

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: Friday, March 16, 1990 10:00 a.m.

Date: 90/03/16

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: Prayers

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

Lord, renew us with your strength; focus us in our deliberations; challenge us in our service of the people of this great province.

Amen.

head: Introduction of Visitors

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to introduce His Excellency Israel Gur-arieh, who is the ambassador of Israel to Canada, and his wife, Mrs. Shulamit Gur-arieh. His Excellency has been Israel's ambassador to Canada since 1987 and is visiting Alberta today. We trust that his visit will provide him with an opportunity to become better acquainted with Albertans as well as with our dynamic economy and that this will lead to further enhancement of our relationships with Israel, which is an important trading partner with Alberta and with Canada. I'd ask that he rise and that his wife join him and that we give them a warm welcome.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to the Legislative Assembly our Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. Patrick Ledgerwood, who is seated in your gallery, and the recommendation for the fifth Ombudsman of Alberta, Mr. Harley Johnson, and his guest Lynn Staples. They are seated in your gallery this morning, Mr. Speaker, and if they would rise, I would ask the Legislative Assembly to give them the cordial welcome that they deserve.

head: Introduction of Bills

Bill 11

Petroleum Incentives Program Amendment Act, 1990

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 11, the Petroleum Incentives Program Amendment Act, 1990. This being a money Bill, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

[Leave granted; Bill 11 read a first time]

Bill 9

Electrical Statutes Amendment Act, 1990

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 9, the Electrical Statutes Amendment Act, 1990.

The purpose of this Bill, Mr. Speaker: it would allow minor nonutility-owned electric services to be extended across public lands. Also, this amendment would allow persons to extend their existing electrical service across a public road for use on their property.

[Leave granted; Bill 9 read a first time]

head: Tabling Returns and Reports

MS McCOY: I have the pleasure today, Mr. Speaker, to table the annual report of the Department of Labour for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1988.

MR. GOGO: With your permission, sir, I'm pleased to file the 14th annual report of the Alberta Council on Admissions and Transfer for the period April 1, 1988, to March 31, 1989.

head: Introduction of Special Guests

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this morning to introduce to the Assembly 10 students from the Manyberries school in Manyberries, Alberta, which is the furthest school in the southeast part of this province. I think in the 15 years that I've been elected, it's only the second time a group from this school has been able to come to the Legislature. There are, as I said, 10 students accompanied by their teacher Judy McDonald and their teacher/bus driver combination Dan Leis. I'd ask them to rise in the gallery and receive the warm welcome of the Legislature.

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to the Assembly today Mr. Roy Louis, the president of the Indian Association of Alberta, and his wife, Mrs. Peggy Hutchison Louis, who is the communications director for the Indian Association. They've been meeting with me this morning, discussing concerns of the natives with respect to fish and wildlife. I would ask the Assembly to join me in welcoming them and giving them a warm welcome.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Stony Plain.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Legislature 19 students from Kiskatinaw school, located on the Enoch Indian Reserve. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Dave Schmitt and bus driver Mr. Gerry Stawnichy. This is a very unique school not only because that was the school that I was principal of but because it was written up in a most positive light as an example of tolerance and understanding in the Ghitter commission of 1984. I'd like you to give them a good welcome. Stand up, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to members of the Assembly 45 English as a Second Language students who are studying just blocks away at the historic Grandin school. They're here today with their teachers Emilio Gatto, Rosalind Turnbull, Linda Deary, and Linda Kastelic. I'd ask that they please stand in the public gallery and be recognized by members of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly 30 students from St. Mark junior high school. They are supposed to be in the public gallery, and I would request that they rise

and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly. Looks like they're not there. They were accompanied by Carole Alonso, but I guess they had to leave.

I also have a group of students in the members' gallery – at least I hope they're there; I can't see – from the Alberta Vocational Centre, which happens to be in the riding of Edmonton-Kingsway. There are 20 members from the English as a Second Language group, and they are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Faye Turpin. I'd request them to stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **Oral Question Period**

Conflict of Interest Guidelines

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. It's been obvious to almost everybody except this government that we need strict conflict of interest rules for MLAs, cabinet ministers, and senior public servants. I might point out that my late colleague Grant Notley and I have introduced a code of ethics Bill some eight times since 1979. Reaction always was by the government backbenchers, "We don't need this sort of Bill." Now, we've waited long enough for action, and in the House the other day the Premier said he was going to respond – I believe he said "in due course" – to the recommendations of the Conflict of Interest Review Panel. It's the "due course" that worries us somewhat. We don't want it to gather dust like a lot of other reports. So my question to the Premier is this: will he give his assurance to this Assembly that we will deal with the recommendations in this report as amendments to the Legislative Assembly Act in this spring session?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, first, let me make it very clear to the people of Alberta and to the Leader of the Opposition: we have conflict of interest rules. We have conflict of interest legislation. The Legislative Assembly Act has powerful conflict of interest legislation, so powerful that it actually reverses the will of the voter, the people, and disqualifies members from sitting in this Assembly: extremely powerful conflict of interest legislation. For the hon. member to in some way try and convey the fact that we do not have it is absolutely wrong.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we have put in place as a government a panel to review those because times change and complexity of governments change. We did get three absolutely outstanding Albertans, who have provided us with a very comprehensive report which meant them crossing the country, meeting with people in various – even in the United States. That report deserves very detailed assessment, and we will and we are. And we will bring it to the House as quickly as possible. It will not gather dust. We will have that report assessed and brought to the House. I would hope that the other members of the Assembly would also be doing the same thing, members outside of the government members, and that they would tell us whether it's a total acceptance of the report. Do they want it to be tougher in certain areas; do they want it to be changed? Now, they have a responsibility here. It's a very important matter, and the government will deal with it in a measured, detailed way.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. The conflict of interest laws that we have in this province are a joke to everybody. We've had examples of patronage. We have examples of people voting, you know, on the Alberta Energy Company Act.

For him to say that we have the toughest laws is just absolute nonsense, and he knows it.

I appreciate that they're going to look at it. I think the recommendations are fairly obvious. I want to again ask the Premier, because we've gone through this process. I want to get some time frame from him. We are sitting here in the spring session; we've only been here a week. I'm giving him lots of time, even for Tory backbenchers, to read it. My question is: will we be dealing with this report in this spring session? Yes or no?

MR. GETTY: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we are discussing it right now. It's being dealt with.

Could I tell the hon. member: I didn't say we had the toughest conflict of interest rules in the world; I said we have very tough conflict of interest rules. I recall my friend the leader of the ND Party in some records I was going through on conflict of interest matters, who stood and said: "I've broken them. They were so tough I didn't know. I've broken them." And the Assembly said, "Well, that's okay; we'll actually let you off." We wanted him to be here. I wanted him to be here. I respected the fact that it was inadvertent, and members did.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the matter I was raising, and I want the members to know that we will deal with them as quickly as we can, but they require detailed assessment.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Premier that he wasn't here. That was even before he was a Member for Edmonton-Whitemud; now he's a Member for Stettler. My question to the Premier, because by the answer I take it we're probably not going to deal with it in the spring session. Would he at least do this in the meantime. Mr. de Rappard, who has resigned as the deputy minister of economic development – and I point this out because the minister over there said he would now be eligible to have private contracts. This would be a blatant misuse of the power of this Assembly by this minister, and it directly flies as a contradiction to what they're offering. Would the Premier at least give this assurance to the House: that Mr. de Rappard will not get a private consulting contract with this government until we deal with this report in a public way?

MR. GETTY: First of all, the member said he assumed we would not be dealing in this session. I don't know why he'd assume that. I said we were going to give it detailed assessment and deal with it as quickly as possible. So why make some other assumption?

Mr. Speaker, in terms of Mr. de Rappard, I find it offensive that the hon. Leader of the Opposition – to a gentleman who has served this province for so many years and the people of Alberta, Deputy Minister of Executive Council, identified by the chamber of commerce as outstanding citizen in Canada, and then serving in Economic Development and Trade as a chief deputy minister when this entire province was down in terms of investment and economic development and guided a tremendous growth, the growth we all now are benefiting from. To have the member take on in some way an opportunity to besmirch his name when the matter under appeal now – I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw those kinds of things and not continue that type of attack.

MR. MARTIN: Boy, are they defensive about their old colleague there, Mr. Speaker. I know he was a good Tory.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we could have the second main question, hon. member.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to designate the second main question to the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

Natural Gas Exports Deregulation

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the National Energy Board under pressure from the Minister of Energy dropped its cost/benefit analysis. In 1986 his government removed a similar protection when it amended the Gas Resources Preservation Act. This issue raises the question: is the Minister of Energy more concerned with winning favour with his friends in the energy industry than he is in protecting the long-term interests of all Albertans? To the minister then. Given that the price of gas has fallen from \$2.08 a thousand cubic feet in 1986 to less than half of that today, why is the minister continuing to advocate the export of vast quantities of natural gas at rock-bottom prices?

MR. ORMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd be interested to know what the hon. gentleman thinks the long-term interests of this province are. I know one thing: it's not having the NDP in government to run jurisdiction of our resources. I can tell you that a healthy industry, a market-based approach to developing our resources, requires unrestricted movement of hydrocarbons without government bureaucracy being compressed down that distorts the marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, it's like the grocery store. If you're not allowed to move your inventory, you can't replace your shelves. You constrict the process. For a healthy industry we must allow for the inventory of natural gas to move into a new marketplace. We have 50 years of reserves at today's production in this province, another 50 years in the Arctic and in the Hibernia area: we have over a hundred years of natural gas supply. The opposition would take Maude Barlow's approach: shut it all in. Then in 10 or 15 years if we're not using natural gas, what's their answer? I think it's a despicable attitude, and it's classic why Albertans continue to reject that opposition party to run this government.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, it's really obvious that this minister has no interest in protecting Albertans. He wants us to be condemned to long-term priced gas from the Arctic.

Mr. Speaker, our established natural gas reserves have been declining for six straight years. The NEB's decision is likely to result in even greater amounts of this finite resource being pumped out of the ground at rock-bottom prices. Will the minister tell this Assembly whether the NEB's decision is really in our best long-term interests, of taxpayers and Albertans generally?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, who happens to be from a constituency in Calgary that bounds my constituency, I can't believe would have this type of attitude when it comes to resource development in this province. We have in this province for the last 50 to 75 years done a good job of stewardship in terms of our resources, and we must continue to have a healthy and vibrant industry. To be faced with the situation that is facing the United States, where there is no ability to expand markets, the infrastructure then falls apart, there is an increased demand for replacing inventory, and there's no industry to do

that. We have supported the industry during the tough times. They are now poised to take advantage of increased opportunities and export markets, replace the inventories, increase the gross domestic product of this country, and contribute to a healthy industry, which means long-term supply balance in this country. I just don't understand the position taken, and it's a total lack of understanding of a market-based approach to developing our resources.

MR. PASHAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, given that this minister's actions and the impact of the NEB decision will be to accelerate the depletion of Alberta's gas reserves at a time of very low prices, what action is the minister going to take to ensure that Albertans' long-term energy needs are met – that's the question, or is he going to make us completely reliant on expensive Beaufort gas – and that we'll have sufficient reserves of natural gas in the ground if and when prices begin to rise?

MR. ORMAN: Therein lies the rub, Mr. Speaker: the question of price. He's supporting the eastern Ontario position. We shut in our reserves at a cheap price today so we don't have to pay for the expensive Beaufort gas. That is irresponsible as an Albertan. Today we want to be able to develop our resources, develop natural markets, and move the inventory so the prices can move up to a level that is reflective of the value of the resource. To suggest that we save it for Canadians at the low price is an eastern Canada position, and I think it is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister.

Senate Appointment

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, it is now five months since Albertans went to the polls and elected or selected their representative for the Senate. It took four months for our Prime Minister to respond to a letter sent by the Premier to him. The letter from the Prime Minister says that he will "continue to reflect" on the matter, that he will give us a decision "in due course." My question to the Premier is this: has the Premier got some kind of a deadline whereby the government has transmitted to the Prime Minister Alberta's position with respect to appointing Mr. Waters to the Senate?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, not a deadline; as a matter of fact, we are working to have it done immediately, as quickly as possible.

MR. DECORE: Well, I'm delighted the Premier is feeling good about the Prime Minister's ability to respond. I don't think Albertans have that same feeling.

Mr. Speaker, my second question to the Premier is this: if Albertans can't have Mr. Waters appointed by, say, June 1, is the Premier prepared to tell the Prime Minister and his government that we will take away our signature, that we will take away our support for the Meech Lake document?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is an entirely hypothetical one.

MR. GETTY: First of all, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is dealing in a hypothetical area. But could I straighten out his mind on how I feel about the Prime Minister not appointing Mr. Waters immediately? I am frustrated by that, upset by it, and angry about it, and so are Albertans. We are exerting pressure

on the Prime Minister and on his caucus and his government to appoint Mr. Waters, and we're doing it in a variety of ways.

I also wonder about the position taken and expressed now, I guess, by the Liberal Party – when you consider the importance of the unity of our nation, when you consider how great this country could be if we could be unified and working together and building for the future a great country – that the hon. member ends up with that kind of a flippant attitude towards something as important as constitutional reform.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, hardly flippant to note that Albertans by a pretty overwhelming majority do not accept the Meech Lake position.

My last question to the Premier is this. Surely there must be some evidence that he has, some discussions that he has had with leadership in central Canada, that gives the Premier comfort in knowing that a Triple E Senate, which is, I guess, the best now we can do, will come to Alberta for Alberta's benefit. What assurance does the Premier have from that central Canadian leadership at the provincial level that they will agree to this Triple E Senate initiative?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I should just point out to the leader of the Liberal Party that it wasn't that long ago there was just one Premier who supported the Triple E Senate position, and that was this Premier and this government. Now, over an incredibly short period of time, when you think that we have had our nation 120-some years, we have been able to persuade eight Premiers with regards to a Triple E Senate. That is a dramatic accomplishment in a short period of time. One of the key matters for constitutional reform is to make sure that all of the players in constitutional reform are sitting around the table. That's what we're working towards. That's what the Meech Lake accord provides.

I remind the hon. member that it is a unanimous resolution of this Legislature supported by three national parties, the House of Commons, the Senate, and also 10 Premiers and eight Legislatures. I find it hard to believe that in dealing in an area so sensitive to the future of our country, he'd be dealing with it so flippantly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary-Fish Creek, followed by Calgary-Mountain View.

Natural Gas Sales and Distribution

MR. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The National Energy Board is now hearing some pipeline-related arguments that are critically important to the continuing vitality of the natural gas industry in our province. Simply stated, the issue concerns the tolling methods and formula that will determine whether or not pipeline expansion will be feasible in Ontario, Quebec, and the northeastern United States. Needless to say, the National Energy Board has to understand the urgency of ruling in favour of rolled-in tolls as opposed to incremental or add-on tolls. Will the Minister of Energy tell the Assembly what he'll be doing in the near term to make sure that the NEB gets that crucial message on the part of the oil industry and on the part of Albertans as a whole?

MR. ORMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to say, first of all, that there are two critical issues that are facing Alberta with regard to National Energy Board hearings. The first one,

and the decision that came down yesterday that was referred to earlier in question period, was on the issue of cost/benefit analysis. As I've indicated, I'd like to congratulate the National Energy Board for their open-minded approach and for supporting the Alberta position and the industry position on doing away with cost/benefit analysis. Mr. Speaker, the jurisdiction over natural gas is the sole jurisdiction of the province, and the National Energy Board decision has actually confirmed and acknowledged Alberta's jurisdiction over the development of its energy resources. The result of the cost/benefit analysis decision will allow for four licences to be reheard that involve about 100 million cubic feet a day of natural gas worth about \$30 million to \$40 million per year over a 15-year period.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to tolling methodology, it is the second important issue. We must impress upon the National Energy Board that pipeline expansion into Quebec, Ontario, and into the northeast should be on a basis that is consistent with existing tolling methodology, and that is that it is rolled in and that incremental expansion is not paid for solely by the new producers on the system. If that's the case, we run the risk of losing the Iroquois project, which is important to the province of Alberta.

I can assure the hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek that the Alberta Department of Energy, together with the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission, will be making forthright and forceful representations to the National Energy Board on this issue supporting rolled-in tolling methodology.

MR. PAYNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, in order that the members of the opposition and the government members – indeed, all of us in the House – can understand just how serious the implications are of an incremental tolling decision, is the minister able today to share with the House any specifics on the financial data to help us understand just how serious the matter is?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, yes. I was remiss in my first comments in not mentioning the financial impact. The National Energy Board decision, if it rules in favour of incremental tolling, may have disastrous effects on pipeline expansion beyond the existing southern Ontario marketplace. There is in the Iroquois project alone 578 million cubic feet a day at risk, representing a total of \$350 million a year of revenue to the producers in the province of Alberta. As the hon. member knows, and as the opposition should know, if you multiply that by 28 percent, Alberta's royalty share, you will very clearly come up with the impact of incremental tolling taking over on this decision and the gas not being able to move out.

Mr. Speaker, it also addresses the issue of not being able to move inventories out from Alberta because it further depresses the price in Alberta. Not allowing natural gas exports to leave the province means there's more product here in the province, which serves to drive the price down, Mr. Speaker. That's the position taken by the NDP, and we reject it absolutely.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Mountain View.

Proposed Goods and Services Tax

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Provincial Treasurer suggested from time to time that the goods and services tax might be okay with him if it were used to bring down the federal deficit, although each time he said that he's been forced to beat a hasty retreat. In a recent TV debate

between our provincial opposition leader and the Hon. Harvie Andre – a debate, by the way, in which I note the Provincial Treasurer and his colleagues were too scared to participate – Mr. Andre cast further doubt on the sincerity of this government's opposition to the GST. Mr. Speaker, would the Provincial Treasurer confirm that the real reason they refused to debate Mr. Andre is because Mr. Andre might reveal in stronger terms than he did that this government's private position on the GST and their public posturing contain two different messages?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Calgary-Mountain View must have been reading a joke book over the weekend. That's the funniest story I've seen yet.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Alberta absolutely understand the government of Alberta's opposition to this GST. Our opposition is understood not just in Alberta but is well recognized across Canada. The Premier certainly has been a leader in developing a provincial consensus against this tax, and the government of Alberta has done what it can to ensure that the message is carried here in Alberta. Let me point out that in terms of communication of positions, the polls are showing very clearly that Albertans, to the extent of 76 to 80 percent of the population, oppose that tax. So don't try and mislead anyone by suggesting that the people of Alberta have any doubts where this government stands. Our opposition is clear; it's been vociferous. It has been on point, and it will continue.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, the New Democrats have adopted from the word go the only responsible position in this debate, and that's to offer concrete alternatives to the GST which would make the tax system fairer for ordinary Canadians and ordinary Albertans. In fact, providing alternatives is a way of determining who's serious about opposition to the GST. Will the Provincial Treasurer today outline for Albertans: what would the government replace the GST with? What are their alternatives, Mr. Speaker?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a sophist trap that has worked before. I would be glad to recite for the member the GST paper. As a matter of fact, I have neglected to file it in this Assembly. I'll make sure it's here on Monday so the member can have a chance to read it, because obviously he hasn't seen it. It is recognized to be one of the best positions with respect to the opposition of that tax. Let me make it very clear that one of the major reasons we have opposed this tax is on the revenue side. Now, we have said time and time again that the federal government since 1984 has been able to generate about \$50 billion to \$51 billion of additional tax revenue from the people of Alberta and from the people of Canada, and in the meantime the debt has increased to over \$400 billion. So the resources are there, and we think the people of Alberta and Canada want governments to reduce their expenditures. Now, that's the message, I think, the people of Alberta will see next Thursday when our budget is brought down, and we will talk more specifically then about our continued opposition to the goods and services tax, a wrong-headed tax for this province, a wrong-headed tax for Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Stony Plain, followed by Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Francophone Educational Rights

MR. WOLOSHYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Conservatives have been in power far too long, as evidenced by the fact that the Supreme Court has had to intervene twice this week to provide some fairness to Albertans. One decision is being violated. But with respect to the French schools decision the minister has said that he would consult with Francophone parents. My question to the Minister of Education is this: given that yesterday he waxed eloquent about urban French schools and ignored the issues facing rural Francophones, will he now commit to meeting immediately with parents of St. Paul, Legal, and St. Isidore to resolve their concerns?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, as I said in the House yesterday, what the Supreme Court judgment does is help to clarify some ambiguities from section 23. It clears up the management and control of Francophone schools; it gives direction to us on the provision of English language instruction in those schools. It does a number of other things that go into a great deal of detail, and what we want to do is make sure that we fully understand the judgment and then discuss it with my colleagues in cabinet and in caucus and then go out and speak with parent groups, Francophone groups, and then ultimately make a decision. We have committed to do that. I have said so in this Legislature and outside this Legislature, and that's precisely what we will do.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Mr. Speaker, the court decision was unequivocal that Francophone parents have the undeniable right to control the teaching of their language and culture in the schools, yet this minister is trying to set up a regional administrative structure for l'École héritage in St. Isidore, and Francophone parents are afraid of losing control of their school. If the minister is so concerned about the rights of parents, then why did his department officials hold an in camera meeting with school officials and refuse to allow parents to participate at the portion of the meeting which his department attended?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, the arrangements that are being made in St. Isidore, along with some six other participating boards, will meet the needs of the Francophone community in the Smoky River-Peace River constituencies. The comments I have heard back from participating boards is that they want to participate in providing advice to the St. Isidore board because that board is delivering Francophone education in co-operation with those other six school boards. Without that advice, without that input, the St. Isidore board knows that it won't do as good a job as it wants to do for those children. So I flatly reject the hon. member's suggestion, and we will continue to work with the St. Isidore board as well as the other boards in the Peace River-Smoky River area, and I welcome the participation of all of those boards in the delivery of Francophone education for the kids in that area.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Meadowlark, followed by Highwood.

Environmental Impact Assessment Process

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the MLA for Whitecourt revealed results of tests into the toxicity of

soil resulting from fly ash air emissions from the Millar Western pulp mill in Whitecourt. He indicated that the tests reveal that this soil can be harmful to small children in the area. What he failed to indicate is that Enviro-Test labs, the company that did the tests, also recommended the need to undertake a comprehensive risk assessment of soil toxicity in the area. To the Premier. Could the Premier please tell us why his government failed to reveal this important recommendation and when his government is going to act upon it?

MR. SPEAKER: First off, hon. member, in terms of this Chamber we do not have the hon. Member for Whitecourt; we have the Minister of Occupational Health and Safety.

Mr. Premier.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I was going to point that out to the hon. member. But as well, leading into a question regarding the hon. member's statements, obviously you would think that with courtesy the hon. member would present his case when the Minister of Occupational Health and Safety is here.

MR. MITCHELL: Since this is a clear illustration of what can happen when we don't do proper, open, public environmental impact assessments, will the Premier please make a commitment to direct his Minister of the Environment to initiate a proper environmental impact assessment now into the Millar Western pulp mill and place a moratorium on Daishowa, Weldwood, and Alberta Energy Company projects until such time as a proper, open environmental impact assessment can be done into those projects as well?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is getting himself all twisted up in his desire to shut down Alberta. If the hon. member has any sense, if he ever leaves this city, if he travels and sees the people of northern Alberta who are looking forward with hope and anticipation to the growth of their communities, to their young people having jobs and opportunities, living with their families and building their own families and building a career rather than having to come to Edmonton or Calgary for a job – surely the hon. member has got some sense of balance in his mind and in his party. I just say this: environmental impact assessments have been done. They were carried out. They were approved by both our government and the federal government. For the hon. member to try and give any other impression is absolutely false. Have some kind of sense of the hopes and aspirations of the people of this province and the dramatic change we're able to make in diversification and in a growing, strong economy for this province.

Highway 22

MR. TANNAS: Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the Minister of Transportation and Utilities. The possible relocation of Highway 22 is a very serious and contentious issue in the Turner Valley, Black Diamond, and Millarville communities. This Saturday I'll be presented with a petition by a party of mounted ranchers who feel very strongly about this and its adverse impact on them.

My question today, then: is the minister prepared to review with his department officials alternatives to the controversial preferred route?

MR. ADAIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, any time you're dealing with change as it relates to progress, it causes some consternation and some concerns. I think it's fair to say in response to your question that yes, I'm prepared to look at any other alternatives there may be other than the three that were presented at the January public open house meeting in, I believe it was, High River. I'm not sure; it was in the Black Diamond-Okotoks area.

One of the concerns that has been expressed to us was the fact that the two communities have a major support mechanism relative to the road that goes through them right now. Then, of course, the other alternatives as to the farmland that may be eaten up, if that's the right term: yes, I'm prepared with my officials to look at that. We are presently taking those concerns that were presented to us and reviewing them so that we can start some additional meetings with the people in the area.

MR. SPEAKER: Final.

MR. TANNAS: Okay. Thank you. That will bring some comfort to the area. Now, will the minister agree, then, to meet with mayors of Turner Valley, Black Diamond, representatives of the communities, and MD councillors sometime in the near future?

MR. ADAIR: As I said just a moment or two ago, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to meet with any of the groups that relate to that that have good suggestions as to how we may be able to realign the road in the interests of progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Centre, followed by Westlock-Sturgeon.

Communicable Diseases Immunization

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Despite all the talk by both the federal and provincial Conservative governments about their concern for the prevention of illness, in Alberta today there is a growing epidemic of whooping cough involving hundreds of preschool- aged children. Now, we know that with effective preventative immunization programs the vast majority of children – 95 percent I would argue, whether they be aboriginal, immigrant, or other Alberta children – two years of age and under should be well vaccinated against the very contagious communicable disease and not allow some health units to drop below a 50 percent level. Will the Minister of Health undertake to do a thorough examination into the current immunization levels for all children two years of age and under in the province for whooping cough, meningitis, measles, and other communicable diseases that threaten a healthy future for our children?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have the issue of whooping cough raised in the Legislature and to have an opportunity to speak to Albertans about how important it is to ensure that young children, particularly preschoolers, are immunized against certainly the pertussis but also the other communicable diseases, which is provided free of charge within our health units. I think rather than the province doing the review of immunization levels, we are working with the health units to ensure that they are doing those immunization levels.

But I think it's important to lay on the table where we are

with respect to pertussis, because we are unfortunately experiencing the highest number of whooping cough cases in our province since the 1960s. There have been approximately 1,200 cases reported to date this year in Alberta compared to 33 cases throughout the 12 months of 1984.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre calls "shame," yet the efforts that are being undertaken through the birth of children – their parents being alerted that the need for accessing vaccination is very important. Unfortunately, one of the realities of a generation that went through with immunization when we were growing up is taking for granted the fact that immunization levels are perhaps not as important as they are. So I would like to take the opportunity to urge all Albertans to ensure that they're taking the utmost precaution with immunization of young people.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do yell "shame" for this government to allow this kind of epidemic to break out among our children when in fact we should well know that this generation needs more education, has not been through such a communicable disease before. What else is out there lurking in terms of measles or meningitis?

I want to know what the immunization levels are, Mr. Speaker. That is the question the minister has not answered, and she needs to. If she's not going to do that immunization level testing, will the minister at least, instead of standing up with her platitudes here today, launch with her federal and provincial officials a full public education campaign to ensure that at least 95 percent of two-year-olds in this province are vaccinated against these communicable diseases? They deserve a healthy future, after all. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: I would like to commend the health units in this province for the work they are doing. But I also think there's some responsibility on the part of parents, on the part of individuals across this province, to ensure that their children are vaccinated. You can't go and force somebody to be vaccinated. So our public education program has been aimed very much towards that level. Clearly, there is a line between Red Deer-North where the immunizations have fallen off, and there are particular areas of our province, some of which are on the native reserves, particularly in Hobbema, where the immunization level has dropped off significantly. I have written to the Minister of National Health and Welfare and told him that the province of Alberta will do everything we can to ensure that those immunization levels come up and in fact have impelled the federal government to please take note of the level of immunization, particularly on that reserve.

MR. SPEAKER: Westlock-Sturgeon.

Agricultural Research Institute

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture responsible for the Alberta Agricultural Research Institute. The '87-88 report of the institute and the public accounts spell out a horrible story of mismanagement and shameless patronage. In '87-88, for instance, 30 percent of the agricultural institute's funds went to salaries and expenses and of that, 54 percent to the chairman, the hon. Member for

Taber-Warner. And '88-89 doesn't prove much better in that 14 percent of the expenses of the institute went to operating expenses, 32 percent to the chairman. Now, what I want to ask the minister is: what possible reason could he give for the astounding amount of money, over \$20,000 a year, to go the chairman, the hon. Member for Taber-Warner, for such a small job?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I do not think that the chairmanship of the Alberta Agricultural Research Institute is an insignificant or a small job. Agricultural research in our province is very important to our agricultural producers, and I take exception to that comment very much. I also take some exception to the way the comment has been framed, because I would glean from the question that we are talking about the administrative budget, not the budget of the institute as a whole.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'd advise the minister to do a little research. The budget was \$2.2 million, and 60 percent was not spent. What is this board doing, sitting on its hind end charging up bills, visiting people around the provinces? If it's so important, why isn't the money spent?

MRS. McCLELLAN: I believe there was a question in there. I would also ask that the hon. member refresh his memory on the mandate of the Alberta Agricultural Research Institute. It is a co-ordinating body, and therefore a number of the funds will be directed in that way. I will stand on record in this House on the past performance of that research institute and look forward to discussing that in either Public Accounts or in heritage fund estimates at the appropriate time.

Small Business Assistance

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, in the past few years we've heard a lot said and talked about of the large plants and companies opening up in this province. We've given a lot of grants and incentives and loan guarantees, but the majority of all jobs created in this province are still created by the small businesses. I wonder if the minister of economic development can tell us: what is he doing to help the small businesses in the province?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, we are very active with the small business community throughout the province in a number of areas. I commend the hon. member for his concern as it relates to this very crucial sector of our diversification process and the strengthening of our economy. Our department works through counseling, through actual programs. We announced a number of significant programs over the last number of years that are very supportive of the small business community. We're going to continue to be very supportive of what is the lifeblood of the economic well-being of this province.

MR. SHRAKE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Many of the companies are trying to expand, and there's a lot of indebtedness out there. I wonder if the minister can give the Assembly some kind of an update on the status of the interest shielding program. What kind of help are the small businesses getting through this program?

MR. SPEAKER: At the end of question period. Might we have

unanimous consent to complete this series of questions?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.
Hon. minister.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, it is my wish, and I shall follow through with issuing a press release next week and make sure that it's available to all members of the Legislative Assembly, indicating the high uptake in three of the programs that we recently announced: the interest shielding program which the hon. member referred to, plus the capital loan guarantee program, and our business initiatives to the small communities throughout rural Alberta. There has been a substantial uptake. I believe, off the top of my head, in excess of 7,000 individuals have accessed the program that the hon. member referred to earlier, but we shall give an update and a commitment to have a release next week covering the uptake on all these programs.

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday with respect to a tabling the Chair reserved opinion as to whether or not the document as tendered would be indeed tabled. With regard to that issue the Chair advises that it's had a chance to examine the documents in question. They consist of an unsigned, undated memo purporting to be from an assistant deputy minister to a deputy minister.

Beauchesne citations 498(1) and 499 are concerned with relying on documents whose origin cannot be confirmed, specifically unsigned letters and telegrams. While these citations are specifically concerned with reading or quoting such documents in the House, the Chair feels it is a fair and equitable extension of those principles with regard to tabling such documents, particularly when they are represented by an hon. member as evidence of correspondence between two individuals.

Normal and fair application of House rules obliged the Chair to ensure the authenticity of certain documents relied on. As such, the documents presented by the hon. member cannot be tabled until the member can provide the Chair with a signed and dated version.

Thank you.

head: **Orders of the Day**

head: **Government Motions**

1. Moved by Mr. Horsman:

Be it resolved that the report of the special committee appointed Wednesday, August 16, 1989, for the purpose of recommending to the Assembly the person it considers most suitable for the position of Ombudsman for the province of Alberta be now received and concurred in and that the Assembly confirm the appointment of Mr. Harley Johnson, made by order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, as Ombudsman for the province of Alberta for a term of five years from the date of this resolution.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move Motion 1, standing in my name on the Order Paper. This motion, when accepted by the members of the Assembly, will appoint Alberta's Ombudsman, who is with us today in the gallery, Mr. Harley Johnson.

In moving the motion, I just wanted to make a few remarks, and those remarks were to thank the members of the select special committee of the Legislature, in which all parties were represented, and to compliment them on the activities they undertook in the search process in which they sought out and obtained the nomination which we are dealing with now in this motion. The hon. Member for Calgary-McCall, as chairman of that committee, and all the members are to be commended.

I think it may be useful to point out for the record that the utilization of select special committees is a function of the Legislature as a whole and does not come under the direction or control of the government. It is a function of this Assembly and has over the years been carried out in an excellent manner. I can hardly think of any examples of select special committees where the members did not gather together, despite partisan differences, in a spirit which would lead to a proper conclusion of the goal assigned to them by the Assembly. That is particularly true in a matter as sensitive as obtaining an Ombudsman. The Ombudsman's office is highly respected and regarded by not only members of this Assembly but by the people of Alberta. The choice that they have made is unquestionably, I believe, accepted by all members of the Assembly, and I am confident that their choice will not only be accepted by the members in the adoption of this motion today but by the people of Alberta in the services which will be provided to them by Mr. Johnson.

On behalf of the government, in moving this motion, may I wish him well in his responsibilities. They are onerous, they are heavy, but they, I'm sure, will be carried out in the tradition that is inherent in the office itself. On behalf of the government, therefore, I'm pleased to move this motion and call for its adoption by all members of the Assembly.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, rising to support the motion of the hon. Government House Leader, I would just like to say as a member on that select standing committee that we appreciate the process very much. Though the government may refer often to ways in which Alberta leads the nation, there is a legitimate claim that can be made about the function of the select standing committee that deals with the legislative offices and, by extension, the Ombudsman selection committee. It's a worthwhile and to be recommended nonpartisan process where members join to do useful work on behalf of Albertans.

I would just like to say that in my experience on this committee and the last, the one thing that impressed me was the calibre of applications that came forward to the committee. It really restores or renews the faith that I have in Albertans and their commitment to the province. That should be extended as well to other Canadians. We had a number of very excellent applications from across the country, people taking an interest in the position of the Ombudsman in the province of Alberta and wanting to serve.

I'd like to offer our congratulations to Harley Johnson, who I am confident will serve the people of the province in his role of Ombudsman with the kind of energy and commitment and vigour he's brought to his other positions. We certainly support the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Question? Call for the question. All those in favour of Motion 1 as moved by the Deputy Premier, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried; let the record show unanimously.

2. Moved by Mr. Horsman:

Be it resolved that the Assembly recommend to the Lieutenant Governor in Council that Mr. Patrick D. Ledgerwood be reappointed Chief Electoral Officer for the province of Alberta.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm also pleased to move Motion 2, which would have this Assembly accept the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices to implement the recommendation whereby Patrick Ledgerwood be reappointed as the Chief Electoral Officer for the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ledgerwood has served in that capacity now for some years. The fact that he has successfully completed his first term in that office and that he is being recommended once again by an all-party committee speaks highly of his abilities to carry out his responsibilities on behalf of the people of Alberta in a fair and impartial manner. It's not an easy job undertaking the electoral process. I might also add that he has had an additional responsibility placed on him by this Assembly in conducting the first senatorial selection in the history of Canada. In doing so, he trod new ground and did so in co-operation with municipal electoral authorities throughout the province in a way which resulted, to my reading, in no complaints but a great deal of commendation for his patience and understanding and his ability to co-operate with municipal authorities in a fair and effective manner. So I would like to compliment him for that particular responsibility as well. I'm not so sure that he was entirely happy when I brought the Bill forward, because he anticipated a lot of extra work, but he did that fairly and enthusiastically. And I think history will show that having participated in that process will indeed have been worthwhile.

I want to add just a brief comment about a standing committee. Once again I add the same remarks that I made with respect to the special select committee which dealt with the selection of the Ombudsman. The standing committees of this Legislature have a responsibility to carry out their duties assigned to them by this Assembly, do so very effectively, and do so, once again, with the least amount of partisanship and in quite an effective way. I would like on behalf of the government to thank the chairman of that committee, the hon. Member for Taber-Warner, for his responsibilities there, and all the members of the committee for having carried out their responsibilities.

I urge the hon. members to accept their recommendation inherent in this motion I now move.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a member of the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices and on behalf of my colleagues in the New Democratic caucus, we too want to add our congratulations to Mr. Ledgerwood on his reappointment as the Chief Electoral Officer for our province. Having worked with the office in a capacity a number of years ago when I served as the executive assistant to the late Grant Notley, Pat and I came to know one another in that we worked together as research staff on the previous Electoral Boundaries Commission. I've come to know Pat in work with him over the years. I know

that as a candidate in the '86 campaign and again in the 1989 campaign – especially in the 1989 campaign – anytime we needed assistance from the Chief Electoral Officer's office, it came to us. It was handled fairly and impartially, and we appreciate that. So I, too, on behalf of my colleagues in the New Democrat caucus, want to welcome Pat back to his position.

Congratulations, Pat. [applause]

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, we in the Liberal Party also congratulate Mr. Ledgerwood. I don't think anybody could quarrel with the efficient manner in which he has looked after electoral affairs in Alberta.

I noted with great interest that the Deputy Premier had broadened the scope of the motion somewhat by talking about the senatorial selection process and how Mr. Ledgerwood handled that. I would put a question to the Deputy Premier and ask for his assurance that Mr. Ledgerwood would be overseeing the next election based on new boundary designations in our province.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion has been made by the Deputy Premier, Motion 2. A question cannot be entertained at this particular part of the House proceedings, hon. member.

All those in favour of Motion 2, please signify.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? The motion carries; let the record show unanimously.

Hon. members, might we have unanimous consent to revert to the Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.
Member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

head: Introduction of Special Guests
(*reversion*)

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try again to introduce the students from St. Mark junior high. I thought they would be in the gallery by 10 o'clock. It was my mistake. They were not here till 10:30 to 11.

So it's my pleasure, then, today to introduce to Mr. Speaker and through him to all the members of the Assembly 30 students from St. Mark junior high in the constituency of Edmonton-Kingsway. They're in the public gallery, and they're attended by their teacher Carole Alonso and a parent, Bernice Kadyk. I would request that they stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly, and thank you for doing it again.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Yes. I'm sorry; I didn't know if my group was here. Are they? Yes.

I'd like to introduce to members of the Assembly 12 Continuing Education students. They're here with their teacher Joan Farhall. I'd ask that they please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly this morning.

**head: Consideration of Her Honour
the Lieutenant Governor's Speech**

Moved by Ms Calahasen:

That an humble address be presented to Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To Her Honour the Honourable W. Helen Hunley, Lieutenant Governor of the province of Alberta:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present session.

[Adjourned debate March 14: Mr. Hyland]

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess the only disadvantage when you speak on a throne speech or any speech and a time period elapses, like a day: if you think you're on a roll, you may lose that roll by the time everything quiets down for another day. And, hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont, I wasn't talking about that kind of roll.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, when I finished speaking on Wednesday, I was talking about agriculture and the things that are happening in agriculture, where people are taking their raw product they're growing and producing, doing something to it, and marketing it in a different form. I'd just finished talking about a company in Bow Island called Classic Grains and what they had been doing. This is, I think, happening in many areas of the province that I've seen over the last while, where people are manufacturing to a greater degree their own product so they can market it in a way to obtain the extra cash flow out of it to show that their operations are more productive and employing more people in rural Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the toughest things and the most expensive thing involved in agriculture and small business today is the cost of money, the interest rates. Not being an economist, I find it hard to try and understand when economists explain to you that you've got to have high interest rates to control inflation. Yet you ask them or you ask senior bank employees: where is the great advantage when interest rates go up? People can't pay for the stuff; you get it back and have to resell it at a loss. How does that help the economy? It doesn't seem to matter which government is in government in Ottawa. Whether it's the Liberals or whether it's the Conservatives, both groups seem to follow the exact same high interest policy and let the Governor of the Bank of Canada, who can go and sit in that beautiful tower that's all made of glass, look out and decide what he's going to do Thursday morning when he comes to work. He looks out and feels calm and cool; he looks out and decides what he's going to do, and the rest of us sweat like you know what after he announces what's going to happen to interest rates, till we can get our loans paid off.

I'm sure I'm not any different than a lot of other people. When you're trying to do things, you owe money, you have loans, you have mortgages, and you try and live through that. I don't think there's anybody in any kind of business or sitting with mortgages that supports those kinds of moves. Perhaps they should be set by people who are a little closer to the action, people who understand the effect it has over the whole country and what it's doing to the whole country versus trying to control

something that's happening in a small area of Canada maybe a hundredth the size of the country. We're trying to make a policy to control something that's happened there, and it's killing the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, we've talked and we've heard speeches and we've heard questions relating to the GST or sales tax or whatever you want to call it. It's proven to be an interesting topic. In a coffee shop conversation or public forum conversation, if you want to get everybody mad, just mention GST and look out. It's something that obviously people have expressed their views on. There have been many petitions sent in on it. There have been people who phone their MPs and say what they think about it, and I would suggest and encourage people to continue to do that: to express their opposition to the GST in their own words and continue to phone their MP so they can do their job of representing their constituents' views when they get to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, in the spring of last year the residents and the workers in the Redcliff and Medicine Hat area received a very heavy blow. That was the announcement by Consumers Glass Company, after they had purchased Dominion Glass, that they had decided to close the Redcliff plant and put 480 people out of work. The community, obviously, still isn't over a closure like that, but a group of union officials and mayors and the public have continued to work with me. And we have now, as a group, a proposal in front of the minister of economic development requesting a grant to do a study relating to the recycling of glass, the use of recycled glass in products, the marketing of those products, and indeed what those products should be. The group and I look forward to an answer from him in the near future so we can see if indeed there is an industry there that could be developed either by the workers that are still around or the other people in the area who would be interested in participating in such a product or, indeed, if there are other people in Canada or the States that would be interested in promoting the use of recycled glass in some form so that it can be sold in a finished product and create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to listen to part of the speech, and it is always interesting to listen to the speech of the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry, as the leader of the Liberal Party, when he talks about fiscal management. I'm sure it would have been interesting when the Liberal Party – and I assume they must have had something when they were getting ready for the election; had their candidate schools or whatever you want to call them – showed the right way to get the wallet out of your pocket, to get it in your hand and for gosh sakes make sure nothing falls out of it; make sure it's empty so you can wave it during the public forums. I wonder how many times they practised that and got it out, got it open and waved it so they could wave and talk about fiscal management. And, Mr. Speaker, what people in my area said is that it's an empty pocketbook. But it was empty for a reason. It was empty because of the guidance that that member gave to the city council of Edmonton, and when he got through with the city council of Edmonton, that's what the people of Edmonton had left: an empty wallet.

The member talks about fiscal management. We have the building of Genesee, which was built when a hearing was held – and we hear them always talking about hearings and impact studies, this study and that study, and "We need to do these because you need to listen." Yet four years ago, or however many years ago the study was done on Genesee, they said: "Ah, they don't know nothing; the ERCB doesn't know nothing; the PUB doesn't know nothing. I do; I'm going to build it. I'm

going to see that the city builds it." And he builds it in the highest interest rate times, so it drives the cost of the project up. The city now has to go to the Public Utilities Board because of the tremendous debt that they're carrying to get permission to kick the cost of Genesee into our electrical rates so all of us can share – all of us can share – in his fiscal mismanagement. It'll drive the cost of power up. I've seen some estimates to irrigation producers, for example, in my area: 15 to 20 percent to cover off the cost. And that's fiscal management. Remember, that's fiscal management, members, or that's what he tells us. So the Public Utility Board refuses to trigger it in.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but his time apparently has expired.

I'd recognize the hon. Member for Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a privilege today to respond to the throne speech which was delivered on March 8. In doing so, I would like to bring to the House the concerns of my constituents.

They continue to request assistance for accessing service and fair treatment from a number of government services and programs, including the maintenance enforcement program – I had a call this morning – the Workers' Compensation Board; social services, AISH, income security as people try to work through these systems; the Students Finance Board. I hear from people concerned about school closures and closures of bilingual programs; busing of children, which means that their community can no longer be centred on their schools; a lack of resources for special-needs children; and calls about health care and a fear of a new two-tier health care system. People come to me and lobby against the kind of support that has gone to Gainers and Peter Pocklington, the good money that has been thrown after bad money. They indicate their concern about the pulp mills and the danger to the environment, and I've also heard in regard to the number of toxic spills that have unfortunately occurred in my constituency. People call for protection of the environment. They speak out against the goods and services tax. They ask for support for their families, particularly in the area of working for families in which violence has occurred. We've been lobbied in regard to the inclusion of mental disabilities and sexual orientation in the Individual's Rights Protection Act.

More importantly, I've heard of the great consternation my constituents have felt in regard to a number of issues, one of them being the much touted Family Day which we celebrated in February. For some people it meant the loss of a summer holiday. Other people were very concerned about the cost of the public relations material that went out in regard to Family Day, but others were even more concerned about the content of the public relations materials that went out. The material acknowledged the harsh reality faced by many families in this province. One of the fact sheets says that the average family in 1986 earned less in real dollars than the average Alberta family earned in 1981, that there was an increase of children from low-income families from 93 percent in 1981 to 12.2 percent in 1986, and that 68 percent of two-income families would be poor if both partners were not working.

The solutions offered in the package were very middle-class solutions: 8 Ways to Stop Scolding, 98 Ways to Say "Thank You," and a recommendation that if you feel overworked in the home because you have a two-income family, maybe you should consider hiring household help. The solutions did not, then, deal with the reality for too many families. They did not deal

with the poverty that our Alberta families experience and did not deal with the violence that is a reality for far too many families in Alberta. It does not offer solutions for the child care needs of many of these two-income families.

We have also heard great consternation over the lack of standards, and this Family Day package certainly did not address that issue. The message I have received consistently from my constituency is one of alienation and powerlessness. Sometimes it moves into apathy when people say, "What good does it do to vote?" or "Politicians are all the same," a kind of cynicism that is rampant about both politicians and the political process not only in this province but in this country. They feel that it's pointless to try to influence the government and the policies they make, that the government is not listening.

I would suggest that a number of reports recently released by the government bear this out. The first one is Meeting the Need, a white paper on reform to Alberta child care. This is indeed a shocking report with shocking recommendations. As some of the women in my constituency have said, "It's a report that would legislate women back into the home," because in two-income families where the costs of child care will be escalated, the one earning the lower income may discover that in order to pay the child care costs and the costs of being employed, they will work for no financial benefit at all. But more important and worse is that some of the recommendations put into jeopardy the well-being and healthy development of infants. I refer to the increase in staff/infant rates from one care worker for three infants to one care worker for four infants. This totally ignores the infant's need for human contact and cuddling. I would draw to the attention of this government research done with children in foundling homes in which the children were physically cared for – that is, they were fed and kept clean – but they received no emotional and physical nurturing. These children, these infants – their little bellies swelled up as if they were nutritionally malnourished and they died. This government, in making this kind of recommendation, is ignoring the infant's need for human contact, which is the basis of bonding and the ability to form long-term relationships in the future.

Another issue, of course, that has been raised is: what if there were a fire or an emergency in a child care centre? How could one worker care for four infants? How could they escape with four infants? Which two would they have to leave behind?

We hear that this increased ratio is being done because of the increased educational standards and the need to save money. Well, I would suggest that this government is saving money at the expense of the well-being of children, of infants, of babies, the most vulnerable members of our society.

A second report that has been recently released is The Rainbow Report: Our Vision for Health. Like the Family Day information, it acknowledges the grave problem that poverty is in this province and the implications that poverty has for health care. It also recognizes the mental health problems that far too many of our citizens face. But the recommendations do not address the issue of poverty or of mental health. Instead, there is a tendency to blame the consumers of health care and recommendations for a two-tier system cloaked in a rhetoric of choice and a personal health care budget and card, as if ill health is not enough of a burden, and people that have to access health care do not need to be further burdened by the guilt that may be imposed on them. A tiny minority of people may, in fact, abuse the health care system and go to the doctors more often than they should, but I think they probably have unmet needs. I think of the battered women of the past who went to

their doctors repeatedly for tranquilizers and the doctor failed to ask, "What is happening in your home that you are depressed?"

Another report recently released is the Brassard report on caring for the disabled. It calls for deinstitutionalization, certainly a worthy goal. But where are the funds for community and family support for those who are deinstitutionalized? Again we have the use of a rhetoric of responsibility and choice, as the government has divested itself of responsibility for ensuring that all citizens live with dignity.

The last document I would speak to is the throne speech. We hear a rhetoric of stewardship of government as manager, provider, protector, responder, defender. These are the words from the dictionary. In the same speech on page 2 we see, "Market forces must determine Alberta's economic future." Certainly there's a contradiction here. Market forces are rarely good stewards. They exploit natural and human resources in the name of production and profit in the present with little concern for the future. Indeed, we have throughout history required governments to control the exploitive nature of the market forces and the marketplace. Perhaps the government should consider the implications of stewardship when it comes to the marketplace and make the marketplace and the economic system more responsive to the needs of families, minority groups, the environment, and the social, psychological, and spiritual needs of us all. The government in its white papers, policies, and initiatives cloaks its agenda in a rhetoric of care and concern and choice and responsibility: choice and responsibility for families, care and concern for the future generations. But these concerns are applied selectively.

In talking about the family, I attended the Family Day conference, and I felt like I was participating in a newfound religion as the family was glorified in word and song by some of the government-sponsored parts of the program. This glorification, as it was presented in word and song, denies a reality that we must all recognize. We all come from families. We all care about families. We all want to create loving families. What we do not need is a glorification of some ideal form of family which has never existed, and all of us have concerns for creating families that will protect our future generations. We have also a rhetoric around the family as the government speaks of the future generation and caring for the future generation, but it's used only as a rationalization for the government's obsession with the fiscal deficit in an absence of concern for human needs. It is in pursuing this obsession that the human cost is ignored, a human cost that will be borne by Alberta families today and into future generations.

If this government cares about families and future generations, it will address the issue of poverty. Poverty, we know, touches one in six families in this province, 20 percent of children and 40 percent of female-headed families. Food banks have become an institution, surely a shame in this province. Freud said that the child is the father of the man. How the child's developmental needs are met determines the health and potential of that person, the physical, psychological, emotional, and spiritual well-being of the adult. Malnourished pregnant mothers bear children that have irreversible brain damage. Children who live and are malnourished suffer irreversible effects on their intellectual development. They are limited in their future and in their potential participation in our future. In addition, hungry children cannot learn. Hungry children sicken and die. Stressed children cannot learn. They also sicken. They turn to drugs and alcohol. They become violent. They kill themselves. That's a

reality we must face.

If this government cares about its children and their future and future generations, they will not tolerate poverty. They will not tolerate the need for food banks. Such a government would recognize that children who suffer personal deficits through thwarted development are also a social deficit to be carried by future generations. Similarly, if this government cares about women and children, families, future generations, as they say, they would look at the proposed child care funding reform. They would recognize our concern that it is a way of enforcing the government's idealized image of the family, with mom at home and dad working and 2.5 children and a cat and dog and two TVs. They would recognize that there is great diversity in families. They would recognize that 68 percent of families would be poor on one income. They would recognize that these policies thwart women's aspirations and limit their choices. Even as it is cloaked in a rhetoric of fiscal responsibility, there has been a funding cut to the program. Even as it is cloaked in a rhetoric of personal choice and responsibility, there is no concern on the part of this government for children. The rationalization of increased child/staff ratio to make up for increased cost is shocking beyond words, as I said – that a government would sacrifice its children in the name of some theoretical deficit. Child care standards as proposed throughout the report are woefully inadequate. Where is the government's concern for our future generations, our children and our grandchildren?

We require teachers to have four years' training before they can teach in a school, and they are evaluated. We have public funding to ensure that all children have access to quality education. Surely we can do no less for our more vulnerable preschool-age children. More importantly, we must ensure that parents have real choices among quality alternatives. We must reject a proposal that forces parents to place their children in unregulated care of questionable quality in the name of balancing the budget. This government says it speaks for Albertans, but who speaks for Alberta's children?

This government shows its lack of concern in the rhetoric of choice. This government states that it wants to provide an opportunity for people to make choices, but the government must ensure that viable alternatives exist, that true choice exists, that people can access one or more alternatives, that the quality of options is not diminished by the increased number of choices. Choice in and of itself is not an ultimate good if basic levels of human dignity are not protected, if basic needs are not met. If under conditions of greater choice, quality of alternatives deteriorates or if some or many people cannot access many or most of the alternatives, then there is no real choice. In the Rainbow Report on health care, under the guise of choice the government proposes an establishment of two-tier health care, one system to cover basic care and a second area to ensure nonessential care. But who decides, who determines what are basic services? And what level of choice is there for people who cannot afford insurance? Would any Albertan knowingly and freely choose second-class or inferior health care? Who speaks for low-income Albertans in this Assembly?

The other word we hear is responsibility – personal, family, community. That's the rhetoric of choice and responsibility. The government cloaks its agenda of divesting itself of responsibility for providing basic services, pushing this responsibility onto already burdened families, community groups, and the volunteer sector. In providing for the disabled, the mental and the physical, deinstitutionalization was brought forward. Sounds

good, but it does not work if the government does not allocate funds to create alternatives to support families and communities. The homeless, the burdened inner-city agencies demonstrate the results of the failure to provide alternatives. It demonstrates a lack of real concern for the disadvantaged. The rhetoric of choice and responsibility was empty. There were no real choices, and as families and communities struggle to provide, unaided, an increasing number of essential services, the quality of life for all is diminished.

The government uses a rhetoric of personal choice and responsibility to mask its irresponsible policies and initiatives, policies that lack care and concern, policies that jeopardize the well-being of many and burden the coming generations. The government in its obsession with the deficit is like a skittish rabbit caught in the glare of headlights. It's blinded to alternatives. The government with its rhetoric of reduction of the deficit offers us false choices. It says that we must cut spending on the social infrastructure or be burdened by increasing deficits. But there are other alternatives, better management of the economy. On a daily basis we hear about money being thrown away. We need fairer taxation. But more importantly, we have to look at the human cost and the deficit in human potential created by failing to ensure adequate food, clothing, shelter, health care, and education, by failing to provide economic conditions that provide an opportunity to work at a fair and living wage for all who choose to work.

We need to address the issue of false choices presented. We need to look at the root causes of the demands for social services. We need to redirect our efforts at eradicating those causes. We need to address the issue of poverty and how it escalates costs in health care, because it is held that poverty is the major threat to health. We need to address how poverty escalates educational costs. We need to address how poverty impacts on mental health and the despair of those that live impoverished and without hope. We need to look at what happens in abusive homes, too often linked with poverty. We need to look at suicide that arises out of poverty. We need to look at the correction system and how it, too, feeds on poverty.

Today we read in the paper about the inner-city violence that is a result of poverty and homelessness and hopelessness. People without hope, people with mental health problems, and people who do not receive an education: these are the people that enter our correction system. We don't look at why they are there. We just look at punishment. Too often we look just at symptoms in the area of drug and alcohol abuse. We focus on how bad it is for the person and their family and society, but we need to look at the societal causes. Why do so many people turn to drugs and alcohol to help them cope with their lives? What is it in our society, in our families, that destroys their commitment to life? I've heard children express profound hopelessness in the face of environmental degradation, the threat of nuclear war, a profit-motivated society that takes no heed of the human need for co-operation and community. I would also say that in setting up a family life and drug abuse foundation, we have a government that has failed to recognize the valued programs already presented by AADAC.

Let us look at how government and business policies make it hard for families to flourish. Family Day is not the solution to the needs of families in this province. We need to create a workplace that is responsive to the needs of all families, not an idealized form of the family, to recognize the diversity of families and our changing social reality; a government that does not simply deny it or blame it on those of us who describe it. Mr.

Speaker, we need a new way of thinking, a broader, more complete understanding that includes all families, all children, all women, and all men. We need to see that our economic system is established to serve human needs, not that human needs be ignored or sacrificed to serve the interests of the economy or sacrificed, worse still, because of economic theory which is accepted as fact. When I hear some economists speak, I feel like I'm in the presence of a rarified academic dissertation, posturing in a way that has no basis in human reality – indeed, that ignores human reality and human needs.

In the world of international affairs we have heard the call for a new way of thinking, although I must admit the federal and provincial governments seem not to have answered that call, nor have they recognized the changing world reality as they prepare for a NATO conference in Kananaskis in May of this year. What a travesty that we would use this beautiful site to continue the kind of arms buildup that puts in jeopardy the existence of this very world we live in. It indicates how this government and the federal government continue to cling to old ways.

In our province our concern for our children and grandchildren requires a broader vision than is reflected in this throne speech. We need to address our future in broader terms than those of the economy. We need to include in our vision a province that is free of poverty, an economic system that includes economic justice for women through pay equity, eradication of job ghettos wherein the work traditionally done by women is undervalued – simply encouraging women into nontraditional work is not a solution – an economic system that recognizes the contribution made by women in giving birth to and caring for children, an economic system that is responsive to the very needs of family by providing parental leave, flextime, job sharing, part-time work with benefits, family leave, those kinds of things. We need a health care system that addresses the real causes of ill health and promotes prevention, a health care system that ensures all people have access to quality health care. We need an education system that ensures quality education to all children in the diversity of their needs and is not dependent on parents' ability to pay user fees, and that ensures that every person can access advanced education in keeping with their abilities and interests and that none will be excluded by the cost of that education in the form of tuition fees or however we exclude them.

We need a government that truly protects our environment and does not sacrifice it to business interests, and we must reject the false choice of jobs or the environment. We must see that they come together and that we have jobs in protecting the environment. We need human rights legislation and practices that include all Albertans so that all human rights are protected and that protection is not denied because of prejudice. We need a vision of a society free of violence against women and children.

Mr. Speaker, we need a vision of a future of not only a healthy industry and economy but a healthy people with real hope, a people whose voices and human concerns are heard and heeded; a vision that includes all Albertans, one that does not sacrifice the well-being of some to serve the interests of a few or in the service of an outdated theory and philosophy. As we enter a new decade, we need a new way of thinking founded on a broader understanding and perspective. For it is in our understanding and perspective of the problems facing us and the questions we ask that we find our solutions. Let us have a vision of a future of Alberta that includes . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Redwater-

Andrew.

MR. ZARUSKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's indeed a pleasure to rise and respond to the Speech from the Throne. I think congratulations are in order to the Lieutenant Governor on her gracious presentation, and also to my colleagues the Member for Lesser Slave Lake and the Member for Banff-Cochrane for giving us the response to the speech, the insight to what the future is for this province and the good stewardship of this government.

Mr. Speaker, as the two members outlined, I know their constituencies are good to them and they are working hard for their constituencies, but I think Redwater-Andrew is right in with the top constituencies in this province. But as I've said, at the outset of a new decade fiscal responsibility continues to be the most crucial concern as we work toward a bright future for Alberta and a bright future for our young Albertans. Fiscal responsibility is one way this government is going to carry on. As we go into the third decade of this government's fine stewardship in this province, we know there are changes that are needed, and this government is committed to it. You'll see it in the . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Change the government.

MR. ZARUSKY: Well, maybe in about 50 years, and I'm sure it's not going to be the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, as this government sets its priorities, you can see that health and education are the top priorities for this government and the people of Alberta. We are leaders in health care and education in this province, and as I go along I will point out some areas in the Redwater-Andrew constituency where this in fact did happen, and throughout all Alberta. This government is committed to balancing the budget in 1992. We have to work toward a balanced budget, because as I've said, we're working for young Albertans; we can't afford to let our young people come into a deficit and a debt, as has been happening. So we are committed. This will happen without hurting Albertans.

Unfortunately, federal fiscal initiatives serve as obstacles at times, and I think this government has come out loud and clear opposing the goods and services tax. I think this is a tax grab for the east, for Ottawa, and lowering the rate from 9 percent to 7 percent I don't think helps any, because there is no clause that says it cannot increase. So increases can come. And when we're told that it's going to work better than the manufacturers' tax – I had a constituent come to me just last week with some figures on the way the manufacturers' tax is administered and collected and the way the retail sales tax will be, and he used a bolt as an example. To the manufacturer, this bolt probably costs about 10 cents. The manufacturers' tax is collected on the 10 cents. When it comes to the retail hardware store, it probably sells for a dollar. So you can see the difference. It would be 7 cents on a dollar and 13 cents on the manufacturers' tax. So if somebody tells you it's going to work better, I have yet to see it, and I would like to see the federal government prove this.

Another thing that the goods and services tax will do is create more paperwork and more bureaucracy, which I think Ottawa is famous for anyway. I know it'll hurt small businesses and farmers. Even though the farmers will be exempt from the tax, they will still have to go through the process of paying the tax and then filling out all kinds of forms to collect it back. As a farmer, I know how busy it gets on a farm at times, and it makes

it pretty difficult to fill out all these extra forms. So I think . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Especially during curling season.

MR. ZARUSKY: Well, some of us in Redwater-Andrew have to farm full-time.

You can see that the paperwork would be horrendous. As Albertans are used to under the fine leadership of this government, we do not have a provincial sales tax. Our people are not used to a tax, and I know as long as this government is in power, there will be no provincial sales tax. So Albertans have the safety and assurance that they are protected from the sales tax as long as this fine government is running this province.

One of the proposals we could give to our federal friends is maybe lowering the interest rates. As my colleague from Cypress-Redcliff outlined, I haven't heard anybody really explain to me what high interest rates do to help our businesses or our farmers. So this is one way I think we can do it. You all know what high interest rates can do. I know myself as a businessman and a farmer – in the early '80s when interest rates hit up to 24 percent, it just about devastated some of our businesses. This is what we have to protect as a government, and this government has taken the steps with interest-shielding programs, with the farm credit stability program for farmers, guaranteeing them 9 percent for 20 years up to \$250,000. So we as a government have to look after Albertans because the federal government obviously is not at this point.

Another area which is very dear to my constituency of Redwater-Andrew and to myself and many members of our government is agriculture. Agriculture is the backbone of this province. It was one of the first industries, if you want to call it, or areas where people did settle and contribute to this province in food production. This government is committed to agriculture and has come up with many programs that do help our farmers, and as my colleague from Red Deer-North outlined – he probably looked at this alternative to the throne speech, and I did too, and there is just a little blurb on agriculture, really nothing saying too much. But when I looked at the opposite side, there is nobody there with any agricultural background, whether it be with the NDP or the Liberals. When you look at our caucus, look at our Minister of Agriculture involved in farming, our Associate Minister of Agriculture involved in farming, our Member for Wainwright involved in farming, the members for Rocky Mountain House, Drayton Valley, and it just goes on and on and on. So you can see that we have a knowledge of what the needs are in agriculture, and this is why we have put in the fine programs we have; as I said, the farm credit stability program, the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation, the red meat stability program, our fertilizer rebate programs, our fuel programs – our farmers do not pay any tax on their farm fuels. So this is how this government operates, and I think that is why we have a healthy agricultural industry in this province.

We are working toward a freight system, a system that will assist our meat producers in keeping the grain in this province, fed to the livestock raised here, and offset the Crow benefits. I think we are making a lot of progress.

We are, I know, meeting with our federal counterpart the Minister of Agriculture, and we are, I'm sure, going to get a pilot project for paying the Crow rate, the freight rate, on grain to producers in this province, keeping the livestock that's raised and fed here and, in turn, opening up all sorts of processing industries. It is working because of our Crow offset program

that we have paid to livestock producers in this province. All of a sudden you can see the shift of our feeder cattle that would be going to eastern Canada staying in Alberta, being fed here. Ontario is already feeling the pinch of those cattle not coming there. They are scrapping for cattle right now. They're willing to pay anything to bring them out there, but we are going to keep them here, and I know our processing industries are going to be in this province.

Another area I want to touch on that's also in the throne speech is a new breed of people coming into this province: entrepreneurs who are starting, whether coming out of universities or young people just starting their own businesses. These people are ambitious. They are not people who are looking at somebody who's going to say: "Well, you just spend, spend, spend. Let's close down all the needs that these entrepreneurs have, whether it's to start up some chemical plants or pulp mill plants." I think the opposition is ready to shut them all down about now. I don't think they realize that you cannot close growth, because if you want all these fancy programs that I know the NDs and the Liberals are talking about, you need people working; you need taxpayers to keep them going. So I think you should just look at it that way.

I know the environment is important to Alberta. It's important to everybody; we all know that. We understand that, but we cannot shut down industry, whether it be chemical or pulp mill or others, just because we're afraid that we're going to get some bug or whatever. If we're going to think that way, we might as well live in a glass bubble, which I think most of them are living in anyway. I think there is a way to go through this and keep our environment safe, and that is working with industry: government working with industry, individuals working with industry. We cannot afford to work against them, because they are the people who are willing to invest. They invest a lot of money, and anybody who's invested money knows what it's like if something goes wrong. Overnight you can lose a fortune. Unfortunately, the opposition, I guess, never invested, so they don't know this. I think maybe one day I could sit down with them and give them a lesson on investment and what it takes and how important it is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thank you very much. Anything you know, Steve, tell us. We've got a second.

MR. ZARUSKY: Well, we've still got enough time, and I think after I finish, I'll probably teach you a lot of things. You'll know and hopefully will leave this Assembly thinking a little differently.

Another area we are working strongly on is multiculturalism, which is also very dear to my heart and to this government. As the chairman of the Alberta Multicultural Commission I work very closely with our fine Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism. I know we are on the right track in this province for people to live in harmony and come together and be productive citizens. I think it's unfortunate when the opposition, especially the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods, runs around the province and condemns something, before it's released, that the people of this province put together. As the chairman of the commission I know we have been working hard for the past eight months, meeting with people all over the province. In October of '89 we released a report called Focus for the 90's. In this report the people of this province had their input for the recommendations and suggestions on the way they wanted to see this government handle multiculturalism for the next decade and

beyond.

MR. WOLOSHYN: That's a first.

MR. ZARUSKY: If the hon. Member for Stony Plain would once in a while attend to his constituency, I can tell him he's got a fine multicultural centre at Stony Plain that is working with all peoples in that community and working in harmony with a very good group there. I had the opportunity to visit it and have lunch with the administrator. So maybe, hon. member, you should visit that place.

What we've taken as the three areas of multiculturalism we want to work on in this province are public awareness and education, and this commission is working on a program of awareness for all peoples of this province, along with the Human Rights Commission. I think we're heading in the right direction, and you will see some of this coming as time goes on. Another one is education programs. We are going to be traveling the province and hopefully giving information to people that is relevant to the needs of our new immigrants coming into this province.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

Another is institutional access. In this area the government must seek to develop partnerships with Alberta institutions, and that's to promote opportunities for all Albertans. This government has done that. We started it back in 1971 and '74 with our human rights Act and other areas, but we are continuing because as the new immigrants come into this province, their needs are different. So we are going to be dealing with them.

Another area we are targeting is integration; that is, diverse resources available will be used to assist Albertans to integrate more quickly and effectively. That's an area where we have to work with all different business sectors: industry, government departments, and institutions. Some of these areas are in progress already, and what comes to mind is a project that the Misericordia hospital is doing now on the medical needs of new people coming into this province and the understanding of why somebody has a special need when they get medical attention.

You can see that multiculturalism is on the right track in this province. We are leaders in that area. I know that other provinces, as a matter of fact other countries, are even coming to this province for advice on how we're going to live in the future. I know Albertans, as peace loving people, people who get along, are going to live in harmony, but we don't need somebody from the opposition running around and stirring up problems and stirring up certain communities and telling them that the government said this or that, which isn't true many times.

Mr. Speaker, another area that the Multicultural Commission will be working with is the preparation for the centennial celebration of the first Ukrainian pioneers in this province, people who have contributed a lot to this province. I'm proud to say today that the first settlers of Ukrainian origin who came to this province settled in the Redwater-Andrew constituency in a little area called Star. It's very special to me that this celebration will be kicked off in that area. As I said, these are the people who toiled the land, and then as they prospered, they got into many businesses and many other areas. They are the ones, along with many others, who made this a fine province. They are people who did not depend on government programs, government assistance, government handouts. They did everyth-

ing on their own. They took care of their families. When the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore, I believe, said that family is very important, well, let me tell you, these first pioneers in this province knew that. They looked after their families. They didn't depend on government to look after their families. They didn't need government to teach them how to be parents, as the member has indicated.

We commend these people, and we're going to be helping along some of these celebrations with exchange programs with their motherland of the Ukraine and maybe some other areas. So be prepared for some good celebrations in '91-92, which are the years it will happen. There'll be lots of kobasa too.

AN HON. MEMBER: We're looking for samples.

MR. ZARUSKY: Well, you'll have to see your good friend Stawnichy.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, as we go on, another area that is very important to this government, as I outlined as I started, is education. As we all know, it's a top priority with this government. The commitment is there to ensure that every Alberta student has access to all levels of education.

One area where this government has taken a step forward is the distance learning education program, programs for rural Alberta that are going to give the same educational services as the cities. I'm proud to say that in the Redwater-Andrew constituency over 209 students are participating in this fine program, and that's mainly in the county of Lamont, in the village of Andrew. These students are benefiting from this program. I've spoken to the principal in the school, and he is just overwhelmed with how well it's working and is really looking forward to building it up to be one of the best programs for rural Alberta.

Another area I think our minister of economic development has been working hard on is trade for this province, trade with other countries. This government is very involved and ahead of many governments and countries in trade, whether it be with Asian countries, the eastern bloc, the Soviet Union, and in fact all of Europe. The throne speech outlines, I know, the importance of these initiatives and the vast opportunities out there. I can tell you, as a member of this government and having had the opportunity to travel into the Soviet bloc and to eastern Europe on a couple of trade missions, the potential is great out there. We can work with those people. They are looking for ideas in energy, agriculture, and advanced technology. As long as we can keep that line of communication going, I think we have a potential for selling a lot of our product there.

I have to commend the Alberta pork producers' marketing corporation for the initiative they've just taken lately, and that's selling, I believe, over 100,000 head of carcasses of hogs to the Soviet Union, frozen in this province out of Fletcher's and out of Gainers. The Soviet Union is going to try this to see if in fact the product will flourish on the trip over. I know it will be accepted by their citizens because our product is superior to anybody's in the world. I think that brings me back to our trade, how important it is to keep some of our slaughter industry in this province. I think the government made a wise decision when, in fact, they did back Peter Pocklington with a loan, because they kept this packing plant here and, indeed, helped my constituency, northeastern Alberta, my cattle producers, my hog producers. Unfortunately, it went sour with the guarantees, but this government took the initiative to take over at the right time and bring this packing plant back out of the dilemma it was in.

I know right now employee relations are at the best they've been in many years. I know that the plant is seeing some profits right now, some viability, and I know that my cattle and hog producers are very pleased that they have a plant to take their cattle. I know that in Redwater-Andrew we have many smaller cattle feedlots. It does not pay for them to truck them to Brooks or High River or other areas. It is important to these smaller feedlot operations, and they are an important part of this province. So I think when the opposition gets out there and tries to run down the government on the decision made with Gainers, let me tell you, if you went into rural Alberta and listened to some of those people, you'd realize the good move that was made, because it was important.

Another area this government has taken initiative on and that is in the throne speech is a better comprehensive crop insurance program. As you all know, this is a safety net again for our farming community, to help them along in years when either the weather or other disasters cause failure in crops. I know that this government has taken the initiative to make sure they're protected through crop insurance. Another beautiful thing about this insurance is that it is voluntary. We do not force it on any farmer who does not want to participate. So you can see that we give people the option to choose for themselves.

Another area I'm very pleased to see come into the hail and crop insurance is in the forage end, an insurance this year for pedigreed timothy seed growers. That's very important to my area as I have some timothy seed growers. In the past three years they were devastated by the rains that came, and there was just no way to help them, so they are pleased. The input to implement this program came from producers in the Redwater-Andrew constituency, so I want give to my producers credit for coming up with such a fine program.

Another area which this government is committed to, as I said in the past – and it's also in the throne speech – is health care for this province. Our hospitals are, again, second to none, and as all of you in this House know, it was the opposition that said we should shut all rural hospitals down and move everything into Edmonton. I think that's a wrong move, and I think some of our opposition members from rural Alberta are not looking after their constituents. I think they're just going along with their city colleagues and not worrying about rural Alberta. I think this is an area that rural people should know about: what their members are saying and what this government, in fact, is doing; how we have to fight with these people to keep rural Alberta alive.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to address the Speech from the Throne. It's a Speech from the Throne about which I am not particularly happy. To the extent that it attempts to address environmental concerns, it does a woefully inadequate job. It raises many more questions than it in fact answers. It mentions, for example, that this government will be "holding public discussions on major development projects throughout the province," consistent with this new environmental policy. Well, if that's the case, then why hasn't the Minister of the Environment stood up and said, "We are going to have a proper, open public environmental impact assessment into Daishowa, Weldwood, and the Alberta Energy Company," at least as good as the one they brag so much about in the case of the AI-Pac project?

As this government goes on to say in its throne speech, if they are going to enhance their environmental policy "by preserving land for parks and recreational use," then why is the minister responsible for that policy area actually reducing the size of ecological reserves and not pursuing the objective of establishing 17 ecological reserves to reflect the distinct ecological regions of this province? If this government is truly convinced that it must pursue environmental policy "by working with other governments to find common environmental standards," then why do we see this government this week saying that a Federal Court ruling on environmental standards simply doesn't apply to this government? The reason is, Mr. Speaker, because the links of this government's commitment to environmental issues go no further than a public relations commitment to deal with the political problems they are encountering on environmental issues. It does not address the substantive issues related to environmental problems associated with the kinds of projects that they're pursuing improperly in this province today.

Sometimes I will speak to people like the people across the way and I will realize that they honestly think, for example, that science is going to solve the kinds of environmental problems that we are facing today. I'd like to relate to the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, an analogy drawn by David Suzuki when he spoke in Grande Prairie late last year, because it addresses so powerfully the concept that science, in fact, will not solve the problem. Take, for a minute, a test tube, put one bacteria in that test tube that will double every minute as long as it can survive, and assume that test tube is the world, all its resources. In 55 years that test tube will be 3 percent full, and the bacteria in that test tube will say: "Jeez, no problem. We've been at it for 55 years, and it's only 3 percent full. We have an infinite amount of resources, it would seem. We will never stop surviving." Well, in five years that single test tube is full. The world is full. Its resources are consumed. If science could create three more test tubes, if science could create three more worlds, those worlds would be full and gone in four years.

Science isn't going to do it, Mr. Speaker. The results are going to be found in actions undertaken by individuals in our society and by business in our society. Government must play a role to support, to precipitate those actions, to create a context within which individuals can make decisions that are environmentally sound and within which business can be encouraged to make decisions which are environmentally sound. The problem is that the first step must be taken. We need a government that will admit and accept that there is, in fact, a problem. We don't have such a government.

Let's look at the pulp mill project. Do you know that if we are to proceed and build the two new projects to completion, Al-Pac and Daishowa, and expand Weldwood and expand Procter & Gamble, there will be four to six tonnes of organochlorines dropped into the Peace River and the Athabasca River every single day, day after day into perpetuity as long as those pulp mills continue to operate? Four to six tonnes. If one of the members over there took his pickup truck with four to six tonnes of organochlorines in the back, backed it up to the North Saskatchewan River, and dumped it in once, that member would probably be and should be subject to fines and imprisonment.

In fact, if we authorized those mills under the technology they are claiming to utilize today, that will happen every single day. The Al-Pac project in its own environmental impact assessment established that it will put eight tonnes of sulphur equivalents into the air every single day. Do you know how they were going to solve that problem? They were going to build a smokestack

high enough so it dropped 3,000 metres away. That was how that company was going to be allowed to solve that problem. One-third of the province is going to be handed over to corporations, some of them foreign corporations, under forestry management agreements, and there will not be a proper environmental impact assessment of any of that area. Mr. Speaker, there is a problem, and this government must acknowledge that problem before it can ever proceed. It hasn't acknowledged the problem.

Let's look at another area that's very, very important to this province: fossil fuel emissions of carbon dioxide. [interjections] We must be getting to them. There is a general consensus in the scientific community – as difficult as it is to achieve a general consensus in the scientific community, as the Minister of Education will tell you – that the world's temperature has on average increased in the last 40 years by about one and a half degrees centigrade. You say: "So what? How bad is that"? The difference between today, Mr. Speaker, and the last ice age is four degrees centigrade. Is this a problem for Alberta? Canada produces 2 percent of the CO₂, carbon dioxide, which of course is one of the most effective greenhouse gases. Canada produces 2 percent of all the CO₂ produced in the world today. Do you know what, Mr. Speaker? Alberta produces as much as 25 percent of that level of CO₂. Do you know what that means? That means that two and a half million Albertans, whose economy is fundamentally premised upon fossil fuel burning in the world, produce one-half of 1 percent of all the CO₂ produced in the world. [interjections] You should listen to this, Mr. West.

In the Heritage Savings Trust Fund Committee hearings I asked the Minister of Energy this question. I said: Mr. Minister, has your government determined yet to endorse and accept the resolution passed by a major international environmental convention in Toronto two years ago; have they accepted the resolution that jurisdictions in this world must undertake measures to reduce by the year 2005 carbon dioxide emissions to 80 percent of the levels created in 1988? Do you know what the minister said? He said: don't be ridiculous; the world will never, ever accept to pursue that resolution. Do you know what I say to the Minister of Energy? I say that you've got one of two problems and maybe both. If the world doesn't accept that resolution, then Albertans along with the rest of the world share a huge potentially catastrophic environmental problem. Alberta, producing as much of the CO₂ in the world as it does, has a moral obligation to provide leadership in solving that problem. If, on the other hand, you're wrong, Mr. Orman, and in fact the world does embrace that problem and begins to reduce dramatically its use of fossil fuels and its production of CO₂, then Alberta has another very special kind of problem. We have a huge economic problem. The one thing I know is that if ministers like that minister put their heads in the sand, then that problem can only be worse.

Do you know what the tremendous frustration is, Mr. Speaker? That, in fact, the context, the public will exists to allow concrete, effective steps to be taken to solve these problems. It is not a political problem. This is why it was so difficult to understand – but maybe not so difficult – that a government stuck in the '60s and '70s would come out and rush to announce seven major pulp mill projects in time to beat the announcement of an election that we didn't even need, two years before they had to call it, in order to buy votes. A government that had some insight into what the problem is and how people in this society are viewing that problem would have understood

that the way to be successful electorally should have been to have announced an enlightened environmental policy. The context exists in the public for governments to be aggressive, to be innovative, to be creative about overcoming these kinds of environmental problems.

I'll give you an example of what I mean. In October of last year a woman called Donna Remington phoned me from Calgary. I'd never met her before. She has four children. She works in the home. She said: "I want to do something, Mr. Mitchell. I'm very, very concerned about the pulp mill projects." I said, "Great; I'll send you some information." She phoned me back a week later, having got the information, and said: "You know what, Mr. Mitchell? I really want to do something." And I met with her. I said, "Why don't you set up a meeting, maybe in your home, with some neighbours, or in your community league." [interjections] I allowed you to speak. "And I'll come down and speak to people, and we'll debate that issue." Do you know that three weeks later, 800 people appeared at the Louis Riel high school adamantly concerned about those pulp mills? Do you know what's happened, Mr. Speaker? This issue is no longer the domain of professional politicians and semiprofessional environmentalists. This has gone to the level of the individual in society who is extremely concerned about what is happening to their environment. The level that it has not gone to is the level of this government. Even in economic terms, which these guys should be allowed to understand implicitly, it hasn't got there.

I'll give you an example of how quickly markets can change, how quickly people's views of these issues can change. My wife and I 10 years ago were in Ireland, sitting . . . [interjections] Mr. Speaker, could I ask you to ask them to give me the courtesy of being allowed to speak? You haven't stepped up once and asked for order, and I'd like to see that happen. [interjections] I'm getting tired of it.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has made a good point, I think. More courtesy could be extended to him. Also, I have been watching this rather carefully, though, going back to the previous member speaking, Redwater-Andrew, and I was reflecting on the fact that the hon. member who is now speaking was also interceding and interrupting the debate. So perhaps we could have more decorum in the House.

Would you like to proceed, please.

MR. MITCHELL: That's not true, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

MR. MITCHELL: The fact is that my wife and I were sitting in a lineup – I can remember this vividly – 10 years ago in Ireland, waiting to buy gasoline. There was a gasoline shortage in this world. And do you know what? Today we don't hear any of that, because the world restructured its supply and the world restructured its demand, and we have cars that go twice as far on half the gasoline. All of a sudden the economics of that particular industry have changed fundamentally. You'd think that this government and these guys, with their kind of orientation, would at least be able to understand that. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we have a problem, that it is a special problem for Albertans, given the CO₂ greenhouse issue as it emerges, and that the context exists within Alberta for governments to take strong measures – measures that need to be taken to assist and support individuals and businesses to

make the kinds of decisions that will begin to solve these problems, not just for Albertans but for us to make the contribution to solving these problems around the world. A number of things have to be undertaken. Specific steps have to be undertaken by way of policy so that governments can begin to solve these problems.

First of all, we have to understand that you've got to regulate on the environment. I know they'll say, "Ah, we don't need anymore government intervention." There are issues that require regulation. There are issues that require a concerted, co-ordinated, collective effort, and the environment is one of them.

Do you know what? I'll give you an example of why it doesn't in fact need to bother even those guys, because regulation not only works to assist in preserving and protecting the environment but it can with it generate economic opportunities. Millar Western built a CTMP pulp mill in this province three years ago. Do you know what it does? Among other things, it has liquid effluents, and these effluents are a particular problem for the Athabasca River, because it's not big enough to absorb during certain times of the year the kinds of organic compounds that go into it that suck up oxygen. Now, we had liquid effluents. Millar Western, two or three weeks ago in Saskatchewan, announced that it is building the same kind of pulp mill with zero effluents.

MR. WEISS: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may rise.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Career Development and Employment.

MR. WEISS: I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for arising and interrupting the hon. member, but it took a minute to find within the contents of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, sixth edition, Fraser, Dawson and Holtby; the green book, sir, I might add. I would ask you to refer to section 71, page 21: Reflections on the Speaker. I listened intently to the hon. member. I certainly appreciate his views, but I don't appreciate the reflection he cast upon the Speaker when he referred and challenged you, sir, in your Chair, as to what you said in regards to his actions. I would ask you, sir, to refer to the Blues and give us a ruling on that order.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I apologize.

The fact is that Millar Western announced three weeks ago that they were going to build a pulp mill in Saskatchewan. The difference between their pulp mill in Saskatchewan and their pulp mill in Alberta is that the pulp mill in Saskatchewan has zero liquid effluents. It still has some problems with CO₂ production, but it has zero liquid effluents. Why is it that that technology has been developed for that pulp mill and not for our pulp mill? Because this government begged Millar Western with \$125 million to build a pulp mill here. And you know what they got? In Alberta they got \$125 million, and in Saskatchewan they got tough environmental regulations.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

You know what's going to happen? When people come from all over the world to look at that technology, they're not going to stay in Edmonton hotels . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order in the whole House, please. Please

continue, Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: When people come from all over the world to investigate and look at that technology, they're not going to stay in Edmonton hotels, they're not going to use Alberta students, they're not going to use Alberta marketing mechanisms, and they're not going to use Alberta engineers. Do you know what they're going to do? They're going to use Saskatchewan engineers, and they're going to stay in Saskatchewan hotels. We have missed the economic development opportunity that was inherent in that opportunity because we didn't regulate them. That is what we are missing.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, the other thing is – and these guys should be able to understand that very clearly – that business doesn't mind spending the money to meet standards as long as they know that those standards are being effectively and fairly and consistently implemented so that the company next door has to spend the same amount of money to remain competitive. Well, if you look at the need for environmental law reform in this province and you look at how infrequently this government has ever prosecuted any company, you know why companies are reluctant to pursue higher and higher standards. They're not so sure the next company is pursuing them, and therefore they can't remain competitive. I believe that the business community will embrace this kind of regulation if it's applied consistently and effectively, and I know that there are economic development opportunities if it is done properly.

Mr. Speaker, we also have to have – and this is a very, very significant point – government that throws out the conventional economic wisdoms that they seem to be obsessed with. How many times have I heard this government say that these northern pulp mills are state-of-the-art economic development technology? Do you know what? I can remember reading as a student about how they said that The Bluenose schooner was state-of-the-art technology. You know what the problem was? It was a dying art; they didn't need schooners anymore. I think about how quickly demand and supply for gasoline in this world structured because of this crisis that we confronted 10 years ago, and I think about who is going to want to buy bleached kraft pulp paper in 10 or 15 years. They know that if it's not damaging their environment, it is damaging somebody else's.

You know what? As we go off into oblivion with seven major pulp mills, what's happening in Ontario? Jeez, Canadian Forest Products today is converting two of its major bleached kraft pulp mills to recycled paper. You know why they're doing that? Because in the United States today there is a market that they want to meet. [interjection] That market has been structured by initiatives by government, Mr. Day, and governments in 26 states have set up procurement policies to buy only recycled paper, everything else being equal, and it's becoming equal. That represents 70 percent of the American population.

Connecticut today has legislation that says that in nine years they have to have 90 percent recycled fibre in every newspaper, every periodical, every magazine published in or imported to that state. And do you know what else? The United States Senate is discussing a Bill that will make exactly that policy across the United States. Nebraska has legislation in place that will outlaw paper diapers by 1993. And do you know what we're doing? We are forging ahead like it's never going to end. Well, Mr. Speaker, the world is restructuring its demand, and what we

may very well end up with we don't know, because no environmental impact assessment ever considered economic development alternatives for the north. What we very well may end up with are white elephants in the north that have polluted our environment already and no longer have any economic advantage.

World markets have structured in the past; they are restructuring right now. Do you know how fast that can occur? Well, I can remember six months ago people saying, "You've got to use recycled paper." The government still doesn't have that as a policy. So you get recycled paper. Now, six months later, people are saying, "No, not recycled bleached paper; recycled unbleached paper." It can happen extremely quickly. It is happening quickly, and this government is not keeping up.

Mr. Speaker, what we need is to have enlightened policies about a new cutting-edge technology with respect to pulp and paper production, and that is recycled. We should have a government that understands that you don't have to intervene to pick winners and losers, like you did in the Gainers' case. You can create an environment, you can create an infrastructure within which that kind of recycling technology can take hold. How do you do it? Well, maybe we'd better get blue boxes across this province. Why haven't we done that? One, that creates more of the raw material, but that's only half the cycle. You've also got to create markets so entrepreneurs can see them and come in and make products from that picked up garbage. How do you do that? This government should make a commitment to spending its 8 and a half million dollars on paper every year only on recycled paper, and it should insist that government-funded institutions around this province purchase only recycled paper. It should negotiate with municipalities to encourage and require them to purchase only recycled paper. I don't know exactly what that will amount to, but I'll bet that will amount to \$50 million or \$60 million or even more. If there are entrepreneurs out there in Alberta, they're going to look at that and say: "There is a market that we can fill. We can develop that technology." And people will come from around the world to look at that technology.

Mr. Speaker, CO₂ production. I can't emphasize enough how important it is that we anticipate world market changes with respect to fossil fuels. We have too much to lose if we don't. We should be the province, we should be the jurisdiction, that plays a leadership role. Maybe I can use an analogy, an illustration, that might be of some help to the members opposite. You know, I remember looking at Coca-Cola. Coca-Cola was the first company to bring out decaffeinated cola. Who was it that was decaffeinated all those years? They competed with Coca-Cola, tried to beat them, and never could. 7-Up. Who was it that addressed the problem and turned it into an opportunity? That company with the biggest problem.

Well, Alberta has a problem in the sense that we contribute one half of 1 percent of all the CO₂ produced in the world, and we have a huge economic dependency on that. I argue that Alberta should be the first jurisdiction in this country to embrace the resolution that I have before this House on the Order Paper that we will find ways to reduce by 2005 our production of CO₂ to 80 percent of 1988 levels. That will send a message to entrepreneurs, to individuals around this province to focus their attention on finding ways of reducing, conserving, and creating technology that captures and recaptures CO₂ and reduces the emissions of CO₂, so we can sell that technology around the world. Mr. Speaker, we need to have a government that will accept that resolution. We need to have a government that

looks very seriously, for example, at taking the CO₂ that comes out of the natural gas when it comes out of the ground and perhaps pumps that back into that ground. We can sell that technology around the world. We need to have an R and D commitment to developing technologies that will reduce the production of CO₂ and that will assist in capturing the CO₂ that is produced, and we need to support alternative energy initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, we also have to look at tourism in a different light. We have to understand that as the world's forest resources and wildland recreational opportunities are diminishing because of the use of wild resources around the world, our resources here, our wildlands become increasingly more significant and more important to people in the world. One day I can see many people wanting to come here just to see the kind of environment that we're on the verge of jeopardizing because of this rash obsession with pulp mill projects.

Mr. Speaker, what we should be doing is following what was a good idea in Tofield and may be in jeopardy now. The people of the town of Tofield had the great good sense to set aside a thousand acres of land which was a bird sanctuary, recognized internationally as being a particularly important area for certain kinds of migratory birds, and they had a level of development that was very, very rustic and very appealing; 1,500 people a year come to see that in a town of 1,000 people. Well, there is an opportunity. Unfortunately, they've just invested \$60,000 in some kind of commercial development assessment which will very likely ruin that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about ecotourism, a new way of looking at wildland recreational development, a way that is self-sustaining, emphasizes it in fact, that is based upon a clean economy, that doesn't degrade that economy for some kind of short-term, short-sighted gain.

Mr. Speaker, this government also has to look to programs like that being set up by the Environmental Resource Centre in this city that will promote action at the community level. This group, struggling as it is for funds, is now setting up seminars where group leaders can come, be taught how to teach other people and work with other people in their communities to assess and achieve alternative environmentally sound decisions. In the west end of my community I am working with an action committee to establish seminars like that, along with the Environmental Resource Centre, and in turn develop programs that people in our community who have been trained in that way can actually work together to implement.

Mr. Speaker, I can remember reading two years ago about a candidate for the democratic nomination for the presidency in the United States. When he started, he said that the environment was going to become the most important issue in Americans' minds and it was going to make him the President of the United States. At that time a very leading columnist in the United States wrote: this guy must be crazy; of course it's not going to be the most important issue in the United States, in Americans' minds, and of course it's not going to make him the President. He said after he dropped out of the race that they were both half right: it did become the most important issue in Americans' minds; it didn't make him President of the United State.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that that is fundamentally changing. I believe there is a population out there, that there are people in

places like Alberta who are prepared to vote for the environment, who are demanding that before they get the next chance to vote in this province, they have a government that will respond to their concerns about the environment. These are the same people who are going to be buying and who are looking for environmentally sound, commercial purchasing consumer opportunities that this government is not facilitating and assisting business to offer.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, what we need is a government that will understand that it can be part of creating a very important partnership amongst and between individuals in our society and businesses in our society so that businesses can make the kinds of personal decisions that are increasingly environmentally sound, individuals can make the kind of personal decisions that are increasingly environmentally sound, and so that businesses can make the kinds of business, technology, development decisions that are designed not only to protect the environment but to take advantage of a new, emerging world desire to take care of that environment. Mr. Speaker, what I don't see defined in this throne speech is that kind of government.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Member for Wainwright.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In listening to the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark in his speech on pollution and environmental control, I would like to remind him that under Standing Order 26(c) he was recycling his own verbal waste without an environmental impact study.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour, could I adjourn debate in order to have it put all together?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, we'll test the House.

MR. FISCHER: Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. There's a motion put forward to the House. All those in favour of the member's request to adjourn the debate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion carries. The Chair would comment that it is somewhat unusual.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, the business for the House next week will be the continuation of the throne speech debate, with second readings of certain Bills on the Order Paper, and of course, as already been announced, the evening of March 22, a very special night.

[At 12:52 p.m. the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]