

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Thursday, August 17, 1989 2:30 p.m.**
 Date: 89/08/17

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

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

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

Amen.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 26****Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 1989**

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 1989.

This Bill is the traditional manner of a Bill that corrects and deletes some of the more innocuous items that have the agreement of all parties.

[Leave granted; Bill 26 read a first time]

Bill 259**An Act to Amend the Widow's Pension Act**

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce Bill 259, an Act to Amend the Widow's Pension Act.

This is an Act that will change the discriminatory nature of this Bill by removing the marital status language contained in it.

[Leave granted; Bill 259 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to table the Alberta Newsprint forest management agreement in response for Motion for a Return 149 as amended and agreed to on Tuesday, July 18, 1989.

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to table the Crimes Compensation Board annual report.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table in the Assembly the response to Motion for a Return 210.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file with the As-

sembly today responses to questions 165, 199, 212, and the responses to motions for returns 176 and 185.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table with the House a response to motions for returns 188 and 189. I mentioned yesterday that the opposition motion for a return involved half a tree. This box and those boxes next to your Chair represent a whole forestry management agreement.

Thank you.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you to members of this House Robert Dalziel, a visitor from Corby, Northhamptonshire, England, who is in Edmonton visiting his daughter Lindsay and his son-in-law Don Wanagas, an esteemed member of our media gallery, and their family. He is seated in the public gallery, and I would ask that he rise and receive the warm welcome of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The visitors I'd like to introduce are also from Britain. Well, they were, I should say. They've recently immigrated to Edmonton from England. They had immigrated to Ontario and lived there for 15 years before they returned to England, and now Alberta is lucky enough to boast the presence of Ray and Phyllis Hudson. I'd like to ask them to stand. Before I ask members of the Assembly to join me in welcoming them, I'd like to note that today is also their 43rd anniversary. Welcome.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, there are some special visitors today from the Lethbridge community in the members' gallery I'd like to introduce. It was just a month ago, July 26, when there was a major expansion of the NovAtel plant in Lethbridge, creating some 300 additional jobs and indications that NovAtel had about 40 percent of the American market with regard to cellular telephones . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction please.

MR. GOGO: . . . which should indicate to hon. members how competitive this province is. The special guests today visiting the Legislature are Miss Leone Bechard, Mr. Andy Cimolai, Mr. Jim Roth, and Mr. Gord Stanford, who will be meeting later with our Minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications to discuss their industry. I would ask these visitors in the members' gallery to please rise and have members of the Assembly welcome these people in the traditional fashion.

MR. SPEAKER: Solicitor General.

MR. FOWLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you the parents, in the members' gallery, of one of our lovely pages, who comes from the garden city of St. Albert. Her parents and three sisters and a brother are in the gallery today. I would ask that John and Marianne Willock and their family please rise and receive the traditional welcome of this House.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of Health**

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Health. [interjections]

MS BARRETT: Well, this is a first

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, our government, this Legislature, and virtually all Albertans are struggling with the issues of the changing face of society in the 1990s. Albertans, while known for their strong independence, their pioneer spirit, and their big hearts, are also facing the realities of family breakup and violence, stresses on our mental and physical health, and substance addictions. This government took a major step in addressing this reality last year with the presentation in this Legislature of *Caring & Responsibility: A Statement of Social Policy*. Its basic principle is that the self-reliant individual is the foundation of our society, and his or her participation in the family, the community, and the life of our province is the strength of our society. Other principles emphasize Alberta's strong traditions of volunteerism, support for a co-operative partnership between government, private business, industry, and community agencies, and the need for a focus on strategies that address the causes of social and health problems and a search for innovative ways of preventing their occurrence.

Guided by this philosophy and in recognition of the threat to family life posed by substance abuse, our Premier took a very bold and innovative step by proposing the Alberta Family Life and Drug Abuse Foundation. The revenues from a \$200 million endowment identified within the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund will fund the activities of the foundation. Already in our province we have some world renowned programs delivered by the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission. The commission's resources have been substantially increased this year, primarily to enhance AADAC's capability of dealing with the more intense treatment needs of Alberta youth as well as preventive programs.

But AADAC can't do it all, nor is AADAC the only agency of government which must cope with the effects of stress on our young people and their families. The departments of Family and Social Services, Education, and Solicitor General, as well as our health units and hospitals, our mental health clinics, our schools, our courts, and our police forces are all dealing with the effects of changing social phenomena. The symptoms are clear and touch the lives of so many Alberta families, but our challenge is to determine the causes and search for more innovative and effective approaches that will ensure our operating programs are fulfilling the needs in the best way possible.

As a major instrument of our government's social policy the mandate of the Alberta Family Life and Drug Abuse Foundation will include, number one, education. There is a need to enhance the awareness and therefore ability to detect individuals addicted or at risk by their teachers, their health care professionals, or their family. Finding innovative ways to address these educational and preventive programs is a major challenge. The training of future professionals such as teachers, doctors, lawyers, and social workers in Alberta must emphasize increased understanding of indicators that put individuals at risk.

Number two, community involvement. Support mechanisms

for parents and young people and co-ordination of government, community programs, and volunteer efforts are vital to the operation of the foundation.

Number three, treatment. New models for treatment need to be assessed and innovative approaches stimulated. The foundation should not involve itself in the ongoing operation of programs, which is left to existing government agencies, but rather should concern itself with being a catalyst for new and innovative approaches.

Number four, research and evaluation. Basic research is needed as well as clinical research that evaluates the outcome of specific programs. A vitally important area of research will be the research programs to identify risk factors which lead to substance dependency. Both biochemical and environmental circumstances that predispose individuals to substance abuse must be supported. As well, the overall mandate of the foundation requires a strong information base and the demographics of drug abuse and other social indicators as needed.

Mr. Speaker, Albertans have told us that they want some new approaches to deal with the changing face of our province. We believe that government alone cannot do the job. What is needed is the input and the partnership of government, private business and industry, the community, and individuals. To co-ordinate this effort and to consult with these agencies, I have assigned the task to the Ministerial Health Policy Advisory Committee, chaired by the MLA for Lloydminster, Doug Cherry, with the MLA for Calgary-Foothills, Pat Black, serving as one of the members. Along with the public members of their committee they will do the necessary consultations with the community groups, the existing agencies, and experts in the field of addictions and family services before recommending to government the form the foundation should take.

To assist them in this task, I am filing with the Assembly draft legislation which proposes an organizational and a structural approach to establishing the foundation. The draft legislation is modeled on the legislation used to establish the very successful Heritage Foundation for Medical Research.

The committee will begin its work immediately, and I expect them to report to me by the end of February 1990. I will then return to this Assembly during the spring session of 1990 with the necessary legislative and administrative framework to set the foundation in place for the benefit of all Albertans.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, you can imagine the surprise in my office. I almost died of a heart attack when I got this ministerial statement. I want to first of all commend the minister for bringing this up in the proper place and not wasting time in question period.

To look at the announcement, I don't think any of us could disagree with what the minister is attempting to do. Obviously, education, under number one, is very important. As she points out, finding innovative ways to address these educational preventive programs is a major challenge. Like everything else, Mr. Speaker, to detect drug problems, to detect possible suicide victims among young people, the people dealing with them have to be very cognizant of some of the symptoms. I would hope that would be a major thrust of this particular program.

Who can argue with involving the community? If you don't involve the community, the chances for success would be absolutely nil. Treatment, looking at new models for treatment, obviously makes good common sense. As in every program that is brought in, you have to have some means to do the research and

evaluate if you're on the right track.

So let me say, first of all, that we would support this initiative, Mr. Speaker. But there's one criticism I would like to approach with the minister. I notice that there are two MLAs from the Legislature, both from the government side. It seems to me that if we wanted to look at this, it should be a nonpartisan approach. I might suggest that perhaps the critics from the two opposition parties be involved with this committee. I think it would add to the stature of the committee, and I would lay that out as a suggestion to the minister.

Mr. Speaker, the only concern I might have is that if we take a very narrow approach to substance or drug abuse, I think we will be barking up the wrong tree. There are many reasons why people resort to drug abuse. It can be for many different reasons, I guess as many reasons as there are people. It could be problems of poverty. It can be stress in the workplace. It can be high unemployment. It can be that in fact in the past we've cut back on some needed social services in this province; i.e., some health care, social services, cutting back on some of the welfare programs. Often these people are the people involved in drug abuse.

So I look forward to the future not only with what the minister's going to bring back in 1990 in terms of a legislative approach, but I'm going to watch very carefully how the government is dealing with these needed social programs as we also deal with the deficit and the debt that this government has created. But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that all in all we support the initiative and will look forward to the spring session.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Ombudsman's Report on Principal Collapse

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Unfortunately, or perhaps conveniently for this government, a printing delay has held up the release of the Alberta Ombudsman's report on the Principal collapse. Now, I'm sure that the Premier would say that this is just a coincidence that this has happened in that the Legislature will not be sitting when this report is released. But I want to say to the Assembly that this is one of the most important reports that this province has seen in many years. It is crucial to this government. It is crucial to the investors affected, and it's certainly crucial to the taxpayers of Alberta. Unlike the Code report the Ombudsman can freely talk about the government's role in this fiasco, but he can also, more importantly, make recommendations. It's absolutely crucial that the Legislature have an opportunity to deal with this report, and I would think the Premier would want this to happen. My question to the Premier is: would the Premier be prepared to convene a special sitting of the Legislature just for a few days to debate the contents of this Ombudsman's report?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I guess I should make it clear to members of the Legislature the origin of the report. This is being carried out by the Ombudsman at the order of the government. As I explained to the House at times in the past, we wanted all the information regarding the Principal matter to be out; therefore, we ordered the Ombudsman to carry out this report. Therefore, we want the fullest possible discussion of it.

Now, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has made a suggestion. I would be prepared to consider it. I'm certainly not prepared to make any commitment to that, because it's hypothetical

as to what's in the report at this stage. As a matter of fact, I'm not aware of the delay and the printing problems. Mr. Speaker, I just assume the report is coming as soon as it possibly can.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, rest assured we've talked to the Ombudsman. There is a delay.

I'll ask the Premier, then, because we will be out of the Legislature and it will be easy for him to say he'd consider it here, and then we're not back. So I'm asking the Premier: would he give us a commitment that there will be this special session? The Ombudsman's report is coming. If it praises the government, all the better. He might want to be back here, Mr. Speaker. Or would he at the very least, then, give a commitment to a fall session where we can deal with this or other serious matters that will have arisen by that time?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. Leader of the Opposition is prejudging the Ombudsman's report. What I would only say to him is that he has raised something and he's asked me to consider something. I'll consider it in respect for the hon. Leader of the Opposition and for his position in this House. I know his concern for Alberta, so I will consider it.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the Premier is going to consider it. But he's well aware that probably tomorrow will be the last day of the session. When, then, will he give us a commitment? Will it be by tomorrow morning that we will in fact be able to debate this very serious report that he takes great pride in saying they caused? Let's be back here. Give us a commitment by tomorrow then.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition isn't listening to my answer to his first question and a supplementary, and the same answer applies.

Federal Sales Tax

MR. MARTIN: If it happens, Mr. Speaker, I'll be the most surprised person in the world.

My second question is also to the Premier. With each passing day it becomes more apparent that this Premier's 'getty-up-and-go' has gotten up and gone. Today we have the spectacle of the Premier canceling a previously scheduled news conference to discuss among other things the upcoming Premiers' Conference. But more seriously, Mr. Speaker, we also have the spectacle of Conservative Alberta MPs like Jack Shields and Jim Hawkes basically laughing at this government and calling its so-called battle against the federal sales tax -- and I quote -- a sham and empty rhetoric. Obviously, this government has no clout with the federal government and has lost all respect of its federal cousins.

My question to the Premier is this. How in the world is this government going to put pressure on Mulroney and Wilson when its Alberta MPs are basically treating them as a joke in this province?

MR. GETTY: Again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition places great store in press reports. I would caution him that there have been the odd occasions when they're incorrect. Nevertheless, I do not find it strange that members of the federal government would try and deflect the attention which the Alberta government is focusing on their goods and services tax.

Let them try.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the point that I want to make: this Premier is going to take on Mulroney, he's supposedly going to take on Mr. Wilson in this great battle, and we have Alberta MPs here laughing at this government. I want to ask the Premier. He says that he has a strategy of fighting the federal sales tax. Will he now, so that people stop laughing at him, tell us what that strategy is?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, again I must caution the hon. member, as perceptive as he is, to find out first what in fact people are saying before he just goes blindly by press reports.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I think it's fairly clear what they said. Albertans, frankly -- this is a very important issue -- are afraid that this Premier will look as weak and as silly as he did in his last battle when he went to the Premiers' Conference on the high interest rate policy. He came back and got KO'd after the first round. What is different about this fight as he goes into the Premiers' Conference?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, again the hon. Leader of the Opposition is surely taking his direction and information from some weird place, because the facts that he has just presented are completely false. What the government of Alberta has been able to do not just in the matter of the sales tax -- he raises the issue of interest rates. As you may recall, Mr. Speaker, the government of Alberta was the leader in fighting the high interest rates. The government of Alberta was able then to pull together all of the Premiers and all of the governments of Canada to focus public attention on interest rates. We have done it, and they all have followed the Alberta leadership in this area. It has caused the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, and the Bank of Canada to take a very careful look. I submit that it is impossible for the federal government or the Bank of Canada to ignore the combined efforts and the combined concerns of the 10 provincial first ministers. But Alberta has been able to focus public attention on the high interest rates, and we submit that that has been effective.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there was only one province, one Premier, that was pointing out the need to resist the goods and services tax, and we've been able to pull behind us again all of the provinces with perhaps the exception of Saskatchewan. I will be looking forward to hearing what their position is rather than trying to take it long distance or through the news reports. But we have been able to focus the public of Canada on these two important features in Canada through the leadership of the Alberta government, and I know that that effort has been very successful.

Responsibility for Financial Institutions

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, many FIC and AIC investors who are dissatisfied with the government's response to the Code report are preparing lawsuits that will involve the government of Alberta. That process will be time consuming, and it will be expensive for everyone. The Ombudsman will soon report on the responsibility of the government with respect to Principal noteholders, regrettably somewhat after the government has solidified its position on this issue. Finally, if there is one thing we know after this whole sorry mess, it is that where there is a

duty upon the government to monitor and regulate, it must do so rigorously with the best of staff at its disposal.

My first question is to the Attorney General. Given that when two sides in a lawsuit agree to a statement of facts, it saves each of them both time and money, will the minister agree to signal to those investors and to their legal agents that the government is prepared to work out such a statement of facts -- based facts -- based on the Code report so as to save time and money for all parties concerned including taxpayers of Alberta?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. member is giving a hypothetical, but even in view of that, if there is an action commenced -- there hasn't been to date -- that would be something that would have to be discussed between the solicitors for the two parties.

MR. DECORE: Well, that doesn't help the taxpayers of Alberta who have to pay for these lawsuits, Mr. Attorney General.

My second question is to the Premier. We now know, of course, that the Ombudsman will bring forward his report after this Assembly adjourns. Accepting, then, that noteholders are correct, that the Ombudsman will report in their favour, will the Premier agree to change the government's premature conclusion with respect to the noteholders?

AN HON. MEMBER: Talk about premature.

MR. GETTY: Yeah. Mr. Speaker, it's remarkable that the leader of the Liberal Party would talk about premature reactions to the Code report. It was almost comical the way the rush was on to the media when he hadn't even read it and then placed such a garbled position out that his own party wasn't able to follow it, his own members here in the Legislature. So the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry has put together some hypothetical positions that the government surely is not going to try and speculate on at this stage.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, it's not comical that the Premier's leadership has cost Albertans a hundred million dollars in this whole matter.

My last question, to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, is this. Given that the minister's department is responsible for protecting Albertans by monitoring the regulatory compliance of thousands of organizations, ranging from huge financial concerns to small nonprofit societies, what has the minister done to ensure that his department has sharpened up on its reporting, its monitoring, and its control of such organizations?

MR. ANDERSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member invites me to at length reply to the many initiatives that have taken place within our department regarding safeguarding the Albertan's position in the investment community. The first I would indicate is the dramatic changes that have been made over the past few years to the Securities Commission, where we've split the administrative and the investigative functions from the judicial or semijudicial functions of that. We've over doubled the size of that commission in terms of its resources and in terms of its ability to investigate. There is a series of initiatives, which I'm sure you wouldn't want me to take the time of question period to elaborate on, which the Securities Commission itself has taken to ensure that investments are looked at properly and considered carefully.

On the other side, with respect to organizations generally in the province, we recognize that there has been the fall of those traditional four pillars of the financial community, so we have tabled in this Legislature the financial consumer Act which will supply for the Albertan who wants to purchase financial products basic information with basic terminology and a required way and format in which individuals will learn about and, therefore, be able to make objective judgments on financial investments that they would engage in.

There are with respect to the department itself fundamental changes that have taken place over the past few years at the hands of my predecessor and since I've taken over the department in terms of how it's organized and the reporting responsibilities that are there. I would be more than pleased at a future time to discuss those in some detail with the hon. member or with other members of the Assembly. Overall, the government has taken what I believe to be decisive, continuing, and well-thought-out steps to ensure that those people who invest in this very complicated, fast-moving financial market have as good protection in terms of our regulatory system as exists . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister.

Banff-Cochrane, Edmonton-Kingsway, Edmonton-Whitemud.

Premiers' Conference at Quebec City

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Leader of the Official Opposition has alluded to the upcoming Premiers' Conference. As these conferences are an excellent opportunity for our Premier to articulate Alberta's vision of Canada, I would appreciate it if the Premier would advise this House of the agenda items for this very important meeting.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, in several discussions with the chairman of this year's conference, the Premier of Quebec, it's been clear that he was trying to frame the agenda for the Premiers' Conference in the broadest possible agenda items. He has, in fact, established these five, and for the information of the House they may be interested. The five agenda items are economy and trade, social issues, environment, interprovincial and federal/provincial co-operation, and then the tabling of reports to the Premiers which they have asked for from their ministers over the year since the last Premiers' Conference. Now, this type of a flexible agenda in broad areas the way he has framed it, Mr. Speaker, usually provides to the Premiers the opportunity to raise all of the matters of concern facing their provinces.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Because the Meech Lake accord is not supported by all of the provincial leaders and there's considerable debate in this country as to whether there is currently being formulated or should in fact be formulated a collateral or a parallel accord, will the Premier undertake to attempt to have this item added to the agenda; that is, a thorough review of the Meech Lake accord?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, there is a uniqueness about this Premiers' Conference in that the province of Quebec is now in the middle of a provincial election. Therefore, there will probably be a certain amount of sensitivity by the Premiers to that

fact. Meech Lake is not on the agenda as a specific discussion item. However, there are also opportunities where the Premiers will meet in private breakfast, lunch, or dinner situations, and I anticipate that during those meetings, if it does not come up in the public portion of the discussions, Meech Lake will be bound to be discussed in some manner. I'll be looking forward to hearing the concerns of the Premiers of Manitoba and New Brunswick and the results of the hearings which their Legislatures have conducted and also to hear from other Premiers as to their positions regarding parallel accords or some type of accommodation which might allow Meech Lake to proceed.

MR. EVANS: My second supplemental, Mr. Speaker, is again to the Premier. The issue of high interest rates is a matter of great concern to the constituents of Banff-Cochrane and certainly all Albertans. With a policy of the Bank of Canada which allows for an interest rate which is some 4 percent higher than the U.S. rate, will the Premier kindly advise this Assembly if he will attempt to have again the interest rate policy of the central bank placed on the agenda for this meeting?

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has identified one of the areas, as I said earlier in replying to the Leader of the Opposition. I think it's been very effective that we've been able to pull together all of the governments of Canada in focusing attention on the high interest rate issue. As the hon. member points out, we have a historic difference between the United States and Canada in terms of interest rates now. I think we must continue to push and must hammer away at the Bank of Canada and the federal government to get lower interest rates. I know that with the confidence and investment that's flowing across this province, for Alberta businessmen and for Albertans to participate fully in that investment and the expansion which we anticipate in this province, lower interest rates are essential. So we will be working with the other Premiers to make sure that happens.

I will also, of course, Mr. Speaker, be pushing the matter of Senate reform with my colleagues. I think that's a matter that they all understand, the importance to Canada, particularly western Canada. I believe we'll have an opportunity. It's interesting to know this will be the first Premiers' Conference in history where six of the Premiers now support the Triple E Senate. That's an important breakthrough, following Alberta's leadership.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Kingsway, Edmonton-Whitemud, then Highwood.

Authority for Regulating AGT

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are to the Minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications. The recent Supreme Court decision regarding regulatory jurisdiction over AGT gives the federal government the ability to act on its stated intentions of increasing competition in long-distance communication services. Regulatory changes in the United States similar to the federal government plans have already led to local telephone rate increases of up to 100 percent, and the Supreme Court decision leaves the Alberta government's control over AGT in doubt. Given that until the federal government makes the necessary amendments to the federal Railway Act AGT is subject to no regulatory authority and

is unable to claim immunity from the federal Competition Act, what steps is this minister taking to ensure that AGT's interim operations are not rendered ineffective by a number of legal challenges?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court decision to which the hon. member refers is indeed a very complex decision, and we're certainly taking the time to study it thoroughly to make sure that we are aware of all of the consequences and ramifications that flow from it. But the one thing that does appear to be clear is that it indicates that this government does in fact own and control AGT and, therefore, has the right to regulate it as a consequence of that. Therefore, any further moves in respect to matters such as the hon. member raises are strictly speculative at this point in time.

MR. McEACHERN: Well, the American situation has already showed the direction it goes.

Given that AGT's long-distance revenues stand to be significantly undercut through this increased competition from other telecommunications companies, will the minister assure us that there will be no attempt made to finance AGT's Out-of-province competitiveness on the backs of average Albertans through increased local rates?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, again the hon. member apparently is dealing with certain areas that are certainly what ifs and speculative. All I can say to him is that at this point in time and indeed for time in the future it's the policy of this government to ensure that Albertans continue to receive quality service from AGT at reasonable rates with universal access.

MR. McEACHERN: There's only one direction that this sort of competition leads and that's to lower rates for businesspeople using sophisticated telecommunication devices. What assurances do we have that the average people are not going to pay for that in their local telephone rates?

MR. STEWART: Well, again the hon. member is jumping to certain conclusions. But let me assure him that come what may, AGT will in fact be regulated in the public interest in any number of possible scenarios, but it will be regulated in the public interest. The first is by this government, as I indicated, as the owner and being in control of that company. Secondly, if there are certain moves of the federal government, then it would be controlled in the public interest in that way.

MR. McEACHERN: Sold out.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. STEWART: Thirdly, through an agreement between the federal and provincial governments: we are moving in that direction and hope to succeed.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Whitemud, followed by Highwood, then Stony Plain.

Community Enhancement Programs

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, who is also responsible for

the community facility enhancement program, stated in a press release dated October 6, 1988, and I quote from that press release, which I have a copy of:

MLAs will play a community liaison role as part of the implementation of the Community Facility Enhancement Program.

I repeat: MLAs, not government members but MLAs. Yet he arranges for the hon. Member for Calgary-Foothills to present a cheque for \$153,000 to an organization in the constituency of the Liberal MLA from Calgary-North West. And I point out that big glowing smile in the *Westlock News*: the minister handing a \$250,000 cheque to a mayor in the riding of Westlock-Sturgeon. Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister. Is the minister prepared to live by his earlier commitment and allow all -- I repeat: all -- MLAs to participate in this publicly funded program?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I filed with the Assembly Motion for a Return 176. When hon. members and the public of Alberta have an opportunity to take a look at the Motion for a Return 176, they will note that to the period of August 4, 1989, under the community facility enhancement program we have now approved 686 projects at a total value of \$24.9 million. Now, the difficulty that I have is that I simply could not attend every presentation throughout the province of Alberta. There is an incredible amount of work that's gone into this, 686 projects throughout the province of Alberta, everywhere in the province of Alberta, and it's simply impossible for me to attend. So from time to time I ask one of my colleagues who happen to be members of the government -- the government. This is a government program.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that even in this Assembly in recent months some hon. members of the opposition referred to it as a crass program; the leader of the Liberal Party has ridiculed it as a silly program. They don't want to help the people of Alberta. Part of the reason, outlined of course in the document, is that hon. members are asked to explain the program. I simply cannot trust someone who refers to it and ridicules it as an unnecessary program. It's a government program.

MR. WICKMAN: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the minister only has a passing acquaintance with the truth. Will the minister now state that he no longer will live by his earlier statement that I referred to in his press release of October 6, 1988? Is this a contradiction? Is it a flip-flop?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat it again. We've had this exercise in what parliamentary democracy's all about. The people of Alberta elect Members of the Legislative Assembly. In the Legislative Assembly there are members who are members of the governing party. It is the government party which determines the agenda, which creates the programs, which seeks the approval for the programs. It is also the government, it seems, that every time somebody has some concern about it, including hon. members of the opposition -- they pounce on the government and hammer them and ridicule them and lambaste them, and they do it time and time again. It's interesting. When there is a program that they finally, finally, finally catch on to as being of positive benefit to the people of Alberta -- which of course applies to virtually every program that the government enunciates. But in this case now they want

to piggyback on the program. Well, they can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, let me try a minister where I can get some straight goods. To the Minister of Recreation and Parks. Mr. Minister, as I have indicated concern before about the community recreation/cultural program being replaced by a giveaway-by-Tory-only fund, will the minister commit himself to this House that he, in fact, will extend the CRC program beyond 1992?

DR. WEST: I'm glad to hear that I'm straight, anyway, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have addressed this question many times in the House recently, and I assure the people of Alberta that we will deliver the commitment of \$240 million that was committed some three years ago in the CRC program; \$163 million has been delivered to this date. At that time we will reassess all the programs in the Department of Recreation and Parks. I will communicate with my colleague the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism, which shares in the CRC grants, to see where this program will go.

I must add that at the present time for the communities throughout the province of Alberta and the organizations that access funds on a volunteer basis, we have some \$178 million in programs this year that are delivered through on grant bases to these organizations. Of that, \$24 million of it is the CRC programs. I have a list of some 10 areas that are funded and accessible for these organizations, and if the member would like to contact my office, I would be glad to share those programs with him.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Multiculturalism, no.
Highwood, thank you.

Calgary Annexation Proposals

MR. TANNAS: As you know, Mr. Speaker, the growing economic strength of this province of Alberta manifests itself in many ways. The city of Calgary has demonstrated this kind of growth with major annexation proposals that will affect many people in my constituency of Highwood and neighbouring constituencies of Banff-Cochrane, Drumheller, and Three Hills. Now, there are many people who have been involved in public hearings, making presentations and petitions, and these people, including school boards, municipal councils of Rocky View, Wheatland, and Foothills, are waiting for answers as to whether or not they're going to be annexed, whether they're in the city, or whether they're still in the country. My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. When may these rural people know the recommendations of the Local Authorities Board?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, early in 1989 this process started whereby public hearings were held by the Local Authorities Board, and the respective municipalities that the hon. member has mentioned were involved. The Local Authorities Board reported to myself as minister, which they are responsible to do under the municipal government grant, on July 27. Prior to that time I also personally held meetings with various persons who wanted to make representation; for example, the city of Calgary, the municipalities, and interested persons. We now are consid-

ering all of that information, and it will move through a process through cabinet committee and from there to cabinet for a recommendation, and that will come soon.

MR. TANNAS: Mr. Speaker, my first supplementary would be then: what are you going to do with these recommendations, and when may we expect to learn of them?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. member and certainly the many interested parties, it'll be our intention to take the information, and we have three options at our disposal: first of all, to reject it if we wish; secondly, we can accept the Local Authorities Board order in whole; or thirdly, we can vary that recommendation in terms of some of the representations we have had and then through order in council make it law.

MR. McEACHERN: How about releasing the report?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Just as added information with regards to that in terms of disposal, the recommendation will go to cabinet on August 23. Following that point in time, once we have made a decision with regards to the board order, then the Local Authorities Board report will become public so that that information is available to the public. At that time a decision will be made and final.

MR. TANNAS: Okay. Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary question again is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Will there be adequate notification and time for the local MD councils, the school boards, and the city to finalize the electoral boundaries before the forthcoming municipal elections and -- who knows? -- before the forthcoming senatorial election?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the reason the government has moved quickly on this matter and put it on a fast track to move it into cabinet for a decision was for that purpose -- for other purposes as well, but that was one of the main reasons, so that boundaries for the upcoming municipal elections could be established in time for those respective elections.

Impact of New MD and School Division

MR. WOLOSHYN: Mr. Speaker, the creation of the new municipal district of Brazeau and the Twin Rivers school division were fraught with difficulty beginning with the initial proposal in 1973, second proposal in 1977, third proposal in 1984. In every one of these instances the government was warned that the creation of a new district would have adverse effects on the tax bases of surrounding counties, particularly the county of Parkland. My first question is to the new Minister of Municipal Affairs. How many millions of dollars did the government spend to create the new municipal district, including the start-up money for Brazeau and municipal compensation to Leduc, Parkland, Clearwater, and ID 14?

MR. SPEAKER: Sounds like the Order Paper.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, it's certainly a very good question by the hon. member in that in taking action such as this, we want to be accountable for the funds. I regret very much that I haven't those numbers at my fingertips. What I will

do is commit to get them for the hon. member. If our session doesn't extend itself over a longer period of time than predicted earlier in this House, I will give the information by letter to the hon. member.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Given that school taxes are requisitioned from the municipal authorities by the school divisions and the fact that the Twin Rivers school division claims that they have no money, what is the minister prepared to do about the fact that Twin Rivers is not paying the Yellowhead school division their \$550,000 which they should be requisitioning from Brazeau?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the present time I haven't had a direct representation from the groups to intervene or to facilitate that decision. If necessary, I am prepared to do that.

MR. WOLOSHYN: To the Premier. Given that it's clear that the former Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Education have both taken actions which are hurting the taxpayers in a number of counties, will the Premier now grant the requests of local authorities and local taxpayers by establishing an independent review of the effects of the creation of the new MD and school district on the county of Parkland's board of education and some of the other associated authorities?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, of course, I don't agree with the lead-in to the hon. member's question, but I would encourage him to do this: rather than presenting questions based on false information, to try and work with his constituents in a constructive way and with the ministers who are involved. I assure him that he will get every possible assistance in representing his constituents.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-McKnight, followed by Rocky Mountain House.

Attitudes Towards Family Violence

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in late June Albertans were outraged by comments made by a provincial court judge to the effect that women are often to blame for inciting violence against themselves. In response to questions asked by my colleague from Edmonton-Gold Bar at that time, the minister responsible for women's issues assured this Assembly that the transcripts of that particular case would be reviewed and that any necessary action would be taken. It has now been over a month and a half, and we have heard nothing. My first question is to the minister responsible for women's issues. Can the minister indicate whether or not any action has been taken in this serious matter?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, it is true that I answered those questions both as Acting Attorney General and as minister responsible for women's issues on that day. There has been action taken, but I would ask that the Attorney General respond in more detail.

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to inform the hon. member that the transcript was reviewed. The comments were included in the transcript. The transcript was forwarded to the

chief judge of the Provincial Court and because of judicial independence, now it's his job to take it on to the Judicial Council if he finds that that is the action to take.

MRS. GAGNON: Mr. Speaker, then again to the Attorney General. Is it possible for the report following this investigation to be made public?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, that would be in the domain of the chief judge. I'm quite certain if action is taken that he would do that. There's certainly no cover-up, and I will convey the hon. member's comments to him.

MR. SPEAKER: Final.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you. My final question is again to the minister responsible for women's issues. What concrete steps has the minister taken to assure that all Albertans, especially those in positions of authority, are sensitized to the issue to ensure that a repetition of this sad incident is avoided?

MS McCOY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member indeed raises a point that I think we all struggle with, and certainly by the very fact of asking questions in this Assembly and our answering them and actions being taken in this matter does raise the awareness of all Albertans, and I think that's a step forward. However, we are dealing with individual attitudes, and there is only so much we can do.

One positive note that I might add, however, that I think in part at least arose out of the incident that the member has raised, is that I think the chief judge of the Provincial Court himself has arranged or is in the process of arranging four seminars for members of the judiciary so that they can become more familiar and, therefore, more sensitive to these issues, as they are raised so very often and so very unfortunately in our court systems.

MR. SPEAKER: Rocky Mountain House, followed by Edmonton-Avonmore, then Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Ya-ha-tinda Area

MR. LUND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In this great province of ours there are many unique environments. One such unique area in the Rocky Mountain House constituency is an area of approximately 26 square miles of grassland located in the mountains abutting Banff National Park. Early in our provincial history the federal Parks Service acquired this land and have used it since by the warden service as a ranch for their horses. This area that I'm referring to is known as the Ya-ha-tinda, which means "prairie in the mountains." To the Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife. I'm curious as to the status of the negotiations between the federal government and our government to relocating this horse ranch to a more appropriate area.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I regret to advise the hon. member and the Assembly that I received a letter from the director general of the western region of the Parks Service, and she advised me that they had now made a decision that they were not going to consider the trade of land for the Ya-ha-tinda.

MR. LUND: Supplementary to the minister. I'm certainly very disappointed to hear that, as this is a very prime elk range and

very suitable for sheep and other wildlife. Would the minister please advise us as to what the actual proposal was?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I saw this, and working with my department, as a win/win situation for everyone. I saw that there was an opportunity to trade some land that would create a heritage ranch and a natural extension of the Parks Service where the horses could go, and that would free up the Ya-ha-tinda for a haven for wildlife. I was working closely with the North American elk foundation, because it's a natural elk habitat, and it certainly would have created a win/win situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Final.

MR. LUND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the same minister. Given that this was such a win/win situation, could you give any reason why the federal government would not proceed with such a situation?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, they were fairly positive to the situation and were happy to work with us. Then when the letter we received from them didn't really give any reasons, I was advised that there was some lobbying done by organizations, the Alberta Wilderness Association and the Speak Up for Wildlife groups, which sent letters that were opposed to the transfer of land. I think that's regrettable, because if they did in fact do that they certainly weren't working with proper information and putting it in a bad light. It's extremely unfortunate. I talked to the North American elk foundation today, and they are very concerned as well. They've raised some private-sector money, and hopefully they want me to do all that I can to see that it is developed. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to do that, and I also intend to work with the federal minister responsible and see if we can work an arrangement.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The time for question period has expired.

The Chair would like to point out to the hon. Member for Calgary-McKnight that the Blues will be checked as to the introduction to the main question as to the comment made with regard to one of the courts in the province. *Beauchesne* 493 then gets cited:

All references to judges and courts of justice of the nature of personal attack and censure have always been considered unparliamentary, and . . . [have been] treated as breaches of order.

So we'll just check the Blues on that, but I think it's sufficient just to bring it to the notice of all members.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

229. Mr. Chumir asked the government the following question:

What is the amount of the unfunded accrued liability under the following pension funds:

- (1) local authorities pension plan,
- (2) public service pension plan,
- (3) public service management pension plan,
- (4) universities academic pension plan,
- (5) special forces pension plan,

- (6) Members of the Legislative Assembly pension plan, and
- (7) Teachers' Retirement Fund
as of March 31, 1989?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: As the Acting Provincial Treasurer -- I know, as hard as that is to believe, perhaps -- I would like to say that we will reject this question because the amounts of the unfunded liability are not available for March 31, 1989, nor are they documented plan by plan. It is a total that's accumulated, and the most current numbers are to March 31, 1988. So the province has no choice but to turn down the question.

231. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question:

- (1) How much money in each of 1986, 1987, and 1988 did the federal government supply to the provincial government for disaster aid in Alberta?
- (2) How much money was paid in total by the province, including the federal government contribution, in disaster aid in 1986, 1987, and 1988?
- (3) What were the names of the recipients and the amount each received from the Alberta disaster aid program in each of 1986, 1987, and 1988?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the government would be pleased to accept Question 231, and I would like to file a response.

232. Mr. Wickman asked the government the following question:

- (1) What is the paving schedule for secondary road 754 from Highway 88 to Wabasca and Desmarais?
- (2) When is the final paving of the road scheduled to be completed?
- (3) What is the total cost of the upgrading project?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in response to Question 232, the MLA for the Lesser Slave Lake area and I are working on the next project for secondary road 754. It's hopefully planned for next year, earlier if possible, keeping in mind that the current construction in the area is on the road between Wabasca and Calling Lake. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the secondary highway program that was announced during the last election will assist us in our discussions with the members of the municipal districts, counties, and IDs -- in this particular case, an ID -- as to their priorities for the roads like 754 or the one between Calling Lake and Wabasca.

The second part of the question is: when will it be completed? The best answer I can give at this time is that that depends on the annual budget process and the discussions that I stated earlier. In response to number three, it's hypothetical at this point.

MR. SPEAKER: The answer: the government accepts Question 232, and the answers will be tabled.

233. Mrs. Hewes asked the government the following question:

How many clients were seen in mental health clinics operated by mental health services in Alberta in the fiscal years 1987-88 and 1988-89, providing a breakdown by

- (1) clinic,

- (2) gender, and
- (3) service provided; i.e., long-term maintenance, acute care, family counseling, and other?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I will accept Question 233.

CLERK: Question 234, Mr. Mitchell.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we could go on to the next one, 235.

235. Mr. Bruseker asked the government the following question:

- (1) How many recipients have received money under the Alberta business development program to date, since its inception?
- (2) Who were the recipients and what were the amounts received on each individual grant?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, this is an absolutely, totally redundant question. All of this information is public. A press release is put out on each and every case. They're all public. All the information's there. However, if it helps the Liberal opposition to understand what's going on, the government will accept the question.

236. Mr. Woloshyn asked the government the following question:

In respect of the Code inquiry and the Final Report of the Inspector, William Code, Q.C.:

- (1) What was the total fee paid by the Crown to each counsel appearing at the inquiry, listed in schedule O of the final report?
- (2) What was the number of hours and/or days for which the fee was paid?
- (3) How much was paid for disbursements?
- (4) What was the total cost of the inquiry including both the above and any other costs; e.g., clerical, rent, travel?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, as Acting Provincial Treasurer, the government will have to refuse Question 236 because the second part of the question is unable to -- since the question cannot be amended, the government has no choice but to reject it but will provide the information requested at an appropriate time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Now let's recall 234.

234. Mr. Mitchell asked the government the following question:

With respect to intervenor funding for public hearings into the Alberta-Pacific project at Athabasca:

- (1) What is the procedure for applying for funding?
- (2) Where are the applications available?
- (3) What eligibility criteria will be used in deciding which groups will be receiving funding?
- (4) Where are the applications to be forwarded?
- (5) What is the deadline for applications?

MR. SPEAKER: Solicitor General.

MR. FOWLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that that be

rejected.

head: **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

CLERK: Motion 192, Mr. McInnis.

MR. McINNIS: Motion 192 asks for the name and affiliation of each person on a government aircraft flight. I've got the information privately from the minister of public works, so I seek to withdraw the motion.

201. Mr. McInnis moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of the report on the survey on photolineation in the Oldman River region prepared by J.D. Mollard.

MR. KOWALSKI: The government would be pleased to accept Motion for a Return 201, and we'd be just as pleased to file a response.

[Motion carried]

CLERK: Motion 202, Mr. Wickman.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw 202. After discussions with the Minister of Transportation, I will resubmit a new question at the next session.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

214. Mr. Hawkesworth moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of the status report and financial information submitted by the Emr/Curtola International Entertainment and Film Corporation for their meeting with Department of Tourism officials on January 30, 1989.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion 214 requests certain financial information and a status report which was provided to the Department of Tourism earlier this year by the Emr/Curtola International Entertainment and Film Corporation as part of discussions and negotiations around a grant they received to set up the World Blitz Chess Championship in Calgary. I would be quite happy to debate this at some length. I've got my notes prepared, but I'm quite happy, also, to not put the Legislature through that unless it comes to the point that I need to convince them, if the minister rejects the request. If it's not necessary to do that, I won't do so, Mr. Speaker, so I'm hoping that the minister will agree to provide that information to us.

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, we do not accept this motion, and for several reasons. This report was given to both our department and the city of Calgary; whereas under the city of Calgary's access-to-information policy the report would not be considered as a releasable document by the city of Calgary. The city of Calgary is currently conducting a legal action to recoup moneys awarded to them by Associated Canadian Travellers. Out of respect for this action I consider it inappropriate to release this report. Also, Mr. Speaker, a final accounting of expenditures has been requested from Emr/Curtola International Entertainment and Film Corporation, and we have asked to have

this accounting received by August 31 of this year. The Department of Tourism's files are also currently being reviewed by the Attorney General's department to determine the options available to the government for redress, if any.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, at this time we cannot accept this. At a later date, if this situation changes, it could be released.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is one of the typical reasons that we get from the government when they don't want to release documents: that it's too sensitive. Well, it's too politically sensitive at all times. I'm sure that in the next session or the session thereafter or the session after that, if the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View were to put a similar motion for a return on the Order Paper, at that time the minister would say, "Well, it's interdepartmental, and therefore we're not going to release the documents then either."

The truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that it is politically sensitive. My colleague the Member for Calgary-Mountain View has throughout the course of this session stood up and asked a number of questions of the minister about the relationships with Emr/Curtola International Entertainment and Film Corporation and for documents that were to have been filed. Every time he stood up and asked the question, the members opposite got on my colleague's back and attempted to shut him down. It was a stonewall effort. It was tantamount to, I suppose, smacking one's head against a brick wall.

Well, Mr. Speaker, now, as we get close to the end of this First Session of the 22nd Legislature and questions are all gone through and motions for returns are being responded to so they can get them off the Order Paper, we find the minister standing up and saying: "Well, we just can't do it now. It's just not convenient. There are too many other variables getting in the way. Perhaps the Attorney General's department is going to review something. Perhaps there will be information coming from that that will be too sensitive." What absolute nonsense. It's garbage.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

You know, my colleague has consistently asked for the information, and what do we get on the last day or the second "last day, the dying hours, of this session? We get the buck passed to the city of Calgary. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, this is just another example of this government closing the door, locking it, and throwing away the key. Don't let the public in. Don't give the information. It doesn't matter, the fact that we gave tens of thousands of taxpayers' dollars away that should not have ever been given away in the first place. It doesn't matter, that fact. What happens is that the door is shut, the door is locked, we can't have the information. It's too sensitive. It might conflict with what the city of Calgary is about to do. It might conflict with what the Attorney General is about to do. It might conflict with what the family is about to do. Mr. Speaker, it's outrageous, but it's typical, and it's shameful, and it ought not to happen here.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, just to draw this motion to a close, I suppose I shouldn't be particularly surprised by the minister's response. You ask the minister what's going on in

his department. He says, "Well, I'll table a report that will clear the air." You get a report to clear the air. All it has basically, by and large, is information from the city of Calgary: a report from the city of Calgary, reports to the city of Calgary. Mr. Speaker, here we are again, coming back to the city of Calgary. I mean, is the city of Calgary running the Department of Tourism?

I thought the minister was in charge of the Department of Tourism. What we get from him -- and we've gotten it throughout the session on this particular issue -- is that it's the city of Calgary that's running the Tourism department. You know, it was the city that came to the province first: it wasn't, but that was the impression. It was the city that was taking the lead: maybe that's the case, but somewhere along the line the minister has got to take responsibility for what goes on in his own department. That's the fundamental rule of ministerial accountability. Now, if the minister wants the city of Calgary to be responsible for the operation of his department, then why don't we just get rid of the Department of Tourism and maybe ask somebody at the city of Calgary to take over the department? They'd become a deputy minister and do it instead of him.

The question is: when is this minister going to take responsibility for what went on in his department whereby this company, Emr/Curtola International Entertainment and Film Corporation, came forward with information on January 30, 1989, at which time they convinced the city of Calgary and the department to continue to support this project? It wasn't just the city of Calgary that they met with; it was the city and the department. And the reason that those two parties wanted a meeting with Emr/Curtola was because of concerns that were surfacing at that particular time about creditors not being paid, about deadlines not being met, about commitments not being met, and concerns about whether this entire project would ever come off. By that time, I know at least members of the city of Calgary were aware of an NBC documentary in the United States indicating that Mr. Emr, in that case, was the subject of a \$15 million suit by people alleging that he wasn't satisfying terms and conditions of a project that he was promoting in the United States.

Now, given all of these conditions, they had a meeting with this company on January 30, 1989, and as a result of information presented to this minister's department and city of Calgary officials, they became convinced that this was a project they would continue to support -- jointly, Mr. Speaker. It could have been the minister's department that said, "We're not prepared to support this any longer." It could have been the city of Calgary that said, "We're not going to support this any longer." But in any case, if either one of them were to say they weren't going to continue with it, then the city of Calgary and the provincial government and the taxpayers of the city and the taxpayers of the province would have at least been saved some money.

Now, I will say this, Mr. Speaker: full credit to the city of Calgary. At least the city of Calgary is doing something about this particular project. If I can believe the reports I've read about this, they are at least doing something to try and recover \$70,000 of city taxpayers' money. I don't see how this government or this minister are doing anything of the kind to try and do something for the people who support, with their taxes, the province of Alberta, to try and get anything recovered for our taxpayers. If it takes the city of Calgary only a few months to move on this, why is it that the provincial Minister of Tourism over here isn't prepared to at least do the same on behalf of

provincial taxpayers? That's going to be a key question, Mr. Speaker.

Now he's saying this particular document may be key to all of those court proceedings. Very interesting; very interesting. We have to rely again, now, on the city of Calgary in taking action in a court to get released a document that convinced or persuaded the Department of Tourism to continue to support this project, yet we don't have any similar court action by this minister to recover that same money. I think that's what concerns me more than anything else, Mr. Speaker, and not so much the fact that the report is not being tabled. If I knew that this minister was at least worried and concerned about the taxpayers of this province, or at least worried and concerned about the actions of his department, and that he would at least launch some kind of action in the courts or elsewhere to get this money back, I would be far more satisfied with his response this afternoon. But at this point there's no indication. He gave us none this afternoon in reply to this motion for a return.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, given the inaction, given what strikes me as being a lack of care in the review of this project over the many months leading up to its demise earlier this spring, given that lack of concern, it is incumbent upon this minister to take actions to recover this money. He didn't have to lose a single cent. He didn't have to lose a single cent of provincial taxpayers' money. He could have said no. He could have shown some leadership, or his department certainly could have, back last fall and again this past spring. There was no need for them to commit \$100,000 of taxpayers' money to this project when they should have known Despite what they might have been given on January 30 of 1989 by Emr/Curtola, despite what they might have been told at that meeting, they had no obligation to give either of the two \$50,000 cheques for this particular project. The fact that they did, Mr. Speaker, and the fact that they are not pursuing this in any kind of a vigorous or aggressive manner, to me detracts from the credit of this department and from this minister.

So, as I say, if the minister could have said today that this was going to be the subject of court action in which the provincial government was going to try and seek some remedy or redress, I wouldn't be nearly as concerned that we were not being provided with that document. But the fact that we get neither the document nor action by this minister is of grave concern to me, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion lost]

221. On behalf of Rev. Roberts, Mr. Pashak moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing copies of all studies prepared for the Department of Health and its predecessors, the Department of Community and Occupational Health and the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, within the last five years, including the one prepared by Michael Joffres showing epidemiological and statistical data relating to the health status of children aged zero to 14 years in the province of Alberta.

MR. PASHAK: I agree with my colleague that it's very important that we obtain copies of all studies within the last five years that show epidemiological and statistical data relating to the health status of children aged zero to 14 years in the province of Alberta.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I suggest the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn stick to Energy.

I will not accept this motion, and I will cite citation 446 in *Beauchesne*, sixth edition, subclauses (n), (o), and (p), in terms of all studies prepared for both the previous departments of Community and Occupational Health and Hospitals and Medical Care. Certainly if there's a question which members wish to review, that would be different than asking for all of these documentations, which are internal by their nature.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is not the first time we've had *Beauchesne* used to argue the way the Assembly should vote on a question before it. There's nothing in the book of rules and forms which indicates how the Assembly is supposed to vote on the issue. If the hon. minister wishes to assume the black robe and sit in the Chair, she should run for office along with other candidates at the opening of each session. Reality is that this motion is either out of order or it's not. If it's out of order, then we shouldn't be voting on it. If it's in order, then the question has to be asked whether or not there is some public interest involved in making information about epidemiological studies public. It does seem to me, as a member of this Assembly, that there are many reasons that persons would like to know about the health status of children aged zero to 14. I'm one of them, and I'm going to vote in favour of this motion for that reason.

There is absolutely nothing in any of the rules and forms of this Assembly that somehow makes it improper to seek studies from a department that doesn't exist or that were prepared under a minister who's now in a different job. It's a dodge, in my opinion. If the government has a good reason for holding this information safe and secret, they should stand up in debate and make that reason known, because there's nothing in the green book that says anything about the question at all, about Motion 221. Like I said, it's either in order or it's out of order. It appears to have been moved, we appear to be debating it, so therefore I can only conclude that it's in order. For that reason you've got to debate the thing; you can't simply rule it out of order from a ministerial bench.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think everyone in the Assembly is very concerned about children's health and the status of children in this province when it comes to health issues. I would think that if the department has studies that they have done and the previous Department of Community and Occupational Health has studies that they have done, it's only proper that they share it with this Assembly. I know that my colleagues in the Official Opposition -- and I'm sure most government members and in the Liberal opposition -- have all worked on cases or for their constituents with concerns about health with children. I think it's only proper that the government share this information, because we have a responsibility, as MLAs and as representatives of our constituents, to work on behalf of our constituents. We need the knowledge that we could get through seeing studies like this in order that we can help our constituents in the best possible way. I think that if the

studies have been done by the Department of Health and other departments, we have the right to see those studies.

I would say that I can only conclude that the minister and the government, in saying that they won't share this information with us, must seem to think -- it leaves us to conclude that the information that was found in these studies probably reflects badly on the government in terms of what they're doing with children's health in this province. I know personally I've worked on cases dealing with mental health of children in this province: serious, serious issues in this area. Because we're not only talking about one specific area of health; in this motion from my colleague from Edmonton-Centre he's talking about studies that relate to the health status of children in this province in all areas. I know that I've worked with many cases, and it really concerns me that the government is not willing to share the information they have. I would think they would feel obligated to share that information. I know on this side we certainly feel obligated to help our constituents, and I think by denying us this information, the minister is doing a real disservice to the people of this province.

Thank you.

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

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just briefly in support of the motion for a return proposed by my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Centre requesting the epidemiological studies. It wasn't our intention to get under the minister's skin nor to cause a rash of response or debate on this issue. But I do want to encourage her to reconsider. I suspect that she may be stuck in her previous mode, being the Acting Provincial Treasurer, and just kind of got that mind-set, saying: "No. No. I've got a secret. We can't show you. We're not telling anybody." So I just want to give her the opportunity to move back into the Department of Health and exhibit that aura of glasnost that was apparent earlier during the consideration of written questions and motions for returns, when she was very accepting and in the mode initiated by the first ministerial statement in this Assembly for some time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Well, I've just barely got enough energy, Mr. Speaker, to conclude debate on this important topic, and I just wonder if the minister's reason for refusing to provide the information that is requested is that the Department of Health is somehow short of energy.

[Motion lost]

222. Mr. McInnis moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of all reports prepared by or for the government since February 1979 on the impact of timber harvesting operations on wildlife and wildlife habitat in the area covered by the proposed forest management agreement for Alberta-Pacific Industries Inc.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. FJORDBOTEN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I'd like to thank the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place in working

with me to amend the motion, because the way the motion reads I wouldn't be able to provide that information to him. With the amended motion I will be able to provide baseline data that I think will be helpful. The impact on timber harvesting in those particular areas as stated in the motion for a return is in the annual operating plans, and I would be happy to provide that when it's available. Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking to the amendment on Motion 222, and it's the same amendment that will be in 223, 224, and 225.

I move that we amend this motion for a return

- (1) by deleting the word "all";
- (2) by deleting the words "by or"; and
- (3) by deleting the words "February 1979 on the impact of timber harvesting operations" and substituting therefor "1975."

Mr. Speaker, the reason for that amendment is that going back to 1975 I think will provide more baseline data and it would be an excellent motion for a return. I compliment the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: On the amendment. Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: I would like to thank the minister for discussing this matter with me beforehand and for circulating copies of the amendment prior to his moving it. I understand the primary reason for the amendment is that there aren't studies that deal specifically with the question of the impact of timber harvesting operation on wildlife, and I wish to state my concern that there are no such studies available. I do appreciate that the minister is attempting to be helpful by providing what he does have.

The effect of all of this is to put an awful lot of pressure on the people who are involved in the forest management planning process, particularly the annual operating plans of the forestry operations for the protection of wildlife and for quite a number of other things. This isn't the first time this issue has come up. The protection of wildlife, the critical environmental concerns that were a force were all going to be dealt with in the forum of the annual operating plans. I want the minister to know that we're going to be watching with interest to see what type of changes he's able to make in that process to guarantee some public involvement, to get some specific studies done on the question of how these timber operations are going to affect wildlife prior to the annual planning process. I'm hoping, as well, that the minister will have some legislation along those lines in the next session.

So what's being offered today is a fine offer. I'm going to support it, but I'm also urging the minister to realize the importance now of the annual operating plan and the involvement of the citizens of Alberta in that process when it comes, because that's where the action's going to be.

[Motion as amended carried]

223. Mr. McInnis moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of all reports prepared by or for the government since February 1979 on the impact of timber harvesting operations on wildlife and wildlife habitat in the area covered by the forest management agreement for Daishowa Canada Co. Ltd. and the reserve area.

MR. McINNIS: Can I move we consolidate all three of them?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: You cannot.

MR. McINNIS: How can the Government House Leader do that and I can't?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. members, but while that indeed may take place within committee, in the formal section of the House it's not deemed to be appropriate. Nevertheless, we can still read very quickly.

Minister, propose amendment

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I propose that Motion for Return 223 be amended

- (1) by deleting the word "all";
- (2) by deleting the words "by or"; and
- (3) by deleting the words "February 1979 on the impact of timber harvesting operations" and substituting therefor "1975."

[Motion as amended carried]

224. Mr. McInnis moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of all reports prepared by or for the government since February 1979 on the impact of timber harvesting operations on wildlife and wildlife habitat in the area covered by the proposed forest management agreement for Alberta Newsprint Company Ltd.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I propose an amendment to Motion 224

- (1) by deleting the word "all";
- (2) by deleting the words "by or";
- (3) by deleting the words "February 1979 on the impact of timber harvesting operations" and substituting therefor "1975"; and
- (4) by deleting the word "proposed."

[Motion as amended carried]

225. Mr. McInnis moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of all reports prepared by or for the government since February 1979 on the impact of timber harvesting operations on wildlife and wildlife habitat in the area covered by the proposed forest management agreement for Alberta Energy Company and the reserve area.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I propose an amendment to Motion 225

- (1) by deleting the word "all";
- (2) by deleting the words "by or"; and
- (3) by deleting the words "February 1979 on the impact of timber harvesting operations" and substituting therefor "1975";
- (4) by adding the words "existing and" after the words "area covered by the"; and
- (5) by deleting the word "agreement" and substituting therefor the word "agreements."

[Motion as amended carried]

228. Moved by Mr. Taylor that an order of the Assembly do

issue for a return showing a copy of all analyses done in the last two years by the Department of Agriculture on commercial foods and food supplements manufactured in Alberta for the feeding of hogs and cattle.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to accept Motion 228, and further, since I know the member won't be able to understand the information, I will provide him with an interpretation if he requests it. [interjections]

(Motion carried)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I would request, after discussions with the House leadership, unanimous consent of the hon. members of the House to move to second reading of Bill 26.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before us is a request for unanimous consent to move to second readings, which is the first motion. All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Carried. Thank you.

That's the first part. What we have done, we have now received unanimous consent of the House to move to second readings.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Now we would be . . . The request was to go to Bill 26. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Would someone care to move that Bill?

Bill 26 **Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 1989**

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 26, Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 1989.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Fine, except I can't understand section 7, which allows the Minister of Agriculture under the Department of Agriculture Act to

delegate in writing to any person any power or duty conferred or imposed on him by this Act or any other Act or regulation under his administration

when under the Public Service Act he and all other ministers already have that power.

MR. SPEAKER: Additional comments on the principle? The Attorney General.

MR. ROSTAD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I could provide the infor-

mation that section 15 of the Department of Agriculture Act allows the minister to delegate to someone any power he has as Minister of Agriculture, whereas section 8 of the Public Service Act refers only to the delegation of those powers granted to the minister by the Public Service Act and not as power under any other Act. That's the reason for the amendment under section 7.

[Motion carried; Bill 26 read a second time]

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and that the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I think we need to have a little pause. [interjection] We do. So I would declare that the House would be adjourned for three minutes.

[The House adjourned from 4:13 p.m. to 4:16 p.m.]

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.
Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the House leaders of all parties, agreement was reached to suspend the ordinary business of the House on this Thursday and to deal with Government Bills and Orders.

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

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

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, members of the committee.

Bill 22
Electoral Boundaries Commission Amendment Act, 1989

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

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: When we last left this Bill, the minister had been asked, generally speaking, for an assurance that the process of redistribution of boundaries and the enumeration of voters would be complete before the next election was held, and I asked the minister if, in summing up debate on second reading, he would outline the time frame in order to have that assurance. I just want to quote one passage for the benefit of the acting minister today.

It will be incumbent upon the government to bring that legislation . . .

This is the legislation to amend the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act following the report of the select committee.

. . . before a fall sitting, or a spring sitting if the work were done soon enough, but no later than the end of the second session. It must be done or it will be necessary to appoint a commission under the current legislation.

So I think what the minister said was that we've got a time frame up until the end of the next calendar year -- that is, 1990

-- but beyond that nothing at all.

Rather than creating assurance that the process would be done before the next election, I think that particular answer actually leaves that question wide open. I guess the minister's argument is, well, there's a process set up and he doesn't want to make judgments beyond that and he doesn't want to make any assurances beyond the fact that there will be some type of a commission set up by the end of calendar year 1990. I just want to point out that setting up a commission at the end of the calendar year 1990 virtually guarantees that it will be 1992 before there is any legislation to create new boundaries, because the commission will require at least 1991 in order to do their work. And that takes us three years into the mandate. The election was March 20, 1989. March 20, 1992, is three years into it, and you don't have to stretch your mind very far to see the possibility of an election in three years, because we just had an election which was held well within a three-year period.

So I'm just wondering -- if the Government House Leader is unwilling to lay out a time frame, is he willing to give some type of assurance that this process will be complete not just before the next election but in time for the Chief Electoral Officer to complete enumeration before the next election, because enumeration can't be done until the redistribution of ridings is complete? This is a simple request, and I'd appreciate an answer.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this Bill, obviously, is to have it dovetail with the appointment of the special select committee of the Legislature who will, in turn, be examining all aspects as it relates to the Electoral Boundaries Commission and the broad terms of reference which it has. That committee is due to report to the spring sittings of the next session. This extends any necessity to move with the existing commission under the terms of the existing Act and suspends that and puts it over until the Second Session of this Legislature, whether it be a spring sitting or a fall sitting. Therefore, it allows a time frame within which the committee can do its work, the committee can report, new legislation formulated, and new legislation brought forward to this Assembly. That's strictly the purpose of this particular Bill, and I think that it accomplishes it.

As to the time frame itself, it would be our hope that the committee will be able to undertake this important work with dispatch and that it will be able to complete its work in accordance with the time frames and the allowances that are established by the terms of the special committee as well as by the terms of this Bill.

MR. McINNIS: Maybe I'll just put the question in a slightly different way, and it might clear things up nicely.

The commitment was made by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs that if the committee reviewing the Act doesn't get its work done in time for the legislation to pass in the spring session, there will be a fall session in 1990 in order to do this work. That commitment was made. All I'm really asking is that the government make a similar commitment in respect to the report of the commission when it comes down, so that if that work isn't done in time for the spring session 1991, the government will commit that there is a fall session in 1991 so that the new boundaries are established by the end of calendar year 1991. Because if they're not, then it wouldn't be possible for the enumeration to be done in time for an election in fall of 1992, which I think is getting, you know, close to four years,

getting to the point where an election could be held any time.

I'm not asking anybody here to speculate particularly on when the election should be; simply that the words I read earlier in *Hansard*, page 1498 -- this is the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs -- say:

It will be incumbent upon the government to bring that legislation before a fall sitting [next year] . . . or a spring sitting if [it's] done soon enough, but no later than the end of the second session.

All I'm asking is the same commitment with respect to the work of the commission: that the government will ensure that that can be brought into legislation before the end, I guess, of the Third Session; if that means coming back in the fall to get the work done, that the work will be done by the end of the Third Session.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I think the important point is that there is a suspension of the existing appointment of the commission under this present Act, the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, in order to allow time for the committee to do its work, report, and new legislation passed. If indeed, for any reason whatsoever, the whole process was not completed within the time frame that is anticipated, then the current Act would require the appointment of the commission, and it would be a commission which we believe may be subject to challenge by any individual or group of individuals pursuant to the Charter of Rights. Therefore, that's the compelling aspect of the committee doing its work and reporting to the Legislature, and that appears to be the best basis upon which an amendment can be made to this particular Act at this time through this Bill.

MR. McINNIS: We're going backwards here instead of forward. It's not the commission that would be subject to challenge; it's the boundaries that would be subject to challenge. The thrust of my questions is pretty clear. I would not want this process to be used somehow by the government to allow another election to be held under the existing boundaries. I mean, it's probably true that a challenge of the boundaries could fail on the grounds that the Legislature is in the process of undertaking some action. And perhaps it should, because my position clearly is that the Legislature does have to act. But you know, it seems to me it's a relatively simple matter to say, "Okay, we're going to study the Act, and then we're going to have a commission to do the boundaries."

If the government is prepared to commit that it will convene a fall session to act on these recommendations from the committee, why won't it also make the same commitment with respect to the commission -- I mean, if the commission's work comes too late for spring session 1991; this will be the Third Session of the current Legislature -- that we will come back in the fall and act on those recommendations, simply so the machinery can get under way? It's a simple matter. The commitment was made in respect to the committee; I just want it to be made in respect of the commission, because it's the boundaries that the courts would be concerned about, not the commission per se.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, looking at Bill 22 and the specific wording, as I read it, we are merely moving back by one year the appointment of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. By this Bill, and assuming the Bill is passed, then by the Act this Legislative Assembly is committed to fulfilling the requirements

of Bill 22, and to do otherwise would require yet another piece of legislation. Therefore, the safeguard the hon. member is looking for is contained within the Bill. The Bill is clear. The Bill is straightforward. It hoists the appointment of an Electoral Boundaries Commission to the Second Session of the 22nd Legislature rather than the First Session of the 22nd Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions or comments? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Yes. I would like to know why the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs will make the commitment to bring the Legislature back in the fall of next year to deal with the committee report, but the government will not make such a commitment to deal with the commission report. I would like to know why that commitment is not forthcoming.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, it very well may happen that will be in the spring session of that same year. And by leaving it open for that period of time for them to do the thing, with the assurance that unless something is done to change the legislation as a result of that report, then this would kick in.

The hon. member suggests that the boundaries commission itself may not be challenged. I would submit that if you read the Dixon case, which the Deputy Premier referred to, it could very well be challenged, and indeed, perhaps with some success. So the whole process as established by the current Act is under review, as it should be under review. I think there is adequate protection there, basically by virtue of the current suspension, to allow that to happen, with the consequence that if it doesn't happen in accordance with the proposal as put forward and through the standing committee, then we end up with a situation which would be perhaps intolerable in law.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I understand the concerns being raised by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place, and I can assure the House that this was a subject of considerable discussion between the three House leaders prior to the introduction of this legislation. I concur with the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place in his request for that commitment, because the alternative to that commitment is that it would remain possible, under government intentions, to come back next spring and introduce an extension motion for this type of legislation; that is, to hold it off yet again. Given that the Conservatives are in the majority, no matter what we do, eventually that Bill would win. So what we would like on the record is that which the Government House Leader has already said -- certainly to me, but I think it's important that it be on the record -- that it is the government's intention that it will not move next year, either in the spring or possibly the fall sitting, to further extend the current amendment; in other words, to put the commission on ice beyond the end of the next calendar year.

I agree with the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place. I've been told that. I think the Liberal . . . Oh, there are no Liberals here. Anyway, the Liberal House leader was told that. You know, while the Government House Leader proves to be an honourable person, I think it doesn't count until it's on the record, and that is exactly what we're asking for, Mr. Chairman.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill 22 agreed to]

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

[Motion carried]

Bill 24

Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1989

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments? Is the House ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill 24 agreed to]

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

[Motion carried]

Bill 14

Regional Airports Authorities Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe that when the committee was last dealing with this matter, there was a subamendment proposed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona to the amendment proposed by the Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yes, when we were last discussing the subamendment, we were having an entertaining time, I suppose, trying to show the Minister of Economic Development and Trade the difference between an organization of workers and a workers' organization. That was in section 5 of the Act, and why we have the amendment to section 14 is because we feel section 5 isn't at all clear. We need to ensure that with respect to the directors we do have at least three, which is three directors on the board of directors that shall be between nine and 15 persons. Three of those representatives should be people that come from groups that have collective agreements with the authority. So I'm hoping now that the number is in there and in fact it's a maximum number. It says "not exceeding three" members. If the minister will stand up and agree to it -- I know he does want to have representation on there from workers' organizations, although that's not clear, as I said before. At least it's not clear enough to me. I'm hoping now that we have made this amendment and this subamendment, the government will agree to both the subamendment and the amendment.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, I regret that we will not be able to accept either the amendment or the subamendment for reasons I've indicated earlier, that being that we feel there is sufficient protection for the workers within this legislation. We have a number of other groups that also wish to have representation on the local airport authority, and we want to make sure our

hands are not tied as it relates to this so we can make sure that those who wish to serve have that opportunity. That is not to say that we will not give consideration to a number of individuals from the various labour organizations or bargaining units, because we will. But we don't wish to have our hands tied so that in the event there are other groups who wish to have that representation, we would have to disallow them that participation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. As the minister was giving his assurances that he wanted to have participation on there from labour organizations, I'm reminded of another board we have in the province of Alberta that's supposed to have labour organization interests represented on it, and that's the Workers' Compensation Board. Now, with all due respect, when you get an absence of labour interests on the Workers' Compensation Board for the extended period of time we have, it does make one skeptical about other boards having representation on them at all from organizations when the terminology used is framed inside the Act in such a nebulous way. You have to appreciate the skepticism we do have. I'm sure the minister will monitor the situation closely, but I too want to leave the minister with the assurance that we're going to monitor the situation closely, because these are considerable, substantive changes to the system we have in place right now. If it's going to be good for the economic development of our region, I'm concerned about the economic well-being of Albertans in this region as well, and I want to make sure their interests are represented.

So we are going to monitor what goes on with respect to this legislation. We are going to monitor what goes on inside the authority and the board, because we're not satisfied with the nebulous terminology contained in section 5. While the minister gives his assurances, rest assured that we, too, will be monitoring the situation most closely to ensure to our satisfaction that workers' interests are indeed represented on this board.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour . . . The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm not sure I have a right to reply on the subamendment I've said all I need anyway, Mr. Chairman.

[Motion on subamendment lost]

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next amendment is by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, relating to section 13.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This follows out the general plan that we believe -- and there is no dissent from any part of the House on this. This is a curious thing with all these amendments. There's really no dissent but the reply is made, "Well, we'll put it in the regulations" or "Well, it'll be in the agreement." What's the point in having a framework unless it's an adequate framework, which is what this is supposed to be. It's not a typical government Bill, in the sense that it's simply the government bringing forward a proposal made by this

authority with which we all agree.

So the proposed amendment to section 13(1) of the Act is to order the origin of the board of directors in this sense: that there shall come from each municipality within the boundaries of which the airports lie directors proportionate to the population of each municipality. That's a rather long-winded way, but necessarily so I think, of expressing the simple idea that because the biggest municipality is Edmonton, that will have the majority of the directors. St. Albert will have some doubtless. Villeneuve's in here, and the county of Strathcona and so on.

So the amendment is in handwritten form before all of us, Mr. Chairman. I'll just read it -- not that there's any doubt, I think, about what I've written here, but some people claim there is from time to time.

13(1) An authority shall have a board of directors consisting of not fewer than 9 and not more than 15 persons appointed as directors by the councils of the municipalities within whose boundaries the airports lie, in numbers as nearly as possible proportionate to the population of the municipalities, and in accordance with the regulations and the authority's articles.

So it's just the same as the existing section, with the addition of the proportioning provision. This, although consistent with our previous proposals, all of which have been defeated, stands independent of them, because however the board is composed, the nominators must be from particular municipalities.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, it is with a bit of regret that I find myself having to reject this amendment too. I can appreciate the frustration the hon. members are finding with me as it relates to this legislation, but as the hon. member recognizes himself, it is our intent to do that. I recognize the validity of the amendment. But, again, recognizing that we are breaking new ground -- and I realize that at times, and justifiably so, our intent is questioned -- I want to make sure we do have some latitude as it relates to this legislation so we can proceed on a basis that is sympathetic to the causes that have been developed by those groups within the municipalities that have worked so hard on this. And recognizing in the event that we deem it advisable sometime down the road, as I indicated to other members when they proposed amendments, I would be willing to examine this amendment in some future legislative session, but not at this time, recognizing that we are breaking new ground and I don't wish to have my hands tied, to make sure we do have the flexibility to make sure the airport authorities themselves can function with the intent that is desired.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you. Mr. Chairman.

I think the argument should really go the other way. If you are breaking new ground, then you should do it with caution rather than leaving it wide open so there can be a number of things happening that you're not in control of. So that is why I find it difficult to believe the minister really accepts our ideas yet at the same time rejects them, leaving the terms broad enough. Like, the "bodies corporate" covers all kinds of organizations. We're saying it should be narrowed down to municipalities. But we've been through the arguments, so I won't repeat them at great length.

What I would like from the minister is a commitment that . . . Well, I'll ask him about the Calgary situation, because I think it highlights if things are happening there, as I've sort of

heard rumoured, and I really don't know. I know more about the Edmonton situation. I heard, for whatever it's worth, that in the Calgary situation it seemed like the council either was sort of being pushed aside or had stepped aside and was allowing the chamber of commerce to come forward with the petition, as one of the main petitioners, and hence may be in the position to appoint the directors. So I guess what I'm asking the minister is: if you won't limit that possibility in the legislation, will you in a practical sort of way be very, very cognizant of the fact that the real representatives of any region are the elected officials in it and not some organized body of . . . I think of Edmonton. What if we took the 124th Street Business Association and gave them the right to appoint somebody to this board? It would not make any sense to me, yet the legislation allows that. It would not make any sense to allow any body or organization other than the councils to appoint those people, and if the minister will assure us that that is his intent, if he will state that that's his intent and will stand in this House a year or two years or three years from now when there are a number of authorities around the province and say that there aren't any and we'll know that to be true, then that's fine. But if he's saying that he's just sympathetic but wants to leave the legislation this way so somebody else can do that, then that's not acceptable.

MR. ELZINGA: So that there is no doubt, I won't say a great deal except to leave the hon. member with a strong assurance, and the answer is yes.

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. ELZINGA: I just wish to leave hon. members with one assurance. It has been raised during the discussion of this Bill. In thanking hon. members for a very thorough and in-depth discussion as it relates to this legislation, I leave them with the assurance, as was questioned by both parties opposite, the Liberal and New Democrat parties, that I am more than happy to make sure the regulations are published in a very open way. As members know, they have to petition the Lieutenant Governor in Council in the event that they wish to have these established. The regulations under which they function I am more than happy to share with the public so that everything is aboveboard and they are aware of all that is taking place.

MR. WRIGHT: Can we at least have a look at . . . [interjection] No, I'm thinking as I stand here. Can we at least have a look at the regulations before the Act comes into force. But I guess that's not possible if they aren't ready now, because it comes into force on Royal Assent, does it not? So we have the peculiar situation of an Act which can't work until the regulations come.

MR. ELZINGA: I'm happy to leave the hon. member with the assurance that I will examine as to whether there is any way I can share with him the regulations prior to the enactment of the regulations. I will examine that possibility so they will have an opportunity, hopefully. I don't know the complexities of it myself, so I can't give him the outright assurance, but I will examine to see if there is some way I can do that.

MR. McEACHERN: It seems to me that the proposal for the airport authority for Edmonton in fact has put a lot of details out already, and that will likely be the case in almost all instances,

will it not? One would be very surprised if the final regulation form took much of a different direction than the negotiations and the proposals that were put forward to the public. A bit more public hearing and input would help, but it would seem to me that most of the information will be available before the actual setting up of an airport authority, although maybe not in its final detailed form.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill 14 agreed to]

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that Bill 14 now be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 16

Provincial Court Amendment Act, 1989

MR. WRIGHT: There are some handwritten amendments, but these are superseded by the typewritten ones which are slightly different, however. They're not very different, so I'll . . .

Mr. Chairman, the Provincial Court Amendment Act is deficient, in my respectful submission, in two points. It's a very good Act in general, but not in two points only. The first is that there is no appeal beyond the Queen's Bench. The purpose of this is a good one. Since these are not lawsuits of large size, there should be early finality. With that I agree, except in this respect, and that is that particularly because these cannot be particularly large law suits, certain types of decisions are made in this court that are precedents for a lot of ordinary folk going about their ordinary business. I refer particularly to landlord and tenant laws or precedents, Mr. Chairman, and also some employment law precedents, discharge of employees and the like. For that reason I believe the existing Act is deficient, and the proposed Act is likewise deficient in preventing appeals to the Court of Appeal even on points of law.

So the purpose of amendment (a) is to allow an appeal to the Court of Appeal, Mr. Chairman, on a point of law only after special application. So if some outrageous ruling happens or a ruling that any person, any citizen, thinks is outrageous in point of law -- or if not outrageous, wrong in point of law is the case -- he or she or it, in the case of a corporation, can appeal it to the Court of Appeal. By the nature of things this is not something that will happen often, because in 90 cases out of a hundred matters in the Provincial Court, civil division, as it will be called, will be simple debt matters. There might be disputes on the fact about the debt, but where there are disputes in the law, the fact that it's a common person's arena doesn't mean to say he or she isn't entitled to correct law.

When the Provincial Court's jurisdiction was very small, it made some sense, I suppose, to say even questions of law should not be appealed. But now that it's getting up to a respectable size, \$4,000, it becomes more important, I believe, and sufficiently important that in those uncommon circumstances where there is a real point of law at issue, there should be resort to the Court of Appeal. It's not that the particular case by itself is important perhaps, but it may form a precedent for a very large number of other small cases which in the aggregate are very important. For instance, rules about damage deposits: interpretation of those sorts of things that affect citi-

zens very closely and frequently but are rarely of very large size, yet they can be very important to ordinary tenants. The same with the period of notice that employees are discharged upon. In the case of organized labour where there are collective agreements, they don't need to go to the Provincial Court, but for ordinary folk they do.

These two amendments are quite separate, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps we can deal with (a) first. It's quite separate from (b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready for the question?

The hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to address some of the issues brought forward by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona. Firstly, I'd like to thank him for complimenting the Bill in general. I think it is a very positive Bill.

With respect to his concerns about an appeal to the Court of Appeal, again, with respect, the intent of the amendment to the legislation is to recognize the integrity of the Small Claims Division and in fact to grant greater stature to that court in the eyes of Mr. and Mrs. General Public in the province of Alberta. As the hon. member has indicated, there is in the existing legislation an appeal process to the Court of Queen's Bench. This is carried over again not on a trial de novo basis but on the record. It's felt that this has been a very effective tool. As the hon. member has indicated, there are very, very few situations -- and I would respectfully submit, none -- that require an appeal beyond the Court of Queen's Bench to the Court of Appeal. Had this been introduced a number of years ago when some of the Provincial Court judges did not have legal training, I would have looked more charitably on the hon. member's proposed amendment. However, the Provincial Court judges are all legally trained. Their decisions are very infrequently appealed. When they are appealed, to allow an appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench, in my respectful opinion, is certainly sufficient for the purposes. Again, it recognizes the importance of the court itself, that we wish all Albertans to recognize the integrity and the stature of the Provincial Court.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready for the question on the (a) portion of the amendment?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion on amendment (a) lost]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona: (b).

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, the Premier says, "Well, you'll have your chance in the process of the Bill to make amendments, if you can persuade the House." It's really like butting one's head against a brick wall, but I'm afraid we are compelled to do it if we think about these things very carefully. I just hope someday the seed will not fall on perpetually infertile ground.

The second amendment concerns the jurisdiction of causes in an Act which will be tried and is currently tried in small claims court, will continue to be tried in the Provincial Court, civil division, as the thing will be called. This is a curious Act in that it's been neglected for 35 years as to the limits of jurisdiction. It was in 1954 that the limits were put in of \$500 for wages owing.

six months' wages or \$500, whichever was less. So you can understand it was a long time ago when \$500 was six months' wages for some people.

The \$100 refers to another limit on jurisdiction, where the judge can give damages in lieu of notice. The maximum is four weeks' wages or \$100 under the existing legislation, whichever is less. So that needs updating too. I daresay, Mr. Chairman, that this is the most anomalous Act on the books in terms of money limits, because all the others have received updating from time to time. This has escaped updating I think because it's not in the interests of employers to raise the limit, obviously, and organized labour doesn't use the Masters and Servants Act because they have collective agreements in which these matters are decided upon grievances. The labour standards have more or less given up on this because it has such low limits. No one seems to bother about it. I think we should bother about it. I think we should take the chance, when we're increasing limits in the Provincial Court Act, to increase the limits for ordinary employees who want a cheap way of recovering their wages. At the present time, when the maximum is \$500 or \$100 for four weeks, it's silly. Here's a chance to amend it, and we can do it this way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to thank the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona for bringing this matter to my attention, albeit I don't feel that the appropriate way to deal with any amendments to this particular piece of legislation, the Masters and Servants Act, would be through a consequential amendment to the Provincial Court Act. However, I would undertake to the hon. member that I would certainly review this matter with my colleagues and in fact have a full review of the Masters and Servants Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready for the question on the amendment proposed by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona?

[Motion on amendment (b) lost]

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's an amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, we're having problems reading these amendments that are handwritten. Is there any chance these could be typed, or could the member . . .

MR. McEACHERN: That's lawyers for you.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not always.

MRS. BLACK: Well, not really.

I'm sorry. Could they be read out to us? Because it's very difficult to interpret the handwriting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will attempt to read it:

Section 4 is amended in the proposed section 47 by striking out subsection (2) and substituting:

(2) If the Court is satisfied that it is in the interests of justice to do so, it may allow the summons or the dispute note to be amended.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you. I was hoping that was not my handwritten amendment that was being referred to, having not so long ago predicted that it would be very legible. Compared to some of the other amendments, it's neatness itself. However, the hon. Chairman did a great job of reading.

Now, the purpose of this amendment is as follows: the new legislation provides for the first time that the grounds of appeal must be set out in a dispute note, and it provides in 47(1) that

at a hearing, the parties are confined to the particulars set out in the summons and the dispute note.

In subsection (2) there is somewhat of a softening of that position, and I say "somewhat" because I don't think it's adequate. It provides that

if the Court is satisfied that sufficient cause is shown, it may allow the summons or the dispute note to be amended.

Now, this being a court of equity and justice where individuals are there without lawyers, it's in the interests that they not be hamstrung with legal requirements to set out in advance what their causes and concerns are and to be bound by them unnecessarily. There is a difference in emphasis on these things in that the provision that is there at the present time is one which, by it's very wording, appears to set some form of standard and requirement of fairly strong onus on the individual seeking the leave of the court to expand beyond the particular ground set in the dispute note. I thought it would be useful if the language were somewhat more inviting to the court to signal to the court that we're dealing with matters of justice and not the same legal formalities that prevail in higher courts.

So that is the purpose. I know that my friend the introducer of this Bill agrees with the principles and the concerns I've expressed, and he feels that the job is done. That may be so, but I think this would provide some improvement and felt it incumbent upon myself to deal with that, seeing as we are quite often dealing with a category of person that needs every advantage and, in the event there are problems, is not generally able to look after himself or herself as well as perhaps they should be looked after.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to thank the hon. member for providing me with information about his amendment. I'm also happy to see that there's someone in this House who has poorer handwriting than I do or on about the same level.

With all due respect to the hon. member, I think there is a history of informality in the Provincial Court at the small claims level which tends to work in favour of those who appear before the court to, in essence, bend over backwards to ensure that all those who appear before the court have the best opportunity possible to present their case. With that in mind, I do feel that the provision that is set out in section 47(2) is certainly adequate to give the court that kind of discretion. I would hope the hon. member would allow the process to proceed, and we will take a look at it and see how the courts deal with it. If a problem does arise, I'm sure we could deal with it by amendment at another session.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. Again we have the situation where the problem is noted and the reply is made, "Well, if it in fact arises, then we can perhaps consider amending this statute." The wording as it stands at present is: "If the Court is satisfied that sufficient cause is shown . . ." That's rather obscure, Mr. Chairman, because it could refer to the facts or it could refer to the excuse that the citizen made, is adducing as the reason for not expressing it right, getting it right, in the dispute note and so on.

Surely the overriding thing is: will it get to the justice of the matter to amend the dispute note? So why don't we simply say that? I mean, ideally we are dealing with these matters as you or I might deal with something we're trying to agree on over the kitchen table. It's more formal than that of course, but that's the essence of it. So why don't we admit that there is something inapt, not totally apt, about this written form here and agree that it is the justice of the matter that counts and therefore adopt this little amendment. It's not a big one, but it could be very important in particular cases. We're dealing with a citizen's court here. If the court is satisfied it's in the interests of justice to do so, allow amendments of the summons or the dispute notice, as the case may be. It strikes me as eminent good sense, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

With respect, the provision as it now reads is: "If the Court is satisfied that sufficient cause is shown . . ." This court in particular applies the rules of natural justice on a regular basis, and I believe that the wording is perfectly sufficient to allow the court to continue in the process.

[Motion on amendment lost]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill 16 agreed to]

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 16, the Provincial Court Amendment Act, 1989, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 26

Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 1989

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments or amendments to be offered with respect to Bill 26, the Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 1989?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill 26 agreed to]

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Chairman, it's my privilege to have Bill 26 reported.

[Motion carried]

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

Bill Pr. 1

Canadian Union College Amendment Act, 1989

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment by the hon. Member for Lacombe. Is somebody prepared to move the amendment on the hon. member's behalf?

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleague the Member for Lacombe, I move the amendment proposed and circulated to the Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments? [interjection] I believe they were all circulated to hon. members previously.

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill Pr. 1 agreed to]

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

[Motion carried]

Bill Pr. 2

General Hospital (Grey Nuns) of Edmonton Amendment Act, 1989

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are no amendments to this. Are you ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill Pr. 1 agreed to]

MR. WRIGHT: On behalf of the Member for Edmonton-Centre, I move that Bill Pr. 2 be reported to the Assembly, Mr. Chairman.

[Motion carried]

Bill Pr. 3

Canada Olympic Park Property Tax Exemption Amendment Act, 1989

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane.

MR. EVANS: There are no amendments, Mr. Chairman. Are we ready for the question?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill Pr. 3 agreed to]

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 3 be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill Pr. 4
Edmonton Community Foundation
Amendment Act, 1989

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's an amendment.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, the amendment to Bill Pr. 4 has been circulated to members. It's an amendment to section 2, which is a general statement regarding policy and bylaws. This amendment will simply require specific written policy statements in the three areas of administrative procedure, distribution of income, and how the funds are to be invested.

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill Pr. 4 agreed to]

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 4 be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill Pr. 5
Misericordia Hospital Amendment Act, 1989

MR. ZARUSKY: Mr. Chairman, I move the amendments to Bill Pr. 5 as circulated.

[Motion on amendments carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill Pr. 5 agreed to]

MR. ZARUSKY: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 5 be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill Pr. 6
Calgary Research and Development Authority Act, 1989

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment, as circulated, and if there are any questions, we can try to answer them.

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill Pr. 6 agreed to]

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 6 be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill Pr. 7
Calgary Foundation Amendment Act, 1989

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, there is a short amendment to Bill Pr. 7, as has been circulated as of yesterday.

MR. CHUMIR: I have a question. I might speculate that the reason for the amendment would probably be redundancy and, by trying to play lawyer, that it really is not necessary to have those particular words in the Bill. But I'd be very interested to hear from the sponsor of the amendment what his perception of the amendment is and the thinking and the purpose behind it.

MR. NELSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the reason for striking out section (b) as identified is that under our Constitution there's no reason to really place a paragraph of that nature in a Bill. We all have equal rights under our Constitution, so it's not necessary to really just state that.

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill Pr. 7 agreed to]

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

[Motion carried]

Bill Pr. 9
Claudia Elizabeth Becker Adoption Act

MR. WRIGHT: I move consideration by this committee of Bill Pr. 9.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill 9 agreed to]

MR. WRIGHT: I move it be reported, Mr. Chairman.

[Motion carried]

Bill Pr. 11
Tammy Lynn Proctor Adoption Act

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, there are three amendments to the preamble to Bill Pr. 11. The first and the third correct references, one spelling and the other to a date. The second amendment, (b), strikes the second preamble, which refers to Tammy Lynn Proctor having had no contact with her natural mother since she was nine months of age. She did contact her natural mother prior to these proceedings and sought her consent for the adoption, so obviously that preamble no longer applies.

I move the three amendments previously distributed.

[Motion on amendments carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill Pr. 11 agreed to]

MR. McINNIS: I move that Bill Pr. 11 be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration and reports Bills 14, 16, 22,

24, 26, Pr. 2, Pr. 3, and Pr. 9, and reports the following with some amendments: Bills Pr. 1, Pr. 4, Pr. 5, Pr. 6, Pr. 7, and Pr. 11.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Thank you. Carried.

[The House recessed at 5:24 p.m.]

