

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Wednesday, June 20, 1990 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 90/06/20

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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 and country.

Amen.

head: **Tabling Returns and Reports**

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the 1988-89 annual report of Olds College.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table the annual report of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1989.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I table for the consideration of the Legislature a study done by Dr. Schindler of the University of Alberta outlining that there is more recent evidence that dioxins in fact are carcinogenic, and appended to this report are extensive studies backing up that point.

I also table, Mr. Speaker, a report presented by Admiral E.R. Zumwalt to the veterans department – he was the former head of the veterans affairs department – where he establishes the association between adverse health effects and exposure to Agent Orange, specifically dioxins in Agent Orange. This is a breakthrough study, because it underlines a number of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Thank you, hon. member. [interjection] Order please. Thank you.

head: **Introduction of Special Guests**

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Drumheller, followed by the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure for me to introduce to you and to all members of the Assembly a man who is well known to many members of this Assembly and who has touched for good many thousands of Albertans. He is the former Member of the Legislative Assembly for the constituency of Drumheller, which he represented with distinction between the years 1940 and 1979 – 39 years – and then represented Albertans in the House of Commons as the Member of Parliament for Bow River between 1979 and 1988. He has also helped many, many thousands of Albertans in the running of Camp Gordon. He has just done a tremendous amount for our province, and I'd like all hon. members to greet him and help him celebrate his 80th birthday. I'd ask him to rise and receive the traditional welcome of this Assembly: the Hon. Gordon Taylor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism.

MR. MAIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In my time in the Ministry of Culture and Multiculturalism I've developed a deep appreciation of those involved in the library community. So it's a great pleasure today to introduce to you and to the other members of the Assembly Ernie Ingles, the current president, and Beth Barlow, the immediate past president of the Canadian Library Association. They're in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, and they are accompanied by Blake McDougall, your assistant deputy minister and the Legislature Librarian. Ernie is the chief librarian at the University of Alberta library. Beth is head of the humanities department at the Calgary Public Library. It's a rare occasion, Mr. Speaker, when Albertans have the opportunity to head a national association two years in a row. I would ask Ernie and Beth and Blake to rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to welcome today to our Legislature 33 students in grades 5 and 6 from the Laurier Heights school. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Bourlai and parents Mrs. Bonanni, Mrs. Toker, Mrs. Dobson, Mrs. Walker, and Mrs. Budd. We had a great meeting. I look forward to presenting them to members of this Assembly and would ask them to stand and receive a very warm welcome from the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Clover Bar, followed by Grande Prairie.

MR. GESELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is with pride and pleasure that I introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly two hardworking ladies who are providing superb service to the residents in the Clover Bar constituency: Susan Wanner, secretary, and Heidi Schlack, STEP student. I would ask our guests to rise and receive the recognition and welcome of the Assembly.

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce a group from the Hythe elementary school. There are some 33 students and teachers and parents and drivers. They're in the members' gallery, and I'd ask them to rise to receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure today that I rise to introduce to you and to members of this Assembly the Chair of the Alberta Advisory Council on Women's Issues, Elva Mertick. With her are two artists, Maureen Harvey and Chris Saruk Reid, who have indeed done the artwork on the annual reports for the Alberta women's council for the last two years.

Maureen Harvey received her education at the University of Alberta, also at l'école des beaux arts in Montreal, the University of California, and of course our own excellent Banff School of Fine Arts. She's exhibited locally, nationally, and internationally. She lives and works in Edmonton.

Chris Saruk Reid was born at Lamont, Alberta, graduated from the University of Alberta, and got her masters at the School of Art Institute in Chicago, Illinois. She, too, has exhibited locally. Her work is in several private collections.

With these three women today are staff members from the women's council: Laurie Blakeman, Peggie Graham, and Michele Emslie. I would ask all six of these women to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Might we have unanimous consent to revert to the Tabling of Returns and Reports.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.
The Minister of Labour.

head: **Tabling Returns and Reports**
(*reversion*)

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for that. I would like with pleasure to table with the Assembly today the annual reports of the women's council for the years 1988-89 and '89-90. I would certainly encourage all members to take the '88-89 annual report and frame it, because it is a beautiful picture, and also to notice the picture on the front of last year's annual report, both of which were done by our two Alberta artists.

Thank you very much.

head: **Oral Question Period**

MR. SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition.

Environment's Public Consultations

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of the Environment. It seems that the minister got what he asked for when he sent out his survey on Albertan's environmental concerns. In fact, I would have to say that the minister got a lot more than he bargained for. This summary of some 4,000 responses to the minister's plea for ideas frankly is a ringing condemnation of this government's weak-kneed approach to protecting and cleaning up our environment. I'm sure the minister felt really warm inside when he read response after response that contained sentences like this one: "I feel that, to date, our ministry of environment has been doing little more than paying lip service to environmental concerns." Right on, Mr. Speaker; right on. The title is *It's Yours: Alberta's Environment*. I hope the minister is going to try to prove that that is the case. We're certainly going to give him the opportunity. My question to the minister: now that Albertans have been kind enough to spell it out for the minister, is he prepared to commit himself and his government to environmental practices and standards that the people of Alberta are demanding from this government?

MR. KLEIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would think that the hon. leader of the NDP should be mighty pleased that we just didn't put out a document full of pap. You know, we could have put out a nice friendly document, taken all the nice things that Albertans said, but we had the honesty and the courage to print not only a full reflection of what Albertans thought about environmental policies but what they thought about the minister too. Now, I think that takes a lot of courage and a lot of honesty. That's typical of this government: we don't try to hide anything. With respect to what's coming, I say to the hon. minister, stay tuned – hon. member, I'm sorry.

MR. MARTIN: That's fine, Ralph. Don't worry about it.

Mr. Speaker, yes, honesty and courage: let's see how much honesty and courage we have from this government. It's just a report, there's no environmental action, Mr. Minister. The report says that

the central issue of concern was the environmental effects of pulp and paper mill development in the province. The majority strongly oppose such development.

Show some honesty and courage. My question to this minister then: will the minister accept the will of the people of Alberta and call an immediate public review of operating licences recently issued to Daishowa, Procter & Gamble, and Weldwood? If he does that, then we'll talk about courage and honesty.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, the booklet that the hon. member has in his hands is a reflection of thoughts on a multitude of environmental issues and doesn't restrict itself solely to the issue of pulp mills. It's to the hon. member's political advantage, of course, to lift out those things that are negative, because it's the duty and the obligation of the opposition to be negative. It's the duty and the obligation of the government to be forward thinking and positive, as we are.

With respect to the licence reviews, Mr. Speaker, those mills played by the rules: Daishowa played by the rules; Weldwood played by the rules. They have put in place the finest mills in the world. I don't know what more they want. With respect to Procter & Gamble, had the hon. member been paying attention, he would have noticed that indeed there was a public review of the Procter & Gamble licence prior to the reissuance of that licence.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, what's the point of putting this out if you're not going to listen to the people of Alberta? You're more worried about Weldwood and Daishowa. This is what the people of Alberta want, and the minister should be listening to them. He said he has honesty and courage. Where is that honesty and courage, Mr. Speaker? I want to ask the minister – even the ones he's apparently prepared to cave in on. Now that he's had a look at this booklet and he knows where the people of Alberta stand on it, now that he's had such a strong position from the public, will he now absolutely guarantee that any new proposal from Al-Pac will not go ahead without a full public review, or is bringing this booklet out just a waste of people's time?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the position relative to the revised proposal from Al-Pac will be a matter for discussion by my government, and after we've had full discussion, we will decide what course of action to take, but it will be in the best interests of Albertans. While we're on the issue of pulp mills and Daishowa and Hinton, I'm still waiting for the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place to stand up with his buddy the hon. Member for West Yellowhead, go up to Hinton to a town hall meeting, stand up, and tell the people to close the mill down.

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

MR. MARTIN: This minister knows full well: if he wants to have a course of action, listen to the people of Alberta and stop giving us huffing and puffing, Mr. Speaker.

Provincial Budget Projections

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to Magic Johnston, our hon. Treasurer. It's again on a conversation about our projected revenues from oil and gas in the 1990 budget. Now, the Treasurer's remarks on Monday, if I may say frankly – I hate to hurt his feelings – weren't too convincing. In fact, energy industry analysts don't share the Treasurer's optimism when it comes to oil prices reaching his forecast of \$21 per barrel. The

executive vice-president of Esso Resources Canada is planning his company's future – of course, he doesn't have to worry about the taxpayers' money – based on an average price of between \$18 and \$20. The Conference Board of Canada tells us it expects to revise its projections downward from its original forecast of prices between \$19 and \$21. So that leaves the Treasurer holding firm; everybody else is wrong except him. My question is this: will the Treasurer give up trying to tell us he's right and that everybody else is wrong and give us the revised revenue projections for crude oil royalties?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's very easy to pick holes in the forecast when the market is, of course, running against you. As the Minister of the Environment said, it's the obligation of the opposition to take these small advantages and to overplay them generally. That's essentially what's happening here. The Member for Edmonton-Norwood, as I recall, reporting in the House a year ago forecast \$10 oil. Ten dollar oil: that's what he said, Mr. Speaker; that was part of his forecast. Now, that's the kind of negative and unintelligent view that is typical of the NDP. Surely you would never go to the NDP and talk about anything that was driven by market forces, that had to do with investment-driven decisions which talked about the optimism and the strength that's implicit in this province. Sure, the market is down a bit today. Sure, there's an uncertainty with respect to OPEC prices. But do you know what, Mr. Speaker? I think that the price of oil is going to be \$21. A fair bet. It's up front. It's open. Albertans understand it. It's going to be much closer to \$21 than to his \$10 estimate, I can tell you that. I can assure you of that, Mr. Speaker. And I'm going to tell you one other little prediction. I will bet you that next year at this time when I bring this up again, there's going to be a red-faced Member for Edmonton-Norwood across the way when we talk about his forecast versus our forecast. Notice very well here, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Edmonton-Norwood is not saying what his forecast is going to be. [interjections] Put up or shut up I say.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have all those high-paid Tory hacks to get those projections that are always wrong. I do agree with the Treasurer about one thing he said: it is very easy to pick holes, especially in his projections.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister knows full well that he's misleading. What I said was that some analysts projected that. I went back and checked the *Hansard*. So tell the truth, Mr. Minister. It usually helps when you're making projections.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Treasurer is this. The Treasurer's budget for both oil and gas revenues is higher this year than last year when last year's prices were higher. Add to that a decline in conventional oil production and the pressures from jurisdictions like California for even lower gas prices, and frankly the Treasurer's predictions look silly. Under the circumstances, how can the Treasurer possibly stand up with these projections that we will have a 16 percent increase this year in gas revenues and a 13 percent increase in oil revenues? How does he make sense out of that?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, as I have said in the House before, part of the revenue increase is a result of adjustments we made in Alberta royalty tax credit and other forms of revenue deductions which are netted out of that calculation. Secondly, the gas price, we think, is going to continue to be favourable for Alberta over the course of the year ahead. Let's remember, Mr. Speaker, that the winter of 1990 was one of the warmest winters the United States has ever

experienced. I think the numbers show that it was on average 21 degrees Fahrenheit hotter than we've experienced before. That simply equates to a gas demand, Mr. Speaker. I can assure you that it's too soon to panic, too soon to push the panic button, as the opposition would like to do on every glimpse of doom. On every note of sadness they're up on their feet saying, "How can you be so far off in your forecast?" That's not the way we operate. This government sets a plan in place. This government knows that the strength of this province is here, and I can assure you, as I said before, that the supply and demand of energy is going to come together in favour of Alberta. It's going to come together in our favour. That means jobs, it means economic growth, it means new investment, and it means a strong Conservative Party as well. That's why the opposition's upset, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the only energy we've got on track is the stuff coming out of the minister's mouth. I'm sure the wind power is going up.

On Monday in *Hansard* this minister said, "We reduced our deficit last year by over \$1 billion." Well, that's news to almost everybody, Mr. Speaker, and now he's insisting that we're on track this year again when he knows both these statements aren't true. I'm going to ask the Treasurer a very simple thing. Why doesn't he be honest with the people of Alberta, quit trying to fool Albertans into believing this nonsense, and get busy with the job of revising his pie-in-the-sky budget, Mr. Speaker?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's precisely the fact that we're working in partnership with the people of Alberta that we have put out the oil price. Albertans are very wise people, despite what the opposition leader may think. He treats them as though they don't understand what's happening. That's not the view of this government. We work in partnership with the people of Alberta, and part of the partnership deal we have struck with Albertans is that we're going to reduce the deficit, we're going to get to a balanced budget, and thirdly, we're going to tell Albertans some of the bases on which we strike our budget forecasts. Albertans are reasonable people, Mr. Speaker. They understand that we're doing the job for them. They know that it's a difficult game to forecast oil. Yes, I know the member can point to the weakness today, but last year, Mr. Speaker, we underestimated the price of oil. We don't hear him giving us credit for that of course. The people of Alberta have a right to know what our basic premise is. They have a right to know what the price of oil in the budget is going to be, and they're going to be the ones who can judge how we're managing the economy.

Now, I haven't yet heard the Member for Edmonton-Norwood go on record as to what his oil price forecast is. Do you know why? Because he hasn't got the courage to stand up and tell us what he thinks is going to be the future price of oil. It's a courageous government that says to the people of Alberta: here's our summary; here's our forecast. Under this partnership agreement with the people of Alberta we're going to share the responsibility for getting things done. It's a plan of action. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order. [interjections] Order.
The leader of the Liberal Party.

Home Mortgage Interest Shielding Program

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, the government now has an accumulated debt of about \$10 billion and no plan to pay down

that debt. We have an unfunded pension liability of \$9 billion and no plan to pay that down. We now have the minister of the Treasury telling Albertans, "Don't worry; we're going to balance our budget; things are going to be fine," and we can see that oil prices have gone down and that he isn't going to be able to balance that budget. Mr. Speaker, we have the interest shielding program that is going to cost an additional \$70 million to \$100 million for this year. Well, \$20 million is budgeted in this year's budget; \$70 million to \$100 million is needed to carry it for an additional year. I'd like to know from the minister responsible for housing where that additional \$70 million to \$100 million for this year alone is going to come from.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the numbers the hon. member quotes are certainly numbers that I've placed in the public for their discussion and understanding. One of the things we have to recognize, though, is that the first commitment is to expend the \$20 million that's in that program. Secondly, as the program progresses and we reach the final stages of the current fiscal year, then we determine what that deficit is at that point in time. If that deficit is there – we don't know at this point completely because interest rates can change, circumstances can change, and predictability is rather uncertain at this point. But if it is, the general method by which you look at it – there are two: one, you look within your department and see if you can reassess priorities; secondly, if circumstances prevail, then you have to look at a special warrant in those circumstances.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister has already unilaterally grabbed away from municipalities grants in lieu of taxes, without even consulting them. Is this the money that's going to be used to pay for the interest shielding program? Is that the way you're going to get the money?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, that statement is a very unfair one and a very misleading one to the municipalities of this province. What it actually is saying is: can the municipalities have a trust between the minister, the department, the government, and themselves? They absolutely can. The commitments we've made with regards to grants and payments to the various municipalities we're committed to: they will receive them, every penny and every dollar. So any inference by the hon. member that that won't happen is absolutely false and unacceptable.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, there's a saying in the military that if it walks, salute it; if it doesn't, paint it. I think the government's principle is that if it walks, subsidize it; if it doesn't walk, keep talking until you can subsidize it.

My last question to the Treasurer is this: does the minister have no sense of responsibility, no sense of honesty to the people of Alberta in getting his debt under control by saying right here and right now: we will not continue the interest shielding program because we can't afford it; our debt is too high?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the question of the relative size of Alberta's debt of course is a concern of the government. I can advise Members of the Legislative Assembly that the relationship of our debt to our assets is in proper balance. The percentage of our budget that goes to cover debt servicing is probably amongst the one or two lowest provinces in Canada, and the percentage of debt coverage is less than the income that we receive from the heritage fund. Now, since I've mentioned the heritage fund, I can assure you that if Alberta

had been able to maintain the revenues that were justly its during the national energy program, a program driven by those Liberals across the way who happen to be mustering in Calgary today, we wouldn't have any deficit. This province has given too much money to central Canada as a result of those wrong-headed Liberal decisions. This member's speaking from both sides of his mouth.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, it grieves me terribly to be on the same topic as the Liberal Party, but my question is also to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and it has to do with the interest shielding program. My constituents are phoning me and asking me if during this session we will be announcing an extension of the interest shielding program, and I ask the hon. minister if he has any announcements in mind.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Good question. Mr. Speaker, the two programs that are alluded to – one the hon. member has mentioned: the Alberta mortgage interest shielding program; the other is the Alberta family first-home program – were initiated in 1989 with the objective of stimulating the construction industry in this province to assist homeowners and renters, and those goals have been accomplished in a very successful way. We have helped some 95,000 people in terms of their homes and stabilizing their capability of being in those homes during this past year; in terms of renters, these programs have assisted the rental rates for vacancies to be increased from about 1 percent to 2.6 percent: very successful programs.

The question of the hon. member is whether they would be extended beyond February 28, 1991, which is the current commitment of the government. We have assessed both of those programs very, very carefully, and there are a number of uncertainties, some of them raised here in the Legislature today with regards to interest rates, with regards to the capability in terms of the budgeting responsibility of the government in the fiscal year 1991-92. Based on those uncertainties, Mr. Speaker, it is the decision of the government at this time to defer a decision on that matter until the fall budgeting cycle, which initiates the budgeting of the 1991-92 budget year. We want to look at it in terms of our responsibilities at that time: what we can do and what we can't do. What we also want to do is make sure – and this concerns me about the attitude of the opposition. We want to assure ourselves that if we must be in a position where we help Albertans in need, we are there. So we made the decision that it is best to look at that in the fall of this year, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that is a very responsible position to take at this time.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, we also had a small business interest shielding program that was running parallel with the mortgage interest shielding program. I wonder whether that program will be carried on until February and whether it will be reconsidered this fall.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I could not put it nearly as well as my dear colleague and friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs has put it. Let me just indicate that the position as it relates to our interest shielding program for the small business community is exactly parallel to what the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs indicated as it relates to the mortgage program.

MR. SPEAKER: Vegreville.

Interest Overcharges

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The issue of bank interest overcharges is well understood by farmers in the province of Alberta who were bilked out of millions of dollars by banks in the late 1970s and early 1980s because they were unfairly and unlawfully charging variable rates of interest on loans that specified fixed rates. Recent court decisions involving Dunphy Leasing in Calgary, for example, indicate that banks and other lending agencies continue to squeeze millions of dollars unfairly from Albertans by misleading them about the actual rates of interest being charged on consumer loans and credit cards. In fact, judges have used the provisions of the Interest Act, 1886, to roll back interest rates to 5 percent in these cases. I'd like to ask the minister why this government has done absolutely nothing to help Albertans fight these cases and recover the hundreds of millions of dollars that is rightfully theirs.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the case of alleged interest overcharges, the government some time ago indicated to individuals who've raised the issue with us that we would work with them and with the banks in reviewing the specific circumstances involved. I have to emphasize here that with respect to governance of the banking system itself, it is in fact federal jurisdiction. However, if indeed there have been problems, and there are obviously perceived problems, we would like to assist in any way possible.

To this point in time the court cases that the hon. member refers to have been mixed with respect to their response. The court cases themselves have dealt with individual circumstances. In our review what we're attempting to ascertain on eight-, nine-, 10-year-old circumstances is whether or not in fact those are individual circumstances that need to be decided individually in our court system through a process that's given to the people, to determine through that process, or whether there is a general policy problem that we can assist with in terms of mediation or other kinds of negotiations with the banking system.

MR. FOX: Just so much talk, Mr. Speaker. The matter of contracts between clients and companies is in the jurisdiction of the hon. minister, and his inaction is unacceptable.

On April 24, Mr. Speaker, I introduced Bill 283, the Interest Charge Review Board Act, on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona. This Bill would establish a simple, fair, and effective means of reviewing these cases and getting the money back for Albertans in cases that they win. I'd like to ask the minister why he hasn't adopted this Bill as a government Bill and passed it or devised one of this own that would take concrete, positive action on bank interest overcharges on behalf of Albertans.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, what in fact is unacceptable is the use of this circumstance and people who are in particular situations as a political football to indicate that there is an overall response when, to the best of my knowledge, the member at least hasn't given me that data, and any data I have received is far too individual and complex to have determined that general policy.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the cases, we continue to try to reach this almost decade-old question as people across this country try to reach it. If the member is at all aware of a specific circumstance or has information that would lead us to conclude that the banking system has in fact done wrong, given

the wrong information and abused individuals in the province, then I'd like to see it, and I'd like to see it on my desk in the morning.

Workers' Compensation Board

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, my questions today are directed to the minister responsible for the Workers' Compensation Board. It's my understanding that the information that has been sent to me he has as well, so I would assume he's informed to respond to my questions. Mr. Speaker, recently there was the awarding of a huge contract, and there are subsequent negotiations for additional work worth millions of dollars for the installation and development of the computerized systems within the Workers' Compensation Board. Admittedly 10 percent will benefit local firms, but the bulk of the action benefits the American-based firm of Andersen Consulting. My question to the minister responsible for the Workers' Compensation Board: why would the minister permit criteria to be so restrictive that it excludes any Alberta-based companies from competing in the original tender?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, the member is completely wrong. The competition, the bidding process, was open to all companies in Canada and in Alberta.

MR. WICKMAN: Answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, you get a supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: Not if he doesn't answer the first one.

MR. SPEAKER: Not you, Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: He doesn't even understand the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Mr. Minister.

MR. DECORE: Answer it. [interjections]

MR. TAYLOR: Saved again.

MR. TRYNCHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members do not wish to hear the answer, maybe they can ask a supplementary.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the reference that I made made it very clear that I talked in terms of it being so restrictive that it excluded the possibility of any Alberta-based company from competing in the tendering process.

My second question, however, to the minister: if the government is so serious about diversifying Alberta's economy, why did the minister not use this opportunity to utilize Alberta companies for the systems servicing agreement, which is worth millions of dollars, instead of negotiating with that one company only, the American-based company, Andersen Consulting?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, to the first question: the hon. member is wrong. To the second question: we had the

competition open across Canada. There were, I believe, five or six firms that bid on the contract. The Workers' Compensation Board in their discussion with a private consulting firm, Gellman, Hayward, picked, on their advice, the firm that would do the best job for workers' compensation, for the workers of Alberta, and for the province of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Highwood.

Train Tours

MR. TANNAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Minister of Tourism. Several hon. members in this House have brought to the attention of the Assembly the steam engine 6060 and mentioned that there are at least four organizations bidding for that engine. One of those organizations is from my constituency. I understand from the High River group that they have secured the support of the Rocky Mountain Rail Society for their application to acquire rolling stock from the sale of Via Rail inventory – namely, 13 or more passenger cars – to form a heritage steam passenger train. My question, then, to the Minister of Tourism: is the minister prepared to support the joint High River/Rocky Mountain Rail Society request that Via Rail extend its financial deadline for purchasing these culturally very valuable passenger coaches?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, we have been requested to support their proposal, and I think it's a very valid request they're making of Via Rail, to extend the time frame for their acquisition. We've tried to encourage the various groups that did come to us with proposals to get together to try and set up a valid tourism opportunity that would operate on a self-sufficient basis. They definitely do need rolling stock; they do need the rights to run on the railroad of their choice. They've got a lot of work to do prior to the acquisition of 6060.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Highwood.

MR. TANNAS: Thank you. My supplementary is again to the minister. Well, to acquire these cars, then, will require an extension of time, but it'll also require some money. Is the minister prepared to support the joint application to the Western Diversification Office?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, we've had a very successful arrangement with the federal/provincial CATA agreement, and since the end of that agreement, on March 31, we have worked with the deputy minister and our federal MPs to make sure that tourism development proposals are eligible for the western diversification fund. If they apply to that fund as they are intending to do, we definitely would support them because we think that if they do get their proposals together, they will have a valid application, and we would work with them to achieve western diversification funding.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

Advanced Education Funding

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This government continually underfunds institutions and expects them to survive and carry on operating as if they're meeting the rate of inflation, the cost of living increases that they face for operations, and it's precisely true when it comes to advanced education institutions.

All you have to do is look at, you know, tuition fees for most of the major institutions. They're all up by the maximum allowed: 15 percent. The Correspondence School fees are up by up to 500 percent. Graduate students' fees are up in some instances by nearly 400 percent. The latest round of implications comes from Athabasca University, which, effective August 1, is now forced to cancel its toll-free service for students for registrar, tutorial services, course materials, library, and other faculty services. In other words, the correspondence, long-distance university has to cut its phone service. My question is to the Minister of Advanced Education. Given these consequences, is he prepared to redraft his budget now, provide enough money for these places to function properly, and bring it back through the Treasurer for consideration of the Assembly?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, one wonders at the outset how long the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands has been here. Surely the member knows better than that. We go through an exhaustive process in terms of budget preparation. There's a full hearing within this House, where all members are allowed to participate. I would think the Member for Edmonton-Highlands and others would agree that if one looks at the expenditure in the province on the 29 institutions . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: How much?

MR. GOGO: . . . of \$1 billion, one would see that it's amongst the highest per capita in the nation.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the problem. The minister thinks this is a joke.

Every institution has had to cut quality services to students; the students are paying more and getting less. Is there any measure that this minister is willing to undertake to solve this crisis, or is he just going to let it happen until the institutions are on their knees?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member has some suggestions. Surely the taxpayers of this province are making a very significant contribution to the postsecondary system. We have the second lowest tuition fees in the country. I have ordered a review on the whole question of tuition fees. Surely the hon. member is not saying that this minister should be attempting to take away the setting of priorities by the postsecondary institutions. If that is the thrust of the hon. member's question, then I look forward to the discussion on Bill 27 in committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Belmont.

Labour Code Enforcement

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Labour. I have here an original sample of Mr. Kirkpatrick's handwriting. I have here a handwritten draft of a memo that advises merit employers to discriminate against union members. I can produce the original at the appropriate time if requested. And I have here an expert opinion from a forensic document examiner stating that the two are written by the same individual. My question to the minister is: what more evidence does the minister require to take action in this matter?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear at long last that the Member for Edmonton-Belmont is willing to produce

the evidence that he has, and I would say to him that I would have expected him as a member of this Legislature and, I would presume, a member upholding some of our deepest held values in Alberta to have been down in my office weeks ago with this information looking for a solution. Instead he is waving documents around. All he is doing is creating suspicion. Now, I'm interested in getting to a solution, and if he would bring the originals, as I've asked him for weeks now, down to my office, I would appreciate it. I would also point out that the opinion that he has produced from the forensic document examiner is dated May 29, 1990, which is three weeks ago. He's been holding this information back for three weeks. I would also point out that it is so far unproven from what he has as to who is the author of the two documents, and the opinion that he has sought does not establish the authorship; it merely says that the person who wrote those drafts is the same person. But who is that person?

Now, let me say that we are dealing with some very substantial allegations here. I for one would like to see us all get to the bottom of it so the suspicions can be laid to rest and a solution can be found. The appropriate place to do that is not in this House. It requires a quasi-judicial hearing. The Labour Relations Board has exclusive jurisdiction in this area. The allegation has been raised, on one hand, by the company that there could be an offence under section 149 and, on the other hand, by the member opposite that there would be an offence under 147. Both allegations are very serious indeed, and I would like to get to a solution.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, for the longest period of time the minister has had sufficient documents to conduct her own investigation. I was giving her the time and the opportunity to do that. I shouldn't have to do the minister's work for her, and the minister well knows that on one hand . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The question.

MR. SIGURDSON: Yes, indeed. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On one hand, we have very quick action with respect to nurses and social workers, but when it comes to friends of this government it takes forever to get anything going.

MR. SPEAKER: Succinct question.

MR. SIGURDSON: Then, Mr. Speaker, very succinctly. I would just ask the minister what steps she has taken with respect to this. What investigation has she conducted into this matter of her own department? Any investigation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member.

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I have been looking into the matter, and I am continuing to look into the matter, and I again ask this hon. member to do his duty as a citizen of Alberta, as a member of this Legislative Assembly, and let us look for a solution instead of merely spreading suspicion around as this person is doing.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo.

Natural Gas Sales to the U.S.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is to the Minister of Energy. For years United States regulatory agencies

have been the only real impediment to fair and unrestricted access by Alberta's energy to the United States, which is supposed to be guaranteed by the free trade agreement. Now we're finding that the California Public Utilities Commission is taking actions which are designed to drive down the price of gas which Alberta producers receive from that California market. Now, I support the efforts of the Energy minister to ensure that we get a fair price for our gas, but what Albertans can't understand is why we have to put up with continual harassment from U.S. regulatory agencies when we have the free trade agreement. I'm wondering if the minister, then, would tell us why it is he isn't seeking a remedy under the free trade agreement for this harassment by the California Public Utilities Commission and other regulatory harassments that our natural gas has been incurring.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, with regard to our new potential market expansion into California, I should say that the expansion of Pacific Gas Transmission or the Altamont project or other projects carrying gas into the state of California will be a direct result of the free trade agreement. The OII order by the CPUC, California Public Utilities Commission, ordered that Canadian gas be treated on the same basis as American gas on expansion into California. So I think that in fact the free trade agreement has worked to the benefit of the gas producers in the province of Alberta.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, the fact is that the reason he isn't going to the free trade agreement is that it doesn't protect Canadians. It doesn't even have a dispute mechanism. I'm wondering whether the minister will undertake to push for this type of regulatory harassment to be covered under the free trade agreement so that we can ensure that we have free access to the United States markets in the same way as American consumers have been guaranteed access to our energy resources.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, I'm sure, knows better than to accuse a lack of remedy under the free trade agreement for the difficulties we're having in California today. The problem with California today in moving our gas has to do particularly with a lack of expansion, and in that there are negotiations currently going on today with the producer and Alberta and Southern, the agent for Pacific Gas Transmission, we are in a difficult period because we don't have the expansion to be able to match the regulatory intervention that we perceive with the California Public Utilities Commission. Under part 2, section 10 of the Natural Gas Marketing Act we have plenty of remedies in the event that there is not an agreement reached between the producer and the aggregator.

This has nothing to do with the free trade agreement, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, as I've indicated, the free trade agreement gives us national treatment for natural gas expansion projects into California. If the hon. member was legitimately concerned about the issue of the current round of negotiations with Alberta and Southern and the producers, he wouldn't be dragging in the free trade agreement, because it has nothing to do with the issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Millican.

Milk Production

MR. SHRAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the last few years we've tried to diversify our economy, and we've had a lot of

success in the food processing industry. One of the areas that really took off was cheese manufacturing; we make great cheese in this province. But throughout the last entire effort at this, the cheese factories around this province have continually had a hassle getting a reliable source of milk to make cheese. You've got to have milk to make cheese. As far as the supply of milk, if the dairy farmers are allowed to – I mean, they can't increase their production. They get penalized. So I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture could please explain why we have this type of a situation in this province. We can't blame the NDP.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the hon. member, maybe we can't blame the NDP here, but maybe we can somewhere else.

The milk industry in this province is under supply management. There are basically two types of milk. Fluid milk or, if you wish, table milk is where the maximum amount that can be produced under a quota is the amount that Albertans consume. As far as the industrial milk – and that's the milk that goes into such things as cheese and ice cream and yogurt and on and on and on – there is a national milk plan or agreement under which Alberta as a whole gets a certain percentage, and any industrial user demanding milk has to get it from that quota amount. It's a finite amount, and that's the problem you're identifying.

MR. SHRAKE: Well, Mr. Speaker, in Calgary we've got a real success story: a fellow who started producing cheese. He makes great mozzarella, really great. He went from sales of a couple of hundred thousand dollars to over \$4 million. He wants to build a new, good plant, a real big one, and spend over \$1 million, but he cannot get any assurance that he will be able to have enough milk to keep this plant going, to justify this type of expenditure. So could the minister please advise us: would he take some initiative to find a reliable source of milk for these cheese producers in this province?

MR. ISLEY: As I just explained, Mr. Speaker, there is a finite amount of milk under the supply managed process. The other difficulty that creeps in here is that under the multilateral trade agreements and the free trade agreements you're not to use internal programs to subsidize the development of products for export purposes, and if you truly analyze supply management, it is an internal type of subsidy where some regulatory body is saying to the consumer, "Here's the amount you pay for the product." So it's a difficult issue, and as I say, it's a limited growth area because of supply management.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Advanced Education in reply to Stony Plain.

NAIT/Westerra Merger

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to provide some supplementary information to the question raised by the hon. Member for Stony Plain yesterday with regard to the NAIT/Westerra merger and the disposition of the Westerra staff. The Westerra full-time staff complement as of April of this year was 110. The disposition, which is germane to the question, was as follows: 36 accepted full-time offers with NAIT; 37 accepted temporary offers at NAIT; 16 chose not to accept offers with NAIT and elected to receive severance; 10 chose not to apply and elected to receive a severance package; 17 secretarial/clerical staff had the option to compete for 10 identified positions; nine did not receive an offer of employment

with NAIT, which was consistent with my answer yesterday; two chose not to take early retirement incentive programs. Based on the above, Mr. Speaker, 37 staff will not, for a variety of reasons, be employed at NAIT, and only nine of these positions did not have a choice in this matter.

The hon. member also stated that 48 staff were offered positions and declined. As indicated above, Mr. Speaker, the correct number is 16.

I do wish to add that the hon. Member for Stony Plain sent me some information earlier today, and it shows that when there's co-operation between members of this House, the interests of those affected, I think, are best protected.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Stony Plain, supplementary.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Yes. I appreciate the answer. However, the answer is exactly the problem that I was trying to address yesterday, and perhaps I wasn't clear enough. There are 37 staff members who are being downgraded from permanent with Westerra to temporary with NAIT and the 16 that chose to go on early retirement. The information that I've been getting is that the process of talking to these people or the information they are receiving has been somewhat intimidating, and they don't feel that these decisions were made freely and of their own volition.

So I would reiterate the two positions that I made yesterday to the minister, and I would add one further. Since we do have contradictory information – and I think both are coming from sincere sources – we have confusion with respect to time lines, would the minister now be prepared to meet with members of the Westerra Academic Staff Association and the support association to hear firsthand and perhaps clear the matter once and for all? Would he be prepared to meet with them?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I have staff whose very responsibility is to do that through the transition team, so I would make a special point of advising the transition team to consider the question put by the hon. member.

Orders of the Day

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.
Grande Prairie.

head: Introduction of Special Guests (reversion)

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thanks to the members of the Assembly. This is a banner day for the Grande Prairie constituency. We've had two classrooms come to visit us today, first from Hythe, and now it's my pleasure to introduce a group from my hometown of Beaverlodge. We have 77 students and relatives and parents in this group. They're in both the members' and public galleries, and along with the students we have their teachers Charlain Shields and Alan Walker and a good representation of parents and bus drivers,

the group it takes to make the trip worthwhile. I'd ask them to stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

**head: Government Bills and Orders
Second Reading**

**Bill 31
Livestock Industry Diversification Act**

Moved by Mr. Fox:

The motion for second reading be amended to read:

That Bill 31, Livestock Industry Diversification Act, be not now read a second time but that the subject matter of the Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Affairs to assess the need for an environmental impact assessment on the provisions contained therein.

[Adjourned debate June 15: Mr. Woloshyn]

MR. SPEAKER: Stony Plain.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With reference to speaking on the amendment submitted by my colleague, if I recall, my concluding remarks of Friday last were a suggestion to the ministers involved that they should perhaps get their acts together and maybe have a little chitchat to see where they stood on it. If you go through other comments that were made by the then Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife on February 28, '87 – in speaking to the Fish & Game Association: "I am going to oppose game ranching; I am going to tell my colleagues that" – the record is interspersed with comments made by various ministers and officials of this government that clearly indicate that the public was given the impression that game ranching was not going to be permitted. Now, instead of it coming up in regulations, it comes up in a so-called diversification Bill. On May 2, 1989, our Premier in response to public concerns declared: "Game ranching is not allowed in Alberta, and we are not considering allowing it."

Now, all that this amendment seeks, Mr. Speaker, is to do what honourably should be done, and that is to permit the people of Alberta to have their say on this important issue and, further, to look at the impact on the environment, if you will. Now, some people may wonder: "Ha, ha, ha; what's the environment got to do with game ranching?" Well, if you go back about 60 years – I believe it was 1929 – the federal government in its infinite wisdom took and placed a contaminated buffalo herd in Wood Buffalo park. Since that time there is now a Yukon buffalo herd, there is a Northwest Territories buffalo herd, and cattle ranching has come to within 60 miles of Wood Buffalo park. All the species of wildlife and in fact domestic cattle are in danger of getting brucellosis or tuberculosis from that contaminated herd that was inappropriately sent up there. Whether it be a federal problem – or people claim it's a federal problem – it has become very, very clearly our problem. Can you imagine what would happen if those diseases hit the cattle industry, if the rumour of it hit the cattle industry? Our foreign markets would be wiped out, and we are fooling around currently on one problem that should have been cured years ago. The cattle are within 60 miles, and any of the cattle producers here know that you don't have to have direct contact; you've got such things as birds and coyotes and wolves or whatnot that can spread the disease.

AN HON. MEMBER: Flies.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Flies, if you will.

We have a problem there. Now, that is a very, very serious environmental problem. It's a serious wildlife problem. There are two significantly large buffalo herds that are in danger of being contaminated with the same diseases, all because the decision to move them up there 60 years ago wasn't properly thought out, all because since that time the herd has not been addressed properly to in fact eradicate the disease or eradicate the herd, whichever is a solution, and that I don't know. I would imagine if we got into that, we could get into an awful lot of debate.

You can then say: "My goodness; you're talking about buffalo that were around 60 years ago. What's that got to do with this great Bill we're looking at here?" I would suggest to you that not too long ago, a matter of a couple of years ago, there was a ban placed on the importation of elk into this province, and I will quote from a September 1988 letter from a Mr. Stevenson, head of commercial wildlife, who wrote:

Please be advised that a moratorium has been placed on the importation of ungulates for game farms in Alberta effective September 26, 1988. The Departments of Agriculture and Forestry, Lands and Wildlife are seriously concerned about the risk of introduction of diseases into Alberta's agricultural and wildlife stocks through imported game farm animals. Of particular concern is the possible introduction of brainworm *P. Tenuis* into Alberta. This parasite is fatal in moose and mule deer as well as domestic sheep and goats. The moratorium will be retained [until] such time as procedures are developed that ensure a minimum risk of introduction to Alberta.

I don't know of any procedures of a minimum risk that have been established, but I would say that if it's a minimum risk, it should only be permitted if there is going to be no risk.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

We are talking about putting the current game farms into a hazardous situation. We are talking about putting all wildlife into a hazardous situation. We are talking about putting the sheep industry, or what's left of it, into a serious situation because of this nonsense and because we don't take the time to go beyond a silly smile and look at what we are really doing. I would say that in two years – a year ago the Premier said no game ranching. Now we have the smiling Minister of Agriculture – who has done sweet tweet since then to address these risks, because it doesn't show up in his Bill – just say, "Oh, we're going to have game ranching, and we're not even going to let anybody have input into it." I would suggest that the people who should be most concerned are not the ones who are living in the cities and whatnot. We're talking about improper implementation of game ranching and its effect on the domestic industry. Our cattle people . . .

MR. HYLAND: How much time are you supposed to speak for, Stan? You're watching the clock closely.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Hey, I've got another 20 minutes, hon. member, and I'll give it all to you if you don't . . . [interjection] Should we give him that one too, Nick?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WOLOSHYN: If we go on to the disease angle some more, we don't even have a sufficient number of qualified veterinarians to monitor the existing game animals in this province. Now, you have to have, I would suggest, some pretty

specialized people to be dealing in that particular field, and we just don't have enough of them. We don't have enough of them around, so now we're looking at a very serious possibility of contaminating all wildlife in Alberta, of contaminating specifically the sheep, and no way to get around it. [interjection] Now, you can ah and ooh all you want, hon. members across the way, but I would suggest you look at the record of what's happened with the Wood Buffalo situation.

I would suggest you look at what you haven't done to clear that up, and I would suggest very strongly that you do not want to spread that problem throughout Alberta, especially since this particular so-called diversification will not – and I stress will not – have a significant impact on Alberta agriculture in an economic sense. It may have a few producers and give them a bit of a perk, and I don't have a problem with that. I don't have any problem at all with people making an honest dollar, but I do have a problem with the way game ranching is being introduced into this province and what its implications in fact are. I would strongly suggest to the minister that he take this amendment in the spirit that it's written, and that is to give the public an opportunity to have input. We have dillydallied with this situation for a long time. You have skated around the pond trying to find a way to slip it in. It won't hurt to give it another six months, another year, another year and a half, until you're sure that what you are doing is right, because at this point you cannot honestly tell me that you've had fair public hearings, because you haven't. That can be proven.

You can't honestly tell me that you've kept out the importation of elk and whatnot during that ban, because it can be proven that they did get imported via Saskatchewan into Alberta. So even when you had limitations going, you weren't able to enforce them. You can't tell me that you've got sufficient staff in any of your departments to monitor properly game ranching, because you don't even have enough staff to monitor the wildlife hunting. The Fish and Wildlife people will tell you that. Those officers are understaffed. You don't have it there. You haven't put a thing into place to cure it. All you've done is you've started with letting it be breeders, and they say: "Oh, yes. No problem. We'll pen them up a little bit, and then we'll sell the stock off."

Then there was the great demand, from the east primarily, for animal parts. So, okay; we do animal parts. We got animal parts going. What happens from that? When you legalized the sale of the antlers, you didn't just restrict it to antlers of elk, of that particular one, but you opened it up for virtually every species of bird and animal where you could sell the pieces. If you check in the U.S., they're trying to monitor the illegal, the poached movement of caribou antlers. I would suspect there's a large movement of poached elk antlers, too, going on right in this province right now because the dollars there are good, and perhaps there should be a restriction of the sale of these things as opposed to an opening up in the meat.

Okay, we'll assume that this particular Bill goes through. Where are we going to have the slaughterhouse? I would suggest that it's going to continue at the Lambco plant, which is currently owned, I believe, by the government and which I believe is currently up for sale and which I further believe will go against the greatest fear of the sheep producers of this province: that that plant will be converted or lost to the sheep industry. I can see that one coming. The minister may shake his head, but I don't have any faith in the head-shaking when the very spoken words of the Premier of a year and a month ago, of 13 months ago, are broken with legislation now. You shake your head till the cows come home; it won't make a darn bit of

difference, because I don't think your head-shake can be trusted any more than the Premier's words of 13 months ago. [interjection] Mr. Minister – the minister over there of Occupational Health and Safety – if you would like to speak up, I might give you the courtesy of an answer for your . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Through the Chair, hon. member.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Well, Mr. Speaker, would you ask the minister of Occupational Health and Safety to speak a little louder so I can hear him?

This legislation as it stands is currently irresponsible, simply unnecessary, and must be put to a review so that we can have a look at what in fact the impact will be, not only the "environmental impact," because that's got broad implications, but whether it's economically useful. If we go back on to the environmental impact, look at the animals themselves and look at what's been happening in Manitoba and why they've taken a step backward, they have found that in particular areas – and we're going to have those areas here – it is impossible, and I stress the word "impossible," to keep the wild animals from intermingling, no matter how you fence, with the domestic animals during rutting season. What that leads to . . .

MR. TAYLOR: They carry on more like people all the time, don't they?

MR. WOLOSHYN: More like Liberals; they like to mess around.

What that leads to or can lead to – and again the isolated areas are where it's going to be at – is that when the wild bulls in rutting season are trying to get to their loved ones across the domestic fence, you are opening the door for planned poaching in particular areas, because it's just like having a calling card yourself.

MR. TAYLOR: You're getting so old you've forgotten.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Speak for yourself, hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. You may have a short memory, but I don't.

There was mention made in the House here of reindeer farming. I had the occasion to be up in the Northwest Territories in the late '50s – and the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is certainly young enough to remember the late '50s – and there was a herd up there that was brought over from Norway.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. The Chair has been trying to follow the hon. member's remarks carefully and trying to relate them to the amendment before the House. The Chair is having great difficulty relating the Northwest Territories herds to the need for an environmental impact assessment with regard to this legislation.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, if you'd just bear with me for a moment, you will see the relevance.

MR. TAYLOR: It's all about the birds and the bees.

MR. WOLOSHYN: It's not about the birds and the bees.

They took a herd from Norway. They found a very similar environment, and they took and followed this herd through its free movement from Rainbow depot on the Mackenzie River – that's close to the shores of the Arctic, Mr. Speaker, for your

information, and for the hon. Minister of the Environment; it's not on the Wapiti River – and they had a very broad-ranging area to go. They were free-moving, and the people followed them in their own natural environment, and that herd was successful until it was chosen to let it go. It did provide what it was brought there for, and that was some, if you will, meat and animal products for the Eskimos of the area. That is an example of bringing wild animals, if you will, and doing a proper assessment of how to manage them. That's just the example I wanted to contrast with the Wood Buffalo situation, with what we are doing here.

Now, the reindeer up in the Northwest Territories were not fenced off. If these game ranchers want to follow the elk around and do it right, I don't think I'd have a heck of a lot of a problem with that either. But you can see, Mr. Speaker, the relevance of the Northwest Territories' situation and what this amendment really does. It opens a door for us to look at situations which may in fact help the minister come up with some acceptable legislation. The hon. minister across the way says he can't see it. Well, I can agree with that; he can't see anything. So I'll accept that as an honest statement, Mr. Minister. I think what this amendment would do, if you submit it to the public affairs group, is that you would have another extremely important, beneficial aspect that the Minister of Agriculture, the sponsor of this Bill, could really latch onto and use to his own advantage. Instead of putting out little glossy pamphlets, the minister would then be able, through the Standing Committee on Public Affairs, through the hearings that would be held with this, to in fact properly enter into the education process, and in fact he himself may be a beneficiary of a bit of education instead of a very stubborn, narrow-minded approach to ramming through legislation that should be set aside for a short period of time.

Now, if you look at the reasons for having that meat on the market, there aren't any. We're dealing with taking animals out of their natural state and putting them into a very, very different situation in a very short time span. Now, cattle, as we know, aren't totally domesticated, as was discussed in here a little while ago, but they are closer to it than the animals of the wild, and we should give that consideration. We should look at the people in Wyoming and Yellowstone park that have problems with elk. They've got problems with them messing with the wild elk, where they are very sorry now that they didn't carefully assess their interference in those patterns in the wilds, Mr. Speaker.

What we are doing here is legalizing, encouraging, something that will not benefit the agriculture industry as a whole, and as a matter of fact it may be a threat to certain segments of it. Through the minister's own department, through his own figures, through his own people, he could read up and see that it can be a threat very, very specifically to the sheep growers – that's right – through the diseases that are borne by elk. You know, I got it from Alberta Agriculture. I didn't dream it up; it's there. If you get good researchers, you can find it too.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to . . . I was going to say repeat, but I won't repeat, because you'll get up and tell me you've heard it before.

AN HON. MEMBER: You're pulling the wool over our eyes.

MR. WOLOSHTYN: I am not pulling the wool over your eyes. I am supporting the sheep growers. I want them to have a viable industry in this province. I want the cattlemen to have a good industry in the province. I would like to see the wildlife in this province fit into their proper role in the scheme of things,

and I would suggest to you that most members, if they stopped and gave this some rational thought, would see very clearly that there is no good reason to speed this legislation through. There is every reason in the world to support this amendment, which does give the minister information that he could use, and it does give the public a chance to have input on something that they deserve input on and they have been denied input on before.

So on that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude and say thank you for your indulgence.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was entertained in reading the Edmonton Journal this morning to learn that the other opposition party in this Legislature is fighting for this amendment that's currently on the floor. That surprised me, having heard the comments from the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon some several days ago that the Liberal Party had decided they were going to throw their full support behind Bill 31, which is the subject for debate. I wonder whether the other members of the Legislature were as entertained as I was to learn that this is now the policy of the Liberal caucus in the Legislature, to be seen to be fighting the Bill especially after the critic has given such a ringing endorsement for Bill 31. I wonder whether it was that they've decided to fight for our amendment or to fight for their credibility in the environment network in the province. Anyway, I'm glad to hear that we're not the only ones in this Assembly who are speaking out in favour of the amendment that's currently on the floor.

I think one thing that has to be mentioned and emphasized, Mr. Speaker, is that what's being created here is a market for wildlife. We can talk around it, as in terms of being the livestock industry, but let's just call it what it is: that the government through Bill 31 is facilitating a market for wildlife in our province by creating a system for allowing wildlife to be raised, to not only create the market but to build on the market that's already there. Let's not make any mistake, because that is a major shift in policy for this government, a major shift to allow for the raising of wildlife in this form in order to satisfy a market. The problem with doing that: there's already a market that exists, but by creating game farms, they're going to increase that market to the point that I don't believe the game farms that are being contemplated in this province will likely ever be able to fully satisfy that market. In essence, Mr. Speaker, they're trying to satisfy a market that is essentially insatiable.

I was interested to learn about how valuable elk products really are worldwide, throughout Asia . . . It's not just in the form of meat, but all kinds of products from the elk are sold for various purposes and various reasons all over the world, whether it be the velvet on the antler – and it has to be that soft, blood-engorged velvet antler. It's largely bought in Hong Kong, and it's made into medicines and aphrodisiacs.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. The Chair is again having difficulty. The hon. member's remarks seem to be very well directed towards the general principle of the Bill, but unfortunately we are debating today the amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Vegreville, which calls for this legislation to be referred to the Committee on Public Affairs to decide whether it should have an environmental impact assessment. So the Chair would urge the member to direct his remarks more closely to the amendment than to the general principle of the Bill.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Your point's well taken, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate it.

MR. TAYLOR: Sex fixation: birds and bees, and now it's aphrodisiacs.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View has the floor and is entitled to say what he wants with respect to this amendment without chirping from you.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon was perhaps a bit hurt by my earlier comments – I don't know – and a bit piqued. Anyway, it certainly wasn't my intention to hurt his feelings, but I appreciate your comment.

Yes, it is important. I didn't want to get into needless repetition of the actual amendment on the floor, but the point that I'm going to be making in my remarks is this: we've created or are trying to satisfy a worldwide market for elk products, among other things, without understanding what the impact of that policy change is going to be on the wildlife of this province. Without fully understanding what the impact might well be, it would be prudent of this government to take the time to refer the matter to the Standing Committee on Public Affairs in order to fully assess what the environmental impact might be on wildlife in this province. If I didn't make that point clear at the outset, I ought to have done, and I appreciate you redirecting me and drawing that to my attention.

Now, this is important, Mr. Speaker, because Alberta is not the first province or the first jurisdiction in the world that will have to cope with the implications of using wildlife to satisfy a very lucrative international market for animal parts. That's why I was making the point that in terms of elk, not just the meat but its parts are extremely valuable and are being used and will be used and marketed and sold throughout Asia. Whether it be antlers, whether it be tails, testicles, whether it be hides, whether it be trophies, whether it be teeth or amulets or use of elk parts in cufflinks or jewelry, there is a market, and it is the intention of this Bill, as I understand it, to allow various Alberta producers to raise elk on regulated farms in order to satisfy this market, a very lucrative one. The point I'm going to make in my remarks this afternoon is that once you start satisfying that market, it's potentially a very large market and one that would be willing to pay a lot of money for our elk, the point being whether it be elk raised on farms or whether it be elk in the wild.

So I think there are some examples and some experiences in other jurisdictions that we ought to be cognizant of before proceeding with this Bill. I think if we look at the experience of other countries, members of the Assembly will understand why it is that we've brought in this amendment requesting that this Bill be subjected to a full environmental impact assessment. It's not being done flippantly; it's being done quite seriously. I would like to take a few moments this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to tell you what the experience has been in other countries.

I was intrigued – there was this image in my mind. It occurred to me to go down to the Legislature Library to do some research and get some articles, because it only happened a few months ago. As this Bill came forward, for some reason the president of Kenya, Mr. Daniel Moi, setting a torch to a stack of elephant tusks was an image that came into my mind, because it was only a few months ago that that was undertaken by the president. He did it to make a point to the international

community. By torching this warehouse full of ivory tusks, he said, and it was broadcast in Alberta and all over the world: "When we so desperately want the world to stop buying ivory, it is hypocritical for us to use this warehouse full of ivory and export it ourselves." So he put the torch to millions and millions of dollars worth of ivory tusks, very valuable to a developing nation, a Third World nation, in order to make a point as graphically as he could to the international community. It was this point: that elephants in Africa are more valuable dead than they are alive until the international market for ivory is stopped. Only then will Kenya be in a position to start protecting its indigenous wild elephant population.

AN HON. MEMBER: We're in Alberta.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Yes, we are in Alberta, and the point is . . . [interjections] Yes, this is exactly the point, Mr. Speaker. This government is creating a market for elk parts and other animals that are going to be extremely valuable, so valuable that we will be unable to protect our indigenous wildlife in this province. If you want to know what measures you're going to have to go to to protect wildlife in this province, you'd better darn well understand what the experience has been in countries like Kenya. This is serious. If we don't start to learn from other countries, we're going to end up potentially making the same mistakes in our own province.

MS M. LAING: Those who do not learn from history repeat it.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Yeah. If people don't learn what's happened in other countries, they're going to end up repeating the same mistakes here.

In the last 10 years, Mr. Speaker, the world population for elephants has dropped from about 13 million to slightly over 600,000. That is a drop of 50 percent inside 10 years. [interjections] I can't believe this group over here. Are they so dense that they don't understand how valuable the international market for wildlife is? By creating the demand through this Bill, you're going to start setting in place the organization of taking elk parts from Alberta into an international market throughout the world, a very valuable and a very lucrative one, and by so doing, you're also going to be creating a market for poachers. This is what has been going on in Kenya, and if you want to know . . .

MR. MAIN: Oh, come on.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: If you don't want to listen, that's fine, but I'll tell you that presumably in Kenya there's a very highly regulated market for the legal operation of supplying ivory to that international market. Theoretically, the business of taking ivory from elephants alive or dead is highly regulated and ostensibly restricted by the African governments. There's also an international quota system that puts limits on the tusks each country can export. However, Mr. Speaker, the formal system, the quota system, has been highly ineffective in controlling the trade of ivory internationally. Up to 90 percent of the tusks that enter that marketplace have been taken illegally by poachers and smugglers that apparently have little trouble in getting that ivory out of Africa. Here's an example from Somalia: there are only 4,500 elephants in Somalia, yet Somalia in the last three years has managed to export tusks from an estimated 13,800 elephants, to give you some idea of how the illegal trade in ivory has absolutely overwhelmed and swamped the legal trade.

If you want to know to what extent poaching has impinged on the elephant populations in Africa, here is an example from Kenya's Tsavo National Park. This is from *Time* magazine of February 20, 1989, which is just a little over a year ago. Scores of poachers dressed in battle fatigues and armed with automatic weapons killed one policeman and wounded several others.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Agriculture is rising on a point of order.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, Standing Order 23 says:

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

(b) speaks to matters other than

(i) the question under discussion, or

(ii) a motion or amendment the member intends to move.

Now, I've been waiting and waiting to see what connection there is between poaching elephants in the wild in Kenya and raising elk on a game farm under highly regulated conditions in Alberta. I would suggest that the member either get on the subject or, if he doesn't have anything to say, sit down and we'll all be happy.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Vegreville wishes to participate in this point of order.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I know these are difficult things to consider in debate. The fact is that the government members in this Assembly made up their minds long ago how they're going to vote not only on the amendment but on the Bill. It's our challenge, as members of the Official Opposition expressing concerns on behalf of Albertans, to try and convince them otherwise. In order to do that, in order to convince them of the merit of our amendment in this regard, we have to lay out arguments. I know they don't like to hear facts. I know they don't like to be confused by precedent, by history, by experiences elsewhere in the world, but the fact is that the onus is on us to make those arguments in the hope that there is at least one light that might be turned on in that porch over there. I would suggest that if the members opposite find flaws in our arguments, they have every opportunity, ample opportunity, to stand in their places and refute them. But they don't. They just stand there and nitpick with their meagre interpretation of the Standing Orders, and I think the Minister of Agriculture should be ashamed for burdening the Speaker with such specious references.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair has already interjected once, asking the hon. member to try to stay closer to the amendment than he has been. The hon. member then comes back to the amendment, but the Chair also notices that he tends to then stray again. The Chair has a certain amount of sympathy with the point of order raised by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The Chair would respectfully submit that the hon. member, if he wishes to connect the comments about the elephant to elk, should really say how this Bill before the House is going to create the huge demand for elk that he says is apparent for ivory. So far the Chair hasn't heard that connection, and until that connection is made, I think there is a certain amount of merit to the point raised by the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see that the light has gone on with you. It's unfortunate that it hasn't

gone on with the other members of the Assembly on the opposite side of this House. That's the point, and if I have to repeat it. . . You know, I didn't want to have to be admonished by Mr. Speaker for repeating a point time after time after time throughout my talk, but if that has to be the only way this is understood by the members opposite, then I will certainly endeavour to do that.

I'm saying today, Mr. Speaker, that there is an international market for ivory. The results of that have been the decimation of the elephant population in Africa.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. That isn't the part that the Chair was wanting the hon. member to repeat. The Chair was suggesting that maybe to make the hon. member's references to ivory more relevant to this debate, could he demonstrate to the House how the Bill before us is going to create this huge demand for elk parts or other animal parts that could be similar?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, yes. Look, if the Bill doesn't allow for the sale of elk parts – I don't know which Bill other members have been reading, but that seems to me to clearly be the intent of Bill 31. If you want me to find the relevant sections in which that's the case, if you want me to do that, I will take a few moments to find them.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. I think perhaps the hon. member has misunderstood the Chair. To make the Chair's position perfectly clear, the Chair is well aware that the Bill provides for the sale of elk parts, but the question the Chair was asking: could the hon. member please demonstrate how that is going to create the huge demand and pressure for these parts that is going to then put a burden on the supply?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, if I need to read the amendment on the floor, it is that this matter "be referred to the . . . Standing Committee on Public Affairs" in order to do an "impact assessment." The reason that ought to be done in this instance is to evaluate whether this Bill is going to result in the same impact on our wildlife in Alberta as has been the experience of an international market on the decimation of the elephant in Africa. That's the point I'm trying to make. We have some experience with another species, where there's an international market, a very valuable market, for elephant tusks for the supply of ivory internationally. It's had a tremendous impact, which I'm trying to explain to the hon. members this afternoon. If that experience is illustrative of anything, it should be this: that if you're going to get into the international market of supplying parts of a native species in Alberta, we should at least understand what the potential impact on that species may be. I'm trying to explain to the members that we can learn from experiences elsewhere, that once you start to market wildlife and create a market, a valuable market, for that wildlife, it may have repercussions, it may have impacts that these members were not anticipating when they brought this Bill to this Legislature.

In fact, the Minister of Agriculture on his point of order earlier talked about the highly regulated system in Alberta. Well, let's look at how highly regulated the ivory system is internationally. The point, if he wants one – and I'll make it at the outset – is that attempts to regulate the ivory trade have failed miserably. There's a system that's been set up since 1986. It requires ivory producing nations to adopt export quotas intended to safeguard existing elephant populations. In order to

implement it, this is the extent to which in theory the system is to work: each tusk in international trade must be covered by an export permit and marked with a unique serial number – each individual tusk. Furthermore, that serial number is recorded in a computer in Cambridge, England. So internationally all the record keeping is in place. In theory that serial number would allow nations to trace the tusk as it goes from country to country to country in the form of this international trade.

But what has happened is that quotas have been ignored, falsified export documents have been discovered, and of course there are all kinds of people who work in collusion with traders and poachers to skirt the system and ultimately defeat it. That's been the experience. I'd like the minister to understand that these sections of his Bill in which he requires a carcass to be ribbon branded and otherwise somehow registered – there are ways of getting around even, in theory, the best system this minister could himself devise. So he should pay attention to what the experience has been in Kenya.

I can see that the hon. members are not too impressed with the arguments I'm making about the elephant. I can see that. I can see that by the looks on their faces.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about dinosaurs?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Yeah, they might be able to identify more readily with a dissertation on the dinosaur. That would be more appropriate.

The elephant is not the only species under stress from poaching and from this international trade. Here's an example, again from about a year ago, another experience in Kenya. This was in Kenya's Meru National Park. Poachers overran the warden's headquarters. The rangers at that national park were armed with 303 bolt-action rifles, but they were no match for the poachers, who raided the warden's headquarters with AK-47s. "The poachers tied up the rangers, pistol-whipped them and then opened fire on five white rhinoceroses . . ." [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order. The Chair has been rather indulgent with the hon. member. The hon. member really should recall that we are on an amendment. We are not on a wide-ranging debate on the principle of this Bill. The Chair has allowed the hon. member to try to relate the situation in Africa with regard to the need for an environmental impact assessment on this Bill and has allowed him to go a long way to make that point. The Chair now says he has made whatever point he wants to make, and the Chair is not prepared to entertain any more examples of what's happening in Africa with regard to the elephant.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, wildlife around the world is under tremendous pressure and facing extinction, and one of the reasons for that, in the case of the elephant and in the case of the rhinoceros, has been . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair has made a ruling about the elephant, and the Chair is not about to reverse that ruling. If the hon. member has something else to say about this legislation and its need to go to the Public Affairs Committee, fine, but no more talk about the elephant in Africa or the hon. member will lose his spot in the debate.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Socialists and communists are extinct too.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, free thought perhaps is in danger of extinction too.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that environmental impact assessments . . . I don't know why this government is afraid of environmental impact assessments. Look, we have wildlife in our province under our protection. It ought to be a responsibility and of concern to every member of this Legislature, and any legislation and any policy which potentially might threaten that wildlife ought to be of concern to us in this Assembly. If we want to blindly accept this particular Bill, that's the business of this Assembly, I suppose. But I'm trying to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all members of this Assembly that there has been an experience in other parts of the world that we ought to be very concerned about. I'm not being flippant about it. I'm not trying to draw into the debate this afternoon some esoteric academic discussion. These are things that are happening in other parts of the world in other jurisdictions, and before we adopt any kind of Bill that commits us in this province and the wildlife under our jurisdiction to international trade, we should be pretty darn sure and concerned about what the experience has been in those other parts of the world.

When wildlife officers charged with the protection of other species in other parts of the world are attacked with AK-47s, we should at least be concerned that perhaps the potential market for poachers in our province might have . . . We might have something to learn, that this is going to put a similar stress on our wildlife and a similar stress on our system of wildlife management and the people we've hired to protect wildlife in this province. Because the more expensive, the more valuable our wildlife is dead than alive, the more it is going to be a target for those who would like to skirt the system set up under Bill 31 and go directly to the wildlife and capture or kill those animals directly and then take those parts and channel them through the networks and systems of marketing that are set up to supply that market internationally. That's my concern, Mr. Speaker, that by creating this market, it's potentially a market that is insatiable – insatiable. In fact, I understand the elk in this province were hunted virtually to extinction at the turn of this century. So these things have happened in our own province, and they're happening elsewhere around the world.

So before we launch into this enterprise, it would seem to me if we're concerned about the potential, have a look at it, call in the experts, call in the people who can give testimony, and learn about what the impact of this Bill might be on our own wildlife in this province. Because the parts for elk worldwide – as I said in my opening comments, it's not just the meat. In fact, the meat may be the least valuable of all the parts which can be taken from the elk. We've already seen what game ranching exists already in this province. The taking of the velvet antlers: as I understand it, they're dried and used as aphrodisiacs and medicines throughout Asia. It's a huge market potentially. So what happens then when we start to find our elk in the wild now – and I understand there has already been an example – being deantlered for their velvet? Where has that antler gone, and why are people even at this point willing to take the risks of abusing our own wildlife? We haven't even had the Bill adopted. We apparently don't even have full game ranching legalized yet, although this Bill will do so. As I understand it, we already have examples that our own wildlife people have been unable to prevent, and the more that this market grows,

the more our wildlife, I submit, is going to be under threat in this province.

So I'm simply saying to the members of the Legislature this afternoon . . .

[Mr. Hawkesworth's speaking time expired]

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

MR. TANNAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I take up the invitation of the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View to talk about the elephants, with the Speaker's indulgence.

I would agree with some of what the member talked about. He talked about ivory being legal and there being a regulated trade. That, I think, is at variance with the facts. Kenya has for many, many years not allowed a legal trade in ivory, and many other countries in Africa. It's interesting to note that the one country he quoted as allowing this trade was the socialist republic in Somalia.

I wonder if he could realize that there are a number of differences between Africa and the elephants and Alberta and the elk. The situation in Africa is such that a pair of tusks represents many times the annual income of any individual. So the price differential between a dead elephant to the average African and a "dead elk" is monumental, a tremendous difference. But we're talking about game farming where the farmer who owns the domesticated elk wants to keep that elk alive. With a dead elephant, if you hack out the ivory, it's useful at that point and you can take it away, whereas with an elk, the product that we're talking about – the antlers and velvet – you take out while the animal is alive under some form of anaesthesia, and the elk then can produce another rack the next year. That's not the case with the elephant. They're only entitled to one set of tusks during their lifetime. Dealing with an elk in a domestic situation is a far different thing than the African elephant, which has never been domesticated anything more than a little bit in the areas. So you need to kill the elephant in order to take the tusks; you do not need to kill the elk in order to avail yourselves of the opportunity for taking the antlers: I think that's an important thing.

The other thing is the whole system that we're talking about. If we're talking about Kenya, it's quite easy to take the long trek across the desert into Somalia, and that's exactly what's happening. The poaching may be occurring in Kenya, because it's not allowed to take the tusks, and moved into Somalia. I think that's what he's talking about, having lived in Africa in this area and having actually come upon what's called a poached elephant, which you can smell for at least a half mile away. It really is a sad sight indeed to see this kind of wastage of such a noble beast.

The communication network that we have with the Forestry, Lands and Wildlife officers is much greater than what it is in Kenya, where you have hundreds and hundreds, indeed thousands, of square miles of desert and no roads. The poachers are able to get across those deserts and take it to the coastline, where there are little dhows that sail up and down the Indian Ocean and are engaged in a variety of smuggling, and it's been honoured by – hundreds of years ago they were involved in the slave trade. Now they're still in some illegal trade, with tusks. In Alberta it's a far different situation. The elephant in Africa is a wild animal. The elk that we are talking about today is a domesticated animal, and I would suggest that there's quite a bit of difference.

More particular to the amendment, one of the prime means by which we can avoid all of the dire consequences conjured up by those who have spoken to the amendment *in* the positive can be eliminated by embryo transplants. Indeed, in this industry that's a whole lot easier than shipping a live elk. Embryo transplants can be transhipped as far away as New Zealand. Indeed, there have been embryos from Alberta elk taken to New Zealand for their game farming purposes.

For those reasons, then, I would oppose the amendment.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favour of the amendment to Bill 31, the Livestock Industry Diversification Act. As the minister informed me some days ago, if I looked in my riding, I would find at least two elk ranches. He told me that if I couldn't find them, he would tell me where they are. Well, I want to remind the minister that on the weekend I did find them. One was Jasper National Park and the other was Banff National Park. Those are the only two game ranches in my riding, and I don't want to see those touched by any individual. I don't want to see you take your elephant guns out and shoot those poor little Bambis that run freely around those parks for the enjoyment of people from across Canada and, indeed, across the world.

Mr. Speaker, a total assessment has to be done on the use of our public lands for the raising of elk and for the sale and destruction of the elk population. Not only is it a serious problem that these poor animals will be used for exporting their horns and their other parts. The meat today, of course, has always been a great favourite of Metis settlements and other natives who like to hunt such great animals as the elk, but as we go outside the park, it's very noticeable how the animals are being slaughtered in the bush. I have on many occasions come across elk that have been poached. The woodland caribou along Jasper National Park are also in danger because of no protection for those particular animals. Mr. Speaker, I can see that it's probably just a matter of time before this minister and this government want to also put the woodland caribou up for sale for profit for their rich and corporate friends.

Mr. Speaker, the meat from these elk, as the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View reported, is probably the most important part that many people survive on, yet they're just going to use the parts other than meat. I don't know if we've done a proper assessment to make sure that we're using these animals wisely. That's why I speak *in* favour of this amendment "to assess the need for an environmental impact assessment on the provisions contained therein." The minister has not clearly indicated, when he assesses this through the environmental assessment, if he's clearly addressed the amount of Fish and Wildlife officers who are presently on duty in the province that will be able to monitor and control any poaching that could take place because of this diversification in this area. Mr. Speaker, we're very short of Fish and Wildlife officers. Programs like Report a Poacher and those types of programs have worked very well in the past, but I'm not too sure that in elk farming it is going to work quite as well because, as the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View said, as one poacher comes, you've got two or three more to cover him up, and the elk population is going to be decimated throughout the province.

The stock, Mr. Speaker, have not been assessed properly, I believe, by the minister or by the government. That stock has to be assessed and targeted – their locations, their protection – to make sure that we do not endanger the population of the elk in such beautiful spots as Jasper National Park, Willmore

Wilderness Park, and all those other areas that are now the protectorate of these great animals.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, we have to address in this environmental assessment is the transportation of these animals. When you transport elk, they have a very high rate of accidents and death while in transport. I don't believe the minister has paid any attention to this item. Diseases also, Mr. Speaker. As these elk pick up worms, ringworm, and other parasites that infest this elk population, they can easily spread into the pork industry and into the beef industry. I believe that this closeness with these beasts is going to be a detriment to the beef farming and the pork farming in Alberta.

But most important of all though, Mr. Speaker, is the environmental assessment that has to be done to make sure that we know where we're going with this program. So for that reason I believe that this Bill should not receive second reading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Smoky River.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Oh, excuse me, hon. member. The Chair notices that you've already participated on this amendment.

The hon. Member for Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Cypress-Redcliff has moved that debate be adjourned on Bill 31. All those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Carried.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

For the motion:

Ady	Gesell	Nelson
Anderson	Getty	Osterman
Black	Gogo	Paszkowski
Bogle	Horsman	Schumacher
Bruseker	Hyland	Severtson
Calahasen	Isley	Shrake
Cardinal	Klein	Sparrow
Cherry	Laing, B.	Speaker, R.
Clegg	Lund	Stewart
Drobot	Main	Tannas
Elliott	McClellan	Taylor
Elzinga	Mirosh	Thurber
Fischer	Moore	Trynchy
Fjordbotten	Musgrove	Zarusky
Fowler		

Against the motion:

Barrett	Fox	Martin
Doyle	Hawkesworth	Mjolsness
Ewasiuk	Laing, M.	Roberts

Totals: Ayes — 43 Noes — 9

[Motion carried]

Bill 37

Alberta Government Telephones Reorganization Act

Moved by Ms Barrett:

The motion for second reading be amended to read:

That Bill 37, Alberta Government Telephones Reorganization Act, be not now read a second time because this House believes in the principle of a public utility being operated with a primary mandate of serving the interests of the public in a fair, equitable, and affordable fashion, which could be superseded by the Bill, which makes possible providing handsome profit opportunities for the shareholders, who could be as few as 20 individuals or corporations.

Moved by Mr. Ewasiuk:

The amendment be amended by adding after "corporations": , and because this House believes that any foreign ownership or partial ownership of a public utility in Alberta is wholly inappropriate.

[Adjourned debate June 19: Dr. Elliott]

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to rise and make some comments on this Bill and on the subamendment. I would like to take this opportunity to offer my strongest support to the minister and his department and the government with what they're doing on this important Bill.

I'm recommending that we support this Bill as is and defeat the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: Going to give them your elephant speech?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Yeah, right. I'm going to give my . . . [interjections] I take it from the comments, Mr. Speaker, and given that the subamendment on the floor has to do with foreign ownership, I will hasten to advise all hon. members that I'm not going to talk about the potential ownership of AGT by interests in Kenya.

I was intrigued, Mr. Speaker, by a little letter that went out over the signature of Dr. Neil Webber and Mr. Neldner, who's the current president and CEO of AGT, to virtually every household in Alberta a week or two ago. What it mentioned in this letter — and I'm just trying to find it. It made no reference at all in the letter to the possibility that a significant percentage of AGT would potentially fall into foreign hands. I thought that was interesting. It seemed to me that everything else that this government has been promoting about the AGT privatization was at least touched upon in the letter. I just found it interesting that this letter wasn't indicating to Albertans that the Bill that's presently before the Legislature would allow for a

significant foreign ownership of AGT. I'm sure the government themselves recognize that that possibility is not popular with Albertans, and that's probably one of the reasons that in sending out this little blurb to Albertans, they conveniently avoided mentioning that this was going to be the case.

I think all Albertans understand very, very well and very, very fully that since the inception of AGT, it has served all Albertans well and was intentionally set up out of the response to public pressure back at the turn of the century. Albertans at that time felt that interests in Ontario and farther away than that were not interested, first of all, in serving them but were more interested in serving the interests of the shareholders of Bell itself. I think that's important to recognize, that AGT's genesis, as it was, was initially set up in reaction to concern in Alberta that the service and the standard of telephones in this province should be first and foremost to each and every Albertan and not first and foremost to shareholders and business interests in distant parts of the country and indeed in countries outside of Canada.

You know, that principle has served Albertans well. Look at it this way: at the present time every Albertan is a shareholder in some way or another, and all the benefits of being a shareholder flow to all Albertans regardless of where it is that they might live. If they live in an isolated area, they get the same access, or reasonable access, to the same modern, high-technology service that AGT offers to its urban customers. In fact, for those that perhaps have to put up with the inconvenience of a party line, this government has initiated a multiyear program of providing exactly the same modern services to rural Albertans that urban Albertans currently enjoy. That comes with being shareholders of Alberta Government Telephones, but with this privatization, Mr. Speaker, that all is going to change. This company is going to be motivated by different principles because the shareholders are going to be a different group of shareholders. In fact, the principle has opened up for the first time in decades, in generations, the opportunity or the possibility that people of residence outside of Canada can become shareholders of something that all Albertans own.

Now, it's important to recognize that it's been a long tradition in this province that Albertans have felt that institutions controlled outside of our boundaries have not been responsive to Albertans. Whether that was institutions headquartered in Ontario or federal institutions, we felt that those which are outside of our control have often been insensitive and unaware of the circumstances of Alberta. So my concern is, Mr. Speaker, that by opening the door for 10 percent of the total number of shares to fall into the hands of foreigners, in essence perhaps if not effective control then certainly significant control over the operations of AGT could fall into the hands of foreigners.

The important thing to note about share offerings, Mr. Speaker, is that if they're going to be successful, it's not only dependent on small investors: mom and dad, who have some money socked away; or grandpa and grandma, who have an RRSP coming due for retirement; or someone who has a few extra dollars set aside and wants to make an investment of, say, 10, 20, or 100 shares. Those kinds of investors are not going to make a successful share offering to the public fly. What's going to make this share offering fly is if the institutional investors, on behalf of pension funds and mutual funds, move into the market and buy up the shares that are offered.

It's these big institutions and the large shareholders that are going to make or break this share offering by the province of Alberta. So when we see the possibility that as much as 10 percent of Alberta Government Telephones could potentially be owned by foreigners, it's not – how shall I put it? – somebody

in Topeka and another person in Des Moines and half a dozen people in Tallahassee that are going to be buying that 10 percent share. The people that are going to be buying an offering on this are going to be the mutual funds, Bell telephones perhaps, or other interests in the United States who would like to buy into a very profitable and modern telephone system here in Alberta, and they're going to buy in big. They're not going to just, you know, make an offering on a couple of thousand shares; they're going to go for what they can get out of the total share offering. And they will recognize that if you've got this kind of share offering where the shares are widely dispersed, it doesn't take 50 percent to control the operations of the company. It will take a much smaller percentage of that to have effective control, and an even smaller percentage would give an individual fund significant clout in the operations and control of this particular company. So the concept that's being propagated throughout the province by this letter that was sent out to all Albertans has, I would say quite candidly, avoided raising an issue that might raise alarms, might raise red lights for those Albertans who opened it in their mail and proceeded to read it. As far as they're concerned in reading this, they're unlikely to realize that Americans may well have the kind of clout that I envision will result from this privatization.

[Mr. Bogle in the Chair]

You know, Mr. Speaker, I found it interesting a couple of years back. One of the interventions I made during the debate on the debt of the province during the provincial budget – I think it was 1987 – one of the points I made at the time to the Provincial Treasurer in regards to borrowing overseas was that when Alberta goes overseas to raise capital to fund our deficit, in paying off the money to pay the interest on those bonds, that money ends up leaving Alberta and flowing outside of the province into the coffers of New York or the funds that we're borrowing from in Switzerland or wherever the Provincial Treasurer is raising his money. I suggested at the time that it would make good sense to go to Albertans to raise the capital. If the province had to go into debt to fund that deficit, why not raise it from Albertans so that when you pay back the interest on that money, it flows back into the Alberta economy, back into the pockets of Albertans? It gets captured by the Provincial Treasurer in the following year's income tax and in essence is generated within the province, within the local economy, and leads to greater wealth and prosperity all the way around. Well, I was pleased to see – and I've said this on a number of occasions – again with the prompting of some other members across the House, that the Provincial Treasurer issued Alberta capital bonds starting in 1987. In fact, I heard him not too many weeks ago. In discussing the most recent issue, he was able to announce with great pride that some \$50 million dollars, I think was the figure, was going to be pumped back into the pockets of Albertans as of June 1, 1990, to honour the commitments to Albertans under the Alberta capital bonds.

Well, Mr. Speaker, now we have a government that in another situation is going in an entirely different direction, because what happens when 10 percent of the shares of Alberta Government Telephones are held outside the country, what it means then is that the profits of this company in the future are going to flow to the shareholders, 10 percent of whom may well live outside of Canada. That money is going to be lost to Alberta. It's going to be money that's taken out of the pockets of Albertans, our consumers. It's going to flow through to the shareholders, and the shareholders could be resident outside of Canada. It's

going to be lost to Alberta, and that money is going to be lost to Canada.

Now, look at the existing situation that we have at the present time, Mr. Speaker, where 100 percent of the shares are in effect owned by the people of Alberta right now. That means that the money that's raised through tolls and otherwise through Alberta consumers – they pay their monthly bills to Alberta Government Telephones. Whatever profits are made on that go back into the retained earnings of the company and are used for the operations of Alberta Government Telephones on behalf of all Albertans. Whether it goes into the modernizing of new equipment, whether it goes into providing some new switching equipment or some new service, that money flows back into Alberta on behalf of all Albertans, who are the users and the shareholders of this company. It just works for the benefit of everybody.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the cross-subsidization that presently occurs where long-distance rates are charged at a rate much higher than the cost of providing long-distance services, the profit that Alberta Government Telephones makes on that ends up being used to subsidize the local service of the local users whether they live in rural Alberta or urban Alberta. In fact, rural users get a heavy cross-subsidization through AGT. AGT does that and can do it because all of the consumers of Alberta Government Telephones are also all of the shareholders of Alberta Government Telephones. So by looking at the entire province as one unit, one market, both as shareholders and as consumers, these kinds of decisions are rational and make good sense on behalf of everyone. So the system works on behalf of everyone.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Now that you're moving into privatization, a whole new, different set of dynamics begins to operate, and that primarily becomes a mandate for Alberta Government Telephones to simply provide the maximum amount of profit for the shareholders, which now are no longer all the people of Alberta but a smaller group of Albertans. As well, now the shareholders are going to be other Canadians and are going to be owners who live outside of Canada and outside of Alberta.

So we see that two things are going to begin to operate, Mr. Speaker. We're going to see a shift in mandate so that the whole business of cross-subsidization will not be working to the maximization of the profits of the shareholders. The shareholders are going to begin demanding the management of the company to change its rate structure in order to eliminate those cross-subsidizations in order to increase the profit and the bottom line for the shareholders. I say that this is going to affect Albertans in the quality of service and this cross-subsidization that has traditionally operated on behalf of all Albertans. But what's more important is that if profits are maximized, it's going to also maximize the amount of money that's paid in dividends that then leave the province in the form of payments to residents outside of Alberta and, what particularly concerns me, as a result, because of the subamendment, is going to go into the pockets of people who don't live in the province of Alberta.

So we see the mandate changing, and as a result of that mandate changing, we're going to see money leaving the province that is not going to any longer be available to us to regenerate and recirculate and be reused for the benefit of all Albertans, which has traditionally been the way Alberta Government Telephones has operated. This means, Mr. Speaker, that

with less money circulating in the provincial economy, it's obviously going to have an impact on incomes in the province. It's going to have an impact on the circulation effects of AGT not any longer having that money at its disposal to invest in the province, to contract with local contractors. It's not going to have the money to pay to its employees. That money has in effect left the province; therefore, the compounding effect is no longer going to be available to us.

So I'm very concerned about the possibility being opened up here with this legislation that a significant ownership of this public utility is going to fall into the hands of foreigners. As I said in my early remarks, Mr. Speaker, 10 percent represents a significant clout over the operations of this company, and the fact that they're likely to be held by institutional investors means that those people in parts of the world other than Canada could effectively sway and carry significant clout in the operations of AGT and will be directing, in essence, the mandate of the company to work in their interests and not necessarily in the primary interests of Albertans and of Canadians.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some people may say: "Well, the 10 percent is there. But not to worry, Hawkesworth. You know that the likelihood of this 10 percent ever being reached is very remote indeed." Perhaps in theory that may be a reasonable position for someone to hold, but I remember being intrigued by a small newspaper clipping that came out some months after the initial share offering for Air Canada. The newspaper clipping said that the largest single shareholder other than the government of Canada at that time had turned out to be an American mutual fund. That was really all that was contained in that particular news article. Well, in the meantime the federal government has got rid of all the shares it had so that no shares are left within the hands of the federal government; they've all been issued. I was quite curious to know whether any of the shares of Air Canada had been taken up by foreigners, so I did a bit of investigation, and I've learned that 18 percent of all the outstanding shares in Air Canada are now held by foreigners. That is approaching the 25 percent ceiling of foreign ownership that was contained in the legislation that led to the privatization of Air Canada. So within a matter of just a few months since the privatization of Air Canada has taken place, Mr. Speaker, that ownership is very rapidly approaching the 25 percent cap contained in that legislation.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, without knowing any further how many companies or how many shareholders might be represented by that 18 percent, all I can say to you is that in referring to that newspaper article that I had read some time ago, the biggest single shareholder was the Magellan fund, which is owned by First Boston Fidelity. I think that's the name of the financial institution that is the owner of the Magellan fund that had at that time purchased and loaded up in a big way on Air Canada shares. They were the biggest shareholder outside of the government of Canada. I can't say whether they own that 18 percent or whether that 18 percent is divided up and shared by a number of institutional investors. All I'm saying is this: 18 percent of a company in many cases is effective ownership and control of that company if it's concentrated into the hands of one shareholder or one company or one institution. So if that 18 percent is held by even a small number, two or three companies, it could give any one of them significant control over Air Canada, which has been something that Canadians have always been proud of as their airline.

So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all members of the Assembly that I can predict with some confidence, based on this track record, that within a couple of months the cap of 10

percent of the ownership of AGT by foreign interests could easily be approached and could very easily result in them having if not effective control, significant control over a company that we've all been proud of as Albertans for the service that they've provided over many decades and generations. I really don't think that's a legacy this government should be proud of if that's the result.

We have a company that's worked on behalf of all Albertans. The profits that they make, the income that they generate, the spending that they do: much of that occurs in Alberta as a primary market. Once we change the mandate, change the ownership and the flow of income within that company so that it starts to serve shareholders and owners outside of our country, a major economic opportunity and force is going to be lost to this province. It's not a situation that I welcome, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that other members of the Legislature would recognize what's being lost by a move in this direction. I'm sure that all Albertans, if they were ever to learn, hopefully can learn before it's too late that this company, which we've owned as shareholders and have been served well by, could end up in the hands of foreigners. I'm sure they would not appreciate it or like it or support it either.

I'm pleased that I have the opportunity and the privilege to be able to speak to this subamendment in this Legislature this afternoon. I hope I'm not going to be in a position some few years down the road where I will be in a position to stand up and say, "I told you so." I hate to have to read in *Hansard*, as I have on many occasions, comments, predictions I have made, concerns that I've raised, read them with the experience of history, even a short history, to look back on them and realize that those concerns have come to fruition. I certainly hope that in this case, Mr. Speaker, some months or years down the road I won't have to stand up and draw to the attention of the Legislature that Bell or IT&T or some other technology company in the United States is now the key shareholder of AGT and is directing the management of AGT to make decisions that harm Albertans but work to the benefit of that shareholder.

I don't want to be in that position, but I'm afraid that at some time in the future I may well be saying to this government and to this Legislature, "I told you so," that this has been the net effect of what Bill 37 has resulted in: Albertans have lost not only an asset but have lost a voice over the direction of that asset; it's controlled by some far off and distant and unresponsive individual or company that doesn't have the best interests of Alberta at heart.

That, Mr. Speaker, would bring us full circle to the situation that existed in this province at the turn of the century when public pressure resulted in the Legislature and the government of the day moving to create a provincewide telephone service. Because Albertans at that time learned a bitter experience: that far-distant shareholders who didn't have Alberta's interests at heart basically told Albertans at that time that you can do without service, you can do without telephones, you can pay through the nose, or whatever.

Those were the directives given to Alberta back at the turn of the century, and it was that kind of attitude and those kinds of decisions and those kinds of directives that led Albertans to set up Alberta Government Telephones and Edmonton Telephones at that particular time: to ensure that these services were provided to all Albertans, that there was no discrimination on the basis of where they might live, and that those services would be provided at affordable prices. They learned a lesson, and Alberta Government Telephones has . . .

[Mr. Hawkesworth's speaking time expired]

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a privilege to rise and speak on this amendment, to speak in support of this amendment. I think nothing demonstrates like this amendment and this Bill the difference between those of us that sit in this caucus and those that would sit in the caucus across the way in terms of our commitment to a level of service for all citizens and a kind of social conscience and commitment to the overall and the common good.

When this Bill came forward, I was reminded of a book I saw many years ago called *Silent Surrender*. It talked about the foreign ownership of Canadian companies and what that meant for a nation when much of its industry, which was what was being talked about at that time, was owned and controlled from outside of the country. *Silent Surrender*, the title of the book, refers to the fact that as an economy is taken over by the interests of a foreign country, be it those multinational corporations or whomever, the very character of the host country is changed. Its values and its political ideologies somehow are changed by the impact of that ownership. So the notion of *Silent Surrender* is a surrender without guns. That's what one thinks about when one hears about how something that belongs to Albertans and has belonged to them from its beginning is now not only being sold to them but being sold to interests in another country.

Again we can say: "Only 10 percent. What's 10 percent?" But the 10 percent sets a tone, a kind of thrust to a company. This 10 percent could represent a block of interests that are totally uninformed and unconcerned about the interests of Albertans. Furthermore, we can say: "Today 10 percent. What about next year?" We have seen in this Legislative Assembly how easy it is to change the amount of foreign ownership by a government that is bent on that kind of change. I think the fact that the free trade deal has been put through by a government that represents less than half of the Canadian population demonstrates how a majority government can really go against those that would oppose them.

I think if we look at foreign ownership, we can look at it in the context of the Third World where the developed nations have gone in and exploited those nations' resources and their peoples without concern for the people of that country. One of the really tragic results has been the urbanization in the Third World. That means that people that were once self-sufficient in agriculture have now been forced off the land, as it is owned by foreign owners who raise cash crops. So not only have these people lost their homes, they have been impoverished, and they have lost the very source of their food. We see that foreign ownership means that the needs and concerns of the host country are not a concern to those that own the resources, the industry, the companies. The bottom line is profit. When the company has taken its profit, and in some cases devastated the country, they then leave, and the people of that country, of that nation, are left with a nation without an infrastructure, be that an economic or a political infrastructure.

I've heard members in this Assembly in an earlier debate today unable to understand or to generalize how the experiences in other parts of the world can be used as lessons for us that we could learn from. I think it's instructive to know that those that do not learn the lessons of history repeat them. I think it is very important, then, that we look at what foreign ownership means, has meant for other countries, and in some cases what it has

meant for us. It means that the goals of Albertans will take second place. It changes the very nature of this utility, which was to serve. I think the people in this caucus, the members of this caucus, understand the notion of service: that we provide a level of service to all of our citizens, that the bottom line is not always profit, that we do not live in this Darwinian world of the survival of the fittest but we live in a Christian world of care and concern for our fellow human beings and our fellow citizens, that we provide a net of service, that we deal with the demographics – geography, the unique circumstances – of where we live and provide the right to participate fully in society for all members no matter what their circumstances.

Certainly this is what Alberta telephones was all about. It was all about geography and all about isolation, and it was all about people being able to communicate and connect with each other. That was what Alberta Government Telephones was about. I remember when the telephones came to our neighbourhood what a wonderful thing that was. We could now phone for health care or phone a doctor; we could phone our neighbours; we could phone our relatives.

So that is what a public utility is about, and that is what the values of this province . . . We hear, "What are the values that this province is built on?" Well, many of the values of our province are values of co-operation and care and concern for our fellow citizens. We have not embraced much of the American system of, "The bottom line is profit and too bad if you can't make it." I think we need to look at the whole notion of

co-operation and competitiveness. We hear about how wonderful competitiveness is and how it saves money. Well, every time I turn on cable TV from the States, what do I see? Telephone companies competing for the markets. Don't tell me those advertisements don't cost a fortune. Who is going to pay that fortune? The subscribers, the users of the those telephone companies.

Mr. Speaker, I have much more to say on this matter, but in view of the time I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion, those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion carries.

The Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, the business of the House tomorrow evening will be committee study of various Bills on the Order Paper.

[At 5:29 p.m. the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]