

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Monday, October 30, 1972

[The House met at 2:30 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

POINT OF INFORMATION

MR. SPEAKER:

May I draw to the attention of the House that Bills Nos. 83 and 89 are incorrectly placed on the Order Paper; that Bill No. 83 belongs under the heading Committee of the Whole and Bill No. 89 under Third Reading.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Worth Report

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give oral notice of motion today that tomorrow I will move an amendment to Private Members' Motion No. 20, found on page seven of today's Order Paper. That motion now reads on top of page seven, "Mr. Lee to propose the following motion to this assembly, seconded by Mr. King, that the report of the Commission on Educational Planning be received." I would like to give notice to the House that tomorrow I will move, seconded by the hon. member, Mr. Minielly, an amendment to the effect that the name of the hon. member, Mr. Lee, as mover, be deleted and replaced with that of the hon. minister, Mr. Foster, Minister of Advanced Education. This will make it a government motion.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, it is with very great pleasure that I beg leave today to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of this legislature, 120 students from the Holy Cross School in my constituency. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that some of these students are very close to living in your constituency, which should be a point of very great interest. I trust that they will enjoy their visit today, especially on this day of national significance politically, and would express my appreciation to their teachers, Mr. Burkhardt and Mr. Neeham, for arranging this trip today. I would ask them to rise and be recognized both in the public gallery and the members' gallery.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the full text of the hearings conducted by the Environment Conservation Authority on the conservation of historical and archeological resources in Alberta. The planning of this hearing was conducted in co-operation with the Department of Culture, Youth, and Recreation.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the 1971 annual report of the Alberta Hospital Services Commission, along with the 1971 annual report of the Board of Visitors.

64-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Workmen's Compensation Board

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask two questions, if I may. The first one is to the hon. the Premier, and the second one is to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the hon. the Premier can tell us when the government will be appointing a new chairman to the Workman's Compensation Board?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I hope that it will be within about four to six weeks that we will be making that appointment.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'm just wondering why there has been such a long delay? It's been, I believe, since June that the chairman resigned and it seems to me it's been a long time. I would certainly hope that the government hasn't been waiting for the results of today's election so they could find out who the rejected Conservatives are to name as a new chairman. I'm sure the hon. Premier doesn't want to reply to that.

Alberta Resources Railroad

I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. I would like to know if the government, at this time, is negotiating with CNR in regard to the AR&R to establish responsibility for rebuilding, or just what the present status is at this time.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to defer answering the hon. Leader of the Opposition's question until Wednesday, if I may. I am in the process of developing a report. We are in the process of some meetings, and I think that we could give a more complete report at that time.

MR. STROM:

Can I just establish this, Mr. Speaker, by one further question? Will it be dealing with all aspects of responsibility, future progress, and so on, Mr. Speaker?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, it will.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary BCW, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

Transportation Study

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry. Earlier this year you indicated to the House that you were carrying out a transportation study as an overall review of the transportation needs of the province. When will you be tabling this report?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, we are continuously carrying on research programs on needs. I'm sure the hon. member is well aware of the comprehensiveness of transportation problems. No single report is going to identify and isolate the needs of this province, whether it be air, rail or land. We have some reports now prepared, and certainly we have a policy ready for the acceptance of the committee to look at, at this present moment, in regard to the future needs of transportation research for the Province of Alberta.

October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-3

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Given that over \$20,000 of the taxpayer's money will --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is not entitled to prefix his question with a preamble. If you would come directly to the question. We have, this last week after the summer recess, been rather informal in regard to the rules in connection with questions, but perhaps for the expeditious operation of the House we should revert to the rules as laid down in Beauchesne.

MR. WILSON:

Perhaps I can rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. What individuals of cabinet make up the Transportation Committee?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, the Transportation Committee, as so called, is made up and headed by the hon. Don Getty. It has as its members the hon. Ministers, Mr. Copithorne, Mr. Dickie, Dr. Warrack, and Dr. Hohl.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the various reports which you referred to be tabled in this legislature?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, from time to time we will certainly table the reports in regard to the policies as they are defined by this government and would be very pleased to let the hon. members know just what is contained in these reports and the pursuits that this government has taken.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What policy changes -- to the Minister of Industry -- has been defined to date as a result of this study?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member, if I understand the question correctly, is dealing with the report of a cabinet committee to the cabinet, and if the question seeks to elicit the contents of that report, it is out of order.

DR. BUCK:

In relation to a transportation study, have there been any studies done between yourselves and the City of Edmonton in relation to the existing railroads that are coming into part of the downtown area?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we have had preliminary discussions with the City of Edmonton's transportation committee regarding the future of railroads in the City of Edmonton, and we are now awaiting further meetings with them as to their decision, and what part they would like the provincial government to play.

DR. BUCK:

Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In relation to two lines especially, the one coming in from the south in the Leduc area, and the one coming in from the east, the Fort Saskatchewan area, there is a phasing-out, we have been told, of the rail line that runs on these two lines. Has there been any study in your department in conjunction with CP and CN to use these as commuter lines?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, not at this time.

64-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

---

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Industry. What policy changes have been made as a result of the transportation studies?

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the rules are that general statements of policy should not be elicited during the Question Period because of the length of the answers required, and perhaps the hon. member could put his question on the Order Paper.

Freight Rates

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Have there been any meetings between you and the federal minister and this cabinet in this calendar year, to discuss the question of high freight rates?

MR. PEACOCK:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there have been several.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Little Bow.

N. Saskatchewan River Pollution

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Environment, Mr. Yurko. Will any legislation be forthcoming in regard to cities, and I will cite the City of Edmonton, to curb them from dumping debris on the North Saskatchewan River in the wintertime? And by debris I mean snow that contains salt and sand?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, we now have legislation to curtail this without any difficulty whatsoever; however, we have been running a survey or a review of all aspects of this problem and find that there really is no pollution, or that the pollution problem is really insignificant. It is more a problem of aesthetics. There is a certain amount of silt that is deposited on the river in this regard but this silt is small in relationship to the silt carried by the river, so what I do want to suggest is that we are keeping this problem under continuous review, but as of the present moment there really is no contamination problem.

MR. PURDY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister have an idea of how many tons of salt would be used in a year by the City of Edmonton?

MR. YURKO:

I don't have this figure at my fingertips, Mr. Speaker, but I can certainly find that figure and give it to the House.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. What recommendations have been made by your economic advisory committee to date?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I think that question is a long and involved one, and covers many, many subjects. I would suggest that if the hon. member of the opposition is interested in what decisions have been made and what we have been doing in regard to this area, he table the question.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, and possibly this will be a shorter question. How often do these committees report to you, and will any of their reports or recommendations be made available to the legislature?

October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-5

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member referring to cabinet committees?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we will review the minutes and report back later to this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Camrose, followed by the hon. member for Calgary North Hill.

Provincial Government Borrowing

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the provincial treasurer. With the recent rush of foreign governments and corporations to float bond issues in Japan, and with Tokyo becoming the international financial centre of the world, and with the province of Quebec borrowing \$33 million --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is indulging in a fairly lengthy preamble.

MR. STROMBERG:

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, I could reword it. Is the minister aware of this going on in Japan, and is he aware that the province of Quebec has borrowed \$33 million in Tokyo? My question is: is the province of Alberta giving consideration to using this new source of funds, and if not, why not?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, yes, I am aware of Quebec borrowing \$33 million on the Japanese market. I have been keeping in close touch over the past few months with delegates from Japan in the financial community and in the capital markets of Japan. It is true to say that with Alberta's association with Japan and with the Premier's recent mission to Japan -- I was unable personally, to attend, but the deputy Provincial Treasurer at that time met with people in the capital and financial markets -- a desirable financial market is developing in Japan at the present time. The prime reason, Mr. Speaker, that we have not made use of it to date, is simply that through improvements in financial management as well as the fact that we have been able to borrow at cheaper rates through such methods as increasing our bank overdraft at prime bank rates, it has made it unnecessary for us to borrow on the open market to this point. We are interested in the Japanese market and will be watching it.

DR. BUCK:

Can the hon. Provincial Treasurer inform the House as to what opportunity he has provided for Albertans to take some of this?

MR. MINIELY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a question which I have been very interested in. As I say, up until the present time, it has not been necessary with other things that we have done actually to borrow either on the open market in Alberta or in Canada. But I am very aware that Albertans should have opportunities to invest in their province and in the financing of their government. I am looking at alternatives in this regard and I hope to have something by the time we go to the open market.

DR. BUCK:

Has the hon. Provincial Treasurer considered possibly giving Albertans a one per cent rate that it would be on the open market -- just a little incentive.

MR. MINIELY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are various methods and alternatives that could be looked at. The hon. member's question, I think, is one -- they are many different ways that it could be done. As I say, I am exploring these ways and I

64-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

hope to be able to come up with a policy where Albertans will have an opportunity to help finance their own province.

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary, to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I mean in the near future or two years hence, or is there any time?

MR. MINIELY:

Oh no, I would not want to put a time limit on it at the present, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware when we will have to borrow on the open market. In the meantime I am addressing my mind to the question that the hon. member raises in anticipation of the fact that when it does become necessary, we will fulfill a policy of allowing Albertans an opportunity.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. How much has been borrowed this year, from what market, and at what interest rate?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I have to answer the hon. member's question basically this way.

Some of these are a matter of estimates. I think I outlined to the House in the spring session that we were centralizing cash management. This has resulted in a substantial improvement in the province's cash balances. I think I had indicated that royalty cheques had been mailed to individual departments and there was a time lag between the time they hit the departments and hit the province's bank account. This type of thing, Mr. Speaker, we anticipate has improved our cash balances by about \$10 million. We have increased our overdraft limit with the bank from \$60 million to \$80 million, which is \$20 million of prime rate. We have, through utilizing surplus funds in Crown corporations, which were formerly invested at low interest rates, used them in the province's general revenue fund. This has provided \$33 million. We have used Canada Pension Plan funds providing \$30 million, which is a total of \$93 million.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, is this why he is called Miniely the Magician?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliffe.

#### Property Tax Discount

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can anything be done, Mr. Minister, to publicize the new Senior Citizen's Shelter Allowance Act? In my area I understand a number of senior citizens have failed to apply. ..[Interjections].. Do you want to know what the question is? Nothing could be simpler than that. Do you want me to repeat it, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

I think the hon. minister understood the question.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think I understand the question and it is a good one. It is one that all hon. members of the legislature should be addressing their minds to because we all have constituents who are no doubt going to miss the December 31st deadline for application for either their home owner's tax discount or the senior citizen's assistance. Although it has been well publicized on the tax notices and on the application forms that the deadline is December 31st we always have a number of people who miss the deadline for one reason or other, and are trapped into that deadline by existing legislation.

Last year there was a fairly extensive news release program carried out and we are trying to improve that again this year. But I urge all hon. members to

October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-7

try and get the news back into their own constituencies so that our citizens can be helped by meeting the deadline.

MR. FARRAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as this is the first year of the act could the deadline be extended?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, I don't believe it can. We are looking at the Homeowner's Tax Discount Plan trying to see if we can use a clause in the legislation. Everything will be done in order to help the people who may be late for one reason or other, but I think the best approach is a positive one and that is to help our constituents get the applications in by the end of the year.

MR. FARRAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the municipalities be encouraged to advise senior citizens of their rights where they are aware that a particular senior citizen has not applied?

MR. RUSSELL:

I would hope they would do that, Mr. Speaker. It is rather a difficult thing to do particularly in some of the rural municipalities where tax notices, in fact, come out after the year end. That is one item that we are looking at and I hope we will be able to reduce the number of disappointments that were evident last year.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister consider amending the act making it possible for extensions to the end of January for real genuine cases? I wouldn't mind if they were spelled out. Would the hon. minister be prepared to amend the act at this session or bring the act before the legislature in that regard.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, we are rather reluctant, I think for obvious reasons, to amend any of those acts because it has been indicated that probably they all will be brought forward in 1973, depending on the outcome of the final recommendations of the Provincial-Municipal Task Force. We anticipate the possibly of amendments to one or more of those acts. In the meantime we are trying to do everything possible to see that every citizen does get the benefit this year. But that is a good suggestion.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff, followed by the hon. Member for Cardston.

#### Opportunity Fund

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Given that the regulations on the Alberta Opportunity Fund did not come into effect until late in August, almost three months after the passage of the bill - and I have the order in council dated August 11, 1972 - would the Minister confirm whether this program is now operative?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, it is. It may be of sufficient interest to the hon. Member for Medicine Hat to know that we have some 250 applications in process now, in the Opportunity Fund.

64-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

---

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What is the total amount of dollars to be loaned out in 1972? Do you have any idea?

MR. PEACOCK:

It is a hard thing to estimate, Mr. Speaker, because the applications total now some \$12 million.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce, under the fund, have there been any government guarantees approved with the banking? of the institution?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, not to my recollection at this time

MR. BARTON:

Supplementary, do I take it then that the banks are holding back?

MR. PEACOCK::

Mr. Speaker I do not think so. We have had some preliminary meetings with several of the chartered banks in the province, and, as they get to know the policy better and the objectives of the government in this respect, I think you will find that we will get more and more activity in this area.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government given any grants on a matching dollar basis to rural communities on Alberta in 1972?

MR. PEACOCK:

Well, Mr Speaker, prior to the passage of the Opportunity Fund Company, there was a program that was carried over from the previous government and there were commitments of grants and that was rescinded with the passing of the Opportunity Fund. Prior to that there were certain grants that were honored, that were made by the previous fund.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Cardston followed by the hon. member for Highwood.

Rail Abandonment

MR. HINMAN:

A question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce with regard to the Rail Abandonment and Ceasing of Service. Has the department made any representation to Ottawa with regard to the proposed discontinuance of the dayliner from Grand Centre to Cold Lake or, with regard to discontinuance by the NAB from Dawson Creek to Edmonton?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker in regard to the first mentioned we did intervene in regard to the second we did not.



October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-9

Mr. hinman:

Last year I think they were discussing whether or not the service could be reinstated from the Three Hills areas. Has any submission been made? If so have we had any result from it?

MR. PEACOCK:

Submission has been made but we have no result yet and I suppose that part of it is through the changes of the chairmanship of the CFC.

MR. HINMAN:

Has the department made any study such as that made in Manitoba to discover what the probable cost to the agriculture industry would be from the abandonments already proposed in Alberta? MR. PEACOCK:

As a province, Mr. Speaker, we have not. I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture stated the other day, that the Grains Committee in Winnipeg was now looking at the situation on the prairies in regard to the abandonment and reassessment of transportation facilities for agriculture, and we as a province have not.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Trespass Act

MR. BENOIT:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is addressed to the hon. Attorney General. Is it the hon. Attorney General's intention during this session to either amend to or bring in a new Trespass Act in accordance with the resolution which was passed in 1971?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker. No, it is not our present intention to introduce at this session legislation dealing with trespass.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Airlines Conference

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the hon. minister, on behalf of the government, made any further representations about getting a decision from the biennial conference on airlines and air service in Canada?

MR. PEACOCK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. With regard to this whole problem of transportation, I might, for the information of the House, suggest that in the areas of bilaterals, and in the area of intra-, as well as inter-provincial travel on air, we have established some priorities and are attempting to establish further priorities as to the development of our whole program, and the interests of Alberta regarding north-south traffic, as well as inter-continental.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since it is the Americans who are holding up the considerations in the biennials, has the hon. minister, on behalf of the government, solicited the support of men like Governor Reagan, who I think is on our side in connection with this matter?

64-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

---

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we haven't specifically solicited the support of Governor Reagan, but we have contacted Chambers of Commerce in the southwest American cities, that have been very influential in supporting these services that the hon. member of the opposition is asking.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary. Is a case being presented to the biennials? And when does the hon. minister hope that there might be a decision?

MR. PEACOCK:

We have no specific date, Mr. Speaker. We would hope, though, that they would certainly be after the federal election in the United States.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking followed by the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

Financial Aid -- Airstrips

MR. COOPER:

A question for the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Have you completed the study for providing financial assistance for airstrips in towns not qualifying for federal assistance?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we're in the process of doing that. As the hon. member knows, the federal government have extended a merial sum of some extra million dollars in the year 1972, and are increasing that in 1973. We recognize that there have to be some established priorities in regard to these airstrips that will not come under federal aid, and we are attempting at this time to identify those priorities. There is only so much that can be done at one time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Bow Valley followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge-West.

Government Purchasing

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. What changes have been made in the government purchasing policy as a result of the annual meeting of the Provincial Government Trade and Industry Council?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I didn't think I was going to get up to bat until today. I think the House, Mr. Speaker, is knowledgeable on what a sensitive position we place ourselves in as a province when we start to legislate or move into this area of purchasing or control purchasing. First of all, the problems that we are confronted with in regard to inter-provincial purchasing and international purchasing -- we have to deal with these provinces and we have to sell our products to them. I think the best answer I can give you at this time is that we recognize that we have a responsibility for Alberta-made produce that could be used here, and we suggest that where quality and price are equal or better, certainly an Albertan be given the advantage.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder.

October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-11

Worth Report

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Education, or House Leader, in whichever capacity you prefer to answer it. It is regarding the Worth Report. Will the hon. members of the legislature have an opportunity to discuss or debate the Worth Report during this session, and could you give the hon. members some indication about when and how you intend to handle it?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. On today's Order Paper there is notice of a motion appearing on page seven as a Private Member's Motion No. 20. As I indicated earlier today, Mr. Speaker, that would be converted into a Government Motion moved by the hon. member, Mr. Foster, and then will be available for moving, either tomorrow or on some subsequent day when the government feels it would be appropriate to have it called. I think that we would probably see the start of that debate going on this week, and it may well continue for a number of days, I would think through the next week or ten days.

As noted on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, I think the motion is broad enough to enable all members to give their thoughts and points of view on the Worth Report. In recalling the last day of the spring session, I indicated that I had hoped by this stage of the year all members would have been able to canvass the opinions of at least 50 or 100 people in their constituencies over the summer regarding the report and their reactions. I would think that perhaps this week we would be in a position to commence debate on that motion.

MR. GRUENWALD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Hon. minister, do you intend to introduce any legislation at this session implementing any of the specific recommendations in the Worth Report?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Certainly not in this session, Mr. Speaker. No, we would wish to have the viewpoints of any and indeed all the hon. members of this assembly before working on and continuing with the merging of policy decisions.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Just one further question, not regarding the Worth Report, but in your line of education. Will you be announcing soon, or are you ready to announce in the very near future, what the finance formula will be for the I to XII system for 1973?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would be in a position to announce the guidelines of that plan before not too long.

MR. BARTON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Education. This spring in the session you stated the Worth Report would be a 'best seller'. How are the sales coming?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to report sales are at 13,500 which is a record for a Royal Commission report in the Province of Alberta, if not in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Calder followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

64-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

Automobile Pollution

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. My question is I wonder if the hon. minister will give consideration to the technical study as to the total quantity of pollutants that are emitted from automobile exhaust with and without the current emission control devices that these machines have on them. I think it is very commonly recognized that gasoline consumption is up considerably, perhaps by as much as one-third, and when you consider the incremental --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is giving rather than eliciting information.

MR. CHAMBERS:

I'll just finish rapidly, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK:

Question!

MR. CHAMBERS:

I have real doubts whether anything worthwhile is being achieved with these devices, so cost to the general public is high and we're using up rapidly a valuable resource. I would like the hon. minister's comments on this.

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very worthwhile suggestion on behalf of the hon. member. We shall certainly take his suggestion under advisement. We don't have any legislation in this area. We have been in correspondence with the federal government in regard to just what their intent and regulations are in this area, but we hadn't considered an actual study to determine the volume of contaminants both before and after the installation of these devices. However, as I said at the beginning, I think it is a very worthwhile suggestion, and we'll pursue it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Exports to Japan

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. As a result of the trip to Japan, and as a result of the changing attitude of the Japanese government, what manufactured goods does the Province of Alberta anticipate exporting to Japan?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'm getting a little support over here. To state specifically what we will be exporting, I think at this time is a little difficult. Certainly we will be exporting those track vehicles that are manufactured in Calgary. Certainly we will, as the Minister of Agriculture has pointed out, be exporting processed products such as pork -- we've got a long term contract with the Saita Company of Japan. We will be, and are, exporting honey. We certainly hope that we will be expanding some of our feed grains and malting barleys. We certainly hope that we will be exporting some of our petro-chemicals, as they are processed, and as we develop more activity over here. I refer to where we have moved the molecular chain out in such areas as PVC's and polyethylene sheets, etc. We certainly hope that we will be moving into the areas of steel products, and that, in turn, will be dependant upon how active the follow-up to our trip in Japan has been and in other areas of the world.

October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-13

Opportunity Fund Influence re: Exports to Japan

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the minister if the Alberta Opportunity Fund has been given any direction by the government to give priority to the kinds of manufacturing that could be carried on in Alberta and the produce being exported to Japan?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Read the act!

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, as you appreciate, we have published the regulations and the act. We have identified our concern particularly with the rural Albertan in affording him an opportunity to expand and develop his programs within the Province of Alberta, without any particular direction. I don't think at this time that we could say we've identified any specific area.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place.

Coal Shipments

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question today to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. I'm sure the minister is aware of the concern in the Ogden Shops in my constituency of Calgary and the concern of the civic administration in Calgary regarding the proposal of shipping coal from southeastern B.C. to the Pacific Ocean over American rail lines rather than Canadian rail lines. I'm sure he is aware this would mean unemployment in our own city of Calgary.

MR. SPEAKER:

Could the hon. member please come directly to the information he wishes?

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I shall be pleased to do that. My question is: has the minister or the government been in touch with the Transport Commission on this problem, or could he enlighten the House on any action this government has taken to avoid that situation?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, once again, that's a very long, detailed question. Specifically to answer the diversion of coal into southern international routes, such as the United States and the west coast is a very complex problem; it involves labour and labour union agreements, crews, etc. Therefore the economics of shipping coal into the United States is not feasible. Our problem of shipping coal to Tidewater from Alberta, (whether it be in southwestern or northwestern Alberta) is being constantly challenged. We hope to set up a program to afford alternate routes, more economic routes, whether it be by slurry line or by rail transportation unit train etc.

We are conscious of the position that Alberta as a landlocked province finds itself in, and are constantly striving for a better position for Albertans to meet the world competitive market position.

MR. DIXON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Then I take it from the minister's remarks that I can tell the workers in Ogden Shops that the coal will not be shipped over American lines?

MR. PEACOCK:

We still live in a free enterprise province, Mr. Speaker, and at this time I would suggest that the economics do not lend themselves to shipping coal over the American lines.

64-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

---

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

The Worth Report (Cont)

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Education: I am wondering if he intends any arrangements to advise the House of the nature of the tremendous public feedback on the Worth Report?

MR. HYNDMAN:

May I suggest that the question and answer might be left until the Worth Report comes up for discussion so that we will not be dealing with it twice?

Environment Conservation Authority

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Environment: how many applications did you receive for membership in the Environment Conservation Authority?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, at the last count, there were over 200 applications, and they are still coming in.

MR. RUSTE:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When might we expect to have the finalization of that competition, or whatever you might call it?

MR. YURKO:

Well, this is a matter that will be considered by the cabinet and I expect that the decision won't be made until after the beginning of the new year.

MR. RUSTE:

A final supplementary question then: with agriculture's tremendous stake in the environment, and the effects of the decisions of this body, will the minister give consideration to having somebody fully acquainted with agriculture on that Authority?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated last spring, we would certainly give that consideration, but certainly I am not in any position to give a commitment in that regard. All applications will be considered and there are a number of other areas that need equal representation on the Authority.

CREDITS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Calgary Inquest

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to answer a question posed during the Question Period Friday by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican. He asked whether there would be an inquest into the death of the boy who was killed in the grocery store in Calgary. The answer is yes, the inquest is now scheduled to be held on November 7th; there was some delay in the calling of the inquest; the autopsy report was late in coming out.

October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-15

Human Rights Submissions

MR. LOUGHEED:

Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could have the leave of the House to revert to Filing Returns and Tabling Reports.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LOUGHEED:

I have here copies of the submissions that we received with regard to Bill 1 and Bill 2; The Individual Rights Protection Act and the Alberta Bill of Rights which I wanted to table today so members would have an opportunity as quickly as possible to peruse them in advance of our dealing with the two bills at the committee stage.

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Committee of the Whole)

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of certain bills on the order paper.

[The motion was carried without dissent.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair]

\* \* \* \* \*

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Mr. Diachuk took the Chair.]

Bill No. 83, The Mental Health Act, 1972

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I will follow the pages of the amendment with the exception of the exception.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, on this Bill No. 83 and the amendments brought in, I was just wondering if the minister had given any consideration to making a reprint all together for consideration, because when you have the bill itself that was brought in for first and second reading, then you get into the amendments, and you have a pretty sizeable volume to deal with.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, before the hon. minister answers, I would also like to say a word in connection with this. We find that the amendment is much more extensive than the original bill, and while considerable study was given to the bill through the summer months, the amendment, which changes a great deal of the original bill and is far more extensive than the original bill, was handed to us on Friday afternoon. We have had the weekend to study it. This is a very important piece of legislation and I personally question any thought of rushing this through without proper study. This involves the rights of individuals, some of whom may or may not be mentally incompetent. I really think this is so serious and has such vast extensions, that while I studied a good deal of it during the weekend -- as I am sure the hon. members did, and probably the hon. member to my right more than anyone -- it still left a lot to be desired in regard to research on certain of these items. So I would like to bring this matter to the attention of the hon. minister.

64-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the concern that has been expressed over the extent of the changes is, in fact, an overstatement, and unwarranted. The extent of the changes that have been made, of course, appears to be very imposing as soon as one looks at the mimeographed material as compared with the original printed material. But the fact is, as I indicated on Friday, substantial portions -- and this may respond in some way, too, to the point raised by the hon. member for Wainwright -- of what is in the bill are, in fact, reprinted in the amendments. It is true that there are new parts added. It is true that they are of some significance, but I suggest that there aren't more than a couple that fall into that classification.

Once again, you get into an area like the role the advisory council, for example, on mental health. You may have two or three pages of additions based on that, and it is correct to say that they weren't in the bill in the spring. However, the situation there simply is that rather than having a short section not ideally authorizing the Lieutenant Governor in Council to go ahead with the appointment, it seemed fit to place before the legislature what was actually proposed for those appointments, and to detail in the amendments the various bodies from which the appointees should be drawn. I suggest that it can only be seen as an advantage to all hon. members, and to the public, to have that degree of further clarification now. When you reflect that by approving it at second reading and agreeing in principle to it, there was a strong indication that the House was willing to approve it without the additional detail, which I suggest is now more helpful than not.

I maintain that the ability of hon. members to follow it will not be greatly taxed in the way it is put out. The additions are, with very few exceptions, are items that probably only reflect the concern expressed that the act had not provided quite enough information in the first place and would now do so.

MR. TAYLOR:

I don't want to prolong this debate because this is taking time that we could use on the bill. But it seems to me that there is some change in principle in the amendments compared to the original act. I am referring to the items such as The Marriage Act which is introducing a new principle entirely, as I see it, into this whole legislation. Consequently, while we discussed the original bill on principle, this is a new principle now contained in the amendment that really was not included in the original bill. This is the type of thing that worries me in connection with this procedure we are following now. I think it would have been far better for the hon. minister to have written a new bill and to discharge the second reading and go back to second reading.

I am just raising this as I think this would have been the better way to do it. If the government and the hon. minister decide to proceed with this bill today I would hope that in any of these sections, where we feel there is a principle, we will be permitted to discuss the principle if it was not included in the other sections. Also that we would not hesitate to hold any section in committee if we require some further research. If that is done I would think that the hon. members on this side would be prepared to go ahead today without wasting further time in discussing the matter.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I think, Mr. Chairman, a sufficiently wide degree of latitude in discussing the bill would certainly be our view of the situation. If there are one or two priority matters in which further research is needed, or on which the hon. minister cannot provide information, I am sure that perhaps one or two sections could be held. Also I think we could feel that the hon. minister who will be handling the bill will himself initiate a discussion in respect to any changes in the amendments which deal with principle, so it won't be simply a matter of members questioning whether they are matters of principle. I think the hon. minister will say so and initiate discussion in that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well, on that point I will permit hon. members to return to clauses and sections that we may have approved.

[Section 1(a) to Section 1(e) were agreed to without debate.]



October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-17

Section 1(f)

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, just to clarify it for myself, I was just looking at the amendment on the act itself and I want to make sure that I am not missing something. "1(a) admission certificate means a certificate issued pursuant to Section 15," but that is not what it says in the act, and is that the first amendment? Which do we follow? I'm a little confused because of the procedure we used to follow before, where we would refer to the amendment sheet rather than the act, and right away we are into it. I thought maybe you would want to clarify it right here.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I am glad of the opportunity to join with you in clarifying that because it seems to me to make a lot of sense that we dispense with the repeating of the words as amended each time we read from the large sheets. When you started to read you were, in fact, following the amended version and did say in your opening remarks that you would be referring to the amendments unless otherwise stated.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

That is right, Mr. Strom, I am referring to this all the way through.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I take it that it is agreed, from the technical point of view, we are dispensing with the repetitious use of the words "as amended" when we go through that, because of the Chairman giving the understanding he has.

MR. STROM:

Fine, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I trust everybody has his copy of the amendments and we will follow that.

[Section 1(g) to Section 1(h) were agreed to without debate.]

Section 1(i)

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, may I make a comment on this for consideration if not during this particular sitting, then at a future date? I would like to suggest that this does not exclude alcoholics, drug addicts and mentally retarded. There has been some confusion in this area, by citizenry professionals, and operators of various facilities. Although I think the intention here is, in fact, to include these particular problems, I think it would be more precise and certainly more comforting to those that have relatives with this type of problem to know that these facilities can be used for such problems. And so, to be sure that there is not misunderstanding, I wonder if you would clarify this and maybe consider making some changes at a future date, if not today?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if, considering the size of the bill, I should respond individually when these matters come up. I am certainly prepared to do so. But I would invite other members who may want to remark on the same subject matter to do so now. I would then be quite prepared to deal with the matter raised by the hon. member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. STROM:

"Mental disorder" means lack of reason or lack of control of behaviour." Now I am sure there are many times in this House that there is a lack of reason; it is a very broad term. This is really serious even though I try to interject a little humour into it. I am disturbed by the the simplicity of trying to determine what mental disorder means.

64-18

ALEERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, if there is no one else on (i): it does happen to be -- and I realize we were not looking at it in detail at that time of the subsections which was not changed from Bill No. 83. It was there in those words. Dealing first with the remarks made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, I suggested as far as retarded patients are concerned, that there is a different stream of treatment that will probably be accentuated, rather than the reverse, and that perhaps his references to the retarded are not as appropriate as his references to alcoholics and drug addicts.

The assurance I would be able to give him, I think, is that the existing institutions are certainly dealing with people who have problems in the areas of alcoholism and drug abuse; no change in that part of the treatment pattern is expected. I don't mean no change in respect to program, but no change in respect to the eligibility to be treated of people suffering from alcoholism or drug addiction.

Coming on then, Mr. Chairman, to the remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition in regard to lack of reason or lack of control of behaviour. I would point out that this is a very carefully weighed description of mental disorder, but it does not, by itself, authorize any apprehension of anyone. When we get to the section that relates to the description of a person who may be conveyed to a facility for an examination, it will be seen that, apart from suffering from mental disorder, the person must be seen to be presenting a danger to himself or others. So I think that at the point of apprehension or conveyance of a person to a facility for an examination, it becomes critical that he not be picked up on what might appear skimpy grounds, if it was only looked at in the sense of lack of reason.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that even that is hardly sufficient, because I have seen many people who have been inebriated who were a danger to themselves, and considerable danger to others. Would it be possible for a man like that to be taken or committed because of a mental disorder? It is not a mental disorder at all, it is a temporary period because he is drunk and many times drunks are a danger to themselves, and many, many times they are a danger to other people. You just have to go to a mining town or a lumber camp to see that, and it becomes very, very evident on a Saturday night. I am just wondering if this definition isn't just too simple, and that it might get us into difficulty later. And if the definition is not going to have any real bearing later on in the bill, perhaps we should strike it out. Is a definition of mental disorders necessary?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that an extremely important part of the bill is to define mental disorder. When I said that the ability to convey a person for examination depended upon the fact that he presented a danger to himself or others . . . I think it is clear -- and has been for a long time in the law enforcement process dealing with people who are drunks -- that they are dealt with as drunks, and they are not dealt with as mentally disordered persons. The only other thing that I think I might add to it is to give, what I hope, will be an assurance to the hon. member that the right that arises on the part of, say, a peace officer or person who is examining, or about to examine someone, in a facility, is not the right of committal. That right does not arise from this situation of being a mentally disordered person who is a danger to himself or others.

That is only sufficient to require the person to be examined. Then the committal follows from a separate procedure.

DR. PAPROSKI:

A point of clarity again, because this is of very significant concern to me and to the people that I have heard from. Are alcoholics included in this, or not? Or are they going to a separate channel for therapy? In other words, what I am saying is "mental disorder" means lack of reason and lack of controlled behaviour -- does it include alcoholics and drug addicts?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, my interpretation is there is no question that it includes both alcoholics and drug addicts. There is, after all a considerable difference between the meaning implied when you refer to a person as being intoxicated, and

October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-19

when you refer to him as being an alcoholic. An alcoholic is a sick person, a drug addict is a sick person who is not just high at the moment. He is in need of treatment of some sort, perhaps medically, perhaps from the point of view of his mental health, or perhaps simultaneously from both standpoints. There is no difficulty, in my mind, over the confusion of the person suffering from alcoholism in the whole treatment program.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Then I am to understand that if a person is to be conveyed to a facility for therapy and the therapist or the physician may state that he is an alcoholic and suffering from a mental disorder, that facility, in fact, will have to admit him under the normal circumstances as defined in this act.

MR. CRAWFORD:

The only way to answer that, Mr. Chairman, is to say that if a patient in Alberta is in a condition that he should be admitted to a facility, whatever degree of facility that may be, he should be admitted, and under the ordinary course of events would be.

[Clause (i) was agreed to without further debate. Clauses (j) to (r) were agreed to.]

Section 1(s)

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a question with regard to Clause (s). I think one of the biggest concerns that I have heard with regard to this bill is the definition of a therapist and what is really meant by it. The concerns certainly are raised because all people feel that a therapist must have certain backgrounds and certain qualifications to make the judgment in order to carry out the tasks that he is asked to carry out in this particular act. What I would like to ask the hon. minister, first of all, is that I feel (s) doesn't really say anything about the therapist and our point of view certainly is that it should in this section. There should be a clear definition of what the government means by a therapist whom they're putting out into the field. There are no guidelines at all established for the board, at this point in time, as to what a therapist is. There is a committee of four or five people with representations from various groups, but that still doesn't say what a therapist is. Our strong point of view is that there should be a definition of a therapist.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two on this too. The definition that means any person who is registered as a therapist by the registration board really is something that we were always taught in school -- never use the same word when you're trying to define something; don't use the word you are defining. There is a very serious mistake being made here I think. It reminds me of the old definition we used to have in The Highway Traffic Act about day-time and night-time. Day-time is when it is not night-time and night-time is when it is not day-time. It is very revealing.

But a therapist here means someone who is registered as a therapist. I would like to know what a therapist is. Is he a masseur? I don't know. Is he a doctor? Is he somebody who has taken certain training? I really think that we should know. The therapist has a lot of power and a lot of authority later on in this act and I think it is important that we establish what the qualifications or what the standards for a therapist really are. What is a therapist? I would strongly urge the hon. minister to take this definition back and define it without using the word 'therapist'.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, maybe I can make this a general comment in regard to matters that are considered to be of significant importance by members of the House, and that is, I rather expect that we will be more than one sitting period on this, and we can certainly hold items. However, I wanted to say, in respect to the question raised by the hon. Member for Drumheller, which is the one I will deal with first -- unless when he asked about the suitability of a masseur he was speaking of a gentleman from France -- I don't know. The answer, otherwise, is, no, it would not include a masseur because what we have is a criss-cross between a couple of sections here which will make the matter entirely clear.

64-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

The point that I would like to make here is that the definition section, I suggest, is not as critical as is suggested by the remarks of either the hon. gentleman or his colleague from Little Bow.

For example, under application for registration, which is farther on in the act, it mentions that before being eligible to apply to become a therapist, a person must be endorsed by one of the associations referred to in Section 5, subsection 1. That's fairly narrow. That deals only with the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses, the Alberta Association of Social Workers, the Psychologists' Association of Alberta, and the Psychiatric Nurses' Association of Alberta. The effect of that is that four categories are added to the physician and surgeon category of people who may be involved in the treatment of people who are mentally ill. By saying that those four groups, as just read out from Section 5, subsection 1, will have members who are involved in the treatment of persons who may be mentally ill, is generally regarded, I believe, as a significant step in the direction of broadening the base of treatment available to the patient.

In the community, quite apart from the traditional way over the years we see the mental patient, someone who is either in a psychiatric wing, if he's not too serious, or in one of the two mental hospitals, if he is in serious difficulties with his mental health; this foresees all of the other arrangements that might be made in local general hospitals. In the community, we are referring more to the counselling side of the treatment of a person who has a mental health problem and may require nothing more than family counselling and group therapy - this sort of less intense approach to his problem, less intense and perhaps therefore, in his case, more likely to succeed, type of treatment.

In order to open up the likelihood that treatment will, in fact, be pursued by people who are involved in social work, psychology, psychiatric nursing, and in nursing, in order to encourage them and to bring them out with the consequent result that the whole base available to treat people is so much wider - in order to achieve that we've come up with the reference to therapist. I do suggest that it is fairly realistically circumscribed by keeping it within the groups that I've described, and that the section we have under discussion at the moment, relating only to the definition of therapist - means any person who is registered as a therapist by the registration board - really is adequate for our definition purposes at this time.

If we start going beyond that and trying to suggest that there is some variation to that, other than the simple statement that now that the registration board, having registered him, he is now a therapist - if we go beyond that, we will confuse the role, I fear, of the registration board itself.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I don't think we want to argue with the fact that there should be available more people capable of assisting in helping within the area of mental health. They are bringing these other people in so that they have the power of committal or the power to issue certain certificates.

I think that we are concerned about the standards that a therapist must meet. For example, and I think both of us are very much aware, the difference in experience may be not so much in experience, but in training, between the psychiatric nurse and the physician, the psychiatrist. There is a terrific difference in abilities in making judgments that have to be made. What we are saying is that because of that type of difference, there should be something in this area that spells out some terms of reference that the government feels delimit the qualifications or the types of people that will be working in this area.

Within the act as we mentioned, and you know the powers as well as I do, they are given certain powers: (a) to commit someone to an institution, and whether it's an hour or six months, that really doesn't matter; it's the principle of committal, and (b) that the person doing that must have the right kind of qualifications to make that judgment. I think that's the point we want to make.

The other point, reacting to what you have said; in the bill it also says that a person does not have to relate to his profession; he can come directly to this board or this committee that is established, to make a request to become a therapist. In other words they can go around their own profession and go directly to the board. They can avoid (a) their own profession, (b) there is no relationship then to the board that may hire them at a later date. Let's take, for example, a hospital that on a therapist. They haven't anything at all to say, really, about the therapist. Later on in the act I would like to discuss

October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-21

that question further. The act seems to be a little unclear with regard to that.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, could I add just one or two points. I notice further on in the act that a therapist and a physician or two physicians may, by written certificate, formally commit somebody to a mental hospital. Now, in other words this man or woman is going to have quite a tremendous power over other human beings. I see also where the therapist certificate is very important in whether a person is kept in a mental hospital after they get there, I believe, also, in whether a person is able to leave a mental hospital.

Now, when a person has that much power over other human beings, surely there should be some minimum standard of qualification, because at the present time there is no minimum at all. When there is no minimum education, it could be grade 4 or grade 8 or grade 12 or university. While I don't think many of these things have to be directly related to university degrees, I think there has to be some indication that the education is sufficient so that that person isn't going to be overawed by his letter of admitting a person -- a therapist and a physician -- after separate examinations.

I wouldn't want somebody who wasn't qualified examining a loved one of mine to see whether or not that person was going to be admitted to a mental hospital, or examining me to see if I have to be admitted to a mental hospital. I realize that there is no stigma so far as I am concerned, to a mental hospital. If there is something wrong with the nervous system of the brain it's just as sensible to go to a mental hospital as it is to go to a hospital if you have a broken leg or a heart disease, but that commitment is done by a highly qualified man, a physician.

Now it doesn't even say that it has to be a registered nurse, it doesn't say anything about their education. Surely we should establish a minimum standard, because I think we have to realize that the five groups you mention are people who are very able and well-educated and well aware of what is going on. But at the same time, I think there should be a minimum standard set, in order that the public will know that this matter is going to be reviewed by somebody who at least has a minimum of qualifications.

MR. BENOIT:

I think that the previous speaker said part of what I was going to say, but I am glad that we are breaking the bureaucracy of the professionals in some respect in this particular registration board application situation. I hold that there are some people who have common sense that far exceeds the abilities of some people who are highly trained in certain areas, and this may be one of the areas where this can be used. Now the one thing that I am concerned with, and I am not sure that I need to be too concerned, in 5 (3) it says that he must apply to and have his application endorsed by one of the associations or organizations, and 5 (9) says he doesn't have to belong to one of those in order to get the endorsement. All he has to do is to persuade that particular group that he is capable and they will give the endorsement. Do I read that correctly?

DR. PAPROSKI:

One concern here will possibly alleviate some of the concern of the members opposite, Mr. Minister, if you would consider this. If, on a registration board, be sure that one of those members is, in fact, a psychiatrist. The way it states here in (a), "one person nominated by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the Province of Alberta", would imply that this doesn't necessarily hold true. It could be an orthopaedic surgeon, or what have you. And I think, that for this registration board, it should be at least mandatory that one member is a psychiatrist.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, my reaction, I think, is substantially based on the feeling that we should be making some of these remarks in sections 5.2 and 5.3, although I acknowledge that the definition is certainly relevant. I don't know if the hon. member for Highwood, when he raised the point about the applicant not having to be a member of the association, was overly concerned about that, but all that does is allow for the fact that any of these occupational groups may have formed associations and have people who are active in the field in the association and out of them. We didn't want to bring in the whole area of

64-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

membership in occupational groups in The Mental Health Act. So we were satisfied to use the word 'nominated'.

Mr. Chairman, maybe it would be simpler if I just agreed that (s) could be held until we have completed section 5 which relates to therapists, and then if the results of going through all of section 5 is that we adopt it as written, it would be sensible then to come back and adopt the definition.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Minister, that would be section 5 as amended in the amendments?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, having had a long discussion bringing you up to date if I can, was the item we held (s), on page 4 of the amendments?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes. We will come back to that. Section 2 as in the act that was printed, not in the amendments now.

Section 2(1)

MR. RUSTE:

Just one point. It reads that in accordance to The Public Service Act, "there may be appointed now." For the carrying out of this, wouldn't that be mandatory? What is the reason for the wording 'may', rather than 'shall'?

MR. CRAWFORD:

That is a good point. I believe the existing Mental Health Act of 1964 provides for a director of mental health. The position is in fact, filled at the present time under that previous legislation by Dr. Hellan who is the Director of Mental Health Services. I suggest there is no great significance to 'may' or 'shall'. I suppose 'may' is always good, in that if there is a period when the position has to be filled in an acting capacity, or something like that as did happen last year, then there is no mandatory requirement to proceed with undue haste in filling it.

[Section 2(1) to Section 4.1(1)(o) were agreed to without debate.]

Section 4.1(1)(p)

MR. BENOIT:

Having gone through the list I am now raising the question as to why there are two persons in (i) from the Canadian Mental Health Association and only one from all of the rest of those professions. I realize this in (o) we have two persons to represent the public; this is understandable, but here is a list of associations and there are two from the Canadian Mental Health Association and only one from the others. Is there a reason for that?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is meant to reflect the importance that the government attaches to the voluntary sector. Most of the other groups named are associations of professionals. The Canadian Mental Health Association is a national association of volunteers.

Section 4.1(2)

MR. HENDERSON:

Could I refer back to Subsection 2? I just want to be clear here that in the case of the main representative who is appointed by the body or the professional group of bodies involved, do I understand correctly that if the individual who is the delegate can't make it, he as an individual can select an alternate, rather than the association doing so?

October 30, 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

64-23

MR. CRAWFORD:

The key to that is the meaning of the member of the council, and the member is verifying that the membership is not the association in each case; it is the individual. So your interpretation is correct. The individual would, in fact, choose a representative.

MR. HENDERSON:

In keeping with the fact that the organizations are nominating the individual that is to be the regular member in the first place, would it not be more desirable to have the association nominate three or four people also as alternates, which would leave the association with some degree of control of judgment as to who the representative is going to be, even if he is an alternate rather than just the one individual?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I think the hon. member's point is very well taken. It would seem to make sense that if the body itself names the individual, the same body should name the alternate. The only thing I can think of which could be difficult in any way would be the cumbersome nature of that requirement, that if a meeting of the advisory council was about to be held it might be necessary, if someone could not attend a meeting, to actually call the executive committee or, indeed, the association who knows what the by-laws of the group might provide, just to name an alternate. That is the fear that I would have. My guess would be that if, say, the Law Society was not satisfied that a person could not attend a meeting and had sent one of his friends in his place, if he had acted very foolishly in doing so they could always replace him, and not allow him to act foolishly again in the selection of his substitute.

I suggest that it is just one of those things where the point is extremely well taken and the intent of the body should be assured, rather than some individual member of it, but that no harm will come from passing it in this way. I would suggest but that it go through the way it is.

MR. TAYLOR:

Does the hon. minister anticipate that the nurses will appoint a nurse and that doctors will appoint a doctor? Would there not be a safeguard then, in saying that the alternate would have to be of the same category?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Dealing with the alternate, I was going to say that I can't feature, for example, the College of Physicians and Surgeons appointing anyone other than a physician and a surgeon. But that was not the point that you were making. If they did choose somebody else, and this individual, whoever he was, had all of the confidence necessary for the college to have appointed him, who should say that any harm has been done?

I think that, once again, it will prove workable. It will be one of those things in which, from the strictly technical approach to it, a small defect could be found, but I suggest it is workable the way it is.

[Section 4.1 (2) was agreed; Section 4.1 (3) to (5) was agreed to without debate.]

Section 4.1(6)

DR. PAPROSKI:

Section 6; is this Section 6 in the printed form?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No, it is still on the amendments.

DR. PAPROSKI:

I am just wondering if we have not passed Section 6 of the book.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No.

64-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

DR. PAPROSKI:

Have we, or haven't we?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No. This is really part of Section 4, Doctor.

MR. DIXON:

I would like to ask a question, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. I think this is a good place to bring it up. Last spring session we mentioned facilities for the criminally insane; there have been some arguments that we should have special facilities and I think that even Bowden was mentioned as a possibility. I was wondering what progress has been made to find such an institution within our province, in order that we can separate the patients who are in there because of illness from the one who is in there because of the criminal act that he has committed.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the answer to that observation and question is, that there is no need to legislate, and the question of proper facilities for the type of dangerous patients the hon. member describes is something that does not have to be the subject of any action. Now the question as to what progress there is; I think I could assure the hon. member, in spite of my view that this may not be the most appropriate time to deal with, that the Attorney General and I are very concerned about that question, and that we have discussed it several times during the summer and feel quite close to a satisfactory solution to the problem mentioned.

MR. DIXON:

I thought this would be the place to bring it up because under here you've got, "may advise on planning, development, standards," in (d) and even "may inquire into and consider any matters pertaining to mental health." That is the reason I brought it up. I would have been glad to bring it up any other time.

MR. CRAWFORD:

The only observation that I would make is that we are dealing with the section on the Advisory Council, and their role would be advisory, and of course they would have the right to advise on the matters described. But the actual providing of the facilities is a matter of government program, and no legislation that does not already exist is probably required to provide such a facility.

MR. DIXON:

Just one final question then. I know the former government, and I am sure this government, has taken into consideration that some of these cases involve charges under the criminal code. Now I was wondering if there had been any meeting with the federal departments in this matter?

MR. CRAWFORD:

As far as the content of the act is concerned, Mr. Chairman, we have not found it necessary to meet with the federal people in that respect. Although I am not fully conversant with the recent amendments to the Criminal Code, (that being, of course, not a provincial matter) my information is that it goes quite a long way to making the sort of assurance that is needed in the law to look after this type of patient. In our drafting of this act, as you will find when we get farther on to about Section 33, we recommend that certain proposals of ours actually be withdrawn from the amended version because of our view and our understanding that the federal legislation now satisfactorily deals with the matter.

[Section 4.1(6) and 4.1(7) (a) and (b) were agreed to.]

Section 4.1(7)(d)

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the hon. minister would care to outline for us the extent of the review that they would be permitted to pursue. I am thinking in terms of two areas; one, where it would relate to an individual --



October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-25

would this be something that would come to the review board that they might pursue, and seek information from the department? If it is, to what extent then would departmental information be available to them? This suggests administrative procedures, and I can see where problems might arise there. Secondly, if they are going to be doing some of this, what research capabilities would be provided for them? Maybe I am thinking too much in terms of active participation on the part of the review board.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, in spite of the broad meaning that is usually attached to the word 'any', where it says, "may review any policies", I suggest the section does not contemplate the review of individual cases, because of the advisory nature of the committee. There are appropriate places for individual cases to be reviewed in the office, of course, of the Ombudsman, and through the review procedures which are mandatory in respect to individual cases -- mandatory in the sense they must be presented to review boards set up under the act under subsequent sections from time to time.

MR. STROM:

How about research allocations?

MR. CRAWFORD:

You are wondering what resources would be made available to them for research? I would think it is not possible to set up an advisory committee without allowing them a reasonable budget, and that they would have enough authority, the way this is written, to engage in some original research.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, how would the planning component of the Department of Health and Social Development relate to this group?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I don't think in any way other than the most friendly and co-operative manner.

[Section 4.1(7) was agreed to.]

Section 4.1(8)

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, on 8, it is not spelled out here, but referring to it. What would be the compensation for the members of this committee? I'm thinking here particularly from the general public area?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a fairly well established range of figures for remuneration of people involved in a voluntary -- I suppose I mean part-time -- way on advisory boards throughout government, and all I can say is that it would be our intention that their remuneration be consistent with those broad guidelines.

I would rather answer the hon. Member for Wainwright more specifically, but at the present time there is a degree of divergence in this area which leaves me only able to say that it would be within a range of so much per meeting, and that it would be in the range that other such bodies also get.

[Section 4.1(8) was agreed to, and Section 5(1) (a) to (e) were agreed to without debate.]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

We were going to refer back to. . .

MR. R. SPEAKER:

No, Mr. Chairman, I think we should hold that referral until at least we cover page 10, Section 5.1.

64-26

ALEERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

MR. CHAIRMAN:

O.K., that's fine.

[Subsection (f) to Section 5.1(e) were agreed without debate.]

Section 5.2 (1)

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to go through all the points we raised before, but the duties and functions of the registration board are listed here. It gives them power to register persons as therapists in accordance with this act and regulation. Is it the intention of the government and the hon. minister to bring in regulations which will more clearly define a therapist? Is that the route that we will go, or will the committee of this board be given the power from the act to define their own terms of reference as therapists, and then make the decision from that point forward? My feeling is that government has a responsibility to set some policy guidelines as to what a therapist is.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, we are approaching it from the other end. It is a subject that has received a lot of discussion. Primarily, we are proposing that the associations themselves are the ones which should be pre-eminent in establishing standards within their own areas. However, I'll start with a description of the way it is done. The group would make a proposal to the registration board as to what requirements there should be for the people who would like to be named as therapists from their particular association. It is then up to the registration board either to accept it or not, and once one has been accepted, the body doesn't have any further ability to change it without, once again, coming to the board. So, if they place in their bylaws a series of requirements for a person to fulfill, if he is going to be registered as a therapist, if the registration board accepts that, then that is established and it is clear and it is well-known.

Now, I think the area where the hon. member's concern arises is that he would say it shouldn't be the registration board that approves that proposal from the group in question. It should perhaps be the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I agree that there are two sides to that and it is quite a debatable point. A good case could be made by either side, but it is necessary to adopt one course or the other. The one we adopted was to place as much confidence in the bodies involved as possible. That is the way it was put forward.

MR. HENDERSON:

I just want to ask a question about the manner in which the board is going to function. I notice in subsection (2), page 9, it says, "The members of the registration board shall appoint a chairman, a vice-chairman, and a registrar." But I don't notice anything in the section where the board is going to have a staff. I see some real pitfalls in having somebody act as a part-time registrar who is of the board members. Or is this board to be a full-time board? I rather viewed it as a board that would be convened as circumstances required it, or it had some business to entertain them. What is there going to be in the form of an ongoing secretariat for the board, and under what authority in the act is that service provided? Or is the board a full-time board?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, it wouldn't be anticipated that it would have to be a full-time board. There would be, of course, at the outset quite a lot of time having to be spent in registrations, you might say, of the first crop of therapists. But there are two sides to that, too. In the beginning, not all that many people will be ready to plunge into this field. Not all that many will have fulfilled the requirements laid down by their own association. I think, therefore, the actual registration of therapists will proceed, in the beginning, at not too great a rate. So the first crop may not be all that onerous a thing for the registration board to have to deal with. However, I think that the amount of time, being a part-time assignment, that has to be spent is something we'll have to gauge in the first few months of operation, and we'll keep an eye on it.

I do think the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc has made a good point in saying that there should be some assurance of continuing support, say, in the sense of a registrar or a full-time secretary for the registration board. I would have to agree with him that if there isn't that assistance for them, they

October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-27

would have some difficulties. And, of course, they'll have to maintain records. My thought is that that's the responsibility of the registrar, and the government would simply have to make the necessary arrangements for the storage of records, keeping a record of proceedings and a record of applications that are made and granted and refused, and so on. Once again, I doubt very much if, in order to provide that service to the registration board, it's necessary to put it in the act, but it will certainly have to be available to them.

MR. HENDERSON:

I can't help but wonder, in the interest of continuity, if you are going to set this board up, having had some experience with the problems of getting boards going and functioning; if it's made up of all part-time individuals I can see some pitfalls in it. I really question the desirability, if you really want to see the board functioning, of having the registrar as one of the part-time members of the board. That's all I'm really getting at. I would think it would be more preferable for the minister to pick somebody, such as a senior civil servant, who has other responsibilities - not trying to make a full-time job out of it - and make him available in an occupation capacity as the registrar, subject to the direction of the board. He should be doing something that fits in with other responsibilities within the department. I think that's really the main question I would raise. However, it's a problem the hon. minister himself is going to have to live with, and I'll let it go at that.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Following the minister's earlier remarks with regard to the approaches to defining what a therapist is, what did the minister consider as the role of the regional hospital board, with regard to a therapist, and what powers are provided for them here?

Secondly, what do you see as the powers of the actual professional associations? I know Section 5.2 talks about the process that we have already talked about, where they make recommendations, but what do you see as their powers as a profession in determining the definition of a therapist?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's based on the assumption - not a bad one, I think - that in the areas of treatment, that some innovation is taking place in the sense that a member of the Psychologists' Association is performing a role that is more recognized than it was before in regard to mental health and has certain rights that accrue to a person who is being named a therapist. Notwithstanding, there is a little bit of innovation there. There is no reason to believe that the professionals who make up the membership in that association are not the best equipped and best qualified to say what requirements their people should have in order to do this work. We all know that psychologists work in the mental field now and have certain skills. The theory is that they can be increased and that their services can be more useful to the patient and the population as a whole.

I suggest that it is at least as reasonable to conclude that the very members of that association are going to be able to arrive at what the standards and qualifications should be as it is to presume that any other person should be able to arrive at them. So this is a reflection; you asked me the power they would have in making a proposal to the registration board, using the best of their experience and ability in their own area of competence to make that presentation. That would be entirely within their own judgment as to what that presentation was. And then the group made up from all of them, being the registration board, will have a few different perspectives to put on that proposal and can come to a conclusion among them with their various talents as to whether or not it is a reasonable way to expect, for example, a psychologist to make his contribution. I think that is the way we opted on that and those are the reasons.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, was there consideration in having the professional organization itself make a prior endorsement of a candidate before he made his application to the board? In other words he would have to have the approval by the association as the first step, the second step then, approval by the board. Was there consideration of that approach?

64-28

ALEERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

MR. CRAWFORD:

That was considered, and the only difficulty there, would be the one that I referred to in the reaction to the question by the hon. Member for Highwood. It is possible that a person who is skilled in one of these areas, and is in fact a psychologist or is in fact a social worker; under existing laws regarding professional associations and occupational groups, just may not be a member of one of these bodies, and therefore so long as he can go to the registration board and say: "Here are the rules made up by that body of which I don't happen at the moment to be a member, but here are the rules and I can comply with"; then his application should be heard. That is my conclusion on that and the reason for doing it that way rather than requiring a nomination in advance, which was your question.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member also asked in regard to the relationship between the therapist and regional hospital board. I think that we know that hospitals, district hospitals and hospital boards generally do employ, of course, all sorts of people who aren't physicians and surgeons. Everybody from the one that runs the boiler employed by the board right up to people who are working on rehabilitation, therapists or the like. What this will mean is that they may also employ therapists for work in the mental health field, and that is important that that be the case, because of the hope that hospitals, other than the traditional mental hospital, will in fact be encouraged to handle mental health cases. As I am sure the committee is well aware, the hospitals have been encouraged in that regard over the past few years and many of them have taken on the responsibility of having up to 10 percent of their beds allotted to mental health cases. That being so, the therapist is then in his proper element, if his employer happens to be a hospital board say, instead of perhaps the Family Service Association or some other body like that.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I am not quite clear from the way the act is drafted as to really who is going to be responsible for setting standards, like Section E or clause B which is on page 10. ...to ensure the training of persons wishing to become therapists. Down below on 521 it says "for the purposes of establishing standards of training." There are a lot of pitfalls in this whole area in trying to figure out how some of this is going to relate to the question of the role that the universities play. For example, I say quite frankly the Alberta Nurses Association are of the opinion that their Faculty of Nursing at the University, should have the prerogative of setting all the standards for nursing and training. I am not really certain that I agree with this, in fact, I would say that I am not in agreement with it. I think there is a very definite need for input from a much broader spectrum of the public in general. I think that the professional groups all eventually get ingrown and there is a tendency to pursue expertise for the sake of expertise.

One of the examples come to my mind, and the Minister of Agriculture will eventually face the problem if he stays in politics long enough. He is going to be technically obsolete when he goes back to practice medicine. And there is the question of technical competency, and this has to be balanced, against, even possibly I have to say, maybe an incompetent doctor in an out of the way place, incompetent in some area, might still be better than no doctor at all. When you relegate -- well, I think it is very true -- when you relegate to the profession the prerogative within itself of setting the standards, the public interest, I don't think, is always looked after. It is a trend in other jurisdictions to provide -- and I think Ontario, I don't know if they implemented it, but I believe they did -- in some of their legislation dealing with professional groups or bodies that are setting standards and so on for professional personnel, broaden it to include lay people on their boards. It would bother me somewhat then, in light of this experience, any experiences that have previous years in Alberta, to hear the minister suggest, that he is quite happy to leave it up to the professional group itself to determine what the standards should be.

I know for example -- I think there was a bit of a campaign on to add one year on to the training of psychologists. I think all these people are now with Medicare, 100 per cent employed in the public sector. They may be getting money through the hospital commissions, they may be getting it through the department of health and then you are getting it through Medicare. Very clearly, the employment opportunities are 100 per cent in the public sector. I cannot but wonder, if we are really being a little bit overly optimistic in suggesting that the professional group itself is really competent to set all these training standards.

October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-29

With this the back of my mind, when I read the bill I have difficulty really grasping in this instance, who is going to set the standards for training therapists. If it is the board, well, it has the broad perspective on it. The board says, make recommendations to any person -- this is in clause (c) -- to make recommendations to any person, association, or organization concerning the training or examination of persons wishing to become therapists.

Very clearly, universities get into the act here. As the minister of advanced education knows, they are pretty independent. As I say, I am not certain in my own mind that they always act in the public interest, so who is going to set the standards clearly? Is it the board, or is the university, through the General Faculty Council, in some of these instances going to have this authority? If it is with the board I think it is well covered, but if it isn't --

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to express a sense of gratification and relief that when the hon. gentleman began to speak of the possible obsolescence of the deputy premier, that he limited it to the relatively unimportant area of his medical practice. The hon. member is taking on a very large assignment.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD:

But, I think there are a number of reactions that can be made to what has just been said, and once again there is an attempt to find a workable system involved. You go to the nominee, the five of them of each of the five groups referred to in section 5, subsection 1, and he is the person, under 5.2, subsection 1, who in the first instance, makes for the purpose of establishing standards. Each member

64-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

represents an organization or an association shall, following their appointment, submit in writing a proposal of the requirements. It is not as if they were given the continuing responsibility for training and standards. It is not as if that was left solely with the association. What it does mean is, that each one will sit down and say; "Here I am. I'm the best person that our association thought they could find for this job. Therefore, I now have the statutory obligation to work out what I think is the most likely set of requirements for people from my group." Surely he will do that with a benefit not only of experience and careful attention to his task, but also with the benefit of consultation with his colleagues and peers in the association. But this is only a beginning; that set of requirements goes to the chairman and then (this is, I think the important part, where the process becomes workable, even though it only is one of at least two options that would be available to us to arrive at the point that we would like) have the five together, have the full examination of each proposal take place as is in the first instance supported under Section 5.2(1). I just don't see that there is any conflict between that and 5.1(b) to which the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc referred, with its reference to ensuring that the training of persons wishing to become therapists is adequate. That assurance may be a communication to one of the associations in question, saying that as time goes by they have not brought their list of requirements for their particular group up-to-date and think that they should now look at this or that in regard to their training. No doubt there will be consultations with the universities and perhaps with the technical schools on a continuing basis. But taken all together the results are as likely to succeed as it would be if some other course were followed. Not perfect, perhaps, but enough to try, in the first instance, when this innovation is being attempted.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I really hope the hon. minister is right. Some experiences I have had in dealing in this area leads me to think that he has really over simplified the problems that he is going to get into. Because, as I say, the universities or some of the other institutions are going to control the actual training and education. I find that they can be very reluctant to accept direction even when the hon. minister is fully convinced that it is in the public interest to give it.

I come back to looking at the makeup of the registration board on page 8. This board, presumably, has got the job of trying to see that standards are established, regardless of how it goes about doing it. Would the hon. minister consider adding somebody from the public sector -- one or two more people -- to this board? I think this is highly desirable. It is a new board that has been set up. There is a growing problem in the whole field of health services, a growing proliferation of these allied workers in the whole delivery system, I think there is growing pressure for input from the broader public sector into all these professional boards. With a board composed as this is, I think there could be something to gain by adding one or two representatives from the public sector. There are therapists going to be employed in the public sector, presumably in the main, at the community level. I wonder, for example, if there couldn't be some opportunity for adding a board member or two from the local authorities that are going to deal with this on a day-to-day basis?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman. . .

MR. HENDERSON:

So this is what you really have in mind with those two there?

MR. CRAWFORD:

. . .[inaudible]. . .that the hon. member has made to, for example, the Ontario Medical Association which I now believe on their disciplinary body has two members of the public.

Section 5(3.1)

[Continued on page 32.]

64-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

MR. R. SPEAKER:

I am still not quite satisfied with the condition of the thing. I would like to hold that section. As mentioned earlier, we have some people who are doing some background work for us, and we are trying to do as much work as we can on these areas. I would like to hold this section if possible, and go on with the rest of the bill. Certainly we are not going to finish the Committee of the Whole study on this particular act; so we could come back to 5.1 and 5.2; there might be one other section related to this. But as far as I am concerned, I have not completed the discussion.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Perhaps the minister could respond to this. The Registration Board -- Section 5(1) (a) on Page 8 implies the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Would you also consider adding a member of the Alberta Association of Psychiatrists? There is a concern expressed by psychiatrists that they are not necessarily going to be members of this board.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, under item (f), the Director of Mental Health Services or an alternate designated by the minister is a member. At the present time (and I cannot see it being very likely otherwise) the Director is himself a psychiatric specialist. I am sure that any minister making an appointment of an alternate for the odd meeting would surely look to his people in the Mental Health Division who, if not all psychiatrists, certainly would be available for such a purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Minister, do you also agree to hold 5.2 to the next time? Is it 5.1 and 5.2, Mr. Speaker, that you want to come back to?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I was, as sometimes happens, engaged in one of those side conversations when the hon. Member for Little Bow gave his reasons. I wonder what the real reasons were for asking it to be held, and if he would mind expressing that briefly again.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, our concern is with the qualifications of a therapist and in the terms of reference. We have only had the bill over the weekend -- a point that has been made before. We have not been able to discuss it in a group, as a caucus; that is one point. The second point is that persons who wish to give us advice on this particular act have certainly not had the opportunity to do so.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, perhaps you could help me at this point. We are on Page 10; I believe we had approved it down to 5.1(e).

MR. CHAIRMAN:

That is right.

MR. CRAWFORD:

The request therefore is that 5.2 be held, and 5.3? Would it not serve the hon. member's purpose, since we dealt with 5.1, if we just held 5.2? No request was made to hold 5.1 as we went through it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Will it be O.K., Mr. Speaker, if 5.2 be held, so that we can come back to discuss it in principle?

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for 5.1 and 5.2. 5.1 seems to deal with the definition of therapists. The hon. minister of Agriculture says that we have had all summer to do this; fine. Why did we not have some of the amendments the day the House opened, instead of waiting until Friday? I think, Mr. Chairman, that we certainly have the right to some time to study these, and the minister

October 30, 1972

AIEERTA HANSARD

64-33

has agreed to that. The Deputy Premier seems to want to rush things and bulldoze them through the House; what's new?

DR. HORNER:

We would be the same as the old government, Mr. Chairman, if we did that. They used to excel in that. I do want to point out, though, that in fact the idea of licensing therapists was in the original act, and instead of putting it in the regulations, this puts it in the act, which broadens the scope of the thing entirely. I am quite agreeable that the hon. Member for Little Bow should have a little more time to study the situation. I know he has not had very much experience in this area and perhaps requires some assistance.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well; we will hold 5.1 and 5.2. Mr. Speaker, we will come back to these two sections tomorrow evening; is that agreeable?

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to coming back tomorrow evening, and I have no objection to the statements that the hon. Minister of Agriculture makes, if he wants to make that kind of statement. All I am suggesting is that we should consider this seriously in light of the House Leader's remark earlier, which was to the effect that we can hold sections if we wish to hold them.

Now, I want to make another point very clear, that I suggested if we come back and started reviewing all the discussion we had on 5.1, just have a rehash of it, I would object to it too. I don't think we should. And, really, all we have in mind is a reasonable chance to review certain points that are related to information we have now, that even if it was in the act previously, we may not have had at this point in time.

[Section 5.3 (1) to 5.4 (1) agreed to without debate.]

Section 5.4 (2)

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. minister would explain 5.4 (2), where it provides that the board "may register him as a therapist with or without conditions". What does that mean?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, it means that the normal registration, of course, would be without conditions; a license when it is normally issued, is a license to do so and so, in other words to conduct oneself as a therapist in this case. It does allow for the possibility that a person that you would like to appoint might be appointed subject to some condition. For example, a person who is, say, well experienced in volunteer work, but is not entitled to be appointed without conditions, may be appointed on the condition that he work with someone else, for example, who is trained and licensed as a therapist. So you might have the one therapist who is not circumscribed in the way in which he could carry on his work, but another one who is subject to a condition that may be that, if he is to work, he must be, say, in a general hospital where a person of some other training is also present.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, this gives us some of the difficulties that we are having. We still don't know what a therapist is, and now we are attaching conditions to it. I don't see how we can carry on a meaningful conversation on this bill until we know what the minimum standards of a therapist are going to be. We are making a sham of the whole thing, and a mockery of debate. We're talking about conditions; we're talking about making them therapists; we're talking about the duties they are going to do; and we still don't know what a therapist is. I think we should start this thing at the beginning and find out what a therapist is, find out what the minimum standards are, because if you are going to have a grade eight minimum standard, I'm going to have some very serious concerns about this. If you are going to have a professional standard, then as the hon. Member for Highwood said, there may be some concerns to. At least we should know what the minimum standards are, and surely it is not asking too much for the government to set out what it considers the minimum standards of a therapist are going to be.



64-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, one of the great difficulties in public communication in regard to advances that are being made in mental health is the insistence on the part of those who have not brought themselves up-to-date in the area on regarding the whole area of treatment in the traditional way. As soon as we get into the situation, as the hon. Member for Drumheller is doing, of ridiculing, say, someone with a grade eight education, if he thinks --

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I am not ridiculing him; I want to know what the standard is.

MR. CRAWFORD:

I'm trying to relate my remarks, Mr. Chairman, to what the hon. member's remarks were. And he indicated that he thought a certain minimum standard should exist, and did imply that people without a certain level of academic competence probably shouldn't be allowed to treat in this field. What people, who do know something about the new approaches that are being taken throughout most of the world in regard to treating people who have a problem with mental health, are finding out is that the whole area of treatment now is circumscribed, not by some institution filled with keepers and filled with perhaps psychiatric specialists, physicians, and surgeons, but filled with people who bring to the whole area of treatment an attitude that they care. That is their biggest asset.

I realize now that what we're into is a debate perhaps on the whole question of the changing role of treatment patterns in mental health, and as to the concern that some hon. gentlemen opposite are showing in regard to the introduction of the idea of therapists in the areas from which the therapists will be drawn, it is perfectly clear that we have expanded it from psychiatrists, physicians, and surgeons, to four other categories of people. I hope that the members of the Association of Registered Nurses, the Psychologist Association, the Psychiatric Association, and the Association of Social Workers are not under attack here this afternoon for their competence. It is perfectly clear from the discussion we have just had that it is from these areas that therapists will be drawn. To make the statement that we don't know what a therapist will be is simply not accurate. It is an over reaction to an unknown. It is an over reaction to an area that, with all respect -- and I do have respect for the hon. Member for Drumheller -- but with all respect to him, I feel that he hasn't acquainted himself with the changing patterns in treatment that are occurring in the field of mental health. I hope that, in the course of our discussion here, all hon. members will become better acquainted with it, and indeed that all hon. members who haven't done so before will become part of an important communication to the public that will be there on a continuing basis. The whole public of Alberta has to take an attitude that is appropriate to the 1970's in regard to treatment in mental health. The opposition to that will be seen for what it is, that is, that it is archaic and anachronistic.

[Applause]

MR. TAYLOR:

That's fine. The sheep at the back can clap all they want. Maybe if they asked a few questions they may help to enlighten us. All I want to know is what are the minimum requirements of a therapist, and the government is not saying. If it is grade six, fine, then we'll know what it is; if it is grade four; if there are no qualifications. But you're saying there are standards but you refuse to say what the standards are going to be. Surely, that is a logical and sensible inquiry. Why don't the hon. members in the back row speak up and say what it is? What is the standard? That's all we're asking.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, I don't pretend to be any more of an expert in the field of mental health than the hon. Member for Drumheller, but it does occur to me that the outstanding story of success in at least one field of mental health is the story of Alcoholics Anonymous. They're lay people, and they're not all psychiatrists by any means.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, firstly I don't think that the suggestions of the minister that we oppose, in principle, what he is trying to do should really go left unanswered. Because I'm certainly familiar from the brief experience I had with

October 30, 1972

AILEEN HANSARD

64-35

-----

this problem, that one of the major handicaps -- it is probably one of the major problems in trying to de-centralize treatment facilities and services -- is a lack of professionally qualified personnel. There is no question about it. The standards have to be broadened insofar as the type of people who are involved in the mental health treatment program beyond just the conventional psychiatrist or beyond the psychologist. But I think what is bothering us is not having a clear picture, as apparently the hon. minister has in his mind, as to the type of work, for example, that a therapist is going to do. If a person had more intimate knowledge of this, one could, I think, come up with a better picture himself, in his own mind, of what the qualifications for the person should be. If the minister could possibly say a few words on this subject, and it touches on the question, what is this broader role of broader methods and new techniques that will be involved in the treatment of mental health? I certainly think it would be highly educational to all the members of the House to learn what they are.

I have some background in the not too far past, as I say, in the problem and in the matter, and I would suspect that a significant number of the members of the House are not too well versed in what the role of this therapist is going to be. I think it covers a broad spectrum of the type of service and work that they would do. If the minister could elaborate on that, I think it might help us out a little bit.

One of the things that concerns us is the fact that the definition of the type of work and the qualifications, in a broad sense, of a therapist, are really not dealt with in the act. Yet these people with, as yet unknown responsibilities and unknown qualifications will have in law, under the act, the power to apprehend people and whatnot, and have them detained for up to 12 hours, if I interpret the act right, before a review takes place. I think this is legitimate cause for concern, when we start broadening legislation in that regard. It's with respect to this particular question of the legal powers that these therapists will have to detain a person for a mental examination that gives us some cause for concern as to what the function and role of a therapist is. I think people have a generally clear picture of what type of work a psychiatrist does; psychologists I think to a somewhat lesser extent, but it's still an established professional group. So if the minister could elaborate very briefly on the type of work and services that these therapists are going to provide, I think it would certainly help expedite the progress of the bill through committee.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the attitude of the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc in approaching the subject. I think that what I said a few moments ago, that what was really at issue here. It was the concept of whether or not patterns in the treatment of mental health are actually going to change. I think that that is coming out in the remarks that are being made by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House this afternoon, and that therefore it should indeed be treated.

The sort of example that I would like to propose begins from an assumption that the historic institutionalized patterns of treatment by primarily psychiatric specialists, physicians and surgeons, and psychiatric nurses in an institution will not continue to be the overwhelming thrust in mental health treatment of any patient who requires it. The introduction, therefore, of the idea of a therapist adds something to the skills that already exist in the area of the psychiatric specialist and the physician and surgeon. It adds a new role that that therapist may play. It adds areas, indeed treatment areas and geographic areas, where he may play that role. It adds, for example, by escalating the services of psychologists and social workers through the guidance clinics. It makes it possible, in areas of the province where no services at all have existed over a period of years -- they have tended to exist only in the major centres of population -- it raises the possibility in those other centres for preventive work, for example, and to have somebody who is there in the community, working with the voluntary associations. The Canadian Mental Health Association and a few others are very enthusiastic about making sure that volunteer work in those areas is done. You have the possibility in those communities of home care and after care programs. For example, the act makes it necessary for a facility discharging a patient to indicate the fact of discharge to the referring source, so that if we have a physician and surgeon practising in one of the smaller communities -- probably there without too much support in the sort of treatment that he is giving to people who are patients because of their mental health -- if he knows the patient is being discharged to his community, he can bring an after care type of service to that patient that under existing practices is too often overlooked. I have had doctors from the smaller communities in particular make that particular complaint to me.

64-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

Feature your psychologist, then, through a guidance clinic or as a staff member in one of the hospitals, wherever that may be in Alberta, as engaging in counselling, family therapy, these follow-up services and, hopefully at least in time, some reasonable preventive services along with groups that are volunteering in the community. And then compare that, as an example of the type of approach, with the situation where the person who is mentally ill (as has been the case in many jurisdictions in the past) didn't really have much alternative for continuing treatment unless he did admit himself to an institution; the ability to do it voluntarily was there, however, in the unfortunately many cases where it has happened in the past and maybe shouldn't have happened, the person would actually be committed.

Now, we hope that changing patterns and treatment will bring the number of committals way down. This has been the experience in some of the areas that have tried that. That by itself is an important thing to try to achieve. In bringing down the number of committals and in reducing the population of the major institutions, we are, of course, following some of the principles declared as being so important in Dr. Blair's report. And I think I might mention that I had the advantage, on one of these days, Mr. Chairman, of going through some files, of reading the understanding in the form of a memorandum that the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc had of the progress that could soon be made, in his view a year or so ago, regarding the steps that were recommended by the Blair Report. If I can venture a humble opinion, he showed an excellent understanding of what was intended.

We do feel that the time has come, indeed perhaps in a lot of ways it's long overdue, to recognize and accept what is a fact in treatment patterns in other jurisdictions and of course in Alberta what has begun to be a changing pattern of treatment, and to enshrine that in legislation, to declare it as a matter of the policy of the provincial government that these modifications in approaches to people who require help in this way be backed up by legislation and be facilitated by legislation and that the steps that have been taken and the successes that have been achieved to this point be accelerated and that we pursue them with the vigour, all of the vigour we are capable of. As I mentioned earlier, we certainly wouldn't be unhappy if in that quest we had the support of both sides of the House in saying that what is happening in Alberta at the present time in regard to mental health legislation is that we are bringing it into the 1970's and that we do have an understanding of this particular type of illness that the population as a whole didn't have before -- at least that we understand it, and that we encourage, of course, all Albertans to understand it and to join in this very important extension of treatment into areas that can now be used to supersede the traditional, institutionalized, stereotyped, old-fashioned, 19th century types of institutions that, unfortunately, members often still think of when they think of the problem of mental health.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to be critical but the minister seems to talk all around the subject and didn't really quite get right at it. Would it be a fair statement to say that I gather, from what you saying, and reading between the lines, that at least at the outset, the therapist, in all probability, would be the person that would have the qualifications as we presently would know of a social worker, who has a specific interest and some additional specific training in the area of mental health. Is this the type of person we are thinking of, because in a number of the areas you mentioned, there is a habit in the medical profession to draw a line and say this is a medical problem and this is a social problem, and I think we are trying to transcend the two and say it is a people problem.

But, at least at the outset, I envision the type of person you are talking about is a social worker that has university qualifications in all probability, but has a specific empathy for the mental health picture as well, and once the standards are drawn up, to be sure the patient's interest is protected. This is the type of person, at least at the outset, that we are talking about. Am I right, or way off base?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I will answer the hon. member this way and say that the type of person he describes would be most likely to be in the forefront of the registration of therapists once the proposals of the various associations are approved by the registration board, and once it has established the things that are within its terms of reference to establish. I agree that that would be a most likely area to proceed in.

October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-37

There is something else that might be said, and that is, a therapist -- let's not forget that his talents, say those of a psychiatric nurse or a nurse working in a hospital, maybe right in a mental hospital -- will continue with a smaller population, but will still continue as a major referral centre for more intensive treatment. The therapist in that circumstance, will be, perhaps, a member of a very highly integrated team led by a psychiatric specialist, whereas a therapist in another may be an independently operating type of person whose interests are in family therapy. This brings to mind the suggestion that the social worker's role is going to be in the forefront of the registration of therapists.

The other possibility, of course, is that by special training courses, municipal nurses, people who are public health nurses with the local boards of health in various parts of the province, where the main facility for psychiatric services may not be in the community, may be in a community some miles away. Then that person in the local board of health, or a municipal nurse, with the requirements laid down by her association and approved by the registration board, may be acting on her own in an area where no treatment was available in the past for a patient in that community. There are, I believe, a great number of communities where that has been the case up until the present time.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I will just ask one more question; the last question that I would like to ask of the minister. I gather that what is being advocated in the bill, or espoused, is really a philosophy and the definitions, by and large, aren't really too clear or too well crystalized as far as the type of people are concerned. I am not being critical in this sense but there is a bit of groping going on here. I'm groping to find out what the minister is really saying, and I get the impression that it is the philosophy he is talking about, and he needs a legal framework within which to try to develop standards and services for these therapists. services under. It is breaking new ground which is rather a vague area to get into.

Again, my reason for belabouring this is still the cause for concern of the fact that with this unknown area we are talking about, these people are still going to have powers of commitment for a limited period of time which, I think, is twelve hours. Is this right? Maybe the minister could --

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, we will get to that section later on and it relates to either two physicians or a physician and a therapist. There is no power for a therapist acting strictly on his own to send someone for a examination even for 12 hours, and that, by the way, is subject to an amendment to 24. But the point that was being made by the hon. member, I think it would be fair to say that what we are looking for is a structure that will enable us to work towards some new goals, and that if we had this structure more stereotyped than it is, it might not serve the purpose as well as we hope it will in the form in which it is presented. I do believe that it will be the means by which we can get to the goals that I have tried to give voice to this afternoon.

MR. LEE:

I think that I might just be able to clarify briefly the procedure that is being followed. As a member of the Psychologists' Association, I know that our association is looking first of all at the act that is presented, then are trying to determine what kind of a person can fulfill the particular aspects of the act. The hon. minister is faced with one of two possibilities in determining these minimums. First of all he can consult members of his department, those experts that might assist him; he can draw up regulations himself. Or the other way he can go is the one that he is going now, directly to the associations which are going to be involved and asking them what they feel should be the minimum requirements.

In particular, the association that I belong to, they would probably be looking at something like these four things; they are probably looking for a supervised and evaluated practicum experience, in other words some way of evaluating what the people have done in assessment and treatment. Secondly, they are probably looking at certain minimum educational requirements. This may be university training, and probably will be. Thirdly, they are probably looking for certain actual subject studies. These may involve such things as psychological assessment, analysis of behaviour and so on. But they will probably insist on certain subject studies. Fourthly, they are probably looking for some kind of experience. That is what one association is doing and I am sure that all of them are, but by melting this together, by groups of people, I

64-38

ALEFETA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

think they are going to come up with something that is going to be very workable. The other way around it may be more tedious, and it may not be as workable.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, the philosophy outlined by the minister of trying to make the lives of those who are mentally disturbed happier and to rehabilitate them and so on, I don't think there is any argument with that philosophy at all. Surely every hon. member and every citizen of the province wants those who get into that category to have every possibility and every hope and every chance to recuperate and to live a normal and worthwhile life. Some people, in spite of what we do, are going to become violently mad. I don't suppose there is any difficulty in determining that particular group and recognizing that they have to be confined or committed, at least until doctors or psychiatrists or nurses are able to help them to regain normal posture.

The group that I am concerned about are those where there is some doubt, and every one of us, if we have been a member very long, have had people come and object to certain people being committed to mental hospitals. Others come and think other people should be committed to mental hospitals, not foolishly but because they think they might commit a very serious offence at some time in the future. You have to view these things pretty seriously. That is my whole purpose in making sure that a person who is going to have the authority, or partial authority, to commit a person to a mental hospital should surely have some minimum training or some minimum experience. If there is not going to be a minimum educational requirement, I think the hon. minister should say so. If it is going to depend entirely on the appointment of a therapist on his or her good sense and experience and so on, then the hon. minister should say so. I think the public of this province are entitled to know what type of person is going to have the authority to commit persons to a mental hospital. This

This is not a light thing; this is a serious thing. All we are asking is that we get some further enlightenment on this. The definitions as I have outlined already just don't answer the point at all. If you just refer to 5.6 it is what I am trying to say; "Subject to any conditions specified on the registration, a person who is registered as a therapist is entitled to perform the duties and functions and exercise the powers, duties, and functions of a therapist." It is meaningless. In no place have they said what this person is. The duties are outlined; the powers are outlined; but the standards are not outlined. If the hon. minister is saying that there is no minimum educational standard; that is what we want to know. If he is saying there is no minimum experience required; that is what we want to know. But I do not think that is the case. I think there will be some minimum requirement I am sure of it, educationwise and experiencewise before anyone is given the power that a therapist is given in this act.

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Chairman, in speaking in support of this bill and the form of this bill, and speaking as somebody who had considerable concern with the definition of therapist and the functions of a therapist, I think I should say that it would be very hard to define these qualifications in the legislation. After all, even in my own profession, there is no legislation that stipulates the qualifications of a physician. We simply rely on the discretion of the examining board of a university to provide us with that security that we feel and expect from the medical profession, also the discretion of a College of Physicians and Surgeons to license that person to practise in this province. It also applies to most of the professions. I think one can go on to say that even The Highway Act does not stipulate the qualifications that a person has to have to drive a highly lethal motor vehicle about the highways where he could be in danger of doing even worse than committing a person to a mental hospital.

We do rely on the fact that a person has to be tested by an examiner and we put our faith in this examiner having sufficiently high standards to assure us of some degree of security as far as the highways are concerned. And therefore, I do not see how one can legislate here for a qualification of these therapists.

I think this is a very courageous bill. I think it is one that has gone a long way towards answering a need which the smaller communities of this province have been searching for over many years -- the ability to get support from other than the medical profession in the treatment of mentally ill patients within their area without having to send them out to large institutions in the bigger centres. The whole concept of a therapist is the very guts of the bill, in that it is introducing into our society a person who does take on some of these

October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-39

responsibilities of therapy that cannot be assumed, mainly because of time by the medical profession.

I think in our effort to make sure that a therapist is a person who will be qualified to take on these duties, we have in this bill instituted a protection, in that they are licensed, and the qualities and the qualifications of your licensing board are such that I think that we can either accept that these people will provide that protection towards the public that the hon. Member for Drumheller is concerned about, or we have to turn around and decide who is more qualified to license these people to carry out these duties. I certainly think that the licensing board as described in the bill does show a body of people who, I think, fill this qualification. It certainly is not something that one can put down in terms of university degrees, because there are not any university degrees in therapists as such, and because the therapist does cover quite a cross-section of degrees of training and degrees of experience, that it is necessary to appoint a board that will review this and assess the qualities and qualifications of a person who is to be registered as a therapist. I personally, having had considerable doubts at the beginning, having studied the situation, feel that such a board has been nominated in the act.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I want to say once again, certainly I, personally, and I am sure my colleagues support the principle of what the hon. minister is trying to do. And I come back again and repeat that my concern is about the rather vague role and definition of qualification of therapist.

I don't disagree with the hon. minister who just spoke that it is difficult to talk about putting it in the act, but I would just like to ask the hon. minister to take cognizance of this right now because I have a different interpretation of this act than he has. I thought the minister said a therapist could not make a formal committal of an individual on his own initiative. And the way I read the admission procedure on page eleven, quite clearly, I gather, a therapist on his own initiative can issue a conveyance and examination certificate, the basis on which, a person could be held 24 hours.

So I have no qualms whatever about what the minister is trying to do in broadening the field of preventative services, social services, in this particular area at all. It is just this one question that I get a little hung up on quite frankly. It is the fact that some, as yet undefined individual with a yet undefined qualification, with his as yet undefined responsibilities, as in the act, will have the authority on that person's own signature, in effect, to basically apprehend a person, have him committed for a period of 24 hours for further examination. I quite realize that -- if I am wrong in interpreting the bill -- I quite realize that once he is at a place for further examination, it is a therapist and physician, or two physicians must examine him and either decide to issue additional certificates to detain him or let him go within 24 hours.

Am I wrong in my interpretation that the certificate of one therapist would detain and hold a person for 24 hours? Because to convey them and examine them -- they have to be detained if they don't want to, and I gather what we are talking about is formal admission procedure -- it could be involuntary as far as the patient himself is concerned.

Maybe, as I say, we are getting ahead of ourselves in the bill, but the two are tied together in my mind, and maybe the hon. minister does not wish to deal with it now, but would rather wait until we come to that particular section to expand further on it.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I don't mind doing two things. One is indicating to the hon. member that he has indeed correctly interpreted what is there, and that the procedure of committal, of course, is a different one than the examination procedure, but he remarked upon that.

The other thing is that I would prefer to deal with it when we get to Section 11, and not deal with it now. But if I can make this one comment in passing, another one of the things that will happen as a result of this act, is that people, for the purpose of an examination, are not likely to end up at Oliver or Ponoka. They are going to be examined at, as the act says, a facility. So the whole atmosphere of conveying a person to a facility for an examination is not the stereotyped view of being taken to a frightening place like a mental hospital at all. It could well be an examination elsewhere.

64-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

October 30th 1972

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't have it cleared up in my mind, it's Oliver -- Ponoka, it wouldn't matter whether it was Lethbridge, or Medicine Hat, or wherever it happened to be. The basic issue is that the therapist can issue a certificate, under the act, to detain a person against his or her will, for a period of 24 hours for examination. Where the examination is going to take place is somewhat academic as far as the principle is concerned.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, just one more word in connection with the points raised by the hon. Minister of Public Works. I appreciate his points. I think he was saying exactly what I was trying to say and that is, where there is a driver examiner, and we trust that examiner to examine people before that examiner is appointed, there are minimum standards. There are minimum educational standards, and there are minimum driving standards that he must meet or he cannot become an examiner. Before a person can become a doctor or a lawyer, he must not only attain a certain grade in high school, but he must also have certain subjects that are a minimum standard before he even enters the faculty. All we're saying is that is there a minimum standard in regard to therapists? If so, we would like to know what it is?

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to further expand upon the comments that are being made. I think that we have to take into consideration the groups that have the privilege of making the appointments or the nominations. I think that surely we can understand that if the Psychiatric Nurses' Association was making an appointment, they're not going to take into consideration someone off the street who doesn't have some basic training in that field. If we have the medical profession making that appointment, surely we have to consider that they'll not select someone who will not have a basic standard as to what the problem requires. When we have the hon. minister making an appointment we also have to take into consideration that he will look at someone who has the kind of basic education that can cope with the problem, to set out, in the act, the requirements for a therapist. What may be suitable today may not be suitable tomorrow. We have to leave it flexible enough to meet the kinds of needs that come with the change in times.

I think that our concern here, in having it specified as to what the minimum standards must be, is wrong because tomorrow they may not be adequate. So these are just comments that I would like to bring to the attention of the members to think about.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move at this time that the committee rise and report progress on Bill No. 83 and beg leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 5:27 p.m.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the following bill, Bill No. 83, and begs to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

October 30, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

64-41

FCINT CF CRLER

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to outline to the assembly, tentative business for tomorrow evening in the House. Firstly, because a number of bills aren't printed, at 8:00 p.m. tomorrow night I will ask leave, and I would now like to give notice of motion that I will make at that time that we revert to introduction of bills, and subsequently to Orders of the Day. The purpose at that time for reverting to Introduction of Bills will be to have three bills introduced, a Bill to Amend the Lord's Day Act, The Improvement Districts Act, and The Municipal Government Act. Following that, upon moving to Orders of the Day there will be two money bill resolutions. The first, which is on page 4 of Votes today, will be a resolution for An Act to Amend The Legislative Assembly Act (No. 2), and secondly a resolution for a bill being The AGT-Edmonton Telephone Transfer Act, which is Government Motion No. 3 on today's Order Paper.

Following completion of those matters tomorrow night, Mr. Speaker, we will move to continue committee study of Bill 83, The Mental Health Act, and following that, committee study of The Legal Professions Act, The Workmen's Compensation Amendment Act, The Defamation Amendment Act, The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, The Department of Public Works Amendment Act, The Brand Amendment Act, and The Financial Administration Amendment Act.

I might advise the assembly that tomorrow night and on other evenings, if time permits, the motion with respect to the receipt of the Commission on Educational Planning, which is on today's Order Paper, will be called. I don't know whether it will be tomorrow night in the House, Mr. Speaker, depending on business, but tomorrow night or perhaps Wednesday. Also, Government Motion No. 1 may or may not be called in future, as time allows.

As we are not sitting tonight, Mr. Speaker, I would now move the House do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader that the House adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 5:31 p.m.]

ADDENDUM

The following pages are those missing from Vol. 1, No.63.