

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Tuesday, April 25, 1995**

8:00 p.m.

Date: 95/04/25

[The Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please be seated.

head: **Government Bills and Orders**
head: **Committee of the Whole**

[Mr. Tannas in the Chair]

THE CHAIRMAN: I'll call the meeting to order. Again we'll abide by the usual convention of only one person standing and speaking at a time.

Bill 15 Charitable Fund-Raising Act

THE CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Macleod, would you like to begin the evening with amendments, suggestions, comments?

MR. COUTTS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It's a pleasure to rise this evening and to open the debate in Committee of the Whole on Bill 15, the Charitable Fund-Raising Act. I have to say I have appreciated the comments of the members opposite during second reading. Yes, because some of the suggestions that they had were very worth while, although many of the suggestions were very, very repetitious as they got up one after the other. A number of the members opposite were also quick to point out during second reading that there was need for this type of legislation and that they find some of the points very positive, although I'm sure that through the debate this evening they will reaffirm some of their original concerns.

One criticism we heard in the Bill is that it isn't specific enough. The rationale in this enabling legislation is to deal with the specifics in the regulations. Because many of the changes to fund-raising require a quick response as the issues around fund-raising emerge and the continued consultation with charities and fund-raisers develop, they will assist in developing a sound portfolio for all affected parties to adhere to, and that's what is important to Albertans. This legislation is not to be as burdensome as members opposite would hope it to be nor even as the Public Contributions Act had for this particular legislation. Therefore, the annual applications will be simple, clear, and concise, because we know that the Public Contributions Act was flawed and allowed for multiple approvals with corresponding and appropriate financial statements. Charities have even suggested a reasonable fee to cover the cost of processing these applications or help enforcing the Act, and that's input that the charities have had for us because it is in the best interests of credible charities and fund-raisers alike to legitimize themselves and ultimately expose those that are less scrupulous.

Bill 15 provides protection for consumers as well. It adheres to the standards set out in the regulations that will provide assurance to our donors, to Albertans, that their decisions to support their favourite charity or a new charity are put to good use. It has been said that the powers of the minister are very broad, and so they should be to ensure the proper enforcement of this Act. Consumer protection, Mr. Chairman, requires strong legislation with strong enforcement measures, not tight restraints that the members opposite would wish to have. However, there

are sufficient checks and balances in this legislation and in the system, and any decision of the minister is appealable to the courts based on a question of law or jurisdiction.

The \$10,000 threshold was one of the big things the members opposite talked about, but what this does, Mr. Chairman, is allow smaller organizations raising funds within their own community to be exempt from registration. The key here is on whose behalf the dollars are being raised. Many branches of these chapters raise funds for two purposes: one for the local level or one for a provincial or national level. All funds that follow whatever particular body that may be acquiring the funds may be required to register.

Retention and auditing and record keeping is part of any good accounting system operation, and the regulations will be set out to those accountability parameters. The satisfaction of the ability to retain a receipt for contributions and the reassurance that information of who you are, who you represent, and the additional information that would be available upon written request or by telephone is a comfort to Albertans. Again, we will have an opportunity through regulation to perfect that system.

As you see, Mr. Chairman, Bill 15 will not set up any roadblocks for charitable fund-raisers or organizations or volunteers. It will provide a streamlined process that will add credibility to legitimate fund-raisers and maintain confidence in charitable organizations.

When developing Bill 15, we did speak to a number of stakeholder groups, Mr. Chairman, groups that identified the problems and pointed out potential solutions. These stakeholders felt it was important to maintain donor confidence in charitable fund-raising because the donors need some information at the time that they are solicited for funds in order to make the proper decisions. These charities and stakeholders have provided us – even as early as yesterday I had a professional fund-raiser in my office saying, "This is good legislation, Mr. Coutts, and we can support this."

We've not just talked to people in my office. We've also talked to the city of Calgary. The city of Edmonton has been included in the negotiations. The Alberta Association of Fund Raising Executives has been involved, the University of Calgary, the United Way of Alberta. We've talked to museums, art galleries, libraries. We've talked to the University of Alberta. We've talked to many foundations – hospital and educational foundations – and they have helped us prepare and will continue to help us prepare the regulations after this legislation is passed. But in their consultation, Mr. Chairman, they have suggested a number of things. Therefore, I would like to present to the House this evening four amendments to Bill 15.

The first amendment to section 5 . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: Does everyone have a copy?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. COUTTS: I understand they're at everyone's desk, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. This amendment has the prerequisite signatures and will be referred to as amendment A1.

Go ahead, Pincher Creek-Macleod.

8:10

MR. COUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first amendment I would like to propose this evening is under section 5, hours of solicitation. Where in the Act it says "A person making

solicitations in person or by telephone may make them only between 8 a.m. and 9 p.m.," we would ask to delete "in person or" in section 5. The effect is that only telephone solicitations, not personal solicitations, are subject to the requirement that they may be made between 8 a.m. and 9 p.m. That is to assist those foundations that wish to have a fund-raising breakfast at 7 or 6:30 in the morning.

The next amendment I'd like to bring forward is in section 10, Mr. Chairman, 10(1), where it says, "A person making a solicitation must give to each person making a monetary contribution a receipt for the contribution." I would amend that to read:

A person who makes a solicitation must give a receipt to a person making a monetary contribution if the person making the contribution requests a receipt.

The third amendment I'd like to make to the Act, Mr. Chairman, is on sections 18(2) and the corresponding 26(2). I'd like to add "within" before "30 days" in both those sections. Under this amendment the information will have to be provided not just for the changes occurring on the 30 days after suspension or cancellation but also for changes occurring during the time between the suspensions or cancellations of the following 30 days.

The last amendment, Mr. Chairman, is to section 54. I'd like to suggest that we amend that section by striking out "On the coming into force of this Act, a charitable organization that is authorized" and substituting "A charitable organization that on April 29, 1995 is authorized". This section applies when the Act is proclaimed into force, and the section only works if it comes into force on or before April 30.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that we can move all of those amendments together under one?

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any further discussions? Are you ready for the question?

The hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan on amendment A1.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. To expedite matters, I certainly will communicate that I would be very supportive of A and B, but I would like to just discuss or debate briefly 10(1), the amendment

A person who makes a solicitation must give a receipt to a person making a monetary contribution if the person making the contribution requests a receipt.

I have some reservations about the fact that when we're actually making solicitation of monetary contributions, we're looking at an indication from the person contributing of requesting a receipt. I just want to point out that, yes, the majority of volunteers are people of integrity, and I certainly can understand why this amendment's coming forward, but at the same time, Mr. Chairman, I do have reservations about this amendment. Indeed, when there is no ability required to give that receipt and it many not be pointed out to the person at the door, there is a real temptation when you're specifically into cash donations. Now, normally at the door when it is cash donations, they are small, usually \$10 and \$20-type of donations. But you know, if you've five or six of those and you've no receipt, the temptation can be great. So I certainly have some reservations with that amendment. The other amendments I can fully support.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'd like some of my colleagues, who are seeing these amendments for the first time, to be given the opportunity to speak to them. I certainly wish to have a sense of the comfort level within our caucus with this amendment dealing with receipts. Indeed, if there are any other areas within the other amendments that I may not have picked on and that my colleagues

have, I'd invite them at this time to please speak to these amendments.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora.

MR. SAPERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am obviously just seeing these amendments for the first time and don't have a tremendous amount of difficulty with the amendment labeled A or those amendments C and D, but certainly the B amendment does give me some concern.

On the one hand, Mr. Chairman, I myself have canvassed for many organizations and have gone door-to-door and have collected \$5 and \$10 and \$15 and \$20 cash donations. Several times the donors have said, "Don't bother with a receipt." We understand that this could be an onerous or a burdensome requirement. Perhaps it would cost more money to properly receipt a \$5 donation than it's really worth to the organization. On the other hand, you do want to have a certain amount of accountability for the individual canvassers. You do want to have a certain amount of accountability for the fund-raising organization, and, thirdly, you want to have accountability for the charity that receives the money collected. So I understand the rationale as presented by the hon. member for the amendment that's labeled B: that a receipt would only be issued if it was requested. On the other hand, I also understand why the drafters may have originally drafted the legislation in the form that it was originally presented to the House; that is, to guarantee a certain level of accountability and a paper chain.

Perhaps the resolution may be that the amendment needs a subamendment. Mr. Chairman, I'm not proposing such a subamendment at this point, but I'll just suggest in debate, and I would appreciate the mover of the amendment to reflect on this and to comment on it. Perhaps section 10(1) should include some kind of a dollar limitation or a dollar value. So a receipt would be optional or at the request of the donor if it was under a certain amount of money, perhaps \$25, but the receipt would be mandatory if the donation were for a higher amount of money. That would allow for those donors who don't want to burden a charity with unnecessary or unwarranted paperwork or administrative costs to achieve that, but for larger donations it would guarantee some accountability. So that is my initial thought on these amendments.

I take it that they've all been moved as a package, so I'm not even sure what procedurally we would have to do if we were going to move a subamendment to just amendment B, but my suggestion is that we should have some comment from the mover of the amendment on whether or not that would be acceptable. Maybe there's a way that we can strip this one out of the rest of the amendments that have been moved so we can focus on that.

8:20

THE CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Macleod, maybe you could help the committee in this. We appear to have four amendments here, and you had asked for them to be treated as one. Is that still your wish and the wish of the committee?

MR. COUTTS: That is the wish of the mover, yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

The hon. Member for Leduc.

MR. KIRKLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to belabour the point that was made by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora, but I wonder if the hon. Member for Pincher

Creek-Macleod could expound on the point that he was making. I missed his comments there.

When I looked at the amendment, I certainly would indicate that I thought it was a positive amendment. It gave that optional aspect to it. I supported that wholeheartedly. But in a quick discussion here, as the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora indicated, it could be somewhat onerous if we start filling out little receipts for \$2 for a box of cookies or chocolates or the likes of that if somebody demands it. I would ask the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Macleod if he could perhaps educate me as to why we couldn't, and hypothetically I would stick a \$10 figure in there. Is there some strategy that I'm overlooking here that precluded that?

MR. COUTTS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. members for their comments. The stakeholders that we talked to, their big concern with giving out receipts for every single, solitary donation was the amount of paperwork and the retention of files and holding those files for a number of years. For small cash donations, as the hon. member mentioned, for funds around \$2 it might cost more in the long run to make out receipts for those types of donations, for the smaller donations. That is why it was the suggestion of the stakeholders we talked to to have a part of the legislation that said to have a receipt upon request.

Not everybody wants a receipt or wants to retain a receipt for \$2 or \$2.25 or for a handful of change. As it was even explained to me, some people go to their change drawers and take enough cash out of their change to make that donation. They felt it was cumbersome, burdensome, and we want to make it convenient for those that are looking for the donation and those that are getting the donation. So those are the main reasons: the paperwork involved for small donations; retention of those receipts for a number of years. Therefore, having receipts issued upon request was the appropriate way to go.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we recognize the next speakers, I just would like to remind people that I'm really pleased about one standing and speaking at a time, but we do have a number of people who've moved to the front ranks and have commenced to talk back and forth on both sides of the House, it would appear, although some people, I am sure, might indicate that that is not so. The Chair begs your indulgence if the Chair thought he heard.

We would like to continue, then, on amendment A1. Calgary-West.

MR. DALLA-LONGA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just following a little bit on the comments made previously by my colleagues for Edmonton-Glenora and Leduc, I think we need to give serious consideration to what it is that we're trying to accomplish here. If somebody reaches into their drawer and pulls out a handful of change, that's good, charitable, but do we as a government need to get involved and try to control that kind of stuff?

You know, personally, I don't really care whether the guy gets a receipt or not. The minute you have a situation where you can or you cannot have receipts, the legislation will lose control. Like, the very reason that we're having these receipts issued but being issued on a discretionary basis, we lose the impact of what we're trying to accomplish here. If they were mandatory, then the government or the proper authorities could step in and control that in fact the charities were issuing the receipts where required. Where you say, "Well, if you don't want a receipt, you don't have to get one," we're going to lose control. We're trying to bring in this legislation to bring in a little bit of control.

DR. WEST: The courts said they didn't want control.

MR. DALLA-LONGA: Well, the hon. minister of transportation says the court didn't want control. I'm not sure what he means by that. It would seem to me that we're trying to bring in some legislation that will help us control some of these charities.

I believe I understand the reasoning for discretionary receipts, but the minute we have discretionary receipts, we should also have a minimum amount. None of us, I think, are in here for the paperwork, and we are going to have all sorts of little problems crop up. You might have had focus groups, but I believe I've had experience with this sort of thing. This thing is so vague that when you have Girl Guides going around selling cookies, theoretically I could require a receipt. Is that what we want? Maybe. I don't think so. So I would ask the hon. member – maybe if I could have his comments; maybe I'm missing the point here.

If I could summarize, my point is: what are we going to do with these pieces of paper? We're not getting them for anyone; they're not going to serve any control purpose at all. Why can't we consider a minimum amount? Quite frankly, if someone goes into their change drawer and pulls out a handful of change, I don't care about issuing a receipt. I think it's such a small amount. We have much bigger fish to fry in this Legislature here.

So those are all my comments. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Lethbridge-East, and following that we're going to have Edmonton-Rutherford and then Leduc.

Lethbridge East.

DR. NICOL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've just a couple of comments on it. I agree with most of the other speakers this evening in terms of the three main amendments: A, C, and D. The B section, where the debate seems to be focusing: I think this is a good amendment. I think it should be supported the way it is.

Basically, when we look at issues of giving out money, if a person wants the receipt, they're going to ask for it. They should have that option. If the person is given a receipt and says, "Look, I don't want a receipt," that means they don't want a record of it. They don't need a record of it. They have no intense feeling of accountability for that dollar. So let the person who takes it then be accountable to the people they're collecting the money on behalf of. The accountability can come from that side in terms of making sure that all the money is turned over to the receiving agency.

So I think this is a good option. It allows for the people who want a receipt to get it, and it doesn't place a burden of a lot of paperwork on people who are collecting small amounts that they just have to deal with a lot of paperwork in order to keep track of it. So I think we should all support this. The accountability is built in by the integrity of the people who are collecting the money looking after the agents and the people who are giving it looking after their own self-interest in terms of tax receipts or whatever they want the receipt for. So I think this is a very supportable amendment.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I want to focus in on amendment B, as well. I want to relate amendment B to, I believe, the main thrust of legislation that pertains to charitable fund-raising, just as the charitable bylaws do at the present time or the existing Public Contributions Act. The whole thing really, the key, in a nutshell, when it comes to fund-raising by nonprofit organizations,

is accountability, and that accountability leads to trust within the community. When people part with that \$5, \$10, \$20, whatever the case may be, they want to know a hundred percent that those dollars are going to a charity, that they're not going to an organization where the name sounds like it's a charity but it's not. I call recall that years ago a troublesome organization was Opportunity Handicapped. They gave the impression that handicapped people – at that time the term "handicapped" was used – were selling lightbulbs on the phone and making money. They weren't.

8:30

MS HANSON: I know; I bought some.

MR. WICKMAN: I bought some too. It wasn't really a scam. They weren't doing anything wrong. It was just misrepresentation. But a lot of times when one gets phoned right now . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: I bought a lightbulb.

MR. WICKMAN: I bought a case of them.

MS HANSON: I've still got half a case.

MR. WICKMAN: Alice still has a case.

Mr. Chairman, right now even, when people phone me at home – I don't care what the organization is – I say, "I'm sorry; I don't respond to telephone solicitation." I give at the end of the year to various charitables that I want to give to where I know the dollars are going to the organization and 40 percent, 50 percent aren't going to some boilermaker operation. So without provision in there, without specific provision ensuring there is a proper method of accountability, that trust is lost and we're doing a disservice to those charitable organizations, because people aren't going to want to give. To say that one can simply ask for it is sufficient accountability, no, it's not.

I can see that for 69 cents you don't ask for a receipt or have to issue a receipt, but there's got to be a minimum amount. I don't care if that minimum amount is \$20 or whatever, but if there isn't that, then you've lost a significant degree of accountability. I can't support the amendment as is, for that reason.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Leduc. Oh, sorry.

MR. KIRKLAND: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I rethought my position. I'll give my support to the amendments from the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Macleod.

THE CHAIRMAN: Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan. No? Okay; we'll allow Edmonton-Meadowlark to continue.

MS LEBOVICI: Thank you. I'm looking at this amendment also for the first time and looking at it in conjunction with the legislation. The way I read it is that there are going to be problems in terms of auditing, when an auditor goes in, to try and find out who gave what dollars. In other words, under this particular amendment I could say that I'm going to give a thousand dollars to the Girl Guide that comes to the door and sells me the box of chocolates. Then someone can just put that thousand dollars into their back pocket, and there will never be a record of it because I haven't asked for a receipt for it because I don't want to claim it on my income tax for some reason. The same goes in terms of whether it's \$100 or whether it's \$5. Also, what happens if there's no minimum in terms of receipts? I give

my \$5 to the Girl Guide at the door; she goes away and just puts it into her wallet with all the other dollars that she's put together. I then phone up the association, the organization, the next day and say, "I'd like a receipt now." Well, how is there any way to know whether I should be getting a receipt? There's no record that I've given the \$5. It's been amassed with everything else. Somewhere there has to be a paper trail at a certain point in time.

If I can make an analogy to the elections Act, where we all go out to get contributions that can be taxed, that are tax deductible, there's a dollar amount over which we need to give a receipt. Why would this be any different? I know I can't say in this Legislative Assembly that this is a stupid amendment, because that would be unparliamentary, but I know I can say that there doesn't seem to have been a lot of forethought with regards to the implications of this particular amendment. I'm amazed that the government members – because this is a government Bill, I can talk about it as being the government members – have perhaps not seen or not looked at what this particular amendment is saying, and it's going to cause more problems with organizations and individuals and auditing than the hon. member who proposed this particular amendment is going to solve.

Now, I listened to the explanation that the hon. member gave with regards to why this amendment was put forward. In reality, his explanation justifies, as far as I'm concerned, that there should be a minimum dollar amount with regards to the issuing of a receipt. If you look back at your words in *Hansard* within the next few hours, hon. member, you will see that your justification is justification for a minimum dollar amount. Now, I know it appears from the conversations that are going on on the government side amongst the government members and from the lack of interest in this particular amendment that the government's mind is made up. But I would hope that the member can stand on his own two feet, can read what he has proposed, can understand what that proposal indicates in terms of the paper trail that will not occur and perhaps should occur because of the ability for fraud to occur, and that he can say, "Well, I don't think this is the amendment that should be put forward; it should read otherwise." I would hope that the member has the courage to do that.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. When you get amendments put before you and you only have a few moments to look at them, you can't really address them in the context of the total Bill. I've had a few seconds to start to peruse the Bill in light of amendment 10(1). I look at the "duty to maintain records," section 7.

Every charitable organization and professional fund-raiser who makes solicitations must maintain in Alberta

- (a) complete and accurate financial records of its operations for at least 3 years after the solicitations are made,
- (b) records regarding the solicitations for at least 3 years after the solicitations are made, and
- (c) other records and documents described in the regulations for the period described in the regulations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when I have communicated with charitable organizations around the province, they found this section cumbersome for the small charitable organizations. So my question has to be to the mover of specifically amendment 10(1). You're moving this to take away what I'm assuming is a further

cumbersome process for that small donation. Now, that would make sense and would fit in with what my hon. members have been speaking about in supporting this if indeed we had seen some amendments coming forward dealing with section 7, because in essence this is where there's a large responsibility being put on the small charitable organizations, the small fund-raisers, and it's a very costly process that's been laid out there. In essence, if section 7, duty to maintain records, is happening, I would think that the receipt would possibly be one of the most effective ways of keeping that record.

Mr. Chairman, I'd certainly welcome it if the mover could address my concern there. My sense is that my colleagues in the majority are prepared to support these amendments that are being put forward by the government because they appear to be meaningful amendments and will improve this Bill, although it still needs substantial amendments to it. I'd be more reassured if section 7 somehow had been addressed in a way that the small charitable organizations weren't having to have this costly process included in Bill 15.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'd wait for the mover to address those points before I'd say wholeheartedly that I support all of these amendments he has moved at this time.

MS HANSON: I would like to say just a few sentences on the amendments. I support the amendments, aside from a small change in section 10(1), again going back to the receipts. I think that it would make common sense to say that you do not have to issue a receipt for anything under \$10. That's the limit, and then over that you must issue receipts. I suppose if people request them for \$10 and under, that option could be there; I don't know. But it certainly would simplify the whole thing, and people know exactly what their guidelines are.

Other than that, I support the amendments.

8:40

MR. COUTTS: Mr. Chairman, under this amendment a receipt could be issued for 50 cents, a dollar, \$2 dollars, \$2.50, up to \$10, \$25, at the request of the individual who is giving the donation to whatever charity he or she wishes, and that is the freedom that we would allow. However, the advice of the members opposite will be taken into consideration as we work through the regulations. I now call for the question.

[Motion on amendment A1 carried]

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is being called, but we already have people on our list, so that is not exactly useful.

The hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to move the following amendment. I believe they've not been circulated as yet. It's the one dealing with section 1(1). I won't start until they've been distributed.

THE CHAIRMAN: While they're being circulated, I would indicate that this amendment to Bill 15 will be classified A2 and that we have the necessary signatures of the Parliamentary Counsel. This is the one, then, that is item one, moved by the hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan, under section 1(1). I think we've got a fair distribution. Perhaps the Government House Leader hasn't received his yet.

I'd invite the hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan to begin her comments on amendment A2.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Speaking to amendment A2, I would move that section 1(1) be amended by adding the following:

(m) "volunteer" means a person who offers their services in any capacity and does not receive remuneration.

Mr. Chairman, I found throughout Bill 15 that indeed the word "volunteer" is used continuously throughout it. So it was somewhat disturbing to realize that within the interpretation there was no definition for volunteer. That is why I felt it was important to bring forward this amendment at this time. It's key to the Charitable Fund-Raising Act because the basis of any fund-raising is the volunteer, and to not have that definition within this Act I believe is doing a disservice to the key component of successful fund-raising. It's interesting that this is the week to acknowledge voluntarism in the province of Alberta, and yet we seem to see a government who has completely forgotten to define this word within Bill 15.

I'd ask, please, that the members of the Legislature this evening support the inclusion of this definition of "volunteer" within Bill 15.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Beverly.

MS HANSON: Yes. I just wanted to speak briefly. One of the reasons that "volunteer" needs to be defined is that at one time it used to be that when you said volunteer, everybody knew what you meant: you meant somebody who didn't get any kind of remuneration for the work they did. But the term has become quite loose in the last few years. Quite often people are referred to as volunteers because they only get an honorarium or they only get their expenses paid. Now we don't really know what "volunteer" means, and I think that with charitable organizations volunteers have been the backbone of the charitable organizations. They've been so important to municipalities. They've built this country, particularly the rural areas of Alberta. So I really agree with the mover that "volunteer" should be clearly defined so that it doesn't have a double meaning.

Thank you.

MR. COUTTS: Mr. Chairman, in looking over this amendment and seeing that adding clause (m) to section 1(1) and in view of the fact that we have made an interpretation of all other criteria here, I support this clause (m) in identifying volunteers under the criteria.

[Motion on amendment A2 carried]

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wish to acknowledge the support of that amendment at this point in time. It's timely in that it happened during the week of acknowledging volunteers across the province of Alberta. I thank the government member who came forward supporting this amendment.

At this time I'd like to move a further amendment, and that is that section 29(2) be amended by adding the following after clause (c) – and while it's being distributed, I'll just read out what that amendment would say – "provided that such remuneration shall not exceed 50 per cent of the gross contributions." I'll leave it at that until they're distributed, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: While we're waiting for the distribution to occur, the Chair would confirm that we have the necessary signatures from Parliamentary Counsel. This amendment with (3), as moved by the hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan, will be known as amendment A3. I don't know whether the Government House Leader has had a chance to look at that. Okay. I think we can safely assume that most people are able to see amendment A3 and would invite Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan, then, to give her explanation for this amendment.

8:50

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This amendment would prevent any for-profit professional fund-raisers from receiving more than 50 percent of the gross contribution that it may help collect during a campaign. It's needed because there have been many cases in the United States and indeed in Canada, including Alberta, where more than 50 percent of the moneys raised went to a private corporation instead of the charity doing the fund-raising. In these cases a professional fund-raiser would promise to raise X amount of dollars for the charity. While they're acting as representatives for the charity, the professional fund-raiser would then proceed to raise five or six times the amount they promised to the charity; thus, 80 or 90 percent of every dollar the person donated would end up going to the for-profit professional fund-raisers and not the charity.

Mr. Chairman, when I have been discussing this Bill, Bill 15, with charitable organizations and with Albertans, this has been a concern raised numerous times. Albertans are getting increasingly concerned about the small portion of the money that they donate reaching that charity of choice that they have supported. When I was speaking to the second reading of the Bill, I acknowledged at that point in time that charitable organizations had said that it was unfortunate that they really didn't get together collectively in trying to come forward with documents like the Canada West Foundation has tabled in the past two weeks. So in fairness to the government many of the things that I was hearing in the latter days over these past two weeks were things like they want Albertans to feel confident that the largest portion of their dollar that they're contributing does go to the charity of choice.

The other that I was hearing from the charities was that there's been a commitment made by the government of Alberta, and to some degree I have some reservations about this commitment because of past experiences. That is where they felt they have not had the impact through the consultation process with the government resulting in what should be in Bill 15. The commitment being made was that it would indeed appear in the regulations and they would be part of that committee. Part of that was the development of a code of ethics, Mr. Chairman.

Now, that's down the road. I firmly believe that this legislation would start to be good legislation indeed if we see the government supporting this amendment that I'm putting forward at this time. That is: "provided that such remuneration" – and I'm trying to put on an Italian accent – "shall not exceed 50 per cent of the gross contributions." I believe that will begin the process of bringing credibility and a code of ethics into the fund-raising process. Mr. Chairman, we have to recognize that this has indeed become an industry. In fact, it concerns me that we are now having to see a growth industry of for-profit fund-raisers happening right here in the province of Alberta.

So, Mr. Chairman, I certainly am seeking support for this amendment from both sides of the House. With those comments, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to make some comments on the amendment brought forward by the Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan. I fully support what she's doing, and I can understand that at times you've just got to take little steps to gain the larger steps, the giant steps. But even 50 percent is somewhat questionable as to whether that's sufficient. Many people don't have the opportunity to realize exactly what happens with some of the charitable fund-raising.

I had the experience of serving as chairman of the Edmonton Charitable Appeals Committee, and I can recall when I took over from Alderman Ron Hayter. When Alderman Ron Hayter went on, the requirement was that 17 and a half percent had to go to the nonprofit organization. While Alderman Hayter was chairman, he raised that to 30 percent, and during my period of time I raised it to 50 percent. Every time we raised it, we had the professional fund-raisers coming in their big cars and complaining that they were going to be out of business and all these charitable groups were going to suffer as a result of that.

The Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan is exactly right. They would approach organizations and say, "I'll give you \$30,000 if you sign this application," and even if the boilermaker operation raised \$120,000, they would skim off \$90,000. What they did, Mr. Chairman, every time we tried to raise it, is they would get to the charitable groups, and the charitable groups would feel threatened that they were going to lose their \$30,000. They didn't care that it was only 25 percent; it was \$30,000 being handed to them. A lot of people don't realize that. You look at the history of the ACT telarama. I commend the work that the ACT did in attempting to raise money to help many worthwhile causes in the community, but the expenses involved got totally out of hand. They themselves admitted that eventually, and that's why the ACT telarama was dropped.

You've got to have this type of thing. To not have this type of legislation to protect the consumer that gives to charitable organizations, again I'll state, will simply hurt the charitable organization in that people will be skeptical of giving if they don't know that a sufficient amount is going to a charitable cause. They'll say no. Instead of giving anything, they'll say no, and that group won't get anything. So if we want to do those charitable causes some good, support this amendment and put a little bit of teeth in this piece of legislation.

MR. COUTTS: Mr. Chairman, the government doesn't support this because in the legislation there is a provision that the fund-raisers themselves can make individual agreements and establish the remuneration that that professional fund-raiser wants on an individual basis. To have this 50 percent of gross contributions go towards that would set a precedent. There are some smaller charities out there, and this would not give them the dollars that they wish. Therefore the government does not support this amendment.

[Motion on amendment A3 lost]

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thought my voice was much louder.

Mr. Chairman, it's with some disappointment. I believe that the amendment was moving in the direction that the charitable organizations want to see happening here in the province of Alberta. Indeed, when we get into developing the code of ethics

and the regulations, I'm sure that this government is going to see some of the things that I'm suggesting right now actually happening, and I'd rather have seen it happen now than later.

I'd like at this time to move a further amendment, that section 9(1)(b) be amended by adding the following after "other purposes" wherever it appears, and it would state: "including the fulfillment of agreements with professional fund-raisers." I'll stop at that, Mr. Chairman, until the amendment has been distributed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. This amendment which is on section 9(1)(b) will be called amendment A4, and again the Chair would advise the committee that the necessary signature of Parliamentary Counsel is upon the copies at the Table.

I think we've covered nearly all the hon. members by the amendment A4 and would invite Edmonton . . . Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan to continue.

9:00

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: No, no, Mr. Chairman; Edmonton has not reached out to Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would ensure that if a person requests information regarding the charity, then the charity must also provide information on any agreement it may have with a professional fund-raiser. So in other words, within the Bill they have the right to ask for information, and the charity has to share that information. This amendment would allow that the agreement that they may have with a professional fund-raiser must be shared upon request. This would ensure that the public is aware of what percentage of the donation may be going to a professional fund-raiser. Now, we may hear from the government that they say this will already be required. However, it has certainly not been specifically outlined anywhere in the legislation. I believe that it's really important that Albertans have the ability to see what agreements have been signed with that charity and indeed how much that for-profit company is going to make out of that contract and what portion of the dollars raised indeed, once again, will find its way to that charity of choice.

So, Mr. Chairman, although the previous amendment wasn't carried, I believe that A4 would further strengthen this Bill, and I'd hope that the government can see their way to supporting this amendment, because in essence it's just openness. I believe that a government that says it's open and wants to be accountable, the legislation they pass within this House should demonstrate that same principle, that same philosophy. I believe that this amendment to section 9(1)(b) indeed would be in keeping with what this government professes is their philosophy.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Beverly.

MS HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to speak, not to this amendment . . . Are we finished with this amendment yet?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MS HANSON: No? Okay. Sorry; I'm out of turn.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Macleod.

MR. COUTTS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The agreements that come between a professional fund-raiser and the charity: total disclosure of all of those agreements comes forward in the financial statements that would be and could be provided upon request. Some of it might be from the previous year, but it would be available to the donor at any time by the provision in this legislation.

Therefore, this amendment is not required, and I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, with those comments in mind, I simply have to rise to support this amendment. There's no doubt at all that could be, should be, want to be is all nice to hear about, but it's a long way from the reality of the fact here. Definitely, including the fulfillment of agreements with professional fund-raisers is a necessary requirement, given the kinds of situations we've seen organizations find themselves in in the past. I think that your comments in this regard are completely out of turn, and I would ask that everyone here in the House disregard them and support this amendment.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are we ready for the question? Oh, Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I listened closely to what the member on the government side had to say about this amendment. The problem with this Bill 15 is indeed that it doesn't do what the member is saying. That's why I've brought forward this amendment. If there's anything we know in North America, I know that within Canada Bill 15 is being watched closely. Indeed, I would suggest that even some of the states are looking at what's happening here in Alberta with Bill 15, because we have to acknowledge there's a credibility problem out there because of the movement for profit, industry growth when it comes to fund-raising. We have to be responsible as legislators to ensure that we have the best legislation going that ensures that the largest portion of that dollar goes to the charity of choice and that there should be every attempt through legislation to ensure that full disclosure is there. To suggest that financial statements would do that I think doesn't address it at all.

I'll use an example. Say there's a large fund-raising going on for Ducks Unlimited, Alberta Hospital Edmonton foundation, the University of Alberta foundation, and they indeed enter into a contract with some very high-powered for-profit company. I would hope that I would be able to go and say to the chief executive officer, whatever the title of the person who's being paid to manage that charity, or I would be able to go to the chairman of the foundation and say, "Could I see what the contractual agreement is between you and this for-profit company?" and that would be shared, and when I scrutinized it, I would be able to clearly see how much that for-profit company was making out of this contract and what percentage of that dollar was finding its way back to Alberta Hospital Edmonton, the University of Alberta foundation, Ducks Unlimited. I could go on and on. Is it 20 cents out of the dollar that's going back to the charity, or is it 80 cents that's going back to the charity? How did they determine the administrative costs? Those are the things that I believe Albertans, Canadians, people south of the border are wanting to know.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't accept for one minute that Bill 15 in essence does that, and this amendment would have achieved what I am requesting. So I'm very disappointed, because I sense already that we're going to get this amendment defeated. I was excited at the fact that we got the definition of volunteer in; it was a little bit of success. So I'm going to be very disappointed that you can't see that this would not only serve the government of Alberta well but all Albertans.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. The hon. Member for Calgary-Curry.

MRS. BURGNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to speak briefly against the amendment. I think the hon. member has some good intentions, but I think there is an accountability process that hasn't been spoken to, and I think it should be clearly on the table for all Albertans, all North American residents, and any organization that engages in fund-raising.

One of those issues is that when you as a board or as a nonprofit organization or whatever undertake to fund-raise, you have some pretty clear goals about what you're trying to accomplish, and you vest that responsibility in achieving those goals in a group of people, first of all: that board, that foundation, whoever those people are. To tie government's responsibility to the responsibility of those appointed or elected people, depending on how they arrive at their position, is to remove them from the responsibility of proper and appropriate solicitation of funds. I do not support the fact that we give them a little blanket piece of amendment that says, "Oh by the way, in case you didn't ask the question, in case you didn't state your goals publicly before you went forward with a major campaign drawing on the largesse of the community that supports your organization, you don't have to be responsible for that." Again and again and again the responsibility belongs with the people who have the authority and who are undertaking these events, and those are the boards in place or the foundations that the member is speaking to.

9:10

Another issue that needs to be spoken about is the fact that not all fund-raising activities are clearly for the purpose of only raising dollars. There is an aspect called profile. A number of organizations want to find themselves on the map for a variety of reasons. They may be working on a new program. They may be trying to target a new market. They may be seeing an area where they have a niche that they want to speak to. So one of the reasons they hire a professional fund-raiser or go to a major campaign is not just the dollar return but the chance to have their name in the community. If I may, Mr. Chairman, one of those issues might require a significant amount of advertising. It might require particular promotional material to be developed. It might require some consultation in a public way, which is expensive to do when you're using that kind of process. The reason I raise that is that you may have to spend 60 or 70 percent of the dollars in order to achieve the profile that you were trying to establish as your primary goal.

So it's an important element in this debate of fund-raising and the protection of the citizens to understand that boards or foundations may have a different reason for contracting with the professional fund-raiser. I think that if you put those two elements together, it clarifies the reason why this amendment should be defeated. It is not a lack of accountability; it's a reflection of why we're involved in fund-raising or profile-raising

on behalf of foundations and the fact that the responsibility squarely sits with the organization that enters into those contracts.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm stricken by those remarks by the Member for Calgary-Curry to rise once again and dispute some of the comments that she has. She talked about the accountability process resting directly with the organization. There's no doubt that that's true: accountability ultimately does rest there. But in fact with the nature of volunteer organizations and particularly charitable organizations who rely completely, 100 percent, upon public dollars for their funding, to only have a report back perhaps and possibly on the basis of financial statements at the end of the year is simply not adequate enough. It's not timely enough, and it doesn't serve the purpose. So it puts the accountability aspect after the fact in serious jeopardy.

I see the member laughing. The nonprofit organizations that I've worked with over the years – and they are numerous and extensive – I would have to say that they would not find this a laughing matter. This is a very serious issue for them.

You talked about one of the chief objectives of the fund-raising organizations to be raising their name in the community as opposed to raising funds to meet their objective, to meet the desperate need that many of these nonprofit organizations are fulfilling in the community, particularly because this government will take no responsibility to provide some of those services that are very necessary and fundamental to the survival of people in this community. So I take great offence at this member saying that achieving profile, which is really a public relations exercise and not a fund-raising exercise, can be a serious mandate and therefore 60 or 70 or 80 percent of their funds should go to that purpose. I know many, many nonprofit organizations who will take great offence to those comments when we send them out to them, because they are simply trying to survive in this particular climate, this climate which has been actually ruined for fund-raising for nonprofit organizations by this government's stand with VLTs and their gambling agenda. They are placing unnecessary, unwanted, and unrealistic expectations on nonprofit organizations in this province, and I'm absolutely appalled that she would bring forward these kinds of concerns.

So, once again, I'm asking people to support this amendment on a very sound foundation basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-Curry and then Edmonton-Rutherford, if we're going back and forth. Yes, Calgary-Curry.

MRS. BURGNER: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. One of the interesting parts of committee is that issues get raised and they need to be clarified, and in committee you can do that.

Mr. Chairman, in one of my previous lives as a co-ordinator of public relations for a large corporation in the province of Alberta I had the opportunity to review hundreds and hundreds of solicitations for funds from a variety of organizations, nonprofit, major arts foundations: the whole gamut of the needs in the community from a fund-raising perspective. If you are going to make a choice about how you're going to donate and who you're going to donate to, the company or the individual has certain criteria that they would go through. A number of the

documentations one would receive have a clear statement in their proposal how funds will be recorded and how you may access that information. No corporation, company, individual, or community worth its salt would accept the request for funding without looking to see what the reporting process is. That is true accountability. If you want to have a valid place in the marketplace in that game where you're soliciting funds, clearly you put that in your material. If you go through the pro formas, if you go through the goals, if you go through where they're going to solicit funds from, you're going to go and read the information.

They're asking you for money. This is not something that you've decided to do that morning with nothing else on your plate. You go through that material, and if they do not have some reference to how and where you access the recorded information about what has been collected, how it's been disbursed, and how you can get that documentation, you're not going to risk your corporation's dollars or your organization's support. I think it's pretty clear that the way business is done in terms of charities is that information is requested and provided, not on a volunteer basis, as I would have you think it, but on a practical and sound business agreement, which is standard in almost all charitable donation requests.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you. I'm stunned by the comments I'm hearing from the government side. Mr. Chairman, you were at the same meeting that I was this morning when the Member for Calgary-Montrose gave a very impassioned speech on his role as a representative elected to protect people wanting fairness, not to protect the status quo. Although you and I didn't agree with him on that particular issue this morning, one has to admit that they were struck by his speech, which talked about fairness.

Mr. Chairman, here we're into a situation of who are we protecting? We're protecting the professional fund-raiser out there at the expense of who? The consumer, the contributor, the donor, the little guy out in the street there that gives \$5 or \$10 out of his pocket to a charity. What concern are we demonstrating for those people? Why are we so intent on protecting the boilermaker operations that are skimming off vast amounts of money from charitable fund-raising? And it's happening. If you've seen it from the other side where you've seen the financial statements that have been submitted, reality strikes. The Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan has unsuccessfully attempted to give the consumer just a wee bit of protection. Every time the member is getting shot down, and every time boilermakers throughout the province are applauding the actions of the government because you're playing right into their hands.

Mr. Chairman, there was no alternative with any ounce of concern for constituents, our constituents, that we would support this amendment and give something to this piece of legislation.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I simply have to comment briefly on the comments from Calgary-Currie again. In her comments she's talking about a specific constituency of charitable organizations. She's talking about a certain class of people who have resources at hand, who have paid staff, who have the ability and the time to process paperwork and access large amounts of dollars. Well, there are many more constituencies of charitable organizations in this province than large ones

like that. Many of them operate on the basis of collecting less than \$10,000 in goods and services and cash over the course of the year and provide invaluable services for those kinds of returns. For those people the reporting process as outlined here does, as my colleague states, protect the professional fund-raiser. It does not protect the people of the province, and it does not protect the charitable organization. We have to keep that constituency of small charitable organizations in mind when we're bringing forward any kind of legislation in that those constituencies rely heavily on volunteers. In the kind of environment that we live in in this province now which has been dictated by this government, we cannot place any undue stress or burden on those volunteers as the Member for Calgary-Currie so callously suggests that we do.

Thank you.

9:20

[Mr. Clegg in the Chair]

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Mr. Chairman, in speaking to my amendment once again and responding to the comments by the Member for Calgary-Currie, I would suggest that indeed she should have looked closely at the amendment, because what I heard coming from the hon. member was more to do with public relations. We have to acknowledge, and I've stated this before, that within the United States and even here in Alberta we have seen huge percentages of fund-raising going to the corporation. In fact, we saw 95 percent of an \$8.6 million charitable contribution that was raised go to the for-profit company.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when you're out there consulting with the charities, they're the first to acknowledge there has to be a code of ethics, and should questionable practices already identified by the sector – for example, percentage-based or commission-type contracts and shared ownership of donors' lists – be prohibited? Should agreements between charities and outside fund-raisers be made public? They're saying, "Yes, it should be made public." Now, there are two ways of doing this, and my preference would have been through the Bill, but acknowledging the comments that have been made from the government side, that's not going to be achieved, I believe, in Bill 15.

So I want to state once again that the charities out there are saying, "Indeed if we can't get this through Bill 15, then it's essential that it become a component of the regulations". I sincerely hope the government will fulfill that obligation and meet that commitment that's been made to the charities out there, that indeed it would allow the donors to be provided with full information about the incentives to employ good fund-raising practices and indeed what was in the contract with the for-profit company.

With those comments, Mr. Chairman, I would call the question on my amendment.

[Motion on amendment A4 lost]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to bring forward a further amendment. I will state it while it's being circulated, that section 1(1) be amended by adding the following after clause (h): "Minister' means the Minister of Justice."

Mr. Chairman, I'll withhold further comment until the amendment has been distributed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Hon. members, we have to cut the noise down here just a little bit while the amendment is being distributed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm having a great deal of problem with the conduct of the House this evening. I had acknowledged and stated my amendment. I've asked through the Chair that I would do the courtesy of waiting until the amendment had been distributed. I hear government members calling the question before they've even seen the amendment. That's how seriously they take Bill 15, Mr. Chairman. [interjections]

Chairman's Ruling Decorum

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, we have to keep it calm. Obviously, there were a lot of people asking for the question to be called, which was out of order when the hon. member had said that they're distributing the amendment. Now, hon. member, have you anything more to say? [interjections] Order.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Yes, I have a number of things to say, and the first thing I'd like to say, Mr. Chairman, is that for the minister of agriculture to say I should have distributed them earlier I find ironic. He should have been present when the government put forward their amendments all together without any previous notice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. Hon. member, we'll just hold procedure. If we're going to continue to yell, we're going to just hold the procedure up until we get some order in the House. That's as simple as that.

AN HON. MEMBER: How long can we yell?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Okay, hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I certainly am having some difficulty with the conduct in this House this evening. I thought that the rule of the House was that one person stood.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, the rule is that if you want to talk to somebody, you have to sit in a chair and talk quietly. Hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek, would you mind having a chair beside your friend? I know that you've left me. Hon. Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake, would you kindly take your chair?

MR. SEVERTSON: Yes, sir.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

Debate Continued

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This amendment, as I've stated, is after clause (h), "'Minister' means the Minister of Justice." This amendment, as I've stated, is being moved because the government has left it completely unclear

which minister will be empowered to administer this Act. The minister is given a great deal of power through regulation in how this Act will be applied. However, there certainly is no indication . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Carry on.

AN HON. MEMBER: Muriel, come on.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's a bit too much, you know.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, we are allowed to speak in here.

AN HON. MEMBER: And we're allowed to walk around too.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think a kindergarten would be better behaved, quite frankly. [interjections]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. Hon. member, continue please.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: The minister is given a great deal of power through regulation how this Act would be applied. However, there's no indication of which minister will have that power. Mr. Chairman, as the government hasn't defined that, I would put forward that the appropriate minister, because of the importance of Bill 15, would be the Minister of Justice.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Point of Order Decorum

MS LEIBOVICI: I'm rising on two points. One on a point of order with regards to the behaviour of this particular Assembly at this point in time, and then I would also like to address the amendment that's on the floor.

I look under *Beauchesne* 329, "Decorum in the House," as well as 333 in terms of "Interruptions of Members," that there are various items in here that deal with – and 334, "Other forms of interruption" in terms of what is acceptable as a form of interruption. I've sat here for at least the last five to 10 minutes watching the hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan trying to put across a point and trying to impress on the members opposite the importance of the issue. I can't think of anything more important than a Bill that doesn't indicate which minister is responsible for that Bill, yet the government members on the opposite side are interrupting, are being rude in their interruptions, are excessive in terms of the interruptions, are ignoring the requests from the Chair to sit and to keep some kind of decorum in this Legislative Assembly.

9:30

I think I've sat within this Assembly on a number of occasions where the Speaker has taken it upon himself to call a recess of five to 10 minutes so members can remember why they are in this Assembly. They're here to represent their constituents and to

keep some semblance of decorum in this Legislative Assembly. This is not a kindergarten, though I know that the members opposite don't believe in kindergarten. This is not a kindergarten. This is a place of business where conduct of a certain nature is required and is acceptable and is expected. I just find it unbelievable in terms of the behaviour that we're seeing at this point in time. I would hope that the Chair . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Citation.

MS LEIBOVICI: I have cited. Here we go again. It's interruptions. Rather than having the courage, rather than having the guts to stand up and make a point so it can be attributed to the member, the member will sit from a chair and shout. You know, I go back to the kindergarten analogy. A kindergarten and the conduct of individuals within a kindergarten are better than what I'm seeing in this Assembly at this point in time.

So I appreciate whatever ruling the Chair wishes to put forward. Thank you.

MR. WOLOSHYN: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman. Although I don't quite agree totally with the language used by the hon. member in terms of being provocative and descriptive of what is happening in the House, I certainly agree, however, that the noise level in here does impede the ability of the people speaking to get their point across and to be heard by interested members. I know a part of the problem. The noise is most likely emanating more from this side of the House, and that's simply due to the imbalance of numbers. Most of these chairs are filled. However, I will ask my colleagues to keep the noise level down and adhere to your directions so that we can get through the business of the evening.

On that note, Mr. Chairman, I do acknowledge that the hon. member does have a point of order.

MS LEIBOVICI: Thank you. I appreciate that. As a former teacher and principal I'm sure that the member is . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark certainly did bring up a good point, and I was glad that the government Whip did in fact suggest that she did have a point of order. It's very, very difficult, and I'm sitting in the middle of the room here. I like to be very lenient, but tonight is far beyond leniency. So unless we do get order in the House, I will have no choice but to call a recess till everybody can calm down. This is absolutely not called for. You can sit here and try and keep order, but if you don't get the co-operation from members, it's absolutely impossible to keep order. Now, we want to be reasonable in this chair, but we're not being reasonable when 10 people are talking and walking. There's nothing the matter with going and talking. I should be talking to this side too, because it's on both sides. This side tonight just happens to be maybe worse, but I've seen it the other way. The term "kindergarten" is a good analogy for what we have been acting like. So, please, I ask you to just calm down. We may not agree with each other maybe within government or opposition. That isn't the point. Every member of this House has an absolute right to talk. I will have no choice but to have a recess unless we have absolute order.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MS LEIBOVICI: Thank you for that ruling.

Debate Continued

MS LEIBOVICI: My comments will be very brief with regards to the amendment. I made the comments initially that I find it amazing that a Bill would be presented with ministerial responsibility within that Bill and no minister being assigned that responsibility. I would hope that if the Minister of Justice is not the appropriate minister, the government will provide us with that information, and if the Minister of Justice is the appropriate minister, then that that be included within the Act.

Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Macleod.

MR. COUTTS: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I have been very attentive, and I would just clarify, as was indicated in second reading, that consumer protection legislation comes under the Minister of Municipal Affairs and enforcement of our judicial system and law, as we make it here, comes under the Minister of Justice. I don't think I need to say anything more clear than that. My colleagues, I trust, have listened to the explanation of this amendment.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Mr. Chairman, certainly we were listening closely and attentively at second reading, and based on the statements once again by the member, I would assume then that you will support this amendment. I mean, why would you not clearly state it if that's the intent?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Motion on amendment A5 lost]

[The clauses of Bill 15 as amended agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported? Are you agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Opposed, if any?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Carried.

9:40

Bill 16

Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1995

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Leduc.

MR. KIRKLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We're dealing with Bill 16, first stop at Committee of the Whole. I have given Parliamentary Counsel two amendments. I would ask they be distributed at this time. I'll distribute them both at this time for the sake of expediency. I'll just wait for distribution of those two amendments before I start my comments, and I will keep my comments to a minimum here this evening.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. KIRKLAND: No, we won't call for the question just yet.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We'll just give the hon. member a minute or two. The pages are distributing the amendments.

MR. KIRKLAND: Mr. Chairman, most of those amendments are distributed at this point. So again to keep the business of the evening flowing as quickly as we can here, just as a bit of a preamble. The intention of Bill 16 was to create more autonomy for the Workers' Compensation Board, to remove it even further from the arm's-length operation it presently enjoys from the provincial government today. I have spoken at second reading to this Bill and indicated in principle that that particular philosophy is supported. However, there is a concern that by doing such, there is nothing enshrined in Bill 16 that will ensure that some of the voices that are so impacted by the Workers' Compensation Board will be heard, or I should say: will be provided with a voice to ensure that their interests are looked after. That comment is based more on the injured workers than any.

Now, looking at section 4 of the Workers' Compensation Act, what is being proposed by this amendment is that under (a.1) in subsection (1) we indicate that board members themselves – and there are nine – should be chosen by an open competition in concert with the Public Service Act itself. This is something that in essence, I understand, to some degree is followed. It is not written. I'm simply attempting to enshrine that with the autonomy that's being searched for with Bill 16. I think it's critical that we attempt to also ensure that we have the best people.

When you read further on down the first amendment that I'm proposing dealing with section 4, I'm also suggesting that section (a.2) strike out "the general public" and substitute "injured workers". The rationale of doing that is that presently there is nothing to enshrine that the injured workers will have a voice or a seat on that particular board. It is presently stated that the board shall be comprised of three representatives from the employer, three representatives as employees, and three members from the general public at large. The concern that has been conveyed to this side in our research is that there is nothing there to guarantee or ensure that the injured workers have clear representation on that board. As it is today, the government presently practises that there would be injured workers on that. In light of the fact that we're looking for more autonomy, this amendment would simply ensure that the injured workers have that seat, and it is critical, in my view, that they are entitled to it.

Now, in discussing this amendment with the Minister of Labour, we have looked at it quite closely, and in his wisdom he has suggested that we could improve upon that amendment. I would throw out what I am proposing so he can evaluate it and perhaps bring back an enhancement or an improvement of what I am suggesting here. So with those words you will understand what the intent of the amendment is.

The other amendment that's proposed under section 4 is adding a clause in the Bill, and that really is to strike out "the Lieutenant Governor in Council", who presently appoints the president of the board, and we're asking that the board itself make that choice. We felt that there should be a continuity between the board itself and that individual that's chosen for the presidency. Again, you look at the autonomy. If we have the Lieutenant Governor in Council appointing the president, that doesn't give that entire autonomy and remove it from the government, as we would like to see it achieved. So this last point of the amendment that I'm proposing here is that the board actually appoint the president.

With those comments I will take my seat and listen to some debate on the matter.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Very briefly, in support of the amendments brought forward by the Member for Leduc, I want to speak in favour and just make a couple of comments. The first amendment dealing with the structure of the board. If we look back to 1989, since I've been here, the injured workers basically have been crying out for a voice. One mechanism that was tried was to appoint one of the former spokesmen – possibly still a current spokesman for one of the injured worker groups – as a consultant. I think all of us here remember Terry Spencer. There were frustrations on his part in that he really didn't feel that he carried the clout that was necessary trying to represent the concerns of injured workers as a consultant with the board. The board then did appoint on a voluntary basis an injured worker from southern Alberta. I had the opportunity to meet him. But that was done as a voluntary gesture by the board, by the minister, whatever the case may be. It wasn't in legislation, so it didn't ensure that the injured worker was being represented at that decision-making level. So that is important. That is the reason why I concur with that particular amendment.

Then the other amendment dealing with the procedure for placing the president of the board. I think it's sort of a given, wherever possible, to hold a competition. When that is enshrined in legislation to ensure that process occurs, I think it makes for a much healthier, much more productive method and results in a better end result.

So on those notes I'll conclude, just adding that I would hope that the minister does take these amendments very seriously. Even if there are some minor tune-ups to them, so be it. The intent of the amendments is most noble.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, what I'd like to do at this point in looking at the amendment and in discussion with the Member for Leduc – first of all, I'd like to let all members know that all the comments made and the input to date on this particular Bill I have responded to in writing. Each member opposite should have the full correspondence – if it's not on your desk today, it will be tomorrow – my response to the points that were raised at second reading, where I believe the Bill does address this. Just as an example – and it is easy to miss it because of the way Bills are written sometimes, with amending, repealing, and subsections – if I can direct you to page 2 of the Bill, section 4(1), that is the intent of the Bill: that the board of directors indeed "shall select and appoint a person to be the President of the Board" for the very reasons enunciated by the two members opposite. That is accommodated within the Bill.

What I'd like to do is have all members look at those types of explanations which I did send out. If you don't have it today, you'll have it tomorrow. On the amendments themselves I want to work with the member opposite, if I can, to address the situation of injured workers actually on the board, because in fact there are two injured workers on the board right now. I know the member is concerned that some component of representation of injured workers be maintained and perhaps actually the policy be enshrined in legislation. So if I can look at that and get back, I will do that.

Therefore, I would move – because I want to come back with responses to that – adjournment of debate on Bill 16 at this point, and I will get back to the member here in committee the next time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: A motion is on the floor from the Government House Leader that we adjourn debate on Bill 16. Are you in favour of that motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Opposed, if any? Carried.

9:50

Bill 20
Electoral Boundaries Commission
Amendment Act, 1995

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Minister of Justice and Attorney General, do you want to make some remarks?

MR. EVANS: Not right now.

MR. KIRKLAND: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the hon. Member for Fort McMurray I sent you some amendments to Bill 20, and again I would ask that the pages be given a few minutes to distribute them just so all members have it before them. The amendment itself is very brief. Again I will give the House assurance that we'll not spend a lot of time debating the particular issue. It is a rather important amendment that's being distributed at this particular point.

There has been some discussion on Bill 20 in the past. I would have to admit to the House that this is my first introduction to Bill 20, as I was not present during the last debate. I have not had an opportunity today to read all the comments to date. As I quickly skimmed the Bill, I would suggest that what I'm looking at is the composition of the committee. I believe that is what the largest concern was in one and all's mind. I would suggest, as I look at it, that I would commend the government for bringing forth a Bill that appears to be well balanced as far as the committee formulation or composition is concerned that would actually evaluate the Electoral Boundaries Commission Amendment Act, 1995.

The amendment is now before everyone, Mr. Chairman, and I would move it, as I indicated, on behalf of the hon. Member for Fort McMurray. That amendment would read this way: that section 10 be amended in section 13 by striking out "83" and substituting "65". Now, in essence, what that does is suggest that we have 65 constituencies within Alberta as opposed to 83. I can recall some debate that has gone on in this House in the previous session whereby there were comparisons done between Manitoba and B.C., and when you look at a per capita basis, Alberta seems to be overrepresented by MLAs.

Now, when we look at the government of the day, we also know that they certainly are very bent on attempting to find fiscal efficiencies within government and savings of dollars. The thought behind this amendment of reduction of MLAs, of course, is a reduction of costs associated with government. So I would ask all members to look at it in that light. It fits the philosophy of the side opposite very well, I would suggest, because, as I indicated, it is based solely on fiscal reduction, expenditure reduction by the government and thereby savings to the taxpayer. That is the entire essence of that particular amendment.

I won't belabour the fact that Alberta has more MLAs than B.C. and Saskatchewan, I believe, on a per capita basis, if my

memory serves me correctly. We also on a per capita basis have more MLAs and greater representation than the province of Ontario.

With those comments, Mr. Chairman, I would ask all members to look at the amendment in the vein of fiscal efficiency. That is in essence what it is all about. Now, I know that such an amendment would mean that some of us would be looking for jobs because a reduction of constituencies would of course also mean that there will be fewer of us sitting in this House next time around. I don't have a particular fear with that aspect of it. I know some in the House may. Don't be concerned about the potential of giving up your job if it's for the betterment of Albertans. It will save dollars. I don't think that's an arguable point. I indicated that it is very much in line with the philosophy of the side opposite, and I would like to see them look at that amendment in that particular vein and give it serious consideration.

Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise to support this amendment. There's no doubt that by dividing Alberta into 65 proposed electoral divisions rather than the 83 we currently have, we are in line with the Bill we presented, Bill 201, in 1994 making that request. Given the fiscal policy of this government, I'd be very surprised if they once again voted this down, because there is no doubt that there would be significant cost savings associated with this, and we have to take that into consideration. Yes, some MLAs would no longer have jobs, but I think, as my colleague mentioned, that when you're talking about the greater good of the public, that has to be the first consideration.

In previous debates there have been issues raised by a number of MLAs about the concerns they have about being able to meet the needs of rural constituents because of the size of the constituencies that they have to drive within and the distance between towns and communities. Now, I think all of those concerns have been adequately addressed in previous discussion here in the House, and they should also be eliminated when we take a look at the intent of this Bill, which is to set up independent people to review the division of electoral boundaries. I'm sure that government members would be happy to actually trust an independent review, which would be two members of the commission appointed by the opposition and two members appointed by the Premier and the chair to be appointed by cabinet. Then we see that those needs, those requirements, of rural MLAs will be adequately compensated for with this kind of a review. So that eliminates basically the biggest concern that has ever been addressed in terms of reducing the number of constituencies. When we take a look at the federal divisions or the municipal divisions in this province, it seems to be completely irrational that we have 83 MLAs in the province. So surely we have to take that into consideration when we're addressing this amendment.

I would urge all MLAs on both sides of the House to be fiscally responsible, as we are being, and to support this amendment.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

MR. HENRY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I just want to speak in support of the amendment. It occurs to me when I look at the amendment that it's really in line with many of the measures proposed by the current government and governments

generally in terms of consolidation and in terms of being able to provide the most effective service the most efficiently at the cheapest dollar.

Mr. Chairman, there have been comments that we could not go down to 65 MLAs because we would have constituencies that would be too large. All we have to do is compare with federal ridings, and we know that that's not true. Arguments about why this wouldn't work in rural Alberta – there are equal arguments why it wouldn't work for urban Alberta. But I think the public is crying out, crying out very loudly, for leadership, and this is a way that we cannot just focus on the negatives – and we know members on the other side focus too much on the negative – but focus on something positive for Albertans and show some leadership.

If I can be allowed to stray very briefly from the actual amendment, Mr. Chairman, a couple of comments on the Bill. The last time I spoke on this Bill, at second reading, I gave a bit of a history lesson. I won't go through that again, but I just want to point out my concern with the new section 2, which basically allows the Lieutenant Governor in Council to appoint anybody they want rather than more clearly defining. We're going to have to trust that we don't have a commission that is stacked for one side or another.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to point out that there is a weakness, I believe, in the piece of legislation – and I'll point it out without making an amendment – in that there is a start date for the commission but there isn't a finish date for the commission. There isn't a report date for the commission. I think that can be left up to abuse by future governments. It also leaves the public up in the air. So what could happen is that if we pass this on July 1, the Lieutenant Governor in Council in consultation with the opposition and others could appoint a commission, and that commission could decide to take four, five, or six months before they get their act together to actually report. We know the government wouldn't want to proceed with legislative changes to the boundaries until they had that report. What would happen if that committee diddled around a little bit and we didn't get a report until March of next year? The government, rightfully, would say, "Let's take some time to draft the legislation from the report," and we may not see it until the fall of 1996, if then. I think that's a real weakness in this piece of legislation.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would urge all members to support this fiscally responsible amendment and to provide leadership for Albertans, letting them know that it's not just agencies of government and it's not just services and funded agencies and government departments that we want to become more efficient and consolidate and do more with less but that we here are willing to do the same.

Thank you.

10:00

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, just speaking to the amendment briefly. It's an interesting item, and it's something that was addressed on the last Electoral Boundaries Commission actually when I was a member of the all-party committee that set up the guidelines for the last Electoral Boundaries Commission. When this question was discussed, it was interesting to see that it depended where you were in the province in terms of the response that you got in asking for the number of electoral divisions to be reduced. Typically, in anything that might be classified as rural

Alberta, which would not be Edmonton or Calgary, the concerns – and I won't go into great detail on them – were that constituencies, especially so-called rural constituencies, are very large.

Many MLAs in the past, before school boards were combined, have had multiple school boards, multiple hospitals, different municipalities to deal with. Add to that the time and distance factor. Many people here in the Assembly may be able to travel across their constituency in four minutes, six minutes, and for others in this Assembly they could travel for four or six hours to get across their constituency. Added to that is, as I've already indicated, in for instance Edmonton or Calgary or to a degree somewhere like Red Deer – Red Deer is somewhat different and special because it also has a rural component, Red Deer-North and Red Deer-South. In Edmonton, for instance, where there would be 18 or 19 MLAs, depending if you're talking before or after the last electoral boundary change, and in Calgary approximately the same number, you can have a group of MLAs speaking on behalf of one school board or speaking on behalf of one particular issue, and that's not always the case as you move out of the large urban centres. You have situations where you have one MLA and one MLA only, one voice speaking for possibly one school board, one municipal district, one improvement district, and the area, and the whole question of effective representation is very key.

In my own constituency in Red Deer a recent newsletter was sent around to every household, some 28,000 constituents. I asked a number of questions, and one was this very one of should the number of seats be reduced, a brief explanation on the issue and then asking constituents themselves: should we reduce this? I broke the question into two parts, asking: should the number of MLAs be reduced all over the province, and should the number of MLAs in Red Deer be reduced?

There were somewhere between 300 and 400 responses mailed back, which is indicative of interest. The response was interesting because on the question of should the number of MLAs across the province be reduced, it was about 60-40 in favour of that, saying yes, the number across the province should be reduced. Then on the question should the number of MLAs in Red Deer be reduced from two to one, the majority said no, they should not be reduced. To me that really crystalized the issue that individual constituents do not want to have less representation but they don't mind if some other constituency has less representation. So it shows that what is really key here is that the constituents need to feel they have effective representation and access to their MLA.

I appreciate the concerns being addressed by the amendment. We do know there's been considerable population increase in the number of years through the '80s and into the '90s, yet there has been no increase in the number of MLAs. There have been suggestions that in certain areas the number of MLAs be increased, but the overall sentiment in the province is that this indeed should not be so. So on the basis of that, of what I personally heard going around the province on the all-party committee, which would be about three or four years ago now, and what I'm hearing from my constituents that in fact they do not want the number of MLAs to be reduced in Red Deer, I have to give ear to that and to the factors I've already talked about. The population has increased. Certainly issues are on the increase, and yet there has been no increase in MLAs, nor are we advocating an increase in MLAs. We feel that as with so many other sectors, we have an increased workload and we simply bear that and deal with it the same way as the private sector is dealing with it and in fact the same way as the public sector is dealing with it in so many areas. For all of those reasons, I am sensitive to the

concern raised by this, and yet listening to my constituents, I feel I will have to withhold my vote on that particular issue.

[Motion on amendment A1 lost]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I believe that the Minister of Justice has distributed an amendment to Bill 20. The Minister of Justice.

MR. EVANS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. If members of the committee will recall, at second reading in the Assembly I did mention that I'd be introducing these two minor amendments that are on the one page. If members will refer to Bill 20, you'll see that under section 2(1)(a), there are a number of enumerated offices that are potential chairs for the Electoral Boundaries Commission. Under 2(1)(a)(i) and (ii) we've named two of the legislative offices. In reviewing this further, I felt that it was more appropriate to name all of the legislative offices. That results in the first part of the amendment, so that we would strike out section 2(1)(a)(i) and (ii) and substitute the following as (i):

the Auditor General, the Ombudsman, the Ethics Commissioner, the Information and Privacy Commissioner or the Chief Electoral Officer,

We then, of course, renumber the other categories.

Then to be consistent with that position, if members would go across to the next page in section 2(2), "The Chief Electoral Officer is to provide advice, information and assistance to the Commission." We've made another suggested change so that we would say, "The Office of the Chief Electoral Officer" in the event that the Chief Electoral Officer himself or herself were to be appointed as the chair of the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

I think those changes are quite self-evident, and I think that a brief explanation is sufficient, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that hon. members would agree to these amendments.

Thank you.

10:10

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora.

MR. SAPERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I recall when the Minister of Justice made the commitment to look at the chairmanship of the commission, and I commend him for taking action on that and bringing forward this amendment. Of course, it addresses the concerns put forward by my colleague from Edmonton-Glengarry, who I think expressed very well the concerns about a judicial appointment in that position. Certainly there's a lot of confidence in the legislative offices and the officers appointed to those positions.

I'm particularly pleased with the wording of the amendment, because the amendment, in my mind, makes it clear that the government may be rethinking its position on forcing the collapse of the Ethics Commissioner and the Information and Privacy Commissioner into one. The amendment is very clear that one of the following,

the Auditor General, the Ombudsman, the Ethics Commissioner, the Information and Privacy Commissioner or the Chief Electoral Officer

may be appointed. So I take this as encouragement that the government may be rethinking its amendment to the freedom of information and privacy Act and has, in fact, rethought some of the flaws that are in the current Bill 19. I certainly hope that's

what this indicates and would look forward to the debate on that Bill when those amendments come back before the Assembly.

I will be voting in support of this particular amendment as introduced by the Minister of Justice.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Barrhead-Westlock.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, this amendment I guess members of this Assembly were alerted to in second reading of Bill 20 when the Minister of Justice did mention in his overview comments that he would probably be bringing forward an amendment that would allow a provision for the Chief Electoral Officer to be a member of the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

Under Bill 20 under section 2(1) there are two legislative officers who are listed as potential appointees to this particular commission, one the Ethics Commissioner and the other one the Auditor General. Section 2 also, though, does provide another clause in it that would very clearly allow anybody of similar category to be appointed where in section (v)

a person whose stature and qualifications are, in the opinion of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, similar to those of the persons referred to in subclauses (i) to (iv).

Lawmaking, of course, should be succinct and precise and should not be redundant and unnecessary. I, frankly, made the comments during second reading that I thought it was most inappropriate for the individual appointed to be an independent overseer of the electoral process in the province of Alberta, in this case the Chief Electoral Officer, to somehow be involved in a review of the electoral boundaries in the province of Alberta.

There are certain individuals who are responsible to the Legislative Assembly, not to the government, not to the opposition, but to the Legislature itself. There's an all-party committee called the Legislative Offices Committee which oversees and overviews the workings of these independent officers. Now what we're doing with this particular amendment is allowing the provision for one of these independent officers, the Chief Electoral Officer, to be appointed to this particular commission not as an adviser but even with the potential of being the chairman of the committee. I think that is wrong. I think that leaves us fraught with danger, and I think that leads us to some difficulties, the possibility of some certain difficulties occurring.

Bill 20, the way it reads under section 2(5), allows a possible appointment. The amendment makes it much more likely that such an appointment will occur, and I believe that would be a disservice to democracy in the province of Alberta in the 1990s. I believe very strongly that the Chief Electoral Officer should provide advice, should provide information, should provide assistance to the commission but should not be a fully functioning member of the commission and most certainly not be in a position to be the chairman of the commission. Mr. Chairman, when you also see the potential for even the Ethics Commissioner to be put in that kind of position, I think the Legislature would be making a very wrong decision to put either one of those people in that kind of a position and hope for independence and hope for complete independence of everything with respect to the elections in the province of Alberta and the drawing up of certain boundaries.

So I know that it's my good friend and colleague the Minister of Justice who's proposing the amendment, but I, for one, will be voting against this amendment primarily because I do not believe on a point of principle that the Chief Electoral Officer should be a member or even have the potential to be a member of the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

MS LEBOVICI: If I may just ask a question of the hon. Minister of Justice in terms of the rationale, if he can refresh my memory, for the amendment to include the office of the Chief Electoral Officer.

[Mr. Tannas in the Chair]

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MS LEBOVICI: Well, I'm not sure if the Minister of Justice heard or has chosen to ignore the question. The question is whether you could refresh our memories as to the rationale for putting into the legislation now the position of the Chief Electoral Officer as a potential chair of the commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. EVANS: Yeah, I'm happy to comment on that. Thanks, Mr. Chairman. As has been mentioned, if you take a look at section 2(1)(a)(v) at the bottom, we're talking about any person whose stature and qualifications are, in the opinion of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, similar to . . . persons referred to [above].

That's very much an umbrella clause for individuals who have stature and capacity to carry out such a significant function as the chairman of the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

Under the draft that you see before you, we had highlighted two of the legislative offices: the Ethics Commissioner and the Auditor General. There are other legislative offices, and it was brought to my attention that we were excluding some by specifically referring to others. Because this is not mandatory – this is a list of possibilities – I thought it was more appropriate to include all of the leg. offices in that category, which, again, is not a mandatory category. This is a possible category from which the Lieutenant Governor in Council could appoint a chair. That is the sum total of the justification for it: to have a number of different possibilities for the chair. I've already agreed that a couple of the leg. offices would be appropriate as a possibility. In considering the other leg. offices, I could see no reason to exclude any of the others from that same category. So I thought we'd be all-encompassing.

MS LEBOVICI: But if I may . . .

10:20

THE CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, do you wish to speak?

MS LEBOVICI: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. You're normally recognized, first, and then you begin. Anyway, Edmonton-Meadowlark has made it clear that she would like to speak on this.

MS LEBOVICI: I respectfully request further clarification on that, because when I look at the Bill as originally proposed and the original intent of the Bill, it's very clear under section 2(2) that "the Chief Electoral Officer is to provide advice, information and assistance." Now, unless there was a clear mistake in terms of the drafting of the Bill, the intent was that the Chief Electoral Officer would be the resource person, which I think is appropriate, so that's why he would have been excluded from the outlining. I understand the rationale that says, "Okay; we've talked about some of the legislative officers; let's include the others,"

but there's a very specific reason to exclude, following on the Member for Barrhead-Westlock, the position of Chief Electoral Officer from the possibility of being chair of the commission. Your answer did not really, with due respect, address that issue.

MR. EVANS: There was very clearly – and you're quite correct, hon. member – an intention when this Bill was drafted that the Chief Electoral Officer would be providing assistance, because I think it is important to have that connection. Again, when we considered that perhaps any leg. office chair could serve in the position of chair of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, we thought: "Well, all right; that's fine. We will then make a second amendment to the Bill." That's incorporated on this same page. It says: "The Office of the Chief Electoral Officer" will provide those kinds of advice. That could still occur, if the Chief Electoral Officer were not the chairman, through the Chief Electoral Officer himself or herself. If the Chief Electoral Officer were appointed as the chair, then the office would still provide that same amount of, as it's described here, "advice, information and assistance to the Commission."

I'm admitting to you that originally it was intended as the Bill reads: that the Chief Electoral Officer would be providing assistance rather than being a member of the commission. But upon reflection it was felt that all leg. officers who serve in the position of chair of leg. committees could and should have the ability in the appropriate circumstances, if the Lieutenant Governor in Council felt it was appropriate, to serve as the chairman of the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

MS LEBOVICI: If I may, and really I'm not trying to be difficult. I'm trying to understand whether the minister feels that there may not be a potential for conflict of interest with the Chief Electoral Officer actually being chair or a member of this particular commission, if that's not a concern. When I listen to what the Member for Barrhead-Westlock had to say, it was a very compelling argument, and I would like to understand where the minister is coming from with respect to that particular issue.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I don't have in front of me this evening the list that gives the breakdown of other jurisdictions in Canada, but there are other jurisdictions in Canada where the Chief Electoral Officer is a member of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. I have no information whatsoever to indicate that that has ever been challenged as a conflict of interest, and certainly it's never been challenged in the province of Alberta because the Act as it currently reads provides for the Chief Electoral Officer to be a member of the commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to follow up on the points raised by the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark. The amendment as proposed adds to the list of legislative officers two more legislative officers, one that has yet to be hired or created.

AN HON. MEMBER: Vote it down.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yeah, that's what I intend to do. One is the Information and Privacy Commissioner, and the other one is the Chief Electoral Officer. Now, with respect to the issue of a possible conflict of interest, a subsequent section, section 8.1, says

that "if there is no majority, the report of the chair is the report of the Commission." So conceivably under this amendment you could have the Chief Electoral Officer as the chairman of the commission writing the report and implementing the entire thing by himself or herself, which is clearly a conflict of interest.

So this amendment that is being put before us is entirely inappropriate and for that reason should be defeated. I would encourage my colleagues, therefore, to defeat this.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We have before us the government amendment to Bill 20 known as A2 amending section 2.

[Motion on amendment A2 lost]

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: In dealing again with the specific details, I do want to pose a question to the Minister of Justice, and that deals with page 5: "Section 16(a) is repealed and the following substituted: the requirement for effective representation . . ." I know that this is a question near and dear to the heart of the Member for Calgary-Foothills because I heard her ask this question many times. So my question to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General is: can he define for us what is the requirement for effective representation? What is meant by the words "effective representation?"

MR. EVANS: I know, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Calgary-North West has his tongue firmly in his cheek when he asks the question, because I know how closely the hon. member followed the legal arguments on the issue of effective representation. I know that he is well aware that the Supreme Court of Canada has said that what we are striving for is not absolute parity; we are striving for effective representation. It is determined by analysis of each and every electoral division, taking into consideration a number of factors if there is to be other than one person, one vote. A number of those factors are as stated in the current section 16, such as

- (b) sparsity and density of population,
- (c) common community interests and community organizations . . .
- (c.1) wherever possible, the existing community boundaries within the cities . . .
- (c.2) wherever possible, the existing municipal boundaries,
- (d) the number of municipalities and other . . . authorities,
- (e) geographical features, including existing road systems, and
- (f) the desirability of understandable and clear boundaries.

All of those factors and many others that may come up in an analysis of constituency by constituency, Mr. Chairman, create effective representation and define effective representation. No more could you have effective representation for any two constituencies than you could have us believe that two constituencies would be identical. There are no two identical constituencies. What we must do as legislators is ensure that Albertans are entitled to effective representation. The courts have said there are a number of factors that we must look at, and that's what we are giving as a direction to our Electoral Boundaries Commission: to determine what is effective representation.

10:30

MR. BRUSEKER: I do have one more question, Mr. Chairman. I understand what the minister is saying with respect to the

definition of effective representation, as he's given it to us, that leads up to what I would call fair distribution of the representation. How do the constituencies get created, and how do we ensure that there are MLAs that are equally distributed across the province? If I may describe it this way, I think what the minister has described is how we get to the point where we draw boundaries, create constituencies, and then go into an election. I think effective representation then also includes what happens after the election occurs, which is also part of it. In other words, how does the constituent in his or her constituency, wherever they may be across the province, ensure that he or she is effectively represented and equally represented in this Legislature? Has that been considered or addressed in this piece of legislation at all, or is it simply the distribution of constituencies? Is that what the minister is talking about?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's not absolute. That's the point I'm trying to make. It is not an absolute. You might have two situations, where you've taken a number of factors from constituency A and a number of factors from constituency B and you've found that there is a 5,000 people difference between the two constituencies. That would be effective representation, given the number of factors that are taken into account. It is at best an educated calculation as to how effective a representative can be in making sure that he or she is available to the people who live within those constituencies.

Now, after the election, hon. member, you're saying, "Well, how can we assure that that happens?" I think all members of this House, on both sides of this House, do the best that they can to represent their constituents well. We may not all work the same number of hours; we may not all do the same things that others do to effectively represent our constituents. It is then not up to us and it is not up to the Electoral Boundaries Commission but, rather, it is up to those electors to communicate with their MLA if they do not feel that they are being effectively represented. Those comments will come back to this Legislature, I'm confident, through the representatives.

Now, all of us face the same kind of challenges in a growing Alberta with more technology and demands on our time, but I believe that today we as 83 elected representatives are effectively representing our constituents. I believe the electoral boundaries that went through the electoral process in 1993 are realistic as they now stand in Alberta. Of course, our Court of Appeal agreed with that and said that they would not eliminate those boundaries and overturn the election. I believe the people who are here will continue to represent those areas well. Even though there are changes in the demographics of constituencies, there are changes in the populations, they will effectively represent their constituents until the new electoral boundaries are in place. Then we will have that same kind of an electoral process and MLAs working hard for their constituents.

That's what it comes down to, hon. member, in the final analysis: working hard for your constituents, not in an absolute sense that everyone works the same but relating well to your constituents and having the degree of satisfaction that returns you to a seat here in the Legislature after the next election.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, just to follow up on effective representation. As the hon. Member for Calgary-North West well knows from being involved in this in the last go-round, one of the biggest questions that was left outstanding was the definition of effective representation. In fact, one of the recommendations

from the electoral boundaries Act the last time was that it be defined as to what effective representation was. That was prompted because right across the country in every jurisdiction there were challenges as to the definition of effective representation. As the hon. Minister of Justice has alluded to, it is different in every location and riding, and clearly there need to be some sort of parameters put around it. That was one of the top recommendations that came out of the last go-round.

I really do think it's important that that be tied into this process, because I know the last time we looked at this, that was the question that was always left outstanding for us and made it very difficult for opinions to come down. I think it is important that hopefully we can encourage other jurisdictions to also come forward with some form of a definition on that, on effective representation, because no one needs continual challenge and uncertainty within the electorate as to which jurisdictions will be in place and which will not. It's very costly, and it's very disruptive for the people that we all represent in this Legislature.

So I would also support what Calgary-North West has said, and hopefully that definition will come out this time and will be quite clear, and we can go forward.

[The clauses of Bill 20 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported? Are you agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried.

Bill 5 Public Health Amendment Act, 1995

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake.

MS CALAHASEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to open debate on Bill 5 in committee stage. I want to thank the members of the opposition, first of all, for all their questions. I believe some of the questions that were asked were excellent ones, and I will try my best to attempt to answer them. To the others, I'd also like to say thanks for the bouquets that they sent our way in terms of what we're doing with the Bill. I think there are times when they do recognize on occasion that we are doing something to help Albertans, and I just want to give a little plug to them tonight.

I'm certain that northern and rural Albertans will be thankful when they read that the principles of the Bill were supported. I believe they'll thank us all as legislators when we pass this through committee. I know they're watching with great interest as we move the Bill along.

As I read and reread the questions that were coming from the opposition members, I just want to highlight some of the concerns that were expressed and maybe alleviate the concerns that were brought forward during second reading.

There were questions from the Member for Leduc and of course the Member for Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert and the Member for Edmonton-Rutherford. They raised a number of questions. The biggest question I think was: what medical procedures will be performed by registered nurses providing extended health services? Well, basically what we're trying to do is that the registered nurses will focus on the health of communi-

ties while providing entry level treatment, with referral and access to emergency services when needed. These RNs will be able to carry out health assessment at an advanced level, order and perform screening and diagnostic tests – such things as pap smears and checking for the cause of infection – diagnose and treat the common disorders which affect children and adults, and access ground and air ambulance and other emergency services. These are presently the ones we're working under, and I know that we're looking at how we can be able to increase the guidelines. I'm going to table this tonight so that you have copies of it.

10:40

The second question was: which geographic areas will registered nurses providing extended health services be practising in? In my preamble at second reading I indicated there were two areas presently that the Minister of Health has indicated are okay to go ahead, and one of the two projects is the northern communities project. That project covers Loon Lake, Peerless Lake, Red Earth Creek, and Trout Lake, and of course the Rainbow Lake community health project and northwestern health services region. I know that concern was expressed.

The third question was from Leduc, Edmonton-Rutherford, and Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert. This one had to do with what training registered nurses providing standard health services will receive. Again, in my opening remarks on second reading I had indicated that Athabasca University will be helping develop these courses. The U of A had this program on at one point, and nurses were trained under that. We hope that could be continued as we go, but I know there's going to be a lot of discussion relative to that as we go. I know Athabasca University is really looking forward to doing this program, and I think they'll do an excellent job. Of course, I believe the northern universities are always open to whatever needs to be done and to changes.

The fourth concern was also expressed by members from Leduc, Edmonton-Rutherford, Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert, Calgary-Buffalo, and Edmonton-Mayfield that the Bill had too many gaps to be filled in by the regulations. I guess that was the biggest issue when I look at that. These guidelines for registered nurses and advanced nursing practices providing primary health care services under service communities in Alberta were developed by the Working Group for Registered Nurses in Advanced Nursing Practice in Rural/ Remote Communities. This is the one the basis of the regulations are now drawn from, and as I said, I'll table it. Then, also in meeting with many organizations that have been involved in drafting this working document, we will continue to work with them to make sure we deal with the issues they brought forward. I know that we'll continue to work on this. This is a working document. It's not a static document. Therefore a committee will be drawn up to be able to look at this in all contexts so that we can address the concerns that have been expressed by members opposite.

There was an issue brought forward relative to the services. I know it has been addressed as much as possible in my preamble as well, as I said tonight. With that I will table this for your information. If you do not want to wait until the tabling comes, you can call Alberta Health and they'll be ready to provide you with this.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question has been called.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora.

MR. SAPERS: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. The government is to be commended for bringing this amendment to the Public Health Act forward and the Member for Lesser Slave Lake in particular for all the work she's done in terms of meeting with stakeholder groups. I've had an opportunity myself to review in detail the impact of this Bill with the stakeholder groups and in particular have met with representatives of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the AMA, the AARN, UNA, and other groups, pharmacy professionals, et cetera. There is general agreement that alternative health service delivery initiatives are necessary. There is general agreement that underserved communities need to be able to access health services in innovative ways. There is general agreement that we need to better utilize our health care professionals, particularly in northern and remote regions, but there was also some concern . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: I think, perhaps, hon. member we'll just take a moment's break while everyone gets a chance. By the way, this amendment is proposed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora to . . .

MR. SAPERS: I haven't actually moved on to the amendment yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: I beg your pardon, then. I thought you had started on it.

MR. SAPERS: Not yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then continue on, and when you reach that point, I'll interrupt you again.

MR. SAPERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The underserved communities, particularly in the north, are looking forward to being able to access health services from nurses that have the ability to act in an expanded capacity. I note that Peerless Lake, Loon Lake, Trout Lake, Red Earth Creek, other areas particularly in the northwestern region of the province have been anxiously awaiting this amendment. In fact, there are many nurse practitioners already working and guidelines that have been in place.

Some of the concerns expressed by people in those communities and by some of the health professionals that I have consulted with since this Bill was introduced to the Legislature have been in three general areas, and they're all areas that are to be addressed by regulation. Now, I certainly understand the importance of having the stakeholder groups and the user groups involved in the formulation of those regulations. I know the draft regulations in fact have been distributed to some stakeholders, but they certainly haven't been distributed to all members of the Assembly. I understand that it's desirable to have input from the people whom the regulations will have an impact on while those regulations are being drafted.

In the areas of concern I think the Bill could have been improved in fact if issues such as training and standards for the nurse practitioners were included perhaps in the legislation, conditions of employment, the relationship the nurse practitioners will have with the regional health authorities as their employers, whether or not they'll be direct employees or under contract, whether or not the nurses that will have the expanded practice will work directly for physicians or not, and the fact that the Bill itself speaks to no particular restriction in terms of geographic area of practice. The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake of course did speak to a couple of specific projects limited in geography where

nurse practitioners with expanded duties would be allowed to work. So there are concerns expressed that perhaps it should say in the legislation that nurse practitioners should not be restricted to just one part of the province, that in fact nurses doing expanded duties should be able to practice anywhere in the province.

Now, the nervousness about leaving these items just to regulation, particularly with the regulations being something that no debate will ever be entered into on, is I think quite understandable. This Bill has been far too long in coming. There has been far too much effort and work put in by government members, by opposition members, and by the stakeholder groups to jeopardize what I think will be the true benefit of this Bill. The unfortunate part of Bill 5, like so much other government legislation that we're seeing, is that it's a bit of a shell. It's a great idea. It leaves all of the guts, the meat of the Bill, if you will, to regulation. I think there is so much public interest, there is so much public concern in this Bill and what it is trying to accomplish that this Bill and the regulations that will flow from it deserve full public debate and full public scrutiny and full public input. It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to move an amendment to Bill 5, and I believe that this amendment was partially distributed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Edmonton-Glenora. This is the amendment to 6.1 that deals with section 75. Would you care now, since all have it, to comment further before I call on Lesser Slave Lake for her comments?

10:50

MR. SAPERS: Yes. If the amendment's been circulated to all members, Mr. Chairman, I'll just speak very briefly to the amendment. I think the intent is self-evident. It would amend section 75 by adding two subsections. The net impact of these two subsections would be to require that no regulations come into force until the Standing Committee on Law and Regulations has reviewed the proposed regulations and reported same to the Assembly.

As I was saying, this Bill speaks to a broad base of public interest and concern. There have probably been few other Bills that have been so long in coming, and it would be a shame to not take the process full circle. This is a very straightforward amendment. I think it would be consistent with the time line the government has. It wouldn't preclude stakeholder consultations. I think it would properly involve all Albertans and all Members of the Legislative Assembly in the debate on the implementation of this Bill.

MS CALAHASEN: Mr. Chairman, just a comment on the amendment. I know that the intentions are good, and I want to commend the Member for Edmonton-Glenora for his work in putting this together. However, I believe the system that we have and we're continuing to hold together which is using the stakeholders who know the issues that have to be dealt with, putting them in a committee to look at revising and continuing to work on the regulations is the best way to go rather than we doing it here. That was a recommendation that was brought forward by all the stakeholders I've met. I think this is an important . . .

Chairman's Ruling Decorum

THE CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, it's getting more and more difficult to hear the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake. I wonder if we could go into a whisper mode so that we may hear Lesser Slave Lake and not force her to strain her voice and use our ears.

Lesser Slave Lake.

Debate Continued

MS CALAHASEN: Thank you. Just to continue, Mr. Chairman. I believe that we intend to carry it out in the way that the midwifery regulations were developed. That's basically a similar route that we want to carry on with the regulations with this specific Bill. The stakeholders are in a better position to know what needs to be done, the scope of practice that could be carried out, and I believe that they're in a better position to be able to do this. So that's why I can't support the amendment that's coming forward.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While I support the intent of this Bill, I have to say that I wholeheartedly support my colleague's amendment that will be brought forward here on this Bill. There's no doubt that when we see a Bill come forward which only provides a framework and then we see a further tabling where the regulations provided are not binding and only presented as a working document, we have to have some degree of concern about not only the timing of this Bill having been brought forth but concern for the haste in which this Bill has been brought forward without due attention to the regulations and the entire ramifications that are brought forward here.

When you see an amendment which is simply asking for the Standing Committee on Law and Regulations to review the proposed regulations and report to the Assembly – it's a very harmless amendment. I mean, it's just looking for due process. It raises red flags for me and I'm sure for many people in Alberta when the Member for Lesser Slave Lake is encouraging her colleagues not to support this.

You talk about the system you've got in place being adequate, that being reviewed by the stakeholders is the best route, that they are in a better position to decide which regulations should or should not be put in place. Well, I think that's fine, but it isn't adequate enough. We need to take a look at having full exposure on these regulations so that we will have full public scrutiny, review, and debate as they come forward and that they will be reviewed by the Law and Regulations Standing Committee, because I think that's a fundamental part of this process. I'm wondering, specifically, why the member is not supporting that.

I do remember that this government defeated Motion 502, which specifically asked that regulations enacted pursuant to Acts of the Legislature which received Royal Assent be forwarded to the Standing Committee on Law and Regulations for review. I wonder what they think they may have to hide or slide by us. That needs to be of concern to all of us. It's not just enough to have . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View was rising on a point of order?

MR. HLADY: I was adjusting my seat.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, pardon me then.
The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Thank you. It isn't enough just to put this by the stakeholders. The general public has to have access to input, and it needs to be reviewed by Law and Regulations. We do have some concern about this Bill, and that is that we're moving along the road to legislation for simply a generic health care worker instead of having various Acts which control each health profession. That's a subject which needs to be significantly debated and put before the general public and not slid through the Legislature by piecemeal Bills such as this.

Once again I would ask that the Member for Lesser Slave Lake defend her position on this. It seems not to be in the best interest of the general public, and that's of course the aim in passing a Bill like this.

[Motion on amendment lost]

[The clauses of Bill 5 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported? Are you agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried.

11:00

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Clegg in the Chair]

MR. TANNAS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain Bills. The committee reports the following: Bill 20 and Bill 5. The committee reports the following with some amendments: Bill 15. The committee reports progress on the following: Bill 16. I wish to table copies of all amendments considered by the Committee of the Whole on this date for the official records of the Assembly. I would also like to table copies of documents tabled during Committee of the Whole on this date for the official records of the Assembly.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. All in favour of the report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Opposed, if any? Carried.

[At 11:02 p.m. the Assembly adjourned to Wednesday at 1:30 p.m.]