

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, September 17, 1986 2:30 p.m.**

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

In our mind's eye let us see the awesome grandeur of the Rockies, the denseness of our forests, the fertility of our farmland, the splendour of our rivers, the richness of all our resources.

Then, O Lord, let us rededicate ourselves as wise stewards of such bounty on behalf of all Albertans.

Amen.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 243****An Act to Amend the Ombudsman Act**

MS MJOLSNESS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 243, An Act to Amend the Ombudsman Act.

This Bill would amend the Act to extend the Ombudsman's jurisdiction to include any public service agency which receives 50 percent or more of its funding from the government.

[Leave granted; Bill 243 read a first time]

Bill 214**An Act to Amend the Securities Act**

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce for first reading Bill 214, An Act to Amend the Securities Act.

This Bill would amend the Act to lengthen from one year to five years the period following the commission of an offence against the Act during which charges could be brought before a court. Similarly, the period during which charges could be brought before the Securities Commission would be lengthened from two years to five years.

[Leave granted; Bill 214 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table copies of the Auditor's report for the Foothills Provincial General hospital for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1986. I'd also like to file with the Assembly a copy of a brochure that will be going to every household in Alberta this week and early next week, entitled The End to Extra Billing by Physicians: What You Should Know. Copies of that will also be made available to all hon. members later this afternoon.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of two introductions today. I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, 33 grade 10 students from the Daysland school. That's my favourite town in Alberta. They are accompanied by Mr. Milton Openshaw as teacher and by two parents, Mrs. Guhle and Mrs. Lindeballe. I'd ask that the Assembly accord them the traditional welcome. They're located in the members' gallery.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of introducing two ladies from Camrose, Carol Dunlop and Lila Rosland, who are also located in the members' gallery. I'd ask that they stand and receive the traditional welcome of the Assembly.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in introducing to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 32 students from the Grant MacEwan Community College. Together with their teacher Dr. Winston Williams they are seated in the public gallery. I ask that they stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 36 pioneers from the Glendon area of my constituency. Glendon is a village located in the heart of the beautiful lakeland. The 36 senior citizens are led by group leader Anna Erickson and accompanied by bus driver Marcel Lapierré. They're seated in the members gallery, and I'd ask that they stand and receive the welcome of the House.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Pollution of North Saskatchewan River**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of the Environment. It has to do with the 4 million litre spill of contaminated water into the river northeast of Edmonton. The minister's response, as I understand it, seems to indicate that the two companies should be embarrassed. That's pretty powerful stuff, coming from the Minister of the Environment. My question is: is this the extent of what the minister is going to do about these spills?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

While I'm on my feet, there are a number of people up there from Bonnyville, which is my home town; some people I have seen before.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I never cease to be amazed by the answers we get in this Assembly.

My question, to be a little more specific: when is the Minister of the Environment going to stop scolding polluters and being embarrassed for them and begin taking some concrete action to stop them instead?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall making a statement in the House in the last number of days that somebody should be embarrassed or anything else to that effect with this matter. I certainly made it outside of the House. I believe very, very sincerely that Esso Chemical and Sherritt Gordon Mines Limited should both be very, very embarrassed.

In terms of the action, I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition well knows that on September 16, which was yesterday, the water quality control order was issued to Esso Chemical. The water control order basically lists six items that Esso Chemical Alberta is going to have to fulfill with some datelines — October 31, 1986; December 31, 1986; October 15, 1986 — that will be fulfilled by Esso Chemical. Failure to do that would see Esso Chemical brought to court. The penalties for failure to fulfill what has been directed under the water quality order would lead to a maximum fine of \$25,000 or, in default of payment, three months imprisonment.

Later today we will be issuing a water quality control order to Sherritt Gordon outlining a series of steps that particular company will have to fulfill. Failure to comply with the water quality order could very well lead to charges and, if found guilty, to fines of a maximum of \$25,000 or, in default of payment, three months imprisonment.

MR. MARTIN: It's all very well and dandy; I guess we're going ahead to work with them. But it seems to me that the minister has the power now to charge the companies under the Clean Water Act. My supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker, is: why hasn't he done that at this particular time?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, in the last number of days both companies in question have provided information to Alberta Environment, as per the rules. Preliminary investigations were held. Consultations and discussions were held between officials of Alberta Environment and the two companies in question. It appears, not conclusively, that in the case of the Esso Chemical spill a force of nature was involved, and it appears that in the essence of the Sherritt Gordon spill it could very well have been human error with respect to shutting off one pump and turning on another pump.

These matters unfortunately have happened. These matters have been reported. The companies in both cases have responded, and the government has said: "That's fine; that's not good enough. We are going to make this a public matter. We are going to issue statements to the people of Alberta and introduce water quality control orders with respect to those companies as well."

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, that's all very well and dandy. Almost all lawbreakers would like the same sort of consideration. It's up to the courts to decide the reason. Surely it's the minister's job to lay the charges, and my question is: specifically, will the minister lay the charges or not and let the courts decide how serious it was? That's their job.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, under the process that has been well established and established and directed by law in the province of Alberta — and those laws have been debated in this particular Assembly — those laws lead to certain processes. If either company were to ignore the directive that the government has provided to them, then it would be no decision one way or the other on my part to see that law proceedings would be initiated. But at the moment every safety precaution and every response has been provided to in a responsible area.

I'm not happy at all that that has happened, and I don't think that any self-respecting Albertan would be happy it has happened. In the case of both companies and the people associated with them, they have responded in complete

openness. They have identified what the problems were and how they've been created. If you want to put somebody in jail, the question is that the law of Alberta clearly indicates they have now been directed to do certain things; if they fail to do those things, then we'll go the next step.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of the Environment. Surely he knows that human error is no excuse. Try telling that to the traffic cop next time.

Could the minister answer if whether or not these companies have ever dumped or charged or broken the rules of pollution of the river in the last five years?

MR. KOWALSKI: It's my understanding that in the case of Esso Chemical this has never happened in the 17 years of association with that particular plant. They've never had a water quality order issued to them. In the case of Sherritt Gordon, I don't have that particular answer.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. What directives have been given downstream to the communities that are taking water out of the North Saskatchewan as to the safety or nonsafety of the water that's being drawn from the river?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, there are no communities in the province of Alberta that take water directly out of the North Saskatchewan River, save for the city of Lloydminster, and all municipalities along the way have been advised. In the case of the city of Lloydminster, they have a reservoir which contains 14 days' drinking water supply. This particular plume in the case of Esso Chemicals is moving down the river at approximately 1.8 to 2 miles per hour. It will probably reach Lloydminster on the weekend. Three cities in Saskatchewan — Lloydminster, North Battleford, and Prince Albert — have been advised, as has the Saskatchewan Department of the Environment.

Social Services Budgeting

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the acting Social Services minister, and my question is simply this to whoever they are. I think it's you over there; I'm told anyhow. Why are local social service agencies, which provide help to the most needy in our society at a most needy time, being asked by departmental officials to develop budgets for next year at levels 5 and 10 percent below this year?

MR. DINNING: Surprise. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Social Services is not able to be in the House this afternoon because of an earlier commitment. I could have her answer the question. I could give her the *Hansard* and ask that she reply to the member's question tomorrow afternoon.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I greatly, greatly appreciate that answer. If I may follow up with the acting minister and his precise answers. It has to do with government policy. It seems that this is more than a general government review. They're being asked to develop real plans for these sorts of cutbacks. My question is to the government: instead, why doesn't the government take the approach of looking at the real needs of the clients so that the fat will be cut where necessary but the poor and the disadvantaged are not made to pay for this government's mismanagement?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I think I could easily pass that question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer in that he might want to comment on the fiscal policies of the government. As for the impact on the Department of Social Services, I believe the hon. Minister of Social Services would want to answer that question herself.

MR. MARTIN: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I love the answers so far. To follow along in social services, because we are not sure how long we'll be here, I want to just deal with the specific case of the late Mr. Belanger and his family of Morinville. Allegations have surfaced that the Social Services department was repeatedly warned of the need for intervention. My question is to the government, whoever wants to answer it: what sort of independent inquiry will the government be appointing to get to the facts of this matter which will recommend improvements in departmental responses to crises?

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. leader could draw some kind of linkage between the original two questions and this one for the Chair's sake.

MR. MARTIN: We're trying to deal with social services, the disadvantaged, and how the service agencies aren't reacting to these sorts of problems.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to take the question as notice on this very tragic incident and refer the question to the Minister of Social Services for when she returns to the House tomorrow.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could add something to the answer already given in the sense that the Fatality Inquiries Act has in place the potential, if the Fatality Review Board makes that decision in that case, to have a public inquiry, and that would be under the direction of a provincial court judge. I should add that when the Fatality Review Board considers deaths of that type, they make their decision on all of the investigations up to that point that they have access to. I won't predict whether or not the board would make an order for an inquiry in this case, but that is the process. It could well result in a public inquiry.

MR. MARTIN: Supplementary question to the minister. That may well be, but it seems to me we're dealing here with government policy in terms of a response time in the Social Services department. My question then to the minister: beyond that, would the government be prepared to provide their own inquiry into the response time of the Social Services department and seeing if clients are being adequately protected?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, any inquiry that is held, if one is held, under the Fatality Inquiries Act should point to some information in respect to the background of that family that would help us in determining whether a further inquiry is justified. I could, I think, assure the hon. leader that if a further inquiry is necessary, including the specific point of response time, we would undertake that.

MRS. HEWES: A supplementary to the Acting Minister of Social Services, Mr. Speaker. There's no question the needs in our communities are escalating due to the economy. All social service agencies are feeling the pressure. The minister

has indicated to us that her department may in fact have to go back to the Treasurer for supplementary funds. Perhaps this minister will answer, or would he please ask the minister: how could a budget cut possibly be compatible with these facts?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, the facts are tragic; the incident is a very, very tragic one. But on the broader question, it is a matter that I believe the hon. minister would want to respond to, and that is also connected, of course, with the fiscal policy of this government.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I came in today loaded for bear, but the front bench looks like the bubonic plague has hit it, so if I may, Mr. Speaker, direct it to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Out of order, hon. member. It's not in order at all to talk about absences. Time and time again in this session the reference has been made to *Beauchesne*: to comment upon absences or presence of members is entirely out of order.

Question please.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I said the bubonic plague looked like it had hit it. I hadn't referred to whether. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, if you persist, the question will pass on to the Leader of the Representative Party.

Agricultural Trade

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. On September 16 at the latest round of GATT negotiations the French foreign trade minister announced that the European Economic Community would not agree to the dismantling of their unfair agricultural subsidies. These are the same subsidies that caused the world trade war in agricultural products and depressed grain prices for the western farmers, pushed the prices to very dangerously low levels. My question to the minister is: can the Minister of Agriculture tell us what discussions he has had with his federal counterpart in the last few days to ensure that if the Europeans won't reduce their subsidies, Alberta farmers are accorded at least the same level of subsidies as the European farmers?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, one obviously is aware prior to going into negotiations that you always make the strongest possible statement. We're hopeful that they will reconsider their position. I know our federal counterparts are working very hard to ensure that they do reconsider their position, as is our Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs who is going to be participating firsthand on behalf of western Canada.

I can also share with the hon. member that, as he is aware, this government has been very forthcoming in their support for the agricultural sector. I won't take the time of the House, but again, I could go through a list of programs that we brought forward to reduce input costs for the agricultural sector, and we're going to continue with that active support that we always have come forward with in the past.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, he's present all right. Can the Minister of Agriculture tell us what steps his department has taken to open up new markets — let's get more on the positive side — for Alberta farmers in the developing

world and whether he expects any trade deals for Alberta agricultural products to be announced soon?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, we've taken a number of initiatives, and I'm happy to point to some specifics. As I lead up to those specifics, as the hon. member is aware the Member for Little Bow asked just the other day, we have had meetings with individuals from Russia. Just the day before yesterday I met with individuals from Japan who are very interested in our processing more of the products that we ship to the Japanese prior to selling it. We have an exchange program in place whereby we have an individual from the Department of Agriculture in Alberta working with the Japanese in Japan, and they in turn have an individual here. Plus, our Leduc plant is looking at the possibility of developing processed foods so that we can ship them to Japan much along the lines that they are accustomed to, so that our sales will be readily available on the shelves in Japanese stores.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, "looking at," "discussing." We'd love to hear a deal announced.

To the minister. Deloitte Haskins & Sells accounting firm estimate that 80 percent of western Canadian poultry producers would go bankrupt if free trade with the U.S. is imposed. What steps has the minister taken to obtain an exemption for the poultry industry, the failure of which would cost western Canada over a hundred million dollars?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, right from the start when the so-called enhanced trade talks began, we indicated, as have all provinces and the federal government, that we will give special consideration to those areas where there are supply-managed commodities. One only has to examine the United States where they have their own supply-managed sectors, such as dairy, that they're not going to give up so quickly on. There are naturally a number of trade-offs involved, but we have indicated that we are going to give prime consideration to those areas that are involved in supply-organized sectors.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, we don't want to trade chickens for butter. What assurances can the minister give the Alberta farmers that any free trade deal negotiated will not restrict the province's ability to provide future assistance to Alberta farmers or reduce the amount of assistance currently given the sector? Are we going to bargain away any of their rights to future assistance?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I would be concerned at bargaining away their rights in the event that the hon. member was doing the bargaining, but because he is not doing it, I don't think there is any immediate concern. We have indicated on a consistent basis that our prime consideration is for those producers within this province. We have constitutional rights as a province. Those rights cannot be violated without our concurrence, and we would not concur in the event that drastic damage was to be done.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the world oversupply of wheat, corn, and soya beans and with the subsidies that the European economic countries are receiving and the United States is now subsidizing the farmers, has the Department of Agriculture done any one-, two-, or three-year projections as to what will happen

to our farm income in this one-, two-, or three-year period? What projections have been done?

MR. ELZINGA: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have done some projections. I don't have the exact figures at my fingertips, and if the hon. member would wish those, I'd be more than happy to see that he receives them. In addition to that, the federal government has also done some projections. I should share with him that it does not look overly promising as it relates to the grain sector for the year's projections because there is a surplus, as the hon. member has stated. That's why we have been so active in attempting to reduce the input cost for this very prime sector.

MR. FOX: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the comprehensive, bilateral free trade negotiations. Does the minister have any plans to initiate an up-to-date assessment of just what the impact will be on all sectors of Alberta agriculture of an agreement such as this if it's concluded?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, there have been initial studies done by a number of worthwhile institutes, and the documents are public. The initial impact overall, as it relates to Alberta and Alberta agriculture, shows that it would be a distinct advantage to increase our market whereby rather than a smaller population we have a greater market share of a population that is 10 times our size, and it is a distinct advantage to the agricultural sector to be exposed to that market.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the minister can share with the Assembly if he has been in contact with the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and can bring us more up to date on what's actually happened in the trade negotiations that are going on right now.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, we haven't discussed it since the minister from our government left, but we had an intense discussion with both him and the Premier prior to his leaving where we did indicate again our desire to have our government and the federal government very actively involved to reduce the high subsidy levels that the European Economic Community is involved in, such as the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon mentioned in his opening statement, and also with the hopes of curtailing the subsidy levels that the United States is presently involved in to offset what the European Economic Community is doing. We recognize that we don't have the population base in Canada to offer the rich subsidies that are offered by some other countries, but we have done a great deal within this province. I'm sure all members are very proud of the action that this government has taken as it relates to agriculture.

Grain Handlers' Strike/lockout

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my questions as well are to the Minister of Agriculture. In this House we passed a resolution on September 9 — and today it's September 17 — requesting or urging the government to take action with regard to the strike/lockout at Thunder Bay. We have moved some 200 cars from the west into that eastern market; whereas Thunder Bay, when it's operating, moves some 1,500 cars a day of wheat through that facility. Could the minister indicate at this time whether the federal government has made any contact with the minister and indicated that

there is a timetable and some deadlines by which the federal government will take action to end that strike and intervene at this point in time?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I can share with the hon. member that as we did yesterday, we were in contact again today with the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board's office. He has shared with us that the task force is again looking at alternate routes so that we can meet our offshore grain commitments.

I would also suppose — I share with the member that I am supposing — they would like to see what is developing on the west coast. As the hon. member is aware, they have not taken a strike vote yet there. Again, I'm not quite sure what action they would take in the event a strike vote was taken and they did vote to go on strike. But they've indicated to me, as they've indicated, I'm sure, to a good number of other individuals, that they are extremely concerned about this, and they're hopeful they will have something in a more positive way to come forward with in the very near future. There's no denying that we are delighted they did put in place a task force so that we can examine alternate routes for our grain deliveries.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate what message the Premier is taking to the First Ministers' Conference with regard to this matter? The Premier indicated in an earlier question period that he was prepared to put this item on the agenda or inject it into the conversation of the First Ministers' meeting. Could the minister indicate what directions or what position the Premier will take? Will it be the request of the Prime Minister and other Premiers of western Canada to come up with some type of firm schedule to stop the strike?

MR. ELZINGA: As the hon. member is aware, when the Premier responded to this some days ago, he indicated that he did have conversations with the Prime Minister on this issue. The Premier I'm sure will speak for himself upon his return. But I can indicate to the hon. member that the Canadian Wheat Board has involved Alberta Terminals now to a greater extent to help alleviate the situation. I can share with the hon. member that presently ATL has received an order from the Canadian Wheat Board for the cleaning of 150 cars of number 1, 2, and 3 durum at Lethbridge. We're also going to have the Edmonton plant at ATL very involved. Hopefully with some of the counteractions we can offset to some degree, hopefully to a great degree, some of the hardships that are being experienced.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Indications are that some 200 cars have moved east, and this week only 100 more cars will move with grain into eastern port facilities at the various locations. Could the minister indicate from the information at hand whether that number will increase on a per day basis, and what potentially is the capability of this alternate system that is being designed by that new agency?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I can only share with the hon. member it is my hope that it will increase. My greater hope is that the situation will be resolved as it relates to Thunder Bay.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Back again to the earlier request: when is the minister going

to stir himself up and put real heat on the Prime Minister to recall Parliament? Can't you just pretend they're Liberals or NDP and charge down there and get really mad for a change and go after them?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, we've been very active in pursuing any type of results that will resolve the situation at Thunder Bay. I am surprised at the hon. member's comments. He endorsed what this government was doing only just a few short days ago. We thank him for his endorsement.

North Saskatchewan River Water Quality

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. The minister indicated yesterday that the studies released on the North Saskatchewan river cost \$350,000, but the minister failed to inform the House as to the methodologies employed. How was this study conducted?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the study cost \$350,000. I seem to recall that yesterday I indicated that some 42,000 tests and some 700 samples were taken. There was an involvement of the Alberta Environmental Centre in Vegreville. I'm sure the Member for Vegreville is very proud of their involvement in this. Samples were taken between May and November of 1982 and 1983. The study took four years to complete, it required 8 person years of work, and about 250 man-days were required for sampling.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, to the minister again. What is being done to improve water quality downstream from the city?

MR. KOWALSKI: In the reports issued yesterday, I indicated that there were really two steps that can be taken. One is to deal with the question of phosphorus removal, and the other one is to deal with the question of disinfection. In both cases statements made by the Minister of the Environment yesterday that officials from Alberta Environment would be dealing with the city of Edmonton and the Capital Region Sewage Commission, which is chaired by the mayor of St. Albert — I talked to the mayor of St. Albert earlier in the week and indicated that there would be follow-up discussions between Alberta Environment and his organization to see exactly how these two items should be implemented in the future.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, with the maintaining of water quality in Alberta, I'm just wondering if there are authorities other than the province and the Department of the Environment for maintaining water quality within the river system of Alberta.

MR. KOWALSKI: There has been involvement by every municipality to make sure their machines are equipped and their sewage removal systems are working and working properly. Earlier this week I tabled in the Legislature a report of the position of the province of Alberta to the federal government and the other provinces in the country about certain standards that should be employed in terms of water-quality standards nationwide. I might point out to the hon. member that, I think, the last several days of September and the first couple of days of October the national meeting of resource and environment ministers will

be held in Alberta. I will be the chairman of that particular meeting. One of the items we have on the agenda is a review of water quality standards.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, as we all know, we've had a considerable amount of precipitation in this part of the country and other parts of Alberta in the last number of weeks. I'm just wondering: have the floods that occurred just recently had any effect on the water quality, and if so, what has been done to correct that circumstance?

MR. KOWALSKI: There were no negative effects other than erosion, Mr. Speaker. Normally flooding or flushing or washouts tend to pick up the debris and the metallic compounds that are found at the base of the river and are washed downstream to another place. What it tends to do in the short term and the long term is essentially clean it up, other than for the erosion that occurs, the type that we talked about yesterday in the Assembly in response to questions from the Member for Edmonton Glengarry.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, Member for Calgary McCall.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate if his water quality experts or consultants are in fact obtaining ...

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me, hon. member. You've had your limit.

MR. YOUNIE: A supplementary on this one, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the minister said that the water quality was better than expected. I'm wondering if that means that we expected it to be bad and it was fairly good or in fact we expected it to be absolutely terrible and it was merely awful. I suspect the second.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, that's a great question, and it really invites one into debate. One of the paragraphs that was included in the North Saskatchewan River: Characterization of Water Quality in the Vicinity of Edmonton Overview I think is a very pertinent one. Perhaps I might just utilize a couple of lines. Basically it says that:

Public interest in environmental problems has in part led to improved treatment of municipal and industrial waste waters, and water quality in the river has improved greatly since the 1950s. Yet, people generally believe that water quality in the North Saskatchewan River is poor.

The reports issued yesterday were the fourth series of reports in the last couple of years, all done by scientists, including the Environment Council of Alberta, which indicated that. We had the Hrudey report. A scientist at the University of Alberta basically says:

... a good source of raw water at most times of the year ... little objective reason for health concerns associated with trace substances ...

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. I'm sure that all members of the Assembly will dash out and read the report from cover to cover. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Just a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Has the minister any record of the number of

successful water pollution prosecutions that have taken place in the last year?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, that would be a great question for the Order Paper. I'd really like to get those answers specifically for me. Perhaps the member would follow through.

Landfill Pollution

MR. YOUNIE: Mr. Speaker, I would say I hate to pick on the Minister of the Environment, but I would never mislead the House.

I visited the Sturgeon landfill this summer and must say that I was absolutely shocked by what I saw, that being a lack of control over what is dumped there, including numerous barrels that seem to go into the dump. I'm wondering in light of this if the minister is satisfied that the present system of small-town landfill sites is secure enough to prevent indiscriminate dumping of dangerous chemicals into these landfills.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd sure hate to get into another minister's area of responsibility, but landfill jurisdiction falls under the public health units. It's my understanding that the minister of community health is the one who tends to answer questions on that, but I can throw in my opinion on that before we get ...

MR. SPEAKER: An opinion is not required. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, perhaps you'd like to redirect the next question to the appropriate minister.

MR. YOUNIE: If he doesn't want to answer the last one.

I would ask then if the minister of community health or the Minister of the Environment — just in case he wants to claim credit for this one — is confident that the much vaunted program of improved pesticide container storage is really safe and effective as previously he believed.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking for an opinion. What we have done now in the province of Alberta is set up a series of mechanisms to clean up the environment. In the case of containers of pesticides, insecticides, herbicides, and the like we have currently now in place — and it's a relatively new procedure — a system whereby purchasers of such chemicals have an opportunity to return those barrels through their local agricultural service boards or through their local salespeople in the communities they live. Eventually those plastic containers that we're talking about now are taken to a series of regional landfills in the province of Alberta and, periodically during the year, Alberta Environment picks them all up. The numbers of these barrels is approximately 800,000.

One of the reasons we are having the Environment Council of Alberta this very year hold public hearings on the very important question of recycling is to determine exactly what we can do with those containers rather than simply burying them as has happened in the past. I honestly believe that we can recycle those materials and we can help eliminate landfill pollution in the province of Alberta and perhaps find a new growth industry out of garbage in this province. We're taking all that together.

So the answer: I'm not happy with what's happening today in terms of what the reality is, but I'm happy that we're moving in the right direction to solve the problem,

and we intend to be very vigilant and very aggressive about it.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. Later perhaps we can look over some photos I have and discuss those, but for now I'd like to file three copies of laboratory tests done on samples taken at the Sturgeon landfill, and they indicated that a number of very dangerous chemicals were there. I would like to ask: is the minister aware that 45-gallon drums can be and are being dumped in this landfill and perhaps in other landfills with no questions asked whatsoever?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has information with respect to testing. I surely hope that he would have taken the initiative to provide that information to the municipal government which has the responsibility for the landfill. In addition to that, if he has not done that, I'd be delighted if he would pass that on to me today and I will ensure that the MD of Sturgeon has access to this very important public safety information that the member has and, as I understand, is still not passed on to the MD of Sturgeon or their local public health unit.

We've had this happen on several occasions, Mr. Speaker, with respect to public safety. If the hon. member is going to stand up in this Assembly and try to make cheap political points on environmental issues that I believe should be dealt with in a nonpartisan manner ... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, there is always a question with respect to procedures; there's no doubt about that for all of us. The final supplementary on this issue, which will be a question without further statements involved. Member for Edmonton Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: I would like to ask the minister if he would like to arrange for the municipal district to test these samples, one of which is the one I had tested, and take whatever measures are necessary to make sure that chemicals of this very dangerous nature do not continue to be dumped in that landfill, because they are dangerous. [the Member for Edmonton Glengarry displayed a box of bottled samples]

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister, there's a difficulty. There's been no request to file the material which is here in the Assembly, and I order the Sergeant of Arms to have it removed immediately. There was no request for filing, and what has happened here is a personal request from one member to another.

Soil Conservation

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Agriculture on the prairies generates more than \$10 billion annually in farm incomes. The threat posed by improper soil management is an extremely important issue. The Science Council of Canada in its recent report on soil degradation in Canada estimates that soil degradation costs Alberta farmers \$429 million annually. Can the minister tell us how much of the government's budgeted \$595 million for agriculture is devoted to soil conservation programs and whether he feels this is enough, given the annual cost of \$429 million from the problem?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, as is the case with all programs, we wish we could do more. As the hon. member is aware and we hear on a repeated basis from her party,

we have to do everything we possibly can to reduce our budgetary deficit. I would hope that she is making representations so that we can spend more money in this area, because it is a deep concern. I should share with the hon. member that we are going to have a study forthcoming within the next number of weeks which will offer a number of alternatives to us as to how we can offset some of the difficulties we are facing as they relate to soil erosion.

I must indicate though, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure you would concur, that it would be more appropriately put in our budget estimates, which we have had a chance to discuss, and I didn't notice the hon. member participate. It was also brought up this morning at Public Accounts, and had the member a sincere interest, I'm sure she would have participated in one of those two debates.

MR. SPEAKER: That's not quite fair.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for the lecture, Mr. Minister.

Can the minister tell the Assembly what discussions he has had with his counterparts across Canada regarding the creation of a national soils conservation policy as recommended by the Science Council and, perhaps, why we don't already have one in place?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I'm waiting for the recommendations from a number of groups that are involved in the release of the study that will be forthcoming in a few weeks. I'm more than happy to take up the view as expressed by the hon. member so that we can have further discussions with agricultural ministers at both the federal and provincial levels to pursue that goal. But I would put the one caveat on it that I'd like to see the study that is presently being done, and it should be forthcoming in a matter of weeks.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, the Science Council recommends that the province hire additional soil conservation specialists to work directly with farmers. The minister has already spoken about the need for more funds. Can the minister tell us if he in fact has any such plans, when and how many new soil specialists Alberta farmers can expect to be hired to address the seriousness of this problem?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, again I would await the study that I referred to earlier prior to giving a specific commitment. I'm sure the hon. member can appreciate also that it is going to be rather difficult for us to hire more soil scientists during this period of restraint within our provincial government.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, the Science Council estimates the problem will cost prairie farmers \$2.7 billion annually in 20 years if we don't do anything. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture can tell us of any plans he has to adjust within his department to assist farmers to improve their soil management techniques.

MR. ELZINGA: Had the hon. member inquired, Mr. Speaker, she would be aware that we do have individuals within our department that are in constant contact with our rural population as it relates to soil conservation. We do have an information flow and work very closely with the agricultural sector with the hope that the farming population itself will exercise proper stewardship as it relates to their land.

Aboriginal Rights

MR. PIQUETTE: To the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The session appears to be about to end, and I want to be sure to ask questions regarding the historic tripartite conference on aboriginal rights next March in the event that we don't reconvene before then. Given the widespread concerns — and many of them have been expressed to me by aboriginal people — about the phrase "existing rights" in the 1982 constitutional resolution, what is the policy of this government on the importance of maintaining or changing that phrase and concept?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that amendment was made to a proposed constitutional package by negotiation in 1981 or '82. It was thought that some provinces or the federal government of the day needed the reference to "existing" in order that the argument would not be made that the Constitution was granting further rights beyond those that had been historic and were existing at the time.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. Might the Assembly give unanimous consent to this line of questioning being completed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

MR. PIQUETTE: There is some debate in interpretation of the word "existing." In terms of specific constitutional changes, what is the government's primary goal for this next round of tripartite negotiations?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to answer in detail on behalf of the Minister of Federal and Inter-governmental Affairs in respect to all of the things that could transpire at the conference next March. I want, though, to respond in the historical context in respect to the reference to "existing." If there is a concern over that, I'm not aware of any policy to rethink that. I think it was done at the time by consensus and is firmly established.

MR. PIQUETTE: What discussion has occurred with the native community and its leadership regarding their concern over enforcement of gaming licensing and enforcement on Indian reserves, given the movement toward self-government?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the whole question of native self-government is one that indeed has to be addressed by the conference with the federal and all provincial governments present. My colleague the minister of forestry and wildlife could perhaps add something in respect to enforcement policy on hunting and other aspects. I know he has had many discussions in that respect. What place considerations like that will play in the conference next March, which is certainly a very important and historic conference, I can't predict at this time.

MR. PIQUETTE: A final supplementary. There have been a number of raids on bingo halls in native communities. Why has the government not declared a moratorium on intervention by provincial gaming officials on the reserves until the negotiations next March are concluded, as some other provinces have already done?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. member was talking about game in his question. If he's talking about gaming, that's different. [interjections] You know, hunting and fishing.

I can respond to gaming only in a limited way because enforcement and investigation policies are those of the police forces to some extent. They of course receive some guidance from the Attorney General's department in respect to the laying of prosecutions.

I think the issue is complex, and I don't deny that it's important and should be addressed. It's complex in the sense that on Indian reserves the federal law, so far as that is based on jurisdiction under the Constitution and so long as the accord is there between the treaties and the federal law — that is, one might say that the federal law runs in the reserves. But at the same time, there is a constitutional principle that provincial laws of general application also apply to such reserves.

That is a small measure of the complexity, Mr. Speaker. I conclude by saying that I acknowledge the importance and the relationship between the question and the issue of self-government, and I think those issues deserve further addressing.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the Attorney General. In view of the fact that the provincial government enforces federal laws on gambling and this particular instance where they're raiding native bingo games, would he consider talking to his enforcers and pointing out to them that this is more in the nature of family gambling rather than a public thing. It's a lot different to have bingo in a reserve ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, hon. member. This brief supplementary is getting into paragraph form. Perhaps since the Attorney General is not present in the House, the Minister of Municipal Affairs might take it as notice and hand it on to his colleague.

The time for question period has come to an end. The Minister of the Environment wishes to supplement an answer given previously in today's proceedings.

Pollution of North Saskatchewan River (continued)

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon asked me if water quality control orders had been issued to Esso Chemical and Sherritt Gordon Mines Limited in the past. I indicated that none had been issued to Esso Chemical in the past. I've now been informed that none have been issued to Sherritt Gordon Mines Limited either in the past.

MR. TAYLOR: I gather I'm allowed to respond, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: For supplementary information.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary information. I didn't ask whether just those particular people had been charged. I wanted to know: what charges for anyone for polluting water in the last year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Blues will indeed be checked into. Again, the matter with respect to further detail might be given consideration for the Order Paper.

The Chair has been notified that there is a point of order.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of grave concern to the people sitting in this area. I feel we've been exposed to a dangerous chemical, and we have no assurance from the member for Glengarry that it was properly sealed to environmental standards. Our health is endangered, having been negligently exposed to these things, even more so than the people in the county of Sturgeon. I think we may have to be evacuated.

MR. SPEAKER: The issue has been given sufficient profile for consideration by all members of the Assembly.

The Chair would also point out that various members of the Assembly from time to time have been falling into the very lackadaisical habit of referring to only partial names of constituencies. This has been happening from all corners of the Assembly. On this issue I'd point out that the Member for Edmonton Glengarry was the one who was the transporter of goods, whether they were dangerous or otherwise. But the matter has been noted.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (Second Reading)

Bill 54

Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1986

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 54.

In addressing the principles of this Bill, they are only two in number. First, the Bill would address the implementation now of certain recommendations made in the Miller report on legislative indemnities in 1979. I will do my arithmetic this way, Mr. Speaker. That was some seven years ago. The recommendation that, in most cases, tied any increase in members' sessional indemnities was a provision which allowed for part of the inflation in any given year. It was not intended to provide for indexing in the sense of following inflation but to provide for part of the inflationary rise year over year in the province. In two years the increases were not taken by the members, and this Bill would give effect to the two increases of 5 percent each for 1980 and 1984.

The only other principle addressed by the Bill would assign to the Members' Services Committee by this amendment to the statute the responsibility for establishing certain allowances for members. Those allowances include situations where a member may by resolution of the Assembly be serving on a committee between sessions and have to do with living expenses; also, the expense allowance that normally attaches to the member's sessional indemnity and the allowance in respect to a temporary residence in the sense that members who have to maintain a second home in the capital city away from their constituencies during a session are entitled to certain allowances.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of the government motion, I'd like first of all to inform the House that I am a member of the Members' Services

Committee which recommended the legislation that the government is now putting forward.

I also want to inform the House that I have freed my caucus to vote as they please, and I think it might be an idea that any of the other parties may wish to do the same. My point is that in the parliamentary process today too often we vote in lockstep and not by our consciences. There are, of course, different issues that are near and dear to some parties. As you know, the government itself has freed its members a couple of times in debate this year. The NDP has favourite issues they will free the members on. So our members will vote as they feel when the vote comes up.

However, speaking to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, of course the first thing that comes to everybody is that it's bad timing. There's no such thing as good timing to fix salaries. It doesn't matter; whatever time it is, it's always a so-called bad time. If you wait until things are a good time, the thing will probably never arrive. Even at that, it then becomes a very, very self-serving bit of trying to fool or play games with the public. I don't believe in that. Through my years in public life in different things, I remember first as a school trustee, I've been lucky enough to have been blessed with enough money that the stipends I've received working for the taxpayers at different times have not been important. But I felt after my initial debates on this — because these debates come up from time to time. Whether you're a school trustee, an alderman, or whatever service, or if you're on a committee for the government, it's very easy for many people to say — and I think I could have many times — "Well, let's cut the pay in half" or "Let's not take the pay."

That sets up a very important principle then: do you get paid? In other words, I think the first question we have to ask in our minds is: do we get paid as MLAs? The question of whether we deserve pay might be an entirely different matter, but the point is whether we get paid. It would be very easy to go back to the early days of Sir Edmund Burke and Stuart Mill and all the rest of the early parliamentarians of Britain and follow their line of reasoning that there should not be pay, that it should be a service to the community. But very quickly the Mother of Parliaments and the development of democracies found that when you follow that line, all you do is make sure that the public is only going to be served by the rich or the sons and daughters of the rich.

So I think that first of all we have to decide the first principle. The first hurdle we make is whether you receive pay or not. I think there can be no question in the modern 20th century that you should receive pay, because it is not fair to hold people out of this Chamber or any parliamentary Chamber on the fact that they cannot afford to send themselves or have friends who would send them to the Legislature. Of course it also acts to help the independence of the legislator if he or she does not have to depend on someone to send the money up. So I have no trouble in crossing the first principle, that you have to receive pay if you're going to be an MLA.

The second principle I'd like to address, Mr. Speaker: who sets that pay? The government of the day? The Assembly as a whole? No matter what way you look at it, if you're setting your own pay, you're self-serving. You can decide to set it high in good years, low in bad years, or maybe vice versa, in the idea that's prime in the economy. But the point is that you are setting your own pay. Consequently, I argue that one of the few things this government did

wisely in the past, in my opinion, was appointing the Miller commission in 1979 that came out and said, "We follow the principle that a third party set your pay; a third party decides what you're going to get." I submit that it's due to the cowardice of some of the people in the past that they did not take that pay increase and that they were playing and grandstanding. A third party sets your pay and it is your duty to take it. If you want to donate it back to society or charity, that's your business. But to turn down a pay raise or to turn down the raise that's set by a third party is thumbing your nose at the principle of saying that the third party should set your pay.

Consequently, when you say, "I'm taking zero", why would you argue to take zero? Why not cut your salary in half? Why not cut it down to zero one year? Why then do you jump up to 15 percent? The point is that when you start saying that you won't take it, you are indeed setting your remuneration, and that is wrong, Mr. Speaker. I say that if there's anything wrong with the principle involved here and if we don't like the principle of what the third party has set up, then maybe we could set up another commission. But until another commission is set up, the third-party rule was that the people of this Legislature would be paid a certain amount and it would be based on the inflation rate. That seems to be a fair rate, and I think it is wrong indeed for us to deny that.

I know it is so easy to get out and make points and say that you're going to be grand fellows, you're going to go in a coach-and-four and in effect throw a mythical purse to the poor by not doing this or not doing that. But the point is that when you do, you transgress one of the most basic principles of making sure that parliamentary or legislative representatives of the public have no control over the money they pay themselves. That doesn't mean not taking it some years and taking it in others. The principle is that you should have no control over it and the money should come through because of a third-party setting it. That, Mr. Speaker, is one of the points I wanted to get across today in speaking in support of the Bill.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this Bill, and it's not a conclusion I've come to very easily. I speak on behalf of the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar and the Member for Calgary Buffalo who, if time permits, will speak against this Bill as well.

I'm not opposed to the Bill out of any disrespect for the principles upon which those supporting the Bill base their support. Clearly, there are some worthwhile arguments for supporting this kind of measure. The third-party argument to which our leader has just alluded very eloquently is, of course, a powerful and important principle for supporting the Bill. The pay to get responsible, qualified people at a level that will attract those kinds of people is as well an important principle. The idea of parity with other provinces has a certain compelling nature to it. However, I should point out that the idea of parity has not always been looked upon with favour by certain members of this government in certain labour disputes.

I would argue that all of these are legitimate principles. I'm not arguing against them. I'm not in any way trying to offend those people who support this Bill based on those principles. However, there are times when those principles conflict, so that we have to establish priorities in our own mind and we have to apply our judgment. Our leader has allowed us to apply our judgment and for that we are

grateful. We will demonstrate our respect for him in that respect.

The principle which conflicts with the principles in support of this Bill is really a question of leadership. Albertans are suffering. It's not just Albertans who are not getting jobs or raises; it's Albertans who are actually taking cuts in their pay and, more to the point, Albertans who have no jobs at this time. It is simply inappropriate for us, with the power we have, to exercise this kind of privilege and give ourselves a raise. We will be sending the wrong message to Albertans, and we will be flying in the face of their experience at this time. It will be very difficult for us as a Legislature to ask them to make the kinds of choices and sacrifices that future budgets and financial and fiscal considerations may require that we ask them to do.

We were not brought to this Legislature to make easy decisions — quite the contrary. If we are to do our job, we have to make very, very difficult decisions. This is one of those difficult decisions. There is always a reason to do everything at this time. The reasons for not supporting this Bill, in my mind, have to outweigh the principles for supporting it. I am not taking this position to make cheap political points. I do not want to do that. I do not want to demean the position of those who are in opposition to my position. Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this Bill at this time.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, I too rise to indicate to the House that I cannot support this Bill. I would draw to the attention of members that the indemnity is not a salary. I think we as elected officials all understand that. It is not a salary in the sense that there is no way it could be comparable to pay for the types of decisions we're expected to make or the number of people whose lives we affect every day. There is certainly a voluntary component in what an elected official is expected to contribute. We're new, whether we've served in this House before, and I don't believe that I've earned an increment yet.

Mr. Speaker, I support wholeheartedly the principle of third-party recommendations and study of the appropriate indemnity for elected officials, having gone through that in a municipal council. I know the agony, as do many people in this House. I believe this is a very sound principle and one that we should uphold. But this is not 1979, and I think we have to make a decision today that's appropriate to 1986. While I uphold the principle, I believe the consequences of that principle being applied today are unacceptable.

We have to look at the reality of today in Alberta. I needn't tell you about the outrageous unemployment, the escalating underemployment — an increasing problem — UIC and welfare costs going out of sight, bankruptcies, firings, and reduced pay all around us. People in this province are hungry for work, Mr. Speaker, and they're hungry for food. Lineups at food banks — increasing evidence of poverty. People are fearful because they are hurting and are beginning to wonder what happened to prosperity and where to turn.

In the face of that, Mr. Speaker, I cannot in conscience support an increase, however well-deserved it might be for the hard work that members do in this House. I suggest that now is the time to pull together with the people of Alberta, that we have to pull together. We're in trouble together; we're going to pull out of it together. The way to do it is to pull together, not to pull apart. Now is the time to show leadership and to show what stuff we're made

of, because we expect those people out there to be made of strong stuff to withstand the circumstances as well. Now is the time to show stewardship for this province.

I don't want to come across as noble or as a grand fellow, Mr. Speaker, but I cannot in conscience support it. And I cannot support it as a representative of the people of Alberta, as I believe my decision is what they expect of me.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on Bill 54 this afternoon, and I want to say a few things right at the very beginning of my remarks.

First of all, I feel really privileged to be in this Assembly. A lot of people worked very hard, and I worked very hard to be here and to be able to speak on behalf of my constituents. I'm delighted to be here; it's an honour and a privilege. I particularly appreciate that the salary that goes with this job affords me a working salary in order to be able to do this job on a full-time basis. I recognize as well, Mr. Speaker, that my circumstances may be different from those of some of the other members in this Legislative Assembly, but the income was not my primary motivation in running for this particular job as a Member of the Legislative Assembly.

Bill 54 is entirely the wrong Bill. It is entirely the wrong time to be introducing Bill 54. Bill 54 could have been many things. It could have been a Bill for rural ambulance service in Alberta, but it's not. It could have been a Bill to cut the personal income tax rates for Albertans, but it's not. It could have been a Bill to extend equal pay for work of equal value to women in this province, but it's not. It could have been a labour relations Bill, it could have been a seat belt Bill, it could have extended aids to daily living to assist those diabetics out there who have been wanting to get assistance under that particular program. It could have been a number of things, but it's not any of them. It's a Bill to raise our salaries, and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think somebody has gotten the wrong signal or missed the boat in introducing this and not some other piece of legislation that could have been introduced. It's the wrong Bill, and it's the wrong time.

One of the hon. members has mentioned that any time is the wrong time to be adjusting the salaries for politicians, and I agree with that particular comment. It was well taken, but I have to say that this is particularly the wrong time to be providing this kind of legislation for our consideration.

Mr. Speaker, has anybody had a look at the lineups at the food banks in this province lately? There is certainly no member of this Assembly there. It is ordinary Albertans who are out there lining up at food banks because they don't have the income to support their families. In many cases they don't even have work. One out of twelve people in Calgary is now living on welfare, according to the latest statistics. They would love to have the job that I have or any job, and they would certainly love to receive \$32,000 a year for the work they perform. We don't have enough social workers to cope with the number of people on welfare in this province because there were cutbacks last year and for several years in that particular department. People requiring oxygen under the aids to daily living program are not receiving that benefit, and I mentioned the diabetics who are still looking for a response to their request to get blood sugar test strips under that same program.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the right time. People are being laid off; it's appearing in our newspapers and our media every day. I noticed again today that a major corporation

in this province is laying off more people. People are seeing their jobs being replaced by part-time workers and reductions in their incomes. If we want to review what has happened since 1979, we could look particularly at what has happened to the skilled tradespeople in this province. Their wages not only have not risen; they've dropped 40 to 50 percent, if they're even fortunate to have jobs at all. They're asking me and the people in this Legislature: "How do we support our families on \$10 an hour? Do you understand what we face?" And what is the answer from this Assembly? Are we going to tell them, "Yes, we understand what situation you face and what circumstances you're coping with"? Or do we say, "Well, we're hardworking and overworked, and we require a pay raise because of some report that goes back to 1979"?

The kinds of signals that are being sent out here are not matching each other. We've already sent out signals that there's consideration of selling Crown corporations and cutbacks in government departments next year, and at the same time we're looking at a pay raise for the MLAs. They are two different messages. This is not the message to be sending at this time. What I say is: let's solve those other problems first; let's spend money on the important things first before we get around to this particular Bill. Even the Bills introduced that have dealt with retroactive pay increases don't match the generosity of Bill 54. The one I'm particularly referring to is the workers' compensation legislation that looks at 8 percent for workers' compensation pensions, not the 10-plus percent being looked at in this particular Bill. I might also mention that the base salary from which to start is much higher for MLAs than it is for those receiving workers' compensation pensions.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 54 is entirely the wrong Bill. This is entirely the wrong time. Get the right Bills introduced, get the problems solved for the people of Alberta, and then and only then am I convinced that the people of Alberta will say, "You've done a job well. You deserve a raise in pay." Then and only then would it be the right time and the right Bill.

MR. KOWALSKI: I rise to participate in this debate with respect to Bill 54 this afternoon, and I am a member of the Members' Services Committee. I believe it's important that all members of the Legislative Assembly know how Bill 54 came to the floor of the Assembly. There are three parties, three caucuses, of the Legislative Assembly represented in the Members' Services Committee. That committee has met on numerous occasions over the summer and has discussed a number of matters. In recent weeks very, very informal discussions were held over coffee and the like about this whole question that has been referred to by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon as a very difficult issue. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is very correct. When the member says "There's no such thing as a good time to fix salaries", the member once again is very, very correct.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, on September 12, the members of the Members' Services Committee held a very informal meeting in the morning and discussed a series of principles with respect to how a process might be developed that could deal with this particular question and this particular matter. As a member of the Members' Services Committee, it was certainly my understanding that there was general agreement among all the members of the committee that certain principles had been agreed to and that certain principles could be advanced.

Now having done that, Mr. Speaker, a process of bringing a Bill such as Bill 54 to the floor of the House then had to be looked at. The government members of the Members' Services Committee advised the Government House Leader of the principles and asked whether or not a draft Bill might be produced. There was an understanding by all members of the Members' Services Committee in the meeting last Friday morning that such a draft Bill should be produced and reviewed. The members of the Members' Services Committee held another meeting on Monday evening of this week, and at that point in time the principles that are contained in Bill 54 were reviewed. In my view, there was unanimous understanding, unanimous appreciation of the principles, and a general understanding that this would be the position that would be recommended. As the process requires a Bill to come forward to the House, that message was then forwarded to the Government House Leader. On Tuesday Bill 54 was introduced into the House.

Mr. Speaker, I think all members really need to appreciate the process that was followed. This is an initiative that essentially has been discussed on two occasions, and as a member of the Members' Services Committee my understanding is that the process was agreed to. In addition to the three caucuses that are currently represented on the Members' Services Committee, the leader of the Representative Party also joined the informal discussions, and I want to make it very clear they were informal discussions. There were certain understandings, at least that the process could be advanced at this point in time.

I think that bit of information is perhaps very important, because I know that all members will want to participate in the debate if they choose to — that's their choice or not their choice. But in terms of the signals that one hon. member talked about earlier this afternoon, I hope the understanding of the phraseology "wrong signals" might be better appreciated in terms of the process that's been followed in the last number of days. Mr. Speaker, there never will be a good time for members of an Assembly such as this to have a discussion with respect to the matter now before us. Every member in this Assembly has his own peculiar, particular circumstances. Every member in this Assembly has come here by way of his or her own commitment; that's his or her choice. I have no idea what the financial backgrounds of the other members of the Assembly are, but it seems to me that several things are rather apparent.

First of all, there is no adjustment whatsoever in Bill 54 to any member of Executive Council, to the Leader of the Opposition, or to the Chair. That is not touched, covered, or dealt with in terms of Bill 54. Secondly, it's my understanding that the members who currently represent the 83 constituencies in the province of Alberta comparatively rank about sixth or seventh on the list of rankings across Canada and with this adjustment will move up one notch, from seventh to sixth or from sixth to fifth.

Mr. Speaker, I have one grave concern, and I go back to the statement given by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon about "not an appropriate time". One of the problems in the history of the development of democracy is that until very, very recent years and decades, you tended to have in the western democratic world only a certain class of person who ever allowed himself or herself to step forward to participate in the democratic process. Those were individuals who had independent means to allow them to participate in the development of democracy in the western world either because of their interest or as a hobby. I would fear very,

very greatly if from time to time an Assembly such as ours did not boldly look at the whole question and did not boldly make a decision with respect to a modest adjustment so that some time in the future we would not find ourselves in the position that the only individuals in the province of Alberta who would step forward to participate in the democratic process would be those who had been fortunate enough to win 6/49, the Western lottery, or whatever other lottery there is, or those who by themselves, by their own independent means — and all praise to them — had established themselves in such a position in society that they could in fact embark on this form of public service without any expectation of assistance or compensation.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to debate the question of the figure that's included in Bill 54, a figure of \$28,141. Each member from his own perspective can choose to suggest that that is too much, okay, or not enough, and far be it from me to debate that. Fortunately, my wife is employed, so it helps the process.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very serious matter. I wanted all members to know the process has been followed in the last several days. I believe it's important that we support Bill 54 and the principles contained in it, and I say it primarily because we have to make periodic adjustments. If we do not, then I honestly and truly believe that democracy will be in deep trouble if the elected people at certain times do not face up to one of the more difficult aspects of decision-making that we were elected for.

Thank you.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my two colleagues in the Liberal caucus in opposition to this Bill. I don't find it very easy to do so. It's a very difficult and gut-wrenching issue, and it certainly is not black and white insofar as the arguments are concerned. On the one hand, and we have heard some of these arguments advanced, I do believe that members of this Legislative Assembly are underpaid for the work that is done. Many members need to support families. I believe the legislators have fallen behind over the last seven or eight years and recognize that MLAs are a very, very hardworking segment of the community and that the per hour pay we get for our duties is shockingly low. I also recognize and acknowledge that there are inherent problems and difficulties in raising the pay of MLAs, that there is, in fact, never a good time. However, there are better or worse times within that particular parameter.

On the other hand, the arguments which have prevailed in my mind are as follows. The arguments that have been presented in favour of the pay increase inherent in Bill 54 along with the other changes are arguments which can and will be made by many other groups in our community which won't get increases. Many of these groups are, in fact, as underpaid or worse than we are, and many are suffering from the indignity of unemployment. We ran, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the existing pay structures; we knew what we were getting into. While they're not munificent and while I know that for many it pinches, I've not been led to believe, from what I've seen so far, that there is a need to be independently wealthy at the present time in order to be able to run for office in this House.

In terms of the situation of the provincial government and our finances at this particular point in time, as we're all aware, we're facing a budget deficit in excess of \$2.5 billion. We have seen that the Provincial Treasurer is asking government departments to assess the possibility of 5 to 10 percent cuts in their budgets for the next year. Knowing

that we will have to ask other sectors of the community for freezes and cuts, I find it impossible to proceed at the same time or immediately before such a time to vote ourselves a 10 percent increase in our basic indemnity. I have spoken in the House in favour of other programs for which we don't have money, and I find it difficult to vote for more money here when others are going to go short.

All of us are going to go back to our constituencies, and we will be speaking there and elsewhere over the next year about the requirements for austerity in government programs. Each and every time that we make those statements and call for belt-tightening, we will have this particular increase thrown back at us. Our credibility will be eroded at a time when it is very badly needed in the history of this province. So it's the wrong message at a very critical time in the economic life of this province.

I entered public life partly because, from what I had observed over the years, I felt that our government often failed to make difficult decisions in our community and that this in fact hurt the community very badly. I felt that we needed examples of a capacity to make some tough decisions, and setting an example often hurts. I must admit that this decision hurts, and I find it very difficult.

I respect the views of those who support the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I respect both their reasoning in detail, because I can see their arguments, and the principles on which they have supported the increase in Bill 54, particularly that of following the mandate of the Miller report. Notwithstanding that respect, the reality is that I personally see this matter very differently, and I feel strongly with respect to the conclusions I have reached. Being free to vote on it the way I see it, I will oppose it, but with the ambivalence that I have constantly reiterated in these comments.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, in commenting on second reading of Bill 54, I'd like to point out that I'm quite impressed with the forms of arguments that have come from both sides of this debate so far. You see, it's my opinion that it's a complicated Bill that actually occurs in phases in terms of recognition. At first glance it would appear to be a very reasonable request that members of the Assembly be entitled to the provisions that are within the statutes as revised in 1980 but which were on two occasions waived by other members of other Legislative Assemblies of this province. It seems very reasonable as a principle. In fact, if it's so unreasonable as a principle, which I don't believe it is, we would be overturning the whole principle. We're not even looking at that. So I think the real question here is whether or not it's right to ask for a change that was made, a decision that was made, by members of previous Legislatures.

At second look then, one has to recognize that certain principles should be operating with respect to decisions that members make on behalf of themselves. This of course is where the greatest sensitivity in all quarters of the province is felt, and rightly so. This subject was addressed by Mr. Justice Tevie Miller at the time of his report. It would seem that because of the parameters of the direction given to the justice at that time to conduct his review of MLAs, their hours of operation, their remuneration, and so forth, neither he nor his committee was able to go so far as to make a broad series of recommendations outside those specified parameters.

With the indulgence of the Assembly, I request permission to read one paragraph from page 7 of his report which I think is crucial to this debate, Mr. Speaker.

It is the considered opinion of this committee that the time may have arrived when the legislature of this Province and the people of Alberta should take a long and searching look at the whole underlying philosophy and approach to the compensation of elected officials at the provincial level to determine whether the presently accepted approaches are still valid and meet the current situations. This committee does not feel that such a major undertaking was contemplated within the terms of reference given to us nor do we feel that any worthwhile study could have been accomplished between the date of our appointment and the date upon which we were to report, namely, September 15, 1979.

A remarkable coincidence of dates there. Sorry. To continue the quote:

It is, however, our strong recommendation that sometime during the life of this present Legislature a thorough study of the situation be undertaken and, if there is to be any change in philosophy or approach, that such change be put in place before the next provincial election in order to let sitting members and potential candidates know what to expect before they decide to run for public office.

Might I add that it would also have provided the electorate with that knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

We are stuck in a very complicated situation at this point. We have the essence of the Miller report incorporated into statute. We have its intent having been overturned by previous decisions. We have as a result members of the Legislative Assembly who, subject ordinarily to modified indexation — that is, according to cost of living increases — have fallen behind. One might particularly note those members who have sat here since 1979, since that clause was brought into the statutes.

However, Mr. Speaker, another complicating factor is this. If there had been full indexing of members' allowances since the time of the Miller report, which was incorporated into statute, the fact of the matter is that sitting MLAs would have a salary — I believe I have computed this correctly and that another member has been through this and computed it correctly — of \$35,566.80 a year, having been compounded by virtue of cost of living increases. One can see then that the request in front of us is actually not a blatant request; it is a request for approximately \$2,500 per year, a little more than \$200 a month. That isn't very much considering that if we had full indexing, we would have been looking at a figure that is much greater than \$28,141.

For the first time today the members of the New Democrats, the Official Opposition, were able to sit with a Bill in front of us. I'm not going to pretend that the discussions we had were easy. We ourselves recognize that we are here neither to be martyrs nor to exploit positions of a decision-making process that we find ourselves unwittingly or otherwise dealing with. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the recommendation of the Miller report which the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon alluded to and commended is an item that we really need to look at seriously. In other words, if a full review is necessary — and I personally believe it is because I note the kind of hours we put in — or if adjustments are necessary, perhaps the very wisest thing to do is not to make those decisions ourselves but again look to a third party.

There is another implication of this — it's a very long argument. The other implication is: are we going to do this every four years? The public thought after the '75 review

and the 1979 review that perhaps the issue was solved, put into statute, and that was the end of the argument. We know now, and we knew in 1980 and in 1984 with the waiving of those provisions, that the issue is not particularly solved. So whether we like it or not, we may be forced into going for external reviews so that the entire field of operation of members of the Legislative Assembly can be undertaken to determine the actual number of hours we work, to determine compensation for not being with our families, for those who have families — I believe they're in a majority — and to determine the pay on the basis of a grid, shall we say, for the skill, effort, responsibility, and so forth that members of the Assembly bring with them to this job.

On the other hand — I think I'm at the final stage of my argument, Mr. Speaker — in representing a consensus that emerged within our caucus today, I must say that we do have some particular concerns, but not necessarily with timing, because as an MLA for one riding I do believe there is no such thing as a good time for any elected officials to find the means by which they can agree to an increase for themselves. I believe that is always going to be a political problem.

I am not worried so much about changes that affect middle- and upper-income earners; I am worried about those changes which affect lower- and modest-income earners. However, the point is that we are facing a series of cutbacks that I think no government member has come forth and actually categorically denied. With the information we received last night which was put to questions in question period today with respect to cutbacks in social service agencies which operate in the voluntary sector but which do receive some funding from the province, I believe that even with a very small amount of money, \$2,615 per year, it is impossible for us to go along with this part of the Bill. Those very people who are being served, who need our help the most, may find themselves penalized or subjected to more adverse conditions a year from now, in which case they would know that we were not.

It's not an easy decision to talk about overturning previous decisions of this Assembly. It seems to me that in the final analysis — and I believe I have encapsulated the general thrust of the debate and the discussion and the final consensus which emerged within our caucus today — if we cannot find the wherewithal to ensure some indexation for those people who live on fixed incomes and to ensure that those people whose incomes are very limited or modest are not going to be asked to pay even further, to tighten the belts even further on what are already very skinny people, to use an odd analogy, then we can't either.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I've had the opportunity to be a member of the Members' Services Committee since I've had the privilege of being in the Assembly, since 1979. On that committee there are seven government members and three opposition members, and of course the committee is chaired by the Speaker. As the Member for Barrhead indicated, we had discussions on not only the issue that has developed into Bill 54 before us but on other matters that affect all members in different ways: how we serve our constituents, how we provide information, how we get to them, how we operate in our offices, and how we work together in this Assembly. We reached a number of decisions, and as the Member for Edmonton Strathcona said at one meeting, he had never understood a government member's part in that committee

to develop with opposition members a package to best serve the members of the House in all parties. We discussed office arrangements. We discussed so many things that finally, in those meetings and on the occasion when we had an informal meeting, we discussed if there were some way to explore this question of indemnities and allowances for members.

Mr. Speaker, I've only been through one such review, and I know there are members in this Assembly who served while an earlier review was conducted. But just as the Miller committee concluded in 1979, we as members of Members' Services agreed that there is no easy way. But everyone involved agreed that something needed to be done and that the best course was to discuss this amongst our caucuses, to look at some ideas, and to come back and conclude by proposing in this Assembly a Bill which would have the acceptance of all caucuses.

As I recollect, Mr. Speaker, in these informal meetings the New Democratic Party representatives proposed a principle, and I've been listening very carefully today to the comments made by the members. That principle was that a mechanism should be established such that that decision would not have to be made every four years or some other time, whether that was done by an independent party or not. The principle was that we should make a determination and then get on about the business of representing our constituencies and our citizens.

From the New Democratic Party came the suggestion that we follow the recommendations that were first set out in 1979 in the report which was tabled by Justice Tevie Miller and which had representatives from management and employers such as Mr. William McGregor and a representative that was appointed, Mr. N.B. Coutts, who, with his background and so on, could somehow represent the possible concerns of citizens who are employees and in unions. That committee presented a report which had in it a formula that, as the Member for Edmonton Highlands suggested today, did not tie itself to the CPI, the consumer price index, in a fully indexed way, as many unions had been striving for during that hectic growth period of time, but suggested a new formula.

What has not been said today, Mr. Speaker, is that that formula also provides that when the CPI in Calgary or Edmonton rises and certain machinations occur, the members would receive certain adjustments. But it also provided that when the consumer price index declined, froze, or held, members should be in the same position.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, that since 1979 and 1980 and all of those deliberations, I have no difficulty at all speaking with my constituents, whoever they are. I have a constituency that is very much like Alberta herself; there are urban and rural areas, Indian reserves, people who are ranchers, and people who are unemployed. And I can say to them: "We have a formula that goes up at less than the CPI. If the CPI exceeds 5 percent, it is held at 5 percent. If it's less than 5 percent, the adjustments are not made. Similarly, if the CPI goes down, members' remunerations follow that." So I had no difficulty with that.

As I recall also, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal leader, the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, agreed with the approach that was being taken by those of us in Members' Services who were there, together with the invited member, the leader of the Representative Party. He agreed with this concept, with some reservations, as he stressed at that time, about the ability he would have to convey this to his caucus.

Bill 54 is drafted and conforms to the agreement reached by Members' Services last Friday morning and, subsequently, as shown in detail on Monday evening, as mentioned by the Member for Barrhead. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, as I listen to the contributions today — and I agree that each of us must bring to this Assembly our own backgrounds and the knowledge that we have about our constituency and the problems that are faced by our constituents.

The leader of the Liberal Party indicated two principles: MLAs should receive remuneration — and he supports the idea of a third party setting that — and the principles that were established in the Miller report. The other members of his party virtually unanimously said they agreed with those kinds of principles, but they set them aside in their arguments. They set them aside for some other time. They feel that 1986 is somehow unique in time because of the events that are occurring in this country, in this province, and in the cities or constituencies they are from, and they used certain terms for that. The Member for Calgary Mountain View talked about it being a wrong Bill and a wrong time but then concluded by saying that he felt there should be some other time. No one in those meetings that I attended set aside their constituents' concerns. Every one of us is conscious of those concerns.

The Member for Calgary Buffalo believes members are underpaid. I don't think any of us discussed the question of underpay. We simply discussed if there is some way we can bring before the Assembly a mechanism for setting this question aside from now on, to deal with the issue of remuneration, and to allow the Members' Services Committee the opportunity to deal with expense allowances, which are certainly not dollars in the pockets of the members. I know that when I visit my constituency, Mr. Speaker, the constituents I represent often assume that I have this wonderful expense allowance. I have great sympathy with their understanding of that, given that very little of what we do may be reported, but it's simply not true. The Member for Edmonton Gold Bar says that she is new. Well, when she leaves, I hope she will have the opportunity to consider what she brought to the Assembly and, when she concludes her service, what she will have when she leaves. Each of us will face untold expenses in terms of direct expenses that are not covered by our present legislation.

The principles in Bill 54 are quite clear. The Bill puts in place the 1979 Miller formula that was set aside for basic salary of members as it would have been had that report been followed. It provides that the expense allowances be determined by an all-party committee of this Assembly, and the principles are very clear. No further amendments may be required for many years to come if Bill 54 is followed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise and speak on Bill 54, I must say with not the least amount of concern.

First of all, I want to say very clearly that as a member of this Legislature the increase of 5 percent — and 5 percent is some \$2,600 — doesn't matter one way or the other in terms of whether it makes me rich or poor or pays my expenses. So we can put that issue in that category. I think the other parts of the Bill before us are incidental to the core issue we're talking about here: whether we should have a 10.2 percent increase or not. That seems to be one of the issues at hand.

There is another issue beyond that that I think has to be laid on the table and before the public of Alberta at this point in time. That's the process — and it was very

well highlighted and outlined by the Member for Banff-Cochrane — and the trust that goes with that process that becomes a very important matter in this Legislature so that we can fulfill obligations as members, so we can act as adversaries, so we can debate, but as well accomplish ends for the people of Alberta in an atmosphere of trust. I want to say this in my remarks: I'm not taking the side for government, for opposition, or for anyone else, but I believe what I have to say has to be put on the record.

I'm not a member of the Members' Services Committee, but the committee allows me the privilege to sit in as a member and give verbal comment on issues that arise. I appreciate that very much. This matter was raised at a meeting last Friday morning at which there were representatives. The Member for Edmonton Highlands and the Member for Edmonton Strathcona, who are the two NDP members, were present at that meeting. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, who is the representative of the Liberals, was present at that meeting, and the representatives of the Conservative caucus and I were there as well. This issue that is before us was brought forward and laid before us with enthusiasm. The two members of the NDP caucus supported the bringing of this Bill into the Legislature with the amendments as laid out in the Bill. There was no dissension and no indication from that caucus that other members would dissent or make the speech such as the one made by Calgary Mountain View, a speech that enables that party to play both ends against the middle and to have their cake and eat it. At that point in time trust was broken with the Members' Services Committee. It was clear from both the Member for Edmonton Strathcona and the Member for Edmonton Highlands that the Tevie Miller report was accepted. If I recall correctly, the two increases of 5 percent were mentioned at that time and would be the result. As MLAs, our incomes would be increased as a result of it. All people around that table that morning accepted that fact and I accepted it. I said: "Yes, my colleague and I will go along with that. And we will speak positively about it. We won't play both ends against the middle and leave this problem on the back of the government."

I understand there was a subsequent meeting Monday night, at which time there was agreement again by the NDP in making the presentation. I want to give full credit to the leader of the Liberal party. He stated his position; he also said at that time that his caucus was not in agreement. I know the information was at hand for the government and for the House leader that three of the Liberal party members might not support the Bill. It was laid there. Before Bill 54 came into the House — and I would like to check with the Government House Leader, who certainly made comment, if he was aware of that fact but proceeded with the Bill because the Members' Services Committee had made a decision and had made a request to government, and the process is that government will usually take the advice of the Members' Services Committee and present that to the Legislature. And it happened; that Bill is before us here as members of the Legislature.

I want to say very clearly that if we had any dissension or speeches or strategies prepared as we saw here today by the NDP, speeches such as the one from the Member for Calgary Mountain View, that information should have been made available to me as an observer on the Members' Services Committee. Other members of the committee should have been made aware of that information and that act that was going to happen in this Legislature. Then we could have looked at it and on that basis the government could have said, "I guess there is enough dissension."

I look at what's happened here between the NDP that is not accepting the raise. Both members have not supported the 10.2 percent, as I understand in their discussion. Three out of four in the Liberal party have not. If there was that kind of dissension, most likely the rest of us would have said, "We would recommend that we do not proceed." But we did. That's got to be made clear here today in that process. I don't think it's fair that the government, the House leader, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, or the Premier will have to take the flak for this kind of action when the action took place because people withheld information or broke a trust that we have in that Members' Services Committee.

I'd like to call on the Leader of the Official Opposition to disclose why that happened and to take the responsibility, because as far as I'm concerned with regard to this Bill, there is no way we can ask the government to proceed under those conditions. I believe the Bill should be held at this point and left, put on the table, because there's been an act of what I would call deception. It's unfair.

I have learned in this House that there are many instances where we as members of the Legislature must put aside our politics and partisanship and make decisions as a group, take responsibilities as a group, and take the flak as a group. I was prepared as a member in this House to take the flak of the 10 percent because there was unanimous agreement of all members present in that Assembly, with the comment of the Liberal leader who said, "There most likely will be some dissension." But I didn't hear that from any other caucus.

Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that we have to end our Legislature on this note. We have had a fairly good Legislature; we've had some good comradeship, debate, and interplay. The members of each one of the new parties from the four parties in this House have been determining their roles, but it is unfortunate that the Official Opposition party has put us in a very difficult predicament at this point in time. I think there's no alternative but for government to say, "Under that environment and under those circumstances, put the Bill on hold, table it, and we'll proceed with other activities in this Legislature."

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I am rather amazed by those comments from the Member for Little Bow. I thought he'd been in this Legislature for over 20 years.

Let me go through the reality of what happened on this particular Bill if I may, Mr. Speaker. First of all, Members' Services does not run this Assembly and it does not run our caucus. While he does not know what went on in our caucus ... I'll let you talk of deception. You just sit and listen and get the facts. The point we went through is that there are two representatives from our party that sit on Members' Services, and they do not speak for our caucus.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, come on.

MR. MARTIN: We did not see that Bill ... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: The level of debate this afternoon has been quite admirable, and I believe that the Assembly has listened to all members with due attention. I ask that the same honour be given to the member now speaking.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point I would make is that it went through a process. We did not see that Bill. At ten after two we asked that if there wasn't party agreement on it, that Bill not be brought to the

Assembly. At ten after two we were told by the government that they were going to do it or not. We had asked them not to do it at that particular time because we did not have unanimity in our caucus at that time, and that's a fact. That Bill did not have to be labelled, put in this House, and the government knew it at that time and they told us they were going to do it.

Mr. Speaker, it's rather amazing to me, if the Member for Little Bow will recall the last Members' Services, how trusting we are now. When his caucus and my caucus went to Members' Services — loved the process then, didn't they, when they cut our budgets down and we walked out of it at that particular time? Since when did this sort of network develop that we're not to deal with our caucuses and we're supposed to be sort of behind closed doors and not talking to the people of Alberta? Let me tell you what has happened, though, that all of us as politicians have to recognize. I for one don't think I need a raise, but I was in a different position from the rest of my caucus because I get a cabinet minister's salary. I felt uneasy about this right from the time, but it was easy for me, as I think it is for cabinet ministers, to be holier than thou on this issue when you make a much bigger salary than some of the other members in the Legislative Assembly. I for one will say here in the House that if this is passed, I will be donating mine to charity because I would feel totally irresponsible if I accepted it at a cabinet minister's salary, Mr. Speaker.

The point I want to make is that we are elected to listen not behind a closed little door here between us, little deals and all the rest of it. I don't know about your phone, but my phone has been ringing off the hook over this. People do not understand. We just went through an election; we all knew the salaries at that particular time. They don't understand why a couple of weeks later, at the end of the month, we're talking in the first session about raising our salaries. They don't understand that. I'm not saying for one minute that some people don't deserve salary increases, but when everybody else is facing hardships, they're looking to us for leadership. I was told by a number of people on the phone today: "Look, we thought that somehow this group was going to be different." People are disappointed in this whole Assembly. That's the more important point, Mr. Speaker, if you want to talk about trust. The most important point we have to look at is the trust of the people of Alberta, that they believe in what we're doing here. That has been seriously damaged.

I don't know if there is an easy way for people to determine their own salaries in political life, because whether it happens in city council or anywhere, we know there's going to be an outcry. The point I make is that I certainly don't need an increase. Perhaps we could look at it in terms of the MLAs without the cabinet ministers, because let's face it, if MLAs get a raise, the cabinet ministers and everybody else is going to get a raise. The point I would make, and I think it has been made, is that we should have let this — and I agree with the Member for Little Bow — die on the Order Paper, and bring in a third party on this. But if we think that Members' Services is the one we are accountable to, then we are vastly misjudging why we're here in this Legislature. We are accountable to our constituents, and our constituents are looking for some sort of leadership.

There was despair and frustration out there as late as last night, and if people aren't getting the message that I certainly got today, then I don't think they're answering

their telephones. Our caucus, when they looked at this particular Bill, made a final decision about it today, and if you want to say that's a lack of trust, you go ahead. I'll campaign on that right across the province.

Our caucus made a decision that we think was a reasonable one. Anybody who says they knew what was going on in our caucus beforehand just doesn't know the truth. They may be embarrassed by where they are now and the stands they're taking. That's their problem, not my problem, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to make some remarks about the difficulty legislators face when addressing salaries and the way it has been done since this government first came to office in 1971, following the process of appointing a three-member committee chaired by a judge, then receiving the recommendations as government, making them public, and coming forward with the appropriate legislation. I had intended to go into some further detail on what happened in both 1975 and 1979, the years I had the privilege of serving in this Assembly.

I was pleased to hear the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands take a quote from the Tevie Miller report, because it was a quote I had intended to use myself in sharing with the Assembly that I think Justice Miller put his finger on a key point. He was trying to send a signal to us as legislators that while he didn't believe it was within his mandate to make recommendations beyond the terms of reference, we as legislators should find a way to do that. The formula devised by the Miller committee was one that would have seen, as the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane has said, increases to reflect part of the cost of living increase in certain years, but in other years when the inflation rates in Calgary and Edmonton are at a lower level, there would be no increase. I suppose, in arguments that have been made by some hon. members in this Assembly, that had previous legislators not interfered with that process, we wouldn't be having this very debate today.

I believe very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that the two most sensitive things we as legislators have to deal with centre around. First, constituency boundaries. Fortunately, that occurs only after every second election, but it is a sensitive issue. It's sensitive because in the course of our duties we get to know our constituents on a very personal basis, and we don't like to lose corners of our constituencies. There are examples — and I point to my good friend and colleague the hon. Member for Chinook — where we see a constituency disappear and a whole new set of circumstances comes into play. Those are matters we have to face as legislators, difficult as they may be.

The other area that I feel is so sensitive, Mr. Speaker, relates to our remuneration. It's not just provincial legislators; we can look at the agonizing federal Members of Parliament go through, the cities and the towns, in reviewing what is paid in terms of an indemnity for services rendered. It's no easy process, and there's no simple solution. No one to date, as far as I am concerned, has devised a formula that has been accepted on a universal basis and works and satisfies everyone, because in the final analysis, as Harry Truman once said, "the buck stops here" regardless of who makes the recommendations or how they're made. The final responsibility comes back to the Assembly, and the Assembly members must decide whether or not to accept that increase.

Many arguments have been made as to whether or not this is the right time. The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon was the first to make that point when he said

there's never a good time, and I couldn't agree with him more. There is never a good time, because in some instances, if you're trying to set a good example because of the inflation rate and other factors, you feel you should forgo the increase. On the other hand, other members argue that when some are hurting in our society, we have to set an example. The end result is that we wind up slipping further and further behind. The hon. Minister of the Environment mentioned that we were either fifth or sixth in comparison with other Legislatures. We currently are sixth in Canada, sixth behind the House of Commons and the provinces of New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, and British Columbia. This modest amendment that's being proposed, \$2,615.50 — that's what the 10.2 percent works down to — this modest increase would move us one point, from being sixth to fifth in Canada. Anyone who suggests, as I heard from the hon. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark, that we shouldn't be looking for parity with other provinces — we are not achieving parity with other provinces with the amendment that's before this Assembly. That would not be achieved by following the principles set out by Mr. Justice Miller.

I think it's also important to put on the record, as again was stated by the hon. Member for Barrhead, that ministers, the leader of the province and the president of the Executive Council, the Leader of the Official Opposition, the leaders of the opposition parties, the Speaker of the House, and other officials of this House are not going to see their salaries increased as a result of what's proposed. It is a basic indemnity, which again would move from sixth to fifth place in Canada.

My good friend from the Chinook constituency often has sage advice for us. I recall that one day when discussing constituency matters he was kind enough to share with a number of us a discussion he had had with one of his constituents, who phoned in quite regularly and often was critical of things that were happening. The hon. member asked the constituent if he felt he got his money's worth. The constituent was a bit puzzled by the way the member was posing the question. He said: "Well, if you take the salary I receive and the total population for the Chinook constituency, every man, woman, and child, and break that down, with a population of roughly 22,500 and a salary of \$25,500, it works out to \$1.13 per year per person in the constituency. Now, do you feel you're getting your money's worth?"

I want to conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by coming back to a principle. I think it's most unfortunate that the trust which has been referred to by other members — and I sat very carefully listening to the comments made by members in this Assembly. The process as to how this evolved, as outlined in particular by my colleagues the Member for Barrhead and the Member for Banff-Cochrane, is very correct. No one was suggesting then or now that members of Members' Services control or dictate to their caucuses. I think the Leader of the Opposition should understand that that was never the intent. But clearly, in being able to sit down to work on issues of common concern and wrestle with problems, we felt we could, in essence, rise above politics; we could find a common ground that would be acceptable and defensible. As the Member for Taber-Warner, I'm certainly prepared to go out and defend what is being proposed, because I think it is fair, it is just, and it is right.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: May the minister sum up? Hon. minister.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I will abandon one thing, and that is my couplet, oft quoted in the past, from some wag in the 19th century. It is this:

'Tis pleasant to see, as you sit in the gallery,
They agree upon one thing, and that is their salary.

Mr. Speaker, in summing up I perhaps will continue the negotiation. I don't want to in effect comment on the statements made, except one. If there was a request on Tuesday for some viewing of the Bill between 2 and 2:30, that never reached me.

The only other thing is that I would ask members to allow second reading to proceed today. When I say that perhaps the negotiation is still relevant, I don't mean that in any hard sense or, indeed, any clear sense, but if second reading is approved today, further consideration can be given to a proposal made. That was from two members. The Leader of the Representative Party suggested that we leave this Bill to die. The Leader of the Opposition also said leave it, and I believe he added, "Let us find a third party as we have done before and at least get another perspective of views from that third party." I think that deserves consideration, and if members oppose the Bill, they will have a further opportunity to vote against it by way of a division that can happen in committee or on third reading. I just ask that the Bill be given second reading now, and we will have half an hour to do some third readings.

[Motion carried; Bill 54 read a second time]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Third Reading)

Bill 11
Alberta Stock Savings Plan Act

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 11, the Alberta Stock Savings Plan Act.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, just a couple of very quick comments. At Committee of the Whole we put forward what we thought were three reasonable amendments that would make this a better Bill. The government turned down those amendments, so at second reading we voted against the Bill to express our displeasure at the inflexible attitude of the government. However, overall, Mr. Speaker, we agree that the Bill has certain merit, and our party will be supporting it on third reading.

[Mr. Chumir left his chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, Member for Calgary Buffalo. Either the discussions are held in the House, or they're held outside in the members' lounge.

[Motion carried; Bill 11 read a third time]

Bill 30
Financial Administration
Amendment Act, 1986

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of the Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1986.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, just to make a few comments. I think we went through second reading and the Committee of the Whole, but I just want to go quickly on record as saying I think this was perhaps the most significant Bill brought in in this session. I for one am still not satisfied that we have accountability. I'm not satisfied that we know why we need to lift our upper borrowing limits by some \$3 billion. Perhaps there is a need, but as I said before, the Treasurer can't have it both ways. We were told that the budget is generally on stream, I believe as late as yesterday — it could have been a day or so before — yet at the same time we're dealing with the worst case scenario. It seems to me we have to be a little clearer when we're asking for these types of borrowing limits. Governments do get into trouble when we have these types of limits put on them, upper limits. They get into serious trouble.

As I said the other day, Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to see if the Treasurer would love a Bill like this and what he would be saying about it if he were on the opposition side. I can see the rhetoric right now about socialists not being able to control budgets and all the rest of it. Because he has a PC after his name, somehow we're to trust him. Unfortunately, we've trusted the government too much. But with the majority they're going to pass it. I for one thought about a last-ditch attempt at a hoist; I thought maybe the Treasurer would go along with it. But in view of getting on with the people's business and not wasting the taxpayers' money, I will vote against the Bill for that reason. I think the Treasurer is well aware of my argument, but I thought it important to say it again in third reading.

[Motion carried; Bill 30 read a third time]

[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
39	Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act, 1986	Johnston
40	Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1986-87	Johnston
41	Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1986-87	Johnston
45	Alberta Corporate Income Tax Amendment Act, 1986	Johnston
46	Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1986	Johnston

Bill 18
Mines and Minerals Amendment Act, 1986

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Energy, I move third reading of Bill 18, the Mines and Minerals Amendment Act, 1986.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, just to briefly state again the comments made last evening about this particular

Bill, I still do not understand how we can provide for a grant without a supply vote being provided through the Legislature and why these particular programs authorized under Bill 18 are not up for review by the Legislative Assembly. I don't agree with the principle.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion carried; Bill 18 read a third time]

[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
21	Petroleum Marketing Statutes Amendment Act, 1986	Orman (for Webber)
22	Petroleum Incentives Program Amendment Act, 1986	Orman (for Webber)

Bill 23 Natural Gas Marketing Act

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Energy, I move third reading of Bill 23, the Natural Gas Marketing Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair apologizes to the House but appreciates the fact that there indeed has been a name change for the Minister of Manpower. The Chair is still working from the plot profile of the House for opening day. The Minister of Career Development and Employment has moved third reading of Bill 23, Natural Gas Marketing Act.

[Motion carried; Bill 23 read a third time]

[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
24	Arbitration Amendment Act, 1986	Orman (for Webber)
42	Alberta Energy Company Amendment Act, 1986	Orman (for Webber)

Bill 49 Take-Or-Pay Costs Sharing Act

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Energy, I move third reading of Bill 49, the Take-Or-Pay Costs Sharing Act.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, on the take-or-pay Bill, it's very important to many of the smaller companies that are trying to make their way now in the gas contracts presently being signed. I think they're already in a difficult enough position when they have a government that acquiesces to nearly any kind of offer they get from eastern Canada or the U.S. for gas under the idea that it doesn't matter, sell it, sell it, sell it again. We're down now to about 50 percent of what our price was a couple of years ago, but if that is not bad enough, I don't think this government has been realistic or — at least let's put it this way — as tough as they sometimes can be in approaching and looking at reassessing the whole monopoly situation that exists in this province of transporting natural gas to the eastern markets.

The eastern markets were arrived at by the old trans-Canada pipeline, and as many of you will recall — and those that haven't sometimes read history books — the trans-Canada pipeline was made possible by the taxpayers. It was the taxpayers of Canada that helped finance her, and in fact the government of the day supposedly lost the election — and even the Treasurer's mind goes back to those days, as a happy smile goes across his face. The fact of the matter is that the national government takes taxpayers' money to help private enterprise. As it so often does, taxpayers' money has to help out private entrepreneurs. Really the modern definition of "enterprise" is who can get the most money out of the government. It used to be who could make the best profits. Nevertheless the group of private enterprisers did build a pipeline with government funds, and the taxpayers paid for that.

Now we have a situation today, Mr. Speaker, where the monopoly pipeline is still charging fees to transport the natural gas not only equivalent to what they do but higher. They've asked for increases and are making increases, added to the fact that back a number of years ago when the gas pipeline company — intemperately because they thought there were shortages — went out and signed up take-or-pay contracts all over, take-or-pay meaning that if you sold them gas and they didn't take it, they still paid you. Of course naturally they paid the producer, and the producer hadn't delivered gas. The money had to come from somewhere. So they got a clause through that they were allowed to borrow money to pay off these debts for which they had not received the gas yet, and that has been added on to the transportation.

So we have a pipeline company now, Mr. Speaker, that's putting almost an unbearable load on the market when the market is slumping at the same time. That's one of the reasons I am speaking against this legislation at this time.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, I have some very brief comments to make with respect to this legislation. I would like to comment on several difficulties which concern me a great deal and which lead me to oppose the legislation. In essence, as all members of the House are aware, the legislation sets up a scheme whereby one group of oil and gas companies pays part of the interest debt incurred by another group of companies. The reasons for this are very, very complex and many arguments can be made pro and con. I don't wish to get into those; they have been debated quite extensively in the House.

The heart of my concern at this moment that I would like to raise with the House and with the government through you, Mr. Speaker, is that this legislation merely sets a framework for certain levies to be made upon the industry, and like so much of the legislation that has been passing through this House, a great deal is left to be done by way of regulation, and that is regulation at the discretion of the cabinet. This has inherent in it many dangers. The aspect of regulation that may take place that concerns me relates to the magnitude of the charges to be borne by that group of companies which will be required to pay a portion of the debt incurred by the Topgas group of companies. I believe it is very important to note that the National Energy Board made a recommendation that charges be paid by these groups at the rate of 10 cents, 9 cents, and 8 cents per mcf over the three-year period. I think that segment of the industry which is affected is operating under the apprehension that that will be the case, and if that is not to be the case, I think it's incumbent upon the government to make that

factor very, very clear to the affected segment of the community because this has very serious implications with respect to the capacity of that group of companies to compete.

So really the question in the issue I'm concerned with is the aspect of openness in dealing with what is at the very heart of this matter. Because one group paying the debt of another group is a problem, but when the magnitude may be in a different amount than that recommended by the National Energy Board which the industry is under the belief will be followed, it's very important that that be made clear in terms of whether or not this House does or does not support that legislation.

So I believe that should have been made clear in the legislation. I hope there would be some clarification by the government at an early time, and if the matter is in a state of suspension pending determination by the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission, I believe it's incumbent to advise the affected portion of the industry of the tentativeness of the matter so that representations can be made, so that all arguments can be heard, and that those affected members of the industry can ensure that they are heard and make their positions clear on what is again, admittedly, a very, very complex and difficult issue with many facets and kaleidoscopic aspects.

So with that concern having been stated, Mr. Speaker, I sit down reiterating that I oppose this legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: May the minister sum up?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to respond firstly to the point made by the Member for Calgary Buffalo. He and I had a discussion earlier in the day on the nature and form of the levy that will be determined by the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission in consultation with government and industry. There is no indication at this time that the levies recommended by the National Energy Board will be adopted. However, there is no indication that they won't be adopted. I think it's very important at this stage to pass Bill 49 in the absence of any reference to levies. Those levies should and will be determined in consultation with all parties involved.

I think it's important to respond to both of the members, Mr. Speaker, in the sense that the direct need for Bill 49, the Take-or-Pay Costs Sharing Act, is as a result of greater access by smaller producers who have been able to arrange their own markets in eastern Canada. I'm sure that without exception the producers who have not heretofore had contracts and who now have access through TransCanada — and the manner in which they get access is by paying their portion of the take-or-pay cost-sharing — is quite reasonable. I think the producers in the industry would be quite pleased. However, I would also acknowledge that that levy has to be a reasonable levy on both sides, and we will strike a levy in the regulations that will be consistent with the desires of this government, the producers, TransCanada, and the National Energy Board.

I think I've answered part of the question of the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. His other part of the question had to do with the monopolistic nature of TransCanada. I would say that that is no longer the case, Mr. Speaker. That was a concern of everybody. I remember former Premier Peter Lougheed back in, I believe, 1972-73 expressing grave concerns about the monopolistic nature of TransCanada PipeLines. As I recall his words, he was suggesting that TransCanada PipeLines should be a common carrier. I think what we have achieved here is a common carrier, but it's

not a common carrier in the sense of forcing TransCanada to carry gas to market on behalf of all producers. It is a matter of sharing in the levy that will be raised for individuals to gain access to the pipeline. It only makes sense, because the people who are gaining new access to that pipeline have not paid any of the infrastructure costs of that pipeline. I think it's quite reasonable. I do not stand here and say that I don't disagree with the Member for Calgary Buffalo. I share his concern, and as I said, it's a matter we should consult closely with industry on when it comes to the magnitude of those levies. I can assure the member that that process will take place.

[Motion carried; Bill 49 read a third time]

Bill 50
Gas Resources Preservation
Amendment Act, 1986

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Energy, I move third reading of Bill 50, the Gas Resources Preservation Amendment Act, 1986.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, we've talked about this Bill at some length. We think it's an extremely important and critical piece of legislation. Together with Bill 1, in our view it gives legislative authority to the Western Accord and the gas pricing agreement that ensued from that accord.

Our principal concern with the Bill is that it replaces the former very specific cost/benefit test to Albertans that's in the current Act, an Act that I think the previous Premier of this province thought was essential to introduce and to bring into legislation because it provided a real protection for Alberta interests against perhaps some predatory interests on the part of the federal government. So I think it could be a disaster to remove that test and introduce this particular piece of legislation.

We have the further concern with the whole deregulation process in general, as we've pointed out, because it seems that Alberta is moving full tilt. We're into a deregulated environment. But at the same time that Alberta is moving in that direction, there is no assurance that the federal government is doing that. There are two very significant tests left within the powers of the National Energy Board that would affect the movement, the sale of gas particularly in the U.S. markets that I'm referring to, the long-term supply tests, and then the adjacent border tests. They still remain there.

Not only that, but I disagree with the hon. minister's previous remarks about TransCanada PipeLines as a monopoly in this situation. It's true that they're going to have to carry gas as a result of other agreements between producers and buyers. There probably wouldn't be any problem with the movement of that gas in a situation where the pipeline has underutilized the capacity, but TransCanada not only has its own marketing company, it also buys gas and even produces gas. The concern would be that as that pipeline begins to approach full capacity, whose gas is going to flow in the pipeline?

With those remarks, I think it's essential that we vote against this particular Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: May the minister sum up?

MR. ORMAN: Just a brief comment, Mr. Speaker. We did talk at length last night in Committee of the Whole

with respect to the removal of the reference of price from the Gas Resources Preservation Amendment Act. That removal of price does not in any way remove our responsibilities as legislators or people of Alberta in determining the sense or nonsense of allowing exported gas leaving the province to other parts of the country or, for that matter, leaving Alberta at a price below what we believe to be a fair return for the commodity. We will continue to make that decision, and it will be made, as I indicated last night, on volumes under 3 billion cubic feet by the minister by ministerial order and by volumes over that amount by the cabinet.

So the decision will still be made, Mr. Speaker, and we will still consult with the Energy Resources Conservation Board on matters dealing with price and reserve life. We simply remove the price reference from the Act so that we would be consistent with our desire to move to deregulation on November 1. The removal of the reference does nothing other than be consistent with our agreement in the Western Accord.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Alger	Drobot	Musgreave
Betkowski	Elliott	Musgrove
Bogie	Fischer	Oldring
Bradley	Gogo	Orman
Brassard	Hyland	Pengelly
Cassin	Isley	Reid

Cherry	Johnston	Rostad
Clegg	Jonson	Shrake
Crawford	Kowalski	Sparrow
Cripps	Mirosh	Stevens
Day	Moore, M.	Weiss
Downey	Moore, R.	Zarusky

Against the motion:

Chumir	Laing	Piquette
Ewasiuk	Martin	Sigurdson
Fox	McEachern	Strong
Hawkesworth	Mjolsness	Taylor
Hewes	Pashak	

Totals	Ayes — 36	Noes — 14
--------	-----------	-----------

[Bill 50 read a third time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, for business tomorrow . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. House Leader, the Chair feels some difficulty. The time has expired; therefore, the House is indeed adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30. But for the purposes of helping the House, perhaps the Chair could suddenly develop a case of having a great need to sit down.

MR. CRAWFORD: Very briefly then, Mr. Speaker, we will proceed with third readings and committee study of Bills 38 and 51 and private Bills.

[At 5:40 p.m. the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]

