

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, June 10, 1987 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 87/06/10

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

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

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

Amen.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, some distinguished visitors seated in your gallery. It is with some sadness that I do so, because it is a farewell introduction to this Assembly of a visitor who's been in Alberta on a number of occasions and who is just completing his responsibilities as the High Commissioner for the United Kingdom to Canada. Today Sir Derek Day is accompanied by his wife, Lady Day, and if I may, sir, introduce as well his charming daughter Kate, who is also visiting our province for the first time. They are accompanied in the gallery by Mr. and Mrs. John Doble. John Doble, of course, is the Consul General of Britain, and I would ask that hon. members welcome to the Assembly and bid farewell on this formal farewell occasion to Sir Derek and Lady Day.

head: **PRESENTING PETITIONS**

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the following petition that has been received for a private Bill:

the petition of Jimmy W. Chow for the Jimmy W. Chow Bar Admission Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the request from the hon. Member for Drumheller for concurrence on the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Private Bills ... Not that one. Good day to go straight. Is there concurrence from the Assembly?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

head: **PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Private Bills has had the following Bills under consideration and recommends that they be proceeded with: Bill Pr. 6, the Alberta

Wheat Pool Amendment Act, 1987; Bill Pr. 8, Edmonton Economic Development Authority Amendment Act, 1987. The Committee on Private Bills has further had the following Bills under consideration and recommends that they be proceeded with with certain amendments: Bill Pr. 15, Lake Bonavista Homeowners Association Ltd. Tax Exemption Act; Bill Pr. 16, Parkland Community Centre Calgary Ltd. Tax Exemption Act; Bill Pr. 17, Lake Bonaventure Residents Association Ltd. Tax Exemption Act; Bill Pr. 18, Midnapore Lake Residents Association Ltd. Tax Exemption Act; Bill Pr. 20, Institute of Canadian Indian Arts Act; Bill Pr. 23, Federal Canadian Trust & Bond Corporation Act. The Committee on Private Bills has further had the following Bills under consideration and recommends that they not be proceed with: Bill Pr. 9, Edmonton Convention and Tourism Authority Amendment Act, 1987; Bill Pr. 12, German-Canadian Cultural Association (Edmonton) Act.

I request the concurrence of the Assembly in these recommendations.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the request from the hon. Member for Drumheller for concurrence in the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, does the Assembly agree with the request?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 272

**An Act to Amend the
Public Highways Development Act**

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce today Bill 272, An Act to Amend the Public Highways Development Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to stop the nuisance of curbing. That is the illegal act of selling vehicles without licence on public streets, which becomes a nuisance to the people in the neighbourhoods.

[Leave granted; Bill 272 read a first time]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce today to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, some 46 grade 6 students from the Keheewin school in Edmonton Whitemud. They are accompanied by two teachers, Mr. Hanley and Mr. Tranter. They are in the members' gallery, and I would ask that they stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, 33 grade 5 students from the Spruce View elementary school in the constituency of Innisfail. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Marguerite Baker and six parents, Mrs. Jody Anderson, Mrs. Sandee Birse, Mrs. Linda Dutton, Mrs. Joyce Johansson, Mr. Dan Larsen, and Mr. Brian Henschel. They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and through you 16 grades 7 and 8 students from the Woking school in the wonderful constituency of Dunvegan. They are accompanied by two teachers, Mr. Jim Gurnett and Mr. Keith Tomalty, and one chaperone, Mrs. Anne Tomalty. I'm sure that most of you know that Jim is the former New Democrat Member for Dunvegan. They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask them to rise. Give them the usual welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Stony Plain, followed by the Minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications. Sorry, Calgary McCall.

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity today to introduce a hardworking young gentleman who is a member of the Marlborough community in the great constituency of Calgary McCall. He has traveled to Edmonton to watch the action in the Legislature. I would ask Duncan Murray if he would rise and receive the cordial welcome of the Assembly.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, 16 students from grade 6 at the Glendale school with their teacher, Mrs. Wischer and parents, Mrs. Lucas and Mrs. Neilson. I would ask them to rise and be accorded a warm welcome by the Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Health Care Cuts

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct the first question to the minister of hospitals and medicare. The annual reports tabled by the minister yesterday indicate that the Conservative government has once again succeeded in making a number of physicians very wealthy. I don't doubt that the medical profession must be grateful to this minister who has boosted the average doctor's income in excess of \$150,000 a year. The minister, it's said, told the news media that he knows personally of one doctor who received between \$600,000 and \$700,000. Rather than deal with this problem, the minister has launched an unwarranted attack on the patients of other health care professionals, namely physiotherapy, chiropractics, and optometry.

My question to the minister: does he fail to appreciate that the figures that he tabled in this Legislature yesterday are the clearest indication yet that he has brought in the wrong solution to the wrong problem?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, once again the hon. Leader of the Opposition has failed to read the entire report. The statistical supplement that was tabled yesterday, which includes the information the hon. leader is referring to, notes on page 9 that "The statistics in the following tables cannot be used as an accurate measure of a full-time practitioner's income ..." and it gives a number of reasons why. It would have been useful for the hon. leader to have reviewed that and then to have looked at the statistics themselves wherein it's indicated that some 17 different medical practitioners had received some \$95 million in payments.

In fact, 16 of those are for laboratories that employ any num-

ber of people. There are upwards of 30 or 40 people working in some of those labs. The system as well is that whoever is the owner of the laboratory -- the medical doctor in most cases -- bills the health care plan in that individual's name.

In addition to that, the hon. leader should be aware that the one ophthalmologist who has billed something like \$1.28 million to the plan is the Gimbel Eye clinic in Calgary, which is world renowned for its services and in fact employs more than 50 people. So if the hon. leader had taken the opportunity, as many did, yesterday and today to not only read the report but inquire as to the real meanings there, he would have learned that there are in fact reasons why those payments show up as large as they do.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I was going by the minister's own books, I didn't think he'd table inaccurate information. To follow up on this a little more specifically then, I noticed that the doctors billed the plan for roughly \$550 million. The other specialities that I'm talking about: \$67 million in total. If this minister is serious about rising costs, why didn't he concentrate on the \$550 million rather than the \$67 million?

MR. M. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, we did. We took a number of approaches to try to curtail the rising costs of health care services. Members will recall that during the estimates and at other times I indicated that the actual amount expended for basic health services paid to all practitioners last year was \$694 million. We budgeted the same in 1987-88, and we took a number of initiatives that I announced three weeks ago yesterday to try to curtail that increase.

With respect to medical practitioners, we've been involved as well in discussions about limiting the number of medical doctors that might be able to bill the health care insurance plan. We've been involved in discussions about limiting laboratory tests and other kinds of tests that are very costly. We've been involved in a number of discussions involving our citizens signing the bill when they go to the doctor's office so that they and the medical profession have a better idea of what costs are.

Unfortunately, the Canada Health Act prevents us from levying any kind of a user fee on visits to medical doctors' offices, and it also prevents the doctor from billing anything to the patient directly. So medical doctors are stuck in this problem with the Canada Health Act where they can't bill the patient directly, and we can't apply any kind of a deterrent fee there at all. The situation is quite different with respect to the other professions like optometrists, physiotherapists, chiropractors, podiatrists, dentists. For that portion of their work that's done outside of the hospital system in terms of surgery, they are able to bill the patient some amount directly. We've taken that approach with them.

On balance, I think we've taken an extremely fair approach across the board, and the changes we've made hopefully will result in a balanced budget this year.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. It's typical of Conservatives. The only thing they can think of in cutting back fees is deterrent fees, Mr. Speaker. They're missing the whole point.

Let's look at the labs, for example. I notice they're up by 15 percent to a level of \$2.2 million each, some \$82 million. Now, I wonder if the minister could be a little more specific. Other than setting up a utilization committee and discussions, what concrete measures has the minister taken to curb these private laboratories that have risen up to \$82 million? And I'd point out

that this is a lot more money than contraceptive counseling, which is a preventive measure.

MR. M. MOORE: The private laboratories do not perform the tests unless they're ordered by a medical doctor. Quite frankly, the situation is, I believe, that the private labs are able to provide those tests equally well if not better than the labs which exist in our hospital system. So the problem isn't one of getting rid of the private sector, as the NDP would want to do in this province, but rather one of finding out how we can utilize these testing procedures differently and hopefully cut down on the increase in the number of tests that occur.

We're working with the utilization committee involving staff of my department, the Alberta Medical Association, and hopefully the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Alberta Hospital Association to see what can be done in that area. But I just conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that our objective is not to throw out the private sector.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's very generous of you. I'm sure they appreciate it. The point is the doctors are giving cyanate to their own labs. That's part of the problem. Surely even this minister must be aware of that. I notice the medical doctor over there is getting excited, but I'll deal with the minister.

To look at the minister's annual report shows that just over \$9 million was paid last year with optometric services, and that was out of a total budget of \$750 million. I notice that's 1.2 percent of the cost. That's what we attack. I ask the minister: why did he pick this rather insignificant cost to cut instead of dealing with the real problems of rising costs, dealing with the whole fee-for-service problem? I notice that's gone up \$53 million, an increase of 9.5 percent.

MR. M. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, we did in fact address the problems of optometric care and I think in a very responsible way. First of all, the optometrists have been saying for some length of time that they wanted parity with ophthalmologists in terms of the amount paid by the health care insurance plan for a basic eye examination. So we did move that from \$24.75, I believe it was, to \$31 and something, effective August 1.

We then looked at how we could save funds in that area and decided that children should continue to have full coverage by the health care insurance plan up to the age of 18 and that seniors should be covered as well. We felt that those people in between, which wouldn't be more than two people in each family at the most, would be able to pay \$31 a year or every two years, whatever the case may be, for an eye examination. We didn't think that was an unwarranted expectation to make of people for their eye care.

I'm confident that the optometrists in this province will be as busy as they ever were after August 1, because I think in fact that many people, when they go to an optometrist and come home with a bill for \$200 and perhaps more for eyeglasses and frames, don't even know that the cost of the actual eye exam was paid for by the Alberta health care insurance plan. So I expect there will be adequate opportunities for optometrists to deliver eye care under the new schedule of benefits. As far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, it's entirely fair to everyone.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Edmonton Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Albertans are of ne-

cessity concerned when they read about the income levels in the morning paper. To the minister: do we have an automatic review mechanism of doctors' billing that kicks in at a certain level? If we don't, why don't we?

MR. M. MOORE: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes, we do.

MR. SPEAKER: Second main question, Leader of the Opposition.

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

Women's Emergency Shelters

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. As one in every 10 or 1 million Canadian women are battered by male partners according to a report released today, this means that 55,000 Alberta women are similarly assaulted. This is a social problem that must be addressed by a number of government departments, as recommended in the 1984 federal/provincial/territorial report on wife battering. As this report made a point of recommending that the Alberta government maintain adequate funding for assaulted women and their children, how is it that inadequate funding levels are forcing two Calgary battered women's shelters to close 10 of 32 much-needed beds?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, funding has not been reduced for the Calgary shelters.

MS LAING: Nevertheless, it is inadequate because women are turned away on a constant basis.

As the Minister of Social Services apparently does not recognize the extent and the seriousness of the problem and will not extend adequate funding to women's shelters, will the Premier advise the minister to review the current situation and ensure that adequate allowances are made to these shelters?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Minister of Social Services will want to deal with the matter when she returns to the House.

MS LAING: It's irresponsible of everyone in this government.

As the report prepared for ministers responsible for the status of women also recommended a media campaign similar to AADAC's to convey society's abhorrence of this crime, when is this government going to put in place a campaign?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, again I'm sure the Minister of Social Services will want to deal with that when she returns to the House.

MS LAING: To the Premier again. As further recommendations of this report indicate the need for data to determine the extent and exact nature of this problem as well as for the need for more outreach and support programs, for example through community health nurses, will the Premier ensure that the government will implement these recommendations?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, in every society -- and Alberta is not different -- there are problems. There are problems that we all face and struggle with. The problems that frustrate us all, the problems of the poor, the hungry, drugs, the problem of battered

wives, abused children: all of those problems are not unique to Alberta. We certainly have them here. What we try to do is do everything possible to solve those problems and help people. That's what our government is doing.

Now, it's certain that any member can focus on any one of these things at any time and, I suppose, get a certain amount of recognition for having done it. Nevertheless, what the government is doing is trying to deal with these matters, that are matters worldwide in society, in every way we possibly can. We have been doing that; we will do it in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: Red Deer North.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary to the Attorney General. Given the fact that this report clearly states that battery also includes women who are insulted by their husbands and women whose husbands don't give them enough spending money, could the Attorney General tell us what would be the actual numbers of women in this province who are physically battered by their husbands?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to gauge exactly the number of women who are the subject of abuse that would constitute criminal abuse such as assault and battery. The difficulty is compounded as well by the fact that in many cases after complaints have been laid, the spouses do not wish to continue with the action and request that charges be withdrawn. In recognition of this serious concern, it has been the policy of the law enforcement agencies to continue to proceed with the charges despite the fact that spouses often, as I say, wish to have charges withdrawn.

It's a very difficult issue, and I know I've had discussions with the members of the Assembly, including the Member for Edmonton Avonmore who initiated this series of questions, about the concerns that the law enforcement agencies and the courts have relative to this serious problem. I cannot give any hard statistics on the number of women who are -- or men for that matter, spouses, let me put it in that way -- assaulted by the other spouse. But whenever those cases come to the attention of law enforcement agencies, they are instructed to proceed, when possible to do so.

Of course, I could obtain the statistics on the number of cases that are in fact carried through, but I don't have those at my fingertips. I must say, Mr. Speaker, the government views with great concern violence towards individual citizens of this province, no matter how that violence originates: in the home or in the streets or otherwise. We want to do what we can as a government to prevent it from happening and to cure those people who are involved in those acts when they do occur.

MR. CHUMIR: To the Premier. Can he explain why the government is sitting with millions and millions of dollars of unallocated lottery funds and is prepared to allow 20 beds for the most needy women and children in our community to close for the lack of \$200,000?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the council in charge of sheltered homes has been allocating the money. The government has given them as much money as it gave them last year, which was enough to do the job. They have been allocating the money, not the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Main question, Westlock-Sturgeon.

Husky Oil Upgrader

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the Premier. It's with respect to the Husky upgrader, I share the concern of most Albertans with regard to the fate of this upgrader, but I am hopeful it will go ahead. I don't want to see a deal made just to make a deal; it has to make good economic sense. It also concerns me that the company in question, Husky Oil, has a large foreign ownership and has very close ties, along with its parent company, Nova, not only with this government but with the Premier in the past.

Could the Premier tell the House whether the guarantees provided Husky for the upgrader could be used by other groups willing to go ahead with their own upgrader? Would he make the same offer to other groups?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, we never made an offer to anybody. We were approached by Husky, and Husky has asked under certain conditions for support that would allow them to go ahead. We as a province did come up with support, entered into an agreement to have it go ahead, and that was a matter that the federal government did not feel they could proceed with. Now we are exploring additional ways to see if the Husky upgrader can proceed.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to be specific in terms of any ties I might have with Husky.

MR. SPEAKER: As a matter of fact, hon. member, there will be no more comments about that -- order please -- because the Premier filed a statement of holdings, as all members of the cabinet have done. Therefore, no more comments along that line.

MR. TAYLOR: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This is a point of fact. Would you take it down. This is a point of fact. [interjections] We'll take it up later.

MR. SPEAKER: At the end of question period.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, definitely. I think you're completely out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Perhaps the supplementary question.

MR. TAYLOR: The supplementary question is what I'm proceeding for. In view of the comments he just said, Mr. Speaker, the Husky upgrader -- it should be any upgrader. In view of the comments of the throne speech as follows, and I'll read it, Mr. Speaker:

... my government invites all those who have interests in potential oil sands and heavy oil projects to bring specific proposals forward for consideration.

Now, has the government received proposals to develop a heavy oil upgrader in the province from any other groups or companies in view of this request?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, there may have been something that I'm not familiar with to the Minister of Energy very recently, but up until my current knowledge on it, there have been none.

MR. TAYLOR: My big concern is that other companies won't be allowed the opportunity to obtain a deal similar to that which

Husky may get. But in light of this, will the Premier assure the House that the details of any offer made to Husky will be made public and will be debated in the House before any formal signing of an agreement will take place?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the government is elected to make decisions and represent the people of Alberta. We will do that.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, this seems to be in keeping. Whether it's the doctors for \$600 million, whether it's signing a new Constitution, or whether it's giving your friends a new upgrader, it's all supposed to be railroaded through.

Now, has the government considered the construction of an upgrader which would be co-operatively owned by the heavy oil producers in a manner similar as you know we do with gas plants, which are run on a cost basis and on a co-operative basis?

MR. GETTY: If the hon. member is trying to describe a utility type of upgrader, Mr. Speaker, that has been considered.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. To the Premier. Has the government then given any consideration to equity participation by the province of Alberta to make sure that that upgrader project goes ahead?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that in the course of the various discussions with Husky that option has been discussed. Yes.

Small Power Producers

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. The government has indicated to the Athabasca small power producers -- potential producers -- that they should make a mini-application. Has the Premier assured himself that the cost of that miniapplication is within the means of those persons that will present the application?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm assured of that by the Minister of Transportation and Utilities, who may wish to add to that answer.

MR. ADAIR: I'd be delighted to, Mr. Speaker. In a meeting that occurred within the last three to four weeks, we had a number of the farmers who were involved in the end project, we had the proponents of the project itself, we had their lawyers, a member of the ERCB, who explained the process and the use of what they call the five-page application, which is a shortened application. My understanding as recently as two days ago was that their lawyer is working on an application with the ERCB.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister or the Premier. In terms of the principle of price for power produced by small power producers, and in this case the Athabasca group, is it the principle of government that the price paid to the small power producers would be the same price as that paid to the larger producers in the province of Alberta? Or is it the policy of the government that the price paid between the large producers and small producers would have a difference?

MR. ADAIR: If you recall, Mr. Speaker, not too long ago we indicated that there would be a public inquiry that would be a joint hearing between the PUB and the ERCB and that all proponents of the small power -- which, incidentally, we support -- would have the opportunity to appear before the joint committee to allow them to make some recommendations to us as to what would be defined as a small power producer, what would be defined as the amount of power that could be allocated to, say, a plant, whether it's 25 megawatts, 30 megawatts, or the likes of that, and what would be the prices that could be considered for something along that line.

One of the questions that was raised by the proponent was a request to have the same price as the Genesee plant, and at that particular time I suggested that that would mean the possibility of waiting until the PUB hears their application for their rate -- some time in 1989, I believe.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Could he indicate what steps will be taken in terms of expediting this application once it's presented, in terms of the need for the jobs in the area and the need for economic development being somewhat of a rush at the present time?

MR. ADAIR: I can appreciate that last particular point, Mr. Speaker, but I think at this particular stage it's in the hands of the developers or the proponents of the Southview project. They're the ones who are at this particular point in time very, very much interested in the project are prepared to put the dollars into the project and get it going. And we have basically opened all the doors that I'm aware of to allow that to begin to happen, even to the point that the last two meetings that were called were called by me to in fact try and see if we could expedite it a little faster.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It's on the same matter but to the Premier, because I think it's his donkey that was being beaten on this case. In view of the fact that we're shoving this group into public hearings when the Premier won't even give Meech Lake public hearings, would the Premier go so far as to pay for the costs of the public hearing? Because this is a small group fighting some of the biggest mightiest wealthiest companies in this province who will be stopping it.

MR. ADAIR: As a matter of fact Mr. Speaker, I can respond in part to that. The Small Power Producers Association of the province of Alberta will be making a representation on behalf of all the small power producers, and we're working with them right now on a budget that they are preparing to allow us to meet a commitment that we'd made some three or four years ago to assist them if we get to a public inquiry. I qualify that because it is a public inquiry not a public hearing, a public inquiry where ERCB and PUB can make recommendations to us as a government that we can then deal with at that time.

MR. PIQUETTE: To the Premier. Why isn't the government prepared to sign a letter of intent with Southview Fibre Tech, subject to the plant meeting all the existing environmental and electrical safety regulations, in order to get this project back on track?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister has just said this already, but I'll say it again. The government is doing everything possible to help the proposers of this project. What they

haven't done is come forward with the official requests. The government is trying to help them in every way possible. I would love to seem them push on and get it done, but the minister has to call the meetings.

MR. SPEAKER: Red Deer South, followed by Edmonton Highlands.

Department of the Solicitor General Staff Cuts

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Solicitor General. I know that all ministers were forced to make some very difficult decisions in adhering to the recent budget restraint, and I noted from the estimates that there was a reduction of permanent or full-time positions from 3,110 to 2,736, or a net reduction of 374 positions in his department.

Now, I'm confident the Solicitor General would not compromise the safety of Albertans, but will the minister comment on the impact a reduction of 374 full-time positions in his department will have on security in the province's correctional centres, particularly on our maximum security facilities such as the Calgary Remand Centre?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, the department actually takes quite a bit of pride in effecting the abolishment of 374 positions out of an overall 1,300 and some odd that the government has been able to reduce. But the real element of pride comes where we've only had to issue 15 layoff notices, and those resulted only because spouses couldn't accommodate transfers.

When we were addressing this rationalization, we did assess the potential impact that this cutback would have on a satisfactory level of security, and we decided not to alter the staff configuration within security units or cell blocks, especially where there's supervision of prisoners. In Calgary there are 224 positions. Only six were reduced; four came from management administration, two from the corrections officers' ranks.

The highest security requirements do come from Calgary and from Edmonton, although I would not call them maximum security facilities because we don't have any of those under provincial jurisdictions. Those are federal jurisdictions.

MR. OLDRING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Solicitor General. We are about to see the completion of the Red Deer Remand Centre, which was built in response to a specific demand and need. I understand now that this facility will only be partially staffed and will be operating at only 50 percent of capacity. Would the minister confirm the status of this needed facility?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, the Red Deer Remand Centre will be opening -- I think the opening is scheduled for sometime in May. When it was in the planning stages, there was a far higher demand as a prison as well as a holding facility. We are opening it on a reduced manpower contingent and a reduced operating contingent. When the demand increases, we will increase the manpower and operation of the facility.

MR. OLDRING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Solicitor General. Will the minister advise the Assembly how these staff cuts will affect the inmate work programs, which provide hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of labour to Alberta forestry, other government departments, and in particular to municipalities and nonprofit organizations?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, the inmate work programs are important to the mental and physical condition of the inmates. As well, as the hon. member has mentioned, it does provide a great deal of material service to nonprofit groups, to municipalities, and other government departments. These programs will continue in forestry camps, and there will be community work projects working from major institutions, such as the Calgary institution providing a number of projects for the Olympics.

MR. OLDRING: A final supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. None of us appreciate lengthy delays or long lineups. Would the minister advise this Assembly how these reductions will affect service to Albertans at motor vehicle offices?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, the motor vehicle division staff contingent was reduced 51 positions. We're offsetting some of this decrease by employing the mail-in system of renewal of licences. Twenty-eight percent of the renewals are done by mail-in. We have a monthly renewal as against a yearly renewal, which helps avoid the lineups. We are experimenting with a weekly renewal basis as well as experimenting with a machine that would dispense the renewal tabs so that they can be accessed at off hours and during the evenings, and we hope that will prove out to be successful.

MR. PIQUETTE: A supplementary to the Solicitor General. Why was the successful Beaver Lake native correction facility near Lac La Biche closed down in March, putting seven workers on UIC? What was the rationale behind that?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the seven native workers going on UIC, but the Beaver Lake facility was rationalized with the Footner Lake facility where we could deliver a more effective service without running the two camps together. The Footner Lake facility was in much better condition and could be operated at a more economical rate than the Beaver Lake.

MR. CHUMIR: It's nice to see savings made by the cutting of 374 staff, but I'm wondering why the minister would not increase staff in the juvenile institutions, particularly for psychologists and psychiatrists, in light of the inordinate degree of overcrowding that has taken place since the number of juveniles in prison has increased dramatically under the Young Offenders Act.

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I'm not so sure there was a question there, but I wouldn't want the member to mislead the House that there is a severe overcrowding situation with young offenders facilities. There was such a problem when we commenced the session approximately a year ago; that has been overcome. We are constantly working with the mental health aspect of the young offender and have made great strides in that regard as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Highlands, followed by Edmonton Meadowlark.

Private Vocational Schools

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Minister of Advanced Education. The Private Voca-

tional Schools Act and its regulations are quite clear. Exaggerating claims about the value of courses offered, luring students to enroll in courses in a misleading fashion are forbidden, and competent instruction must be provided. I've raised with the Advanced Education minister a number of concerns related to alleged breaches of these rules by the Computer Career Institute, and I'm not actually satisfied with his answers to date. I wonder if the minister will now admit that his department has failed to exert proper control over this particular institute, such that it, CCI, has taken undue liberty with the regulations governing it.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be premature to accept as fact the allegations made by the hon. member. Certainly there are situations, not only at that particular private vocational school but at others, that are under investigation from time to time. And the hon. member is quite correct insofar as government regulations are concerned respecting advertising or the return of tuition fees.

With respect to the particular case to which she is referring, that is currently still under investigation. In my view the proper process is being followed. If it is appropriate, the department will step in as required by the regulations.

MS BARRETT: Well, a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It's actually more than one constituent; it's many disillusioned CCI students and former students who have been in touch with me alleging that they have been led down the garden path and that they've gone into debt for courses that aren't going to be recognized by the CGA or NAIT. I wonder now if the minister is prepared to say if CCI -- that's the institute -- is going to have to repay these people, if the department is going to refund the money to those students . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MS BARRETT: This is the question. . . . or if the students themselves are going to be left holding the bag. Will he tell us which way it's going to go?

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the process that is followed is that in the case of a dispute, if it's brought to our attention, we try and get the school and the students together. In most cases whatever misunderstanding, whether it involves a refund or not, is usually resolved at that level. That's the state we're at now with respect to the group of students the member refers to and the Computer Career Institute.

If they are unable to resolve their disagreement, then certainly we're prepared to step in, whether it's tomorrow or next week or whenever we need to. Certainly there's a great deal of misunderstanding. The briefing I have received isn't clear as to whether or not the students believed they were getting something or whether they were told they were getting something. It's going to take a little while to straighten that out, but Dr. Henry and other officials in the department are working on it.

We've also been after the entire system to clear up their advertising, because I think some of that has been perhaps misleading insofar as government financial support is concerned.

What we're dealing with here this year, Mr. Speaker, is really just a tip of the iceberg. Enrollment in the private vocational schools has gone up in the past few years from 5,000 to 30,000, and we have presently pending another 120 applications for that many more private vocational schools. Certainly the

capacity of the Students Finance Board to support that many students at those high tuition levels is not within our reach at this time. So the hon. member is quite correct in identifying a problem that is growing.

MS BARRETT: Well, a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. On the advertising then, does the minister now recognize that in fact in the newspaper and even at their open house the Computer Career Institute is still riding on a government-sponsored program in order to lure people into other courses on what are allegedly misleading bases?

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether the hon. member is referring to courses which are supported through the department of career development or financial support which is given to all postsecondary schools through the Students Finance Board. It was the latter that we had been involved with. I'm not aware of any improper advertising with respect to the former.

MS BARRETT: Well, a final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I was referring to the Career Development and Employment programs. But remember that they are used in the context of luring students to other programs.

I wonder if the minister will now admit that the reason he changed the regulations under this Act on May 15, 1987, was in fact not to further ensure quality education for students at this and other such institutions but in fact to widen the loopholes so that they would legally be allowed to continue to do what they're doing.

MR. RUSSELL: Well, absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. I referred to the growing size of the problem. To put it bluntly, there used to be people in the business of education, and now there are many groups that perceive education as a business. That is going to change the rules, and it's going to require, I think, a greater degree of watching over by the government. Our department is prepared to do that and has started that.

But to conclude this matter, getting back to the original question raised by the member -- had there been misleading information given to one or more students at the time of their enrollment? -- it is going to be very difficult to adjudicate. It's gotten down to a he-said they-said kind of situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton Meadowlark, followed by Edmonton Glengarry.

Government Travel

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm concerned about the fiscal management of this government and about the manner in which it sets its priorities. This government -- that can't find money for women's shelters, can't find money for community schools, can't find money to feed Calgary school-children -- spent at least \$73 million more on government travel over the last five years than the government of B.C.

I'm directing my question to the Attorney General. Could the Attorney General please provide this House with justification for his trip to Naples, Florida, on February 13, 1987, to discuss free trade with Florida at about the time that it must have been 10 or 15 or 20 below in Edmonton?

MR. HORSMAN: The hon. member will be pleased to know

that for the last two and a half years I have been the co-chairman with the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders in the United States of a series of seminars dealing with matters of interest to legislators at the provincial government level in Canada and legislative leaders in the United States. The conference which was held in Naples, Florida, had been arranged as part of that process.

I'm pleased to advise that the sister conference will be sponsored by British Columbia in July of this year to carry on with the discussions which took place in that seminar in Florida, at which governments were represented from across Canada, including Quebec with a Liberal government, Ontario with a Liberal government, Manitoba with a New Democratic government, and of course Alberta and other provinces and the territories. These seminars and conferences which have been held have been extremely useful.

I'm pleased as well to advise that Alberta hosted a conference of a similar nature on the subject of tourism at Banff in the fall of last year. I intend fully, as minister of intergovernmental affairs, not as Attorney General, to continue to enhance and promote a good working relationship with legislative leaders in the United States of America and with legislative leaders in Canada.

MR. MITCHELL: It's always easy to find reasons to spend money, very difficult to find reasons not to spend money.

Will the Attorney General please tell the House why it is that when he assumed responsibilities for the Department of Advanced Education and later for the Department of FIGA, his travel expenses doubled and tripled over those travel expenses incurred by his predecessors? What's going on here?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister, there's a difficulty because we can't deal with that aspect of the question dealing with a previous portfolio.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, I do want to set the matter straight, Mr. Speaker. My predecessor lived in Edmonton. I live in Medicine Hat. I travel to and from my constituency every week. My family has not moved here. I feel it's important to set the record straight. It is my intention to continue to live in Medicine Hat and to visit my family every weekend, and if he would have me do otherwise, well, I am very sorry to hear that.

My travel expenses, which are reported annually, include weekly travel between Medicine Hat and Edmonton. That is one of the major reasons for an increase in expenditure on my travel, and I think it would be entirely improper for me to abandon my family. [interjections]

MR. MITCHELL: Yeah, a hundred dollars a week is hardly a significant portion . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. The time for question period has expired. Might we have unanimous consent to complete this series of questions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair hears a no. The time for question period has expired. However . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, the no was from over there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: There, there.

MR. SPEAKER: It didn't really sound like post World War I, but it was almost like singing "Over There, Over There."

The Chair recognizes points of order from Westlock-Sturgeon and Edmonton Meadowlark.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is simple. You called me out of order, and I just wanted to know what reason you based that on. It's not a question of a point of order, it's just to find out why I was called out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: On this particular occasion the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon was called out of order. And by now reading the various citations -- there will be no discussion of the points of order on this particular aspect. But the citation to be given is really *Beauchesne* 359, subsection (7):

A question must adhere to the proprieties of the House, in terms of inferences, imputing motives or casting aspersions upon persons within the House or out of it.

That also relates with regard to Standing Order 23(1):

A member will be called to order by Mr. Speaker if that member:

introduces any matter in debate which, in the opinion of Mr. Speaker, offends the practices and precedents of the Assembly.

With due respect to the hon. member, while indeed the member did cite a fact which was the case before the Premier took office, the matter of trying to impute guilt or any other kind of false motive by innuendo is really not a feature of the parliamentary traditions of this Legislature. And as for that, the matter of statements of holdings have been duly filed with the Legislative Assembly Office by all members of the Assembly.

The Chair recognizes Edmonton Meadowlark.

MR. TAYLOR: [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, hon. member. That isn't the way the place functions. Edmonton Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. As I rose to ask my third supplementary and began to speak, it was then that the bell went and you rose and asked for permission of the House to continue. The practice in this House has always been that once a member is speaking, they are able to finish their talk and get their question or answer out before you ask to continue the question period. I still believe, therefore, that I have one question at least left, and if we ask that question again perhaps the courtesy of this government back bench would be to allow me to continue in discussing an extremely important expenditure matter on a government that has a great deal of difficulty in setting priorities fairly in this province.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. You do indeed state what is the general practice of the House, but it is not the

exclusive practice of the House. There have been other occasions . . .

MR. MITCHELL: So it's a question of convenience.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, the Chair was indeed expressing its sympathy for your position. Nevertheless, the practice of the House is to request unanimous consent. The House is not bound to give unanimous consent. Therefore, on this day you failed. But I'm quite certain that the member will be back for a few more days of dialogue and opportunity in terms of question period.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: First I wonder if all . . . [interjection] Orders of the Day have been called, and I wonder if the House might join me in extending congratulations to the hon. Minister of Community and Occupational Health and his wife on the birth of a daughter. [applause]

Might we revert briefly to the Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (*reversion*)

MR. PIQUETTE: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly -- and I would ask them to rise as I introduce them -- Mr. Mike Demko, an Athabasca area farmer and spokesman for a group of local residents concerned about the stalled negotiations between Southview Fibra Tech and the Alberta government and with him are Mr. Gordon Clarke, Mr. Butch Drozdziuk, and Mr. Jim Kosyk. I would like the members of the Assembly to give them a warm welcome for working so hard on behalf of the proposed small power project north of Athabasca.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, under the strength of getting kicked out of the House, I would like to introduce the former director of Nova corporation, our Premier.

head: PRIVATE BILLS (*Third Reading*)

Bill Pr. 19 Calgary Assessment of Annexed Lands Act, 1987

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill Pr. 19, Calgary Assessment of Annexed Lands Act, 1987.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: There's a call for the question. Calgary Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Yes, I would very briefly simply like to express my reservations about that aspect of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, that would take away the right of those who have commenced legal actions at the time of the passage of this legislation to continue those actions. This is an interference with existing legal rights rather than a confirmation of what was perceived to be the previous position, as is the case with the rest of the

legislation. That is, the general purpose of sections 1 and 2 is to confirm and to fortify other previous interpretations of the law. But it goes further and affects two pieces of action with respect to section 1 and three pieces of litigation with respect to section 2, and I expressed reservations on second reading. I asked for a justification of that on the basis of principle and need in light of its extraordinary nature. I've not received a satisfactory explanation and, in the absence of that, would not feel able to support this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I spoke at some length on this at second reading, so I won't repeat what I said there; simply to sum up my objection, which I tender with regret to this Bill because I do think the city of Calgary deserves it, in point of the breach of natural justice, as I see it and a failure effectively to notify those whose rights are being taken away of that fact.

MR. SPEAKER: Call for the question. Will the Member for Calgary North Hill sum up?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, just briefly to the Member for Calgary Buffalo and in particular to refer to section 2, I think it's very important to note that section 2 of the Bill does not extinguish any existing legal rights to pursue claims for repayment of taxes paid in years gone by. Those rights were already extinguished by virtue of the passage of the six-month period. As to their ability to pursue their actions in any event, they may do so. They will have to, of course, get over the argument with respect to the Charter and prove the legislation of this province, section 30 of the Tax Recovery Act, as being invalid. That is still open to them to pursue. Section 1 is a different case, and I believe all members understand the circumstances in respect to that.

Mr. Speaker, in closing debate, I just want to express my appreciation for the comments of all members. The Bill certainly has been surrounded by considerable misunderstanding and misinformation, which has resulted unfortunately in a degree of apprehension for several landowners in Calgary. However, in the final analysis I believe this is a very important Bill for all Calgarians, based on the principle of fairness and equity in the municipal tax system, and I urge all members to support the Bill.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 19 read a third time]

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

Bill 9 Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1987

DR. CASSIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move that Bill 9, the Highway Traffic Amendment Act 1987, be moved for the third time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: A call for the question. The hon. Member for Calgary North West has moved third reading of Bill 9, Highway Traffic Amendment Act 1987. Those willing to give their assent to third reading, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Gogo	Oldring
Alger	Hawkesworth	Orman
Barrett	Heron	Pashak
Betkowski	Hewes	Payne
Campbell	Isley	Pengelly
Cassin	Johnston	Piquette
Cherry	Jonson	Roberts
Chumir	Koper	Rostad
Clegg	Kowalski	Russell
Crawford	Laing	Shrake
Cripps	Martin	Sigurdson
Day	McEachern	Sparrow
Downey	Mirosh	Stewart
Drobot	Mitchell	Strong
Elliott	Mjolsness	Taylor
Elzinga	Moore, M.	Weiss
Ewasiuk	Musgreave	Wright
Fjordbotten	Musgrove	Young
Fox	Nelson	Younie
Gibeault		

Totals Ayes - 58 Noes - 0

[Motion carried; Bill 9 read a third time]

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

Bill 39

Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act, 1987

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill 39, the Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act, 1987.

In doing so, I will only make one or two very brief comments: firstly, to put on the record the fact that we've now had an opportunity in this Assembly to debate and to consider the expenditure priorities of this government as reflected in this Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act, which provides dollars to hospitals, to advanced education, and to environment totaling \$317,408,000. There has been, I think, a fairly fair and full debate about those priorities. It's not for me to restate them at this point. I should note secondly, however, that Alberta's very fortunate in that we have a very vast so-called infrastructure of public services system in this province which until last year was paid for by ongoing expenditures of this government and which I think, in terms of matching with other provinces, must be seen to be one of the best there is in any province. I think all Albertans take pride in that, and that's why I'm sure that in this particular piece of legislation there will be significant support. In fact, I would assume there to be unanimous support for these spending priorities, for these social priorities, and for these very major investments which the province has made in some of the best public services I've ever seen.

As well, Mr. Speaker, it would be inappropriate if I missed an opportunity to indicate publicly that with respect to this fund we have now put in place the adequate resources to fund the

\$317 million requirement through 1987, and therefore there should be no doubt at all that in fact the expenditures can take place. Of course I'm referring to the very successful Alberta capital bond fund issue, which raised at least three times as much money as was necessary to fund this particular vote and, I think, is part of the significant response by Albertans to ensure these kinds of spending priorities, these kinds of investments such as those indicated here in hospitals, education, and environment are maintained. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think it is safe to say that we can continue with this program. We do have the funds in place, and it seems to me it's a significant priority of all Albertans as reflected in the [inaudible] capital bond issue.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased for the second time to introduce the appropriation Act dealing with these important priorities, and without any further delay I would move second reading of Bill 39, Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act 1987.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions and comments. This Bill 39 asks for \$317.4 million in capital projects, and these are the kinds of projects that mostly we could not complain about. We've had quite a bit of debate about the hospital and medical care part of the budget which is the bigger part and the education ones -- I have a question left over from there, however -- and the environment ones.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

I suppose in looking to a principle, since this is second reading you have to think in terms of why this part of the capital budget is isolated in this particular vote. I don't intend to dwell a long time on that but would point out that there's some \$1.2 billion in the ordinary general expenditures budgets of the province that we went through in the budget estimates. We got two days to discuss this \$317 million, which was none too much, but I suppose I might point out that that was much more than we got to debate some of the parts of the budget. I think of the social services part for instance. We got two days on that. Some \$2.6 billion in expenditures there only got two days in this House, and on top of that the minister did a sort of minifilibuster to make sure we didn't get too many comments in from this side of the House. A similar thing with education: \$1.3 billion there, and we only got one day to discuss that. So this part of the budget I guess, has had a little more debate than perhaps some other parts of the budget relatively speaking.

I did look at the 1986-87 fiscal year numbers as well as, of course, the '87-88 when the documents were produced. In comparing that to some of the comments in the budget speech, I found some anomalies that I would like the Treasurer to perhaps explain. I did put them on the record the other day, but perhaps he didn't see them.

In the '86-87 fiscal year there was some \$377 million estimated to be the expenditures comparable to this Bill. The budget speech said that some \$71 million of that was not spent because of the freeze, I believe was the reason given. But when you looked at the latest figure for '86-87, the sort of last best guess as the new budget was produced, the amount indicated was \$333 million for the 1986-87 year. Now, the \$71 million of course is not the difference between \$377 million and \$333 million, so I'm just wondering what the discrepancies are there.

There was also ... When you talk about the freeze on capi-

tal expenditures last fall. I do think some specific projects were allowed to go ahead and maybe some of these were. We also had what turns out to be a conflicting trend also, the statement by the government that because it was a mild winter we were able to spend more on capital projects than we might have otherwise, so things didn't slow down as much over the winter. So I'm just wondering if the Treasurer would be able to rationalize those numbers for us and what happened. It's not particularly criticism; I'm sure there is an explanation. I'm just wondering why the numbers don't jibe and what are the explanations.

I also asked a question of the Minister of Advanced Education, and although he commented on it and I looked very carefully at it, he probably doesn't have the answer and perhaps the Treasurer, because he's responsible for the money side of it and it was more the moneys than the program, would just comment on this and give me some idea as to the government's thinking in the future on this program. It's the endowment program for the universities, where if somebody gives \$500 million to the university for a chair, then the government will match them 2 to 1. The government promised some \$80 million over five years, and we got some press releases the other day indicating how much the various institutions have been able to raise and therefore how much the government had given them. By the way, last summer I heard that the government was way behind on making their payments, that the universities were in fact spending money that they were anticipating getting from the government and hadn't got yet. I hope that's been caught up.

In any case, it was suggested that in the first two years of this program the University of Alberta had been so successful in raising money, and some of the other institutions as well, that the program was some \$20 million oversubscribed. Now, what I asked the Minister of Advanced Education -- and I guess maybe he just didn't have the answer for me. He said, "It's a nice problem to have," and I guess I would agree with that to a certain extent. But if there is an \$80 million cap on the program, does that mean you'll end up cutting off the program when the \$80 million runs out say, in three or four years rather than going the full five? Or does it mean that the government will decide to match it 2 for 1 no matter how much the universities and postsecondary educational institutions can raise, because of course it's an advantage to get what money you can from any source? So I would appreciate a comment from the Treasurer, if he has one, in terms of what his thinking is. Of course there are budget implications to that so I'm assuming he will have realized that that may become a problem. If he doesn't have an answer at this stage, I wouldn't be surprised, but it's one the government will have to deal with sometime in the not too distant future.

In terms of the capital expenditures again -- and this budget is only part of those total capital expenditures -- I did raise this one other day and didn't get a very specific answer from the Treasurer. I'm not sure he has one that's all that easy. It gets a little bit messy when you start looking at different programs. But in the budget there was \$1.2 billion in capital expenditures. In this Capital Fund there is approximately \$3.2 billion. In the heritage trust fund capital projects division there was \$1.4 billion this year, and in the Alberta division of the heritage trust fund there was \$0.55 billion. Now, the two from the heritage trust fund amount to \$0.69 billion, which is a little under the \$750 million that the Speech from the Throne indicated. So my total comes to \$2.2 billion, not quite the \$2.4 billion that the government has been talking about. I guess that's not all that much difference to be all that picky about but I just thought I

would raise that and ask the Treasurer if there's something I'm missing in terms of capital expenditures of the government this time around.

I see no reason to sort of hold up this particular vote. The kinds of projects we're spending the money on here are the kinds our party knows are important to the people of Alberta. Although the budget in total has some things in it that we don't like, and there are some parts of it we'll definitely vote against there's no particular reason to hold up Bill 39 and argue against these particular expenditures.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Sorry, Mr. Speaker, I was planning to exit.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May the Provincial Treasurer close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed? Comments by the Provincial Treasurer will close debate on Bill 39. Hon. Provincial Treasurer.

MR. JOHNSTON: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to provide the additional information requested by the member, and if it is in fact cursory, I would ask their forgiveness. But I would follow it up by a detailed analysis, which in any event I was going to provide had it not been asked for at this particular time. It wasn't that I was not aware; it's just a question of processing the paper we get on our desks.

With respect to the reconciliation of the differences as between the years, the major difference, Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure members are aware -- I'm sure the Minister of the Environment has pointed out -- is essentially the fact that the Oldman River dam has been brought into the capital estimates for this period. The reason we thought it appropriate -- and it does deal with a broader question raised by the member to include the dam in this vote -- is as we explained last year: to match the use of the asset with the repayment schedule. That's essentially what has happened here. It is in fact a change of these last two years over our previous reporting practices and funding practices, but in my mind it does satisfy the major test that repayment of an asset should be matched by its use or the use of an asset to match its repayment. We have set up the appropriations both in the General Revenue Fund and the Capital Fund on that basis so that charges to the various departments who have the responsibilities for these capital investments in fact reflect the annual principal repayment of those funding those requirements, and the Treasury Department reflects the interest on all other borrowings including the Capital Fund borrowing. That's the reason these funds are put aside, and I think that's a reasonable approach to funding of such significant investments in these assets.

With respect to the heritage fund, the heritage fund has not been used for any source of funding for the Capital Fund at this point. The liquidity for the heritage fund has been used essentially for the farm credit stability program and the Alberta small business program, and from time to time it's been used by the General Revenue Fund. As I explained earlier, we have now put in place the Alberta capital bonds, and those bonds themselves will more than adequately fund the requirements of the Capital

Fund for the next year.

Of course, we did have unexpended balances this year in the Capital Fund. That's essentially because of the timing problem and to some extent by the freeze in that those new projects, particularly in Advanced Education, which had not been initiated were deferred into this year and came back into the capital budget one more time. I believe the member during the course of the discussion also asked whether or not the Capital Fund debt is included on page 38 -- a question he raised. The answer to that is no; that's entirely General Revenue Fund debt. I will provide more details to allow him to reconcile that as well.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the so-called total capital of the government, I can in fact reconcile that very quickly for the member. The General Revenue Fund has \$1.2146 billion, the Capital Fund has \$317 million, the heritage fund capital division has \$140 million, and additionally Crown corporations account for some \$750 million. Part of that, of course, will be dealt with here very soon when we debate the resolution providing the annual budget for the heritage fund.

And now, finally, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the endowment fund, although I don't profess to speak for the Minister of Advanced Education and I'm sure he will provide additional information to the member, I should say that most of the points made by the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark are in fact accurate. This is such a successful program that in fact the private sector has responded dramatically to its ability to provide dollars to an Alberta advanced educational institution and have that money immediately matched. This program was introduced, I believe, in 1982 and was very successful. When I was the Minister of Advanced Education, we found it had been oversubscribed very rapidly. We paid off a lot of the unfulfilled claims and just before 1986 brought forward a second version of the Capital Fund, the Advanced Education Endowment Fund. Essentially the program now has been refined somewhat so that the targeted areas such as endowed chairs can be focused on more specifically, because this is one of the trends in the United States colleges and universities which attracts a significant amount of funding and makes it very competitive in terms of Alberta institutions and Alberta professors flowing back and forth between Alberta and other American institutions.

So the endowment fund has been very successful. I'm sure all members are aware of both the success of the University of Alberta and its business endowment program -- one which I am particularly familiar with and particularly supportive of -- and also the University of Calgary in a wide range of areas where endowed chairs have been set up as a result of private-sector response. What this does is allow the private sector to muster its economic strength and, secondly, allows the universities and colleges to target in on that private-sector strength and in Canadian private-sector strength, because we go beyond the provinces because it's such a unique program.

Yes, I think it's oversubscribed. We'd expect that we'll continue to make the payments through the balance of the year and if it's significantly oversubscribed, I would imagine we'll find some particular way in which to deal with it. But it is a five-year program, and perhaps the supply of new money may not be matched by the budget over the five-year period, in which case there'll be an automatic balancing process. So it's very successful in helping the institutions and, of course, I think one of the unique success stories of funding of universities and colleges in this province.

I think, Mr. Speaker, those are the essential points made by all members. Accordingly, as I said before, I think this is a very

significant investment that the province is making in these three areas, significant not just to the current generations but it will have long lasting effects into subsequent generations.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 39, Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act, 1987.

[Motion carried; Bill 39 read a second time]

Bill 40

Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1987-88

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, just a few comments about this Bill. The appropriations . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. Excuse the Chair. Perhaps the hon. Provincial Treasurer should move second reading of the Bill first.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 40, Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1987-88.

MR. McEACHERN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This Appropriation Act for 1987-88 for the capital projects division of the heritage trust fund asks for approval of \$140 million worth of expenditures. That number is down considerably from previous years and so it indicates a kind of a winding down, I guess, of this particular part of the heritage trust fund, although they're kept on the books at book value even though most of them are expenditures and we'll not recover the money. So the heritage trust fund will not show a drop because of the winding down of this program because of that particular accounting quirk the Treasurer insists on carrying out.

It would seem to me that it's time to look back at what we've done here with the capital projects division, and I think you might characterize it something like this. In the days when the government had extra money, it was setting money aside in the heritage trust fund, and there came a point -- I think it started about 1982 -- when the amount of money going into the fund was reduced from 30 percent of the oil revenues down to 15. I guess it was '83-84. But in any case the amount going in, in the buildup of that fund, became irresistible to the government. It was not any longer considered money that they could set aside and didn't need for ordinary budgetary expenditures. They evidently decided they had some very nice things to do, things like Kananaskis Country or the Walter C. Mackenzie hospital or the medical research endowment fund. I'm not saying they weren't good projects. Many of them were good projects; some of them have their downside as well, as I've pointed out in the House before. But what it really amounts to is that the government at some point decided that they had to use some of that money which was supposed to be savings, for expenditures.

So we have seen the development of the capital projects division or what are euphemistically called the "deemed assets." We see that over time they've built up some \$2.6 billion worth of money in this division. They call them investments, but basically most of them are expenditures and will not be returned to the coffers. Now, when you're thinking about spending the billions of dollars that we do each year on the budget for the prov-

ince of Alberta, it does not really make much sense to say that these expenditures for the Walter C. Mackenzie hospital, for example, which is just another hospital -- it's maybe a very good one and generates expenses for the province of Alberta; certainly for the ordinary budget it generates a lot of operating expenses -- to then claim "Look what the heritage trust fund did to us." I mean, you set the money aside. You could have done that with the whole budget. Why didn't we, when we had an \$8 billion budget two or three years ago, set half of that too into the heritage trust fund and then said, "Now look what the heritage trust fund is doing for you. It's building these roads; it's doing this, it's doing that"? Why didn't we put the whole budget into a heritage trust fund and then say: "Gosh, look at what we're doing with the heritage trust fund"?

So I guess it seems to me a way of conning the people of Alberta a little bit. Why didn't we just say: "Hey, we put a little too much money into our savings account; we need it to spend on certain projects that we think are good," and do a withdrawal slip, put it back into the general revenue budget the same as anybody would running a household, and spend that money on those projects as part of the budget? It just means that we didn't get the basic budgetary debate that we usually get.

Actually, there is an ironic thing there. This \$140 million got 10 days of debate when in fact it was allowed 12 as part of the heritage trust fund. Yet had it been part of the regular budget, we'd have only got the one day per department. So the government really has some rethinking to do about how it organizes the finances of this province. The setting of money aside and saying, "Look what the heritage trust fund did for you," when in fact they're really just expenditures is just a con game to tell the people of Alberta that somehow you've managed the money in some wonderful kind of way, which is really a silly kind of way when you think about it. So the government really should stop and analyze where they're going with this whole thing, and it is, of course, time, as I said before, for a whole hearing process on the heritage trust fund and where it's going and how it's being handled.

The details of these particular estimates have had good debate in the House in the 10 days that we had, so I don't intend to get into those. I want to save them for Committee of the Whole rather than second reading anyway. But the principle, then, behind this Bill, if there is one -- well, there may be two, I guess -- one, that we can set money aside and then use it for ordinary expenditures and call it something special, that which I just talked about, and I suppose the other is that it's illustrated sort of just by the numbers. If you look at last year's numbers or the year before in fact we're winding this down, and perhaps it's about time we did. It's certainly time that we quit calling them deemed assets and called them expenditures, as they are.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to make two points of concern with Bill 40, the Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1987-88.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that this appropriation is based upon a misleading statement by this government. The Treasurer, in his budget, went to great lengths to take credit for capping the fund, responding, he would tell us, to the desires of Albertans to cap that fund, not to encroach upon it. In fact

this capital Act does exactly that. It encroaches upon the capital of the fund. One hundred and forty million dollars will be spent. It is a one-time expenditure; it is an expenditure which this government will deem an asset, contrary to the advice of the Auditor General and, therefore, contrary to generally accepted accounting principles.

This government, the Treasurer, will blatantly tell people that this fund will have the same amount of money at the end of the year as it had at the beginning of the year, when in fact it hasn't. It has spent at least 1 percent of the total value of the fund, if you accept their value, and considerably more, perhaps 2 or 3 percent, if you value it in any kind of proper market sense. The fact of the matter is that the fund will also be eroded due to inflation, the inflationary erosion of the assets of the fund. And again the minister has misled the people of Alberta in that respect in stating that he has capped the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

But I have a broader concern as well, and that is what the kind of accounting that is going on with respect to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund means for management. There are a number of highly serious examples of where this government has been managing based on accounting facts and figures that are not correct. Therefore, they have an entire management structure that believes it has \$15 billion in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and in fact it doesn't. It has an entire management structure that has spent money, the \$5.5 billion in unfunded pension liability over the last 15 years, which is in fact money . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member, with respect, we're not debating the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund but the capital projects division of that fund. So if the hon. member could come back to the Bill under discussion, Bill 40.

MR. MITCHELL: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate your comment. My point is, however, that clearly the capital expenditure from the fund has broader implications for that fund and in turn for the management.

If I could just briefly summarize then, I would simply like to say that the accounting for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund misleads management; the accounting for the government's unfunded pension liability misleads management; the accounting for Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation misleads management. We have an entire management structure that is making decisions based on money that it doesn't have. These are two serious concerns which we have with this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion carried; Bill 40 read a second time]

Bill 44

Advanced Education Statutes Amendment Act, 1987

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I move for second reading Bill 44, the Advanced Education Statutes Amendment Act 1987.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, Bill 44 is basically a number of housekeeping measures which are quite commendable in their own right but I would like to ask the Minister of Advanced Education if he could explain to the Assembly and to the college instructors of this province why he has not taken this opportu-

nity to respond to the requests he has received from the Alberta College-Institute Faculties Association regarding a change to the Colleges Act and Technical Institutes Act for designation of academic staff.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on Bill 44?

Hon. Member for St Albert.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a concern with Bill 44, too, particularly when it comes to the Banff Centre Act where we see that in section 4(2)(b) it's being amended by striking out 12 and making it 15. Now, you would think in these times of restraint -- why would we be going to an additional three appointees on that board? Perhaps the hon. member or the minister could answer that question for me.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Stettler.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, yes, I can answer that question. In fact. . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The comments of the hon. Member for Stettler will close the debate on this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. PIQUETTE: Basically I had the same question as to why we're increasing. Are they . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. If hon. members wish to be recognized by the Chair, then hon. members will have to leap to their feet prior to an hon. member wishing to close debate. The Chair would advise members to deal with the second reading and not committee business of the Bill.

The hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes, I would like to also ask the minister relating to the Banff Centre and related to people who are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Are these volunteer positions or are these paid positions? I guess the question also is why we're raising it from 12 to 15.

[Motion carried; Bill 44 read a second time]

Bill 50 **Chartered Accountants Act**

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move second reading of Bill 50, the Chartered Accountants Act, and in making just a few preliminary remarks I would like to address Bill 51 and Bill 52 as well to some extent.

These three statutes taken as a package represent the professional statutes for the three professional accounting groups in the province. They've been arrived at after much consultation and discussion with those groups, and really, when taken together it will be found that the basic features are essentially the same.

There are two matters I would like to address in the preliminary remarks, Mr. Speaker. First of all, the joint standards directorate, which will be an entity to set the standards for the exclusive accounting practice, the function of performing audits and reviews, will be operated in common with at least one rep-

resentative from each of the accountancy professions, three members of the general public, and then five to seven people who will be members of the three professional groups and who will be on a pro rata basis, depending on the numbers from each of the groups who practise within the exclusive sector. That system, I think, will work to the benefit of all Albertans who rely upon professional accountancy services within the exclusive area of practice.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

I would like to also specifically mention the provisions that have been made for those who practise accounting in the province who do not belong currently to any of the three professional groups. I've had discussions with representatives of these people as well, and they are satisfied that the grandfathering profession provisions, as they might be called, namely that if they earn over a certain amount -- which will be set in regulations, because it ought to be adjusted from time to time -- or if they have earned more than 50 percent of their income at any time during the two years previous to July 1 of this year, the lesser amount will enable them to be registered with the professional group of their choice: if they've got a university degree, with the chartered accountants or with either of the other two; if they do not have a university degree, either with the society or with the association.

I think those items should be on the record as they are the significant items in the development of the legislation. If there are any questions from members of the Assembly, I'll be happy to answer them.

MR. SPEAKER: St. Albert.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try and make my comments as brief as possible, but again, as the minister indicated, even though we are speaking to Bill 50, I'll include Bills 51 and 52 in some of my remarks, because they are very closely associated with each other.

To start with, I'd like to congratulate the minister, because it appears that he's done an excellent job on writing all of these Bills, not just Bill 50. It's my understanding that the minister met with all the parties involved and that all the parties involved were allowed continual input to come up with something that all three groups feel is excellent. This Bill will allow the chartered accountants to basically police their own members, establish standards for reviews, audits, and probably as well establish an ethics review process under this proposed legislation.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in addition to that it will level the playing field for all three groups. We look at, basically, in part 6 of the Bill that it deals with the joint standards directorate, and under that section in 41(1), (2), and (3) -- basically all the subsections to that Act -- what we see is that no one group is going to have the power to interfere or take over rights of any other group, which I think again is a good thing. When we get into part 7 what we see is the right of the chartered accountants to discipline their own members for unprofessional conduct, which again I think is a good thing, because we have a professional body policing their own members.

I do have some concerns though, Mr. Speaker, and some of these concerns are as follows. Firstly, the concern that I have is that there is no protection afforded to a client over information that's maintained in an accounting office regarding that client's personal business affairs. Now, clients do not have the right of

privilege granted to clients of lawyers, under these Acts. Therefore when we look at this, what we're looking at is protection or affording protection to those clients for, I guess, a joint standards directorate, a practice review committee, or an investigator to go in and seek information where these or any one of these three groups could turn around and place requirements on clients through the provisions that are contained in these Acts, which will possibly cause some problem when it comes to confidentiality of those clients. Now, we don't have that problem where we have a lawyer-client relationship, but in a relationship that we have under this Act, that protection is not afforded to those clients of these accounting groups. And perhaps the minister could look at this.

The second thing I would like the minister to look at is the constitutionality of certain provisions contained in section 18 of not only this Bill but the other Bills, and particularly section 18(2) of each Act that precludes members or former members of one of the accounting bodies from being grandfathered into the others. It appears that the primary purpose of this provision is to prevent CGA's or CMA's students from making application under these provisions. Well, it's going to cause them some difficulty. Not only is this unfair to the student, but he is now worse off because this discriminates against these members of these accounting bodies. I'll draw the minister's attention to participating accountants who are not members of any accounting body who have the freedom to choose the group in which they desire membership. However, a similar courtesy is not extended to other members. It would appear that the accounting bodies are looking after their best interests when they should be looking after the best interests of their members. Again what I'm looking at is the constitutionality of the proposed legislation.

Another question I have, Mr. Speaker, is in regards to discrimination in granting membership based on the gross fees of the individual accounting group. The accountant who is just starting out may not be able to meet the requirements and may find himself caught in the middle, not belonging to any one of the groups and not being able to engage in his chosen profession because of it. Perhaps the minister could take a look at that and answer that question.

I have another concern here that in addition there are some rather onerous requirements put on members by the accounting bodies in their own rights. The joint standards directorate seems to have the power to conduct its own reviews in sections 42(1) and (2), and this check appears to be aimed at ensuring the accounting body is doing its best to maintain standards, but they appear to be at the cost of the individual members. Once again the burden here is placed on the individual practitioner or the small partnership. Perhaps the minister could take a look at that concern as well.

We have again common to all three Acts, this one included, where we see that section 100 allows an accounting body to take possession of a practice in order to sell it in the event of suspension, death, or in certain other circumstances. The concerns I've had expressed to me are that some of the people that expressed those concerns feel that this is a blatant violation of rights, where the assets and, I guess, those assets of that company -- whichever one -- are certainly at risk with no control over who is going to seize these, and perhaps the minister could take a look at those.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. With due respect, might we entertain a moment of adjournment to go to some

other business of the House. Government House Leader.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for adjourning debate. Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor will now attend upon the Assembly.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair]

head: **ROYAL ASSENT**

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

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

HER HONOUR: Please be seated.

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

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

No.	Title
9	Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1987
Pr. 19	Calgary Assessment of Annexed Lands Act, 1987

[The Lieutenant Governor indicated her assent.

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

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

[The Lieutenant Governor left the House]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

Bill 50
Chartered Accountants Act
(continued)

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I had just concluded my remarks when I was ordered to sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Invited, not ordered. Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few questions and comments about not just Bill 50, but as the minister said, we will sort of deal with them as Bills 50, 51, and 52 all together.

I think that to some degree the minister should be complimented on getting this far with sorting out the problems among the chartered accountants, the certified management accountants, and the certified general accountants. But I'm not sure that he's got everybody included even with those three groups, because I've had some contact from registered public accountants,

who claim some 600 to 800 members in the province and wonder where they fit into all of this. I know the minister did say that he had talked to some of the groups not represented and had felt that they were satisfied with his analysis and promises of explanations of what was going on, but some of them were not satisfied and have phoned me and have raised certain questions. Some of those questions have been raised by my colleague, but not all. I guess I would be concerned that if there is a group of this many people that are organized, that they somehow be recognized either by a separate Bill of their own or some fairly specific procedure by which they can come under the other Acts.

I know you do have some procedures for that. In fact one of those procedures bothers me, and that is the idea that if you've worked for a number of years and earned a certain amount of money in the last couple of years, you can qualify to fit into one of these three Acts. I'm not sure that the amount of money you've earned should be the criterion that qualifies you to get some kind of a certificate or give yourself some kind of a tide that you didn't have previous to that.

One further aspect of that that bothers me is that it seems that if you take two people with the same amount of years of experience who earned the same amount of money, an owner of a small corporation that's doing accounting will be allowed in when somebody who is an employee of that same person but may have the same qualifications may not be allowed in, if I read the Act correctly. So I would appreciate it if the minister would look at that problem.

The Act does not seem, because it talks about needing experience to come under one of these Acts, to do very much for new students. Nor do I think it's clear that there will be a consistent and reasonable way of analyzing the qualifications of somebody from outside the country, somebody who lived or trained somewhere else and came here and then maybe worked here for a number of years or whatever. How they will fit into these three Acts does not seem to me to be as clear as it might. Perhaps I'm just not understanding some of the details that are implied in some of the sections of these Acts. But that does remain a concern of not only myself but of a couple of people that I've talked to on the phone about the Act.

This is only the second reading of the Bill, and basically I agree with the principle of trying to sort out just what is going on in the accounting field. It does seem rather confusing, the number of different levels of training and qualifications claimed by the different groups. This is a somewhat valiant effort, I think, to try to sort that out, but I'm not sure that you've got it quite right yet. Perhaps we can debate some of the details in Committee of the Whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Call for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Labour, summation.

DR. REID: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The items that were mentioned by the Member for St. Albert and the Member for Edmonton Kingsway are items that were considered, I can assure them, at some length. We had long discussions with all three groups and with other accountants in Alberta.

Perhaps I should point out to start with, that in Alberta until this time there has been no requirement to belong to any association, society, or institute in order to practise public accounting. That was one of the difficulties that we faced. As a

result there were well-established accountants and well-established accounting businesses where there were no members who belonged to those three groups and there were others who belonged to them. As a result it was felt that we should have reasonable provisions for those who did not currently belong to one of the three groups to obtain registration.

The matter of seniority. We have decided that there should be a minimum of 50 percent of the earnings, unless the earnings from exclusive scope are over a set amount, an amount that is currently thought probably to be \$25,000 a year, although that is not firmly set; it will be in the regulations. For those who are just starting in their accounting practice and who do not belong to one of the three groups, if in the period of time prior to July 1987 they have been earning 50 percent of their earnings, however small they may be, from the exclusive scope, then that will of course entitle them to approach the group of their choice to seek registration under the special provisions under section 18.

I think that deals quite adequately with the problems with those who do not belong to any of the three groups. The group that was mentioned by the Member for Edmonton Kingsway: I did talk to members of that society, and they felt that the provisions, once they were explained to them, would adequately cover those of their members who were earning significant amounts from exclusive accounting practice as defined. It may be that there are others who are earning very small amounts from doing audits or reviews, but if they are earning less than 50 percent of an amount less than \$50,000 a year gross, then it is unlikely that they are in actual fact doing sufficient to maintain proficiency at those processes.

With regard to the protection of clients' information, this is of course a problem for all professions other than the practice of law, where there is in that profession only, and I would emphasize that, the confidentiality between client and lawyer, legal counsel. All professions without exception that I have dealt with, including the accountants, regard their knowledge of individual's affairs or health as being very much between them and their client or patient. It is true that that information can be subpoenaed under certain circumstances, but the professions themselves all take very careful provisions and are very careful that such information is not let out in the public except through the requirements of the justice system. That applies to accountants just as much as to any others, and I'm sure it will continue.

The requirements under practice review indicate of course that other members of the professional groups will have to review the records in order to make sure that the accounting practice is working to satisfactory standards and is being ethical. But one has to remember that the review process will be carried out by people who are also involved in the professions and, in some circumstances perhaps, by the three public members of that board. I do anticipate, however, that the actual review process will be carried out by accountants and will of course therefore be under the provisions that they have for looking after the confidentiality of clients' information.

The Member for St. Albert also addressed the concept of professional standards and educational standards. This is a problem for all professions. There has to be a very sound system in place to ensure that those few members of professions who may step out of the professional limits, whose ethics may not be what they should be, first of all, can be found through the complaint process by clients or patients, and also that once there is a determination that there may be a problem, it can be adequately investigated and dealt with. The provisions of fairness in our justice system of course have to prevail, and that is why

once a member of a profession is disciplined, that member has the right of appeal to the courts for a further judicial review of the process and the facts.

With regard to section 100, it is true that this may appear to be somewhat draconian, but it is a necessity because one has to look after the interests of the clients of the accountant as well as the accountants themselves. And that brings us to the point that professional legislation is entirely developed for the benefit of the general public, not for the protection of the profession. This provision enables the organization to adequately provide for the clients of an accountant who becomes ill, incompetent, or who unfortunately dies. In most cases the business is carried on by the partners or the other people associated with the accounting firm. But there are of course occasions when it's a single accountant in single practice, and there has to be some provision for the care of that accountant's clients if one of these events occurs.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that addresses the issues that were raised, and if there are any others, then perhaps the members will bring them up at committee study of the Bill.

Thank you.

[Motion carried; Bill 50 read a second time]

Bill 51

Certified Management Accountants Act

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I move Bill 51, Certified Management Accountants Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for St. Albert.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think in essence I made the majority of my comments in speaking to Bill 50. But again, I'd just like to congratulate the minister and compliment him on the job that he's done, because it's my understanding that the certified management accountants group had submitted almost 65 requests for changes to the legislation as it went along. And it's my understanding that the minister complied with almost every one of those changes, and I think this group of individuals is well pleased that this legislation is here in its proper manner.

Again, as I indicated, Mr. Speaker, most of the concerns that I had were expressed in addressing Bill 50, because they're common, as all three Bills are common.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Call for the question. Hon. Minister?

[Motion carried; Bill 51 read a second time]

Bill 52

Certified General Accountants Act

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I move Bill 52, the Certified General Accountants Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Yes, a couple of questions, one that I sort of forgot from the first set of questions I asked about Bill 50, and since these are all related, it's fairly appropriate here, I

think.

I guess I'm wondering about the role of the joint committee of the three different groups. They will be, I guess, setting the standards for audits and reviews, but I'm wondering what the role of the minister will be in overseeing that process. I'm assuming they'll come up with some regulations. Will the minister retain a role in seeing to it that the joint committee regulations for auditing are adequate, and is that written into the provisions? I didn't see that that was covered in the Bill itself.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister, in response.

DR. REID: Yes. I think in the case of Bill 50 and I think in the others it's the same number -- it's section 47, Mr. Speaker -- there is provision for an annual report to the minister with a summary of reviews conducted and any other matters that the minister requires. That's where the minister responsible for this legislation, once it's proclaimed, will be involved in the system on an ongoing annual basis. I think that answers the question that was put forward by the Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

[Motion carried; Bill 52 read a second time]

Bill 53

Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Act

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I move Bill 53, the Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Act.

This is a matter of just as much significance as the three Bills we just dealt with and is a statute which establishes a new bargaining structure in the construction industry. It also is what might be called the trigger for recommencing negotiations between employers and the unions in that industry under that new bargaining structure. The intent of the Bill is to have a system where federations of employers and unions will negotiate with each other on a provincewide basis. There will be a general part to a master agreement that will address the common items that apply to all of the trades, and then there will be subsidiary agreements negotiated between groups of trade unions and the appropriate employers, or the employer associations, to address issues that are more limited to those trades on largely economic matters but also the specifics of such trades, such as welder inspections and such matters.

The subgroups in those subsidiary agreements will be related to groups of trades that tend to work in concert with each other on construction projects. It is the intention, as can be seen from the nature of the Bill, to introduce regulations at an early date which will establish the setting up of the federations, and indeed I have had conversations already both with the Building Trades Council and with representatives of management and will have some more in the next couple of days to develop the federations and their constitutions so that they will best address the interests of the unions and of the employers.

Subsequent to that the parties will then be left with at least the time until September 15 to negotiate the general agreement and subsidiary agreements, and I anticipate from the conversations I've had that there is a very good chance of success in that process by that date. If need be, and depending on the progress that has been made by that time, if the process is not complete, they may indeed get a short extension. That is the prerogative of the minister. If there is still failure, then there are provisions for arbitration, if that is indeed necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the development of this legislation has been

done subsequent to the final report of the committee on labour legislation. Recommendation 42 of that committee was that the industry be given the full opportunity, both on the part of employers and employees and their unions, to develop a bargaining structure that was more suited to the industry as it now exists in Alberta. The two groups came indeed very close to developing that bargaining structure, and the one that is contemplated essentially fits the pattern that the two groups had developed. I anticipate that with the degree of goodwill that was shown in that process, indeed we will see a new era in collective bargaining in the construction industry in this province, to the benefit of all the participants and indeed all Albertans.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for St. Albert.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the minister in the pending legislation contained in the Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Act, Bill 53. But you can't just stand here and congratulate this government for basically their absence in the construction industry for the last three years.

Now, certainly I can stand and support this Minister of Labour in doing something that I think is progressive and that is going to end the ongoing problems that have been there in the construction industry for the past three years. What I speak of is no collective agreements in the construction industry in the main for a period of three years, causing extreme difficulty and hardship, not only to those Albertans that were employed in that industry but also to the many contractors that earned their livelihood in that industry as well. If it wouldn't have been for this government's not doing anything about 25-hour lockouts, terminations of agreements, and extending, through bridging clauses, collective agreements, there would have been no need for Bill 53 to be brought into this Legislature.

But enough said about that, Mr. Speaker. I think that in regards to the Bill I have a few questions to put to the minister, and I know I discussed one of them with him last night. Under application, section 2(4)(b), it allows the minister to exclude or exempt "any portions of the construction industry ... by the regulations." In speaking to the minister, I had asked him to consider, and I will ask again, excluding the Canadian Automatic Sprinkler Association from Bill 53, in the regulations. Now, CASA does the majority of sprinkler work in the sprinkler industry in the province of Alberta. They have not had any labour strife, any strikes, any lockouts in that industry for as many years as I can remember. The industry has always been settled under the terms and conditions of a national-type agreement that applied to all provinces in Canada, negotiated by that association and by the united association.

The danger that I see in the minister including CASA in the joint collective bargaining envisioned under Bill 53 is that it would interfere with things that are already there. It would interfere in two parties concluding a collective agreement where there have not been any problems. Now, I would ask the minister, as I did last evening, to exclude CASA from Bill 53 and joint bargaining in the construction industry.

I have another question under section 1(c) where we get to the definition of construction, where it says:

"construction" includes construction, alteration, decoration, repair or demolition of buildings, structures ... but does not include

- (i) supplying, shipping or otherwise transporting supplies and materials or other products to and delivery at a construction project or

- (ii) routine maintenance work.

It's my belief that major plant maintenance in a plant like Syncrude, Sherritt Gordon, or the Strathcona refinery is excluded from Bill 53. My question to the minister is this: is service repair, the service truck, the service plumbing truck going to also be included in the proposal that we have before us, and that's Bill 53?

I also have some questions, Mr. Speaker, in regards to 11(4) of the Bill. It says Questions for submission to the Labour Relations Board," and under (1) it goes through (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e), but then gets into (4), where it says:

From the date this Act comes into force until 2 years after the master ... agreement is concluded, no declaration shall be made under section 133 of the *Labour Relations Act* ...

Section 133 of the labour Act, Mr. Speaker, relates back to spin-off companies. It's my understanding in reading the proposed legislation here, Bill 53, that the building trades unions in that construction industry will not be allowed to seek a 133 spin-off application in front of the Labour Relations Board.

Now, I can understand that The question that I have is: if a union, any one of the 17 or 34 building trades unions in the province of Alberta, goes and certifies a spin-off contractor, can they then make application under section 11(1) for determinations in front of the Labour Relations Board as to whether that employer is party to a collective bargaining relationship under section 1(b)? The Bill would deny, in my understanding, the initial application under section 133, but after that contractor or company was certified, we could apply, as unions, under section 11(1)(b) for a determination in front of the Labour Relations Board. Could the minister clarify that for me, please?

The other question I have, Mr. Speaker, is in relation to the regulations. Will the minister have the regulations out prior to Bill 53 receiving assent? Because I would certainly like to look at the regulations in order to debate whether 53 is good or whether it's bad.

I thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have noted the comments of some of the people that are involved in the building trades, and they are indeed pleased with the introduction of Bill 53, as they feel that once Bill 53 is proclaimed and the parties are going to have to sit down again, the playing field will be somewhat more balanced than what it has been in the last three years. Some of them are in fact rather amazed that the field is going to be quite so balanced, because they didn't really expect they would find this kind of Bill coming from this kind of government. This is, after all, a government that has done nothing for the 25-hour lockout, nor does it propose to end spin-offs or what the industry calls double-breasting.

There is something in this Bill that causes some concern, though, Mr. Speaker, for people that are involved in the labour movement. That's than the principle of collective bargaining seems to be interfered with somewhat in sections 8 and 9 and perhaps 10 -- I'm not reading it at the moment -- because it refers disputes to binding arbitration. The concern that we have about binding arbitration is that once it goes to binding arbitration, is the negotiated settlement really fair? Has it been negotiated to the point that those it brings together -- are the two sides satisfied and wanting to live within the agreement?

We have had situations in the past where those employed by

the government, in the service of the people of Alberta, once had the opportunity to bargain collectively for their demands at the bargaining table, and they had the opportunity to withdraw their labour at one time, to go out on strike, or in fact to be locked out, and then we ended that. We took that right away. We imposed binding arbitration on those employees as we have on other groups. It's unfortunate that we've gone from even that form of negotiation, where it ends up in binding arbitration, to another introduction by this government, where it didn't like the arbitrations, the settlements that were being handed down through binding arbitration, so they introduced a whole new factor into the negotiating process that said, "Aha, but you must take into consideration certain economic factors that come from the Treasurer, from the department" The very government that employs is now going to dictate just what the limits shall be.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

So the system has changed. One would question whether or not the change has changed that level playing field that we've heard so much about. I would suggest that it has, but not in favour of the employee, certainly away from the employee. This Bill, Bill 53, has sections in there that are of concern, Mr. Speaker. They are of concern because it may very well set a dangerous precedent in the area of negotiating collective agreements.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

DR. REID: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Although some of the items might well have belonged at committee stage of the Bill, it's perhaps just as well to answer some of the concerns that have been expressed. There's one thing I would like to emphasize in my remarks, and that is that the Labour Legislation Review Committee, having looked at other jurisdictions, did fairly strenuously reject a concept of introducing into the new labour code, which will be shortly out in public, the concept of binding arbitration as the usual end point for free collective bargaining. Indeed, I can confirm that in my discussions with the Building Trades Council and also with the contractors that concern was also expressed.

To put at rest the concern of the Member for Edmonton Belmont he will note that the whole of this Bill, once it's an Act will be with the repeal of the present Labour Relations Act which will be part of the proclamation process of the new labour code. So it is not intended to be a precedent for the future but rather a one-time-only occasion. The process of going to binding arbitration will of course depend indeed if there are any outstanding issues by September 15 or shortly thereafter.

Section 10(2) mentions a concept that has not been used in this province before, and that is final offer selection. Indeed, the introduction of that would probably be related to the specific issues that may be left unsettled by September. As I said at the beginning, with the goodwill that has been expressed by both sides to myself and to members of the department, I doubt if there's going to be any requirement for the arbitration process at the end of the collective bargaining process.

The Member for St Albert mentioned some specific concerns, and he has, I know, noted the provisions for additions or deletions from the schedule at the back of Bill 53. Indeed, in addition to the sprinkler concern that he has expressed, there have been similar concerns with respect to boilermakers and for whole sectors of the construction industry; namely, pipeline and

road construction. In the case of the pipeline sector, there is already just recently an agreement with all the trades involved, and it is indeed quite likely that the pipeline sector will be exempted from Bill 53 by regulation.

The Member for St. Albert, who has considerable expertise in this industry from his prior time in the work force, picked up on item 1(c)(ii), routine maintenance work. It is indeed intended that maintenance work would not be rolled into Bill 53 as it would be unsuited to the maintenance sector, although indeed the same trades are involved in maintenance work as are involved in construction. This Bill is intended to apply to construction rather than maintenance.

The concern about the spin-off situation: the intention of this Bill is that those existing spun-off entities would be exempted for the period of the agreement from section 133 applications. If, on the other hand, the spin-off or indeed any other entity was certified by the usual process, by vote of the employees, then that subsequent entity -- any attempt to develop a close corporation would be eligible for a section 133 application and would of course have to prove that the development of the additional corporation and the additional employer was not to escape obligations under a collective agreement but was rather for good corporate reasons of another nature. I think that that was discussed at some length both with the contractors and with the Building Trades Council.

The most difficult matter for me to answer, Mr. Speaker, is that of the timing of the regulations. Obviously, the regulations to set up the federations and to enable the bargaining process to commence will be proceeded with as rapidly as possible. As I said, I've already had some discussions since introduction with some of the contractor associations and representatives and with some of the building trades and with representatives of the Building Trades Council. Those regulations, of necessity, should be up and running as quickly as possible to enable the collective bargaining process that is in Bill 53 to start and to operate.

On the other hand, the regulations for arbitration, if indeed it should be necessary, will not be initiated early on, as the type of arbitration, whether it should be a single person or an arbitration tribunal with multiple people on it, would depend upon the issues that have been agreed to and have been signed off during the bargaining process. For that reason, I would rather wait until some time in September probably before introducing any regulations that may be required for an arbitration process. I anticipate that if there is a requirement it will be a small one, but it would depend on the items that were involved and the issues that had not been settled as to what exact type of arbitration might be used and how it would be controlled.

I think that addresses the issues that were addressed by the hon. members. In closing, I would like to point out that having discussed this matter with both contractors and unions and also with construction owners, I anticipate that during the term of the agreement the two years, and indeed the five years in the general agreement, we will see the relationships in that industry return to what we have had in the past and a better relationship that I hope will continue in the future, as was indeed the intention of the committee it was my honour to chair during the last year.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would again recommend to the Assembly second reading of Bill 53.

[Motion carried; Bill 53 read a second time]

Bill 55
Nova, An Alberta Corporation
Amendment Act, 1987

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of Bill 55. Nova, an Alberta Corporation Amendment Act, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, as I said on introduction of this piece of legislation, one of the truly dynamic and successful stories of the private sector in Alberta has been the evolution and success of Nova corporation over the past 30-some years, wherein it's now moving from essentially a gas transmission company to a very large, diversified multinational corporation, with all its intellectual and investment opportunities here in this province but nonetheless serving markets which are far wider than the national boundaries of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, when this Nova corporation, or Alberta Gas Trunk Line as we used to call it, was set up, it was set up to ensure the protection of certain groups within Alberta: gas producers, gas utility companies, and to some extent transmission companies. At the time, the wisdom of the government then, Mr. Manning in particular, was to ensure the protection of the ownership of that company with a structure which is by now somewhat outdated if not anachronistic in its context.

So, Mr. Speaker, what this Bill does in various ways is the following, and I'll simply enumerate the points. First of all, the company has changed somewhat. We changed the name of the company from Nova, an Alberta Corporation, and gave it a little smoother name to ensure that it can be read easier. In fact it may well be more applicable, but notice that we always maintain the word "Alberta" in that title because of the importance of the corporation to Alberta.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the share structure, the reference I made already to the somewhat cumbersome share structure which has existed in this corporation, we are now in two steps providing to the class A common shareholders the traditional rights which normally flow to all equity holders of a corporation, which to this point had not been provided to the class A shareholders, the shares that are widely held, the equity shares of the company. That is that they now have the direct opportunity to vote on all matters affecting the company. Up to this point the class A common shareholders could vote only for seven directors of the corporation, and beyond that the day-to-day operation of the company was left to the board of directors. Therefore, they did not have the clear rights which should accrue to equity owners of a corporation.

Similarly, with respect to the share structure, there is a class of shares called the class B shares, which were unique as well. They were given to protect those groups that I talked about: the gas companies, gas producers, and gas utility companies. These were special class B shares, which also had some unique opportunities, both to elect directors to the board of governors but as well to essentially operate the day-to-day operations of the business itself. This was felt to be somewhat obsolete, and this Bill corrects that obsolescence in that these shares are redeemed.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, we have provided, in terms of the operations of the company itself, an opportunity for the company to come out from underneath the Nova Act the Act of this Legislature, and have its business done under the Alberta Business Corporations Act so that if you have to do the normal kind of routine thing, you don't have to have a special bylaw under the Nova Act and therefore operate in a cumbersome way. You can operate quite fully under the Alberta corporations Act. Of

course, the class A shareholders have all the rights to vote on those issues. That's been done. Mr. Speaker, and that is the change in the share structure which I referred to.

Now, in terms of the protections, Mr. Speaker, because this company is so significant to the diversification of this province and is a remarkable success story in that context, we wanted to be sure of the following points: that all the economic activity accrues to Alberta and that in fact the control of the company stays within Alberta, both in terms of the control of the board of governors and in terms of the voting control of the corporation. Essentially those kinds of protection are provided for in this Act.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, as to the appointment of directors, consistent with the past legislation before it was amended, Executive Council will appoint four directors to the board of governors to ensure that we have a say in the policy questions facing that entity and to allow us to have input in the direction of the company as well.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, to avoid the possibility of mergers or amalgamations, which are quite common now in the energy field, it would require a resolution of Executive Council, an order in council specifically, to agree to any kind of merger or takeover, and therefore there is that additional protection, moreover.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, to protect against large accumulations of shares in the hands of others and to avoid the control of the company passing to others, there is a fairly significant section which provides for the limitation of the voting rights of the common A stock itself to 15 percent regardless of the number of shares held. Further, there are some significant sections within the legislation spelling out who it is that is associated for purposes of the Act and what are in fact the penalties if someone votes more than 15 percent and happens to be associated under the definitions of the legislation.

And finally, in terms of protections, Mr. Speaker, there is the final protection which is in the Bill to ensure that the head office stays in Calgary. Now, my colleague from Lethbridge West and I thought that we should try and keep it in Lethbridge, but we didn't manage to succeed in convincing our colleagues. But it does stay in Calgary, nonetheless, and is an important and significant part of the Alberta head office structure.

MR. TAYLOR: There's certainly more gas in Lethbridge.

MR. JOHNSTON: There's a lot of gas in Lethbridge and Taber north as well.

Mr. Speaker, what will happen when this is all unwound in terms of the amendments is that we will have a fundamental piece of legislation in the Alberta Legislative Assembly which will be called the Nova Act and that Nova Act will provide for the protection of the directors, the share ownership and classifications, and the regulatory powers. Those will be the fundamental powers which are protected by this Legislative Assembly, and then it will operate as a fairly reasonable corporation under the Alberta Business Corporations Act in its normal day-to-day operations. That I think is the essence of what happens here.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that in terms of bringing this piece of legislation into the 21st century, it's important that these kinds of changes be made both in terms of its perception in the marketplace, because it's a widely held corporation and one which is traded very actively, and to bring the rights back to all Albertans and all others who own the class A shares. To ensure that effective operation of the company succeeds, we are there-

fore proposing and recommending to the Legislative Assembly this piece of legislation.

I should say by way of comment that the leadership of the company, as I said when I introduced the Bill, has been a major part of its success story, and during the drafting of this legislation certainly all the senior officials of the company, particularly Mr. Pearce and Mr. Blair, provided considerable advice to us as to how it should be restructured. Finally, I would be remiss if I didn't provide a word of appreciation to two other legal experts who guided our way through this legislation, Mr. Glen Acorn, Q.C., and Mr. William Howard, Q.C. As I understand it, Mr. Howard has been associated in drafting and the regulations and the legal side of Nova for some time and brought a wealth of experience to the table.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore move second reading of Bill 55, Nova, An Alberta Corporation Amendment Act, 1987.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise not in opposition to the Bill, but I do have a number of concerns, and in order to set those concerns into some context, I think it's essential to go back into the history of the corporation somewhat and look at the early days in which the provincial government at that time brought into being the Alberta Gas Trunk Line through a special Act of the Alberta Legislature. At that time, it appeared that markets were beginning to develop in Canada and perhaps in the United States for Alberta gas, and there had to be something put in place in order to get that gas at least gathered up and collected and put into a form that could be transmitted.

At that time, you may recall, Mr. Speaker, that we ran into some problems with the federal government. The Nova plan was in part dependent upon developing a system of getting that gas to eastern markets, and you will recall the horrendous de-

bates that took place in Ottawa before the trans-Canada pipeline system was eventually put in place. Now actually, Alberta Gas Trunk Lines was set up in 1954, and it wasn't until 1956 that passage of the trans-Canada pipeline was approved. At that time, prior to the passage, it looked like Alberta Gas Trunk Line wasn't even going to get off the ground. They'd hired some people, but with the delays it looked like they were going to have to fold up their operation. Then approval was granted to the trans-Canada pipeline and the Alberta Gas Trunk Line really took off.

I remember in those days when those shares were issued, as I suppose many members of this Assembly will remember, the shares, I believe, were originally issued at \$5 a share, and an Albertan was entitled to have as many as 20 shares. There was really a scramble to get them, and the controls on how these shares were listed were not very substantial, so that rumours abounded that people were registering shares in the names of their cats, their dogs, their children. I remember the people that lived across the street from me bought shares. They were also at that time going down to New York, and some big multinational in New York City offered to buy all their shares from them or swap all their shares for Broadway tickets. It was seen at that time that those shares would really be valuable, and I know that within a very short period of time the original shares increased in value from \$5 to \$15. Eventually they went, I believe, up into the \$25 to \$30 range. Then there was a stock split.

In view of the time, Mr. Speaker, may I adjourn debate?

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30.

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

