

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Title: **Wednesday, June 29, 1988 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 88/06/29

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**PRAYERS**

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

O Lord, we give thanks as legislators for the rich diversity of our history.

We welcome the many challenges of the present.

We dedicate ourselves to both the present and the future as we join in the service of both Alberta and Canada.

Amen.

head: **PRESENTING PETITIONS**

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition to the Assembly signed by 23 of my constituents in St. Albert urging the government to institute a committee to investigate the possibility of a plan to acquire the First Investors and Associated Investors assets from the receiver/manager Coopers and Lybrand. The purpose of this plan would be to expedite a distribution of cash to depositors, the majority of whom are elderly and unable to work.

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

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Private Bills has had the following Bills under consideration and recommends that they be proceeded with: Bill Pr. 19, Calgary Municipal Heritage Properties Authority Amendment Act, 1988; Bill Pr. 20, Maskwachees Cultural College Act.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Private Bills has further had the following Bill under consideration and recommends that it not be proceeded with: Bill Pr. 17, St. Vladimir's Ukrainian Orthodox Congregation at Calgary Tax Exemption Act.

I request the concurrence of the Assembly in these recommendations.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report by the hon. Member for Calgary-McKnight, does the Assembly concur in the recommendations?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

head: **NOTICES OF MOTIONS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of motion that tomorrow I will ask leave of the Assembly to introduce Bill 62, the Free Trade Implementation Act.

**Bill 40****Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 1988**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 1988.

This is an annual housekeeping Act consented to by all parties in the Assembly.

[Leave granted; Bill 40 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker. I'm tabling a response to questions 202 and 203, as posed by the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file with the Assembly responses to questions that arose during study of the estimates.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual audited financial statements of the University Hospitals Board and the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise to table a response to Written Question 191.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, sir, and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly, an outstanding Albertan and his grandson. This individual has committed thousands of hours to the betterment of our province and our community. He is in the members' gallery, and I would ask Mr. John Devereux and his grandson Curtis to rise to receive the warm welcome of this Legislative Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Agriculture under the Free Trade Agreement**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Unfortunately, the Mulroney trade deal fails to provide guaranteed access to U.S. markets for our producers; in other words, no binding disputes mechanism. That's the major reason why the New Democrats don't support the deal. It's becoming increasingly apparent, however, that there are hidden costs to Canadians because of concessions wrought by U.S. negotiators. For example, our farmers have already lost the benefits of price guarantees in the Canadian domestic market. My question to the minister is this: will the minister advise whether his department has compiled a list of other benefit programs for farmers which could be compromised or eliminated to satisfy the terms of the trade deal?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, we've done a thorough analysis of the agreement that has been initialed by the United States and Canada. It's obvious to us that if we don't have that access to the U.S. market - I'll share with the hon. member some figures as it relates to our dependency on markets other than what we

do have within our own province. If one looks at our beef production, we only consume 23 percent of that production, and we have to have a home for the other 77 percent. Pork production: we export 60 percent. Barley production: we export 50 percent. Wheat production: we export 80 percent. I just throw that out to underscore the importance that this province places on having markets other than our own. That's why we're encouraged by the greater access and the greater assurance of access that we will have in the event that this agreement is proceeded with.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, nobody denies that the market is important. But the point we make: there is no guaranteed access under this deal. That's the major point.

But I want to be more specific, Mr. Speaker. The provincial interpreter for the national tripartite stabilization program has raised a grave concern about the future of the beef stabilization program under the Mulroney trade deal. Mr. Dowswell says that the U.S. has already hinted, even prior to the implementation of this agreement, that they might consider this an illegal subsidy under the Mulroney trade deal. My question is: does the Minister of Agriculture share the concern of the provincial interpreter, and if so, what is he doing about this to avert this benefit to our farmers?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, in response to the first part of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's question, I should share with him that there is an opportunity for greater access whereby the removal of the meat import law is ensured. So contrary to what he has indicated, there is greater access. Secondly, what we want to do is ensure that our farmers are on a level playing field. That is what we wish. Our farmers can compete with anybody in the world as long as those false subsidies that are both in the U.S. and the European Economic Community are removed, and we're fighting very hard to see that that is the case so that our farmers can compete on an equal basis.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, this is just pure rhetoric. I asked a specific question. I want to ask: is he concerned, as Mr. Dowswell is, about the fact that our beef stabilization program could be history if this deal comes through? Only on that issue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, on that issue, we do not believe that tripartite will be history.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about one of the officials in his department saying this very clearly. Maybe the minister better look into it. Obviously, he hasn't.

There's another program. He said very clearly that we'll probably lose the Crow benefit offset. My question, very specifically about the Crow benefit offset -- and we're going to lose that. Would the minister indicate what assessment he has done on this program and what effect this will have on our farmers?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, we've done a considerable amount of analysis as it relates to the Crow benefit offset, and I'll answer that after I've answered the other questions the hon. leader put to me. I've already indicated to him that we are going to have greater access because the meat import law is going to be removed. That's specific number one.

As it relates to tripartite, we do not believe that it will be affected. That's the specific answer to his question number two.

Number three . . .

MR. MARTIN: Well, how come all your officials think that?

MR. ELZINGA: The hon. member should do a little more research.

Number three, Mr. Speaker: as it relates to the Crow benefit offset, there would be nothing we would like better than to do away with that program. That's why we've been working so hard to have a change in the method of payment under the Western Grain Transportation Act, whereby there would be the opportunity whereby that payment would go to the individual farmer rather than to the railways. So it contradicts nothing that we've advocated since day one. In fact, we're very encouraged with the progress that our farming population could make under a trade arrangement with the U.S.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you,  
Vermilion-Viking, supplementary.

DR. WEST: Yes, supplementary to the minister. Acknowledging that there's approximately a 2 billion pound deficit in the red meat market in California, do you foresee that our killing capacity through plants such as the newly building Cargill plant in High River will be on stream in time to meet the demand that comes through the free trade agreement when it's put in place?

MR. ELZINGA: We're very encouraged, Mr. Speaker, with the added emphasis that is being placed within this province with the further food processing sector, not only as it relates to the U.S. but also as it relates to the Pacific Rim countries.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.  
Westlock-Sturgeon, supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Supplementary to the minister. I wonder if he could share with the House what kind of logic he uses to justify the fact that the Crow benefit, as it's mentioned in the free trade agreement, is highly illegal if it's used to ship beef. It's illegal if it's paid to the railroads. It's wrong. How does he . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. The question . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I was just trying to finish.

MR. SPEAKER: No, Thank you, hon. member.

In the last number of days the House has really been getting very long supplementaries, very long answers. Time after time we have many members left on the question list. So I'm sure, as with the first part of this question, we'll have more succinct supplementaries and succinct answers. Thank you.

No, hon. member.  
Minister.

MR. TAYLOR: I didn't ask the question,

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, you did, hon. member,

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, in response to . . .

MR. TAYLOR: I did not, Mr. Speaker. A point of order. I did-

n't ask the question. How in hell can he answer something I haven't asked him?

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will send for the Blues. The member did indeed ask a question, and there's no point of order.

Minister of Agriculture, with the answer.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member's question . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, just a second.

MR. SPEAKER: Sit down.

AN HON. MEMBER: Time's a wasting.

MR. TAYLOR: Is that a point of order? I don't see how you can deny me a point of order.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member's question, let me indicate to him that under the agreement, for those commodities going through the west coast ports, the western grain transportation benefits will be removed as they go into the U.S. We recognize that that will have an impact on our canola, but we also recognize that they have removed the 7.5 percent ad valorem tax on it, so the two pretty well equal themselves out. Our farmers do agree that in the long run it will prove more beneficial than it will prove a deterrent.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.  
Second main question . . .

MR. TAYLOR: How the hell is it legal to pay it . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: How the hell is it legal to pay it to the farmers?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. [interjections] Oh, I'm advised this is the leadership race. I'm not sure.  
Next, please.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Vegreville.

### **Ethanol Fuels Industry**

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are to the Premier. A major international conference being held this week in Toronto on the changing atmosphere is studying the greenhouse effect and the related problem of serious drought on the prairies. Now, one of the major causes of the greenhouse effect is the increase in carbon dioxide in the air. Because most experts agree that the burning of fossil fuels is the major cause of this carbon dioxide buildup, the U.S. Congress was told last week that we may have to look at reducing the use of fossil fuels by 40 to 50 percent in the future to combat this serious problem. I'd like to ask the Premier: given the extent to which the Alberta economy depends on fossil fuels, is he examining ways in which consumption of these things could be reduced gradually

to avoid dramatic reductions in the future?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are many theories about the reasons for the so-called greenhouse effect. Frankly, I would caution the hon. member from taking any one of them and placing too much importance on them. I've been discussing this matter with our Minister of the Environment just recently, and perhaps the minister may want to supplement my answer.

MR. FOX: Well, my second question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Because burning fossil fuels puts massive amounts of new carbon into the atmosphere whereas burning ethanol recycles it, a senior adviser to Environment Canada has said that an ethanol energy policy could put a big dent in the carbon dioxide problem. I'd like to ask the Premier if he would instruct the Alberta delegates at this four-day conference to contact Dr. Hengeveld to gain a more complete understanding of how developing an ethanol industry in Alberta, using ethanol in gasoline, could help to combat the greenhouse effect problem.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, of course, if we are able to develop an ethanol industry in Alberta on either an economic or even close to an economic basis, we will certainly be trying to do it. Frankly, the people who are at the meetings will be able to obtain the information they require.

MR. FOX: Well, Mr. Speaker, Alberta is a major producer of fossil fuels, and I'm trying to show the Premier that ethanol could be viewed as an ally rather than a threat to his pet industry. I believe he's got a chance to take a leadership role here and show that we're willing to do our bit to combat the greenhouse effect. When will the Premier announce this government's intentions to initiate a program that will promote and encourage the development of an ethanol industry here in the province of Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as we've discussed probably a dozen times in the Legislature this year, the government continues to work with those who wish to establish an ethanol industry. The government would like to establish an ethanol-based industry. However, it has to have some resemblance to solid economics, and as of right now it does not provide that opportunity. Nevertheless, we won't give up. We'll keep working at it.

MR. FOX: Well, I won't give up, and I'm going to keep working on them, Mr. Speaker.

My final question, Mr. Speaker. Because ethanol-blend fuels -- made in Manitoba, by the way -- are available in Alberta and because provincial government vehicles are, you know, large consumers of fossil fuels, will the Premier direct that all provincially owned vehicles begin to use ethanol-blend fuels wherever possible?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it's a representation from the hon. member that we would be happy to take a look at.

I should point out to the hon. member that he should not be living in the past of this great dependence by Alberta on the fossil fuels. If he had been paying a lot of attention, he could see that there's been a tremendous gain in diversification in this province. Through the leadership of this government we have made a massive breakthrough in diversification into the forestry industry. We have the tourism industry. We're just booming in

this province. The technology and research industry: all are the results of the government's efforts in diversification. Remember, too, that our main industry is agriculture. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. Premier. Thank you. [interjections] Order please.

The Chair would also note that perhaps an alternative form of fuel would be some of the hot air that some of the members are intent on supplying into the Chamber, in all parts of the Chamber.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: All parts of the Chamber, hon. members, including from the Chair.

Westlock-Sturgeon, followed by Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for suggesting that your 10 percent helps makes it a better fuel too.

Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. The fuel of the future does seem to be ethanol, in that California has now moved to some fuels up as high as 85 percent by Atlantic Refining. Could the Premier show the same leadership as he's tried to show in the upgrader, by bringing western provinces together for something as outmoded as upgrading heavy oil, and put a joint conference together on making ethanol for the western provinces, which would then cut down our pollution?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker. I already answered that question today.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of the Environment. Can the Minister of the Environment advise the Assembly as to whether or not the greenhouse effect is a theory, or is it based on some scientific fact as to exactly what is going to happen?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker. I don't think there's any doubt that the greenhouse effect is a reality. There has been a dramatic change in climate patterns in most of the geography of the world in the last 10 years. I think it's premature, however, at this point in time to have science tell us quantitatively what is causing the greenhouse effect. There are certainly a number of theories in effect and in place.

I would as well, Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet wish to caution the Member for Vegreville. The burning of ethanol also causes carbon dioxide. Carbon dioxide is a major component factor in terms of the environmental pollution and the environmental degradation that we've had and face in the western world. If the hon. Member for Vegreville is attempting to suggest that ethanol would release and remove carbon dioxide from our environment, then he would be wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Westlock-Sturgeon, followed by Little Bow.

### **Maintenance Enforcement Program**

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is to the Premier. Many deserted, divorced, or abandoned women in this province, many of them mothers, have been thrown into financial and emotional chaos as a result of their inability to collect on their court maintenance. Women are often deserted, their

lives are shattered, and they are left with nothing but children to feed and bills to pay.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. TAYLOR: The bullfrog on the pad over there.

This question to the Premier. When the director of the province's maintenance enforcement program comes out and says that the success ratio is 43 percent meaning that 57 percent of them aren't getting anything, how can the Premier then believe that a 43 percent success ratio is an acceptable program?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, that program is the responsibility of the Attorney General. I've answered a number of times in this House about the impact of the maintenance enforcement program, which is having a very good record relative to collecting, particularly with respect to the new orders which are being filed with it.

I point out to the hon. leader of the Liberal Party once again, though, that there were many orders that had been in existence where for many years no payments had in fact been made, and there was an accumulation of arrears. It was very difficult and has been difficult and in some cases will be impossible to collect all the arrears and, in fact the maintenance payments that are due under some of those older orders. However, significant progress is being made, and I've said that before during the course of my estimates and, of course, in answers to the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore. Whether or not the hon. member was listening, I'm not sure. But it is improving all the time, and we are encouraged by the results.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary back to the Premier, although this is not on the program so much as the fact that part of the problem, as the hon. minister has already pointed out is a shortage of staff and slowly getting worked in. Could the Premier give any assurance to the Legislature that he will increase the staffing so that the present load, apparently of around 1,100 to 1,500 cases per worker, is put down to something reasonable and at a level that they can work at? Would he increase . . .

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the matter will be under consideration in the next round of budgetary considerations by myself as the Attorney General as we move into the next budgetary phase. The hon. members will know that funds have been voted to the Department of the Attorney General by himself and his colleagues and other members of the Assembly for this current fiscal year. We will continue our operations in the current fiscal year with the staffing we have, and we believe that that will be adequate. I would also point out that there is a matter of some cost recovery, of course, for the government and that is a factor that will be taken into consideration in the next round of budgetary discussions with my colleagues in Treasury Board.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, back to the Premier again, although he may want his henchman to answer it. The fact is that we've hired 67 for \$2.1 million to police welfare. They can find the money for that. Why can't the Premier find the money for more people to administer the maintenance enforcement program? It'll do more for the family and everything else that he brags that he's the champion of than just sitting there doing nothing.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, there is no indication that the addition of additional staff will be the sole answer to collecting some of the arrears that presently exist and some of the more difficult maintenance claims and orders which are in existence, some of which have been in existence for a very long time. Therefore, that is only one of the considerations that will have to be taken under review by the Treasury Board in the budgetary process.

I should point out, as the hon. leader of the Liberal Party and all MLAs are aware, that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Can we have order in the House, please.

MR. HORSMAN: There are, in addition to the difficulties for the persons seeking to collect under the maintenance orders, difficulties faced by the spouses who are supposed to be paying, as a result of difficulties with employment and other debt problems that they have encountered. Those matters are reviewed by the court from time to time, and that's part of the process. I'm sure all hon. members have received representations that the maintenance enforcement people are overzealous in their collection efforts.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I haven't run into any of those.

MR. SPEAKER: Final question.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Back again to the Premier on my final question. Would the Premier at least agree to match the increase in staff for maintenance that he is willing to countenance for the increase in staff for policing welfare? Will he at least match that?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I've already answered that question. The hon. leader is repeating himself.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Vermilion-Viking, followed by Edmonton-Avonmore. Supplementaries.

DR. WEST: Yes, a supplementary to the Minister of Social Services. There's a tremendous amount of human stress and confrontation during some divorces. Have you any idea of what percentage of spouses, rather than going through the Maintenance Enforcement Act where there is that confrontation and the hassle of legal confrontation, come to Social Services for welfare instead?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the event that a family is not able to manage, obviously they are entitled to social allowance. It is at that point in time that in the past we would have invoked a particular proceeding under the Department of Social Services. But now we go through the Maintenance Enforcement Act in order to try to assist them to collect.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. I wonder if he would consider notifying other departments of the government, such as the Students Finance Board, of the difficulties experienced in getting maintenance payments. Some people on maintenance enforcement are not getting their payments and are being cut back on student loans because the Students Finance Board assumes that the maintenance enforcement program will enforce the payment.

MR. HORSMAN: I'll discuss that matter with my colleague the Minister of Advanced Education. I appreciate the member's sentiment, but I think I'd better clarify with her exactly what she means, subsequently. But I will certainly discuss that with my colleague.

#### **Procurement of Federal Government Contracts**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister of economic development. It follows up my June 23 question on federal procurement from the province of Alberta. At present the federal government purchases from Alberta some \$300 million, but our share is some \$780 million, half a billion dollars more. The minister's answers the other day were passive rather than active. Could the minister indicate what kind of initiatives, in an active way, the minister or the government will take to secure that half a billion dollars for the province of Alberta that we should have?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct in his numbers. The proportion of federal government procurement that Alberta companies are successful with is about 3.8 percent of the procurement. Within the last few days I met with the federal minister, Mr. de Cotret, and we had a lengthy discussion on this matter as well as matters related to interprovincial procurement. He advised that the federal government intends, in response to our representations as well as other governments' representations, to begin a process of consultation to expand the opportunities for a balancing of procurement throughout Canada. We're going to continue to work at this because it is important, and we do recognize that the amount of procurement that Alberta companies have been successful in obtaining is not proportionate to the federal amount.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether the emphasis could be shifted from the historical emphasis that was based on food, oil, and gas to some of the service industries of Alberta? What plan does the minister have, along with the federal minister, to increase the emphasis in that area; for example in the area of advertising, use of Alberta consultants in other areas, and some other special services?

MR. SHABEN: The business of federal government purchases is a huge part of the spending of the federal government. Included in the plans for amending the policies of the federal government are those areas referred to by the hon. member. We have over a period of time made a number of suggestions as to how balance could be achieved without disadvantaging the Canadian taxpayer in terms of value received for money spent. We expect that many of our suggestions will be implemented.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate what type of activity is put in place to involve the private sector of Alberta in making them aware of the opportunities in terms of the federal procurement?

MR. SHABEN: Through our regional development offices, as well as our departmental officials and our consultants, we work with business groups -- the Alberta branch of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association -- to discuss opportunities for Alberta companies to compete. Also, the companies themselves have the obligation to be aware of opportunities that exist.

There is also pressure put on the federal government to more widely distribute information on contract packages.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The final. Mr. Speaker. I raised the question with regards to certification of companies relative to defence contracts the other day. The minister indicated that the government doesn't actively get involved in certification. Could the minister indicate what steps could be taken to enhance that position when industries that are in Alberta are not certified and can't get certified until they have adequate funds or until they secure a contract? It's a sort of chicken and egg situation. What does the government plan to do in that kind of a circumstance?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, we are working with companies on a one-on-one basis, where necessary, to assist them. My colleague the Minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications responded to that matter. As a matter of fact, just two days ago I participated in the opening of a new facility in Edmonton that the Department of Technology, Research and Telecommunications and ourselves had worked with. They have now secured defence contracts, and their employment has risen rapidly. They now employ 34 highly skilled people. The company name is Amtek. That's just one example of the government working directly with the company in order to assist them in accessing federal contracts.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, Edmonton-Meadowlark, followed by Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you. Mr. Speaker. My supplementary is to the Premier. Could the Premier please tell the Legislature whether he has raised this issue with the other western Canadian Premiers with a view to creating a unified front so that we can strengthen our hand in negotiations on this matter with the federal government?

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, in terms of procurement, will the minister confirm that with the Mulroney/Reagan trade deal the federal government gives up options to specifically direct procurement to regions within Canada? Effectively Alberta is now trying to get on a train that's already leaving the station.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General might wish to supplement my answer, but it was clear through the course of the negotiations that concluded on the free trade agreement that the Canadian government and the provinces agreed that measures that would assure regional strength in our country would be maintained and could be maintained under the free trade agreement.

#### **Enhancing Competitiveness of Western Coal**

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Alberta government, through the efforts of our Premier and Minister of Energy, have been active in pursuing ways to enhance the competitiveness of western coal in the Ontario marketplace. In January of this year the intergovernmental secretariat to the Action Committee on Western Canadian Low-Sulphur Coal to Ontario released its

report, and on May 26 the Deputy Prime Minister announced the federal government's response to this action committee report. My question to the Minister of Energy: could he advise as to what measures the Alberta government will be taking to support this initiative?

DR. WEBBER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct in terms of identifying the action committee on western coal going into Ontario, the committee that was responsible for looking at ways to improve the competitiveness of western Canadian coal. A committee was formed consisting of the chairman, the Deputy Prime Minister, Don Mazankowski, and included Ontario Premier Peterson, Alberta's Premier, B.C.'s Premier, and Saskatchewan's Premier. They dealt with the recommendations on the date that the hon. member suggested, discussed this report and recommendations from the so-called intergovernmental secretariat. One of the important aspects of the recommendations was that there would be no intention to subsidize western Canadian coal moving into the Ontario market.

They discussed 14 initiatives that were recommended in the research and development area. The total cost of all those projects would be some \$82 million over a four-year time period. The Alberta government today is announcing that we are committing up to \$16 million over four years to participate in research and development projects of interest to the Alberta-based coal industry.

MR. BRADLEY: A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise the Assembly as to what initiatives specifically the Alberta government will be responding to in the intergovernmental secretariat report and, in particular, whether any initiative to support coal slurry pipelines will be undertaken?

DR. WEBBER: Well, Mr. Speaker, different governments are taking lead roles in certain of these projects. The Alberta government is taking a lead role in a number, including the project that the hon. member has referred to, the coal/oil slurry pipeline, looking at the possibilities of moving coal mixed with oil east through pipelines, separating the coal from the oil at the Great Lakes, and then shipping the coal into Ontario.

Other projects include fine coal processing, improving the technology at mine sites. One very interesting technology that work is being done on is called coal agglomeration, the process where heavy oil and coal are added together, and you end up with a better product of coal and also a lighter crude. Work is being done at the present time on that project at the Devon research centre.

MR. BRADLEY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Energy. There have been media reports that the federal government's \$27 million support would be going to Ontario. Could the minister confirm as to where the federal government's support will be going?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, that is not true. Those reports were erroneous. The federal government, through the Western Diversification Office, will dedicate up to \$27 million for research and development in the coal area, which would be about one-third of the total cost of all the initiatives. The moneys will be allocated on a project-by-project basis. In fact, from here the provinces and the federal government will be sitting down and examining each of these initiatives to agree on the cost sharing

of each of those projects. As I said before, we have committed up to \$16 million over the next four years for research into those particular projects.

MR. BRADLEY: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Energy. Given the announcement today with regards to initiatives that will be taken, can the minister advise of any other effort by the Alberta government to support coal in research development.

DR. WEBBER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1984 this government established the office of coal research and technology. This office assists industry in improving the competitiveness of Alberta coals in international markets as well as our domestic markets. Also, in 1978, when the Alberta/Canada Energy Resources Research Fund was established, we committed up to \$35 million in coal research and technology. In addition, I've made reference to the Devon research centre. We have spent \$20 million on that world-class, first-rate Coal Research Centre. Certainly hon. members who have had the opportunity to go there have indicated that they are certainly impressed with the work that's being done there.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, let's face it; all the research and development is not going to move one piece of coal. There are only two ways: Ontario has to agree to reduce its sulphur emissions, and then it has to be equalized through a transportation grant. That's the only way it will get there. My question is to the minister. Has he determined that this in fact would be illegal under the Mulroney trade deal and will never happen?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, it seems as though the hon. member points his finger and is more firm on topics he knows the least about. He certainly has demonstrated that with his comments.

Hon. members know full well that Ontario has full intention of adhering to the stricter environmental controls that will be imposed upon them in the future, particularly Ontario Hydro. They have already reduced their purchases of coal that has a heavy component of sulphur from the United States and are in fact buying some more western Canadian coal. When the nuclear reactors come on stream, up until about 1992, when that will be complete, Ontario Hydro will then need more coal to meet future demands. It would be their intention at that time to buy western Canadian coal if our western Canadian coal can become competitive.

These initiatives, Mr. Speaker, are attempts to make western Canadian coal more economic. Ontario Hydro would have the option of building in very expensive scrubbers to try to get the sulphur from the coal from the United States: very, very expensive. We are very optimistic, unlike the hon. leader, who is always pessimistic, that these initiatives will lead to more sales of coal from western Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Mill Woods.

### International Assistance Program

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, my questions today are to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade regarding the provincial program for international development assistance. Many Albertans who are concerned about and work in the field

of international development have become quite distressed in recent years to see some very major cuts in the budget allocations for international assistance which is provided to the non-government organizations through the Alberta Agency for International Development. In addition, many of the people in the international development community have been very concerned about this year's new bizarre regulation that discriminates against "indigenous agencies" versus nonindigenous agencies. My first question to the minister is simply this: can he advise the House what assessment he did, if any, about the impact of that savage 50 percent cut in '86-'87 before he introduced a major cut this year of another 12.5 percent? Did he do any assessment about the impact of that?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, yes, we have. Our Alberta international aid program is a very important program. As a matter of fact, Alberta contributes more in international aid than all other provinces combined, notwithstanding cuts.

Yes, we do discriminate in favour of Alberta NGOs. That's a change that we've made. Where Albertans are gathering money to make contributions to Third World countries, yes, we will discriminate in favour of Alberta NGOs. We've set priorities for assistance in order to accommodate the reduced budget, and we think they're appropriate. They are in health care, to assist people in underdeveloped countries in improving the quality of health, and also to assist them in developing self-sufficiency, particularly in small business.

MR. GIBEAULT: Is that what he told the people who are not going to get a well drilled in their village, that we're number one in the country here still?

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me ask him simply this: how does he justify these new, discriminatory regulations that discriminate against the national churches and the national humanitarian organizations like OXFAM, which are getting dollars from the same Albertans that give dollars to other agencies? Why is he discriminating against those people who have now been limited to a cap of \$50,000 and only two project categories that they can apply for, whereas the "indigenous agencies" can apply for \$200,000 and four different categories? Why is he discriminating against Albertans this way?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has a different understanding of discrimination than I do. I believe it is appropriate that Alberta taxpayers' money be used to match Alberta indigenous nongovernmental agencies at a higher level than those that are located outside of Alberta.

MR. GIBEAULT: It's all the same Albertans, Mr. Speaker, whether they donate through their church or through another agency.

Let me ask the minister this: given that the rhetoric in the government's own report here, *Caring & Responsibility*, singled out the Alberta aid program for special mention as an exemplary program, which it is, can the minister advise why it is that there was no consultation about these particular changes before they were introduced, these discriminatory regulations?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member isn't aware that when it became necessary as a result of the difficult financial situation that the government found itself in, we corresponded with every nongovernmental organization that we had been involved with and asked their advice on how they

thought we should prioritize the aid program and which program should receive priority. That advice was sought. We took it into account when we developed the new guidelines, and the new guidelines are what all members are well aware of. Canadians are very generous in their contributions to Third World countries, but we felt that it was appropriate to give priority to Alberta NGOs and at the same time continue to provide generous support to nongovernmental organizations that are located outside of Alberta.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, let me simply ask the minister this last question then. Given that these very severe budget cuts in the international assistance program create such hardship not only for the nongovernmental organizations but for our development partners worldwide, would the minister at least be willing to do this before he initiates another major cut to this valuable program: make a commitment today to reinstate the previous practice of having a consultation in person with all of the agencies once a year? Would he at least do that?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I can't comment on what the budgetary plans will be for the coming year. That's a matter that all members will be aware of in due course.

I'd like to again advise the hon. member that this program is a very generous program, and it has become an important one for volunteer groups that raise money to help people around the world who need the help. So it is an important program. I will continue to consult with the NGOs, as we have in the past. The comments that I receive are that most NGOs recognize that when a government has a \$3.5 billion deficit, it's necessary to make some cuts and to prioritize. There's been understanding by most people who understand fiscal responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER: Additional supplementaries?  
Edmonton-Meadowlark.

### Loan Guarantees

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This government continues to bend its own rules to give money to friends and party faithful with little regard for objectivity and fairness. We have seen this time and time again with the likes of Peter Pocklington and Les Mabbott, and now we learn of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, sorry. There's a great difficulty in the House. It's a violation of the procedures of the House to be naming people who cannot defend themselves in the House. That's been happening too much, and it's got to stop. So if the member would like to continue with the question, please. [interjections]

Thank you. 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?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair hears "no."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

MR. SPEAKER: There are two points of order to be dealt with at least. The first one comes from yesterday when the Member for Edmonton-Belmont rose on a purported point of order with regard to some comments made by the Premier in question period with regard to questions raised by the Leader of the Opposition concerning debate on Bills 21 and 22. The Chair has reviewed the record and in the opinion of the Chair, taking into account the number of comments that have been made on both sides of the House with regard to the whole debate on Bills 21 and 22, the Chair does not regard the point of order as being, indeed, a point of order.

Now, with respect to this day, the Chair recognizes Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is entirely tied into the Blues, so I am at your mercy entirely -- you said that you would get the Blues -- as to whether or not I had composed a question. I must admit that I tripped over my tongue a few times. I'm usually so articulate, but this time I wasn't. Nevertheless, there's a subject and a predicate; I think I had got through the subject but not the predicate.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay. Well, the Blues are here, and this is what was said by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order in the press gallery, please. Mr. Speaker is standing. No movement please. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Supplementary to the minister. I wonder if he could share with the House what kind of logic he uses to justify the fact that the Crow benefit, as it's mentioned in the free trade agreement, is highly illegal if it's used to ship beef.

That in the opinion of the Chair, is the question. Thank you, hon. member.

The Chair would like to point out to the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon that while it may not be listed as unparliamentary, it is the custom in this House not to use cuss words, and the Blues and the review and the audio show that the word "hell" was used at least three times. Perhaps the hon. member could refrain from doing that. It would be much better for those poor, tender ears out there listening to CKUA ACCESS or on television. Thank you. [interjections]

The Chair is willing to recognize a point of order once the Chair gets a chance to sit down for half a moment. Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order concerning your remark that I should not mention people's names in this Legislature. I would rise on a point of order which I would indicate in either *Beauchesne* or Standing Orders, but I don't see specifically where that has ever been said. But I would like to point out that it's very difficult for you to assume that I was accusing anybody of anything until I had finished stating what I was going to state, one. And secondly, it is also the case that regardless of what Mr. Pocklington or Mr. Les Mabbott took from the government or was received . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Please, hon. member. Let's not compound the issue. Let us deal with the point of order.



MR. MITCHELL: Regardless of what any member of the Alberta public may have received from the government, it is not an accusation against them that they received it; it is simply an accusation, if that's what it can be construed as at all, that the government gave it to them. The situation that you may inadvertently have put this Legislature in is the government spending money in a way that we cannot in any way hold them accountable for because we can't even raise the issue to identify it in questions in question period. I believe that I'm fully within my rights to have mentioned the names of these two individuals and to have mentioned the names of other individuals as well if I'm pursuing the issue of this government allocating money without objectivity unfairly to party faithfuls . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. You are now violating.

Any other comments with respect to the point of order, purported?

MR. MARTIN: What about Werlin? He's been . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Indeed.

MR. TAYLOR: If I may, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is recognizing St. Albert, followed by Westlock-Sturgeon, and that will be it.

MR. STRONG: I rise to support the hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, Mr. Speaker, in his statements on his point of order. I believe that he made it very clear that he wasn't maligning anybody. What he was doing was asking the government -- if they're foolish enough to give out money, then certainly they deserve all the criticism they get, and that's exactly the point. This government has exercised no control when it comes to giving out moneys to particular friends. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please, hon. member.  
Now we'll speak to the point of order. Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a bit of a different tack, and maybe you could enlighten me. My impression was that in the House of Commons or in the Mother of Parliaments, in the traditional British parliamentary system, whatever we say, we are immune from being sued. As a matter of fact, we're even immune from serving notices to ministers who were using the lottery funds illegally.

The question I'm trying to develop, Mr. Speaker -- and you may be able to help me on it. My assumption, then, is that if, indeed, this is the case -- in other words, if they've found it necessary through a thousand years to develop a rule of law that you cannot be sued, well, you must be mentioning somebody to be immune from. In other words, if you were never to mention anyone except each other in the House, how would the custom ever have developed that you could be sued for saying something? Therefore, you must be saying something. Therefore, if you must be saying something, it's got to be from somebody outside the House.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, just speaking very briefly to the point of order as purported, I would point out that the hon. members, perhaps because they are before television cameras,

are loosely using the expression . . . [interjections].

MR. SPEAKER: Order in the House.

MR. YOUNG: The hon. Member for St. Albert obviously doesn't want to listen to a correction of his statement, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. members, perhaps because they are before television cameras, are loosely using the expression "give." I want to put it on the record that when services are provided for a fee, whether by persons who are believed to be friendly to the government or unfriendly to the government, as long as there are services and a fee is collected for same . . .

MR. MARTIN: Point of order.

MR. YOUNG: There is no . . .

MS BARRETT: Cut him off, Mr. Speaker. [interjections]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, when a loan guarantee . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order. Get it straight, hon. members. A point of order cannot be raised on a point of order. Therefore, the Chair will continue to listen.

MR. MARTIN: Well, why did you cut him off and not . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members. Just hang on, folks. [interjections]

Government House Leader.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, when a fee is collected for a loan guarantee, as is the case in loan guarantees, that is not a gift. I do not believe that the hon. member has a point of order based on the statements that he has made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is not prepared to entertain any more comments, thank you. The Chair is not prepared to entertain any more comments on the point of order on the basis of the fact that according to Standing Orders and the tradition of the House, the Chair just listens to as much as it cares to. That's the basis on that.

Now, if we'd like to slow down for half a moment, hon. folks. To the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark: the Chair did not rule the question out of order. The Chair was admonishing the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark with respect to what was leading into casting aspersions upon members of the general public. The citation is *Beauchesne* 359(7), and it has substance with Standing Orders as well:

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's what the Chair was attempting to do, admonishing the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Then what occurred was the end of question period in terms of the time, and then unanimous consent was denied the hon. member to continue with question period.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

MR. SPEAKER: It's inappropriate for any member in the House to be calling out "shame" at this moment either.

It is the custom of the House, and the custom of the House

has been adhered to. But it is also the privilege of the House to deny unanimous consent, and any member, no matter where they sit in this House, can do that. Throughout this very lengthy session it has only been denied once or twice. I believe this is twice -- perhaps a third time. So the House has been more than generous in the use of the extension of time to question period. That also relates back, as the Chair tried to point out to the House again today, to the length of the questions, the length of supplementaries, and the length of answers.

Now, with regard to *Beauchesne* 359(7), about the proprieties of the House and casting aspersions on persons within and without, yes, the Chair agrees it is inappropriate for these comments to be made with respect to two individuals as mentioned today. That's been entirely out of hand. The Chair also agrees it is inappropriate to make comments about certain leaders of the labour movement in the province by name. So the point is: hon. members should take it into consideration that you really are abusing the general public by bringing up their particular names. It is not indeed fair to them who have absolutely no recourse to come back and try to defend their names and their reputations here. And that's exactly what transpired here in terms of this afternoon. [interjection]

Now, is the Chair to interpret that there is going to be an additional point of order from St. Albert? St. Albert.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is raised under Standing Order 23. When the Government House Leader was making his comments on the point of order raised by the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, he alleged or implied that I was grandstanding in front of the television cameras. Clearly that is false. What I was simply trying to imply and what I was simply trying to say was that we in this Assembly cannot blame anybody for accepting government largess. The point was: where do you line up to get it?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. That's not a point of order. Additional points of order? None.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Might we have unanimous consent to revert briefly to the Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you. Edmonton-Centre.

#### head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you. Mr. Speaker and all hon. members, I'd like to introduce someone who does not need to be defended or have any aspersions cast on him, for he's a noted Albertan, a constituent and a senior priest in the Anglican diocese of Edmonton here. I'd ask that the son of Vernon Barford, the Reverend Jack Barford, please stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

#### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

18. Moved by Mr. Young:  
Be it resolved that when the Legislative Assembly ad-

journs on Thursday, June 30, 1988, it shall stand adjourned to Tuesday, July 5, 1988. at 2:30 p.m.

[Motion carried]

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

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

#### head: PROJETS DE LOI ET ORDRES ÉMANANT DU GOUVERNEMENT (Comité plénier)

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Committee of the Whole will please come to order.

#### Bill 52 Land Titles Amendment Act, 1988

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question has been called on Bill 52.

[The sections of Bill 52 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleague the Member for Drumheller, I would move that Bill 52 be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### Bill 60 Languages Act

#### Projet de loi 60 Loi linguistique

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Pardon me committee members. I would like to introduce the Bill in a more formal way.

À l'ordre, s'il vous plaît. Soumis au Comité plénier aujourd'hui, le Projet de loi 60, Loi linguistique. The Committee will please come to order. Before the Committee of the Whole today, Bill 60, the Languages Act [interjections] Hon. members, the Chairman is not finished yet.

Ce Projet de loi suscite-t-il des commentaires ou des questions sur quelque-une de ses clauses? Are there any comments or questions to be offered on any clause of this Bill?

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, M. le Président, we talked about this at sufficient length in general yesterday afternoon. Therefore, I'll get straight to the point which is that we differ in our view of what ought to be done in the way of the official languages in this Assembly in one respect. That is that we believe

it is proper there should be a recognition of the Francophone minority in the province in a wider respect, and that is that certain basic laws, the basic minimum of statutes, be translated and eventually all the statutes be put into French in the province by a measured series of steps. How it would work is like this. Mr. Chairman, as I briefly explained yesterday. A basic group of some 62 statutes ought to be translated right away. This would cover statutes like the Highway Traffic Act, the social services legislation, the Land Titles Act. A group of the most basic statutes should be translated right away. Then any amendments to them would be translated in due course, or any re-enactments of them. Plus, as time went along, any new statutes would be translated into French too. So by the end of a period which we say should not be later than January 1, 1993, which also is the time stipulated in the Official Languages Act, all the statutes from then on would be translated into French.

Now, we do not believe that the place of the French minority in the province and the reality of the situation is such that the translation of the statutes would occur until the statute had been passed. So the difficulty, as I understand it, in the thinking of the government was that it would be inappropriate to have a statute end up in French if there were not French Bills along the way, as is the case where the Legislature is fully bilingual. But that wasn't our belief, Mr. Chairman. Our belief is that it is sufficient at this time -- maybe it would change in the future -- if we go along almost as we've done from the start of the province in our treatment of Bills and the process through the Legislature at various stages of the Bill without any French at all. This would mean that the extra staff to be taken on would be small indeed.

The total annual cost, which I think is a legitimate area of concern, would be really very small. And I mean small. Our belief is that the basic demands of l'Association Canadienne-Française de l'Alberta of the 62 statutes could be translated for a cost of less than \$40,000, that the extra staff that would be necessary to implement our proposal would amount at the most to less than \$140,000 per annum. That, I believe, is a small price to pay for (a) living up to the spirit of the Meech Lake accord -- because whatever the details of that that we can object to, the spirit is correct -- and (b) ensuring that the Francophone minority does have a basic working group of statutes so that when they go to court and have court proceedings in the French language, they can also refer to the laws in the French language. So by cutting out French in the procedure, requiring that Bills be in both languages and that the amendments be in both languages and the records and proceedings of the House be recorded in both languages, we are actually cutting out the bulk of the expense of a bilingual regime. I believe that that expense is not justified, because the extra good it would do is very much out of proportion to the cost. However, to say, as the government does, that it is acceptable in this day and age in Alberta to have no statutes at all translated into French when French is the second language of the country is unacceptable, unrealistic, and backward looking. So, Mr. Chairman, we believe that should be done.

Now, how do we go about choosing the group of statutes? The French Canadian association of Alberta has drawn up a list, and I've looked at that list, as have others. The basic list does appear pretty reasonable to me, but we must be assured that the French Canadian association of Alberta is truly representative of Francophones. I believe it to be, but doubtless that can be ascertained. Perhaps there's some other group or some wider group that can also be involved there. Too, doubtless discussion

should take place, if it is decided to translate any statutes, as to what they should be with that group and more widely. Then too, what regulations should be translated? Because again, it would be silly to have statutes without the regulations being translated that go with those statutes. Take the Highway Traffic Act, for example, or some Act like the Securities Act. The meat of those is very often in the regulations. In point of fact, if there was wholesale translation of regulations, there would be a great amount of added expense. So we have the point of statutes to be translated, some regulations to be translated, and consultation with the Francophone minority in the province on all of those.

So, Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment that will correct, as we see it, Bill 60 to reflect these important concerns. I have them here in both languages. The French set is appended to the back of the English set. I will wait until they are distributed to all members and first to the Table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can proceed with the caveat that we are having the amendment reviewed by Parliamentary Counsel, and if there are any problems with it, we'll have to deal with them later.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The amendment is to add a section after section 3 of the Act which reads as printed in the amendment. I won't read it all. I'll just summarize it. It would be section 3.1, and requires that

The Lieutenant Governor in Council may, by regulation, after consultation with representatives of the francophone communities in Alberta,

designate the Acts which are to be "printed and published in English only before the coming into force of this Act"; "designate any regulations" which are to be printed "in English only as regulations that are to be enacted also in French." In other words, to designate (a), the Acts which are to go into French, and to designate (b), the regulations going into French; to prescribe dates by which these are to be accomplished but which are not to be later than January 1, 1993, and to prescribe a date not later than January 1, 1993, by which the regulations that have been chosen shall be put into French. Then, by January 1, 1993,

every Bill for an Act which is not an amending Act, and every provision that amends an Act that has been enacted in English and French, and all regulations made pursuant to such Acts, shall be enacted, printed and published in English or in English and French, and thereafter shall be printed and published in English and French.

The French Bill, of course, is just a copy of the English.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that reflects the realities of the situation. It avoids the error, perhaps more apparent than real, of the Saskatchewan legislation which was similar, in which they made no reference to consultation with the Francophone community. In our release we said there should be a schedule to the Act setting out the statutes that were to be translated, but we also said there should be consultation before this has been decided. So you can't have them both in one Bill. We'll go with the consultation, but in the firm knowledge that it will not be all that difficult to decide on what is the reasonable basic number of statutes to be translated. There are on the books some 447 statutes, I understand, Mr. Chairman. So 62 of them is not a very high proportion, yet it is a good basic minimum number and fulfills working needs at first. Then, by increments the remainder can be dealt with.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chair finds the amendment to be in order.

The hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wish to rise in support of the amendments introduced by my colleague on Bill 60, the Languages Act. We feel it's the position of the Official Opposition to find a middle ground in terms of interpreting section 110 to allow us to, first of all, start translating some of the existing laws which are, according to the Francophone association of Alberta and the Francophone communities of Alberta, necessary in terms of everyday kinds of laws which need to be available in both official languages. They need to be available in terms of individuals who wish to defend themselves in court so they're aware of the provincial statutes in both official languages, and even available to the lawyers defending these individuals who will now have the ability to defend themselves in both official languages in the Alberta courts.

It is very remiss to not be able to have some of these existing laws in both official languages. This is why yesterday, in my speech to the Legislature in second reading, I indicated why it was such an important step, if we're going to be respecting section 110 in the Supreme Court, that the translation of some of these laws is so very important. I mean, not only are they going to be useful to the legal profession, to our law society, for example, or to students attending university pre-Law. For example, my son is in the pre-Law faculty at the University of Alberta, and he was very much looking forward to completing his education in both official languages and have available to him Alberta statute laws which are in everyday use in terms of making sure he's able to utilize his fluency in both languages, both orally and in the written language and printed matter. So I think there are a lot of very good arguments that can be used.

Now, the 62 statutes which have been identified by the Francophone communities out of the 447 statutes on the book, according to our calculation, would have a total annual cost of about \$140,000 in order to . . . I should say \$48,000 would be what it would cost to implement that translation of those statutes. The annual cost of recordings and publication, staffing costs, et cetera, and printing costs would add additional money, but the total annual cost would be approximately \$140,000, the calculation we've been able to research to the best of our ability.

The second amendment is to call upon the government that after this day forward any new laws enacted by this Legislature, passed and signed by the Lieutenant Governor, be enacted in both official languages. So there would be a continuation of adding onto the existing laws in the province of Alberta in both official languages -- again, as I pointed out in my speech yesterday, not only for the existing Francophone communities in Alberta but also for the thousands upon thousands of young Albertans who are becoming fluent in both official languages through our French immersion program, through our French language schools, which are going to be accelerating in development now that the School Act will shortly be amended to guarantee the delivery of the minority language under section 23; the 148,000 students in various bilingual and core French language programs, which represents around 30 percent of our total school population, and that is increasing in numbers every year.

The government is totally remiss. To be looking at the reality of Alberta today, which is what they made their ruling on, we are standing up for average Albertans on the reality of the language issue in Alberta because we are somehow a distinct

province. Well, I believe the government and the minister are very much addressing perhaps a reality that existed before which is very quickly changing with the kinds of educational opportunities our young people have in acquiring both official languages. It's totally remiss of this government that they should be enacting laws today which do not reflect the new generation soon coming upon us that is going to be at the levers of business, the levers of government, and will be bilingual very much in their ability to be fluent in both official languages and possibly in many other languages our school system is encouraging for our students to develop.

So it's a government again that's to some extent fossilized in its belief of the reality of Alberta today. They're living in the past, and what these amendments would do would be to ensure that it is a forward piece of legislation which addresses the guarantees that were provided in 1886 under section 110 of the North-West Territories Act. It also addresses the new reality of the 1980s and 1990s in Alberta for our younger generation of people.

I would hope the government would consider these two amendments, because I can predict the future. I think, with a great degree of accuracy: that if the government does not accept these two amendments, then we will see a Supreme Court challenge in the very near future if the Meech Lake accord is signed by all the provinces; that this Bill 60, the Languages Act implemented by this province, will be contested by, most likely, a group or an association of Francophones in Alberta to the Supreme Court of Canada, based on the fact that this language Bill has denied fundamental rights the province had agreed to preserve when they were the signatory of the Meech Lake accord. I state that with almost certainty, because I hope the minister and this government finally realize they have been wrong in the past in their interpretation of what they thought were constitutional laws, with their legal experts saying that section 110 of the North-West Territories Act would never be ruled constitutional or enforced today by the Supreme Court. They were proven to be totally wrong. I can guarantee you that some of the recent discussions I've had with experts in constitutional law and those who have looked at the Meech Lake accord are indicating now that this Bill 60, just like the Language Act in Saskatchewan, is going to be challenged and is defective, is contrary to the spirit of Meech Lake.

So there's really more than just simply one good reason why this Act should be amended now, because, number one, it's not in keeping with the spirit of Meech Lake; and secondly, it does not correspond to the reality of Alberta today. The reality of Alberta today is that there is a definite belief by many Albertans that the ability to speak both official languages in this province is an asset. It's a richness, a diversity no one should be ashamed of, and should be encouraged in our young people today. Unfortunately, this government will wake up too late to take any credit for future governments. They might be looking at the political expediency at this time, because they believe there are significant numbers of Albertans who are so anti-French and they somehow have to live up to that electorate. However, leadership calls upon governments in power to practise what they preach, and if this government believes in the tolerance and understanding between our two founding peoples, then they must deliver -- they must deliver -- in terms of what has been judged by the Supreme Court of Alberta as existing fundamental rights Francophones have always enjoyed in the Northwest Territories, and after Alberta became a province in 1905 that these have remained fundamental, existing rights that have never been extin-

guished, even though the government thought they had.

So I hope the minister will take these two amendments, which I think attempt to bridge the gap in terms of addressing the whole issue of section 110 of how we can find an Alberta solution to the Supreme Court decision, and that they also reflect upon their responsibility to all Canadians. For the government to say that we only represent Alberta when we enact laws, and forget about the Canadian responsibility of their role in Confederation, they are very sadly missing the mark. We are all Canadians, and for us to be saying that we are only going to be speaking on behalf of Albertans on questions of national issues, of such national importance when other provinces are looking at us to take examples from the decision made by this government that might have implications on other minorities in this country who are also threatened by their own provincial governments in terms of enacting legislation which threatens their survival -- and I'm speaking here on behalf of the Anglophone minority in Quebec; that we must have justice for the minorities that exist in Quebec and the minorities that exist outside Quebec, as in the Meech Lake accord the Premiers agreed to when they met over a year ago on that very important issue.

I would like to read, in French now, the amendments into the record, because I feel they need to be read into the record in both official languages.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, the Chair doesn't feel that you have to read them. They have been circulated, and they will be part of *Hansard*.

MR. PIQUETTE: Okay. Je veux seulement dire en quelques mots ici que je crois que les deux amendements qui ont été introduits par . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the hon. member didn't hear me.

MR. PIQUETTE: I'm not reading it. I'm just reading a précis.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see. All right.

MR. PIQUETTE: Je veux indiquer que je remercie l'hon. député d'Edmonton-Strathcona des deux amendements qu'il a proposés au gouvernement aujourd'hui pour le Projet de loi 60, qui visent à garantir que la consultation doit exister avec la communauté francophone ici en Alberta pour traduire certaines lois, certains statuts qui existent ici en Alberta. Nous souhaitons que le gouvernement regarde la proposition que notre parti a déposée aujourd'hui, à savoir que nous sommes en faveur, comme parti d'opposition, que la traduction de certains statuts soit une responsabilité de ce gouvernement.

Deuxièmement, nous avons déposé un deuxième amendement qui indique que nous voulons que le gouvernement de ce jour, avec le Projet de loi 60, que toute nouvelle loi, tout nouveau statut, édités par la Chambre de l'Alberta, la Législature de l'Alberta, soient dans les deux langues du Canada, le français et l'anglais, et que ces lois soient disponibles à nos communautés francophones parce que, comme j'ai dit en anglais, c'est important pour nos jeunes, pour l'avenir de nos jeunes, que finalement ils aient dans les mains des documents du gouvernement provincial qui sont officiellement dans les deux langues officielles de notre province et de notre pays. C'est important aussi pour les Canadiens français qui sont unilingues qui doivent se défendre dans les cours de notre province, et c'est

aussi important pour les avocats, les professionnels qui doivent avoir en mains pour leur éducation, pour leurs instructions, pour les recherches, des lois qui sont inscrites ici en Alberta.

Alors, je vous remercie, M. le Président, pour votre attention aujourd'hui.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just rise to speak briefly on this amendment and to indicate my support and the support of the Liberal caucus.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment more or less fills out what we believe to be the major requirements for Bill 60, and one hopes it will accommodate the needs of the Francophone community of Alberta as well. It should also go some distance to remove a part of the rather unfortunate separatist stigma, the sort of "English is the language of Alberta" stigma and labels that we have invited in this province as a result of writing a Bill that flies in the face of fairness and justice to all Albertans. I as an Albertan regret some of the statements and comments that have been made and some of the media attention we have received as a result of Bill 60.

Mr. Chairman, to do what the amendment suggests is not going to incur an enormous cost to Albertans. It is not a requirement that it be done overnight. It is phased, so that it can be withstood and can begin to meet the need, that it can happen in a staged manner in consultation with the Francophone community so we do the most important ones and the most necessary ones first, and so on.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it goes a long way to meet the fundamental rights of all Albertans to be able to read and understand the laws of the province in either official language. I, as I say, regret the Bill as it has appeared and the public comments from some of our government leaders in regard to it. I believe and have come to believe that the Bill without amendment is not compatible with the Constitution of Canada that enshrines two cultures and two languages. Hopefully, these amendments will begin to reduce the irony of our Premier of Alberta signing the Meech Lake accord enshrining Quebec as a distinct society and protecting the rights of French-speaking Canadians whether they are in Quebec or outside Quebec.

I have been embarrassed, as have many Albertans, by this Bill. It is my view that we are all richer as a result of having two cultures and two languages in our country. This is not in any way unique. In fact, most nations of the world have more than one language, often many more than two. I happen to believe that there are immense advantages to each one of us by having two official cultures, two official languages. But there's no question that such a position as taken in the Canadian Constitution and reinforced in Meech Lake must not only be accepted; it must also be nourished in order to survive.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it's a fundamental right of all citizens regardless of their language to participate, through the democratic process, in writing laws. We have that in Alberta. We welcome throughout Canada people of a variety of national origins in our Houses of parliament. But concurrently, it should be a fundamental right to have laws that are written so that citizens of both Canada's official languages, citizens who are French speaking and English speaking, can understand the laws. Only in this way would we uphold the Canadian Constitution and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

It's time for Alberta to stop being isolationist, stop being

snobbish about who we are and what we are, stop being parochial in the laws we write, in the way we speak about ourselves, in the way we talk about our laws. It's time to begin to be noble about ourselves in the nation of Canada and to be proud of what we are as part of Canada and to show leadership in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all members to support this amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to rise in support of the amendment to Bill 60 as proposed by my colleague from Edmonton-Strathcona. I think it's an important amendment. I guess I have to think the reason the government didn't include this provision in the Bill was a fairly mean-minded or small-minded reason, because I don't believe that for us as an Assembly to enter into negotiations with the Francophone community in Alberta to decide which statutes would be appropriately translated into French would be a very big deal at all. I don't think it's an especially big thing, and I'm surprised to see that the government would choose to make an issue out of it. Mr. Chairman. But that doesn't surprise me, given the genesis of this whole situation, and it's a situation I've been involved in to some degree.

I sat on the Privileges and Elections Committee last year and was able to hear the expert testimony of a number of excellent witnesses that appeared before us. Witness after witness gave us assurance that the provisions of the North-West Territories Act, section 110, were in existence, that they weren't extinguished by the Haultain motion, and that the rights of the Francophone minority in Alberta did, indeed, exist and ought to be recognized. It was a painful thing for me and for my colleagues on that committee to sit there and hear the kind of spurious arguments put forward by the government members on that committee in their attempts to justify what was going to come later. What was going to come later was their heavy-handed attempt as a government to extinguish the rights of the Francophone minority in Alberta, and I think that's really unfortunate.

The settlement of our province was done in large part in the very early days by people of French-Canadian background, and that's got to be acknowledged. It was the first step towards creating what is culturally a very rich and diverse community. I can think of my own constituency in that regard. Mr. Chairman. Vegreville was named after a Catholic missionary. Father Vegreville, and the original settlers there were primarily of French background. They were joined not too many years later by a large number of Ukrainian and other east European immigrants who really got the ball rolling, broke the land, turned it into a productive and vital community. We've had successive waves of immigration over the last few years that have made the Vegreville constituency an even more vibrant and culturally rich area, not unlike many other areas in this province.

I think we've got to recognize the fact that Canada is, has been, and will continue to be a bilingual nation. Where there are two founding nations recognized has made it possible for us to develop this culturally rich ethnic diversity where we respect the rights of minorities, where we encourage people to understand their roots, their culture, their tradition, maintain them and develop them in a way that adds to rather than takes away from what makes this province great. It is, as my colleague from Edmonton-Meadowlark said yesterday, a direct contrast with the United States, where they've always tried to absorb and sub-

jugate the minorities that come along and make them all into the same sort of people. We've not done that in Canada, and I'm proud of that. We've not done that in Alberta to this point and I'm very proud of that. It seems a little inconsistent to me for a government that has had a generally good record in encouraging and supporting ethnic diversities that they would want to extinguish the rights of French-Canadians.

We went through, as I mentioned to you, Mr. Chairman, the painful process of the Privileges and Elections Committee where the government decided that MLAs in this Assembly would not have the right to speak in either official language, that they should be speaking English only without prior permission. I think that was an offensive sort of ruling, especially for my colleague from Athabasca-Lac La Biche, who's a very practical-minded fellow and who would not be inclined to speak in French in the Assembly very often because it's his desire that he be well understood by everybody here. But as a member of the Francophone community with strong roots in this province, with family ancestry that goes back decades and generations, he claimed as his constitutional right the right to speak in either of Canada's official languages in this Assembly when he felt it necessary to do so. That was something that had been done in this Assembly ever since Alberta was created as a province in 1905, and it was always done without question. But somehow this Conservative government decided that ought to be challenged and questioned.

Then in the fall we had another opportunity to make things right . . . [interjection] I'm giving the genesis of it here, hon. member. In the Fall we had an opportunity to make things right, where the government brought in some changes to Standing Orders that would require that members seek prior notice before speaking in either official language. They said this was important so we avoid the millions of dollars of cost that would be the result of translating everything everybody ever said in French, and it was an attempt to distort the reality of the situation. What the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche wanted was to be able to speak French when appropriate in this Assembly without having to go to anybody to ask permission, and would graciously provide the translation if members desired. It wouldn't have been anything that would cost money. But the government decided to proceed with that motion . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: It's in the motion. It was in the Bill. Come on.

MR. FOX: It's right here.

They decided to proceed with that and we told them at the time that we ought to have an amendment . . .

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The member should be speaking to an amendment to legislation. The hon. Member for Vegreville is speaking to matters that are included in the Bill, not relevant at all to the amendment under discussion this afternoon. I have no problem with listening to him, but it's not relevant to the point.

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. Attorney General for his reminder. I am indeed speaking to the amendment as proposed by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona. I'm trying to construct an argument to provide the background to my decision supporting this, to say why I think it wouldn't be very difficult at all for us to agree to translate some of our laws into both official languages. We said to the government last fall -- and I was

a part of that negotiation -- that they should amend their motion to say that all these rule changes would be subject to the outcome of the *Mercure* decision, because we recognize . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I would request that you come back to the amendment specifically.

MR. FOX: We recognized that the *Mercure* case in Saskatchewan would establish the rights of the Francophone minority in Alberta as embodied in section 110, Mr. Chairman, which included the translation of various statutes into French. We recognized that. We told them that that ought to be done. They said, "Oh no, we're not prepared to accept that either." But lo and behold, when the decision was finally rendered in Saskatchewan, the government had to acknowledge things.

When they did that and presented Bill 60 to us, they didn't include something that we think ought to be included, and that is a recognition of fundamental rights that have existed since long before Alberta became a province, and that is that Canadians should have the right and the opportunity to have access to and understand and make use of their laws in either of Canada's two official languages. That's merely what my colleague from Edmonton-Strathcona is trying to propose with this amendment, trying to make right with this amendment.

It wouldn't be a very difficult thing. It wouldn't cost the millions that the government claims. In fact, the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche has done some research and estimates that it would cost about \$140,000 initially for us as a province to acknowledge we are part of a bilingual nation and to bring this translation of existing statutes and future statutes into reality. It wouldn't be a difficult thing. It's not an onerous thing. I as an Albertan of Anglophone background, Mr. Chairman, who cherishes the rich diversity, the ethnic diversity of this province, am really offended when I hear the Premier talk about rejecting full bilingualism, even though no one's ever proposed full bilingualism. I don't think the government would have been granting rights to the Francophone minority by agreeing to translate some laws. What they would be doing is acknowledging that these rights do exist. And what they're purporting to do with Bill 60 is with the stroke of a pen deny they ever existed at all. As a legislator that's unacceptable to me, Mr. Chairman. We can't deny history. We can't rewrite history. We can't pretend to be revisionists in this Assembly. We've got to acknowledge and be proud of what is the history of this province and this country.

I suspect there are a few members opposite who see the wisdom in accepting this amendment. I'm not sure who the government has been listening to when they think they're -- well, they may gain some support from their core vote by trying to extinguish the rights of Francophone minorities. But it makes me worry, Mr. Chairman, what's in store for the rest of us down the road, because I believe that when you take rights away from anyone in society, it hurts all of us to the extent that we are capable as a society of acknowledging the rights and aspirations of groups of people. We are a civilized and caring society, and I don't think we as Albertans are demonstrating that in Bill 60.

I'd urge all hon. members to support the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona's amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, would like

to speak in favour of this amendment to Bill 60 as presented by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona. A number of the arguments that have been advanced already I think make the point clear as to why this amendment needs to be supported by all fair-minded Members of this Legislative Assembly here in Alberta. I don't want to reiterate them.

We know, as we've discussed the implications of Meech Lake and what that means, that we are to preserve if not to promote Canada as officially bilingual. Of course, even the political precedents -- what's happened not only in the province of Ontario but in the province of Saskatchewan of late -- have shown that even though our political spirit might be unwilling, the federal system is very supportive in terms of helping financially or in any other way with the translating of statutes into French.

I'd like to advance another argument, Mr. Chairman. I don't know that it's been touched on to this point. But really it's an extraordinary argument to me in terms of how inconsistent it is to leave this amendment out of Bill 60. It seems to me entirely inconsistent to think that we would enact in Bill 60 the provision for French to be spoken in the Legislature, where in fact debate on Bills at all readings brings statutes into being, and that we have provision for the use of French in the courts and in the judicial proceedings and that they can have access to French in that context, and yet the natural, fundamental link of the process between what goes on in the Legislature and what goes on in the courts is that link of the statute -- and the only body which does that is that piece of paper with those words on it. In fact, as I spoke with a lawyer recently, he said: "They don't go back into *Hansard* and look at how it was debated or what was said or what the intention of government might have been or anything like that. They look at only the words of the statute." It's a fundamental link of the process, Mr. Chairman, between the legislative debate and the judicial proceedings.

If by this Bill we are enabling the provision of French to be in those two contexts, then surely any logical consistency of thought and of policy would ensure that certain statutes, particularly those that would have effect for the Francophone Albertans here in the province, would be in French. I really cannot understand how we're going to make these two moves and yet leave out the most natural link of those two other moves and not provide, as this amendment does, for the statutory context to be a context which is also provided for in French.

I think, Mr. Chairman, as members have said, that not to do so is not only illogical and inconsistent but flies in the face of our national unity, flies in the face of what is to be Canadian, and is really an affront to any fair-minded Canadian who wants to live out Canada, as those of us who are of younger age and younger spirit want to see our country come together under the Meech Lake accord to be that of two official languages.

Mr. Chairman, I should just say how, as I rise to speak to this, I feel so compelled today, having just come two blocks from here -- in Edmonton-Centre you just have to go two blocks up to 99 Avenue and across over to 110th Street and there's Manoir St. Joachim. It's a residence for senior citizens, 90 percent of whom are Francophone speaking. They had me there today to present to them . . . They had asked for a Canadian flag, which they wanted to replace their old one and have ready for Canada Day. And I said: "Well, listen. As well as a Canadian flag, how about if I bring you an Alberta flag as well?" And they said: "Oh, yes. That would be great" So they had these two flags that I presented at a luncheon ceremony just today, a Canadian flag and an Alberta flag.

And the symbolism of that, Mr. Chairman, I think is embedded in this amendment. The symbolism of it is to say that we as Canadians and as Albertans want those flags to fly together on the same mast outside of the same senior citizens' centre right here in Edmonton-Centre. And if members are concerned about the faith of these seniors, it was very real. In good faith they said: "No, we don't want to impose French language on everybody. We just want to have our certain rights recognized, and we want to be proud Canadians. We want to be able to stand under the flag and have our rights recognized not only in language and in political rhetoric and in other parts of the land but right here in the province of Alberta, in the Legislature, in the courts, and in statute." And that's of course what this amendment does. It enables a member such as myself to go out and present these flags of Canada, these flags of Alberta, as a symbol of what we are standing for in the Assembly, in the courts, and in our statutes.

So, Mr. Chairman, I can only, then, in summary refer to what the hon. Leader of our Official Opposition New Democrats said in his remarks yesterday, that there is the high road and there is the low road. And I know time and time again we on this side of the House have seen the government, for its own suicidal reasons, take the low road. It seems extraordinary to me that they would not see with some foresight the error of taking the low road, and yet I think the high road, the fair road, the just road would be a road that would lead us all to support this amendment as presented by Edmonton-Strathcona. Now, we've been told on this side of the House that we've been wrong before, and yet our position has been vindicated. We have been voted down before, and yet the vote has had to be reversed by the 61 or so majority members over there. So it's no matter to us if hon. members take the low road and reject this amendment, because I know that we have the high road on our side. We have the principle on our side, we have the future of Canada on our side, and we will stand up for it even in division and vote for this.

Because we realize that Alberta is a distinct society and it is a distinct province, Mr. Chairman, because it is distinctly coming out of the dinosaur age of this Conservative government with all of its inconsistency of thought and low ways of proceeding, coming out of that dinosaur age of Tory governments and distinctly coming into a mature age where fairness and justice will prevail for all Canadians, for all Albertans.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before I recognize the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, I would like to wish the Member for Edmonton-Calder bonne fête. For those members whose French is as good as mine, that means happy birthday.

AN HON. MEMBER: How do you say 37 in French?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Trente-sept.  
Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I just want to correct an impression that I think I left in introducing the amendment, which is that it sets a certain date for the translation of all the statutes. That's not so. It sets a certain date, January 1, 1993, beyond which the date to be fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council for translation of certain statutes cannot go. And that is the basic number of statutes plus thereafter any amendments of them and any new statutes altogether. Eventually, at some dis-

tant time in the future, nearly all the statutes will be translated, but there is no definite date for it all to happen.

MR. HORSMAN: I want to respond very briefly and say that the government took into consideration all the arguments advanced today relative to this issue, and it came to the conclusion that it had to be all laws or none to be translated, because all laws are important to every citizen of the province. That may be a fine distinction, but that was the reason under which the decision was made at that time. I would therefore advise members that we cannot accept the amendments as proposed. I understand that members are prepared to vote now on the subject.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sur l'amendement proposé par le député d'Edmonton-Strathcona, en faveur de l'amendement. On the amendment proposed by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, for the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye. Oui.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Contre l'amendement? Against the amendment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. Non.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The amendment is defeated. L'amendement est rejeté.

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung. Plusieurs députés se sont levés et ont demandé la mise aux voix. La sonnerie annonçant la mise aux voix a retenti]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided. Huit minutes s'étant écoulées, la Chambre a procédé au vote]

For the motion:

En faveur de la motion:

Barrett	Laing	Piquette
Chumir	Martin	Roberts
Ewasiuk	McEachern	Sigurdson
Fox	Mitchell	Taylor
Gibeault	Mjolsness	Wright
Hawkesworth	Pashak	Younie
Hewes		

Against the motion:

Contre la motion:

Ady	Heron	Osterman
Anderson	Horsman	Pengelly
Bogle	Hyland	Reid
Bradley	Johnston	Rostad
Campbell	Jonson	Russell
Cassin	Kowalski	Shaben
Cherry	McClellan	Shrake
Clegg	Mirosh	Sparrow
Cripps	Moore, M.	Speaker, R.
Day	Moore, R.	Stewart
Elliott	Musgrove	Weiss
Elzinga	Nelson	West
Fischer	Oldring	Young
Getty	Orman	Zarusky

Totals: Ayes -19

Noes - 42



Totaux:                      Oui - 19                      Non - 42

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: La motion est rejetée. The motion fails.

MR. TAYLOR: Speaking to the main motion. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a moment, without trying to plow old ground, and refer . . . I was going to use this, but instead of getting the hon. member in French, I ended up with the CBC in English, which is about as difficult to understand.

With regard to Bill 60, Mr. Chairman, one segment maybe I had not talked about yesterday so much is that I believe, and I think the members opposite seem to, too, that if we take Meech Lake and what's going on. Canada is in a state of flux now as far as constitutional change is concerned. There's debate about the Triple E Senate; there's the debate about provincial powers; there's the debate about who should appoint Senators, who should appoint judges. In other words, there's a state of ferment in this country -- or foment, I guess; whatever way you want to look at it -- that is very important to be addressing. Now, we have it going on in the east and the west and in the central part. And I'd like to think of my fellow Albertans as taking the lead and at least speaking for a substantial element of Canada when they sit down to the constitutional table through the years ahead, no matter who is the Premier or what is the government, which should not be perceived as a group that retreated into a ghetto, afraid that in any form or another we're going to lose something, and instead should be very open.

We have the assets here both in natural wealth in the ground, and above the ground some of the greatest farmland in the world, some of the greatest subsurface resources, but the greatest wealth of all is the very big mixture of people that have immigrated from all parts of the world to make up Canada. I think we're lucky, as I often tell new immigrant groups that I welcome to the country, that we were chosen by them, because that cross section gives us a great talent. Now, that talent that we have, not only the nouveau but the old talent, I think can be used to give Alberta a leadership position at the negotiating table of Canada over the next 10 to 15 years -- it may well be a generation -- whether it's in the reform of the Senate, whether it's the reform of the judiciary, whether it's reform of some of the other legislative institutions that we have. And part of that leadership, Mr. Chairman, has to be based on the fact that Albertans look like a broad-minded, open-minded people and are not afraid of change. Maybe they won't welcome change just for change's sake, but they're not paranoid. They're not in any way concerned that somehow or another any change that's for the good of all Canadians is going to work against us.

I think that's one of the things I feel that Bill 60 . . . Although I want to compliment the government thus far; they've come a long way. They've made recognition of the Francophone schools, a recognition of even Votes and Proceedings. These are noble directions, but just that small little bit, that last bit of translating the Acts and regulations into French in the future and of a certain amount in the past would give so much more to the weight of looking like a broad-minded, open-minded province that's willing to take the lead at the negotiating tables of the future here in Canada. I think the public relations that we would gain from it, the negotiating ability that we would gain from it, the credit, if you may call it that, the currency at the national tables of constitutional change would be very great indeed.

I suppose the last argument that I want to make that I didn't

touch on maybe that much before is the hard old economic argument. I've been fortunate enough to work in many political jurisdictions around this world, and every language you have under your management doesn't double your opportunities; it triples or quadruples them. It's a geometric progression rather than an arithmetic one. Consequently, I think, Mr. Chairman, that if we just go that final step . . .

Consequently, I too would like to move an amendment. I'll distribute it now. It is that section 3 be struck out and a new section 3(1) and (2) be submitted. As they're distributing it through the members. I'll just mention that this is very similar to the other amendment that was defeated, but I think possibly simplified and maybe quantified so that the members can see very quickly to voting on it. And if you've come so close, I'd appeal to the members opposite, if you've come so close to really taking that stand, can you imagine the headlines tomorrow if you vote for this amendment? Can you imagine the headlines across Canada welcoming Alberta into the 20th century, welcoming Albertans into taking a lead . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. member. Could the hon. member advise the Assembly if you have the French translation of the amendment?

MR. TAYLOR: No.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We can't accept it. The amendment is out of order. Unless we have it in both French and English, the amendment is out of order.

MR. TAYLOR: I didn't understand that. Of course, we went through what we thought were the proper legal processes. We did not do the drafting; it was done in conjunction with your office. We were not informed when we got it back that it had to be done in two languages.

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would think that either French or English is acceptable.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: According to *Erskine May* an amendment has to agree with the original Act. The original Act is in French and English. Therefore, the amendments have to be in French and English.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question has been called.

On the title and preamble. Agreed? Le titre et le préambule. D'accord?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Opposés?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion is defeated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Pardon me. Sorry. The motion . . . We'll just wait a minute while the Parliamentary Counsel makes some notes here.

MR. WRIGHT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, it is actually not out of order to have a Bill that's defeated or passed without a title or preamble, so don't worry.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Êtes-vous en faveur du Projet de loi, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Contre?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. La motion est acceptée.

Title and preamble. Le titre et le préambule.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

The motion is carried. La motion est adoptée.  
Division.

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung. Plusieurs députés se sont levés et ont demandé la mise aux voix. La sonnerie annonçant la mise aux voix a retenti]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided. Huit minutes s'étant écoulées, la Chambre a procédé au vote]

For the motion:

En faveur de la motion:

Ady	Hewes	Pengelly
Anderson	Horsman	Piquette
Barrett	Hyland	Reid
Bogle	Johnston	Roberts
Bradley	Jonson	Rostad
Campbell	Kowalski	Russell
Cassin	Laing	Shaben
Cherry	Martin	Shrake
Chumir	McEachern	Sigurdson
Clegg	Mirosh	Sparrow
Cripps	Mitchell	Speaker, R.
Day	Mjolsness	Stewart
Elliott	Moore, R.	Taylor
Ewasiuk	Musgrove	Weiss
Fischer	Nelson	West
Fox	Oldring	Wright
Getty	Orman	Young
Gibeault	Osterman	Younie
Hawkesworth	Pashak	Zarusk
Heron		
Totals	Ayes - 58	Noes - 0
Totaux	Oui - 58	Non - 0

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: La motion est adoptée. The motion is approved.

[Title and preamble agreed to. Le titre et le préambule sont acceptés]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Bill be reported.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It's been moved by the hon. Attorney General that the Bill be reported. All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

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

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On the motion that the committee rise and report. For the motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Opposed to the motion?

Sur la motion destinée à ce que le comité suspende la séance et fasse rapport. En faveur de la motion, dites oui. Contre la motion, dites non. La motion est adoptée.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. MUSGREAVE: M. le Président, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration the following Bills -- Le Comité plénier a considéré certains Projets de loi et a établi le rapport suivant -- reports the following Bills: Bills 52 and 60.

MR. SPEAKER: Ayant entendu le rapport du comité, êtes-vous tous d'accord? Having heard the report of the committee, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Contre? The motion is carried. La motion est adoptée.

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

### Bill 22 Labour Relations Code

[Debate adjourned on amendment to motion for third reading, June 27: Mr. Sigurdson speaking]

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you very much, and I'm pleased to once again be able to rise to speak to the amendment that was moved last Monday. It was moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Perhaps I'll have the opportunity now, Mr. Speaker, to read that amendment back into the record. On Monday last the Leader of the Opposition had proposed an amendment . . .

MR. YOUNG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. We're having a difficulty with the signals.

Government House Leader, for a moment.

MS BARRETT: Point of order.

MR. YOUNG: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is that I had served notice of motion earlier on. Regrettably, I was not called, but rather the floor was given immediately to the person who had adjourned debate, which would be appropriate, but not until after I had been called.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. So that would be the procedure, unless this is now a point of order.

MR. WRIGHT: It is a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and the point of order is that the notice given under Standing Order 21 is not returnable at any particular time. It can be moved at any time thereafter once one clear day has elapsed. And we won't get into that argument, of course, again. But it's not returnable at any particular time, and there's therefore no duty on the Chair to call it on. Otherwise, it would say something like that. It simply says that the motion must be made before business starts.

The onus is on the minister of the Crown to move immediately after the order of the day for resuming an adjourned debate is called. He didn't; the debate began; that's it. Next time round there's no reason why he can't do it when this debate resumes again. But I won't presume to read him his rights, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add that even if Standing Order 21 was not as clear as it is, under the circumstances, when a member has already commenced his speaking, I believe that calling a point of order on this issue itself is out of order because the member was already speaking. In other words, the point of order had nothing to do with what the Member for Edmonton-Belmont was referring to in his speaking on the amendment to Bill 22. So, in fact, technically speaking the point of order itself should not, in my opinion, be contemplated.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, if I may. I rose when the order was called. I was not recognized. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont was. I sat down, thought about it for a second, and then raised the point of order not on what the Member for Edmonton-Belmont was saying but rather on the procedure. My point of order has to do with the procedure, with respect, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The understandable difficulty has arisen, but nevertheless the Chair, because . . . First, it's not a point of order, it's a matter of clarification for the business of the House. The next part was that the motion was called, the amendment was called, and the member that was speaking has the right of the floor and will conclude in eight minutes, at which time the Chair will recognize the Government House Leader.

Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you very much. Speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, the amendment that was introduced last Monday, and I'll read it back into the record for those who subscribe to *Hansard*. The amendment reads: "Moved by the hon. Leader of the Opposition ..."

MR. SPEAKER: With respect, hon. member, it's better to just use your time than to reread what's already there. Thank you.

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, okay. You know, I can paraphrase as well. I would think it would be a matter of courtesy extended to those who subscribe to *Hansard* so that they wouldn't have to go back to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. We've been through this a number of times. Let's just proceed with your debate, please.

MR. SIGURDSON: Well . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Paraphrase it.

MR. SIGURDSON: Okay. What the amendment proposes to do is to return to committee stage, to Committee of the Whole, so that the entire committee can consider a new section to be added to the Bill that deals with an application vote to the Labour Relations Board for certification that would not necessarily result in a certification vote.

Mr. Speaker, the need for the referral is really quite clear. The need for the referral is because we have unfair labour practices that do go on in our province during the certification drive. There are occasions when employees choose to collectively join a union and have for themselves a representative known as a bargaining unit or become a bargaining unit so that they can go into contractual negotiations with their employer. There have been on occasion less than fair employers who have participated in what could only be called poor labour practices that have interfered with the process.

Surely to goodness the choice that workers make ought to be their choice and their choice alone, not interfered with by the employer. That's why we have proposed that there be provision in the Act that would allow for the certification process to go ahead if there were indeed an unfair labour practice. We have it now; we have that provision now in the code. But with the proposed code it's gone. With the proposed code what we're going to have is a fine. There could be a fine if the employer interferes with the democratic process of choice that only workers can make. Only workers ought to make that choice, because they're concerned about their future. So I would suggest, quite frankly, that there ought to be provision that allows for certification without a vote.

Also, there are the occasions when you can have the entire work force of a plant sign a union card. You've got 100 percent sign-up, and still with this Act what we're going to have to have is the Labour Relations Board go out and check. Go out and check. Not that they're going to see who signed the card or if they paid the \$2 that was mandatory under the provisions of the current Act, but they're going to go out and are going to have a vote. Even though the employees of the plant have put their signature on the card, which -- as I said before, the signature is far more valuable than the \$2 minimum application fee to join a union during a certification drive. The employees have made a commitment. They make a commitment to join together and get 100 percent sign-up, and still we're going to have a vote.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's tantamount to saying: "You know, what we've got here is that this member is elected by acclamation, but we're not sure that the constituents of a given area knew what they were doing. So although we have this member elected by acclamation, what we're going to do is have a vote

anyway. We're going to go out and conduct a vote even though we have a member elected. Nobody else wanted to run. Nobody else stood in opposition to the member that stood alone, elected by acclamation, but we want to make sure." So what do we do? We go out and we spend money to have a vote to prove the obvious.

What about the need for that automatic certification? I am advised that recently there was a contest. An employer offered a colored television, a 19-inch colored television, or a microwave oven to an employee that could come up with the best antilabour or pro management slogan. This was done during an organization drive.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

AN HON. MEMBER: I agree; it wasn't a big enough prize.

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, we've got a big enough prize to my left.

However, this was an actual case that went before the board. The employer had gone out and said that well, you know, you've decided to join a union, and with the limitations that are placed upon us by an Act we're going to have a contest. For the employee that can come up with the best slogan that would be antiunion -- which is, you know, tantamount to busting the union -- they're going to get a prize.

Well, that's interference. Clearly, that's interference that involves people in something that they ought not to be involved in. It involves the employer in employee affairs. And they had the democratic right; it's a democratic right to choose to organize. They chose that and they had interference. There was no question. The Labour Relations Board then voted that it was indeed an unfair labour practice. Now, is there need for certification there? I would suggest that there is. I would suggest that on those occasions, when the employer has abused the rights of the employees and the employer's place in society ... [The hon. member's speaking time expired]

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. The Chair recognizes the Government House Leader.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 22 ...

MS BARRETT: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair has recognized the Government House Leader. [interjections]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I move that debate on Bill 22 shall not be further adjourned.

MS BARRETT: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. There cannot be a point of order in recognition of a member.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, there can under Standing Orders.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay. On which standing order, hon. member?

MR. WRIGHT: Under Standing Order 21. Mr. Speaker, the motion that "the debate shall not be further adjourned" must be

made "immediately after the order of the day for resuming an adjourned debate is called." One has to wait to make an objection that is contrary to that until after the action has been taken that is contrary to that.

AN HON. MEMBER: You're reaching, Gordon.

MR. WRIGHT: No. What do you mean? That's plain English: A minister of the Crown may, on at least one clear day's notice

which, on the interpretation they use, has been given immediately after the order of the day for resuming an adjourned debate is called, move that the debate shall not be further adjourned.

The order of the day for resumption of the debate was called 15 minutes ago. Immediately means immediately.

So it's too late for the hon. minister to move it on this adjournment. It doesn't mean to say his notice of motion is useless -- at least I think perhaps it doesn't -- because there will be another occasion, presumably, which this debate will be further adjourned to, and then he can use his notice of motion. But the rules are the rules, Mr. Speaker, and I don't possibly see how waiting 15 minutes can be construed as being "immediately after the order of the day for resuming an adjourned debate is called."

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak also on it ...

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair hasn't recognized you yet Westlock-Sturgeon. Thank you.

Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, speaking further on that for a moment and in support of what the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona has pointed out, immediately is not only as he defined it. It means immediately; it doesn't mean at the soonest possible moment. But I would submit too, that the hon. leader of the House on the government side also knew that when he moved the point of order at the time that it had to be done, immediately. He realized that the cat had got away, and he moved. So the recognition is not only by this side of the House, it is by that side of the House, that it had to be done immediately. Otherwise, the House leader would not have moved a point of order on not being recognized after the debate started again.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is recognized by this side of the House; it's recognized by that side of the House. It says quite clearly in Standing Order 21: "Immediately after the order of the day for resuming an adjourned debate is called." We knew the adjourned debate was going to be called; it's in the Order Paper. So everything is in order, Mr. Speaker. I don't see how we can argue that immediately isn't immediately.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the point of order 21(1) I'd also like to point out that at the conclusion of question period today you dealt with a couple of points of order, at the end of which *Hansard* shows Orders of the Day were called, at which time you, yourself, asked unanimous consent to revert briefly to Introduction of Special Guests. In fact when you read the Standing Order entitled Closure -- annotated Closure, I suppose, is the proper way to say it

A minister of the Crown may, on at least one clear day's notice,

(a) immediately after the order of the day for resuming an

adjourned debate is called . . .

That, I think, speaks to the fact that Orders of the Day were called shortly after question period today. The assumption, of course, is that the Government House Leader himself knew that he was going to be calling Bill 22 this afternoon. So I would argue, in fact, that the case is basically sealed up on this point. If he wanted to move his closure motion, he should have done so immediately question period expired or immediately you called Orders of the Day earlier this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: With a reading of Standing Order 21 and 21(a), it would allow that this particular motion with regard to closure under 21 could be moved either after Orders of the Day are called after conclusion of question period or at the beginning of this debate. The chair finds itself in the position that indeed this motion cannot proceed at this time.

It's 5:30. The House stands adjourned till tomorrow afternoon at 2:30. [some applause] Without any applause, hon. members.

