. LYSONS: We can always tell when the Member for Clover Bar is in the House; there's a little noise. That's the first noise we've heard all spring. Thank you very much.

Getting back to the golfing, and that always stirs up the member.

DR. BUCK: How much is it going to cost for new greens?

MR. LYSONS: I have no idea about the questions the hon. Member for Clover Bar is asking, because I don't get a chance to go to a golf course that often. However, my two sons are probably the most critical golfers you could have. They were really looking at it. One's a pretty good golfer and has done a lot of competitive golfing. The other one is in the financial business, so he has an eye for the dollar. When it was all over, they said that there was no way that I or any of our members should ever take any more insults about Kananaskis Country, because it was the greatest thing they had seen in their entire lives, and I believe it.

One of the things that is not often looked at as being part of the country is our cultural programs. The Minister of Culture recently sent out an information report on what happens in culture in our constituency of Vermilion-Viking. There are libraries, senior citizens' clubs, church groups being funded, arts councils, a Ukrainian cultural association, agricultural societies, community associations, hospital auxiliaries, a nursing home, historical societies, museums, dance associations, a players society, and lots more. The total funding for last year was \$67,000. We often hear people say they'd rather not work in the country because there aren't some of these activities. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, those of us that live in the country know things are going on and have more access to them than you have here in the city, although to some extent you have higher quality because of the sheer numbers. But we have some pretty high quality activity out there. An awful lot of our constituents from rural Alberta place very well. As an example, we have six brothers playing NHL hockey. That's a pretty good indication to us of some of the things that can happen in rural Alberta.

MR. PAPROSKI: For all the wrong teams.

MR. LYSONS: Well, you've got to have competition, and we can give you good strong competition.

Mr. Speaker, I'd be remiss if I didn't say something about the energy deal and how it will affect our constituency. It will affect our constituency in a way that probably isn't in a deal. That's the fact that by having our minister of energy work with the federal minister of energy and the ministers of energy from other provinces, they were able to sit down, bargain, deal, and do the things that had to be done with no leaks, no great fights, no great problems, and come up with a deal. In the first place, there was never any need for the national energy program. That was all a myth, as far as I'm concerned. But to see our ministers across this country sit down and collectively deal and solve a problem and do it so skillfully and show Canada that Alberta isn't the bad place or that Ottawa isn't the bad place — I think that has to give our country an awful lot of strength and confidence to know that we have a federal government in Ottawa and 21 MPs here in Alberta who are working for the benefit not just of their constituency, not just for Alberta, but for Canada as a whole. With that extra confidence, that building of togetherness, I don't see that we're going to have any problem pulling this country together, settling a lot of our regional differences, and getting on with building a future for our families and for our country like never before in history.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd certainly like to enter into the budget debate at this time and address the matter at hand.

The Provincial Treasurer placed before us a document that indicated where the government was at at the present time. It was keep the shop open, carry on, and try to do what we did last year. Listening to that speech, Mr. Speaker, I reminisced back to 1971, when the budget speech was delivered prior to the August election when this Conservative government came into power. I remember at that time the statements of the Provincial Treasurer that lauded the great things the government of the day had done: no new taxes, balanced budget, surplus of funds, that we are dealing with the matters of the day, the best health care programs, the best social services programs, the best nursing home programs, the best roads in the province. According to the government, everything was just great. I saw the very same event happening in this Legislature on the introduction of this budget. Here again we have a Provincial Treasurer who feels things are great and good in Alberta. But what we often find in instances like that is we have to go to the people, ask Albertans whether or not that's really true.

In 1971 there was a little test of the government, and they happened to fail. I think we're close to that event again in 1985, when the government is saying: "We've got it all in hand as a major caucus. We all make good decisions, we know what's right, and we're doing the best we can for people." We have a minister of publicity and public relations who pumps out thousands of dollars of information, pamphlets on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund that very few Albertans read. But they pay for them. Those pamphlets were to tell how great the Conservative government was. And that's the kind of budget we've got again. I see some members shaking their heads up and down — yes, it was great. But that's the kind of complacency that upsets the people of Alberta.

In my remarks today I want to address the other side of that issue, because what was not addressed in that budget should have been addressed. There are two things I see as the core of a budget speech. First of all, the budget must address the problems of the province, address the core issues that exist in a current fiscal year. If the budget doesn't address those issues, it has not met the responsibility. In this case, the Provincial Treasurer ignored those responsibilities. It was a budget of self-praise. As I've been told many, many times in my life, self-praise is no recommendation. That document should have brought forward the truth about what's happening in Alberta. That's the first item in terms of a test. Did it address the problems of Albertans? I feel it did not.

The second item is this. Once the problems are brought to the fore, a government then has the responsibility to address those problems in a comprehensive way and not try to ignore them, thinking they will go away. In terms of that second responsibility, I again feel that the government has failed in their responsibility. The Provincial Treasurer, who is the focus of this document, failed in that responsibility. He tried to gloss over the economic response that should have come from the government of Alberta in terms of policies, in terms of programs and objectives. It was not in the budget.

That's not good enough when we're spending some \$10 billion in this province of Alberta, of which the majority comes from natural resource revenue. No other province, as the Provincial Treasurer pointed out, receives that massive input of revenue. All other governments in Canada have to raise the majority of their revenue through taxes, so there's a direct relationship between the people and the revenue that comes. There's a greater hardship on those people. They've got sales taxes. That's another item we brag about here, no sales tax in Alberta. With the revenue we've got, we shouldn't have any sales tax in Alberta. We shouldn't have any if we have responsible budgeting. But a year and a half ago, as my honourable colleague points out, we had an increase of 13.5 percent in personal income tax — totally, completely unnecessary; made necessary only because of the type of budgeting that goes on in this province.

Let's look at the issues or the problems that should have been addressed and looked at in a truthful and honest manner. The first issue is unemployment. Every Albertan puts this on the top of their priority list, whether they're employed or not. It's been raised in this House a number of times, but the government isn't hearing about the problem. They haven't responded yet. They say: "Oh, we're doing this. We've got some employment programs, \$250 million. We're putting \$1.7 billion of capital works back in the budget." Well, let's have an exam. You've had a year to test that theory of dealing with unemployment. What has happened? In the third quarter of 1984 this province had a net out-migration of 14,400 people, which should have reduced the unemployment factor. Those people left because they did not have jobs in Alberta. We had all these job opportunity programs put in place, which should have reduced unemployment in this province. Now we all know the story. Unemployment has not changed." Edmonton 15 percent, provincial average 12.1 percent. The government failed in dealing with the top priority problem in the province. They're saying the same medicine will fix the problem in 1985-86. How can they even say that? On both counts: did they address the problem? No. Did they come up with anything different? No.

Let's look at the second area, it's related to the first and addressed in this budget; that is, the economic stability

and growth in the province in Alberta. I look at some of the statements made by the Provincial Treasurer on pages 5 and 6 of the budget.

I want to say this to the government as an aside. I've had two different copies of the budget, and they're all falling apart. I don't know whether the members are finding that. If I could parallel that to government . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you saying everything you touch falls apart?

MR. R. SPEAKER: This budget speech was first the government's property. I would have to say the first ownership was there, and now I've become an owner of a secondhand product that isn't working too well.

Anyway, now that I've fished it out of my piles of paper, on pages 5 and 6 of this budget the Provincial Treasurer talks about the economic situation and outlook. Let's see what he has to say. He's talking about the external factors:

... the United States and the rest of Canada experienced solid economic growth. . . .

The Canadian economy is forecast to continue expanding in 1985. Real growth is estimated at 2 percent.

But he really doesn't address Alberta. What about Alberta? What things are going to happen in Alberta? He does say some things, and I will credit him with that:

... what stands out is our basic economic strength relative to other parts of Canada. Alberta has  
— the highest family income after provincial taxes . . .

But he forgets to mention that there are 150,000-some people with no income in the province of Alberta. And he doesn't talk about the other side, the cost of living in Alberta. It costs more to live in Alberta. What he should have talked about, to be honest with the people, is the net: what do they have left of their finances?

— the highest per capita construction expenditure . . .

Construction is down in Alberta. Construction companies are still in difficulty. Just in the last couple of days, gravel companies and electrical companies are going bankrupt and losing their businesses. How can the minister not admit those kinds of things in the budget speech? Deal with the problem. That's all we ask. But we've never had that from the Provincial Treasurer. The presentation we get in this Legislature is always a deception.

What are some of the other things that should have been mentioned so that we're aware of them? The other side of the economy. Farm bankruptcies up in 1984. Business bankruptcies up in 1984. Bailouts 1984-85: \$300 million had to be taken from the provincial Treasury to be put into funds to bail out banks, credit unions, and the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation, which should never have started in the first place, and North West Trust. Why weren't those kinds of things entered into the budget so the people of Alberta knew there are problems on the other side? They're not there. The government says, "Those aren't problems; we don't recognize those things."

What other kinds of specific problems should have been addressed if we were really talking in an honest way to the people of Alberta? Agriculture: 20 to 25 percent of the farmers in this province are in difficulty — a well-known statistic. Unifarm quotes the statistic. The Department of Agriculture people quote it. But did the government have

the nerve to lay it up front to the people of Alberta and say, "Look, that is the situation"? Nothing in the budget. What do we get in that budget? On page 8 — and I raised this in question period the other day — the solution to the agricultural problem is going to be better weather in 1985. I say that a bit with tongue in cheek; I know the Provincial Treasurer didn't mean that that was the only solution. But when you look down the list, there weren't many other solutions either. In addressing the new, immediate problems in agriculture of 1985, it wasn't there.

Did they address the question of input cost? The government's own surveys indicate that input cost is the first concern of farmers in the province of Alberta. The government's own surveys, paid for by taxpayers' money, indicate that input cost is at the top of the list. Wouldn't it have been impressive to Alberta farmers if the Provincial Treasurer had listed that and said: "We know that's the number one problem. We're going to deal with it in 1985 to keep you in the farming business, because we know farming is the backbone of this province." They didn't even use those words. They're good political words. They didn't have the courtesy to recognize the number one problem in the industry. How can the farmers of this province ever have confidence that this urban Provincial Treasurer will ever deal with the problem as such? Well, they can't. And he hasn't.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm concerned, that's a neglect in the budget, both in recognizing the problem and recognizing that they should lay out some new solutions to the problem in the budget. That's the responsibility of the budget.

The second area is construction in this province. I had some work done by the Legislature Library in terms of the present conditions of the Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the present circumstances out in the marketplace of the construction industry. The information they gave me is that as of January 1, 1985, 2,200 home properties were held by the Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation. At the present time there are foreclosures proceeding on another 1,800, and the prediction, the best kind that could be given to me, is that there would possibly be another 1,600 in 1985. That means that in 1985 some 5,600 property units could be put on the market by the Alberta Housing and Mortgage Corporation. You can imagine what that would do for the developers, the people who are trying to sell an odd home here and there, who have real estate for sale on the market. Imagine how the prices will be depressed.

That's a very great problem. Construction people who are trying to survive by the skin of their teeth in west Edmonton and east Edmonton have come to me and said: "That is a problem. If those houses stay on the market, we are dead ducks." Whatever money they've got left in inventory or property is risked. The Provincial Treasurer should have said up front: "That is a problem. It's going to devastate the construction industry, and I'm prepared to deal with it."

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Any solutions in the budget? No. If I recall correctly, we're still building more senior citizens' accommodation. Maybe that's all right. But was the question ever asked: what about all this inventory we as the government have sitting here? Are there some ways we could use it instead of building more out of public funds? I don't know the answer to that question, but we'll investigate it. I'd think

a government with all its facility could do a little innovation. What about dealing with those people who are losing those homes and that property and looking at some kind of a buy-out possibility with the banks? We go to the banks; many private people are in the banks every day trying to buy out their debts and commitments. Why can't government try to do something like that? Why can't we look at exchanges in terms of apartments or condominiums to these homes? But there was no creativity or objectivity put into that budget to try to deal with the problems. It was the most politically dead document I've ever seen. It never even raised the problem, never mind deal with it. That's the second area that really concerns me about this government — didn't come to grips with it.

Small business. My small-business friends come to me and say, "We're trying to stay in there." They get concerned, and I don't blame them, when agriculture or industry get subsidies and we hand out millions of dollars for what they think are frivolous projects. They say, "Look, try to keep the taxes down." In keeping in context with my speech, first of all, I should say that the problems of small business were not dealt with in this budget speech, not even enumerated. Secondly, they talk about the cost of money as a problem. The Provincial Treasurer stands in his place in the Legislature and says, "Go out to the marketplace and get the money." That's good enough. I want to deal with that question a little later when I talk about what I would recommend as a five-point program to deal with some of these economic situations in the province.

A fourth specific problem area could have been dealt with when the budget speech came down but was not. There wasn't a clear enunciation of the problems in the oil and gas industry, the problems of discrimination in terms of taxation, problems being created by the \$2.1 billion taken away to Ottawa by the PGRT, problems of government regulations intervening in the oil and gas industry, and problems of multiple inspectors intervening and costing thousands and thousands of dollars in the oil and gas industry. The Provincial Treasurer didn't even have the courtesy to lay those problems into the budget, to recognize that in times of economic downturn you have to get right down to the nub of the issue and deal with it. He didn't have the courtesy to do that.

Since the budget came down, the energy agreement has been presented to us in this Legislature. I want to make this one comment. Certainly, the advancement in that energy agreement in terms of returning the rightful ownership and use of the revenue from the oil and gas resources of this province was good. The discrimination eliminated — good. The less intervention by government brought in — good. Deregulation allowing for more marketplace pricing — good. Very good things. I have no argument with any one of those objectives. They're excellent. As I said yesterday in the House, when governments change, sometimes they start listening to the people and paying attention to the interest groups across the province.

The point I want to add to what I said yesterday in terms of that agreement is that the type of federal government we have in Canada is very important. If this current federal government had had the same principles as the Trudeau Liberal government, whereby they wanted to grab all the resource revenue they could from Alberta with disregard for the province ... In terms of the September 1981 agreement, when the Premier said it was great, clinked the champagne glasses, and then blamed all the ruination of the oil and gas industry on the federal government — I

would have to say that the Premier had equal responsibility. He cannot deny his responsibility in signing that agreement.

If the Premier had had the clout with the federal government at that time, the terms of the national energy program could have been changed, but they were not. The compromise reached was to the detriment of Alberta in its economic future, so we are lagging behind other provinces of Canada. This agreement could have had the same results if the federal government of this country had not had the principles I thought the government sitting across the floor here had. I sometimes wonder; the pragmatic approach of the Premier does not lead to consistency. If the federal government had not established those principles in the negotiations, our minister of energy wouldn't have got to first base. We would not have achieved what has been achieved. That federal co-operation was very necessary. I want to say that I laud the Prime Minister and the federal minister of energy for co-operating and recognizing the need of a region in Canada, recognizing that we're one of 10 partners in Canada, and that just because we have a smaller population with smaller voting clout in the House of Commons, our rightful rights should be protected and enhanced when we're in a minority position. I laud that government for that and give them full marks.

I certainly hope that this government here, in a humble way, at this weekend conference that the Premier and the minister of energy will not stand up and talk about the great energy agreement that "we" negotiated, because it takes a spirit of co-operation, not confrontation, for us to be successful in dealing with our federal counterpart. As Members of this Legislature and as Albertans, we shouldn't forget who participates in agreements such as that.

I hope, though, that one of the questions being raised at the present time in terms of the energy agreement is the matter of royalties. I find the industry at this time feels that there is some inequity between one sector of the industry, the old oil producers, and the Canadian independent companies, whose income would be changed in terms of this agreement. As the government examines the effects of the new energy agreement in the next few weeks, I hope they'll look at royalty adjustment, if necessary. At this point in time I don't know the numbers, but that's a concern in Calgary and a number of small oil companies. I think it's incumbent upon government to say, "That is a problem; we'll try to address it."

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Another area I feel has been neglected in this budget is labour. We really haven't dealt with the question of labour. How do you deal with the labourers of this province? What future have they in the province? In a time of economic downturn the problem that labourers and labour unions have is attempting to adjust to the economic downturn. The question isn't raised in the document before us. I think it should have been, because there are many, many labour people who are free-enterprise individuals, who are contributing towards a sector of our economy, who need a government to represent them. This budget should have been adjusted in some way to recognize that very fact.

Another principle I see indirectly addressed in the budget regards the medical profession. In question period I raised this matter of why the edict through the budget. I would have to say that that didn't recognize what is now a problem. It didn't recognize the problem of the Alberta Medical Association, that they wanted some input into determining

their fee schedule. They didn't want an edict. We've stood in this Legislature, and the Premier has made speeches all over Canada about the edict that was placed in the 1980 national energy program through the federal budget, where they told Alberta what they were going to get. We condemned that principle. In this budget we see that this government, when it suits them, adopts the principle. It's completely wrong. We've created a problem; we haven't dealt with the problem. We've said, "As members of the Alberta Medical Association you're going to get zero percent, and that's good enough for you." I know the polls show that the people in this province are not for more income for doctors, but that shouldn't be the way we mistreat a profession, because of polls. That matter hasn't been dealt with in a reasonable way either in this budget.

I'd like to address those problems I've raised. I think there should have been some major suggestions or components of a financial plan in this budget to deal with people's concerns. To deal with them, I would have recommended that we look at them in two stages in the budget. First of all, those specific problems of 1985 that needed immediate attention should have been dealt with. What are some of them? I've raised them. Agriculture: we've got beets, vegetables, and grain in the north, where people will lose their crops if we don't deal with the problem. We didn't deal with the problems of spring cash flow and input costs for farmers. We haven't dealt with the problem of small business. Housing: I've mentioned the holding in place of some of these before putting them on the market, the workout idea, and the exchange idea. We haven't dealt with the problem immediately in 1985. Those are just a few. There are others. The budget had no approach to or understanding of those problems and should have dealt with them in terms of policy and financial commitment, if necessary. In the second area that should have been dealt with in that budget, I recommend that there should have been a long-term policy and program set.

Mr. Speaker, in the few remaining minutes of my allotted time I would like to quickly list those as a five-point program. Agriculture: I recommend tax relief and the removal of the government, royalty cost in natural gas that goes into fertilizer. Secondly, I recommend for agriculture an equal opportunity fund for interest stability. The second point in the five-point plan is in terms of oil and gas: the implementation of the oil and gas agreement and further consideration of provincial royalty relief in the province. Third, in terms of capital works I recommend urban and rural transportation construction expenditures be increased significantly. Rather than building buildings to house more government employees, we should have put in place projects that provide long-term benefits to Albertans. In terms of urban and rural transportation, the recommendation in this budget should have been a commitment by the government to double that budget over the next five years in equal installments, and in the following 10 years to hold the budget for urban and rural transportation in a fixed position. Why do we recommend that? The government has told us that they're 10 years behind in rural highway construction. We're behind in Edmonton and Calgary. That's the number one reason.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret to interrupt the hon. leader, but I have to draw to his attention that he has exceeded his allotted time.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, if I could be allotted just one minute, I'll quickly go over the other points. I'd like to complete two more points.

The second reason for the recommendation to double the highway budget and then continue it, Mr. Speaker, is that the construction industry can build up and be guaranteed security over the next 10-year period. The fourth point in this five-point program is for small business: tax incentives and the equal opportunity fund as well. The fifth point is the concept of limiting government and reducing the size and role of government, not only in business but in terms of people's lives. We would look at some specifics in terms of the cabinet in this province: reducing the number of cabinet ministers significantly and reducing the top-heavy bureaucratic administration by shifting the responsibility in the organization of government to the frontline people in regional offices down to local government. We would work on programs and legislation that would reduce intervention of government. That's the fifth point in our five-point program, limiting government.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned in my remarks what I call the equal opportunity fund, and I will make one comment with regard to that in my closing remarks. The equal opportunity fund would make available to Albertans money at interest rates comparable to those that have been given to other provinces in Canada. At the present time other provinces in Canada enjoy an interest rate from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund of about 9 percent on some \$2 billion. We're committing ourselves to say that Albertans should have an equal opportunity to have interest rates for a fixed period of time under the same conditions, except that they would be loans rather than debentures. We think that could stabilize Alberta's economy and certainly enhance opportunity and growth in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the extension of time, and I'll stop at that point in my presentation.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor will now attend upon the Assembly.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair]

head: **ROYAL ASSENT**

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order! Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

[The Honourable W. Helen Hunley, Lieutenant Governor of Alberta, took her place upon the Throne]

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly has, at its present sittings, passed certain Bills to which, and in the name of the Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

CLERK: Your Honour, the following are the titles of the Bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed.

[The Clerk read the titles of all Bills to which third reading had earlier been given]

[The Lieutenant Governor indicated her assent]

CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these Bills.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

[The Lieutenant Governor left the House]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before calling it 1 o'clock, I should indicate that it is intended that the Assembly sit on Monday evening and that the debate on the budget speech will continue in both the afternoon and the evening. It is not proposed that the Assembly sit Tuesday night.

Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 1 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 12:21 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 4, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]