

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Friday, May 8, 1987 10:00 a.m.**

Date: 87/05/08

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**PRAYERS**

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

O Lord, grant us a daily awareness of the precious gift of life which You have given us.

As Members of this Legislative Assembly we dedicate our lives anew to the service of our province and our country.

Amen.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 36****Podiatry Amendment Act, 1987**

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Podiatry Amendment Act, 1987.

This Bill allows health care givers other than podiatrists to deliver foot care. Thank you.

[Leave granted; Bill 36 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 36 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table the annual report for 1986 of the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file with the Assembly an announcement made this morning to inform Albertans about AIDS and the dangers of this dreaded disease.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Stony Plain.

MR. HERON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, 23 students from the grade 6 class in Brookwood school, which is in the city of Spruce Grove. They are accompanied by their teachers, Brian Sydora and Monica Thiessen, and they are situated in the public gallery. I ask that they rise and receive the warmest welcome of this Assembly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague Dr. Buck I would like to introduce 18 students from the grade 6

class of Our Lady of the Angels school in Dr. Buck's constituency. The students are accompanied by Mr. John Robertson, their teacher, and two parents, Mrs. Lorraine Hryniw and Mrs. Hazel Paradis. They are seated in the members' gallery, and I'd like to ask them to stand and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, the Pincher Creek Mountain Bounders Junior Forest Wardens club. They are visiting Edmonton today as part of National Forest Week. They have received a distinct national honour in terms of being awarded the Charlie Wilkinson achievement award as the most outstanding Junior Forest Wardens club in Canada. They are accompanied today by their leaders, Mr. Fred White and Mrs. Bonnie Gingras, Mr. John Cardiff and Mrs. Sandra McMullen, Mrs. Bernice Whipple and Mrs. Alice Melo. There are also three parents with them: Mrs. Asta White, Mrs. Lee McClelland, and Mrs. Philomena Benjamin.

Also in the gallery are Mr. Peter Murphy, who is the president of the Junior Forest Wardens Association of Canada; Mr. Gordon Von Tighem, who is the provincial chairman for Alberta of the Junior Forest Wardens; regional consultants Sharon Hill and Rick Wolcott; and also Carson Herrick, who is a staff member of the Junior Forest Wardens of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, they are going to be participating later today with the Hon. Gerald Merrithew, the minister of forestry for Canada, and our Hon. Don Sparrow, the Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, in a number of ceremonies marking National Forest Week. One of the highlights for the Junior Forest Wardens was to be greeted this morning by Bertie the Beaver, who as a symbol of the Alberta Forest Service is also in the gallery. I'd ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce a group of 16 students in grade 6 from Seven Persons school, which is in my constituency. This is the first time I've had the pleasure of introducing a class since the historic day one year ago today that was the election in this province. There are, as I said, 16 students and two teachers, Mrs. Smith and Mr. Barbour. I would ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly please.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce Mr. Ken Davis, who is the area education officer for the county of Kent in England, who is spending two weeks in Alberta getting a firsthand look at our excellent education system here. He is accompanied by his Alberta host, Mr. Gordon Welch, who is the superintendent of schools for the county of Strathcona board of education. Both gentlemen are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of this House.

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly, 34 grade 10 students from the New Sarepta high school. They're accompanied by three teachers: Mrs. Roberta Hag, Miss Cheryl Alexander, and Mr. Orest Olesky. They are seated in the public gallery, and I'd ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

**Government Promises**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker . . . [some applause]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It's all very nice, but you're wasting the time of your own members. The Leader of the Opposition please.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my first question to the Premier. Mr. Speaker, a year ago Albertans elected a new Legislative Assembly. [some applause]

MR. SPEAKER: Let's be consistent. Government members, please refrain from wasting your time.

MR. MARTIN: I would remind them that there used to be four on the opposite benches and now there are 22.

Mr. Speaker, at that same time they gave a mandate, no doubt about it, to this present government in the hope that the present government would improve the economic and social life of Albertans. We now have a \$3.3 billion deficit, high unemployment, and a cutback in the people services. Would the Premier now admit that the first year of his government's mandate has been a total failure, and would he indicate . . . [interjections] Well, if you like \$3.3 billion deficits . . . Will he indicate, more importantly, if there will be policy changes for the second year to turn this economic and social malaise around?

MR. GETTY: [some applause] Mr. Speaker, I'm extremely pleased to recognize the occasion on which this government has received the largest mandate of any government in Canada. It's been a challenging, interesting year, and one in which we've been

able to accomplish a tremendous amount for the people of Alberta. I'm looking forward to another three or four years, and then on in another election and another mandate from the people of Alberta, because they recognize good government.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure they do recognize good government, and hopefully you'll have enough members left to be over here at the end of the next election.

Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at the record, though, that the Premier is so proud of. The labour force statistics issued this morning [interjections] -- they don't want to hear it, do they? -- by Statistics Canada show that there are 2,000 more Albertans unemployed compared to a year ago. At the same time, there are 2,000 fewer people actually employed compared with a year ago.

My question is a very simple, straightforward one to the Premier. Does the Premier not admit that as a benchmark these figures are heading in the wrong direction and that policy changes are needed?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, obviously there is always concern when there's any unemployment in our province. We have faced, as all members know, some significant impacts from matters beyond our borders, but I've been very pleased at the government's programs that have taken on those impacts. Alberta has, after all, the fourth highest level of employment in Canada yet having been hit by those major international impacts. Perhaps the minister in charge of Career Development and Employ-

ment may well want to add to this answer.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Obviously, the Premier is easily pleased that we are ahead of the maritimes in terms of our unemployment. The government also campaigned during the last provincial election on a program of no tax hikes. Ten months later we've virtually hiked up every tax possible, invented a few new tax hikes, and have hiked hundreds of user fees. My question to the Premier: will he advise the Assembly whether the government regards 10 months as an acceptable time frame for breaking election commitments?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, that's an absolutely false allegation. The government's commitment going into the last election was that there'd be no change to that last year's budget, and that was met completely. There were no changes to that budget. There were no tax increases in that budget.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the Premier. Ten months later we announced a billion dollar tax hike -- billion dollar Dick over there. That certainly was not the impression that was left with this government. And I'm saying to the Premier, will he not admit that there was at least false advertising in the last election and people thought they were not going to get tax hikes?

MR. GETTY: There may have been some false advertising in the last election. I think they were saying that they were going to be the government. That was the biggest false advertising I ever heard of, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you probably wouldn't give me time, but I do happen to have a list of commitments by the government. I notice that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please, hon. Premier. The Chair is not going to get applauded for this, but the Chair does get nervous when he starts to see documents opening up like this, getting ready to give the speech. But a succinct supplementary response perhaps.

MR. GETTY: What I thought I might do, Mr. Speaker, is perhaps just go by the headlines briefly here. I'm not going to read this speech. But it is agriculture, the government's commitment to agriculture in the following ways: we would provide the lowest input costs in Canada. We've done it -- \$2 billion of long-term credit; that program has been put in. We have reviewed our crop insurance program. We have reviewed the Agricultural Development Corporation program. We have the largest job-creation effort in history. We have a new thrust for forestry. We can see it happening. We have a greater emphasis on tourism. We've had a commitment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: There's certainly one thing about springtime and warm weather: it brings out a lot of interesting behaviour in all creatures of God. Perhaps in fairness to the House, though, we might be able to be a bit more attentive to both the questions and the answers.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad you brought the frivolities to an end. I noticed when the Premier was reading the headlines that he neglected the one that mentioned there would be a \$3.5 billion deficit. He left that one out.

In view of the Premier's statement that a tremendous amount

has been done in the last year, could he consider possibly giving the taxpayers a holiday over the next year and just do nothing?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, we've seen what happens in Ottawa with that member's party when they did nothing about dealing with the deficit. They have almost bankrupted our country, supported by the NDP. It was fortunate that the people of Canada booted them out of Ottawa because they were bankrupting our nation. The highest level of debt of any country, put on them by the Liberal Party, because they would do nothing about a deficit, supported by the NDP, who all they want to do is spend, spend, spend. We are the responsible government, and the people of Alberta . . . [interjections] Mr. Speaker, it's a damn shame, isn't it? They just don't like to hear the facts. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members, if this keeps up the Chair is starting to entertain the notion of suspending question period.

MR. GETTY: May I finish, Mr. Speaker?

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals and the NDP almost bankrupted the country. Now, to come into the Alberta Legislature and to say, "Do nothing about the deficit" -- obviously, that would be irresponsible. That's why they were booted out of the federal government; that's why the people of Alberta will never support them in Alberta. The worst part is, they're also trying to disturb this Legislature by acting like they do in the House of Commons as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Calgary North West, followed by Little Bow.

### Employment Statistics

DR. CASSIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Career Development and Employment. Statistics Canada also stated this morning that the unemployment in this country is the lowest that it's been in five years. Although there's been an increase in three other provinces, that does not include Alberta. I would ask if the minister could confirm that.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that our members bring forward questions when there's good news, because we certainly don't expect good news questions to come from the opposition.

But I'd like to indicate to the House that labour force statistics did come out from Statistics Canada, and as I've indicated previously, I am somewhat reluctant to look at month-to-month changes in statistics with regard to labour force stats to make a prediction as to what's happening in the economy.

But I would like to point out to the hon. Member for Calgary North [West] two very interesting statistics that have been presented to us, Mr. Speaker, backing up the fact that Alberta has moved from the fifth highest rate of unemployment to fourth. There's a trend there. We're moving in a positive direction, I'd also to indicate to the members of the Assembly that Statistics Canada indicated that since January in Alberta, there are 20,000 more people working in this province today. I think that's significant; it's a trend. It's coupled with the fact that our labour force has increased by 13,000 since January.

So the suggestion that the Member for Edmonton Highlands made yesterday, that outmigration is a significant factor in this province, Mr. Speaker, I would just let her know that the labour force has expanded by 13,000 people, and there are jobs being

created in the economy. It does not mean to say that our job is over, and it doesn't mean to say that we are not going to carry on with our imaginative and significant job-creation programs for this province.

### People Services

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. We recognize in the province of Alberta that health care and education on a per capita basis since the mid-1950s have received the most per capita spending of any province in Canada, a very impressive record. There have been some concerns during the early part of this year of 1987 with regards to the trend that we are now establishing in their priority in overall spending. My question to the Premier is: could he commit in terms of the coming fiscal year that those two areas of public expenditure will receive top-priority spending to the reduced priority in some of the other areas -- and I have raised those matters in the House already -- and, as well, attempting with all vigour to hold the line in terms of the level of spending that we are currently committed to in this Legislature in the next fiscal year and following fiscal years?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's obviously the challenge that we face as legislators, because Alberta has placed such a high emphasis on the people services. We spend more money per capita on people services than any government in Canada, and we will continue to do that. But I want to emphasize that the need is not just throwing more and more dollars at both health and education and social services, but obviously we have to do it more efficiently, because we already spend more than anyone else per capita.

So the challenge is to maintain the excellence of those programs, but to do it in a more efficient way as well. That's what the taxpayers of Alberta ask. Somebody has to think about them. Mr. Speaker, the thing that this government is doing is maintaining the excellence in those programs, maintaining that high level of spending, and yet providing the people of Alberta with the lowest taxes in Canada. That's our government's commitment.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

### Workers' Compensation

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Community and Occupational Health. The minister has been stating his opinion that workers with disabling injuries should be cut off from receiving workers' compensation benefits if the job in which they were previously employed is no longer available. If the unemployment rate remains high under this government, no one will collect workers' compensation following that line.

My question to the minister: will he advise when the government decided it would use rising unemployment as an excuse to cut off injured workers from workers' compensation benefits?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's preamble is totally inaccurate, and I don't think I'll even bother responding to it.

We will continue, Mr. Speaker, to compensate injured workers who are without employment. We will continue to compensate them or provide them with permanent disability pensions.

We will continue to help retrain them so they're better equipped to take on a job when they're better and when they can work.

MR. MARTIN: Well, a supplementary question to the minister, because we happen to have listened to the minister, where he said precisely what we said on an interview that I heard.

My question to the minister: is the minister now saying that if that job is not there, the person will still get the workers' compensation benefits? Is he unequivocally stating that at this point?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, we will continue to provide benefits to those people who are entitled to those benefits under the law and under the regulations. We will help that worker to be retrained so he's equipped to take on a job in the workplace. That's our mandate, and that's our commitment.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. The minister refuses to answer the question. By not answering it, we understand where he's at. But the minister put his agenda before the Workers' Compensation Board through a secret directive, which we had to make public so we knew what was going on. A new directional plan was being planned in secret. Now, my question is a very simple one. If they thought this was a necessary policy change, why didn't the government become honest and open with its policies, rather than operating in back rooms and in secrecy?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, how secret can a process be when the directional planning process consults with representatives of the Alberta Federation of Labour, the Canadian Petroleum Association, and any number of industries and representative groups who are touched and affected by and work with the Workers' Compensation Board?

MR. MARTIN: A directive from the minister stating what they have to do is hardly consultation, Mr. Minister.

The minister complains constantly about a 20 percent increase in the cost of claims. Now, it's my understanding that there are many reasons for this, including an 8 percent increase in benefits that was approved by this government. That's part of it. My question: will the minister table his studies and analysis at the increase so we could know on what basis he starts cutting off people unilaterally? Will he do that in this Assembly?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I'll state again: workers who are injured will receive benefits to which they're entitled to under the law. And as for the reasons, as for the background behind the approximately 20 percent increase in cost of claims, that will be revealed when the government tables the Workers' Compensation Board annual report during this sitting of the Legislature.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Surely workmen's compensation is, as the term implies, a contract to compensate people who have been injured in the workplace and should have no connection with retraining or getting other jobs going. That should be an entirely different department. Would you give the commitment to the Legislature that unless you bring it down for debate, you will keep workmen's compensation as an actuarially sound employer/employee insurance fund for injury and not clutter it up with a bunch of other directives that I think had to do with other departments?

MR. DINNING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that representation from the hon. member because that's precisely what we're trying to do. We have a responsibility to compensate injured workers. We have a responsibility and also an accountability to those people who pay workers' compensation assessments, and that is the employer. By paying injured workers on the basis of what they're entitled to, we will fulfill our obligation to all of the constituents of the Workers' Compensation Board.

### Senate Reform

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I have a question today on the anniversary of all those people with orange carnations over there. Obviously, they've been sprayed with something more than insect repellent the way they're carrying on today.

Yesterday the Premier categorically said that he would not undertake to implement a system to elect Senators from Alberta in the future, even though he has the power to do so. I believe the actions now speak louder than words. Now, if Alberta was to take the plunge and elect its own Senators, it would be a lot closer to attaining the Triple E Senate than we are now. To the Premier: will he now reconsider his comments of yesterday and commit his government to elect Senators from now on?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member raised this yesterday, I recall it as being an interesting proposal on his part. There would be all kinds of problems with it. It may be that if there were some way to work out a real good method of doing it, I certainly would take a look at it.

But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that what the hon. Liberal leader should be doing is talking to his Liberal counterparts in Ontario and Quebec. That's where the majority of the Senators come from, and there is the place that we would get some real impact from elected Senators. So make sure you talk to them.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Premier. A supplementary. I can assure him I am. As a matter of fact, I've caught one already.

I'm interested to see that he's come a long way in 24 hours, but would the Premier be willing to consider having a full election for Senators if the present slate of Senators now representing Alberta were to resign?

MR. GETTY: I gather, Mr. Speaker, that this is a bit of a trick question. We're going to have one more where he's going to say he's going to ask them to. That would be interesting, since so many are Liberals.

However, Mr. Speaker, my main emphasis is to reform the Senate and to do it and have the Triple E option adopted. That's what I'll keep working towards. If the Liberal leader has some way of helping us to do that, I'll consider it.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I am indeed willing. And I notice he very ably and quickly spotted a quarterback sneak. I'm willing; I'm willing, Mr. Premier, to write the six Alberta Senators, five of whom are Liberals. I'm willing to write them, if the Premier is willing to cosign the letters so that the one Conservative Senator will resign also. If he will cosign the letter, I'm willing to write all six Senators and ask them to resign. Will he cosign the letter?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. We finally got a question.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, if he will write them, contact them, they'll contact me and say that with me cosigning, they'd do it -- I'd sure look at that.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, that may be arranged. If you will not agree to this, then how are you going to convince Albertans that you really are interested in an elected Senate? We can get two of the E's tomorrow, and you're turning down your chance.

MR. GETTY: It's clear, I think, to Albertans how committed our government is to the Triple E Senate concept. Could I just say that I have great reservations about finding so much support from the Liberal Party in Alberta regarding an elected Senate -- as you know, Mr. Speaker, a Triple E Senate is to provide more responsibility and strength and support to provinces -- when in fact at the same time as he's trying to jump on the bandwagon of the Triple E Senate, he's telling us that what we need is a federal government to whip the provinces into line, which is exactly opposite to the desires of Alberta in a Triple E Senate. So let's be clear that they're trying to sit on both sides of the fence on this issue and just trying to get on the bandwagon when it looks popular. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. Order please. Order please. It's difficult sitting on a picket perhaps but ... Supplementary questions on this issue? The leader of the Representative Party, followed by the Member for Wainwright.

#### **Hazardous Waste Disposal**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. As of last week the minister has had some pressure to open the Alberta border to bring in hazardous wastes into our potential location in Swan Hills when it is completed. Could the minister indicate at this time that the government's position is still adamant in that hazardous wastes will only be put at that site from within Alberta?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I've had no pressure in the last week from anyone with respect to this, but I'd like to confirm and reaffirm our position with respect to this, and it is that the priority of the government is to handle Alberta's wastes. The Alberta Special Waste Management Corporation is dedicated to cleaning up hazardous wastes generated in the province of Alberta.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The plant, when on stream, will handle some 10,000 tonnes of liquid waste and about 5,000 tonnes of solid waste. Could the minister indicate at this time how much of that capacity will be used in the province when the plant comes on stream?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, at this point in time -- and this is now the repetition of something I've stated on many occasions -- under the agreement that we have for the setup for the dealing of special hazardous wastes in the province of Alberta, we've indicated that there are two other options available to generators of waste in this province in addition to sending those wastes to the Special Waste Management Corporation plant in Swan Hills. A generator might assemble a waste destruction plant on-site, at their own facility. And the second alternative available is that some of these wastes might be able to go to a

recycler, and if there's a safe proven method for the recycling of such waste, we would permit as such.

At the moment the operator of the plant, Chem-Security Ltd., is basically making contact with generators of waste within the province of Alberta. And my understanding is that when the plant opens a little later in 1987, there will be a substantial volume of waste being directed to that plant. We won't know -- and I'm repeating again something I've already said in this Assembly -- for perhaps two or three years if the capacity of the plant will be met. There are some who indicate that basically the plant is now too small already, but we simply don't have the experience of finding out what generators will do, given the three options available to them.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in the contract we have with Bow Valley and Chem-Security, there is a clause in there that guarantees a return on investment in terms of that organization. Could the minister indicate in terms of the changing policy, in terms of only Alberta wastes, whether the decision at a point in time will be made as a political decision or an economic decision in terms of the viability of that plant?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, for clarification, Mr. Speaker, there has been absolutely no change whatsoever in the policy of our government with respect to that plant. When the concept for an Alberta Special Waste Management Corporation plant, the first of its type anywhere -- anywhere -- of this magnitude and this type ... We indicated that clearly the objective of the plant was to enhance the improvement and the quality and the protection of the environment in the province of Alberta.

We've also indicated and made public all of the agreements that basically talked about a rate of return given to one of the participants, the 60 percent owner. It was a depreciating amount of return over a 10-year period. Those documents have now been tabled in this Assembly; they have been filed here. They have been well reviewed and well studied.

The operational side of the plant. We will know whether it will run at a profit or at a loss factor given some experience with the amount of waste that will be going to Swan Hills. And we simply at this point in time don't know what that answer is going to be because we've had no experience dealing with this.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary question Edmonton Glengarry, followed by Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the exclusive control position Chem-Security is in on transporting hazardous wastes to the plant and that that puts them in a monopoly position, will the minister commit himself to reviewing on an ongoing basis their pricing policies for transport to ensure that they are not gouging customers and that they are not billing twice, once through their trucking division and once through the joint venture with the government?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in this Assembly I've already dealt with the first part of the question addressed to me this morning by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry. I've indicated before that the premise on which he addresses the question is incorrect in my view.

There is no gouging that's going on. The purpose of the Alberta Special Waste Management Corporation plant is to clean up and improve the environment in the province of Alberta. There will always be an individual, a generator of a waste, who

will say, "You're charging me too much to get rid of my waste." My position, the position of the government, is that we must clean up our environment in our province. We will take leadership with respect to this, and nobody is going to be able to simply get away with dumping their garbage here, there, and hither throughout the province. If they generate a waste, they are also responsible for the cleanup of that waste.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, an admirable attitude.

You have designated highways; there are certain areas only for hazardous good routes within the city, but in the rural areas, none. And because highway 794, a municipal highway approaching the new plant, has not been brought up to quality by the minister of highways -- it's one of the most dangerous highways in Alberta, with no shoulder -- will you at least ban the use of that road for hauling Alberta's hazardous waste to that plant in Swan Hill?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, that's absolute balderdash. Secondary road 794 abuts the constituency of Barrhead. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, when he campaigned for election in Westlock-Sturgeon one year ago almost -- well, one year ago today, in which he got through -- he basically told all of his constituents, "Boy, you vote for me, and we're going to widen this road and we're going to get this secondary road expanded."

The fact of the matter is that he went out and made a series of promises and now, one year later, has concluded that really the road is in a pretty good condition. But what he is trying to suggest to us is that that is "the" route to Swan Hills, and that's nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, a lesson in geography. Swan Hills is located on Highway 33. If you go directly south from Swan Hills, you now go over a completely rebuilt, paved highway called Highway 32 that goes from Swan Hills to Whitecourt, where it picks up Highway 43. That's one option. This is a very important bit of geography, because what the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is trying to do here is get out of a political commitment he made to pave a secondary road. He's trying to suggest that that's the only route, and that's balderdash.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Wainwright, followed by Edmonton Highlands, no matter which route we take.

### **Rabies Control**

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Concerning the recent rabies scare along the Alberta/Saskatchewan border, could the minister indicate if his department has been taking any additional steps to control this possible outbreak?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. Member for Wainwright, let me indicate to him that because of the seriousness of this nature, we have come forward with a ministerial designation for a vector control sector along the Saskatchewan/Alberta border, which will involve approximately 40 kilometres alleyway from the United States to Cold Lake. We are going to hire additional people so that we can more effectively control the rabid skunks. And that's a very appropriate question in view of the fact that the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon just rose.

MR. FISCHER: To the minister. Have they been able to evaluate the seriousness of this outbreak?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of establishing the ministerial designation was so that we could do exactly that. As I mentioned to the hon. member, too, we have hired additional staff so that the spread of rabies that is coming westward will not enter into the province of Alberta, and we are going to do our level best to make sure that that is the case.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Highlands, followed by Edmonton Gold Bar.

### **Government Appointments**

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In April 1983 the former member of the Assembly for the riding of Olds-Didsbury distinguished himself in Alberta history by making a series of utterances in this Assembly. My question is to the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. [inaudible]

MS BARRETT: Beg your pardon. My question is to the Premier. Noting that that member did not even retain his nomination, let alone his seat, I wonder if the Premier will explain on what basis he feels that the commendable member ought now be reappointed to the public service through an appointment from his government.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, appointments are made on the basis of people's qualifications. I should remind the House, and certainly the hon. member, who you'd think might have the decency to say so as well, that the hon. member apologized to the Legislature. The hon. member lost his seat. You know, there are some levels of decency, I expect, you could have hoped from members of the opposition. I think that when a member has apologized and that member is prepared, though, to serve the people of Alberta . . .

There isn't a person in this Assembly who supported any comments at all regarding the holocaust. I mean, all of us recognize that tremendous tragedy that went on in this world, but to now try and in some way get some political gain out of something that happened in 1983 I find is a real lack of class. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair directs that there will be no further comments with respect to those comments as made by the former member. The line of questioning is dealing with regard to a new appointment. May it continue that way please.

MS BARRETT: That's correct. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to respond to the Premier, inasmuch as he said that the member . . . [interjections] All right. The record speaks for itself; *Hansard* is clear. Will the Premier now explain that he is convinced in his own mind that no other Albertan has qualifications which would be equally suitable or better than that former member for the appointment to the Land Compensation Board? Would that be correct?

MR. GETTY: That's such a foolish question, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, there are certain appointments that there are hundreds and thousands of people qualified for.

MS BARRETT: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, then. Is the Premier not concerned that by this appointment in fact there

has been government tacit approval of that former member's views, which were never retracted?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. [interjections]  
All right, if we're back to the original admonition.

MS BARRETT: Perhaps I could clarify the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Please.

MS BARRETT: I was asking the Premier if he is not concerned that in fact there is tacit approval of this matter by the appointment.

MR. GETTY: There is absolutely no tacit approval of that matter.

MS BARRETT: Final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, then. Following the series of patronage appointments that have commenced with his government, will the Premier now pledge to this Assembly and to all Albertans that there will be at least one defeated Conservative or not renominated Conservative who will not have a special government appointment by the time the life of this Legislature concludes?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the government has responsibilities to appoint people in a number of areas. The government looks for those with the best qualifications, and that is what we will continue to do in the future.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. At the very least would the Premier not agree that this appointment gives a dangerous credibility to a man with a view that is at least abhorrent to the people of Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member. [inaudible] is not. The Chair recognizes Edmonton Gold Bar, followed by the Member for Bow Valley.

### Oil Patch Safety

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Community and Occupational Health has been sending some very clear messages to Albertans: don't get hurt or killed on the job, because settlements are going down.

As members of the House are sadly aware, the province's oil patch experienced nine deaths in a three-month period ending on January 31 of this year, an unusually high number compared to statistics over the past 10 years. Following these revelations the Minister of Occupational and Community Health met with representatives of the industry and called for increased awareness and education. To the minister. Is it still the minister's belief that improved education alone will lead to a decrease in oil patch injuries and fatalities?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, all members share the concern that any Albertan would be killed in the oil patch or on any other worksite in the province. Some eight Albertans were killed in 1986, some nine in 1985: all 17 very unacceptable. But we will continue through our efforts and the efforts of the Minister of Energy and all of my colleagues to work with industry to attempt to bring the safety level and the standards of safety up much higher in the oil patch.

MRS. HEWES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, of course safety is a shared responsibility. But how much share of the blame is the government prepared to accept for the fact that education and monitoring on safety awareness has been substandard?

MR. DINNING: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's nonsense, and I don't accept the member's allegation.

MRS. HEWES: That's not the way it's viewed in the public, Mr. Speaker.

If the minister has decided that further regulations aren't required, that education itself is going to do the trick, can the House assume that safety offenders in the oil patch will be more vigorously pursued and prosecuted under his existing regulations, such as they are?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, we will continue, as we have in days past, to work with all members of the oil patch, all of the representative organizations, to ensure that the level of safety improves in the oil patch.

MRS. HEWES: It seems to me it's rather a pious hope, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister then tell us how any breaches of safety are going to be penalized accordingly? Can you tell us what it is that happens to those who offend against the regulations?

MR. DINNING: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not hope, it's action. First of all, in the throne speech we have stated our commitment to safety. And to that end, if I may, one sentence:

This commitment to the safety of workers in the oil and gas industry is being fulfilled in the construction of a world class petroleum industry training centre this year. That we will continue through inspections and through research and education; that we will continue through the occupational health and safety division. We'll continue to do our inspection just as we did in the inspection blitz in the December-January time frame where we inspected some 280 rigs, service and drilling, and found that those rigs were in large measure operating safely and that workers were well trained and that in fact no work orders, no stop orders, no orders of any kind were issued.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary. Edmonton Belmont, followed by Calgary North West.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that 94 Alberta workers were killed in the calendar year 1985, will the minister establish or provide in the regulations that there be safety committees established at all worksites in Alberta where there are five or more employees, such as the legislation or the regulations in Ontario and/or British Columbia?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, it's a typical NDP ploy to continue to regulate, regulate, and regulate. We believe that we have enough regulations in place today. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the minister would like sit down until he can be heard.

MR. DINNING: We believe that we have enough regulations in place today. We have enough knowledge about safety in the patch, and it is a matter, yes, a matter of attitude. And the attitude must be sharp, must be safe amongst all workers in the

patch and throughout all worksites in the province, and the attitude must flow from the top. The commitment must be made by top management that safety will be a number one priority on any worksite in the province.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary North West.

DR. CASSIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Community and Occupational Health. Of the nine deaths in the oil patch last year, in how many is there a question of a breach of the safety regulations on the worksite?

MR. DINNING: Well, Mr. Speaker, clearly those nine tragic deaths occurred because proper work procedures were not followed and were not ensured or enforced.

### Magnesium Plant

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Could the minister advise the Assembly of the status of the new MCL plant, further known as the magnesium plant, near Aldersyde in the constituency of Highwood?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, subsequent to the announcement about a year ago, throughout the balance of 1986 a great deal of work was undertaken, including the technological work, the site development, the infrastructure, and that is well in place. In late fall one of the joint venture partners withdrew from the project. Since then the lead company, MPCLSA of London, has been working to attract additional major equity partners in order to proceed with the project.

About the end of February when I met with principals of the company, they advised me that they had attracted an additional equity partner and were in a position to move with phase one of the project. Members will recall that the project was a three-phase project 10,000 tonnes per year and then an additional two phases of 20,000 tonnes each. They've made a decision not to move with the first phase without being in the position to move with the subsequent phases and are presently negotiating with another potential equity partner.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. Might we have unanimous consent of the House to continue this set of questions plus one brief response from the minister?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, again to the minister. Would the minister affirm the commitment of this government to further diversification? Would he affirm that, if necessary, the Alberta government would give some loan guarantees for this project?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the initial project involved an undertaking by the province to provide a partial loan guarantee. The total project cost was \$375 million, and we had made that commitment. In my view, the government will be prepared to consider maintaining that commitment subsequent to a review of the final participants in the project and an examination of the new structure.

MR. MUSGROVE: Well, with that information could the minister give us any indication of when there would be a go decision, shall we say, on the project?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm advised -- and I maintain close contact with this project -- that the company is presently negotiating with a well-known Alberta-based company. They're in the midst of their negotiations, and I'm advised that a decision should be provided to us sometime in June.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, Bow Valley? All right, Edmonton Meadowlark, followed by Edmonton Glengarry.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the minister. Has the minister considered requesting some form of equity participation in this project, since the loan guarantee involves such a tremendously high level of risk with a reasonably low level of return balancing out that risk?

MR. SHABEN: I'm not sure I understand the question, Mr. Speaker: has the minister considered it, or ... We have not received a request for equity participation. I'd indicated to the hon. Member for Bow Valley that once the project joint venture partners were established, we would again examine the project, and it would require consideration by the government with respect to the extent of our support and participation.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. In view of the minister's continuing commitment to supporting economic diversification in the new industries and in view of the fact that the Sprung plant has been caused to move out of Alberta to Newfoundland, which was recently announced, I wonder if the minister had looked at any kind of involvement with that business to keep them in the province?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, yes. We're really pleased with the activity that is going on in Alberta in terms of the number of investments that are being made and the environment that has been developed. I had indicated earlier that major petrochemical developments had been announced, two in number. The progress on the Millar Western pulp project is ahead of schedule, on target.

We'll continue to be aggressive in attracting new investment, and also in assisting and maintaining those businesses that are here, and helping to assure that they're viable.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker ...

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order? First, though, hon. member, the Minister of Transportation and Utilities wishes to make a correction of a statement made earlier. Then the Chair will recognize the point of order.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in reviewing *Hansard* of Tuesday evening's edition, May 5, on page 1024, where I had made a comment about the date of the rest of the 4-H's and Junior Forest Wardens and school groups being in the areas to clean up garbage, *Hansard* reports it as May 29. That's a Friday. It is tomorrow, May 9, at the Hanna/Trochu area, the Alix

Lacombe/Ponoka/Red Deer areas, the Drayton Valley/Leduc/Stony Plain/Glenevis/Morinville areas, Athabasca/Fort Assiniboine/Barrhead areas, High Prairie/Slave Lake/High Level areas.\*

We'll be out on the roads and byways of the province of Alberta cleaning up garbage. I just wanted that corrected in the interests of safety for those children.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Point of order, Edmonton Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order subject to *Beauchesne* section 357, subsections (a) through (n). With respect to the question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: One moment please. 357?

MR. MITCHELL: Page 129.

MR. SPEAKER: Section 357?

MR. MITCHELL: Yes, subsections (a) through (nn). That's all of them.

With respect to the question that I asked concerning the appointment of Mr. Stiles and also with respect to the question that my colleague from Edmonton Highlands asked on that subject as well, I have reviewed this section in an effort to determine the basis upon which those two questions would have been ruled out of order. And while I appreciate the difficulty on your behalf of having to make quick decisions to keep the House in order, it is clear to me, at least, that there is no subsection under this particular section of *Beauchesne* which would warrant ruling those questions out of order. I have considered the idea that my question was a repeat of my colleague's question. Of course, her question wasn't a repeat of anything and therefore repetition on that account couldn't be the reason. In fact, it wasn't a repetition anyway. I questioned that the government was in some senses giving that person a credibility. She questioned whether the government was giving a tacit approval to that person's view.

Secondly, we are not allowed to ask questions that contain inference. There was no inference. In fact, the person under question made that statement very clearly. We're not allowed to ask questions that contain imputation; this is subsection (i). There was no imputation. In fact, it was a statement concerning empirical fact; he made that statement. This question was not hypothetical. It was real, and it has real implications that go beyond patronage.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MITCHELL: I'm still talking, and I haven't finished my case.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. Order. The Chair wishes to point out to the hon. member that as over the course of the last year the Chair received enough notes and directions from all quarters of the House, that in actual fact more often than not in terms of referring to *Beauchesne*, the section which is more in effect dealing with question period really is citation 358 rather than 357, although there are the overlaps. Hopefully the member is not going to go all the way from (a) to

See May 5 *Hansard*, p. 1024

(n).

Please continue, hon. member.

MR. MITCHELL: In fact, I have finished making my case. Basically, I just wanted to summarize by saying, Mr. Speaker, that this case goes beyond an incidence of patronage, which in itself is bad enough. It has implications that go beyond that, and a government in exercising good judgment should consider those implications. I have every right to ask that question in this House, and I have every right to demand an answer. I have not yet got an answer, and I would like to get an answer.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, correctly of course *Beauchesne* citation 357 refers to written questions, and I do refer to citations 358 and 359 which refer to the Oral Question Period. My particular perspective on the point of order is that I believe nothing in the citations which govern the Oral Question Period rules out my ability to refer to in a question something which has been said on the record in this very House. The Premier may have wanted to deny it, but I have the copy. It was made April 21, 1983, *Hansard*, page 659, and I reserve my right to refer to that, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair, as always, listens carefully to the points of order. The Chair today did indeed interrupt two members for making, in the opinion of the Chair, comments with respect to a most sensitive issue. The Chair has also had an exchange of notes with at least one other member of the House from the opposition benches with regard to this issue, and in spite of the representations made to the Chair by both Edmonton Highlands and Edmonton Meadowlark, if it is the intention of members to carry forward that issue, so be it with respect to their own personal decision-making process. Nevertheless, the Chair has the onerous duty of having to make such decisions with respect to whether the questions are indeed in order or appropriate to this Chamber, and the Chair made such a decision today, believing it was indeed such a sensitive issue that it ought not to have been raised in the manner in which it was raised by both members. Therefore, the Chair does not apologize for having interrupted, and the Chair will just have to wait to see what happens in terms of the ensuing question periods.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Might we revert briefly to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Calgary Fish Creek.

## head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAYNE: During the course of question period, Mr. Speaker, we were joined in the members' gallery by about 20 boys from the Parkland 173rd Scout Troop in the Fish Creek

constituency. They're here today, of course, to learn more about the parliamentary process in Alberta, and I look forward to meeting with them later this morning. They are accompanied today by no fewer than four leaders -- Allan Wrubell, Burton Shields, Joe Gerritsen, and Brian Schow -- and a parent, Jim Oler. I wonder if I could ask them and the boys to now stand and receive the traditional welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. During question period we were joined by 87 grade 8 students from St. Cecilia school. It will be another three years before I can see from that point of view to know for sure whether or not they're up in the members' gallery. I hope they still are. They are joined by two teachers, Mr. Wasylycia and Mr. Del Fabbro. If they are there, I would ask them to rise and receive the very warm welcome of the Assembly.

#### head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

11. Moved by Mr. Johnston:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly do resolve itself into Committee of Supply, when called, to consider the 1987-88 estimates of proposed investments of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, capital projects division.

[Motion carried]

12. Moved by Mr. Johnston:

Be it resolved that the messages of Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, the 1987-88 estimates of proposed investments of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, capital projects division, and all matters connected therewith be referred to the Committee of Supply.

[Motion carried]

#### head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

Members of the committee, before we proceed with the Department of Municipal Affairs before the committee, members of the committee have commented or complained to the Chair with regard to their opportunity of participating in questioning ministers proposing estimates to this House. The Chair would simply make this comment. The Chair follows section 62 of Standing Orders, which applies to supply. It would be the view of the Chair, based on the activity that's gone on in the past, that if members would put questions to ministers rather than policy statements in 30-minute speeches, more members of the House would have an opportunity of participating in the extremely important business of approving or disapproving of government estimates.

The Chair, however, is in the hands of its members and the Standing Orders. And the Standing Orders provide, as I quote, section 62 of Standing Orders, and the Chair will follow those rules until such time as the Assembly changes them.

#### **Department of Municipal Affairs**

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of Municipal Affairs is before the committee this morning. The minister is the Hon. Neil Crawford. Within the department there is vote 7 related to native support and co-ordination, for which the hon. Solicitor General has the responsibility.

Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Government House Leader, do you or your colleague the hon. Solicitor General care to make opening comments to the committee?

Hon. Government House Leader.

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The overview will be by way of proposing a few observations on the impact and effect of the provincial budget as it affects the Department of Municipal Affairs. This is a restraint budget, and the department has been affected by the restraint policy in the overall budget.

The first thing I want to deal with is the effect on the manpower in the department. We haven't reduced many positions, but overall man-years have been reduced in a significant way. The manpower costs are projected to decrease by over 7 percent.

The supplies and services has been reduced by \$5 million from the preceding year, and that includes reductions in travel and hosting. That is a 25 percent reduction.

Apart from the Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the grants overall to individuals and organizations and other levels of government will be reduced by just about 5 percent, a reduction of over \$18 million. The unconditional grants paid to the municipalities are affected by the 3 percent reduction.

The AMPLE program is alive and well, and about \$22 million will be paid by way of unconditional grants to municipalities under that budget this year.

One or two other things deserve mention. We have the development of local government, and in two areas we have municipalities moving towards reorganization. One is the improvement district No. 8, and that will in due course become the municipal district of Bighorn. We also have the Drayton Valley municipal district to be formed from some counties around the town of Drayton Valley and the incorporation in that new municipal district of some of ID 14. We also have the seniors' rental assistance program, which has not been affected by the budget and will continue to serve some 46,000 seniors.

The support for planning is down marginally, but the support for the regional planning commissions is still significant. I think, Mr. Chairman, there are many other things that may indeed come up by way of members' questions, and that is the overview for the department minus housing and native affairs.

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to acknowledge the officials from Municipal Affairs and from Alberta Mortgage and Housing that are in the members' gallery and thank them for the assistance they've given me since acquiring responsibility for housing and native programs. I'd also like to welcome Mrs. Crawford to the Assembly.

I'm pleased to make a few remarks as it relates to votes 7, 8, 9, and 10 of Municipal Affairs, as minister responsible for housing and native affairs. I'd like to point out that this fiscal year the department will continue to support the important initiatives which the hon. Premier enumerated during his address at the First Ministers' Conference in late March, as it relates to vote 7, native programs. This process that was begun by Resolution 18 will continue and will culminate in a new Act for the eight

Metis settlements, with the department providing developmental funding to assist in the enhancement of the administrative capacities of the settlements in anticipation of implementation of the new legislation, which we expect to have introduced during this session.

The regional funding initiatives that were recently begun with the Metis Association of Alberta will continue. These funding arrangements are designed to enhance the Metis involvement in the various forms of local government in the province, and this regional funding is an experimental project which promises to produce concrete and constructive approaches for greater Metis involvement. The department will continue to pursue the policy which resulted in the amalgamation of the former Native Affairs Secretariat within Municipal Affairs, ensuring that the native people in the province have equal access to all provincial programs and services. And we will encourage, through our funding, interaction between the native people and all levels of government.

In relation to vote 8, housing division, the '87-88 expenditure estimates for research and financial assistance for housing is decreased about \$12.9 million or 21.7 percent from the previous year. Increased efficiencies resulting from the amalgamation of the former department of housing result in savings of \$4.5 million, and the remaining reduction in the budget results from adjustments to program delivery without significantly affecting the level of service to Albertans, as noted in comments I'll make subsequently.

The government recognizes the continuing need for new housing and repairs to existing housing in the northern native communities and Metis settlements. The required budgets have therefore been maintained with either minimal or no reduction from previous years. The department is maintaining a strong commitment to housing research and development through the innovative housing grants program. A commitment of \$610,000 will provide for initiatives such as the development and marketing of residential building products manufactured in Alberta, using Alberta resources.

The pioneer housing grant budget of \$400,000 will provide for the remaining commitments made to senior citizens who were approved under this program. A budget of \$22 million for the seniors home improvement program reflects the government's continuing commitment to senior citizen owners in the province. This budget will sustain a level of assistance which is consistent with the seniors extension program announced in the '86-87 budget. To date, over 60,000 senior citizen households have been served by this senior home improvement program.

We continue to recognize the housing difficulty of handicapped Albertans and, as a result, are continuing our commitment to facilitate their mobility in their home environment through the provision of handicapped housing grants. The rental investment grants program, which is being reduced nearly 48 percent, provides for past commitments made to investors. It's not an ongoing program.

Vote 9, which relates to the Alberta heritage fund mortgage interest reduction program, has ended, having served over 160,000 Albertan homeowners who were faced with very high interest rates during the early 1980s.

In relation to vote 10, which is the Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation, I point out that the '87-88 expenditure estimates reflect the government's changing role in housing. Reduced borrowing costs combined with stable housing demand and the existing supply of subsidized housing will allow for a greater involvement by the private sector in meeting Alberta's

housing needs. Our government will commit \$64.7 million to finance or construct housing units in Alberta in 1987-88.

The implementation of the global agreement between Canada and Alberta as it relates to housing will allow the province greater flexibility in responding to social housing needs. Under a special-purpose housing program transferred to the province, Alberta will assist nonprofit organizations to develop residential facilities for the homeless, physically and mentally disabled, victims of family violence, and other groups with special housing needs. For the first time, sponsored groups will be able to obtain mortgage financing as well as mortgage subsidies from one government agency.

In recognition of the United Nations International Year of Shelter for the Homeless, priority in '87-88 for the 125 units available under this program will be given to facilities providing shelter for homeless individuals. Recognizing the continuing need for social housing in some areas and particularly for seniors, Alberta will target its activities to provide seniors and family housing where needed. Up to 30 percent of the units in new housing co-operatives may be allocated under the rent supplement program to provide increasing subsidized accommodation for families who cannot afford private-sector housing. Senior citizens' lodges, self-contained apartment projects, and community housing projects will continue to be provided in communities in greatest need of these facilities. This will complement the government's existing inventory of 6,727 lodge beds in service, 13,610 self-contained units, 522 seniors' cottage units, and 9,930 community housing units.

The province will continue its commitment to housing rural and native families through the provision of subsidized mortgage loans. This program has assisted 1,322 lower-income families to purchase modest homes. To facilitate the availability of affordable mobile-home financing, Alberta will continue to work with the private lenders through its unique mobile-home loan insurance program. This program has enabled mobile-home buyers to obtain better financing terms by providing investment loss protection for approved lenders. The Alberta government expects to insure 1,750 mobile-home loans in '87-88, in addition to 3,179 loans insured since 1983.

With the reduced interest rates and stabilized housing demand, the province's role in providing subsidized mortgage loans to lower-income families has declined significantly from almost 8,000 loans in '80-81, to 354 loans last year. This decline reflects the increased availability of private-sector financing for families who previously may have required government assistance. This, coupled with the government's intent to reduce long-term operating costs, will mean that financing under the modest apartment and Alberta family home purchase programs will be provided only when it is required to accommodate a sale of owned properties. The government will continue to encourage the sale of owned properties in communities where local market conditions will not be adversely affected.

With those comments, we welcome questions related to each area of responsibility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and hon. Solicitor General, there are 10 votes before the committee. Would it be acceptable, hon. ministers, if members of the committee pose questions on whichever votes they wish and then either minister could respond as they see fit? Is that acceptable?

Hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly.

MR. EWASIUK: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It's a

pleasure for me this morning to rise and respond to the estimates of Municipal Affairs. As has already been indicated, there are three components within this department. There is, of course, Municipal Affairs; there's native affairs and housing. Hopefully, my colleague from Athabasca-Lac La Biche will have an opportunity to address the issue relative to native affairs.

I want to first of all make some observations and comments regarding the minister's pronouncement toward the development of a new municipal district in Drayton Valley. I know this has been on the burner for some time. There has been a plebiscite held, and a variety of meetings were held. There were open houses to discuss the issue with the residents in the area. I might advise the minister at this point that my information suggests there is still a fair amount of divisiveness within the area. There is still some discontent as to how, for example, the plebiscite was held, and in fact even the information sessions were questioned. I would suggest to the minister that perhaps he would take a little more time on this particular area. Probably the best way to resolve the problem would be the appointment of a boundaries commission that would review the need for what is being proposed, but more importantly for the designation of the various boundaries that have been and are being suggested. It's a critical area. It's a major concern to various sectors within that area, Mr. Minister, and hopefully you will perhaps have another look at this one before you make your final decisions on it.

Getting down to the estimates then, my comments of course in some areas will be critical. I do want to ask questions. On the other hand, I think there are decisions here in these particular estimates that I think I want to commend the minister for and so I will, hopefully, through the process, do those things.

Mr. Minister, in the summary of the objectives of expenditures, there's a significant cut in the ministers' salaries and benefits area of 28.6 percent. That reflects itself also in the benefit package. While that's positive and a good thing, I suppose, I wonder why there is an increase of 180 percent in payments to MLAs in this particular estimate: increasing from \$5,000 last year to \$14,000 this year.

I note that in vote 1 there have been, of course, changes within the minister's office. There was the deletion of at least two cabinet positions and amalgamation into the one. So perhaps the minister would, in his response to us later, sort of rationalize the structuring within his office, because I note also there's a rather substantial increase to the budget of the deputy minister's office. Perhaps the minister may want to clarify and let us know just what's transpiring and what happened there.

Also, the minister did make mention of manpower adjustments within the department. I note in this particular vote there is a slight increase of three people in the permanent full-time positions. The minister may wish to also give us an indication why that has occurred.

Vote 2 is of course a very important and significant vote, and I think the objective stated in this program,

To reduce the tax burden on property owners and to assist municipalities in developing and maintaining programs to better serve the community,

certainly is a very noble statement. However, Mr. Minister, I feel that perhaps the objective of this, and the realities of this objective are not being followed, because I think cuts of grants to municipalities is continuing. While the 3 percent of unconditional assistance to municipalities may not seem a significant amount, I think when you're talking to figures that we are speaking of here, a 3 percent reduction to municipalities can

amount to be quite severe to many of them. Particularly, I think municipalities are not being rewarded in a way in that my knowledge and experience is that many municipalities, particularly the large urban ones, had taken the initiative several years ago to cope with the recession. They had taken measures to reduce their costs quite substantially, and of course with the thought that the kind of provisions they were going to get in terms of grants would carry them through. That is not happening and they're of course passing on the costs to the property owners within those municipalities. So it's really just another additional tax being imposed on Albertans.

I of course must be very commendable to the minister on vote 2.4 in vote 2. I think the recognition of senior citizens is well received, and I'm sure the moneys that are indicated here are going to be well spent for a good cause.

Program 2.5 in vote 2, Alberta municipal partnership in local employment programs. Again we know this program was introduced in the throne speech last spring session, and of course I think again that the intentions here are honourable and good. However, Mr. Minister, the kind of expression that I have received from municipalities was that it might be more helpful for them to cope with their requirements and also to cope with unemployment if they were able to receive this funding now in kind of a lump sum amount rather than in the kind of spread out period -- I believe it's five to eight years. They would probably have preferred to have received that money now. They could tackle some of the problems that the city of Edmonton, for example, is experiencing with the sewer and water lines that need repairs drastically. That kind of funding would have helped them and certainly would have aided the unemployment situation in the province and in the urban centres particularly.

In vote 3, again I think the objective is a good one, and I'm pleased to see that again there is continued support for the senior citizens in the rental assistance. However, program 3.3 in vote 3, the property owner tax rebate -- I know this was raised in question period, I believe last week, and the cut there of 9.5 percent is significant. I know the minister indicated in question period that the benefits over last year were somewhere in the vicinity of \$6 and something a month, or about \$80. My figure suggests about \$81 per year. It may not be a great deal of money, but certainly during the difficult times many homeowners are experiencing at this time, even \$81 might have been well received and it would have been good for them to have.

The cancellation of this program is bad news for beleaguered rural Alberta particularly, I would think. In fact, what this really does is add insult on top of injury when other moves taken by this government to rural communities were the increase of 23 cents a gallon for gasoline and the removal of the moratorium on the Farm Credit Corporation. I realize it's not within this department's estimates, but I think we would like to have seen this department come to the aid of the rural municipalities. Why I think it's relative to rural municipalities is because any less revenue received by our people in the rural areas reflects on their ability to support their municipality, and so the municipalities then, as the government I suppose in this case, will have to make adjustments in their estimates, in their budgets, and consequently will reduce services to their population.

A case in point would have to be the Canadian Transport Commission which called for the variable freight rates; again not necessarily the responsibility of this particular department, but this government did support that proposal. What I'm really

saying here, Mr. Minister, is that while some grain companies are going to benefit by the bulk purchase of grain, the long hauls farmers are going to have to undertake are going to require larger trucks, longer hauls. The larger trucks of course are going to have an impact on municipal roads. The municipalities then are going to be responsible for the maintenance of those roads or even build other roads, and consequently again those municipalities are not going to be able to provide the services that they might if it were not for these kinds of things. What I'm saying is that I would have liked to think that this government should have taken at least a position of opposing the proposals, because I'm sure that the benefits the grain companies are going to derive from these proposals will not be passed on to the farmers or to the municipalities.

In vote 4, the support for community planning and services, I'm pleased to see that there have been no cuts to the Alberta Planning Fund. I think that particular group does a good job. It certainly sets the planning for organized community developments, but then I have to go to vote 4 and express some concern that there is a cut of 6.8 percent. I think the planning services to municipalities, to smaller groups particularly, are important and really should be maintained. The only conclusion I can draw from that particular cut is that the minister is projecting a negative growth and development of land use planning in the province. That might well be the case. Perhaps the minister may want to respond to that particular conclusion that I have drawn, whether I'm accurate or not.

In vote 5, the administrative and technical support to municipalities -- again I would interpret this particular vote to be primarily a preventative maintenance program, and that is where advisory administrative support is provided to municipalities. By providing this service, I'm sure there are long-term benefits, both for the department and for the municipalities receiving that support, and of course I note that the minister is cognizant of that fact and has indeed increased the assistance to organized municipalities. And I commend him for that. I think the 11.1 percent will certainly go a long way to helping those groups.

However, the minister might explain why there are cuts to the improvement districts, inasmuch as there are -- and I note -- eight Metis settlements that come under the provisions of this program. Perhaps the minister in his response may want to address that particular item. But I was particularly surprised at the cut in program 5.5 of 9.5 percent; that is, in the assessment services. I see this service as being of great importance to rural municipalities. The need for that kind of service I think is paramount, and I was disappointed to see that the minister chose to make some cuts in that area.

I might also note that again in manpower there is no change in the permanent full-time positions. And again I'm drawing a conclusion here, but it seems to me that because of the cuts that have been imposed in this particular vote, the minister is then probably passing on the shortfalls to the municipalities, because you are retaining your full-time positions.

Vote 6. I just make a comment here; no great deal here. However, the minister may want to advise the Assembly. Does the department monitor the various boards for competence and effectiveness of board members when you consider either their appointments or reappointments? During my time on city council there was some concern about some of the people that get appointed to these boards. I know the city recommends -- in fact appoints -- some of them, but there are the appointments to some of these boards, and whether the people in fact have the background competence to deal with some of the issues that

they're confronted with was questioned. Perhaps some monitoring of those people on these boards, how they conduct themselves and how they adjudicate on various issues, might be a worthwhile project.

Mr. Chairman, I will pass by vote 7 -- in any event, that deals with native affairs -- in the hope that my colleague from Athabasca-Lac La Biche would be able to ask questions on that particular vote, and also I will go right on to vote 10 at the present time. And I have some questions that I'm going to be posing to the minister relative to the Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Regarding vote 10, and particularly program 10.3, the land assembly and development, Mr. Chairman, while the estimates are calling for a decrease of some 18.3 percent in this particular program, I would think that that figure could be substantially greater, given that the Alberta economy is on the downswing, and I think that's reflected in this budget and all the other departmental budgets, and that the province -- and I know there's some argument here, but our figures suggest there is an out-migration from Alberta. I feel that perhaps the Mortgage and Housing Corporation could well have provided or cut the funding here and perhaps the record of funding elsewhere would have been to a better use.

Something else, Mr. Chairman, that I've heard in this Legislature since I've been here is that there have been advocates suggesting that Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation be sold or privatized or in fact in some cases be done away with. For the information of the Assembly I would like to offer some information that I have been able to receive from an article I saw in a newspaper, the *Los Angeles Times*, in February of this year where, indeed, in the United States there was a similar call for the disposition or privatization of the federal housing administration in the United States, which basically is very similar to our CMHC. The President of the United States went to the extent of developing or appointing a task force to study the call for the privatization, and I might tell this Assembly that after the task force had completed their work they reported back and their recommendation was against the privatization of that federal agency in the United States, the agency citing that without government providing the mortgage assurance there was basically nothing to sell. I think that basically applies to the Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation. So long as there is continual government input and supply of funding, there really is nothing there to sell, nor could there, in fact, be any kind of attractive sale price established.

In the United States these recommendations were hailed by both the National Association of Home Builders and the Mortgage Bankers Association of America. Their conclusions or their reasoning for supporting the decision of the task force was that it was unlikely that a private corporation could fulfill the social mandate of a government agency. And I think that applies to a large extent to the Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Still staying with this vote, Mr. Chairman, I want to make some comments with regard to our lodges. I have some suggestions that I think could be or should be implemented in the development and the operations of these lodges. Now, I know that some of these things do occur, but I think a need perhaps for improvement always should be considered in the inspection of lodges and apartments before opening, in looking for practical problems, because these are specifically built for seniors. While I know these inspections are indeed carried out by the foundations and the other people involved, there seem to still be some

problems in that such things as bars across windows and so on that are required are not being done. It is also suggested that when we build a senior citizens lodge, the lanes are paved. If there is a back alley, that lane should be paved because it creates problems for the seniors because quite frequently they access through that area.

I think another area that the government should really consider is including seniors on the AMHC board. After all, the facilities are being provided for those groups, and it would seem to make sense to me that they should have representation on the board. I'm sure their input would be valuable and would assist the commission to develop these facilities.

Two-bedroom apartments should be available to couples in senior apartments. Quite often there are seniors that are obviously getting old together, and they want to go to a facility as a couple. Yet when they get there, they realize that they have to live in separate accommodations. I know that's changing somewhat, because there are facilities that do accommodate couples, but I would hope that the emphasis is placed or looked at to provide more. There are some, and perhaps the posture is that there aren't sufficient numbers of those. Perhaps that should be looked at as a consideration.

Wheelchair dips on sidewalks are needed. Again, something that we may totally have overlooked I think, but there's more cognizance or recognition that there is a need for the wheelchair dips. That might be in the area of municipality responsibility, but I'm sure that could be worked out with the municipality. Doors should have automatic openers for wheelchairs. I have several lodges in my constituency, and each time there is a big, heavy door that needs to be opened. While there are some automatic doors there are, however, those that require arm power to open, and again it poses problems for those seniors who are in wheelchairs, and even for those who are not.

Rent control should be applied uniformly in all lodges. Again, I think the provision of 25 percent of the income as a ceiling for all lodges is practical, because of course recently, I believe it was this year, there was a price increase for residents in lodges and even when their pensions had not increased. So there is an imbalance of the requirements of money that these people need to live on relative to the rent they have to pay. Some centralization is required in the amenities that are applied to the centres, such as carpeting in the common areas and also on bedroom floors.

AN HON. MEMBER: Some have cold tiles.

MR. EWASIUK: My colleague just advised me that some of these bedroom floors have cold tiles, and I think surely we could accommodate and perhaps a little comfort could be provided by providing carpeting on the bedroom floors.

Again this may apply to some of the older facilities, but four residents are using one connecting bathroom. I think that's too many. We should be able to provide these people with the privacy that I think they have earned and deserve. Some units might well or should be provided with showers in addition to the bathtubs. The seniors -- and I suppose one day we will all be there -- do have some difficulty in accessing the tubs, and so assistance, showers, might be a good substitute for them. That applies also to the toilets as well. There has to be a lowering of the toilets so the seniors, because of their difficulty, their weak legs and so on -- there are problems in that area.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that sort of covers those areas of suggestions. I think they are valuable ones. These are ones that

have been passed on to us from various lodges and residents of lodges, so I hope that something can be done about those.

One more area regarding housing, Mr. Chairman -- again I think we all are aware and I've mentioned it and other members of the Legislature have made reference -- is the difficulty many people are experiencing relative to their mortgage obligations. We would hope that the minister might intervene with the commission and would encourage the minister to review the current policies and regulations of AMHC to ease the burden on mortgagees that are currently experiencing economic difficulty. Particularly, the one we received the most comments on is the T1 penalty, which is charged to mortgagees to renegotiate a mortgage. I know that this is done by all private-sector people who carry mortgages, but I think we as a government agency should be able to look, particularly in light of the difficulty that many people are experiencing because of unemployment, at some relief from the penalty, a three-month penalty for renegotiating a mortgage. It would be well received.

I thumb through the budget statement issued this year by the Honourable Miss Hunley, and under housing I note that we are taking the United Nations International Year of Shelter for the Homeless seriously and have indicated in the budget that support will be provided for six projects containing 128 units for specific purpose housing. I was pleased to see that in the budget. However, I thought I heard the minister when he was making his presentation earlier that the figure of 154 had now become 128. Perhaps the minister may want to comment on that. Maybe I didn't hear him correctly, or for what other reason that figure was changed.

Of course, I think one really has to emphasize the need for shelter for the homeless. The unemployment situation has created many problems . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. EWASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Banff-Cochrane.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before starting, I do want to express appreciation on behalf of the many members in this Assembly who heard your opening remarks this morning and reminded us of the rules that you are obliged to follow as the chairman of this committee. I noticed that you had asked that if members wished to have more participation they give consideration to reasonable time limits. So I regret, Mr. Chairman, that I'm now able to be on my feet after 30 minutes or more of the last speaker, who obviously did not wish to follow your suggestions.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to Municipal Affairs, there are 374 or more municipalities in this province. Whether we live in cities or towns or villages or hamlets or . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair would just remind hon. members. Please have the courtesy of not walking between the Chair and the member speaking. Banff-Cochrane.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to resume. Whether we live in cities, towns, villages, hamlets, municipal

districts, improvement districts, counties, or special areas of this province, this department touches our lives every day. This department, this minister, the deputy minister, the ADMs, and all of the services that are provided by this government through this department reach every one of us: local government in Alberta.

I think, Mr. Chairman, we should note that the Minister of Municipal Affairs has brought to his portfolio not only a long understanding of government that he has achieved through his services in a number of portfolios for our government but his reasoned approach, his ability to listen and succinctly get to the heart of the matter, and that's possibly based on not only that experience I mentioned but his experience in local government as an alderman in the city of Edmonton.

I think, Mr. Chairman, we should acknowledge, too, the incredible work of the staff of this department, who are on any day of the year likely to be found somewhere in Alberta visiting a municipal government, providing advice, or responding to MLAs who have concerns from their constituents that we all mutually share with our local governments.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to refer briefly to a book that has been published and circulated to all of us at the beginning of this fiscal year by the minister. I don't want to give it any special commendation, yet why not? It's called *Alberta's Local Governments: People in Community Seeking Goodness*. I think if members all received a copy -- there is a copy in the library. But to think that this year Albertans and our Municipal Affairs department are celebrating 75 years of service to the people of the province in their support of municipal governments . . .

The reason I mention this book, and I hope everybody in the Assembly has had a chance to glance at it, is because unlike most government studies -- and this is a study commissioned by the department and authored by a gentleman whose name is Walter Walchuk -- it's not just a review of this incredible history of Alberta, the beginnings that we had from our native communities, from the eastern Canadian in-migration to our western part of our country to the European wave of immigration. It's not only the whole story of municipal affairs, but if you bear with it and go through the history, you come to a very exciting part, unusual for a government-commissioned study or report: an outlook on the future. I hope that if there is time today, our minister will be able to perhaps project and give us some advice as to some of things that he sees ahead for this wonderful thing called local government, which we all support, particularly in our government and our Conservative caucus.

I wanted to mention this book, Mr. Chairman, because there's a reference in it to a quotation; it's a quotation by Lewis Mumford. And I mention this gentleman, who's an American author, because I once was an employee of the Department of Municipal Affairs, in 1962 under the then Social Credit administration and the minister at that time, Mr. Hooke. So I was a student of city planning and, I think, the first Canadian planner ever hired by the Municipal Affairs department. Of course, I studied Lewis Mumford's book, *The City in History*, in my university training, and I mention this just to say that he, Lewis Mumford, reinforces the theme that there is a desire in Alberta of strong, self-reliant, and comprehensive local government. I still subscribe to that theme. Our government subscribes to that theme. I know this minister does.

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to compliment the minister and his officials for the relationship that has been developed and maintained, notwithstanding the political parties that may be represented, notwithstanding the different views that

municipalities may have amongst themselves or with this government, with the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, with the Association of Municipal Districts and Counties, and with the Association of Improvement Districts. The relationship between those three organizations and this government is very positive, and this minister and his staff are to be commended for that.

With respect to senior citizens, I think there isn't a senior citizen in this province that isn't appreciative of the programs that are available, whether they're in the form of rent reduction, if they're in their private homes, or if they're in the self-accommodation or in the special lodges that are throughout this province.

I'm very proud too, Mr. Chairman, that at long last -- and although we cannot debate that today, it will be coming -- the Minister of Municipal Affairs has indicated that there will be a Bill debated in this Assembly which, if passed, will lead to some rationalization of the rural assessment problems that have plagued a number of us as MLAs and certainly in the constituency of Banff-Cochrane are a very major concern to so many of the rural constituents I represent. I'm very pleased this minister is going to bring that Bill forward and take it through the Assembly.

With respect to Banff -- and perhaps with my colleague the Member for Edson, the townsites of Jasper -- I also want to thank the minister and his officials for the assistance, the advice, and indeed the financial assistance that from time to time they have provided to the townsites committee in Banff and to its counterpart in Jasper as those communities in national parks struggle with and desire to achieve self-reliance and local government. This government has been a strong supporter of their efforts, and I know that this minister will continue to encourage their work. I know he agrees that it is their decision to make. But if they make it, and as they develop that approach, we're there as a government to assist them in exploring the options, developing ideas as to costs, understanding assessments, and understanding the responsibilities that go along with self-government. I hope the community of Banff will soon come to make that decision, with our assistance and with the assistance of the Minister of the Environment for the federal government.

With respect to another kind of unique area in my constituency, Mr. Chairman, I want to mention the community known as Redwood Meadow, which is situated in the Sarcee Reserve south of Cochrane, north of Bragg Creek. This community, which has struggled for some time with its future form of local government, is a community that probably should never have been developed without the answers to its questions having been sought and approved. Yet here we have several hundreds of people living in their homes on leased land on an Indian reserve and no way to reach our government, no way to assure themselves of local self-government. I know that they are struggling with that and that they are working closely with the band council to try and form some kind of a society, a society that with the support of our minister will be able to reach out, manage affairs for themselves and in consultation with the Indian band council. I hope that the minister, perhaps, or his colleague the Solicitor General, will in some way be able to convince the federal minister responsible for Indian affairs that self-government for the non-native community in the native community area is as important to them as it may be for the native people of Canada as they press forward their claims for self-government.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close short remarks and just to

again express appreciation for a government department that not only responds so ably to the everyday needs but has taken a chance and made some predictions about our future.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Athabasca-Lac La Biche

MR. PIQUETTE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to start off by making some general comments relating to the various ministers that are now responsible for native affairs. Native people are expressing a real concern about the numbers of ministers handling native affairs at this time. When the native affairs ministry was disbanded after the election, it was promised by this government that communication and delivery of programs would not suffer, but that has not been the case. Even as a native affairs critic, when I'm trying to get information from various departments -- you know, we're looking here at triplicate type of ministries, and it's very confusing. Would this government reassess the responsibilities of each minister and rationalize it to one minister?

Even, for example, look at vote 7; we have a 35.3 percent cut in administration and co-ordination. Does this mean there'll be less liaison between the government and native organizations? Will this be enhancing the confusion that presently exists? I'd like to get the ministers to respond to that and to look at it very rationally. Because going back even to the aboriginal First Ministers' Conference, in terms of the funding that was to be made available for preparing their case, there was all kinds of confusion that existed prior to money supposedly being made available to the native groups to get organized. A lot of that funding was very often too late for a lot of the native organizations to put their proposals forth to the aboriginal First Ministers' Conference.

I know this is handled by another minister who's not here today, but very definitely here again, when there's native people, they're speaking to three separate ministers about different things. If I'm confused, so are they, in terms of a lot of the program delivery and who is really in charge of what. So I think with the disbanding of the one ministry, we would have thought that there would have been a very clear demarcation of responsibilities. I don't wish to criticize any of the ministers for perhaps their responsibility, but I'm just saying that in terms of the number of people they have to communicate with, it is the real problem, and which minister speaks on behalf of what. If that can be alleviated, I think we can go on with the whole business of making sure that our native people, who are facing tremendous problems in today's society -- we've seen the high suicide rate. You know, it amazes me. If this were happening in any other minority group which was not native, we'd have emergency type of action. This has been compounded by years of high welfare rates. It's not a native problem anymore; it's a people's problem. And I'd like the government to start looking at it in terms of what they have to do to address the whole socioeconomic development of our native people in Alberta.

We look, for example, at some of these statistics. Between 1978 and '82, 146 status Indians committed suicide in Alberta. This is a rate of 61 suicides per 100,000 Indians. The provincial rate was 16 per 100,000 residents. Now, that's almost six times the rate of the average population. Then we look at the unemployment and the welfare rate among native people: around 75 to 80 percent. And a lot of the people who are working -- very often just short-term types of government programs that kick in in the summertime and create basically people going

back on welfare in the fall.

We're talking about native self-government in terms of our Metis settlements, but take a look at the Metis settlements and take a look at the number of people working on those settlements and see if that's not also a very, very important thing the government should be addressing. We see here a cutback, for example, in the job creation and funding for such programs. Welfare rates: okay, we're talking here that the government's cutting back in Metis development by 24 percent, in a situation where the unemployment rate has been unacceptable for years, and we are picking on the most defenceless people in our society to be doing those kinds of cutbacks. An 82 percent cut in Metis housing: I mean, these are shameful statistics by this government when they are picking on defenceless people to make cuts of this nature.

We combine that with some of the educational cuts, like EOF by 75 percent. Those programs in my constituency, for example, are used to provide remedial reading and remedial math programs for the Metis kids. We say we're going to create a curriculum for Metis children, but then we take away the delivery program to make that curriculum work. So this government is really not tackling that program at all, and they should be thoroughly ashamed of the way that not only through the whole discussion of aboriginal . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Solicitor General.

MR. ROSTAD: I love to listen to the dialogue, but could he keep to the vote that's under consideration and not discuss Career Development and Employment and the Department of Education within the estimates of Municipal Affairs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's under section 62, Standing Orders. Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. PIQUETTE: Mr. Chairman, I think a lot of these are all interrelated, and I want to make sure that the ministers in this House finally start communicating together about program delivery. I think it's about time that you are called to task about that. We have a dozen ministers who have interrelated things, and how often do you get together and talk about this thing? This is why I'm making these points today.

For example, one of the recommendations I'd like to see happening within the ministry is this area here of accountability. Metis settlements and Metis associations have to have a sense of self-government, where they are responsible to their membership. One of the things that I would recommend this government do is to make sure that in their discussions with various Metis associations and Metis settlements, it's agreed that there be mandatory audited annual statements, that those organizations have to report to their membership so that they are accountable to their membership. What we have at this time are periodic types of assessments done by government bureaucrats which are not responsive back to the membership, to the native people and organizations.

And one of the things that needs to be corrected is that the credibility and the accountability of native leadership has to be responsive not to this government but to their own people. That's an example of self-government that has to be addressed by this government. For example, we have problems in native organizations, since we don't have audited annual statements mandated by these organizations, that credibility gaps exist in terms of native organizations. Any nonprofit association is

mandated, for example, to have audited statements back to their membership. The same thing should be demanded from our various native groups, not to be responsive to the government but to be responsible or accountable to their own membership, so that the communication line to their members is always aboveboard and responsible to them as a society. But no, what we have created in this government or in this country is that the Indian leadership or the Metis leadership is always responding to the government as opposed to their people. And then we wonder why we have problems in terms of communication and their running of their associations and organizations, which unite them as a people as opposed to being a divisive kind of intrusion by government.

So I would urge the government to one day look at native self-government in terms of the operation of their own organizations. Get out of the business of running their affairs but make sure that they are responsible to their membership, and then we won't have to be having expensive bureaucrats who keep running around and very often are not even doing their jobs in terms of making sure they prevent some of the financial abuses which very often are some of the negatives which come out in the press all the time. So let's take a look at why the problem is there and make sure we put into our programs things which the people can do for themselves, as opposed to what the government is doing for them, and that will go a long way to solving many of our native problems.

One of the things I'd like to see -- for example, I've been dealing with two Metis settlements in my constituency. Municipal Affairs builds houses for the Metis, but they don't, for example, account that when you're building a house, you also have to have power, you have to have gas. Why isn't that all part of the building program? Why is it that after their homes are built, we have to go to the utilities department and try to access some money out of them so they can be connected to power lines? Some homes have been without power for three years now on the Metis colony at Buffalo Lake. Why is that? Now, I did contact the department the other day, and they are thinking about finally combining those kinds of grants, and I hope that this year we will not have to go running to various other government departments in order for people with children living in homes that are not heated, without power, for two or three years -- because that is a shame. That should not be happening, and we should be making sure that those programs are delivered properly to those Metis settlements and those Metis people.

Another thing we see are cuts in the emergency housing program. We've got to talk about making sure that we also provide land for our Metis people, for our native people. Under negotiation right now in the Lac La Biche area, Owl River, is a group of Metis people who are looking at setting up a subdivision or a larger tract of land where their future is secure. Since the election, for example, I've been spending a lot of my time in Lac La Biche trying to get native miscellaneous permits so that they can put a trailer on. And then the department of forestry says: no, we can't do that. The Department of Municipal Affairs says: no, we can't do that, because there's a land study on. Come on. It's time that we started looking at the land settlement of these people so that we know that when we plan for a subdivision, there is a tract of land, and that we go on with the business of providing jobs and creating jobs, et cetera.

Another thing that we have to look at is the whole welfare mentality. Isn't it a lot cheaper to start looking at economic development instead of short-term solutions to our problems? Isn't it about time that we have money accessible to these people?

A Metis settlement -- for example, a Metis who wants to start farming cannot even access AADC funding. Why is that? Why is he a second-class citizen in Alberta? Why isn't there a change in AADC, for example, or Municipal Affairs or the Metis branch, to make sure there's a pool of money there for low-interest loans for beginning Metis farmers? Why, after all these years, is this program not in place? Our party and our agricultural task force took that recommendation; it is now part of our policies. Now, why isn't that a policy of the Conservative government, instead of treating our Metis people who are trying to start farming on Metis settlements without any accessibility to any banking, to any financial institution, to do something for themselves? We have created a system here where these people are made to sit there and just collect welfare cheques.

They start up a cottage industry, and if there's a little problem financially, they pull the rug from underneath them. We've got to have affirmative job-creation programs on Metis settlements and in the Metis areas with high unemployment. It is time to do like the Americans did for their Negro people back in the '60s when they said: this is enough of that kind of built-in prejudice within our system. And we have a big built-in prejudice in our economy here in Alberta and in Canada relating to our native people.

So let's get on with these kinds of things and make sure that we start putting programs together that actually work and actually deliver human dignity and respect to our native people here in Alberta. And instead of following other examples, let's be the leaders in this. If the Premier could not grant self-government to people, at least put where the real issue is: providing bread and butter to our native people. Because out of that we will have dignity and respect and the carrying on of their own people, that proud people, the original people, who helped build this Canada many years ago when the white people arrived here as pioneers. They were partners in the building of Canada. Why aren't we integrating them in our social and economic fabric as opposed to what we're doing now?

So I challenge this government to finally sit up and listen, to put your ministers together and address this absolutely appalling native welfare problem, this appalling native suicide problem, and get on with this business of quitting, this slashing of programs and then saying that they're proud of how they're serving the native people of Alberta.

Thank you very much.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I didn't know we were talking about native affairs, and I would love to debate with the hon. member someday ...

MR. PIQUETTE: At least you're listening.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I'm listening. And, hon. member, I kept quiet while you were speaking, with the greatest of difficulty, I must confess.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on two issues: one that concerns my constituency in particular, another one that concerns it also but also has a broader concern in the community.

The first is the difficulty of the Nose Hill situation in Calgary and the relationship of the Nose Hill situation to the Planning Act and the responsibilities of Calgary MLAs. Just a little history for the interest of the members. When I was a member of city council, I supported the concept of a park on Nose Hill, and this was back in the early '70s. Since that time the city has acquired approximately 55 percent of the land as the land became

available. Presently I think it's fair to say that the economy is such in Calgary that housing in the higher price range, \$140,000 to \$200,000, is moving, surprisingly enough, and some of the housing developments that would go on in this particular area would command those kinds of prices. So as a result of that, the owners of the land -- and some of them have owned it for several years -- feel that in fairness they should be looking at getting compensation of roughly \$40,000 an acre. However, there are others that feel that \$10,000 is a more reasonable price. My view would be that perhaps we could look at the original cost plus interest, plus something for inflation.

But the important thing is that this is a matter that's got to be decided between the city of Calgary and the landowners. Now, there may be some problem with our legislation as a result of the indication of a Supreme Court decision which suggested that perhaps we should look not only at our Planning Act but also perhaps at the board that looks after the acquisition of land on the public behalf. I think that Bill 52, that was introduced last summer, was perhaps a little hasty, but on the other hand I think what the government was trying to do was address a concern that had been raised by our Supreme Court. And it is my understanding and my belief and my position, I should say, that if it's necessary to review this Act, then I would hope to get assurance from the minister that the necessary amendments to the Planning Act and any other Acts would be brought forward into the Legislature, that the concerned parties, such as all the cities of the province of Alberta and landowners, would have an opportunity to review the legislation before it became law. And I have indicated to my constituents that rather than be hasty like we were in the past, we would be more concerned with community involvement.

The other issue I'd like to discuss though, Mr. Chairman, is addressed to the minister responsible for housing. Again, a little historical background. When I was a member of city council, I was responsible for establishing the first housing units, which were in northeast Calgary, which in those days were called public housing. It was the first time the city of Calgary, in support with the federal government, constructed some public housing units. Later I was also involved and a vice-chairman of the committee that succeeded in developing the Shaganappi Village project, which had a small high rise on it, some town homes, and we had a library, day care centre, a health unit. The idea was to try and ensure that this didn't become a ghetto, but rather that it was an important and integral part of the community, of that area. At the time, there was concern by some members of council who were probably a little more right-wing than I was that we were in effect opening a Pandora's box by building these units. Now I understand the Calgary Housing Authority has 1,500 units that they look after, and that's in addition to the ones owned by Canada Mortgage and Housing and owned by Alberta Housing.

Also, when I was a member of city council, I was chairman of the Metropolitan Calgary Foundation. This is a foundation that looked after lodges and self-contained units. Just a little history. Many of these units were first built by the Social Credit government in the early '60s. When oil revenues dried up in the late '60s, they stopped the program, and then when this government came into office and was blessed with increased oil revenues, we started on the program again. Initially the people that were in these units in the early '30s were what I would like to call the veterans of the Dirty Thirties. They were people that had worked for companies that didn't have pension plans. They were lucky if they had employment, coming through the Depres-

sion. Many of them had no home equities to speak of. Many of them were renters all their lives, so the housing program served a very, very important need.

But strangely enough, in the early '60s in some of the units, and I remember in particular the [inaudible] lodge unit development, there was very little parking, because nobody assumed that senior citizens would be rich enough to own cars, so there were no parking spaces. You can imagine the problem that has created. Now as time goes on, we have built more lodges, I would suggest, than any other jurisdiction in North America, or more units for seniors, but I do have some concerns now. For example, my mother, who is in her 89th year, lives in one of these beautiful units. Her rent is approximately \$200 a month. If she were paying an economic rent, it would be more like \$1,000 a month in relation to the kind of facility that she enjoys. Last summer this particular unit had to tear up half of the grass around the project because there was not enough room for cars.

So the same thing goes on year after year, and I would suggest to you that the cars in those units are beautiful cars. I'm not quarreling with the fact that seniors drive nice cars. I would like to get the message across, two messages as far as seniors are concerned. One is that when you become 65, you don't suddenly become penniless, and the other one is that when you become 65, you suddenly don't become senile, because you still are quite capable of looking after your own affairs.

But getting back to housing, what I am concerned about now is that I don't feel that in the housing of seniors -- I think we should take a hard look at what we're doing, because I think we're back to the position of perhaps providing housing for those that can look after themselves. Better still, we should be providing more money to allow those people that wish to stay in their homes -- that we put more money into that program rather than expending more capital on housing. There was a recent study done by Canada Mortgage, about two years ago, that found out that 60 percent of the people living in Canada Mortgage housing units in Canada should not have been there. They were not the kind of housing that was designed for these people. They were financially capable of living elsewhere, and this is the danger I find us getting into.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that Motion 226 is on the Order Paper, asking for a review of the Alberta Housing Corporation. I'd like to raise some areas of concern that I have. I know there will be opportunity for debate, but I think I'd rather address these to the minister responsible. I would like to know why the minister responsible is approving the building of more senior housing units -- in Calgary I'm talking about now -- if he takes into consideration the present vacancy rate in senior housing units in Calgary. My suggestion is: why not stop all capital funding for new units and direct it instead into more money for keeping seniors in their own homes?

On the matter of other housing, I have some concerns too. I'm not convinced that Alberta Housing is moving as fast as Canada Mortgage and Housing has done in our major centres in disposing of foreclosed properties. I know the argument will be that we don't want to flood the market, and I agree that we shouldn't flood the market. When you have 4,000 or 5,000 housing units and you put out a hundred every month, that's going to take you five years, and that doesn't strike me as flooding any market.

I would like to ask the minister if he feels that it is not time we reviewed our whole housing philosophy. Let us start and be more concerned about the ill-housed, and these in my opinion today are the single people and the young people. What con-

cerns me is that there are still many thousands of citizens in Calgary, and I would imagine in Edmonton and some of our other centres, living in basement suites. Now, I'd suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there's something wrong with our housing philosophy when our seniors are beautifully housed in units that are not fully occupied, yet we have people that live in basement suites. Regrettably, often when there's a fire in a basement suite, there is also a death in the basement suite.

I had some concern, too, with the fact that foreclosed housing units are being turned over to the Calgary Housing Authority for subsidy in rental. I know the argument always comes back and says that the feds are picking up a big portion of this and the city of Calgary picks up a little bit and the province picks up some. My concern is this: that it's all tax dollars we're using. Should we be doing this when we can take those properties and do what they've been doing in Britain in the last few years, since Maggie Thatcher came on the throne? I know this will excite some of my hon. colleagues across the way.

Three years ago I was fortunate enough to be visiting an aunt of mine who lives in Yorkshire, which is a pretty depressed area, and the new government housing policy was to make special deals for people living in council housing, as they call it. At that time, I think over 80 percent of Britains were living in council housing. Just prior to my going there on a visit, they had started turning over some of these units to owners that had been in them for years. It was very significant. You could walk down a street of little brick town houses that were anywhere from 50 to 100 years old, and you could see the ones that had been purchased by the owners. They had new doors, they had new windows, some of them new walks, or they had little gardens. You could tell right away the ones that had suddenly become possessed by owners. And I think that this similar situation would exist here. I was talking to the British consul the other day in Edmonton here, and he suggested that it was a very significant change in attitude of ownership and also involvement in community affairs.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would like to come back again to the remarks of the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche. I would enjoy a debate with him on native affairs. I think it's a very distressful situation that we find ourselves in with native affairs, and I think it's the responsibility not just of this government but of all governments and of all citizens of Canada.

In conclusion, I would like it if both ministers could respond to my questions.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to respond to the questions, many parts of which are important enough, but I'd like to also deal with other business today. So I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, does the committee agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

#### head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

14. Moved by Mr. Johnston:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly finding a breach of privilege to have occurred, the Assembly orders that the Member for Calgary Buffalo apologize in the Assembly at the earliest possible opportunity to the Minister of Career Development and Employment, the Provincial Treasurer, and the Assembly for service of a statement of claim within the precincts of the Legislative Assembly while the Assembly is sitting.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move Motion 14 standing in my name on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: The Liberal chap from Calgary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Speaking to the motion or what?

MR. CHUMIR: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, of which I've given the Speaker notice, and it relates to Standing Order 15(6), which provides that:

Mr. Speaker may allow such debate as he thinks appropriate in order to satisfy himself whether a prima facie case of breach of privilege has taken place and whether the matter is being raised at the earliest [possible] opportunity, and if he so rules, any member may give notice not later than at the conclusion of the next sitting day of a motion to deal with the matter further.

The hon. Speaker gave his decision that there was a prima facie case of breach of privilege and that the matter had been raised at the earliest possible opportunity on Monday. Accordingly, pursuant to this rule, any member was entitled to give notice not later than the conclusion of the next sitting day, being Tuesday, of a motion to deal with the matter further.

We find in the Votes and Proceedings of Tuesday that in fact a motion was provided -- that is, Motion 14, as it was then numbered -- and it provided that

Hon. Mr. Johnston propose the following motion to the Assembly:

14. BE IT RESOLVED THAT a prima facie case of privilege having been declared by Mr. Speaker on May 4, 1987, the Assembly orders that the Member for Calgary-Buffalo apologize in the Assembly at the earliest possible opportunity . . .

And it carries on.

This motion, Mr. Speaker, is out of order, and I believe the government recognized that it was out of order, because they changed the motion subsequently. The manner in which it is out of order, of course, is that it provided for the House to order the Member for Calgary Buffalo, myself, to apologize on the basis of a finding of a prima facie case of privilege by yourself. In fact, the rules of this House provide that privilege is a matter to be determined by the House itself and that the prima facie determination or case is merely a condition precedent. Accordingly, that motion was out of order and the hon. proposer of the motion, apparently having been apprised of that, provided what I

would submit is a totally new motion on Wednesday, which appears in Wednesday's Order Paper. It no longer refers to the *prima facie* decision of the Speaker as the basis for the decision and the basis upon which to seek an apology, but it provides as follows:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly finding a breach of privilege to have occurred, the Assembly orders the Member for Calgary Buffalo to apologize in the Assembly at the earliest possible [moment] . . .

That was followed by a letter from the Provincial Treasurer, dated May 6, in which he indicates that:

Please be advised that I wish to replace this motion, as reported in the Votes and Proceedings of May 5, 1987, to eliminate any reference to the Speaker of the Assembly.

Now, as we proceed today and as I look at the Orders of the Day and look at the motion that is before us and I attempt to determine whether or not it is or is not in order, I look at the Votes and Proceedings as the past record of the House with respect to the propriety in whether or not proper notice was given, and we find that this motion only appears in the Votes and Proceedings of Wednesday. The rules of the House, I would submit, require that this motion appear in the Votes and Proceedings of Tuesday, that being the time required by rule 15(6). That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that we do not have proper notice under 15(6), that we are today proceeding under a new motion submitted on Wednesday, which is out of order.

The question is whether or not in some sense that motion can be salvaged. Is there any basis upon which the defect can be repaired? It has been suggested that section 397 of *Beauchesne* may be applicable. It has two subsections, and I'll read them. It states first that

A modification of a notice of motion standing upon the *Notice Paper* is permitted, if the amended notice does not exceed the scope of the original notice. Sir Erskine May, *Treatise on the Law, Privilege, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament*.

That's paragraph one. The second paragraph provides that

A new notice must be given in the *Votes and Proceedings*, under S.O. 42, when a material change is to be made to a notice of motion before it is taken into consideration by the House.

The operative features in this rule are, firstly, that a modification may take place, providing it does not exceed the scope of the original notice. So we have a question as to whether or not we have, firstly, a modification, and I would suggest that what we have is clearly a new motion. The hon. Provincial Treasurer in his letter has said "Please be advised that I wish to replace this motion," being his original motion, and not to amend or modify it. Indeed, we find on the Order Paper no statement of modification or amendment. We find a new motion.

The second fundamentally important aspect of this is that any modification must not exceed the scope of the original notice. Indeed, if there were a new notice -- and if the notice were new, it would by definition not fit the rules, Mr. Speaker. But even if there were to be a new notice, it also provides that it must be given when a material change is to be made. The issue is whether or not the motion of Wednesday exceeds the scope of the original motion. In fact, we find that the original motion is a motion which is not in order; it is a motion based on the finding of the Speaker, a *prima facie* finding. We find that the second

motion of Wednesday is a motion which on its face appears to be in order in terms of its wording.

The reason why there's a significant difference, a material difference, Mr. Speaker, is that in one case the motion is based on your decision, and in the second case it calls for action by the House to make a decision with respect to whether there is or is not a breach of privilege. That is a fundamentally different process, and when we look at the rationale for giving notice and whether or not a change is or is not material, presumably the rule which should be applied is whether or not the notice gives other members of the House a very clear indication of exactly what it is to be debated and to be faced. And the motion of Tuesday provided for a debate on the basis of the Speaker's *prima facie* finding and subsequent request for an apology.

We find the motion on Wednesday providing a totally different process where I would be expected to come into this House, and rather than debating the merits of the Speaker's finding or action pursuant to the Speaker's finding, I would be asked to come into this House and face a debate on a totally different issue, not whether there is a *prima facie* case but whether or not there is a true case of breach of privilege for decision by this House. I would submit that that is a fundamentally different motion and proceeding, Mr. Speaker, and certainly it's a motion which exceeded the scope of the original motion. The change is certainly a material change for which a new notice would have to be given under rule 2. And where there are new notices, of course it would again by definition fail under section 15(6) because it would not be the notice required under the rules of the House.

By analogy, with respect to material change, I might refer the hon. Speaker to paragraph 155 of *Beauchesne* where the issue of materiality in the official reports of the debates is referred to. The rule states:

The debates of the House of Commons are reported verbatim, recording correctly what was said by each Member in the House. Slight verbal alterations are allowed to be made by a Member in order to make his meaning more precise and accurate; however, he may not, by the insertion of words or phrases, effect material changes in the meaning of what he actually said in the House.

We could imagine the hon. minister making a statement in one instance that he's basing his motion on the *prima facie* finding of the Speaker and shortly thereafter seeking a change on the basis that no, he was wanting the House to make a finding of privilege and arguing that's not material. It certainly is material. It's of a fundamentally different nature and, I would submit, is out of order.

So the substance, Mr. Speaker: this notice is a new notice that was first given on Wednesday; it should have been given on Tuesday. I would submit that it's out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Speaking to the point of order.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, what we have here, as has been to some extent outlined by the Member for Calgary Buffalo, is more a debate along the lines as to whether or not this is an amended motion or whether or not this motion in its amended form is of a substantive nature. What has been stipulated already by the Member for Calgary Buffalo is that in fact the original motion was properly filed and that proper notification was given in Tuesday's Votes and Proceedings. So on that point alone, Mr. Speaker, we have it clear that the process at that point has in fact been fulfilled.

Where we must look for direction beyond that, Mr. Speaker, is to the parliamentary proceedings itself. We know full well that as members of this Assembly we do draw upon antecedents and history and traditions which have been given to us by the British parliamentary system. Some of those histories and antecedents are important for us in guiding us here today. First of all, it is probably clear that the amendments of a motion of this order have not probably been before this House, certainly not in the time that I've been a Member of this Legislative Assembly, but of course the reason that there are in fact notices of motion themselves is reason for us to ensure that these notices are a regular kind of notice and that whether it's a material change, a nominal change, those kinds of changes to the amendment to the motion can in fact be accommodated. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, it would not be necessary for us to have the notice process. Traditionally, the notification of this order has been found, and amendments to notices of this order have in fact been effected in traditions of the parliamentary system.

Let us look, first of all, Mr. Speaker, at the kinds of amended motions which are accepted. First of all, there are amendments to motions which can be essentially directed by the Clerk of the Assembly or by the Speaker himself if in fact there is some form of irregular amendment, irregular words, or irregular process implicit in that motion. These kinds of amendments are clearly referred to. I think you can look, first of all, with respect to *Erskine May*, the 19th edition, pages 372 and 373, where in fact it is clear that if the Clerk of the Table informs the member that there has been some inappropriate words used in a motion, it is in fact incumbent upon that member to change it. In fact, it goes even further to say that should the Speaker so direct, that motion may well not be published. Clearly, the intention of the process here is to ensure that if there is an irregular motion, that motion itself can be cleansed, so to speak, before it comes to the Assembly for full debate. Again, Mr. Speaker, that is well cited. Of course, the direction to us from *Erskine May*, the 19th edition, is also clear.

Now, my colleague went on to quote *Beauchesne* 397, I believe. *Beauchesne* also speaks to amended notices. Mr. Speaker, the process of amended notices is one which in history is quite common. And of course that's why under *Beauchesne*, for example in 397, the process of providing amendments to motions is well accepted. Quoting from *Beauchesne*:

A modification of a notice . . . standing upon the *Notice Paper* is permitted, [if the amendment] does not exceed the scope of the original notice.

Now, what we have here is, first of all, reinforcement of the process itself, that in fact a notice can be amended. It is quite a traditional process and, in fact, traditionally has been part of the accommodation over the past few years. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, if we look further at *Beauchesne* -- and I'm looking here for direction -- at 367 of the 19th edition, it in fact restates essentially what *Beauchesne* has given to us.

Interestingly enough, there is a slight change if you move from *Erskine May*, 19th edition, to *Erskine May*, 20th edition. There is an interesting addition to the way in which amendments can be made. I draw to your attention, on page 378 of the 20th edition of *Erskine May*, the following quote:

Amendments may be tabled to motions as soon as they have been handed in to the Table Office. It is not necessary to wait until a motion has been published.

Well, what do we have here? We have a clear reference to a process which shows that should a regular motion be brought forward and due notice given in time, in fact it is quite appropri-

ate and quite within the customs of all parliamentary systems to adjust that motion. So what I have done here, first of all, is to establish that clearly the process is one which we followed. We essentially amended the motion; we provided due notice to the Assembly that that in fact was carried out. The citations, I think, reinforce that point.

Turning now to the second element of the argument which my colleague the Member for Calgary Buffalo raises; that is, whether or not this was a substantive change to the motion, Mr. Speaker. Of course, if it was in fact a substantive change, where you change the essence of the motion or change in fact what was intended to the motion, then you would have, I think, a legitimate reason to raise that question. Well, what we've done, Mr. Speaker, is to move under the irregular motions sections, at the advice of the Assembly, wherein we did not want to bring a motion forward which in an irregular way would cause any reflection upon the Speaker. So what we did is instead of indicating that you would have to be involved in deciding whether or not a case of breach of privilege had occurred, we simply indicated that the Assembly should make that decision. And that's not a substantive change; it's simply one which respects the traditions of the Assembly and which follows under the irregular motion proceedings. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, we did not at all change what was intended by the resolution, and in fact the words are essentially the same to the heart of this motion.

So on the question of substance, it is not a substantial change of the motion at all, Mr. Speaker. It is one which follows both the processes I've outlined and one which certainly has been given direction under the need to correct irregular motions. Moreover, the process itself shows that we can amend that motion at any point. So what we have done here is clearly to follow the process, to respect the traditions of this Assembly, and to proceed along the lines which have now become customarily agreed to by all members of this Assembly given the parliamentary tradition which is before us.

Mr. Speaker, without attempting to give you direction, it is clear in *Erskine May* that in any event this Assembly can agree as to whether or not this was a substantial change in the motion by a clear vote of this Assembly, and whatever the arguments may well be, it will be finally determined, I'm sure, on that basis. It is for the Assembly itself to decide whether or not this is a substantive change.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move that the point of order by the Member for Calgary Buffalo is in fact not of substance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm obliged, Mr. Speaker. There is only one motion before us, and it is the one standing on the Order Paper. Whatever we think of the substantive merits of that motion -- and we do have some thoughts about it here -- are irrelevant. The fact is that in order that it be properly considered at all by us, in my respectful submission, Mr. Speaker, it must conform to the standing order. And the standing order says very clearly that the motion must be filed not later than the end of the next sitting day. A motion was filed which was different from this. Now, if there had been a formal attempt to amend it in the proper way, before the Assembly, then perhaps there would have been an argument, but it wasn't that at all. It was a back-door process in which simply a different motion, which is the one before us, was substituted for something which in point of the standing order was a nullity, Mr. Speaker. So clearly the wrong motion was in time and the right motion out of time, and

whatever we think of the merits of it, there is a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. The Chair recognizes that the Member for Edmonton Strathcona has adjourned debate on the point of order. According to Standing Order 4(3),

at 1 o'clock Friday the Chair has no recourse but to adjourn the Assembly without question put until Monday at 2:30 p.m.

[At 1 p.m. the House adjourned until Monday at 2:30 p.m.]