

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Thursday, September 18, 1986 2:30 p.m.

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

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

As Canadians and as Albertans we give thanks for the precious gifts of freedom and peace which we enjoy.

As Members of this Legislative Assembly we rededicate ourselves to the valued traditions of parliamentary democracy as a means of serving our province and our country.

Amen.

## head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual financial statements for the year ended March 31, 1986, for the Glenrose Rehabilitation hospital.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 52 of the Universities Act, I wish to file with the Assembly the Report of Inspection — Laboratory Animal Care and Facilities — Alberta Universities.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the hon. Solicitor General's reference of Thursday last to the "alleged dictatorship" in Chile, I would like to table three copies of a September 1986 report by Amnesty International giving substance to that allegation, to put it extremely mildly, so that the hon. and learned minister can perhaps come to a different conclusion about the propriety.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the response to Question 131.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Advanced Education, I would like to table the Lethbridge Community College annual report for the year ended June 30, 1985, and copies of the Fairview College annual report for the year ended June 30, 1985.

## head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

## Energy industry

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Energy. As this is probably the last question period of the session we'll attempt again to get some information from the minister. Especially in view of the fact that the population of Fort McMurray has declined by 2,366 people over the last year, what specific proposal has the government presented to the federal government regarding their investment in tar sands expansion?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, I've indicated a number of times the proposal that we have

put before the federal Minister of Energy, which we've referred to as a stabilization plan. Officials from our government in Alberta from both the departments of Energy and Treasury met with federal Finance and Energy officials this past week, and once they've reported to their federal ministers and I've completed briefings here, we'll see where to go.

That particular proposal, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated last week to the media when questioned on this, shows no distinction between conventional oil and synthetic oil. If the particular stabilization plan is approved by both levels of government, we're suggesting that there be no distinction between the two and thus benefits for those companies that are doing work in the heavy oil or in the oil sands area. But other than that, Mr. Speaker, I've not made any specific proposals on the oil sands to the federal government.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, when we questioned the Premier, he indicated that there had been some talk dealing with the tar sands regarding especially the Fort McMurray area. The minister is saying that there is not a specific proposal dealing with tar sands, that they're talking with the federal government, and it's clear that that is different from what the Premier has said.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's different at all from what I understand the Premier said. The proposal that we put before the federal government, as I indicated, is a proposal that would apply to the expansion of Syncrude if they saw fit to use the funds and would apply equally to synthetic and conventional oil.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In dealing with a proposal to deal with tar sands, is this government looking at some sort of equity involvement on behalf of the provincial government?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly not going to comment on any specific proposal that has been presented to me with respect to any further ideas on what can be done to assist the developments in the heavy oil and the oil sands area other than to say that certainly we've had discussions with some of the companies on what they see as their role in the future and also, on a more general level, on the overall energy situation in terms of where prices are going to go and the viability of certain projects in their minds.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, it seems that other governments and companies in Canada know what we're proposing, but we as legislators or the people of Alberta aren't allowed to know this. I find that very curious.

Seeing as this is the last question period, my question has to do with another aspect of energy. What is the minister's best estimate of the amount our natural gas royalty revenue will decline as a consequence of last week's Western Gas Marketing deal? Is it, in fact, around the \$70 million range or higher?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I'm having difficulty finding this as a supplementary to the oil sands situation, but his being such a fine man, I'll respond to any questions that he puts forward.

The agreement that took place this past week with Western Gas Marketing and the distribution companies in central Canada, Ontario and Quebec has been presented to the

producers, and those producers have two weeks to make up their minds as to whether or not they accept that particular agreement. As I think I indicated the last time I was in the House, we are assessing that particular agreement and certainly do not want to influence the producers in terms of how they should react to it other than to say that the discount into the residential market was less than what a number of people in the industry and, if I recall, in this House had predicted might happen with respect to that residential market should deregulation take place on November 1.

We are assessing the financial implication. It's difficult, because obviously if we don't sell our gas in a market that's competitive with other sources of energy, we're not going to get revenues from lack of sales. We have to compete with fuel oil, coal, electricity, and these other sources of fuel. If we keep our prices up too high, obviously we're not going to get any sales and thus no revenue.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to bring back the minister to the original topic of tar sands. I'm sure he is aware that there are two types of tar sands, the open pit and the in situ. The in situ, of course, involves the economy of Bonnyville, St. Paul, and a good deal of northeast Alberta. Has he worked out any financial package as these areas are also suffering cutbacks in population and loss of jobs? Has he worked out anything that is anywhere comparable to the aid he's contemplating giving the Syncrude project? Will he be contemplating the same type of aid or program to get heavy oil and tar sands under way in the rest of northeast Alberta?

DR. WEBBER: There's no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the future security of supply for this country is extremely important, as is, with respect to that, the oil sands and heavy oil development in northeast Alberta. Having just returned from meeting with my provincial colleagues from across the country, it was very gratifying to find every single minister across this country supporting their Premiers in terms of recognizing the importance of our heavy oils and oil sands in the future needs of this country. In that respect we've asked the federal minister to meet with us to discuss different ways in which we can develop our nonconventional sources of oil. I say "nonconventional" because certainly as prices tend to rise, it will be the conventional sources where investments will be made initially, simply because of the marketplace. We feel very strongly that the Husky upgrader and other projects in eastern and northeastern Alberta certainly do need to proceed in terms of meeting the nation's energy needs of the future.

MR. STEVENS: A supplementary to the Minister of Energy. Possibly he may wish to refer this, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister have information which would confirm that in the situation he has just been responding to, the number of persons that were actually laid off, other than by attrition or early retirement, is approximately 300?

DR. WEBBER: I am not sure who the 300 employees are that the hon. member is referring to. Maybe he could clarify it further for me.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, there was a comment made earlier in the question period to a number, some 2,000 or more. I would ask if the minister is aware that the Suncor

company has had 300 persons or less involved in any layoff procedure.

DR. WEBBER: I don't recall the numbers with respect to the Suncor downsizing, Mr. Speaker. If the number 2,000 was mentioned, my recollection would be that it would be too high.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to designate my second question to the Member for Edmonton Highlands.

#### Food Banks

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Social Services. The Edmonton Food Bank, which has its main depot in my constituency, announced last week that it will have to reduce its hours of operation for serving individual Edmontonians in need. The food bank has always stated that as a participant in voluntary solutions to certain crises it would only be a temporary and band-aid solution. I wonder what steps the minister is now taking to ensure that people previously served by the food bank and its affiliated agencies are able to acquire these services elsewhere.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of meetings over the last several months between senior staff — in fact, the deputy minister and others from the Department of Social Services — and the Edmonton Food Bank and also, for the hon. member's information, the Calgary Food Bank. Those meetings have resulted in some clarification, at least in some situations, of why we had the tremendous use of the food bank. We responded partially by providing information and additional social workers so that claims could be processed faster. It was obvious that many people weren't aware of the emergency services that are available through Social Services.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wonder if the minister is giving any consideration to another measure, specifically, increasing social allowance payments so that approximately half of the Edmonton Food Bank clients might have a reduced need for seeking out that service.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is our judgment that in terms of the allowance presently available, which is the highest in Canada, it is adequate. As I have said so often publicly, it is not an allowance that allows for any frivolities of any kind, but we believe that the basic allowance that is in place and also the various extra allocations for special family needs and so on are adequate for food, clothing, and shelter.

MS BARRETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would indicate that the views she has just expressed on behalf of government as policy are those expressed by her or her delegates to meetings with the inner-city agencies such that they are no longer requesting any increases in social allowance payments for the clients they are trying to help serve.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Edmonton group has in fact expressed their opinion that social allowance rates could be higher and has asked for additional information from us. The Calgary people, for whatever reason, seem

to be in a somewhat different situation. From the last report I had, the usage of the food bank in Calgary has declined, where in fact in Edmonton it has increased. I am not able to ascertain at this point in time the factors that have made that happen.

MS BARRETT: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister will report now on the request from her department to the voluntary private agencies in the inner city with respect to their budgetary submissions being in the 5 to 10 percent reduction area for next year. Is that actually an official request from the department at this time?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, absolutely. The absolute, unequivocal answer I want to give is that there has been no request to the agencies that have contractual or other arrangements with us for a 5 or 10 percent reduction. In the normal course of affairs there are always contractual negotiations going on. The negotiations are such that we negotiate for specific services and the costs associated with those services. We have not attributed specific numbers or asked for any reduction.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. If the 5 to 10 percent is not coming off these services, can the minister tell us where it is? So much of the allocations from the department go to private nonprofit agencies that serve exactly the same constituency.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, when phrasing her question, the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar seemed to take for granted that there would be an automatic 5 or 10 percent cut in budgets. The hon. leader of the Liberal Party is also motioning, and I appreciate his gestures. With respect to Social Services, while it is very important for us to understand what the various scenarios would be if, in fact, you had a cut right across the board, because so much of the service is demand-driven and therefore by statute and other regulations must be provided, our particular department is concentrating on the administrative end.

#### Energy Industry Assistance

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my questions today are to the Minister of Energy. Over the last several days the Energy minister met with the provincial ministers, as he has outlined. Federal and provincial have also met recently discussing a proposed short-term stabilization plan. The federal representatives are reported as having indicated that elimination of the PGRT has exhausted the federal government's intention to help the oil and gas industry. Did the provincial energy ministers give an undertaking to help the federal government financially in its stabilization program?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I attended the meeting the hon. member was referring to, because his conclusions about what happened at a meeting he described are not the same conclusions that resulted from the meeting I attended in Banff for three days with federal/provincial energy and mines ministers.

At that particular meeting we spent one day discussing the security of supply problems of the future by presenting to ministers from the territories and other provinces information that showed that possibly as early as two years from now we would be net importers of crude oil in this country

and that this had particular significance to the producing provinces in this country. As a result of that one-day meeting, we issued a communiqué outlining the unanimous agreement on the part of all ministers and territorial representatives on this concern and also a telex to the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, the Hon. Marcel Masse, indicating that provincial ministers from producing and consuming provinces want to meet with him as soon as possible to review the options that are in place to assure this country of security of supply in the future. In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I would like to file copies of the communiqué and the telex sent to the federal minister.

MR. TAYLOR: I have not seen the documents, but I'll bet you a dollar to doughnuts that it doesn't mention financial help there.

But can I go on to a supplementary? I've carefully crafted this question, Mr. Speaker. I've spent a lot of time on this question. It is very careful, and it will not allow the minister to skip around. Will the minister pick one of the following based on the latest information: (a) we are going to have a stabilization program regardless of federal participation, (b) we are not going to have a stabilization program, or (c) we don't have the slightest idea what we're going to have.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, the Assembly enjoys what has now occurred, but question period is not a matter of multiple choice. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon has raised three questions; that exhausts all of his supplementaries. So if the Minister of Energy would like to respond to the three, then that's his ...

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, there were no discussions with the provincial ministers at Banff of a stabilization plan. All the ministers there are aware of the fact that we have a proposal before the federal government at this time. In fact, Saskatchewan and British Columbia are involved in the discussions we're having with the federal government, and as I indicated to an earlier question, we have had officials meeting on that particular proposal this past week. They are reporting back, and then we'll see where we go from there.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, he flunked that one, but I have one. Would this provincial government consider a program of providing loans — and remember, this is the last day of the sitting; this is the last time you're going to hear it — to bring the price of oil up to \$20 U.S. per barrel for, say, the first 500 barrels a day?

DR. WEBBER: That's an interesting proposal, Mr. Speaker, and one that we'll take under consideration.

MR. TAYLOR: Last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Given the terrific lobbying power of multinationals owning their various megaprojects, can the minister assure the House that he's budgeting as much for the stabilization plan as the government is budgeting, and has budgeted in the past, for the Husky upgrader and the tar sands plants?

DR. WEBBER: Again. I'm sure we'll consider the representation in the course of reviewing our budget for the coming year.

MR. PASHAK: To the Minister of Energy. Collapse of international oil prices is as much a disaster at the end of

this session as it was in the beginning. What plans does the government have to recall the Legislature this fall to deal with this problem unless there's some sharp increase in the international price of oil?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, in terms of recalling the Legislature, I think he's directing the question to the wrong person.

However, I would comment that it appears that the only time the hon. members refer to oil prices is when there's suddenly a drop. When prices start wandering from \$10 or \$12 a barrel up to \$16.50 a barrel, there's absolute silence over there, not a word. But the minute it comes back down to \$12, \$14, or \$15, or back from the \$16.50, you start seeing smiles on their faces and they start asking questions about the collapse of world oil prices. They just seem to love the gloom and doom scenario.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of oil pricing, ever since the two-month agreement of OPEC occurred and the fact that the first month has gone by with almost all the countries adhering to their production quotas, the optimism of the forecasters is much greater than what's evident across the floor in the NDP.

#### **Environmental Impact of Insecticide**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. A recent study put out by the American Medical Association has concluded that 2,4-D is one of the most widely used herbicides in Canada and also the United States but it creates a sixfold excess risk of contracting lymphatic cancer. As well, the federal government is concerned about it, and I understand they are possibly going to change the rules. Could the minister indicate the provincial government position with regards to this matter? Will the government be supporting the removal and the replacement by other chemicals, or what action is being planned, if any?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is aware, licensing of pesticides comes under the jurisdiction of the federal government. It is presently under consideration. We will make representation. I appreciate the thoughts of the hon. member prior to making those representations to the federal government, but it does come strictly under federal jurisdiction.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question with regards to the spraying of Furadan across the province of Alberta and excessively in southern Alberta. Could the minister indicate the results of recent studies by the department and whether Furadan could possibly be taken off the market?

MR. ELZINGA: Again, Mr. Speaker, if Furadan were to be taken off the market, it would be taken off the market by the federal government, because the federal government does license these pesticides. I can indicate to him, too, that as he is aware and has referred to, we have done extensive studies. We do not have the complete reports of all these studies as yet. But to those who are attempting to indicate that because of our subsidy to the grasshopper control program that we implemented on June 11, there was some cause for concern prior to that date as to bees dying.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. With regards to the bee producers in the province of Alberta,

is any consideration being given towards a moratorium, limited use of Furadan, or restricted use of Furadan in terms of areas adjacent to bee-producing industries? Has the minister made any decision with regards to that?

MR. ELZINGA: What we have done, Mr. Speaker, in a very extensive way, is notify both the farming population and our honey producers of some of the possible dangers related to Furadan so that they would exercise extra caution themselves as to release of bees and what not. But as the hon. member is aware and as I indicated earlier, the licensing and approval of pesticide usage in Canada falls under federal jurisdiction, and in the event that the hon. member has any conclusive proof that he would like us to pass on to the federal government on his behalf, we're more than happy to do so.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether final arrangements have been made with regards to compensation for losses due to Furadan for the beekeepers of Alberta?

MR. ELZINGA: As I indicated two questions ago, when we announced our program — I believe it was June 11 or 12 — offsetting 50 percent of the costs of spraying for grasshoppers, a number of individuals suggested that because of this program we should assume responsibility for those bees that died and the loss of honey production. We have proof to the extent that bees did die prior to the announcement of that program, so we can't attribute our program to the difficulties the honey producers have faced. I can share with the hon. member that it is under active consideration by our associate minister, who is responsible for hail and crop insurance, and we've made representations to federal responsibilities to the extent that we feel losses should be covered under hail and crop insurance because there is no conclusive proof that our program was responsible for the death of the bees.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Ruling on the chemicals is a federal responsibility. However, as you know, we have experimental stations and many other fact-gathering facilities in Alberta on these types of problems. Could the minister take the leadership or ask his department to take some leadership in reporting to the federal government, because our findings might be different than what they're finding in Ontario or elsewhere, to give a definite Alberta slant to the result of the use of chemicals here in Alberta?

MR. ELZINGA: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we did take that leadership when we announced the grasshopper program. In conjunction with that program we indicated we were going to conduct environmental studies even though it was licensed by the federal government. We have not completed those studies to the extent that I would like them completed, and when they are completed, we are going to share the results with our federal counterparts. But as the hon. member is aware, we did initiate environmental studies. We've also initiated an informational procedure to make the bee producers aware of some of the concerns that might be developed in the event that Furadan is used.

MR. DOWNEY: To the minister. Has his department done any studies on the effect or potential effect of the banning of the use of Furadan or 2,4-D on Alberta food production and prices?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure of that myself. I don't believe so, but there has been concern expressed by those who presently have alfalfa crops and a number of other groups. In the event that we did ban Furadan or 2,4-D, it would cause them additional expenses to produce their crops.

MR. FOX: Supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Losses experienced due to Furadan spraying go far beyond the loss of honey this year by beekeepers. Producers have lost entire hives, which reduces the number of hives they have to overwinter and to claim crop insurance on. Does the department have any plans to compensate bee producers for their loss of hives in the same way that we compensate grain producers for damage by ducks or geese and livestock producers for damage by coyotes?

MR. ELZINGA: As I indicated to the hon. Member for Little Bow, and I'm happy to repeat it, the associate minister, who is responsible for hail and crop insurance, and myself have had communication with our federal counterparts with the hopes of making sure that that loss is covered under hail and crop insurance.

#### Meat Contamination

MR. WRIGHT: My question is to the Minister of Community and Occupational Health, and it concerns the safety of Gainers meats. Meat products from the Gainers plant in Edmonton have been found responsible for three cases of food poisoning in Atlantic Canada. We must be concerned not only for the health of consumers but for the confidence Canadians have in Alberta food products. What assurance is the minister able to give Albertans that products leaving the Gainers plant are safe for consumption?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, the information I have available to me suggests that the problem with respect to that meat in Atlantic Canada was caused through shipping. That meat suffered some extremes in temperature such that the meat arrived in Atlantic Canada with the problem having taken place only during transportation.

MR. WRIGHT: Before the dispute, Mr. Speaker, there were 20 inspectors on the job overseeing the production of 1,000 experienced employees, and there are now some 14, we understand, reviewing the product of some 400 unqualified workers. In view of the ratio of inspectors to unqualified workers properly being 1 to 10 or something like that, what concern has the minister expressed to the federal department over the safety of products that are put in jeopardy?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, the quality of that meat has continued to be monitored by those inspectors. No reports have come to our attention to cause us any alarm, and we feel that that inspection is appropriate at this time.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the federal requirements currently allow ...

MR. SPEAKER: Forgive the interruption by the Chair, hon. member. The difficulty with the line of questioning is federal responsibility and provincial jurisdiction. Please take that into account with the balance of the supplementary questions.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker; I've tried to.

Since the current departmental rules, of the federal department of health admittedly, now permit food processors themselves to have their own employees affix a Canada approved stamp, is the minister confident that this privilege is not being abused at Gainers currently in respect to food products destined for Albertans? If that confidence is there, what are the grounds for it?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I heard one part of the question with respect to Gainers and inspection, and then I heard something about product moving to Alberta. Perhaps the hon. member could differentiate the two and maybe just ask one question.

[The Member for Edmonton Strathcona rose]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. One at a time, thank you. Hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona for clarification.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I submit simply that the minister must have concern in respect to the safety of the products for Albertans. What confidence has the minister in that?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, as you rightly pointed out, this inspection is a matter of federal jurisdiction. If the hon. member has a concern or a particular problem that he wishes to bring to our attention with respect to a problem here in Alberta I would accept that, take it, and do some careful research to see if there is a problem. But I can tell all hon. members now that no problem has come to our attention, and therefore we are not alarmed or concerned at this time about the inspection at that plant.

MR. WRIGHT: The final point, Mr. Speaker, that I would wish to put to the minister is that inspectors have indicated that they only inspect at the point of slaughter and do not inspect the processed products. What use has the minister made of any powers of his own to ascertain the safety of the products or to order veterinary services to take further steps?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member continues to dwell on inspection in an area that is of federal jurisdiction. Again, if he has concerns, I'd ask him to bring them to my attention.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister; that answers the matter. The Member for Clover Bar followed by the Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. TAYLOR: Sir, I had a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Carefully crafted, I'm sure.

MR. TAYLOR: To the minister. The federal government suspected that it was heat-oriented, which means how it's kept in the area before marketing. Has the minister checked whether our systems of holding that type of processed meat in retail establishments are sufficient to make sure that the same thing couldn't happen in Alberta?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, from the information I've been able to acquire on the matter, the answer is yes.

**Small Business Term Assistance Program**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister of economic development. This has to do with the government small business loan program. Can the minister indicate if bankers right across the province are having the same problem in trying to get through to the department to get a number for the loan applications? We've had many complaints that it's almost impossible. Can the minister indicate what problems they're having in the department in trying to get the loans that have already been processed at the local level to the minister's department?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I think we dealt briefly with this subject earlier this week in question period. Yes, the overwhelming response of the business community to the program has resulted in far greater pressure than we had anticipated in terms of our capacity to handle the calls from the financial institutions.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I know what the problem is, but I want to know the solution. What is the minister doing about alleviating the problem so that the loans coming in from the lending institutions can be processed more rapidly?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, as I also advised earlier, we extended hours in which the calls could be made from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. each day. We increased the number of telephone lines devoted to incoming calls in order to process them as quickly as we possibly could. Other than that, in order to have a balance throughout the province in terms of businesses that are spread throughout the province having an even opportunity to have access to registration of their loans, we aren't aware of any additional measures that might be taken other than those that we have taken.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, does the minister have any idea at this time if the program is going to be able to fulfill 30 percent, 50 percent, or 100 percent of the wishes of the businessmen? Does the minister have any projections at this time if the program is going to be adequate or under- or oversubscribed?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I can't be precise, but as of 10 o'clock last night the computers in the department which are recording the approved loans totalled \$161,957,596 that had been processed by the computers through the financial institutions. I'm still not certain as to whether or not we will be able to accommodate the huge demand for this excellent program, but I need to have a few more days to be able to determine that.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Will there be some attempt to possibly prorate the size of the loan if the program gets oversubscribed, say, 150 percent? Is the top limit still going to remain the same as it is, or is it going to have to be downgraded?

MR. SHABEN: All members are aware that the maximum size of loan is \$150,000. Our preliminary indications are that the average loan that has been approved is about \$90,000, which is a reasonable level. It would be difficult for the government to change the rules in midstream — where one group of small businesses had been able to access a program under certain terms and conditions and then

changing them for another group. So I would be reluctant to change the program in midstream.

MR. FOX: A supplementary to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker, recognizing that it's just not working and people aren't able to get their applications in. Banks in Vegreville have been trying from seven to seven every day and have not been able to get through. I myself have tried 50 times today to phone, and it's always busy. Will the minister accept hand-delivered applications for the small business term assistance program?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I think I responded to a similar question earlier from the Member for Clover Bar. The difficulty in changing the manner in which the program is designed to handle applications — we recognize the frustration that's being experienced with the process by the financial institutions and by the individual small business, but it would create a difference in opportunity for far distant branches or communities with a different level of communication availability than for others that are, for example, right here in Edmonton. So I would prefer not to consider accepting hand-delivered applications.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, to the minister of economic development. Has the department analyzed the impact of this particular program on jobs versus the impact of a Syncrude kind of project on jobs to determine whether it would perhaps be more appropriate to fund this program more and to reconsider the government's apparent urge with funding megaprojects such as Syncrude?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think we should not consider any avenue to assist job creation in this province. As the hon. member knows, one of the priorities of the government with respect to economic development is small business, but it is also important in terms of job creation and energy self-sufficiency to look at expanding our capability of meeting Canada's requirements for energy. Both are very important, and I don't think they're mutually exclusive.

**Energy Industry Assistance (continued)**

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Energy. As I talk, the provincial drilling incentives program has been ineffective; unemployment is increasing. It is becoming increasingly clear that we need not just a short-term but a long-term stabilization program. By calling for a federal/provincial meeting on security of supply, the Minister of Energy has in effect admitted that the government's policy of deregulation is not working. Is the minister, by supporting the federal/provincial meeting, calling for national policies which provide long-term stability for oil and gas prices and commensurately for provincial revenues, so that the oil and gas industry does not die by the free market?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, we were all over the country on that particular one, from our incentive programs to stabilization to deregulation, and the hon. member can draw whatever conclusions he wishes with regard to the impact or the take-up on the incentive programs. The reason simply is that the cash flow loss in the industry has been such that most companies were not in a position to be able to take advantage of those programs. However, as the programs are drawing to an end, we do see an increase in the take-up.

With respect to the discussions with the federal minister, we requested with all the provincial ministers that we want to address the issue of security of supply and discuss all the options that are available to this country to address that particular question and the feasibility, the pros and cons, of each of those options. I think it's very significant that we have 10 provincial governments in this country and two territories that want to sit down with the federal government to look at options and are serious and concerned about the problem of security of supply. So I think it's a significant start in dealing with a difficult problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. Might we give unanimous consent for this line of questioning to be completed, provided we have supplementary questions and answers that are quite brief?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR: The questions are okay; it's the answers.

MR. SPEAKER: That's a matter of opinion.

MR. CHUMIR: I'm underwhelmed, Mr. Speaker, by the directness of the minister's answer. Would the minister please advise the House how he, as a mathematician and logician, can state that the government supports a totally free market in energy at the same time as it is proposing a stabilization plan to the federal government and calling for a conference on security of supply?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'm restraining any temptations to sort of get back at the guy from Calgary Buffalo. We're sitting in this Legislature not solely as mathematicians and logicians; we're sitting here as politicians and representatives of the people in terms of dealing with their problems. The main problem we're dealing with here is security of supply.

The proposal we have before the federal government with respect to stabilization is a separate set of discussions than the one we're proposing with the federal government dealing with security of supply. Alberta, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia are involved in discussions with the federal government looking at a proposal that we presented to the federal government. As I've indicated previously, this particular proposal is aimed at a particular segment of the energy industry. The removal of the PORT will have an impact on a certain segment of the energy industry. We've indicated many times that more needs to be done to address the short-term problems, but also we need to have planning with respect to the longer term problems of security of supply.

MR. CHUMIR: The minister picks up getting all over the map very quickly. Will the minister please answer how long-term planning is possible without price stability as ensured by some form of federal government program?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, certainly price stability is necessary for investment to occur in our energy industry in this country, whether it be in conventional oil, the frontiers, offshore, or wherever it might be. One of the options that is in place that we can discuss — and there are many of them — would be looking at what kind of security of supply could occur for North America. In that regard there may possibly be some positives. We want to look at the pros and cons of a North American oil price

or an import duty on offshore crude. That is just one of many options that could be reviewed in discussions with the federal government.

MR. CHUMIR: Speaking of the United States, Mr. Speaker, has the minister or anyone in the government talked to the federal government about commencing discussions with the United States to develop a continental oil strategy, possibly as part of the expansion of current free trade talks?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, we've had discussions with the federal government on the matter of a North American security of supply. We've indicated that we think it would be important for the federal government to discuss the options that are available to both countries in dealing with that particular problem. I haven't initiated any requests as it relates directly to the trade discussions.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Does one of the price stabilization proposals that the government has made to the federal government have to do with a floor price and import quotas?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the particular stabilization program we've proposed to the federal government is such that we do not want to discuss the details in the public arena at this particular time.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. However, there are a number of issues to be dealt with. The Minister of Social Services would like to give a response to questions asked yesterday.

#### **Belanger Family Deaths**

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, as a result of questions taken as notice yesterday — some of that area was covered in question period today, but I should respond in an additional area to do with the tragedy of the late Mr. Belanger and his family. This was raised yesterday in my absence.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this tragedy has affected not only the family but certainly a number of very professional people in the Department of Social Services who over time had a relationship with this family. Unfortunately, as happens not only with people in the community, friends, and family themselves, the professional people are not always able to unlock and find the key to very troubled minds.

Mr. Speaker, several things were followed up as a result of that. First of all, apparently an allegation was made that there was not follow-up in terms of seeing that this family received proper services. Contact was made with the director of student services and the superintendent of the Thibault Roman Catholic school board. They have assured our staff of a number of things: first of all, that the anonymous comment was not on behalf of the school district; that the department was never advised by the school district to remove the children; that in the opinion of the director of student services, in fact, they were working with one of the best social workers that the school district has ever noted; and further that none of them in the school district had the slightest idea that this tragedy would occur.

Mr. Speaker, over the course of the last day and a half the department has completely reviewed the files as well as interviewing staff that had been involved. There is no indication of any lack of follow-up.

I would also add, Mr. Speaker, that funeral expenses, though it's a small gesture, will certainly be looked after by the department, and through another department, bereavement counselling is available to the widow.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, will the government, the minister in particular, recognizing that people are under a great deal of stress with the economic climate in Alberta, be reviewing caseloads for social workers to see if they are overburdened at this particular time and some of these tragedies could be averted in the future?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would that tragedies of this nature could be averted by simply having many more staff on hand. Unfortunately, in this case it is not so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care would like to supplement information from [Tuesday] last.

#### Cystic Fibrosis Clinic

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week the hon. Member for Edmonton Centre asked a number of questions relative to funding for cystic fibrosis and made several accusations with regard to certain matters involving that. The questions about the funding can be answered as follows.

Certain funds, approximately \$75,000 for each hospital, were transferred from the Department of Social Services to the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care at the beginning of this fiscal year. Since that time those funds have been increased to the extent that the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care will be making available to the Alberta children's hospital in Calgary this year approximately \$145,000 in specific funding for the cystic fibrosis program there. In addition to that, the hospital's global budget, which is also funded from the department, has about \$51,000 in it, making a total of \$196,000. At the University of Alberta hospitals \$142,000 is being made available this year, with another \$76,000 in the hospitals' global budget also funded by the department. The funding which is still being provided by the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation is for salaries, in the case of the Alberta children's hospital \$55,000 for one and a half full-time equivalent salaries and at the University of Alberta some \$56,000. The subject of whether or not the salaries will be paid directly by the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care is subject to consideration in the next budget year, 1987-88.

On the second question, involving alleged discrimination of people over 18, I would advise as follows: the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care funding as of April 1, 1986, covers the cost of treatment for all cystic fibrosis patients who are not covered by Blue Cross or private insurance regardless of age. There is no discrimination whatever against people over 18 years of age.

The third question raised was with regard to space at the new Walter Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre at the University of Alberta hospitals. I have contacted the administration of the Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre, and they assure us that the cystic fibrosis clinic is on schedule to move into the Clinical Sciences Building and that patients will continue to be seen by their physicians in the general clinic of the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre until that is completed.

REV. ROBERTS: I'd like to thank the minister for looking into that, and I'll pass the information on to people who have made the representations to me as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Solicitor General wishes to speak to the House with regard to an earlier sitting.

#### Chile

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to clear the record as to my comments last Thursday to the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods relating to his question as to whether the liquor commission would cease sales of Chilean product. As the Member for Edmonton Strathcona has raised today, I inappropriately put the word "alleged" with "dictatorship" rather than the "alleged effect" of the cutoff of the sales. I noted that in the newspapers over the weekend as well as in *Hansard* received on Tuesday and at that time had intended to apologize to the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods. I was advised that he had gone to Chile, and as it is rumoured that today or tomorrow may be the last sitting day of this session, I would like to take this opportunity to apologize to him and to the people from Chile for the inappropriate misplacement of that particular word. I thank the House for the opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: As it appears we've come to the end of question period, at least for this day, the Chair would like to make note of this following bit of legislative trivia: as of this afternoon the Chair has handled 2,540 questions. [applause] Not that all matters were necessarily trivial.

MR. TAYLOR: Carefully crafted.

MR. SPEAKER: Carefully crafted.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

MR. PIQUETTE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to seek unanimous consent of this House to move Motion 236 to the top of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: All members in favour of the motion, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. The motion is carried.

236. Moved by Mr. Piquette:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly congratulate the town of Athabasca on its 75th anniversary to be celebrated by the town on Friday, September 19, 1986, and express its best wishes for continued growth, prosperity, and superior quality of life in the town.

MR. PIQUETTE: I would like to add that I invite all members of the Legislature to invite their friends to come and enjoy the rich heritage of the Athabasca-Lac La Biche constituency as well as its beautiful wilderness and recreational



areas. I gave all the members a tourist brochure so that they may be enticed to come and spend their hard-earned money during the recess break. I'm also donating to the provincial Legislature Library a copy of *Athabasca Landing: An Illustrated History*, one of the rich histories of the province of Alberta.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: In response to the call for the question, all members in favour of the motion, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Let the record show the motion carried unanimously.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that questions 171 and 172 and Motion for a Return 173 stand.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for the unanimous consent of members of the Assembly this day to proceed now to government business.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, all those in favour please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. The motion is carried unanimously.

#### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

16 Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that when the Legislative Assembly adjourns to recess the First Session of the 21st Legislature, it shall stand adjourned until a time and date prior to the commencement of the Second Session of the Legislature as is determined by Mr. Speaker after consultation with the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I should say to hon. members that when passed, that motion won't end the session. Any hopes in that respect will therefore be dashed for some hours. The effect of the motion obviously is, and I should just state it, that once passed, when the Assembly then adjourns, this sitting of the Assembly might return when called after the Speaker sends notices, and that would be after consultation with the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

[Motion carried]

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

##### Bill 35 Business Corporations Amendment Act, 1986

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, I move third reading of Bill 35.

[Motion carried; Bill 35 read a third time]

#### Bill 15

##### Employment Pension Plans Act

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 15, the Employment Pension Plans Act.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, I'll keep my comments brief. In reviewing the *Hansard* of September 11, I'd like to address some comments to the minister in respect to this Bill. With respect to a comment by the minister with reference to jointly trustee plans with respect to single-employer plans, the minister stated on the 11th that the reason single-employer plans were not jointly trustee was "to allow for flexibility." If we're going to allow for flexibility with single-employer pension plans, why aren't we doing the same with respect to multi-employer plans? Perhaps the minister would like to answer that.

The second thing I'll bring up is some misconceptions on the questions I asked the minister with respect to regulations 19 and 21. That is with respect to time limitations. It has nothing to do with the answer put forth by the minister. I agree with time limitations in the Act. The problem I have is that they're not in the Act; they're in the regulations. That is the question I asked.

With respect to regulation 39, again that deals with surplus assets and time frames, and I asked the minister that these time frames be included in the proposed legislation. I don't think it should be that difficult seeing as how they are in the regulations. They should be in the Act and should be very specific.

The third thing I would like to bring up is in respect to employer contributions and surpluses. The minister mentioned that surpluses can do three things: they can give additional benefits to plan members, they can pay for future contributions of an employer in a defined benefit plan, or they can be paid back to the employer on his request and approval by the pension benefits branch and the superintendent. I would suggest for the minister's consideration that he eliminate the first two proposals, paying future contributions and back to the employer, and give those surplus assets to those plan members or beneficiaries for their utilization in increasing their pensions so they can survive later on in life and will not be down at Social Services picking up money to survive in their retirement years.

With respect to the definition of "spouse," I don't have any difficulty with the definition. The question to the minister was about who is to determine and that this legislation does not allow for any determination if the spousal definition is correct. He mentioned section (1)(hh)(ii) and also section 61 of the Act, and that's where I have some difficulty. Section 61 of the Act gives the administrator the right to determine whether or not that spouse qualifies as a common-law spouse under the other section of the Act. My question to the minister was about the right of appeal of a spouse who gets denied by the plan administrator or fund holder.

The next question I asked the minister was with respect to section (1)(m)(i), where it does not require that contributions are required by a plan. With all the expertise that I have with multi-employer plans and some single-employer plans, the plan does not provide for contributions. A collective agreement or terms of employment require that, not a plan or trust document for a pension plan. The minister mentioned housekeeping. What I would suggest to the minister is: why don't we get this housekeeping done now so we have the true meaning in that Act?

The next question I had was with respect to 8(4)(g). The minister responded with the matter of cost certificates. Cost certificates are issued by actuaries, and they describe whether a plan is fully funded or partially funded or has any unfunded liability. That information might contain additional information. Specifically what I asked with respect to section 8(4)(g) of the Act was that we expand on "any other prescribed document" and ask for audited financial statements, latest actuarial evaluation, all financial reports of money managers, and, fourthly and lastly, a list of all assets held in trust on behalf of the beneficiaries of the plan. The minister indicated in his opening remarks with respect to Bill 15 that it was a very, very important piece of legislation specifically as it dealt with plan disclosure. If it's very important, why do we not include in this legislation those items I suggested, to make it fully determinable to those plan members or beneficiaries so they don't have to go to court to find out all about how their pension is being looked after, how it's being managed, and how it's being invested?

The next question I had was with respect to vesting. I believe the minister stated that it would probably add to the cost of the plans. In fact, I would suggest to the minister that the cost to the plan, to the beneficiaries, in decreased benefits or anything else is almost less than nothing. I don't believe there would be a significant reduction, if any at all. Why don't we look at allowing this two-year vesting? It is to the benefit of the employees or plan members.

With respect to 27(10) that I brought up and the perceived loophole in the legislation allowing employers to change, I don't believe I'm at all mistaken. That loophole is still there. It has to be addressed. Perhaps the minister could reconsider.

The next question I asked the minister was with respect to section 31 of the plan, preretirement survivor benefits. The minister ignored the problem, but what he did say was that he agreed with immediate entitlement of a spouse. I would suggest to the minister that if he agrees, why doesn't he change the legislation? It doesn't make any difference if the pension paid to the spouse is small or large. She needs the money immediately. She doesn't need it later on in life. She needs that money with some sense of urgency to look after her family, and irrespective of how much money that is, she should get it immediately. The minister agreed with me in that respect. Why doesn't he make it mandatory in the legislation?

I believe the next question I had was with respect to section 44, concerning delinquencies, and the minister referred me to sections 66 and 67 of the Act, where it states that the Superintendent of Pensions has the ability to invoke sections 66 and 67, which allow for \$100,000 fines. The legislation says "may." My question to the minister: in the case of delinquent employers, can the minister indicate to this Assembly and all Albertans and all members of pension plans if those delinquent employers will be charged and taken to court by the Superintendent of Pensions? Could the minister confirm that and also that directors of those companies will certainly get their due with respect to section 67(2)?

The next question I brought up that I thought was very unfair was the question of fees within the regulations. One of the statements the minister made was that this can be changed by regulation, and certainly we will be putting in a request for change in those regulations. Is the minister indicating to this Assembly with his response that those fees can be changed? Are we going to see further increases in

these fees? Mr. Speaker, I did mention that these fees in those three areas were increased by 400, 500, and 600 percent and can very simply be changed again to make them even higher than that and that I didn't think it was realistic in light of the depression we're going through in Alberta. I reminded the minister that those fees were taken out of those pension plans, therefore significantly reducing pensions for plan members, certainly more so than by changing the vesting.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

I brought up the question of bankruptcies and receiverships and asked the question whether there was any input directed toward them on a federal level by our Superintendent of Pensions. The reason I asked what input and advances were made in those discussions was to protect pensions and things like health benefits and holiday pay that should be protected in addition to pensions because they are trusted benefits. The minister did not respond to that. I believe that my question to the minister was: did he consider anything in this legislation that would protect those benefits and give them a number one ranking before a bank, Revenue Canada, or any Crown agency?

In addition, I'd inquired as to charges by a plan administrator or fund holder and what were realistic charges that could be assessed a pension plan on termination or wind-up. The minister never answered that, and I would like an answer, because it's very important. It's very important, Mr. Speaker, for this reason: a plan holder, administrator, or fund holder could turn around and charge unreasonable fees to the beneficiaries of that trust and therefore deny them the pension money that was put aside for them. I know there's one section of the Act that institutes for unreasonable charges, but that's all it says. Who determines what's reasonable and what's unreasonable?

Another question to the minister is with respect to the minister's comments. He said, "We've always indicated in the annual report the number of terminations" we've had; specifically, "We avoid giving detailed financial information about any specific plan." Then he goes on and says, "It is the information of the members of the plan and not the general public." What I would ask is why. Basically, the minister has indicated that we've always reported in an annual report the number of terminations but that the detailed financial information of a terminated plan is the information of the members of the plan. If that's the case, why do we have Gainers' employees going to the courts to get that information? Certainly this legislation might change that to some extent but, again, if we aren't more specific in what we're legislating here, those employees are still not going to have the right and they're still going to have to go to the courts to find out what's there for them.

The other question that I brought up, Mr. Speaker, was with respect to definitions of full-time, part-time, and casual employees. I guess the minister totally misunderstood the question I asked and the statement I made. The statement I made indicated that if we don't have descriptions of what part-time or casual employees are and if we don't clearly delineate them in this Act, those people are going to be denied benefits. What I said to the minister was that the 35 percent of maximum earnings allowed under the Canada Pension Plan is nothing but a red flag to employers to turn around and say, "In this economy that we have here right now, where we're interested in maintaining some sense of profit and surviving, that is one of the first things we're

going to look at." I suggest to the minister that as soon as those part-time or casual employees approach 29, 30, or 31 percent of what he's got in this legislation, those employees will be looking for new jobs and they will not get what we're trying to get for them; that is, pensions. That was the perspective I had with regard to the question I asked, not what was answered.

There is another one here where he says there is an unfortunate implication that in the new legislation it would be possible for an employer to change the plan unilaterally. That is not the case.

Let me tell you that under the plan and the legislation in Bill 15, any employer can come in and terminate his pension. All he has to do is make a request to the Superintendent of Pensions. Are we saying that we are very, very closely going to examine the question of whether or not we're going to allow that employer to terminate one plan and set up another plan? What I put forth was that if an employer comes in to terminate that plan, and if the only reason for doing so is that the Superintendent of Pensions feels we should beat those employees out of what they should rightfully have and rightfully deserve as a pension working for them, we're going to put a stop to that.

I'd also suggest to the minister that in the future we look at setting up some type of commission or review board to determine whether that employer can or can't do that and that, again, protects the interests of employees and employees' pensions. You don't need to worry about business; they'll look after themselves. They're doing a good job of it right now.

Another thing I suggested the other night in Committee of the Whole was to turn around and examine limiting numbers where we had to get into jointly trustee funds. Certainly I understand that in some of the smaller single-employer plans this is perhaps not possible. But the reason for that should not be to allow greater flexibility for an employer or to say that an employer might perhaps not fund the plan, because I'd suggest to the minister that the Superintendent of Pensions and the whole pensions area was set up to protect employees' pensions, not to look after the interests of the employer. Let him look after his own interests. If we limited numbers within this plan and made it mandatory for jointly trustee boards, perhaps we'd be going a long way to seeing that those pensions of those employees are indeed going to be looked after and are going to be protected. I'd suggest that in the housekeeping the minister is going to do or has suggested over the next year to two years, that's something he look at most seriously.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

With respect to organized labour and cents per hour contributions, organized labour is going to have to take a re-look at this too. If they don't, and if they keep and maintain defined benefits and pension plans, they are going to continue to lose pensions and surpluses back to the employer and thereby not serve the interests of their memberships. Certainly that's one thing I brought forward to some of my brothers and sisters on the other side and said, "You'd better start changing the way you operate."

I thank you very much, and I thank the minister for considering some of the remarks I made.

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

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, listening to the remarks, I wonder if the hon. Member for St. Albert and I have been looking

at the same Bill. It's about two years ago that the Member for Drayton Valley, I think, introduced a motion, and this House had a long discussion about pensions being affordable, portable, equitable, reasonable, and things like that. I'd remind the hon. member that for some two and a half years this process has gone on across the country. There have been many meetings of federal and provincial officials and ministers. There's been open discussion with actuaries and with existing operators and members of pension plans, and the legislation is the result of that. I think it's good legislation and will fulfill the requirements of Albertans. I did speak about housekeeping amendments over the next year or two; that's almost inevitable with a Bill as complex as this.

After listening carefully this afternoon to the remarks by the hon. member, I'm sure that I answered almost all of the points he addressed in my remarks at committee. What I will do is review his remarks this afternoon and the *Hansard* record, and if there are indeed any deficiencies, then I will communicate with the member directly. Otherwise, I would recommend third reading to the Assembly.

[Motion carried; Bill 15 read a third time]

**Bill 48  
Workers' Compensation  
Amendment Act, 1986**

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 48.

[Motion carried; Bill 48 read a third time]

**Bill 13  
Department of Transportation  
Amendment Act, 1986**

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Minister of Transportation and Utilities. I wish to move third reading of Bill 13, the Department of Transportation Amendment Act, 1986.

MR. TAYLOR: This is more a question of a point of order. As you know, I've repeatedly tried to introduce an amendment to bring in seat belts, first under the Highway Traffic Act and in committee, in which I appealed the Chairman's decision to the Assembly, on which we'll hear more. But I believe, Mr. Speaker — and this is what I'm going to ask you for a ruling. You're probably familiar with it. I believe we can introduce an amendment to the Department of Transportation Amendment Act governing seat belts, and I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you give me a ruling as to whether or not you think the introduction of the use of seat belts in this Act would be in order.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, if I may make a comment with respect to Bill 13, this is in effect the Act that establishes the Department of Transportation and Utilities. It certainly would not be the Act under which that consideration could be given. There is another Act on the Order Paper, Bill 17, where that may be more relevant.

MR. TAYLOR: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have an apology. It was in Bill 43 that I wanted to ask your permission and introduce it. I got my threes mixed up. I've already been ruled out of order, although I've appealed the Chairman's ruling in committee, and it was to you on Bill

17. I believe we might have a debate or you might have your ruling on that later. So forewarned is forearmed, Mr. Speaker, when Bill 43 comes up for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: No point of order with respect to this particular Bill.

[Motion carried; Bill 13 read a third time]

**Bill 16**  
**Special Waste Management**  
**Corporation Amendment Act, 1986**

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Minister of the Environment, I move third reading of Bill 16, the Special Waste Management Corporation Amendment Act, 1986.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. members. The Chair can hear. It's a matter of having to wait for members moving to and fro in the Assembly, but the Chair appreciates help as always.

[Motion carried; Bill 16 read a third time]

**Bill 17**  
**Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1986**

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Transportation and Utilities, I wish to move for third reading Bill 17, the Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1986.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will take a few moments while the Chair has some consultation with the Deputy Speaker and the Clerk. [Mr. Speaker conferred with the Deputy Speaker and the Clerk]

The Chair is not able to give out advice prior to receiving an amendment, and if there are any amendments to be presented with respect to third reading, it becomes another kind of matter. The Chair will then have to rule as to whether an amendment has been made, whether it be for this Bill or any other Bill. Is there an amendment proposed to Bill 17?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister, sum up with respect to the Bill, if there is no other discussion. Any further comments?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion carried; Bill 17 read a third time]

MR. TAYLOR: On a point of order on that, Mr. Speaker. I had the impression left with me after it was in committee that before third reading was given, there would be a ruling given by you as to my appeal to the Assembly from the Chairman's ruling. An amendment I had proposed for Bill 17 was passed out and filed by the Chairman while it was in committee stage. He ruled it out of order, and I asked for an appeal to the Assembly, which this is. When will that appeal take place, or can't it take place?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, the Chair's hands are tied with respect to whatever happened in committee. At the committee stage there was no motion that came forward from the committee in terms of a report to the House as a whole. Therefore, the Speaker as chairman of this formal function cannot rule on something that has not been directed to the Chair by Committee of the Whole. This is not an arguing or debating point here, hon. member.

MR. TAYLOR: It's not a debating point, Mr. Speaker. I was under every impression that the Blues said the motion had been made appealing the decision of the Chairman appealing to the Assembly. What has happened to that? Is there no record of it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair calls upon the Deputy Speaker to explain what did occur in committee, because the Chair's understanding is that no motion was passed.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, the Chair in Committee of the Whole advised the committee that the Chair would defer the decision until the next opportunity of the Committee of the Whole. The committee has not yet been called as Committee of the Whole, at which time the Chair would then explain the reasoning for the ruling, if that was satisfactory.

MR. SPEAKER: Was Bill 17 reported?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. There is no more discussion on this point. The matter may be raised again when Committee of the Whole reassembles.

**Bill 27**  
**Alberta Health Care Insurance**  
**Amendment Act, 1986**

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 27, the Alberta Health Care Insurance Amendment Act, 1986.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to note again on third reading what a milestone piece of legislation this is and what a happy day it will be in Alberta on October 1 when it comes into force.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that it's a Bill that is not just going to comply with the Canada Health Act but, rather, will comply also with the principles of access to the medical services of a rich and resourceful society for all who are sick. We feel that the Bill could still be strengthened. As others who have looked at it have said, it seems that the minister has struck a most generous settlement with the AMA, but it does in fact do the deed and, as such, we're quite gratified for that.

It does not, however, seem to end extra billing in the province entirely. As we've noted, the Bill says that it ends extra billing by physicians and dental surgeons, but it allows others such as chiropractors and podiatrists to continue to extra bill. I met with a number of physiotherapists yesterday morning, and they pointed out that they tend not to bill, that they are a group for whom the fee schedule with the department is adequate. I had lunch with an ophthalmologist, and the whole discussion was around the dispute between ophthalmologists and optometrists, that some of the reasons

for optometric extra billing still seem to need a lot of scrutiny. I continue to feel that pressure will be coming from the AMA and the physicians and dental surgeons who are now not allowed to extra bill and wonder why these others seem to have the best of both worlds.

The Bill continues to avoid the question of the whole aspect of fee for service, which others have referred to as just continuing turnstile medicine, of getting as many patients through for as many fees as is possible in a certain day. The minister has talked about needing some control of those costs and services. The question of salaried physicians is one that has never been discussed in light of this. I know it is anathema to some in the department and in the medical establishment, but certainly health maintenance organizations and others who have the practice of salaried physicians find that that is a way of controlling costs and utilization.

Mr. Speaker, we feel that this Bill is not the best of all possible worlds, but it is to the good and to the better health of Albertans. We are gratified that the political will of many Albertans and particularly of one political party is prevailing in this historic legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment as well on Bill 27. I think it should be clearly understood that the Alberta Medical Association has served the citizens of this province very well with its membership. Let no one think that in terms of quality medical care, the needs of Albertans have suffered simply because this Act has been brought before us. Very clearly, it was the action of the Canada Health Act that precipitated this. I'd simply like to make the comment that we as Albertans have been extremely well served by the members of the medical association and the medical profession of this province. The fact of extra billing ending is gratifying to the Member for Lethbridge West, who has opposed it for many years.

I want to commend both the Alberta Medical Association and the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, plus members of the government side who have said that finally we'll bring to a very successful conclusion — albeit a difficult one — recognition that Albertans are well looked after in the medical sense. I think the future for the delivery of medical care in this province is indeed bright.

MR. SPEAKER: May the minister sum up?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'm just pleased that there was indeed support for Bill 27 right across the province in the medical community, among our citizens, and certainly by members of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I have already moved third reading.

[Motion carried; Bill 27 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
32	Water Resources Commission Amendment Act, 1986	Kroeger
33	Naturopathy Repeal Act	Ady (for Jonson)

#### Bill 34

#### Health Disciplines Amendment Act, 1986

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 34, the Health Disciplines Amendment Act, 1986.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, just a small point on the whole aspect of the Health Disciplines Board in third reading. I'm wondering somewhat about the state of the proposed legislation to register occupational therapists under the rehabilitation side. I take it that that is perhaps another piece of legislation outside the purview of this Bill, but nonetheless it seems to be unclear whether it falls under this board or is separate.

Mr. Speaker, it did seem in the discussion on this Act, limited as it was, that everything was going quite well. As I noted, it seemed in the Health Disciplines Board annual report that they themselves have said that some complex and difficult issues have surfaced, that conflicting views exist among professional associations, government departments, experts, and the disciplines with respect to the content of these regulations. It would be a major challenge for the board to evaluate the concerns of all interested parties. It's our hope on this side of the House, too, that these amendments and this Bill will help to further the work of the board.

Thank you.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should clarify that negotiations and discussions have been going on with the occupational therapists for some considerable time with a view to bringing in freestanding right-to-title legislation for this group somewhat similar to that for the physical therapists.

With regard to the hon. member's remarks about the Health Disciplines Board, I think it indicates the debt that all Albertans owe to the members of that board for the work they put into settling what are sometimes difficult and contentious issues, as all professional groups tend to be very protective of what they sometimes regard as their individual turf.

[Motion carried; Bill 34 read a third time]

#### Bill 36

#### Local Authorities Election Amendment Act, 1986

MR. HYLAND: On behalf of the Member for Calgary McCall, I would like to move third reading of Bill 36, Local Authorities Election Amendment Act, 1986.

[Motion carried; Bill 36 read a third time]

#### Bill 43

#### Motor Vehicle Statutes Amendment Act, 1986

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 43, Motor Vehicle Statutes Amendment Act, 1986.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I've already delivered to you an amendment to Bill 43, which would change section 14, which in turn changes section 71 of the motor vehicles Act to incorporate basically the seat belt legislation that has already been attempted once in the Highway Traffic Act and before that by a private member's Bill from the hon. Dr. Cassin.

I believe it is in order because it covers that part of the Act which says what a driver has to do, has to be, and what qualifications are in order to operate a motor vehicle: has to have a driver's licence, has to be insured. And I am going one step further: has to be belted up. It's just one more requirement. I think it can come in under the Act without conflicting with the Act and is a very neat and commendable way to have seat belt legislation enacted in this province. Therefore, I have submitted the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair requests a copy of the amendment for consideration. Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: I could run more off for you.

MR. SPEAKER: No, hon. member, not yet. There has been no agreement by the Chair for distribution. [Mr. Speaker conferred with the Table officers]

Hon. members, aside from anything else, the Chair appreciates the opportunity to sit quietly in the House.

The reference in the proposed amendment is such that it necessitates reference not only to *Beauchesne*, but we need to go further back with regard to parliamentary practice, to the usage of the House of Commons at Westminster. What occurs here then is a reference to pages 576-77 in *Erskine May*, with regard to third reading, debate on third reading, and amendments:

The amendments that may be moved to the question for the third reading of a bill follow the same pattern as those that may be moved on second reading ... Debate on third reading, however, is more restricted than at the earlier stage, being limited to the contents of the bill ...

What is already there. And further:

and reasoned amendments which raise matters not included in the provisions of the bill are not permissible. Therefore, the proposed amendment is not allowed.

[Motion carried; Bill 43 read a third time]

#### Bill 44

##### Department of Municipal Affairs Act

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 44, the Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I record once again my objection to any departmental reorganizational Bill that gives excessive powers of regulation to the minister, taking what should probably be the business of this House out of the Chamber. It is a pattern with this government, completely contrary to its attitude when in opposition before it became the government and indeed contrary to the recommendations of its own committee which reported in 1974. I've made the points before, but I will vote against the Bill.

[Motion carried; Bill 44 read a third time]

#### Bill 47 Chiropractic Profession Amendment Act, 1986

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker, I give Bill 47, the Chiropractic Profession Amendment Act, 1986, third reading.

[Motion carried; Bill 47 read a third time]

[On motion, the Assembly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole]

#### head: GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (Committee of the Whole)

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee of the Whole please come to order to consider various Bills.

Before we proceed, I would like to comment on a decision of the Chair the last day of the committee. At that time the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon submitted an amendment. The Chair ruled that the amendment was not in order. The hon. member then raised a point of order. I would refer members to *Hansard* of that date; the Chair is now looking at the Blues. The terminology used by the hon. member varied at different stages of that. By that time we were within the matter of the vote. The Chair put the vote, which was carried.

On reviewing the Blues, the Chair is of the view that one of the responsibilities of the Chair is to see that the committee functions in accordance with *Standing Orders*. If the language used by an hon. member is at variance with what is in *Standing Orders* — for example, a motion that the Chairman now leave the Chair, which was not in order because it was not dealing with that matter — the Chair, I think on review, had a responsibility to the hon. member to point out the appropriate section, which was section 62(6) of *Standing Orders*; that is, any decision made by the Chair on an order of business in the committee is appealable to the Assembly.

It's the Chair's view that the Chair should probably have explained it to the hon. member, at which time the following would take place: the Chairman would leave the Chair, report to the Speaker in writing the point of order on which he has ruled — in this case that the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon had submitted an amendment and the amendment was ruled out of order by the Chair. The Speaker would then make a ruling in the Assembly to confirm the support of the Chair. That did not happen. This Chairman feels that he shares part of that responsibility, regardless of the terminology used by the hon. members. One of the functions of the Chair is to assist those members of the committee in matters of the standing order where terminology may be confusing.

Although the matter is now behind us, I would like to apologize to the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon and consider the matter closed, if that's satisfactory.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. I think I certainly should, even though I am a new member, be well enough informed to know how I could have appealed it. I didn't. I notice reading the Blues that I finally did get it, but a page later. Certainly no purpose is served now.

I did desperately want to get the seat belts into that Act. I still think it should've been in there. I think it could have been in; however, there's no real purpose in referring your ruling to the Assembly. I think we might as well get on. You can look for me next year on this issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair appreciates the comments of the hon. member.

### Bill 38

#### Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1986

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments pertaining to this Act?

MR. EWASIUK: Mr. Chairman, I rise to again make comments to the Municipal Government Amendment Act. As I said on second reading, basically I have no disagreement with the amendments being proposed. I think particularly the inclusion at this time of the provisions for disclosure of interest by members of council is well received. Certainly it has been something that the municipal councils through the AUMA have requested for some time. The Bill outlines very well the procedures: how this disclosure is going to be made to councils, what happens if an individual fails to disclose or abstain from voting, and also the appeal procedures. If an individual is in fact considered to be in conflict of interest, he does have an appeal. Those procedures are spelled out in the Bill.

Again, as I stated in second reading, Mr. Chairman, the one area of concern that I have has to be in section 443; that is, in these amendments it is being proposed that this section be repealed. I note the minister in his response to the Assembly indicated that the rationale for this appeal is primarily to allow municipalities the autonomy to deal with requests in terms of bonussing and so on. I think that's appreciated certainly. I think municipalities have — I'm sure the minister obviously is responding to that request, that demand for more autonomy. However, I would think the autonomy that the municipalities are calling for is not necessarily in this area. I think they want autonomy primarily in the area of financial and fiscal responsibilities, the ability to spend money as they feel is necessary. They've asked to remove the conditional grants. I think it's in this area where municipalities were requesting and demanding more autonomy.

As I stated the other day, the repealing of this particular section will pit the municipalities in a game of giveaway, particularly the larger municipalities, large centres like Edmonton, Calgary, and you might want to include Red Deer in that. The problem it will create — I have some response from smaller municipalities who cannot get into the bidding game. Their resources are such that they can't compete with the cities of Edmonton or Calgary. Consequently, they have a fear that there will be a diversion of development or business going into these larger centres because it is they who will be able to buy them to come into their communities; that is, the smaller municipalities simply will not have the resources and the ability to get into the bidding war of giveaway and consequently are going to be continual losers. It's a major concern that smaller municipalities have, and I would think the minister should have considered the kind of problem that is going to arise by the deletion of this legislation.

It is also going to remove the opportunity for citizens — and I think this is very important — to challenge a city

council or municipal council in that they are not acting in the common interest, the common good of the taxpayer. This particular clause made that available to the taxpayer. With its repeal, we remove any opportunity for a citizen to be able to challenge ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order in the committee, please. Proceed, hon. member.

MR. EWASIUK: ... a bonussing or giveaway by a municipality.

On that basis, Mr. Chairman, I think it's a good Bill, but I think it has this one flaw in it. I hope that the minister would reconsider and withdraw this section from the Bill.

To that end, Mr. Chairman, I ask your guidance on this. I would like to have a split on the voting on this particular Bill, in that I would like to be able to support all portions of the Bill except the repeal of 443. With the approval of the minister, I certainly hope the Assembly would consider that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which clause is the hon. member referring to?

MR. EWASIUK: I'm referring to section 443, Mr. Chairman, page 14.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, would you care to comment?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the vote being taken on clause 26 of the Bill and then on the balance of the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been proposed to the committee that we deal with all sections of the Bill with the exclusion of section 26; we'll deal with that separately. Would the committee agree with that?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments, questions, or suggested amendments to other sections of the Bill before we proceed with the vote?

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Chairman, I would speak very briefly to section 15, on page 11:

Section 164(b) is amended by adding "or cats" after "dogs" wherever it occurs.

I know we had some jokes about that the other day, but I do object to that section.

Cats are very different from dogs. They react and live differently and are not such a menace in an urban society as dogs can be. I like dogs. I grew up on a farm, and I love dogs: big dogs, little dogs; it doesn't matter. But they react differently from cats to living in conjunction with mankind. It is possible to license dogs, and they don't seem to mind too much. But you can't put a collar on a cat if it doesn't want to live with it. In fact, we have tried. One of our cats was very good at getting out of not only a collar but a whole harness that we put on to try to keep the collar around his neck.

The licensing of cats is a rather difficult thing. The idea of enforcement officers running around chasing cats and carting them off to the pound is not one that sits well with me. I know that people tend to think a little kitten is cute

and run it home to their kids. It gets sort of used and misused and abused and grows up and has little kittens, and they have to be killed or given away. There are those kinds of problems, but it's really a matter of education, of seeing that the people who take cats learn to be responsible for them, that they take them to the vet and have them neutered if they don't want to cope with little ones.

I really think that cats are different enough from dogs and are not to the same degree difficult to live with in an urban setting, such as we have here, or in the country and that they don't need to be treated in quite the same way. For instance, dogs can at times become a menace to the health of people. Dogs have been known to kill children. Cats could not do that and have never been known to do that. You can't have packs of dogs running loose in a society, but cats don't run in packs and are not a menace to people.

I'm really serious that I think this is a mistake, that cats do not live the same way dogs do and they really should have been left out of here. My objection is on record, and I can probably be allowed to go home to my wife, who loves cats and has two of them.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address very briefly the repeal of section 443. I take it that's the clause you are going to be placing before the committee first. I would like it if the minister would at some point in dealing with this clause, in closing the debate, look to subsection (3) of the existing section of the Municipal Government Act, in which there are certain conditions or situations in which section 443 does not apply. It refers to an agreement that was in existence before June 1, 1968. It talks about the disposal of land as being exempt from this particular section and an agreement under section 354, which has to do with the construction of parking garages.

The decision to actually repeal the entire section was taken by the government. On the other hand, they could have proceeded by clarifying that section, adding some situations in which this section does not apply. If there was a concern that perhaps 443 was too general or applied to too many inappropriate sections, there was that alternative. I would really like to know why that wasn't looked at. I think that would have made a lot more sense and certainly would have improved that particular section rather than repealing it and opening up a whole brand-new situation in this province.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair believes that when referring to sections of a Bill it is probably more helpful to members of the committee if they refer to sections of the Bill before us as opposed to a section of a Bill we're amending.

Hon. minister, would you care to respond to the Member for Calgary Mountain View? Are there any further questions?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I recognize that this is an issue which is surely debatable, and the expressions of views of the hon. members for Edmonton Beverly and Calgary Mountain View are reasonable enough in their presentation. I don't propose, though, that this Bill be amended at this stage. The government caucus' position was that it was appropriate to see the repeal pursuant to section 26 of this Bill for the reasons given. Although the argument can easily be made on either side, I think it best at this time if we proceed with section 26 of the amending Bill along with the rest of the Bill.

Perhaps I could add briefly to that and indicate that should it become a concern to any of the associations of municipalities this year at their annual conventions, we could always discuss it further. I realize that members who have spoken would like that process perhaps to await that further consultation and not proceed with section 26 at the present time. But I think, Mr. Chairman, that the principle is the one I expressed the other day, and I believe that city councils and other municipal councils can act with responsibility for their own actions. I was interested when the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly said that when they asked for more local decision-making capacity, this wasn't what they had in mind. That may well be, but it is more local decision-making capacity, and it's being offered to them by this Bill.

I think those are my remarks, Mr. Chairman. I will conclude by saying to the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway that I take his remarks very seriously in respect to cats. If I didn't, my sister would never forgive me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is observant of the comments made by the Member for Edmonton Kingsway regarding cats or dogs, and the Chair, having learned from the House Leader not to make quotations except on special occasions, would make the observation that "when the cat's away, the mice sometimes act as rats."

Are you ready for the question? We'll deal with the question in two parts; that is, section 26 as proposed, followed by the balance of the Bill. Are you ready for the question on section 26 of Bill 38? All those in favour of ... The Chair had better have this correctly; the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly wants section 26 defeated as I recall, so we'll deal in the normal manner. All those in favour of section 26 remaining, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Are you ready for the question on the balance of Bill 38? All those in favour of Bill 38, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, if any? Carried.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 38 be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### Bill 51

#### Municipal Statutes Amendment Act, 1986

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions, comments, or amendments pertaining to this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 51 be reported.

[Motion carried]



**Bill 54**  
**Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1986**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments proposed to this Bill?

MR. EWASIUK: Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a few comments to Bill 54. I want to speak as a person who has been involved in the work force for many, many years, as someone that has sat at negotiating tables for a number of years, and recognizing that collective bargaining is a fair and proper procedure in establishing rates and benefits and that in collective bargaining employees must rationalize or certainly justify why it is that they want this increase in wages or benefits. You can't simply come to the bargaining table and say, "We want it because we want it." You have to justify what it is that you're demanding. In looking at Bill 54, I haven't heard any arguments in this Legislative Assembly of people that have been able to justify and rationalize why there should be an increase for the Members of the Legislative Assembly.

When you go to a negotiating table, in rationalizing your demands you do certain things. You say, "Here are the comparisons with other companies, other people in the industry." But most importantly, you look at the ability of the company to pay, and you also look at the economic situation of the industry. Well, we can make comparisons with other provinces, and this was done. Yesterday, I heard someone say that if we get the increase, we are going to be elevated from sixth place to fifth place in terms of where we stand in our wage scale compared to other provinces. That's not bad; I think being somewhere in the middle is a good argument that management always uses. They don't want to be the leaders in the field; they don't want to be the tail end; they like to be somewhere in the middle. And that's where we are. We're in sixth place — not a bad position.

But I haven't heard anyone say to me that there's an ability to pay and the economic situation in this province is such that we should be able to give ourselves raises. I look at what's going on in the province. All the disputes that are in place now and ones that have been settled have been around wage increases mostly, and the arguments being put forward are that we can't afford it, we are in a recession, and the companies can't afford to give any increases. In fact, in most cases demands are for concessions from employees rather than the possibility of giving them increases.

Let's look what's happened in this province in the last several years. In the building trades industry the government has permitted, and I think has in fact encouraged, that spin-off companies be formed. There's a 24-hour lockout, the company starts operations again, cuts employees' wages, in some cases as much as 50 percent, does away with benefits, and continues to operate. This government has done nothing in its labour legislation to prevent this from happening. As I mentioned, in almost every set of negotiations that takes place in this province, the issue always comes down to the conclusion that concessions are demanded by the employer.

The Member for Little Bow made references to the dispute at the Lakehead relative to the grain handlers' strike, and one can sympathize with the situation in the impact that it's going to have on our farming community. But no one ever told us that the dispute there really centres around concessions. The wheat — the company which operates the elevators there has been sitting on a 20 percent demand for concessions from the employees. That is where the dispute

is. Seventy five percent of those employees are locked out; only 25 percent are on strike.

I think my colleague from Calgary Mountain View yesterday outlined some of the other areas where we could have been directing these funds rather than wages for MLAs. Unemployment is probably the highest it's been in this province for a long time. Young men and women are losing dignity because they haven't been able to work. They can't find jobs. People on welfare have been relegated to second-class citizens, unable to look after their families. We have food banks in the province. It's a shame that a province as rich as this one should resort to having to use food banks. And the prime example of what's happening with it by this government: for the injured workers, an 8 percent increase in workers' compensation benefits. We're asking for 10.2 percent or something of that nature.

I think it's most inappropriate that this Legislature should be asking for a wage increase for itself when all those other things are happening, when this government refuses to act in labour legislation to do away with possible strikes. I look at Gainers, where an employer can simply not bargain collectively, not bargain in good faith, simply force the employees on strike, bring in scab labour, and continue his operation. We need legislation, yet the Minister of Labour keeps telling us, "We have good legislation in this province, and let the two sides use it." They use it all right. The employer uses it to break the unions.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this whole process that is before us now in Bill 54 is totally inappropriate. It shouldn't be here before us. I think if someone is going to determine a proper and adequate wage structure for this body, it should not be this body. As a member on council for a number of years, I had the same experience where there's no way that there is a proper time for politicians to have a wage increase. Referring to some of the issues that were raised yesterday in terms of why we shouldn't, I think this Bill should not have been brought forward. It's totally inappropriate for us to be dealing with it, and I would urge the members of this Assembly not to support it for the good of our own respectability but also for the concern of those outside who are hurting much more than we are.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't planning to address this Bill, but in thinking it over, I want to be on the record as supporting it.

In January 1971, Mr. Chairman, I bought a farm; in April I was married. Three years later I was the parent of two children. In 1974, a year of high grain prices and good yields, I made more money on the farm than I'm making here today. Of course, that didn't continue. In 1978 I went to work for a bank, and in terms of constant dollars I was making more then than I'm making now. When I took my seat in this House after the May 8 election, on June 12 I took this chair, and I put in a concentrated effort to be a good representative for my constituency and a good MLA. I suppose it's too early to assess whether I've been successful. The next time I go to the electorate they will make that judgment.

In good conscience I cannot take a hypocritical position on this issue. I feel that the money we're being paid, and which is allowed under Bill 54, is no more than fair compensation for the kind of effort that a good representative is expected to put in, and I will not be hypocritical about that, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, speaking to clause 2 of the Bill, which is the one that raises the indemnity from some \$25,000 — the earlier figure, of course, as set out in the Bill — to \$28,141. As a member of the Members' Services Committee, it fell to my lot to consider, amongst other things, the level of compensation of members. So I looked into the matter rather more deeply than most have, I suppose, and the first thing that one has to say is that it's never the right time for Members of the Legislative Assembly or any legislating body to raise their own pay. In fact, it's an uncomfortable and abhorrent process. However, since we are the highest legislating body in this province and since it falls to them to set the pay, we have to face it somehow. Consequently, the custom, which is salutary, has risen of giving the task to an independent third party so that members, if they accept the recommendations of that third party, cannot be accused of lining their own pockets.

That has been done from time to time, Mr. Chairman, and the last time was in 1979. Mr. Justice Miller, as he then was, of the Court of Queen's Bench was appointed together with two other members to look into the question of the proper level for MLAs' indemnity and expenses and the indemnity and expenses of ministers and other Members of the Legislative Assembly. The committee's obligation was to report back by September 15 that year. That was done, and the first thing Mr. Justice Miller and his committee noted was that the basis on which indemnities were set was that being a MLA was a part-time job. The indemnity was, as the word itself implies, a recompense for the money you've lost from your regular job by transacting your duties as a Member of the Legislative Assembly. The committee was of the opinion that that concept was obsolete. Nonetheless, they said that their terms of reference did not empower them to engage in a thorough review of the matter to see what should come in place of an indemnity.

So they made their finding on the footing that indeed the task of a Member of the Legislative Assembly was a part-time duty although they had recognized that this was obsolete. On that basis, just before the September 15, 1979, deadline they came up with a figure, based on 1978 figures, of \$21,000 indemnity and an expense free allowance of some \$7,000. Then pursuant to their terms of reference they came up with a formula which was designed to remove from this Assembly for the time being, until that wider report was made, if it ever was to be made, the unpleasant task of sitting on our own salaries and deciding on it. That was a modified COLA, cost-of-living allowance clause, Mr. Chairman, that had to go in 5 percent increments. With a base year of 1978, the \$21,000 figure I have mentioned was for the balance of 1979, and the increases were to operate in respect of 1978 to 1979 figures commencing on January 1, 1980, and so on. Somewhere along the line, this did not occur.

Thirdly, Mr. Justice Miller's committee recommended this wider inquiry. Their recommendation was that during the lifetime of that Legislature elected in 1979, such a wide-ranging inquiry should be made to report before the next election so that when that next election occurred, the public and members standing for election would know exactly what they would face. The fact is that it's never the right time to vote one's self an increase. Either it's too soon after an election, in which case people say, "Well, you knew what the terms were; why did you stand?" or "It's too soon before an election; our election is just coming up," in which case a natural temptation is to leave such a thorny problem to the incoming Legislature. Or as is the case

now, it is a time of restraint, and it seems hypocritical for those calling for restraint to vote themselves a pay raise. We really must fall back on this third-party arbitration.

Therefore, when I was thinking about this point, I tried to consider as objectively as I could the job description, as it were, of a Member of the Legislative Assembly and tried to fit it in to the wider scheme of things and consider what such a job description would command in the marketplace. It's clear that it's much, much greater than what a Member of the Legislative Assembly is paid. On the other hand, I do not discount the fact that fortunately people in this province are willing to serve for perhaps less than the market rate in a worthwhile endeavour such as I honestly and sincerely believe the task of a Member of the Legislative Assembly is. But again, there should be a limit to the extent to which the public takes advantage of the public-spiritedness of citizens.

Since I would judge that the majority of us do in fact have as our sole occupation that of Member of the Legislative Assembly — because you can't take time off from a salaried job. You have to take the whole time off, if in fact you don't have to leave the job, so that leaves you with just the pay of a member. That being the case, it would seem to me that that thorough-ranging inquiry should have been made, but it was not. At any rate, Mr. Justice Miller's recommendation, which was intended to avoid the necessity of debates such as the uncomfortable debate we're going through today, was made. As I work out the figures, Mr. Chairman, the formula, if applied in 5 percent increments but without the compounding which would have occurred, would yield for the \$21,000 figure then the figure of \$34,650 effective January 1, 1986. That's not for next year; that is based on the December figure for Statistics Canada, the Edmonton cost-of-living index, compared to the same figure for December of 1978, which is the formula.

So it's plain that even with this proposed rise, the indemnity of hon. members would be only just ahead of the halfway point of keeping pace with the cost of living since Mr. Justice Miller delivered his report. The notion has got about that this in some way restores Mr. Justice Miller's committee's recommendation to the original figure for us today. That, Mr. Chairman, I would regard as unacceptable in a time of restraint, even though it would have occurred automatically had his recommendation been both accepted, which I believe it was, and implemented. It's obviously too much of a jump at a time such as this. But it has seemed to me that the government's proposal of the particular figure it has come at, which is just ahead of keeping up with half the cost-of-living increase since 1978, itself contains a very large element of restraint and is in fact well behind similar percentage increases to old-age pensioners and employees of the government otherwise but more than what has been accorded, including the latest 8 percent rise, to the Workers' Compensation Board pensioners.

Mr. Chairman, I try hard to stand up for what I believe to be the case from the point of view of what is fair and proper. I have tried very hard to see that figure for the Workers' Compensation Board pensioners more nearly approach the 30 percent drop in their real living standard since 1981, without effect. We have tried for other relief for those who are in difficulty because of inflation. It would be less than candid or somewhat cowardly on my part if I did not say what I honestly think with regard to the indemnity for Members of the Legislative Assembly, that I thought a rate of increase that's about half that of the cost of living over the time period that's relevant — namely,

since the Miller report — is not unreasonable, having regard to the conditions we are in with serious budget difficulties and calling for restraint, because, as I said, there is a considerable element of restraint there.

I'm the first to admit, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps I'm not sensitive enough to other calls on our judgment, that I have not given the weight that perhaps I should to the consideration that we have to set an example. I realize that all people see is the percentage increase at a given time. Nonetheless, I believe that responsible people must relate it to (a) the figure you end up with, regardless of percentages, and (b), even as to the percentages themselves, the time span you must relate it to. Bearing all those things in mind and acknowledging that I am perhaps overlooking something that I ought not to overlook, I do not find myself in disagreement with clause 2.

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of brief words on this. I, too, wasn't going to speak, but I thought I should say a few words.

First off, I think the Member for Edmonton Strathcona has hit the nail on the head: there is no good time and no good way ever to handle this issue. I have seen city councils and municipalities and the provincial government tackle this little problem again and again. It always goes out of proportion. I guess this issue would probably catch more news media coverage and create more anxiety than any other item we tangle with, yet it would hit maybe a hundredth of a percent or whatever of our total budget. It does seem to raise the emotions.

You can get a committee to look into this thing, get yourself a good judge, a university professor, or somebody who has a high profile. In Calgary once they even got a consulting company. Peat, Marwick came in with a recommendation. No matter how you do it, there is a problem.

Personally I wish there were somebody outside who would come and say, "This is what you're worth; this is what you get." Basically I think that's what the Members' Services Committee tried to do. They brought in this report and said, "This is what the recommendation is; this is what we're going with." That sounds fair to me. I'm not asking for an increase or a raise, but it's determined by an outside group. I have confidence that the Members' Services Committee did look at it properly, and they came forth with a recommendation.

I'm very confident that this will probably be the only raise that will take place in the period of the next four years. However this thing comes out, I think it goes way out of proportion to what this government is all about.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against Bill 54. I've sat here as a new member of this Legislature for just over three months. What I note with interest is the speed at which this legislation was brought into this Legislative Assembly. To me it's a question of leadership. It's a question of fairness. It's a question of equality, trust, principles, but certainly demonstrating some leadership.

The things I look at are things like the construction industry. Certainly I am familiar with that. The construction industry has been without a collective agreement for two and a half years. Our members, skilled tradesmen working in that construction industry, have been asked to accept 50 percent wage reductions. We have had things like 24-hour lockouts; we've had things like determining and terminating collective agreements by abandoning bridging clauses.

What I'm looking at is urgency. We bring Bill 54 in here; it's urgent. Where was this Legislature when we sat in the construction industry taking 50 percent wage losses, having 24-hour lockouts sprung on us? Where was this Legislature then? I know what we got. We got Bill 110. As far as I'm concerned, this government encouraged contractors out there to double-breast, to take away rights from unions. Unions and union members are the people that work in this province. There is no difference. Those Albertans were asked to take 40 to 50 percent wage losses.

In addition to that, where was the immediacy, where was the urgency on labour legislation review in this province? I've sat and listened. What we've done is developed a tour, another delay, no immediacy to resolving the problems that working Albertans are faced with, where they are being asked to take those 40 to 50 percent wage cuts.

In all good conscience I can't sit in this Assembly and not speak to a just over 10 percent wage increase. I knew what the wages were when I came here. I think every member of this Assembly did when they put their names forth for election and said, "Elect me, because I want to show some leadership to the people in this province." I'd ask this government — and I've heard judgment calls where we're giving cars to people, but it's a judgment call. Where is a judgment call when it comes to helping Albertans and seeing that we're looking after Albertans? We're not doing that. We've sat here and debated Worker's Compensation legislation; we're offering a niggardly increase of 8 percent over the last four years to those who are partially or wholly disabled. I'm not prepared to sit here and vote myself a 10 percent pay increase.

We look at Gainers employees who are on strike trying to get back what they gave up two and a half years ago to keep that company alive, on the promise that they'd get some of that back. They're getting it back; they're out on the picket line. What about their pension plans? We sat and discussed pension legislation here. Did we bring in some emergent legislation to say that that employer cannot terminate that pension plan because he started termination and hired nonunion employees, depressed people in this province that don't have any choice but to try and earn a couple of bucks to get them by? And we can vote ourselves a pay increase?

What are we doing for the people on strike with the Alberta Liquor Control Board who are trying to gain some parity, some decent pensions for casual employees, some benefit coverages for health and welfare? Are we being fair to them? Have we brought this to this Assembly to be debated and discussed with some fairness and shown some leadership? No, we haven't.

What about Suncor? We've got Suncor employees on strike. All they're asking for is a rollover. They're not asking for a pay increase, not to my knowledge anyway. Have we done anything for them? We're talking about over a thousand Albertans in a small community, Fort McMurray. What are we doing for them?

We've got privatization. I've heard lots about privatization. We want to make efficient use of the taxpayer's dollar. We're not making efficient use of the taxpayer's dollar by turning around and privatizing things in government like janitorial services, security guards, commissionaires, who are only getting paid just over \$8 an hour. But we're bringing Wackenhut or some of these other security agencies to pay people \$4 or \$4.75 an hour. Are we doing something? Are we showing leadership to the people in this province by taking a pay increase? I don't think we are.

The question of food banks was brought up. Do I see us passing any immediate, urgent legislation by saying, "Those food banks won't have to shut down because they don't have groceries on the shelf, foodstuffs to provide for the people who daily go there and say that they don't get enough on social assistance to eat."

We've talked about, and it's been alluded to in here, 5 to 10 percent cuts right across the board for every ministry, for all departments. We're going to be cutting back on services to the people of the province of Alberta, yet we can sit in this Legislature and vote ourselves a 10 percent pay increase? I think not. That's not demonstrating leadership to the province's people. Vote against this thing.

What I do have are a few suggestions of what I think are the priorities in this province. We do have priorities. We've got a very, very large segment of our population unemployed, not getting any money except what they get through unemployment insurance or social assistance. Failing that, there is nothing. What this government should be doing is taking some immediate action to create jobs for Albertans. I'd like to compliment the government, because I've sat here and listened and watched and haven't gotten up on too many occasions to mumble a bunch of rhetoric. I'd like to compliment the government for a partial attempt at creating jobs for Albertans. But they're not going to like the compliment, because what they've done is create jobs for ex-MLAs. I'll give a few examples: Mary LeMessurier, Myrna Fyfe, Milt Pahl. They've demonstrated expertise in those areas, so they've got a job. We also sent somebody to England to look after business there, down to California. Sending people out on tours: we're picking up the tab. I don't like picking up the tab as a taxpayer, not one little bit.

What about the rest of Albertans? Have we shown true sympathy and compassion? I've sat and listened on many occasions in this Assembly that we're sympathetic and concerned. What are we doing about it? Where is the action to really express that concern and sympathy? That action isn't there. It hasn't been demonstrated to me.

One other thing: protecting Albertans' jobs — those that are lucky enough in this province to have a job. What have we done there? I'd like to compliment the government again, because I think they've done an excellent job of doling out billions of dollars to an oil industry and praying with their fingers crossed that those companies are going to create jobs for the people in this province. They haven't done it. In spite of the billions of dollars that we pumped away, they haven't done it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The committee is going to have to rise and report.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration and reports Bills 38 and 51 and reports progress on Bill 54.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should take advice. If I could properly make the motion now that the members reassemble in committee at 8 o'clock, I would so move.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, all those in favour please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. The motion carries.

[The House recessed at 5:30 p.m.]

[The Committee of the Whole met at 8 p.m.]

#### head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS** (Committee of the Whole)

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Committee of the Whole please come to order to consider various matters.

#### **Bill 54** **Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1986**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions, comments, or amendments to this Bill? The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have a point of order, Member for St. Albert?

MR. STRONG: Mr. Chairman, I was speaking when we adjourned at 5:30, but I hadn't quite finished.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You were, hon. member, but the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, please.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Chairman, I'd be very pleased to defer to the hon. member and allow him to conclude his remarks.

MR. STRONG: I thank the Member for Calgary Buffalo, Mr. Chairman.

I believe that when we adjourned at 5:30 I was talking about protecting Albertans' jobs. The last little message I'd like to give this government is that they could do a lot better job of it if they spent their time developing long-term energy policies which would protect Albertans' jobs.

In closing, I would urge all hon. members in this Assembly to defeat this Bill and demonstrate by your actions here that you indeed have some sympathy and compassion for Albertans.

Thank you.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak very, very briefly indeed, merely to reiterate my comments of

yesterday in opposition to the Bill and to clarify the fact that my views are the same as they were yesterday, as are those of my two colleagues in the Liberal caucus, both of whom will speak for themselves very briefly, I understand, if they're able. One of them is here, and the other will arrive shortly.

As I noted, I have some difficulty with the legislation. It's quite clear that Members of the Legislative Assembly are very badly underpaid. They work very, very hard. However, I can't support this legislation at this time because of the financial difficulties which the province finds itself in and the need for Members of the Legislative Assembly to be able to speak with credibility. In convincing and dealing with members of the public, we're going to be asked to be able to undergo austerity as a result of the budgetary problems which this province is facing. From the point of view of leadership, it's essential that we as legislators show the province that we do not take this increase at the present time.

The one concern I have and would like to address very briefly is the suggestion that what we are doing is merely rectifying the original mandate and increase that would have come under the Miller formula. My view on the matter is that if the formula is to prevail and members of the Legislature are to be uninvolved in this form of fixing or establishing their own pay, the two interventions that took place in the past, in which the 5 percent increases should have taken place but did not, were in fact bad precedents. I believe that rather than rectifying that bad precedent we would be compounding the bad precedent at this point of time.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I believe we should have some mechanism which determines the remuneration of MLAs which is free of the views of the members of the Legislature, and I would urge that we implement such a process very quickly or live by the dictates of the Miller commission. However, I cannot support this legislation at this point of time.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to reiterate briefly my position as well in opposition to this Bill. The position may seem unnecessarily extreme; however, these are special times requiring a special commitment from leaders in this Legislature. I believe some extraordinary sacrifice is required at this time to establish the credibility of the legislators in this Assembly. There is a true cynicism about politics, politicians, and the political process. Passing this Bill at this time will not serve to reverse that cynicism but will likely serve to exacerbate it at a time when we can least afford that to occur.

I appreciate the tensions that this creates to some extent in this Assembly. I am not taking this position in any way to belittle the position of those who support the Bill. They are, I know, well intended and well motivated. I appreciate my leader's decision to allow us to vote with our conscience in this respect.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, it's just a short comment, because it's no use going over too much plowed ground. I notice, mostly because of the media reports and that, that there was heavy concentration on whether MLAs deserve or don't deserve a raise or whether or not to set an example. Maybe one of the things that I hadn't emphasized enough — and the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona did today — was the case of a principle involved here of having a third party — and there had been a third party — set our

salary. It's always a nasty business for politicians to set their own salaries. I suppose if you took a vote out there as to what we would get paid for what we're worth, you might end up with something like 2 cents. I must confess that as somebody who tried for 11 years to get into this House, I would have settled to get in here for nothing. The fact that there was some salary was all the better.

One of the things I hear time and again is about people without shoes or people without food, which is true in our society, and it's very regrettable. If somehow or other we could put shoes on them by not taking what the Miller report said, I'd be the very first to move.

What I don't like about it is when we decide that maybe we won't take it this year. I could go a step further. If we're going to send a message, maybe what we should have done is voted to take a 10 or 20 percent cut. What we're arguing here — and I think this is the basic missing issue — is whether or not we're going to honour the Miller report, whether we're going to honour a third-party report. I don't think it's a question of measuring your worth. Some of the representatives in this House are worth much more than the price outlined. I would venture to say that there are some others who are worth a lot less than the money outlined. It's not a question of worth. I'm not going to try to look at anybody. The question is that it was the Miller report that I was supporting and that I am on the side of.

We have a third party set up to set our salaries, and we either honour that or get into this ruckus every year, maybe outbidding each other in how much we're going to give to the poor or how many cuts we'll take. It isn't a question of just remaining at our present salary. Maybe we should take a 10 or 20 percent cut. I've asked my staff in the last while to do that. I'm not so sure it's going to save the company anyhow; nevertheless, the point is that I've asked for cuts and I've taken cuts. Maybe that's what we should be doing if we are going to set our prices. It gets rather phony to hang a big issue on whether we take it or not. If we make the principle and if we decide that we ourselves are going to set it year after year, then maybe we should get it down this year and really get it cut so it hurts and set an example.

I have supported this, and I will very reluctantly support it. I hate getting pushed into this position. Certainly there is a breakdown in communication between the government and the Official Opposition. I don't know if I'd go so far to say that there's a breakdown in trust, but the breakdown leads me into the position of having to reluctantly support a piece of legislation that maybe should have been checked out a lot better before it was presented. Nevertheless, the principle to me is whether I follow the Miller report or whether I start setting my own salary, and I choose to follow the Miller report.

Thank you.

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few comments on this Bill, too, to express some sentiments that I have and that I feel very strongly about. We in this Assembly are sent here to make decisions. We all know that. Sometimes the decisions we make are easy to make, and sometimes they're difficult to make. The way we make those decisions, I think, is by exercising good judgment, considering the input from various sources, and then weighing the pros and cons. In that sense Bill 54 is no different from the other 53 Bills that we've considered thus far in this Legislature.

In weighing those pros and cons, on the one side we can address the issue of remuneration for services performed.

Do we deserve more? Do we need more? Should we be paid more? Is the amount being asked for in this Bill unreasonable? Those are the arguments on one side. Arguments have been presented on the other side. Is this the right time to do something like this? Is it the right thing to do at all? Can we go out and explain to people who are in need, whether they be in the inner city or in rural Alberta or in single-industry towns, what we are doing? These are the pros and cons that we have to weigh, Mr. Chairman.

A principle comes to mind. I heard our hon. colleague the Member for Banff-Cochrane refer to principle in a way that I agree with and he stated very well, but to me there's a little bit of a different principle here. In terms of making decisions, we want to do what we think is the right thing and do what the people who sent us here want us to do. If we can accomplish both of those things all the time, we're not only very successful politicians, we're very lucky politicians.

I think of the debate that we've had on seat belts. I personally favour the mandatory use of seat belts. I hope that a majority of my constituents feel the same way; I'm not sure. What do I do as a politician if I find out that maybe 60 percent of them don't feel that way? How do I make that decision? They sent me here because of perceived good judgment, yet they're telling me something different. What we have here, Mr. Chairman — and it should be crystal clear to everyone in this Assembly — is something that a vast majority of Albertans are 100 percent against and do not understand. I have to ask hon. members if this is the Bill on which we want to say: "We're right, and you're wrong. We know what's best, and we're going to ignore all of that input that's been given to us by the people of Alberta before we weigh the pros and cons."

I appreciate the arguments presented. I know how difficult it's been for people to stand up. There's not an iota of larceny in anybody's heart when they're presenting the views they have on this Bill — a very reasoned and moderate approach. But in the eyes of the people of the province of Alberta, we're nothing but a pack of pocket-lining politicians. That's the reality, and it doesn't matter whether we're asking for 1 cent or \$10,000. Mr. Chairman, it's the perception that over-rides the reality, that over-rides the truth in this, and we can't ignore that.

The over-riding principle that for me was the turning point in this discussion — and I must admit I didn't have a chance to think about it until late last week when it was presented — is: do we as an Assembly have the right to make this decision? I believe very strongly that we do not. It is none of our business. Furthermore, to engage in making a decision like this debases all hon. members in this Assembly, because it's a repugnant process. There is no negotiation here. Who are we talking to about raising our salaries? We're doing it with agreement amongst ourselves. There is no employer with whom we're negotiating.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member. Either the press gallery will stop tearing what they're tearing or I'll have the Sergeant of Arms stop them.

MR. FOX: I believe very strongly that we don't have the right to make this decision, not just because it's a difficult decision — we're going to make some very difficult decisions — but it's not ours to make. We've had part in deciding on how some \$10.5 billion of this province's money is spent. Granted this isn't a very large part in terms of the overall budget, but it's got to be out of our hands. We

don't have the ability to make that decision in a proper and right manner.

Much reference has been made to third-party decision-making. I think we all agree about that. We agree that the Miller report should have been adhered to, but it wasn't. It wasn't twice. That dishonoured that report. We can no longer live by that report, because previous Legislatures have chosen to ignore the recommendations of it.

I think what we need to do is take it out of this Legislature and give it over to somebody else to make the decision. It's an offensive and repugnant process. I urge in the strongest possible way that the hon. Government House Leader withdraw the Bill, not because we're suggesting it, not because another caucus that feels the same way is suggesting it, but because it's an important thing to show that kind of leadership and take the suggestion offered by the dean of this Assembly, the Member for Little Bow, who said that there is no choice for us now but to withdraw that Bill.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 54 be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### head: **PRIVATE BILLS** (Committee of the Whole)

##### **Bill Pr. 1** **Alberta Synod of the Evangelical** **Lutheran Church in Canada Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, suggestions, or amendments to this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 1 be reported.

[Motion carried]

##### **Bill Pr. 2** **Northwest Bible College Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment. Are there any comments, questions, or further amendments to this Bill?

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Chairman, I move Bill Pr. 2, Northwest Bible College Act, as amended.

[Motion carried]

##### **Bill Pr. 3** **Oxford Trust Company Ltd. Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Comments, questions, or amendments to this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 3, Oxford Trust Company Ltd. Act, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill Pr. 4**  
**Canada Olympic Park**  
**Property Tax Exemption Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Calgary Olympic Park Property Tax Exemption Act. There is an amendment to this Bill. Are there any comments, questions, or further amendments to Bill Pr. 4?

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, just a matter of reference, I believe you referred to the "Calgary Olympic Park." I wouldn't want it to go into the record. It's the Canada Olympic Park.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. minister.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 4, Canada Olympic Park Property Tax Exemption Act, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill Pr. 5**  
**Alberta Native Business Summit**  
**Foundation Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 5, the Alberta Native Business Summit Foundation Act, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill Pr. 6**  
**Timothy Z. Marshall Bar Admission Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 6, the Timothy Z. Marshall Bar Admission Act, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill Pr. 7**  
**The Calgary Research and Development**  
**Authority Amendment Act, 1986**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments proposed to this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 7, The Calgary Research and Development Authority Amendment Act, 1986, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill Pr. 8**  
**City of Edmonton and**  
**Northwestern Utilities, Limited**  
**Agreement Act, 1986**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments proposed to this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HERON: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 8, the City of Edmonton and Northwestern Utilities, Limited Agreement Act, 1986, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill Pr. 9**  
**Galt Scholarship Fund Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have any comments, questions, or amendments to this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 9, the Galt Scholarship Fund Act, be reported.

**Bill Pr. 11**  
**The McMan Youth Services Foundation Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment to this Bill. Are there any comments, questions, or further amendments to Bill 11? Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 11, The McMan Youth Services Foundation Act, as amended be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill Pr. 12**  
**The St. John's Institute**  
**Amendment Act, 1986**

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment to this Bill. Are there any comments, questions, or further amendments to the Bill?

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 12, The St. John's Institute Amendment Act, 1986, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill Pr. 14**  
**St. Mary's College Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 14, the St. Mary's College Act, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill Pr. 15**  
**Board of Trustees of the Edmonton**  
**Canadian Native Friendship Centre**  
**Building Amendment Act, 1986**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HERON: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 15, Board of Trustees of the Edmonton Canadian Native Friendship Centre Building Amendment Act, 1986, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill Pr. 16**  
**Maycroft Insurance Company Limited Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments proposed to this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 16, the Maycroft Insurance Company Limited Act, be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, before the motion to rise and report, as Chairman of the committee I would like to make a comment. Since the House opened on June 12 and this committee commenced its meetings on June 26 with 39 new members, as your Chairman it's been an exciting, interesting, and learning experience. None of this would have been achieved without the indulgence and consideration of hon. members, so I'd like to extend, although it may sound somewhat irregular, very grateful appreciation to members of this committee.

Thank you.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration and reports Bill 54, Bills Pr. 1, Pr. 3, Pr. 5, Pr. 6, Pr. 7, Pr. 8, Pr. 9, Pr. 14, Pr. 15, and Pr. 16, and reports with some amendments Bills Pr. 2, Pr. 4, Pr. 11, and Pr. 12.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed?

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

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

No.	Title	Moved by
38	Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1986	Crawford
51	Municipal Statutes Amendment Act, 1986	Crawford
54	Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1986	Crawford

head: **PRIVATE BILLS**  
(Third Reading)

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

No.	Title	Moved by
Pr. 1	Alberta Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada Act	Hawkesworth (for R. Speaker)
Pr. 2	Northwest Bible College Act	McEachern
Pr. 3	Oxford Trust Company Ltd. Act	Nelson
Pr. 4	Canada Olympic Park Property Tax Exemption Act	Stevens
Pr. 5	Alberta Native Business Summit Foundation Act	Hyland
Pr. 6	Timothy Z. Marshall Bar Admission Act	Nelson
Pr. 7	The Calgary Research and Development Authority Amendment Act, 1986	Koper
Pr. 8	City of Edmonton and Northwestern Utilities Limited Agreement Act, 1986	Heron
Pr. 9	Galt Scholarship Fund Act	Gogo
Pr. 11	The McMan Youth Services Foundation Act	Hewes
Pr. 12	The St. John's Institute Amendment Act	Wright
Pr. 14	St. Mary's College Act	Koper (for Stewart)
Pr. 15	Board of Trustees of the Edmonton Canadian Native Friendship Centre Building Amendment Act, 1986	Heron
Pr. 16	Maycroft Insurance Company Limited Act	Musgreave (for Schumacher)



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

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair]

head: **ROYAL ASSENT**

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

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

HER HONOUR: Please be seated.

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

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

No.	Title
11	Alberta Stock Savings Plan Act
13	Department of Transportation Amendment Act, 1986
15	Employment Pension Plans Act
16	Special Waste Management Corporation Amendment Act, 1986
17	Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1986
18	Mines and Minerals Amendment Act, 1986
21	Petroleum Marketing Statutes Amendment Act, 1986
22	Petroleum Incentives Program Amendment Act, 1986
23	Natural Gas Marketing Act
24	Arbitration Amendment Act, 1986
27	Alberta Health Care Insurance Amendment Act, 1986
30	Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1986
32	Water Resources Commission Amendment Act, 1986
33	Naturopathy Repeal Act
34	Health Disciplines Amendment Act, 1986
35	Business Corporations Amendment Act, 1986
36	Local Authorities Election Amendment Act, 1986
38	Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1986
39	Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act, 1986
40	Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1986-87
41	Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1986-87
42	Alberta Energy Company Amendment Act, 1986
43	Motor Vehicle Statutes Amendment Act, 1986

44	Department of Municipal Affairs Act
45	Alberta Corporate Income Tax Amendment Act, 1986
46	Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1986
47	Chiropractic Profession Amendment Act, 1986
48	Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1986
49	Take-Or-Pay Costs Sharing Act
50	Gas Resources Preservation Amendment Act, 1986
51	Municipal Statutes Amendment Act, 1986
54	Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1986
Pr. 1	Alberta Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada Act
Pr. 2	Northwest Bible College Act
Pr. 3	Oxford Trust Company Ltd. Act
Pr. 4	Canada Olympic Park Property Tax Exemption Act
Pr. 5	Alberta Native Business Summit Foundation Act
Pr. 6	Timothy Z. Marshall Bar Admission Act
Pr. 7	The Calgary Research and Development Authority Amendment Act, 1986
Pr. 8	City of Edmonton and Northwestern Utilities, Limited Agreement Act, 1986
Pr. 9	Galt Scholarship Fund Act
Pr. 11	The McMan Youth Services Foundation Act
Pr. 12	The St. John's Institute Amendment Act, 1986
Pr. 14	St. Mary's College Act
Pr. 15	Board of Trustees of the Edmonton Canadian Native Friendship Centre Building Amendment Act, 1986
Pr. 16	Maycroft Insurance Company Limited Act

[The Lieutenant Governor indicated her assent]

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

HER HONOUR: Mr. Premier, hon. Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition; Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislative Assembly:

I have watched with interest your activities over these past many weeks. Tonight was an example of the consideration you've been giving on behalf of the people to these many Bills to which I've given Royal Assent. I'm sure that now, since summer has faded into fall, you're wondering where the summer went. But on behalf of the people, I would like to thank you for the consideration and the dedication you brought to your duties here in the Legislative Assembly.

Probably it has not been an easy summer for you. I know that you have attended to your duties with dedication and with due deliberation for the importance of the matters you've had under consideration. So on behalf of the people of Alberta, I thank you for your diligence and for the efforts you have made on their behalf. I hope that now you will have at least some opportunity for some R and R. I know you deserve it, and I hope you will take advantage of it, because you can't just work like this forever, as I well know. You do deserve to have some rest before you go about all the other numerous duties that you do and have undertaken on behalf of the people.

I thank you for your efforts on behalf of Albertans.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

[The Lieutenant Governor left the House]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Would hon. members be seated, please.  
Order please.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move the Assembly now adjourn in accordance with Motion 16, passed earlier today.

[Motion carried]

[The House adjourned at 8:54 p.m.]

The First Session of the 21st Legislature was prorogued by Order in Council 56/87, effective March 4, 1987.