

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, November 19, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure and a sense of history that I rise in my place this afternoon to introduce to members and to you guests seated in your gallery.

The occasion is one we have chosen which, together with the 75th Anniversary of the province, is a commemoration of an event that took place on November 23, 1894, 11 years before we became a province. On that date, letters patent were issued to Koney Island Sporting Company Limited, in Regina, which was then the seat of government of the Northwest Territories. That company, which still exists today, is the oldest company on record that is part of the corporate system in the province of Alberta; in other words, receiving its charter via the governmental system existing in this province today. We do have companies, such as the Hudson's Bay Company, which have a much longer history in this area of the nation, Mr. Speaker, but in that case the charter did not come from the seat of government which ruled over the Territories as they then were, and now the province of Alberta.

It's the fourth company on our records, Mr. Speaker, the first three having since disappeared. It would be of interest to hon. members to note some of the shareholders and directors of that company through the years and their relationship to the early history of this province, such as Mr. Joe Morris, who owned the first automobile in the city of Edmonton and was a prominent retail merchant in this city. As some hon. members will recall, when the Registrar of Companies also had the responsibility for issuing licence plates, Mr. Morris continued to have the licence plate bearing the number 1 for many, many years because of having the first one. Others were William Short and W.T. Henry, both former mayors of the city of Edmonton; lawyers H.C. Taylor and Sidney Taylor, one of whom, Mr. H.C. Taylor, went on to become a member of the judiciary; Kenneth A. McLeod, who built the McLeod building in the city of Edmonton; Emmanuel Raymer, Edmonton's first jeweller; Dr. Sandy Goodwin, who lived to the ripe age of 99 and was Edmonton's first dentist; and there were others, Mr. Speaker.

The Koney Island Sporting Company Limited was formed for the purpose of erecting and maintaining buildings, clubhouses, boathouses, and hotels on Pine Island, situated in Cooking Lake in the district of Alberta. Pine Island was subsequently renamed Koney Island because of the spruce and pine trees found on the island, and because the members thought they would go on and rival Coney Island in New York with some of the recreational potentials of the island.

Mr. Speaker, seated in your gallery are the grandson of

Joe Morris, who originated this company, and others I would like to introduce. May I begin with Mr. Joe Morris, the grandson of Mr. J.H. Morris, and Mr. Donald Matheson. Both are shareholders of the company. Also seated in your gallery, next to Mr. Matheson, are the former Registrar of Companies, Mr. Warr; the Deputy Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Mr. Martin; Mr. Hal Thomas, the present Registrar of Companies; Mr. Bert Proskiw, the Deputy Registrar of Companies; and a gentleman who has done a lot for our 75th Anniversary celebrations by providing us with some of the history of the province over the last number of years in articles that have appeared in the press of the province, Mr. Tony Cashman, a noted historian.

head: **PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES**

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, as chairman, I hereby report that the Standing Committee on Private Bills has had under consideration the undermentioned private Bills and begs to report the same with the recommendation that they be proceeded with: Bill Pr. 1, The La Fondation de l'Association Canadienne-Francaise de l'Alberta Act; Bill Pr. 3, The Alberta Wheat Pool Amendment Act, 1980; and Bill Pr. 4, The Keith Dial Adoption Termination Act.

The Standing Committee on Private Bills has also had under consideration the undermentioned private Bill and begs to report the same with the recommendation that it proceed, with amendments: Bill Pr. 5, The Alberta Foundation Act.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority, together with accompanying financial statements, for the year ended March 31, 1980.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file two documents completed for the Northern Alberta Development Council. One is Trends in Northern Alberta, and one is the Inventory of Infrastructure for Northern Communities.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file the responses to motions for returns 122 and 124, moved by the Member for Clover Bar.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, today it is my distinct pleasure to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly some two and a half dozen alert students from Sherwood school in the constituency of Edmonton Glenora. They are accompanied by Mrs. Rybock, and are seated in the public gallery. Would they now stand and receive the appropriate welcome of the Assembly.

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly 42 new Canadians, seated in the public gallery. Forty of these young people are Indo-Chinese from Vietnam, one from Romania, and one from Chile. They are living in

Red Deer and going to school. About 25 per cent are going to Lindsay Thurber Comprehensive high school, and the balance are attending Red Deer College. They are accompanied by their very dedicated instructors Walter Pruden, Bev Kneeland, Velma Dick, and Loveday Bougie. I would ask that they rise and receive the traditional welcome of the House.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, today I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group of six students from the Alberta Vocational Centre in Lac La Biche, located in the Lac La Biche-McMurray constituency. They are accompanied today by their instructor and friend Denis Menard.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege and pleasure of attending at AVC on many occasions, and in the Menard home. I have received a most cordial welcome. I would ask that the members of the Assembly return that cordial welcome to the group.

head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Department of Culture

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the 75th Anniversary cabinet committee, I would like to report on the successful celebrations throughout Alberta to date this year.

In many ways our goals, and those of thousands of Albertans for this year, were to highlight Alberta's growth by recognizing our people, culture, and achievements over the past 75 years. That has been achieved.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of diverse programs of lasting benefit for future Albertans of all ages have resulted from the anniversary. Many of these programs have been firsts. Senior citizens' groups improved and upgraded their facilities; local cultural bodies had a chance to sponsor professional theatre and visual art displays; and dance troupes appeared in some communities for the first time.

The fitness of Alberta was not forgotten either. The Alberta Recreation and Parks program touched thousands of Albertans. In the field of education the school-children of this province were involved through various programs, including receiving a commemorative medallion bearing the new augmented coat of arms. Not a single area of the province was left untouched as a result of the celebrations.

The largest portion of the 75th budget was allocated to our municipalities. Many of the projects are an investment for the future of this province. The municipal projects are as diverse and varied as the communities and the people they serve. About 75 per cent of the total per capita expenditures went toward cultural, recreational, or community facilities. Yesterday Mr. Moore tabled an interim report on the ways the municipal dollars were spent and invested. It reflects the thoughtful and, in many ways, imaginative distribution of funds within each community.

The 900 or more homecomings held this year gave friends, relatives, and former Albertans a chance to return to rural Alberta to view at first hand the exciting developments which are taking place in our province, and of course to remember their early days in their communities.

The New Canadian Encyclopedia is the largest publishing project of its kind in Canada. It is indeed a tribute to all Canadians.

The reservoir of organizational ability and the enthusiasm which this year has generated presents a cornerstone for increased participation and interest in sports, history, and art in future years. This is indeed a legacy for the future.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. minister is just making a report of the activities that took place, not an announcement. Is that in order?

MR. SPEAKER: I must say to the hon. member that I was becoming increasingly concerned about the matter. I did think that perhaps we could see what the ultimate scope of it might be, then consider whether in the future members should be getting up and reviewing past activities and extolling the benefits of something that has occurred in the past. It would seem to me that is not the purpose for which ministerial announcements have ordinarily been used in the Assembly, or by parliamentary custom. As I understand it, they are pretty well confined to announcing new policy directions or new undertakings of some kind by the government.

I regret interrupting the hon. minister, but there is one further thought I had intended to mention. Such reviews of what has already occurred are of course to some extent matters of opinion. While it is true that the hon. Leader of the Opposition would have the right to comment on an announcement of that kind, other hon. members who might wish to debate the opinions expressed wouldn't have that opportunity. So there would also be a difficulty in fairness.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In addition to this ministerial statement, I am tabling an interim report on our 75th Anniversary.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Oil Sands/Heavy Oil Development

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, the first question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources is really a result of a series of three announcements which flowed together in the last few days, dealing with non-conventional oil reserves. Primary in those was the Imperial Oil announcement that it's suspending engineering design work on the Cold Lake heavy oil plant. My question to the minister: is the government intending to enter into an agreement with Imperial Oil which will provide the company with the necessary funding to continue engineering work on its Cold Lake plant? I make that question in light of comments by the president of Imperial Oil that that in fact was the only way the project could go ahead.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I would observe that when the announcement of suspension was made by Imperial Oil, they gave as the reasons for the suspension the conditions contained in the recent federal budget, and also the fact that there had been a lack of progress toward an energy agreement between the two governments. Members of the Assembly will recall my comments regarding the federal government's role in those negotiations. In fact, I've described them as being non-negotiations and a public relations exercise on their part.

Mr. Speaker, in view of that and the reasons given by Imperial Oil for suspending the Cold Lake project, it

would seem to me that the commitment which I understand was made in the federal House today by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, Mr. Lalonde, to advance the \$40 million to Imperial Oil if that were necessary — in light of Imperial Oil's reasons for suspending, it's very appropriate that the federal government advance the money.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Were the discussions with Imperial Oil very recently, prior to Imperial Oil making the announcement that unless \$40 million came from someplace — and that someplace obviously being the taxpayers' pocket — that the project would not be able to go ahead?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions with Esso on a sort of continuing basis in respect of the Cold Lake project. This suggestion was raised in one of those discussions some time ago; I can't be precise about the date. But certainly we've been aware for a long time — and I think I've observed that on several occasions — that sooner or later both this project and the Alsands project would have to go into a state of suspension if they could not see government approvals and agreements forthcoming.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Now that the situation in essence is that the government of Canada is prepared to put up the money to continue the engineering work for a period of a few months, perhaps two months, is the government of Alberta prepared to take the initiative in getting the government of Canada back to the bargaining table, and prepared at this time to consider separating the negotiation of the Cold Lake plant so that project could go ahead?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I gather the hon. Leader of the Opposition is asking whether we would be prepared to separate the oil sands projects, or the Cold Lake project by itself, from the other components of what we've been describing in the Assembly as the energy package. I thought I made the government's policy on that very clear recently in the House by saying we would not be prepared to separate them. Essentially we would not be prepared to separate them when the federal government, by its unilateral action in the budget and energy program, is threatening jobs in Alberta in the conventional side of the industry, and when they're not respecting the province's ownership interest in the resource.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, moving on to the heavy oil developments by Husky and the future of the Nova/Petro-Canada oil sands plant in the Lloydminster area, and the announcement now made by Husky that they're going to reduce their activity considerably in the heavy oil coming from the Lloydminster area, what discussions have there been between the Alberta government and Husky prior to that announcement? As a result of those discussions, what are the economic implications for the Lloydminster area?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall having any specific discussions with officials of Husky with respect to their exploration or development activity in the heavy oil in the Lloydminster area. I suspect the hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring to a newspaper report arising from a speech. I am aware of what was said at that speech, but I don't recall any specific discussion with any

officials of Husky regarding their intentions as to development and exploration of heavy oil — and we're talking now about conventional heavy oil — in the Lloydminster area.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Since the federal budget came down, have there been discussions between Husky and the Alberta government regarding the very real possibility that Husky and several other companies — but talking of Husky on this occasion — in fact will be shifting their development out of conventional heavy oil in the Lloydminster area and moving to Canada lands, to use the term of the federal government, which for all intents and purposes are the northern part of the country; moving ahead in their development there, basically at the expense of their conventional heavy oil work in the Lloydminster area?

MR. LEITCH: I've had no such discussions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, incidentally, was on her feet several times during the previous supplementaries.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the hon. minister relates to the Imperial Oil announcement with respect to the suspension of activities at Cold Lake. It's really one of clarification. Could the hon. minister indicate, regardless of whether the federal government or provincial government provided the \$40 million, if the reason Imperial Oil has given for the suspension of their further progress and activities at Cold Lake was really related to the federal budget. For clarification, would providing the \$40 million clear the matter of the problems with the federal budget and the lack of negotiation of an agreement between the two governments?

MR. SPEAKER: In its present form the question is both hypothetical and an attempt to elicit an opinion. Possibly the hon. member might deal with the subject in a different way in a further supplementary, perhaps in a few moments.

MRS. CHICHAK: Perhaps I could rephrase my supplementary; that is, to clarify whether, in the minister's understanding, the announcement that has been made today was related to the need for the \$40 million?

MR. SPEAKER: Clearly the hon. minister's understanding would be an opinion which each member of the House of course is entitled to form on his or her own behalf.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Now that the project is in suspension, what initiatives does the minister plan to take to deal specifically with the commitments the municipalities in the area have had to make with respect to infrastructure and expansion of services? Will there be meetings? Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly specifically what steps he proposes to take?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, certainly it would be our intention, working with the MLA for the area, to have meetings with the three urban communities in the region. However, I should point out that a number of programs, such as the delivery of water and sewer services to the communities, were based on a plan that has seen the province paying or assuming the additional costs of over-sizing to a projected population which had not yet appeared. So in fact on that issue and some others, which I would guess are too lengthy to explain in question period, we had already taken care of the problem that might occur in the event the population growth in the region did not develop as was anticipated. That has been the policy of this government in a number of areas for a good length of time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Will there be specific contingency plans, not with respect to the fact that over the long haul population may not reach projections but the immediate problems over the short run with respect to interim financing?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet been made aware by the administrations in those three towns, or by the MLA for the area working with them, of any specific short-term problems that might exist. If the hon. member is inquiring as to whether this government will be compensating people who may have been involved on a speculative basis in purchasing land or whatever in those areas, the answer is simply no. We're not going to be involved in any kind of compensation in that regard. As far as I am concerned, we'll respond to the requests of the town on a specific basis, but there won't be any general sort of government per capita assistance because a plant has not proceeded.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Economic Development, in the absence of the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. Would the hon. minister advise the Assembly whether there will be any specific programs through the Alberta Opportunity Company for those businessmen who are facing problems and, in particular, whether the government would consider pushing ahead on some of the social projects in the area to take up the gap?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that as notice to my colleague and ask him to respond.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. In regard to the suggestion by Imperial Oil that the federal and/or provincial governments contribute \$40 million to continue the engineering design work, was there any direct suggestion, or was anything inherent in that suggestion, that either the federal or provincial governments would receive a proprietary interest in the development in return for that \$40 million?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the proposal by Imperial Oil was that a sum of \$40 million be advanced to them to assist in the payment of the ongoing costs to keep the project proceeding as rapidly as they had intended and that if the project did not ultimately proceed, that would not be repaid, but if the project did proceed, the funds would be returned.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, if I may. Would the Alberta government tolerate a federal intrusion into the tar sands development, and allow the federal government to proceed with the project?

MR. SPEAKER: A hypothetical question. I suppose it could be put in a different way.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, if I were to put it in a different way, may I do so. You having said so, would the minister please respond? [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I think we'll have to devise a better patent than that.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Economic Development. This is a follow-up to the question asked by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. In light of the fact that the minister cannot answer for the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, is the Minister of Economic Development in a position to indicate what studies have gone on in his department as to the effect small businesses have suffered as the result of the business turndown in the Bonnyville, Grand Centre, and Cold Lake areas? Has that impact study been completed, or is the minister doing anything?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, again I believe the Minister of Tourism and Small Business has addressed that issue, although I've been there myself with the MLA from the area, taking representations and getting a feel for it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister indicating that he has not done an economic study of the area, or any projections as to what the turndown has done to the communities?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I thought the question was: what kind of assessment of small business is being done. Of course that falls under the jurisdiction of my colleague who is responsible for Tourism and Small Business, and I'll give him notice.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Economic Development, please. With regard to the impact of the decisions made on the Alsands and Esso Cold Lake projects, cost/benefit analyses have been done on both projects by the Energy Resources Conservation Board, wherein the economic benefits of each project have been quantified and identified. For example, in the case of the Esso project, they expect 10,000 direct jobs during the construction phase and about 3,500 during the operational phase.

Have any impact studies been done to determine the total economic impact on Alberta from the postponement of construction of both projects, as well as the reduction in revenue flowing to producers and the province from the oil cutback, compared to the revenue this province could expect from achieving the price level it has proposed?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, because of its detail I think that properly belongs on the Order Paper. Maybe it's appropriate, though, to comment that the major impact from the suspension of those two major projects will be felt in central Canada. Fortunately, Alberta has some momentum in a variety of sectors. We feel the

sectors will offer opportunities for the Alberta talent in place to have a participation in an ongoing way that would probably be as high as it would have been in the two major megaprojects.

Also I think the question as to whether they ran sequentially or concurrently needs to be directed. Our studies indicate there is a very real difference in the results to the Alberta economy depending on whether they ran concurrently or sequentially.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister ...

[Interjection by stranger in the public gallery]

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary on this topic. The preceding supplementary doesn't need to be answered.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity you've given me to stand and pose the supplementary question. I for one feel I do have freedom of speech in this country, especially in this Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Economic Development: in response to my preceding supplementary, you indicated that the major impact from these slowdowns and cutbacks would be felt in eastern Canada. Just two years ago a study was done by Energy, Mines and Resources in Ottawa, which indicated that if the price of oil went from its present level to the world level, there would possibly be a reduction of about 10,000 jobs in eastern Canada. Ten thousand jobs, more or less, are less significant than the 25,000 to 30,000 jobs ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I regret interrupting the hon. member. It's true that in these fall sittings there has been a considerable amount of precedent of more information being given than was asked, but perhaps it's a precedent we shouldn't develop any further. If the hon. member would come directly to his question, perhaps we could deal with it.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, the question would be: given the facts as I weighed them out, would the minister please elaborate on how the economic impact in eastern Canada would be greater than that in Alberta from the postponement of the Esso and Alsands projects, plus the oil cutback?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, this is a matter of opinion and assessment. As has been mentioned on a number of occasions, that sort of research should be done otherwise than by requiring all members in the House to be present while it's being done.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could ask the hon. minister a supplementary question. Has a specific assessment or study been made, commissioned by the department, that would compare the impact in Alberta against the impact? Are we talking about opinion, or has a specific study been commissioned by the government?

MR. PLANCHE: No, there hasn't been a specific study done by the government as such, simply because it wasn't

clear whether the plants would be sequential or concurrent.

Iron Ore Technology

MR. NOTLEY: I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Member for Grande Prairie in his capacity as chairman of the Northern Alberta Development Council. Is the member in a position to advise the Assembly what progress, if any, has been made on the technological breakthrough by the Alberta Research Council with respect to extracting iron ore from the Clear Hills in the Worsley area of this province?

MR. BORSTAD: The Northern Alberta Development Council has written for information on the subject from the council, but we have not received any information on that yet.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the hon. Minister of Economic Development in a position to advise the Assembly of the reasons for the technology being worked out with Steel Alberta on a no-royalty basis, I believe, and whether there have been any discussions with that particular firm as to why Steel Alberta is developing its properties in Carter Creek, Montana, as opposed to Clear Hills, Alberta?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, Steel Alberta develops their own prospects, as does any other commercial entity, and takes them to fruition if it appears they'll return properly to the shareholders. They don't need the direction from this department.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Economic Development. In view of the government's commitment to economic diversification, what discussions has the government held with Steel Alberta or other corporate interests concerning the rather significant developments by the Alberta Research Council in the technology which now makes iron ore development in Clear Hills feasible?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, there is some discussion as to whether the iron ore development in the Peace River is in fact commercially viable. Certainly there have been some bench tests that indicate some potential there. I guess the larger issue is whether a steel industry is appropriate in Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of its concern for diversification of the economy, has the government commissioned any studies on the viability of a steel industry in Alberta, and have there been discussions with the Alberta Research Council specifically concerning that matter?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I think a study was commissioned some years ago by the Alberta government on the steel industry in Alberta. But the prospect of downstream manufacturing of steel into salable products is a different issue than an industry that manufactures basic steel. That's a very much different issue. In terms of the Alberta Research Council, yes, we have had discussions on their progress in defining the ability of Peace River ore to be merchantable.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The hon. minister referred to a study some time ago. Have there been any updated studies, in view of the importance of this matter, particularly with respect to the conference on economic development in the north that we're having in Grande Prairie over the next several days. Have there been any updated studies, and will that information be shared with the several hundred delegates attending the development north project?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be at that conference, and I would be glad to make some comments on it at that time. I can't speak from certainty and would have to check, but I believe the original market surveys were in fact tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question. I'm not talking about surveys that were done some time ago. I'm asking whether or not the government in the last few months has commissioned any further studies concerning the viability of the steel industry. I raise that because the breakthrough in the technology has been a relatively recent phenomenon.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I think it's appropriate for the people of western Canada to develop an economic market unit to satisfy the ability of IPSCO to produce out of Regina, and that's the tack we're taking. I think there's some question whether or not we've had a technological breakthrough that indicates the Peace River iron ore is in fact merchantable. As I indicated before, there have been some bench tests that indicate promise there. But it's a long way from coming to fruition.

Social Studies Textbooks

MR. L. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the Minister of Education arises from some complaints I've had from parents in regard to a Social Studies 10 program being taught from this book called *Canada Today*. Could the minister inform the Assembly if he has reviewed the contents of this book?

MR. KING: Yes I had that opportunity, Mr. Speaker, as well as to review briefly another of the textbooks used in conjunction with the Social Studies 10 curriculum.

MR. L. CLARK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister inform the Assembly, especially to the fact that the first chapter is called *Countdown Canada: The End of a Country*. Although fictional, it deals with Canada coming to an end and joining the United States. Could the minister inform the Assembly of the procedure his department uses when approving a book for the classrooms, and whether or not this book is compulsory in Social Studies 10.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, we first attempt to develop a curriculum that corresponds to our needs in the province. Having developed the curriculum we think is appropriate for education, we seek appropriate materials that can be used in teaching the course. You can't always find books or other materials precisely matched to the curriculum you have set. Social Studies 10 is a good example of this.

Five books are prescribed for Social Studies 10, and

one of the reasons five are prescribed is that we were unable to find one or two that completely met our expectations. Teachers are expected to use pertinent material from all five rather than two. So the hon. member shouldn't believe that the textbook he referred to is the only one students will be exposed to in Social Studies 10.

More important, the question is raised about the fact that in many cases we must necessarily use curricular resources developed in other parts of Canada and sometimes in other countries, particularly the United States. I can only say to the member that we are very concerned about our historic dependence on materials produced in other jurisdictions. We are trying to encourage the production of material in Alberta, and the Alberta Heritage Learning Resources Project was an example of that. In whatever other way is feasible, we will continue to try to develop materials locally.

The hon. member asked if I had an opportunity to review the book. I did; it has some strengths, but I also believe it has some deficiencies. We would look for other or better books; we're constantly doing that.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are any Alberta authors or educators involved in the development of the books used in these courses, other than the Learning Resources Project?

MR. KING: The two I'm familiar with were entirely authored in Ontario, and they were produced by publishing companies in Ontario. Of course members of the Assembly will appreciate that a lot of the material in the Alberta Heritage Learning Resources Project was developed by Alberta teachers. In our view that is one of the strengths of the Alberta Heritage Learning Resources Project.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Education. Can the minister advise the House whether or not he is aware if the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation acted as a special consultant to the authors of this book? I raise that in light of the title of the chapter: *A CBC Special Report, Countdown Canada*.

MR. KING: I can't answer the hon. member's question. I can speculate, but I understand that's not the purpose of question period.

Student Housing

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. I believe the University of Calgary has requested the minister to give aid in the construction of additional student housing on the campus of the university. I wonder if the minister is in a position to indicate to the Assembly whether he can respond affirmatively to that request.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, at this particular stage in the current year I'm afraid it's not possible to respond affirmatively to that request. However, I can say that in the budget submissions that have come forward from the various institutions, the University of Calgary has made clear to me that that particular project is its number one priority for future capital development projects at the University of Calgary.

MR. OMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate that's also his first priority?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, there are some 20 institutions in the province, all of which have priorities. At this particular time I think it would be unwise for me to comment affirmatively on that particular question.

Federal Budget — Economic Impact

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. About three weeks ago in the Assembly we raised the question with regard to the effects of the federal budget, and the ministers of various departments indicated they were going to monitor the situation. I was wondering if the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources could indicate at this time what effect the measures instituted through that federal budget are having on the oil industry, especially with regard to employment in the exploration and servicing sectors of the oil industry, also the effect on the non-Canadian sector in the oil industry at the present time.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, the question really involves an expression of opinion as to what impact the budget will have on the industry. I think all I can say in response to the question is that it's too early to make an assessment.

It's certainly very clear that people who were employed in the conventional industry on October 28 are not now employed. So already some jobs have been lost on the conventional side of the industry. It's also equally clear that funds intended to be spent on exploration and development in Alberta in the immediate future are being reduced in very significant ways, simply because the cash flow or the funds available for development and exploration in Alberta have been very significantly reduced by the federal budget and energy program. It's also equally clear that some equipment and people are moving to the United States where, because of a net-back to the explorer, it is a much more attractive investment than is Alberta, despite the fact that Alberta is generally regarded as having a better geological prospect than the United States. Clearly there is that impact.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is too early to make a firm assessment of how serious it's going to be, simply because the industry has commitments it made prior to the budget coming out. Those commitments have to be met. Land development or exploration commitments and drilling commitments have already been made, and contracts entered into. All those will be carried out. So it's certainly going to be a little while before we can make any realistic forecast of the assessment. But I don't think there's any doubt that the impact is very, very significant, and it's all adverse.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources with regard to how the monitoring is being done. Is it a very informal procedure at this point in time? Or has some letter been sent to the various companies in Alberta saying: what effects has the budget had on your industry; could you please relate them to us in government so we can monitor and relate government policy to the effects? Has anything like that been done, or is it a very informal monitoring at this time?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I would describe it as informal rather than formal in the sense in which the hon. member has put his question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to ask a question of the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. He's away. I believe the acting minister would be able to comment on this. I wonder what effect has been seen with regard to the federal budget on small businesses, particularly in the Fort McMurray area, or small businesses throughout the province of Alberta that may have been affected by the federal budget action.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the absence of the Minister of Tourism and Small Business and the similarity of the hon. member's question to earlier questions, I'll take it as notice and advise the minister.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the minister could indicate the implications of the federal budget on the cost of fuel, heating, and transportation in the agricultural industry. Has the minister a specific type of program or strategy in place that will monitor these types of things for the farmers of Alberta?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, over the period of years, Albertans have enjoyed the lowest fuel costs . . .

DR. BUCK: Don't give us that speech. What are you going to do now?

ANHON. MEMBER: The truth hurts, Walter.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, may I continue? Farmers have enjoyed the lowest fuel costs . . .

MR. SPEAKER: As I understood the question, it didn't quite relate to the enjoyment of farmers, rather to whether a certain assessment was in existence, which of course would be an appropriate question for the question period.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I have to mention farmers if I'm going to continue with the assessment. [interjections] I have to repeat again that farmers in this province have enjoyed the lowest energy . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Possibly the hon. minister would be welcome to indulge in that kind of repetition to whatever extent he might wish, outside the question period.

DR. BUCK: What are you going to do?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, to continue with the statement that was already made, it's difficult to assess what rising costs will face agriculture in the future due to the federal government change and budgetary move in the energy field, other than to say that on behalf of agriculture in this province, we have accepted the basic responsibility to see that as energy costs rise they will enjoy among the lowest fuel costs of anyone in North America. We will continue to do that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister indicated it's difficult to speculate. However, at this stage has the department not undertaken an evalu-

ation of the impact on farmers of increased fuel costs as a consequence of the federal budget and the schedule of prices set out? Has that not already been done by the department? [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is actually a repetition of a question that was asked before. Although that has happened a number of times in the fall sittings, hon. members know what right of insistence there is in the question period. It's nil.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary on my question, to the Provincial Treasurer. While the Minister of Agriculture is monitoring agriculture, I'll move to the Provincial Treasurer and we'll try to find a few things in the meantime.

In the June 8, 1979, presentation of the budget by the Provincial Treasurer, there was an indication that:

Major projects such as the next oil sands project, the heavy oil project at Cold Lake, and the northern pipeline from Alaska, if they proceed, will not begin actual construction for some time yet. Therefore, to offset a possible [turndown] in the industry in 1979-80, we propose a large increase of 41.5 per cent in capital construction.

My question to the Provincial Treasurer is: due to the fact that the tar sands plant isn't proceeding at the present time and there is a turndown in the Alberta economy, as we've all admitted, will the government, through your office, sir, be looking at some type of proposal such as that given on June 8, 1979?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member will have to contain his enthusiasm until the next budget.

Grazing Reserves

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. I'd also like to remind the minister of a quote he made in *Hansard* on May . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps the hon. member could come directly to the question, and the reminder could be given by way of memo.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the hon. Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife indicate, as he did in May, that public hearings will be held before any decisions are made by his department as to grazing leases? Regarding the Blackfoot Grazing Reserve, can the minister indicate what public hearings have been held on what development will be taking place in that reserve?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Blackfoot Grazing Reserve was formerly the grazing association, as the hon. Member for Clover Bar pointed out. The people in the grazing association came to the government and asked if it could be made a grazing reserve, in view of the fact that in former times periodically we used to have fires going through the country and burning the scrub, so there was always plenty of grass. However, in the past when we haven't had fires, a lot of the pastures have grown up to bush. As a result there has been a dramatic decrease in the amount of grazing available. The people in the grazing association recognized this and, as such, asked for a grazing reserve.

We did an integrated land management plan in which various departments — Public Lands, Fish and Wildlife, Agriculture, Environment, and Recreation and Parks — all got together and submitted their ideas on what should be done in regard to the Blackfoot Grazing Reserve. The preliminary plan was completed last February. In March last year the plan was submitted to the public so we could have input from the user groups.

It might be of interest to the member, as well as to the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, to know how widespread the plan was presented to the various interested groups. I would emphasize that we did advertise in the *Edmonton Journal*, the *Sherwood Park News*, and the *Tofield Mercury*, that the plan was available and anybody wishing to see the plan could apply to get it.

Besides that, we sent copies of the plan to the Blackfoot Grazing Association, the Ryley Agricultural Development Committee, the Waskahagan Trail Association, the Sherwood Park Fish and Game Association, the Edmonton Fish and Game Association, the Alpine Club, the Sherwood Park Snowmobile Association, the Alberta Snowmobile Task Force, the Blackfoot Area Cross-country Skiers, the Edmonton Nordegg Ski Club, the County of Strathcona's Bennett Lake Outdoor Education Centre, the North Cooking Lake Community League, the Alberta Forestry Association . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It's difficult for the Chair to foresee whether the answer to the question is going to require such a substantial amount of detail that it should be dealt with through the Order Paper, but the hon. minister has indicated that the answer is of that nature. Unless he's able to answer briefly, I would respectfully suggest that the hon. Member for Clover Bar put the question on the Order Paper.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is that we made contact with all the user groups. In fact people from the department met with groups and individuals on many, many occasions during this past summer. I believe the hon. Member for Clover Bar attended one of the public meetings and suggested that another one be held in another area, and it was. I feel we've had a tremendous amount of input from the local user groups, and the plan is widely accepted by everyone who has had a chance to view it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that large funds from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund are to be expended, can the minister indicate what will be the increased carrying capacity for livestock in this reserve after the program is in place?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, one of the things the hon. member is forgetting is that when we establish a grazing reserve, it's not only to increase or maintain the grazing capacity but to have concern for other user groups. One of the things we have to remember is that here is a specific part of Alberta, a grazing reserve which will be utilized by people who want to graze animals, by cross-country skiers, by snowmobilers, by hikers, and by nature groups. So in effect we're not only increasing the grazing capacity but making greater utilization of this whole Blackfoot Grazing Reserve.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that from the minister, and that is why I ask my next question. In light of the fact that this is a multiple-use facility, can the

minister indicate why no members of the minister's department would meet with the cross-country ski group?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, we have met with members of the skiing association. If the member is referring to a meeting that was . . . A request came to us a few days ago. I personally was unable to attend because of a prior commitment.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate why he would not send other members of his department to a public meeting, as requested by this group?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, part of it was the time frame involved. I think if you contact members of the Alpine Club, they were told members would be prepared to meet with them, but not at the specific time they had asked for.

Fire Protection

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Labour. Could the minister indicate whether his department is conducting any experiments to determine whether all Alberta landlords are putting fire alarms and smoke detectors in their apartments?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I can indicate that the Department of Labour is not conducting experiments as such; however, some monitoring is being done from time to time. I'm sorry that at the moment I'm unable to provide the exact frequency of that monitoring, but we are attempting to keep ourselves informed of the increasing application of smoke detectors in multi-residence buildings.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister have any statistics that would indicate the number of apartments in Alberta that don't have fire protection?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, that would get us into the very item of statistics. I am certain there are data available on that because, as I've already indicated, we do in fact try to get reports based on surveys.

MR. SPEAKER: We've run a little past the time for question period, but we did have a somewhat unusual interlude. If the Assembly agrees, perhaps we might hear from the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Energy Negotiations

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources is in response to what the federal energy minister said in question period today. He said he had instructed Petro-Canada to loan money to the Esso project, and that he hoped Alberta would co-operate in that venture. Has the federal minister contacted you about a shared deal?

MR. LEITCH: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Minister responsible for Personnel Administration and the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health would like to supplement some information previously given or asked.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Public Service Negotiations — Division 8

MR. STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In reviewing Hansard Blues for yesterday, November 18, 1980, I believe I inadvertently gave incorrect information to members in response to a question from the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I advised members that the Public Service Employee Relations Board had requested the Division 8 negotiating team and the government of Alberta to return to the bargaining table after the application for arbitration had been made. In fact the board directed that the matter go to arbitration, and that has happened.*

Dependent Adults Legislation

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to supplement an answer I gave yesterday to a question raised by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Little Bow with regard to The Dependent Adults Act. I did indicate that although the Act is under review at the present time, there were no firm plans for amendments next spring. I believe I further alluded that I was not aware of any of the concerns pointed to by the hon. member.

I want to clarify that through a phone call to my office, a concern was expressed about the possibility that the estate of a dependent adult could be subject to abuse under our present legislation and/or regulations. As a consequence of that call, the matter was referred to the Public Guardian and to the Public Trustee who, with their respective staffs, are reviewing the matter and will report to the Attorney General — to whom the Public Trustee is responsible — and to me. If in our view changes are required to either the legislation or the regulations to ensure that both the estate and the social well-being of the dependent adult are properly secured against manipulation, of course those changes will be brought forward.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

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

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Committee of the Whole Assembly will please come to order.

Bill 75 The Liquor Control Act, 1980

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any section of this Act?

*See page 1562, right column, paragraph 8

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, I believe there is an amendment circulated. Perhaps I could comment briefly on the amendments. The amendment to the Bill whereby Section 28 is struck out: that section was intended to expand the delegation authority of the board to handle orders for liquor purchased by the board. It has been reviewed in light of Section 10(1) of the Bill. It is believed the delegation provided for in that section is sufficiently wide to cover all that's intended to be covered by Section 28. Therefore Section 28 has been struck out.

With regard to the new Section 28, under section B of the amendments, that is formerly Section 29(3). Therefore it is struck out and placed in Section 28. I think it is better that that particular subsection be contained in a section of its own, as it stands in a somewhat different position from the other subsections in Section 29.

Section D, which relates to Section 58(2) of the Bill, adding a new clause under the regulation-making section, is intended to cover the situation that exists particularly in the national parks. I understand the typical lease arrangement in the national parks is one under which rents are received as a percentage of the volume of business. While that type of arrangement is prohibited in general, as that is the nature of leases in the national parks we want to be able to provide for them. They presently exist, and in fact there is no change from the present situation as far as the practical application of that section is concerned.

Section E relates to the previous matters in section D. With regard to section F, the old 96(1) in the Bill was too broad, as it provided for its application to all licensed premises. It was not intended that it be so sweeping. We only want that section to apply to beverage room, lounge, and night club licences. Therefore the section is rewritten as it appears in the amendment.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions regarding the amendments to the Bill?

[Amendments agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, I move Bill 75, The Liquor Control Act, 1980, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 62
The Petroleum Marketing
Amendment Act, 1980

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any section of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I move Bill No. 62, The Petroleum Marketing Amendment Act, 1980, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 63
The Natural Gas Price Administration
Amendment Act, 1980

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any section of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I move Bill No. 63, The Natural Gas Price Administration Amendment Act, 1980, be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report, and ask leave to sit again.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration and reports Bills 62 and 63, and Bill 75 with some amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed

head: GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill 73
The Public Inquiries
Amendment Act, 1980 (No. 2)

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 73, The Public Inquiries Amendment Act, 1980 (No. 2).

As mentioned at the time of first reading, the purpose of this Bill is to ensure that a duly convened public inquiry has full access to public buildings and documents contained therein, if in fact such documents are relevant to the inquiry in question. As was also mentioned at the time of first reading, the Bill provides a comprehensive set of rules concerning the disclosure to a public inquiry of such documents.

In some further elaboration, I should mention that the Bill in fact will make the existing legislation under The Public Inquiries Act more complete. I should point out to members that Bill 73 goes on to define with great specificity a public building, and refers to social facility, a hospital, and third category of a building where a government-funded service is being carried. I should advise members that this legislation is somewhat more restrictive, if you will, than comparable Ontario legislation, which isn't limited to public buildings. This of course is to ensure that there is no violation of any private rights.

It should also be mentioned in the course of second reading that even with all the above, the ability to inspect a public building would only exist if in fact there were an order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council; even following such order, that a court order be obtained or, in the instance of a commissioner being a judge of a court of this province, a declaration by that commissioner.

Dealing very briefly with the question of privilege, it's

fair to say that in the first instance the same rules would apply as in a court of law, with two exceptions. Firstly, one would not be able to claim Crown privilege in the normal course. Secondly, one would not be able to withhold disclosure if required by some other Act, regulation, or order, unless of course a certificate were granted by the Attorney General allowing for the non-disclosure under certain criteria established in the Bill.

In conclusion, it's fair to say that some provisions of this Bill very closely parallel those in The Alberta Evidence Act and The Ombudsman Act. Those would conclude my comments with respect to second reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion carried; Bill 73 read a second time]

Bill 77

The Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1980

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 77, The Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1980.

[Motion carried; Bill 77 read a second time]

Bill 78

The Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Supplementary Act, 1980

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 78, The Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Supplementary Act, 1980.

[Motion carried; Bill 78 read a second time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, we propose to continue in the order of the Order Paper; Bill 84 would be next. The minister who adjourned debate is to return to the Assembly in a few moments, and I wonder if I could just ask hon. members' indulgence for a very few moments.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Bill 84

The Health Occupations Act

[Adjourned debate November 17: Mr. Bogle]

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I actually had concluded my remarks on second reading of the Bill last day. I look forward to the comments of other members of the Assembly at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, rising to speak on Bill 84, The Health Occupations Act, I would say that while it's probably true that some form of self-governing regulatory authority is necessary for the rapidly proliferating professions involved in the provision of health care services in the province of Alberta, I have at least three concerns about Bill 84 before the House this afternoon.

First of all, flaw number one, in my judgment: the

self-regulation principle is in question as one reviews Bill 84, at least as I read the legislation. As the minister noted on Monday, the government's policy governing future legislation for the professions and occupations, issued on May 16, 1978, clearly stated — that's point number five, and I think is worth repeating:

the decision to place one profession or occupation under the legislative supervision and/or work supervision of another profession or occupation should be made only where it can be demonstrated that the advantages from a public interest standpoint clearly outweigh the disadvantages.

Mr. Speaker, the composition and structure of the board proposed in the Act, in my view, conflicts with policy statement number five. The only health occupation, for example, for which places on the board are specifically reserved, is the traditional medical profession. Section 3(1)(a): "at least one, but not more than 3 members of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Alberta" out of a total possible maximum of nine board members. So we're looking at a minimum of one, a maximum of three.

Of the remaining six to eight members, it's impossible that the up to 30 occupations envisaged by the minister as eventually falling under this Act, will be represented. Over a period of time, perhaps as they go through a process of rotating chairs, they may be. But there is in fact no guarantee that the many occupations that eventually will be covered by this umbrella legislation will be automatically represented on the board.

I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that this is an important matter because, with the exception of the right of the individual to appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench, the board is the final authority in all questions relating to the designated occupations. As the minister pointed out several days ago, even if one accepts the role of the proposed committees to provide some degree of self-regulation, they really do so at the discretion of the minister and not at the direction of the occupation involved. I think that's a rather important point to keep in mind as we address the principle of Bill 84 in second reading.

Although the Act, for example, provides for the drawing of members of the committees from among the membership of the given occupation's association, where such an association exists, there is no provision for the members of that association to choose the representatives. In other words, we may have associations established — one would assume, Mr. Speaker, that these associations would be selecting the representatives, but that's not necessarily the case at all. The very legitimacy of the association itself, for the purpose of Section 5(6), is left to the discretion of the minister. Where associations do not now exist, the creation of committees, as I see it, will quite possibly effectively preclude the formation of associations in the future.

I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that the basic flaw is that rather than the self-regulation principle, which we were told was the guiding philosophy, if you like, of the government's position in 1978, what we have today is very extensive, effective, government control over these occupations.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to look at another flaw in the legislation, as I view it anyway; that is, the very considerable power we give to the minister. In almost all areas outlined in the Act, the minister, or the Lieutenant Governor in Council, is the final arbiter if not the outright final authority. For example, the Lieutenant Governor in Council appoints the board and decides who the

chairman of that board will be. The minister may direct the board as to which occupations are to be designated — that's Section 4(1)(b). The minister designates the committees; appoints the committee members, who in his opinion are knowledgeable with respect to the practice of the designated health occupation; also the appointment of the committees' various chairpeople; and determines whether a professional association is appropriate for consideration as an association for the purpose of appointing members to the committee. The Lieutenant Governor in Council sets regulations governing just about every facet of a given health occupation, including those relating to the individual conduct of professionals practising that occupation. It should be noted that the board formally requests such regulations, but the real power rests with the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Mr. Speaker, I would make two observations with respect to this power. The first, as I see it anyway, is that this makes a mockery of the claim of self-regulation, which the minister says is one of the prime goals of the Act. For example, one has to look at the viewpoint of the medical profession. Should they have the same rules applied to them? I would say that if they did, Mr. Speaker, there would be the kind of outrage that would make the current hassle over second billing a small dispute indeed.

I think there is a third flaw in the legislation; that is, very substantial power is given to the medical profession. As it is formally the board which exercises the considerable power under the Act to designate, delineate and, through the committee, govern the functions and scope of a given health occupation, the make-up of the board is a crucial consideration.

As I mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, of the nine board members, one and possibly as many as three will belong to the medical profession through the Alberta College of Physicians and Surgeons. So they're going to have a very significant presence on the board. We could very well find that three of the members will be members of the medical profession — six other people. Mr. Speaker, when you've got three members from one profession out of a total of nine, you have a very significant impact on the decision-making process of that board. I think it would be misleading to argue otherwise. Admittedly, it could be one, but the point that has to be addressed is that in the legislation before us today it is one to three. Thus, we're in a situation where the medical association might, for whatever reason, want to move the board to decide one way or another. If three members on the board are doctors, they need only persuade two other members to go along with them. This is not impossible to do.

This assumes that the minister does not use his powers of appointment to put other doctors who are not practising at the moment on the board. That's certainly possible as well. So we could conceivably have even more than three, although I would suggest that's probably a hypothetical possibility. It nevertheless exists the way the legislation is worded.

I just note the November, 1980, brief of the society of masseurs and physical therapists:

... the medical profession, by virtue of its pre-eminent position of authority over members of the non-medical staff of hospitals, may well influence the decisions of members of the Health Occupations Board who are also members of occupational groups who normally provide their services within hospitals. Once again — and I want to keep coming back to what I think the important point is — the principle of self-regulation is, in my judgment, seriously undermined on

the basis of the legislation we have before us.

It can be noted that this situation in fact places the medical profession in what could be seen almost as a conflict of interest position; if one doesn't quite go that far, at least in a pre-eminent position. That's a matter of concern to many of the occupational groups we're dealing with on this matter and, no doubt, a major part of the reason members on both sides of the House have received a lot of correspondence on Bill 84. As a matter of fact, we've probably gotten more calls on Bill 84 than we have on the resolution pertaining to Bill 50.

I would have other concerns about the Act as well. It lumps several different and often disparate professions together under one umbrella piece of legislation. Of central importance here is the problem of supervision and direction. We have professions which, in essence, operate independently; for example, a clinical chemist or a speech pathologist. They're lumped together with professions which operate under direction and supervision. An example might well be paramedics or lab technicians. It seems optimistic, to say the least, to think that the Act can effectively make provision for the fair governance of both those occupations which operate independently and those which operate under the supervision of someone else.

The definition of precisely what constitutes a health occupation is so broad — "a health occupation designated by a regulation under section 27" — as to be virtually non-existent. Once again this places tremendous power in the board and thus, through the board, in the hands of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. It is they who decide what the health occupation is, wholly unencumbered by any legal definition. While I don't suggest that the government is deliberately going to abuse this power, the question has to be addressed as we pass legislation: should we be consigning this very considerable power to the Lieutenant Governor in Council?

Mr. Speaker, as I look over the legislation, there are good features in it; no question about that. I'd be the first to admit we obviously have to do something. It's an area that demands attention. But I submit that under the terms of this legislation we are seriously putting in abeyance — if I can use that term, since it's been used in other documents tabled in this House — the principle of self-regulation. We're giving excessive power to the minister. We're setting up a board where the medical profession will have enormous influence. We're not guaranteeing representation to all the occupations that come under the provision of this legislation. They're going to have to go through a situation of revolving chairs, and some of them may never in fact be on the board. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we are linking under umbrella legislation occupations which in fact are on their own in terms of being able to make certain major decisions — that is, they operate independently — with those that operate under the supervision of others.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, while it is not my intention to formally vote against Bill 84 on second reading, when we get to committee stage I look forward to the opportunity to question the minister on some things in more detail. At this time I must at least express some of the reservations I have. They still remain after having an opportunity to read the minister's initial speech on second reading. Perhaps we'll have an opportunity to go into it in more detail in committee stage.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm indeed pleased for several reasons to have the opportunity today to partici-

pate in the debate on Bill 84, The Health Occupations Act. It's now some years since there has been recognition in this province by the governments — and I say "governments" advisedly — of a need for rationalization of the development of professions and occupations. Going back in history, the former Social Credit government in 1969, I believe, initially appointed a committee to review the status with respect to the procedures that needed to be followed, and to rationalize when, how, and under what circumstances or criteria the various occupational/professional groups ought to be given legal status by way of independent legislation or through a government means of control and directorship as to who may carry out, or provide to the public, services in the very broad field of what we call professions or occupations. Although very often linked together and referred to simultaneously, the two are not necessarily in the same classification or under the same kind of umbrella. However, it is extremely difficult to separate the two, and indicate they are totally different entities, because each in its own scope provides to the public a kind of service the public requires or demands.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make several remarks with regard to this legislation, but I'd like to refer to some of the comments the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview put forward, his concerns and what he has reflected as concerns expressed to him. There's no question that a good number of professions today function under their own independent legislation and are self-regulatory. It is also recognized that a number of professions and occupational groups are self-regulatory in a sense, but really do not have the kind of structure that the public can recognize, that they feel they can approach where there are weaknesses or difficulties arising as a result of inadequate or incompetent service that's provided, or discrepancies in the level and type of service provided, or where discipline is necessary with regard to the nature of services provided. There is confusion in the minds of much of our public in many areas.

With respect to the area of health disciplines — and the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview quite correctly indicated that this piece of legislation will bring together a great number of occupations and professions that do not currently have their own independent legislation, and that perhaps are not quite similar in nature. However, they do fall under the broad interpretation of health disciplines. To bring some sort of rationalization and order in the establishment of standards and criteria of what recognition ought to be given to various professions or occupations, how they might be controlled and disciplined, and how and to whom the general public can have recourse when there are matters to be considered or examined with respect to discipline and nature of service . . .

Although there are concerns expressed by the hon. member, it is not always necessarily true and accurate to say that each and every occupation or profession should be totally independent and self-regulating in every aspect, at least not in those areas that fall very close and directly to the nature of service being provided by a particular member of a professional or occupational group to the general public. So if there is joint recognition of control in certain areas, or an examination of where there needs to be reflection by a body other than that particular professional group, I think it is important that the citizens of this province know and are aware that when standards are being set and have been developed, they have been examined and are at a certain level, and if

there are weaknesses in those standards, they have a place to go or a reporting mechanism which would not necessarily be directly to the particular group affected.

If the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview feels the professional groups are undermined, I'm sorry that exists. I will acknowledge that some groups have expressed the same kind of concern to me. However, there is also a recognition that if in fact every consideration is given to the professional or occupational group to be able to function and resolve their problems without interference from government, then their concerns would be alleviated. I think that is the intent of this legislation.

Going back to the review. Initially a select committee of the Legislature was appointed back in 1969, which did not have the opportunity to complete its study. In 1971, another committee of this Legislative Assembly was appointed with new members, of which I was privileged to be the chairman, and continued and concluded its study, its examination of the problems in 1973, and reported to the Assembly. It was recognized, I believe, by the many groups that made representations to our committee in public hearings, that certainly many problems needed to be resolved, and that all of them could not be resolved simply by passing or providing independent legislation for each and every group that was to come forward.

We have not heard the last or even the beginning of the many different areas of service that are yet to be developed in the matter of health disciplines. Regardless of what any individual group may call itself, there are certainly differences in how they develop. There are differences in the thinking, design, or plan of an individual group which wishes to provide a service at a level or in an area they feel others are not providing.

To leave the matter of legislation or the ability to regulate in abeyance, as we have for this great number of years, would not serve the public in any satisfactory way whatsoever. As well we have had a considerable amount of pressure from the general public asking that there be a means for public redress where they feel aggrieved with respect to services, so they do not have to go back only to the group which primarily has the very direct interest of their own membership who provide the services. Apart from whether there is accuracy in that feeling or not, they have felt over years and decades that to go back to oneself to examine weakness or error; somehow there would not be the proper satisfaction of redress.

I'm not standing in my place today and saying that such accusations or statements are accurate and that any professional individual or member of any group by design or intent would carry out any kind of service that would need to come under scrutiny or discipline. I'm simply putting forward the two scenarios, where a service is provided, the recipient is not happy with the nature of the service provided, feels aggrieved, and feels he cannot go back to the same group and ask for redress because there is not an objective balance.

Here, I think legislation goes far to meet the kinds of recommendations the select committee of the Legislature made in 1973. It follows very much in the area of bringing together an ability to set a standard, not only in the level or type of service, the competence that must be present at all times if an individual holds himself or herself out to provide a service with particular descriptions to the public; the educational standards that must be met; the ever-changing times, where there needs to be examination of whether standards that have been set in our decade are at an appropriate level in years down the road, particularly in the health disciplines, where so many

changes are taking place through science and research, so many changes in the health of the people and the needs they have to cope with in the resolution of the kind of health problems that continue to arise.

I think it is very important that there be closeness between government and those professional groups and occupations that deliver the service. There is an influx of people into the province. A rationalization is needed for how these new people will be recognized, whether they meet the competency and educational standards necessary for the protection of the people who are going to be served.

There's no question that each organization has a degree of pride, feels that it is distinctive in its service, and therefore should not be put together with other groups who are quite removed from the description of service they provide. I don't accept that this legislation necessarily puts all of these groups into a common base or goal and links them all in the same recognition. I think this legislation only provides a mechanism through which we can put forward and rationalize the matter of standards.

I recollect when the select committee on professions and occupations was holding its public hearings, we had many submissions, even from members of various occupational groups, indicating that they were not happy with the way the associations functioned internally, although they agreed with the standards and exams, the competency aspect. They didn't like many other aspects of how an organization functioned. I don't think we want to get involved with the internal developments or operations of any particular association or group. Because we don't want to get involved with that, and because there are people who have not joined those associations — therefore there is a distinction as to whether they are able to provide the service to the public for which they were trained and are competent, but simply because of refusal of membership, in a manner in which an association functions, it creates the difficulty of whether one is able to earn a livelihood.

We've had representations by members of certain occupations. When there is a preponderance of a particular influential group in the executive structure of an association, there is a waiting of direction on where certain independent members, operating through their own offices, are able to purchase their supplies. It may seem ridiculous that such a matter would have relevance to how one may function and earn a living when one is competent. I'm not talking about where there's any kind of difficulty with respect to the standard of education that may have been achieved and the competency in delivering a service. I'm talking about real kinds of things in some business areas. Certain undesirable elements exist and do not serve the public interest in any way.

What we're saying in this legislation is that there is a mechanism to register people who are competent, that regardless of membership in any particular type of association provides a registry, a constant review mechanism, an observation of individuals wishing to provide a service in the health disciplines — they could register. Membership alone should not be the factor of whether one earns a living.

I may be interpreting the legislation a little farther than perhaps the hon. minister intended. If I am, he will certainly clarify that. I would just like to say to a lot of the professions and occupations that would come under this legislation that I would like to see them work together to enable this legislation to work effectively. After a trial period of bringing this legislation together and bringing

in some sort of rationalization, if there are areas in the legislation that are not easily dealt with and do not provide the desirable aspirations and goals, I'm sure the minister would be very receptive to making changes.

I know the matter of board membership has greatly concerned a number of groups. They have indicated their real concern with respect to the number of medical doctors that might be appointed to the board. When the Bill was initially introduced last year and allowed to die on the Order Paper, there was an indication of a minimum of three doctors. We recognized the concern expressed there, so that was altered, although some members say, you're still making room available for up to three doctors. But surely we're talking about health disciplines. I could not envisage this Legislature passing The Health Occupations Act, which deals with the health and lives of people in this province, that would not have a mandatory requirement to have at least one medical doctor on the board. Surely we have to recognize the kinds of standards that must be considered, and the examination with regard to competency must be considered, and therefore must allow at least one member of the medical profession to be on this board.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

With regard to appointment of memberships from the many groups that may fall under this legislation — those that will come under the legislation at this time and others that are perhaps yet to come forward in their development — it is certainly recognized as difficult to say that each occupational or professional group should have its own representative. It simply would not be possible, because it really does not matter. By having just one representative from each group, you would have so many on a board that the board absolutely could not function. Again there has to be some rationalization among the organizations to link together to some degree, at least in some common areas, and to choose from among them a representative to the board who would speak for those groups. Surely with the ability provided in the legislation to have appointments changed every three years if the groups so desire, representation from the various groups, as they link together, can be rotated. I would expect that rather than being difficult and unco-operative in attempting to make this legislation work, it would far wiser for these organizations to start talking and putting together some lists.

I've had listed for me approximately 40 different occupational organizations that would or could come under The Health Occupations Act. Out of those, I simply did a combination of a number of organizations. I'm not going to identify or cite an example, because I think it would be unfair to cite into *Hansard* any particular groups, leave out others, and create a real concern. That's not my intent. I'm simply saying that I would appeal to the professional groups and occupations that might come under this legislation to work together to make this legislation work for them; not work for the government, but work for them. If they do that, I think the problems that may arise will and should be minimized. With co-operation the government is attempting to bring in rationalization. As I interpret it, this is a first step toward making this area work. If we decide we want to succeed with it, we can do that, and surely give it a trial period in order that we can see where we can and can't have it work.

If we refer to the report of the legislative committee of

1973, it cited some suggestions in the recommendations, not exhaustive and not necessarily ones that need to be accepted — suggestions on developing criteria for self-government. This legislation may not be termed as self-government. As the legislation is, it wouldn't necessarily be self-government, but it would come a long way in being able to put together at a level where the public can be happier and not so dubious about the functions and intent of the many occupational groups that now exist. I think that is the important factor.

I know all the organizations have represented that they are working for the public interest and the public good. It is difficult to accept that the self-interest good and the public good can be compatible and never run amok, so to speak. There is a very fine line where the two are just not compatible. I'm not going to set out in my remarks today where they are not compatible. I think the members of the various professions know where they are not, and where this takes place. I think it's one where many of the professions feel they have not retained the degree of respect they are entitled to from the public. That has in fact happened.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we are to bring the respect and recognition for the dedication and service being provided by these people, we must go a long way to say: all right, we can't have everything we would like in the way we would like, independently; then let's join forces. There's no question these people are entitled to receive much more respect than a lot of them currently receive from the general public. Unfortunately, whether it's a cycle or because of a small number of individuals who have not provided a service with some degree of competency, or where discipline should have taken place and did not, it really has cast a lot of doubts as to the real status and recognition due a great number of individuals, associations, and the professions as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make a few remarks. I would hope that the many groups that have written to the minister and Members of the Legislative Assembly with concern about the way the legislation is written, that there may be a predominance in representation on the board by the medical profession, or that they no longer have the kind of independence of self-regulation — I would just like to say, and appeal to them that we have heard many of their concerns. We have attempted to write this legislation in a form that would accommodate as many of those concerns as possible. But it must also be recognized that some of the demands are not acceptable. For many reasons it is not possible or desirable to accommodate them.

I think it is necessary to recognize that we have an influx of people into this province, putting up shingles, and offering all kinds of very foreign services. There is no restriction or control over what they are providing to the public. There is no discipline mechanism. There are no standards requirements. The various occupations and professionals themselves have expressed concern about the number of people who are just coming in, putting up their shingles, making the dollars, then slipping out of the province when things get hot for them.

I would just like to say: let's work together and bring the standards and controls in those areas that need to be brought in. I'm sure the government will allow all these people to work as independently and as uninhibited as is possible, bearing in mind that our primary interest must not be the self-interest of the professionals or people in the particular occupations, but the public who is at the

receiving end of the service.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make one or two comments on Bill 84. I'd like to start out by saying that I have to be fair to the minister. I know he has a problem. So many people are practising health services that really don't fit under any umbrella. This is basically the problem, isn't it, Mr. Minister? Also, in fairness to the Member for Edmonton Norwood and her committee who brought the legislative report to the committee, which until now has not really taken any action. It is a problem, and I appreciate that the minister is the one who is going to take the flak. But I guess that's what ministers are for. In fairness to the minister and the government, I would just like to say that I think some type of action has to be taken. It's not every day that I come along and pay the minister or the government any compliments, but there is a problem, and I think we have to try to resolve the problem.

Some areas do concern me, of course. The regulatory body: as stated by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, we can't put 30 or 40 people on a board. This would be unreasonable. But probably the greatest concern that has been expressed to me is that some of the groups that will come under this umbrella legislation feel that it's a bit too heavy on the medical end. The minister has indicated that it says, up to three but one at least. So I would like to make the recommendation to the hon. minister that it be just one medical person, not up to three.

Then possibly, if we can, that we do look at some type of rotational system on this supervising board, so people who may not be on the board this year, or don't have representation, may have some representation two years down the road. Possibly that would alleviate the fears of some people that they are being regulated by a body which doesn't understand their specific problems, even if it's just a perceived understanding that the people on that board don't understand the problem. So I think we can do something in this area.

The section I'd also like to bring to the minister's attention is on page 1542, where we talk about one profession or occupation supervising or controlling another, the section with The Dental Association Act and the dental hygienists and assistants. It says they could be brought in under Section 33. This is really an example of a group that is related to another group. Some mechanism should be worked out that they go under the supervision of the original parent group, which they're working under now — the dental profession's Act or the hygienists' Act — but associated with that particular group. I think it would be more functional, because the problems of the hygienist and the assistants are problems that relate to the profession. Even though the provision is there, I think they should stay and be regulated by those. Now I know there are some problems. The other groups would say that maybe that's not a good way to go. But I think if we try to keep it in that direction — we're going to end up with some groups where the only place you can put them is under the umbrella. I appreciate that problem that the minister and the department have.

Mr. Speaker, with those few comments I would like to say that I am going to support the Bill, because we have to start taking a step in that direction. I believe it is a step that has to be taken. I certainly will bring some of the other comments I have to the attention of the minister

when we go clause by clause through the committee stage.
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: May the hon. minister close debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In closing debate I'll respond only briefly to the comments made by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, as I see he's not in his seat at the present time. I'm sure these are issues which he indicated he would most likely bring up during the committee stage in any event. I would like to mention very briefly the government's policy on professions and occupations to ensure that there is no misunderstanding in *Hansard*, because in my view what we are doing is totally consistent with our policy on professions and occupations. The health occupations board should not be compared to a professional association, because it is not. There is a wide difference. On the other hand the health occupations committees, as described under this proposed legislation, would be made up of members of that practising group and, where an association exists, the members would be drawn from the same.

I'd also like to remind members, and it was with some considerable concern that the government caucus agreed with this recommendation. Because we're dealing with such a wide variety of health occupations, some of which have associations at the present time — some fairly well developed, others in the initial developmental stages — still others do not have any associations at all, it's not accurate to compare these organizations, these professional groups, with some of the larger, more established, professional organizations like the medical profession, the dental profession, the architects and so on. Therefore no fees will be charged to the members of these health occupations in terms of registration and regulation, which is quite unlike the other groups I previously mentioned and other self-regulating professions within the province.

A concern was expressed by the hon. member regarding the authority of the Executive Council, in terms of being the final body to approve matters referred to it by the health occupations board. I suppose we could discuss that at some length, and probably will during the committee stage, from a philosophical point of view.

One of the things we wanted to ensure with this Bill is that, as is very right, not all of the approximately 30 groups that we expect will be eventually regulated by the Bill will have an opportunity to have a member on the nine-member health occupation board. We want to ensure that any concerns a group has can still be vented through their MLA, through the department, or directly through the minister. So there is that one last avenue of appeal if you like.

The third concern mentioned by the member was with regard to the representation of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Members will recall that in Bill 30, which was introduced a year and a half ago, it was indicated that three of the nine members on the board were to be of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. The present Bill 84 has been brought forward with an amendment whereby we've indicated that at least one, but not more than three members of the board be from that professional body. We've further provided an amendment that the quorum of the board will be six members, not the normal five. Again that is to ensure that decisions not be made by the board in the absence of other members of the board

who are not members of that particular profession.

I would certainly like to clarify one misunderstanding; that is, the point that The Health Occupations Act is not intended in any way to suggest that these occupations will be totally self-regulating. In fact, during my opening comments — and possibly the Member for Spirit River-Fairview was not in his seat at that moment — I listed seven primary objectives of the Bill. The sixth objective is to provide a degree of peer regulation for those manpower groups regulated under the Bill. That's a very important distinction.

Moving on, Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciated the comments by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, because I believe that no member in this Assembly has spent more time, both in terms of studying and speaking with groups and listening to concerns by various professions and occupations, than the Member for Edmonton Norwood, in her previous capacity as chairperson of the legislative committee on professions and occupations and in her involvement since that time with a variety of groups.

I would certainly like to echo one thing the hon. member said; that is, that this is a first step. It's a first step, a bold step. We have no illusions. We're walking on some ground with some trepidation. We know there are groups and organizations that are not totally satisfied; some are downright angry. But we have to take a step and we have to move. I'm determined that if we do proceed with this Bill — and I certainly urge the Assembly to do so — that we do so with an open mind, and be prepared, after a period of time, to look at the legislation and, if there are shortcomings with it, be prepared to come back and address those.

The hon. Member for Clover Bar made some remarks regarding the make-up of the board and the medical representation. It's my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the first members appointed to the health occupations board are going to have a very difficult task determining which health occupations should in fact be regulated under the board. Keeping in mind the first objective of the Bill, which is to provide the public with a safeguard where there is risk from the practice of unregulated health occupations — and I'm saying this as one member of the Assembly and would certainly like to hear other members' thoughts — I would certainly want and expect that the first priority of this Bill will be to safeguard the public. We want to ensure that if the board is going to err, it will err on the side of caution, that it will not move ahead in a reckless way. Therefore I believe there is a need, at least in the initial years, for three of the nine-member board to be from the College of Physicians and Surgeons. One of the reasons we have amended the Bill in this particular way is so there certainly is no obligation to stay with any fixed number. I think it might well be advisable, over a period of time, to reduce that membership on the board. Again, that will have to be considered as we move on.

I have one concern with the rotational system the hon. member mentioned. Although there is certain value to the suggestion, I think it would be dangerous or folly if, by appointing members of the various health occupations to the board, the practice fell into place that, well, if you support me on this particular resolution or motion that my health occupation wants, then I'll support you on yours. The members appointed to that health occupations board must be appointed for their personal qualifications and qualities. Yes, we need to take into consideration their professional occupational background, but first

their own standing in their communities, their own competency as individuals. I firmly believe that whether or not the intent of this Bill is met will depend more on the make-up of the health occupations board than on any other single factor. That's more important than the various health occupation committees or the registrar who is appointed or any of the intent. It's the make-up of the board that will make or break the entire concept.

With regard to the comments by the hon. member, specifically Section 33 and the concerns of the Dental Association, I have had a number of meetings with the Dental Association. I think we have worked out an arrangement whereby the Alberta Dental Association and the dental assistants' and dental hygienists' associations are going to continue examining other ways that we might include those two health occupation groups, not under the dental Act but under a separate mechanism, and it may be with one other related group. To allow for time, we have agreed, and I would recommend to the Assembly, that proclamation not be given to Section 33, to allow approximately 12 months. But if at the end of that time we have not been able to come up with an agreement that is satisfactory to the two occupations involved, to the association, and to the government, then I don't believe we would have any alternative than to recommend proclamation of Section 33.

Again, I'd like to echo a comment by the hon. Member for Clover Bar, which really builds on the comment made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, who said that this was a first step. The hon. Member for Clover Bar said it's a step in the right direction. I believe that as well. It doesn't solve all the problems, it doesn't have all the answers, but I believe it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, with those comments I recommend Bill 84 to this Legislature.

[Motion carried; Bill 84 read a second time]

head: **PRIVATE BILLS** (Second Reading)

Bill Pr. 5 **The Alberta Foundation Act**

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill Pr. 5, The Alberta Foundation Act. The purpose of the Act is to establish a charitable foundation with its main objective to cover all kinds of charitable purposes in Alberta, and as well to provide management services on a non-profit basis to other charities that may need management services for their funds. Those are the two main principles.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 5 read a second time]

Bill Pr. 3 **The Alberta Wheat Pool** **Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I move Bill Pr. 3, The Alberta Wheat Pool Amendment Act, 1980. The purpose of this Bill is to facilitate the pool's paying out dividends to its shareholders.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 3 read a second time]

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

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Title	Moved by
59	The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1981-82	Hyndman
61	The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Amendment Act, 1980	Fyfe
64	The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act, 1980	Harle
66	The Students Loan Guarantee Amendment Act, 1980	Hiebert
67	The Students Finance Amendment Act, 1980	Knaak
69	The Irrigation Amendment Act, 1980	Thompson
68	The Agricultural Societies Amendment Act, 1980	Schmidt
70	The Agricultural Statutes Amendment Act, 1980	Campbell
76	The Rural Gas Amendment Act, 1980	Batiuk
81	The Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1980 (No. 2)	Hyndman
83	The Court of Queen's Bench Amendment Act, 1980	Crawford
86	The Pension Fund Act	Hyndman
87	The Ground Water Development Act	Stewart

head: **NOTICES OF MOTIONS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous leave of the Assembly to give oral notice that Bill 96, The Engineers and Related Professions Amendment Act, 1980, would be introduced tomorrow, if unanimous consent is agreed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Before I give unanimous consent, can the minister indicate if this Bill would be acted on at this fall sitting or held over till the spring?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Bill would be a companion piece to The Architects Act, which is on notice at the present time and will be introduced tomorrow, and represents consequential amendments only to The Architects' Act, and in fact is not a complete new Act.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Has the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower unanimous consent of the House that the Bill be introduced tomorrow?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of record I should indicate that I am making this motion on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Housing and Public Works.

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**(Third Reading)***(continued)*

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No	Title	Moved by
79	The Labour Relations Act	Young
80	The Employment Standards Act	Young

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'll shortly move that we call it 5:30. But before doing so, I just note in regard to the Order Paper, that a number of Bills will still be available for second reading or committee in regard to tomorrow and Friday. For that reason, it seems to me that my earlier indication that we would sit tomorrow night is one that we should continue with, even though today we found the House progressed more quickly than we'd thought. I will give a further firm indication on that to the hon. members as early as possible in the day tomorrow in order that we would know about tomorrow night. I think it most likely that we would want to start then with The Election Act.

Mr. Speaker, other than noting that there are some remaining items to be dealt with and indications of some important legislation still to be introduced, I don't think I can add too much on government business, unless the hon. member has a question.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. House leader. Mr. Minister, can you indicate if the revisions to The Election Act will pass at this fall sitting, or will it be held over and proclaimed in the spring?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's colleague, the Member for Little Bow, sent me a note on that today which I haven't had an opportunity to respond to yet. All I could say is that at the time it was introduced, it was certainly intended to pass it this fall, and that is the intention until the present time. But the matter having been raised, we'd be pleased to take it under consideration and advise further.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask the hon. minister a further question, in light of the fact that there really has not been an opportunity for political parties of all stripes in the province to make representation to the government on The Election Act, and in light of the fact that enumeration will not take place until a year from this September, which is about 10 months hence, I would just like to indicate to the Government House Leader that that may be one of the considerations he takes under advisement as to possibly holding the Bill until next spring.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 5:30.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:10 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]