

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Wednesday, May 25, 1988** 2:30 p.m.

Date: 88/05/25

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**PRAYERS**

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

O Lord, grant us a daily awareness of the precious gift of life which You have given us.

As Members of this Legislative Assembly we dedicate our lives anew to the service of our province and our country.

Amen.

head: **NOTICES OF MOTIONS**

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that I intend to move tomorrow, May 26, when Bill 10 is called for resumption of debate at third reading, that debate on the Bill shall not be further adjourned.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table with the Assembly today a report titled A Strategy for Fisheries Mitigation in the Oldman River Basin, volume 1: Upstream Component.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table four copies of the communiqués -- there are 13 of them -- arising out of the Western Premiers' Conference in Parksville, British Columbia, last week.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, visiting us today is a delegation of more than 20 members of the Alberta Motor Association School Safety Patrol. I think all members of the Legislature know that these young students take the responsibility of helping their schoolmates cross busy intersections every day of the year. The group we have today has been selected as the best school patrollers in Alberta. They are on their way to Ottawa, where they will join thousands of other school safety patrollers in the annual national jamboree. They'll be accompanied by three chaperones for the trip to Ottawa. The chaperones are also here today: Constable Jack Lemire from Medicine Hat police department. Constable Wayne Nordstrom from the Edmonton police department, and Yvonne Corbeil, representing the AMA from Calgary. Also with them are certain AMA officials: Mr. George MacDonald, the president; Mr. Ken Quinn; Mr. Rob Taylor; and Dave Barr. There are parents as well: Lorna Klute, Bob Undseth and Denis Dubord.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outstanding group of young Albertans. They met earlier with our Minister of Agriculture. In recognizing the 50th anniversary of the AMA School Safety Patrol, they have placed items in a time capsule which will be opened in the year 2038, which would then be the 100th anniversary of the safety patrol. I'd ask the school patrollers, their

chaperones, and others accompanying them to please rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in introducing to you and through you to members of the Assembly, 94 grade 8 students from Calgary-West, the A.E. Cross junior high school, who are seated in the members' and public galleries. I'm sure that many of these youngsters are Flames fans but nevertheless are hoping that tonight Alberta will bring the Stanley Cup home once again. [interjection] Tomorrow night. We always look for success in Calgary-West, and sometimes we get a little impatient for it.

They are accompanied today by their teachers Mr. Al MacDonald, Mr. Tom Matthews, Ms June Hughes, Ms Paula Shaw, and Mrs. Carol Gemgembre, and parents Mrs. Robin Heseltine, Mrs. Martine Bourreau, and Mrs. Marian Jones. Would you all please give them a warm welcome as they rise to accept it?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, a grade 6 class from Elbow Park school in the constituency of Calgary-Elbow. They are accompanied by teachers Mr. McCale and Miss Wenzel and many, many mothers. I'd like them to rise and receive our welcome.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon members, on behalf of all the Assembly, earlier -- actually in the last week -- a letter was sent to the Member for Edmonton-Centre and his wife to congratulate them on the birth of a new son, and I'm sure that all members join with us in extending our warm regards.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

**Free Trade**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. The enabling legislation, called Bill C-130, for the Mulroney trade deal has finally been tabled in the House of Commons. Section 9(5) of the legislation makes it plain that the federal government claims the right under the trade deal to make regulations in areas of provincial jurisdiction which are binding upon the province, and I quote 9(5):

A regulation made under subsection (1) in respect of a province is binding on Her Majesty in right of that province.

My question to the Premier. He said there was a consultation process ahead of this enabling legislation. Did the Premier agree to this intrusion into provincial jurisdiction under the guise of the Mulroney trade deal?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition should be clear that the trade agreement is not an intrusion into provincial jurisdiction. What has now been tabled in the House of Commons, which is legislation that the federal government is introducing, may have some problem with intrusion into provincial jurisdiction. For that purpose, we have asked our Attorney General's department to give us a full assessment of the potential for that intrusion, and until that assessment is completed, I would not want to judge it one way or another,

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I thought you were good buddies, that you were consulting about this. Is the Premier now saying that he doesn't know whether this enabling legislation intrudes into provincial jurisdiction or not, that he hasn't even read it? Is

this what the Premier is saying?

MR. GETTY: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, just as in our House we do not take legislation which is going to go into our House and send it about to other people. We feel that the Legislature, and in this case, the House of Commons, deserves to have the first look at legislation, and while we have gone through some consultation processes between the federal minister, Mr. Crosbie, and our Attorney General, the Member for Medicine Hat, we have not prejudged this Legislation till it was introduced in the House, and it is now being assessed.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's appalling frankly, because it's already in the House and it's going to be debated now. Clearly this does go into provincial jurisdiction.

Also in this legislation it says:

requiring or prohibiting the doing of anything in relation to which a regulation may be made under this subsection and prescribing penalties for the contravention of or non-compliance with any such regulation.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the federal government can penalize the provincial government for not going along with it. My question is: why did the Premier so meekly go along with this ahead of time, where perhaps we can't do something about it now.

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition must be writing his questions out in advance and not paying any attention to the answers I'm giving him. Obviously, I said that we had not agreed to this legislation; we had agreed to the free trade agreement. The legislation is now being introduced, and it's being assessed by the law officers of the Alberta government. When we have that full assessment, then we will respond.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, you'll respond when it's too late. That's what we've been trying to harangue you about all the time. If I may say so, we can reverse the quote: the feds are now back in the back porch; in fact, they're going into the living room with this legislation. They have wide-ranging powers under section 6 to move at any time in the future. My question is to the Premier. What is the Premier going to do about it now that this legislation is here? Is he still going to blindly say that the free trade deal is good for Alberta? Is that what he's still going to do?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, again the hon. Leader of the Opposition is not making a distinction between the free trade agreement that we were part of and the legislation. They're distinctly different things. The free trade agreement does not impose on provincial jurisdiction. The legislation, as I said, is being assessed to see whether it is, and frankly, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not proceeding quickly. It will sit in the House of Commons while the provinces assess it. I've discussed that matter with the Prime Minister on the weekend, and it will sit. We are going to assess it. If, in fact, it does not meet with our desires, obviously Alberta will express those views very strongly.

I know one thing: we will not rely on federal Liberals or federal NDP to support us on provincial jurisdiction, because they're the very ones who tried to sell the provinces down the river in the past.

MR. MITCHELL: One thing is certain about this piece of legislation: it does involve intrusion into provincial jurisdiction. Once the Premier's officials confirm that, will the Premier be withdrawing his support from this free trade agreement and continuing to fight, the tradition that's been established in this province, for provincial jurisdiction and provincial power over its . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member.

MR. GETTY: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can't seem to make a difference in his mind -- I don't know why -- between the free trade agreement and the legislation. They are two different things. Obviously, the free trade agreement was worked out with the first ministers, and we always insisted that it did not impinge on provincial jurisdiction. The implementing legislation, because Ontario is trying to protect some small number of wine growers in the Niagara area, has placed the federal government in the position of being, as I understand it, unable to enter into an international agreement, which is within their rights as representing us as a country. Therefore, they are trying to work out with the Ontario government an agreement so that they will be able to enter into the agreement with the United States.

We'll have to see, Mr. Speaker, when we get our assessment from the law officers of the Crown, but I will say this: we strongly support the free trade agreement. That free trade agreement is very positive for the people of Alberta.

MR. MARTIN: I'd like to designate my second question to the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Forest Lawn.

#### **Emissions Control at Hub Oil Plant**

MR. PASHAK: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On six occasions since being elected to represent the residents of Calgary-Forest Lawn, I brought to the attention of members of this Assembly and to the Minister of the Environment serious concerns about noxious odours emanating from the Hub Oil recycling plant. Twenty-two months ago on this date I tabled complaints in this House from a residents' committee that said that the fumes were harmful to their children, to seniors, to the health of people in that area in general, and to their property values. My question is to the Minister of the Environment. Why did it take this minister nearly two years to respond to these citizens' concerns, that have been raised in the Assembly on so many occasions?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that the hon. member forgets that on April of 1986 an air emission control order was provided to Hub Oil, and over that period of time there have been improvements in terms of the air quality, reductions with respect to Hub Oil. Today, as a result of consultations not only with the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn but more importantly the Member for Calgary-Millican -- who has spoken to me on many, many more occasions than the half-dozen that the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn talks about -- and as a result of consultations recently held over the weekend with the MLA for Calgary-Montrose, we moved today on an emission control order for Hub Oil, which will hopefully dramatically improve the odour emissions that will be emanat-

ing from Hub.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The minister's response raises some very interesting points, because in answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier said that the government's desire is to assist Albertans in every part of this province. To the Minister of the Environment. Do the residents of Calgary-Forest Lawn have to wait two years for relief because they needed two government MLAs to come in and try to take credit for this situation?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, it's always been my experience, Mr. Speaker, that the most effective MLAs in the Assembly are in fact the government MLAs. But I would like all members to be assured that when matters are brought to the attention of the government, the government of course deals with them in quick rapidity, as obviously the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon can attest to. When he's brought concerns to the Minister of the Environment and asked for responses, they've occurred. As the Member for Vegreville can attest to, when he brought to the attention of the government concerns with respect to Duvernay, the immediate response was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for all the examples.

MR. PASHAK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since Turbo's recycling plant will remain closed until next month and the emission order that you just issued today may force Hub Oil to close down to refurbish, what contingency plans has the minister made to ensure that all oil that would have gone into these plants will be disposed of safely?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are three oil recycling plants in the province of Alberta. There's Turbo, of course, in Edmonton; there's Carmoil in Red Deer, which does a volume of approximately 7 million litres per year; and of course there is Hub Oil in Calgary. The emission control order that was issued today causes Hub Oil to come back to us no later than June 30, 1988, with a plan to improve the equipment that it has on site, to reduce odours emanating from that plant, and to have that new equipment on stream by November 30, 1988. There is no decision today to close down Hub Oil; what it is is an action plan to dramatically improve and reduce the amount of odour emissions that would be emanating from Hub Oil in the area.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, final supplementary. The city of Calgary has indicated that space for a new plant is available in the foothills industrial area, which is far from residential areas. Given that the plant is offensive to sight as well as smell, will the minister now commit to providing Hub Oil with a one-time capital grant so that it can relocate away from people's homes? Because this is the only real answer to the problem,

MR. KOWALSKI: That subject matter is under review. It was certainly brought to my attention by both the MLA for Calgary-MilUcan and the MLA for Calgary-Montrose. I have no confirmation, though, at this point in time that the city of Calgary is prepared to allocate land for the relocation of Hub Oil, but I suspect that now that the matter has been raised in the Legislative Assembly today, the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn will soon be asking the mayor of Calgary to send me a letter confirming his commitment that he's just made to that.

MR. SHRAKE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The concerned residents are a bit skeptical about the effectiveness of our orders, because I know that in '86 there they made changes and we still have the odours and the aromas. Can the minister assure this House that he will carry through a review of this until such time as all of the equipment is installed to see that there are no further odour emissions in that area? Oh, and if the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn wants to take the credit for it . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. [some applause]

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much. I very much appreciate that warm reception when I stood up.

In reality, Mr. Speaker, since April of 1986 there have been dramatic reductions in the amount of hydrogen sulfides and sulphur dioxides that have emanated from Hub Oil, and there has been an improvement in terms of air quality over the last two years. What there has not been is an improvement in the hydrocarbon vapour emissions -- the smell, in other words -- and that's what we're talking about in terms of Hub Oil. The Member for Calgary-Millican, in whose constituency Hub Oil is located, can take a great deal of credit today for causing the government to move with this emission control order that was issued at noon today.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, if I may, to the minister. Could the minister tell the House whether or not the government, in order to clean up the emissions, has given any loan, grant, or guarantee to Hub in order that they can go forward with cleaning up their plant in situ?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the government has not provided any loan, grant, debenture, dollar allocation of any type to Hub Oil. It's our belief that this is a bona fide private-enterprise firm working in the province of Alberta. There are two other oil recyclers. Should the government choose to move in this direction, the policy that would be announced would be a fair one to all of the parties that would be involved in oil recycling in our province of Alberta, not a policy that would simply look at one of the firms in question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, on behalf of the Liberal caucus.

#### Weather Modification Program

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Premier. As the spectre of drought tightens its grip on the land, many Albertans who cannot get away for a saltwater cruise are searching for some solutions. Such a group has been formed north of Calgary. The Alberta weather modification group, representing 40 million acres of farmland, has written the Premier asking for a measly 10 cents an acre support to renew the weather modification efforts. My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Premier. Can he assure this group that he will be able to provide them the 10 cents an acre to go ahead with weather modification efforts?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to a letter which, from the way he's described it, I have not yet received.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry about that; I thought you had. I checked with your office.

Let's go on a little bit further, Mr. Speaker. This group represents 40 million acres, 10 cents an acre. Will the Premier consider allowing this equipment that's already mothballed in Calgary because of the associate minister's decision a couple of years ago -- and it's raring to go. Will he just give the word that they can go ahead?

MR. GETTY: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, I understand the hon. member's interest in this matter and his representation. But I want to see the letter and respond to it myself.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, if I may supplement that. The member said 40 million acres. There aren't 40 million acres of farmland in the province of Alberta farmed at the present time.

But the decision to terminate the weather modification program was based on a budget in which we had a \$3 billion deficit. In terms of looking at our overall budget, we had to terminate a lot of programs and cut back. I think the member is referring to the Krick method of seeding clouds, and if it's 10 cents an acre, I would think that farmers would be interested in participating, because crop insurance is more expensive than that.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary question.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The associate minister is on top of it. The 20 million, of course, isn't just farmland; it's ranchland and all other kinds of land that need water. But Krick and Associates and this co-op group are ready to go ahead, and 10 cents an acre is very small: on 40 million acres it would still only work out to \$400,000, less than 5 percent of the \$20 million allocated. Could the Premier, if it comes out to less than 5 percent of what's allocated, make room for weather modification to get under way?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I've already told the hon. member I'll be looking with interest at the letter he's referring to. I must say that I'm uneasy about taking details from him. He has now said that 40 million acres times 10 cents is \$400,000, and I think that's probably a wrong multiplication.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it's 20 million in the letter that's written, a total of 40 million in the province.

The counties of Pincher Creek and Vulcan are also interested in joining the co-operative plan, and probably you will be hearing further about it. I guess there's not much further I can ask, Mr. Speaker, except to ask whether or not the Premier would go ahead and give second thought to reinstituting the old Loughheed program of Krick and weather modification.

MR. GETTY: Again, Mr. Speaker, if this is contained in the letter, I'll be interested in seeing what the request actually is.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Vegreville, supplementary.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the associate minister. I'm wondering if she could tell us if any of the people who worked on the weather modification project in the Innisfail area have found employment elsewhere in the government and would be available to work on a refurbished program if that was a deci-

sion taken in the future? Or is that expertise just lost to us?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I'd just like to refer to the leader of the Liberal Party's last statement that the Krick program was a Loughheed program. It was not. That was what the fight was over for years and years and years, about whether it should be ground-generated seeding or cloud seeding by aircraft. So you're wrong again. But facts don't mean a thing.

In terms of the people who worked on the weather modification program, yes, many of them are still in government and that expertise is still around.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the associate minister. In some of the programs that the minister is looking at as far as cloud seeding goes and weather modification, what involvement do the provinces downstream have with the province of Alberta? Because if the thing works, then what do we leave for downstream people?

MRS. CRIPPS: The Member for Clover Bar very ingeniously put words into my mouth, saying that I was investigating the program. I may. But I wouldn't want the member to say that we're going to do something in advance of any decisions we might make. But that's always been the problem with the weather modification program, Mr. Speaker: who gets the rain and where does it rain? The people further east, even within our own province, complain that if we had not had the weather modification program, they may in fact have gotten rain. So it is a controversial program. In the past when we've had the weather modification program in effect, there's been a lot of rain in the area in general. So, really, it didn't prove anything as far as rain augmentation is concerned. It might be interesting to try it now and see if it really does work.

### Regional Economic Development

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. It's recently been announced that the federal government and the province of Quebec have reached an agreement regarding the creation of a regional economic development agency. The agency is to spend some \$1 billion over a five-year period that is comparable to our western diversification fund. However, the Quebec government will take part in the decision-making. Could the Premier indicate whether he has reviewed that matter and will assure us in Alberta that we will get the same kind of a deal with the federal government?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I guess the hon. member is referring to our Western Diversification Office, which is here in Edmonton, and the fact that that office is roughly the same type of a program as the regional economic development one in Quebec. Frankly, in working out any projects within Alberta, there is a great deal of provincial government responsibility and input and decision-making, because obviously if we aren't going to support it, it isn't going to go.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Could the Premier indicate what formal steps the provincial government is involved in in the decision-making with regards to the western diversification fund?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask our Minister of Economic

Development and Trade to respond to that, since he's the minister responsible.

I should only also say to the hon. member that following his request, this matter was raised at the Western Premiers' Conference in Parksville last week, and the Premiers unanimously supported the idea of faster, less bureaucratic decision-making and the decision-making being made on a federal/provincial basis here in Alberta or in the other western provinces rather than being slowed down by having to go to Ottawa. But in terms of the Alberta government's input and the procedures that we use, I'd ask the Minister of Economic Development and Trade to respond.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, since the inception of the western diversification announcement and the program, the government has maintained a close liaison with the minister responsible, the hon. Mr. McKnight. As well, through the public service the federal officials are in contact with provincial officials with respect to exchanging information. But we do not as a province have direct influence over the decisions that are made by the Western Diversification Office. We do, however, have the opportunity to provide advice.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether the province of Alberta would want to have the rights to have some influence or be part of the decision-making in a formal way such as has been allowed for the province of Quebec under the Quebec/federal government agreement?

MR. SHABEN: At the present time, Mr. Speaker, there is a number of ministers and departments that are reviewing the federal steps that are being taken that relate to the reorganization of the new department of industry, science and technology and, with respect to that, how that department interfaces with our government as well as with other governments. That discussion is taking place with the Minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, the Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, the Minister of Tourism, and myself in order to frame a policy recommendation from our province that will go to the federal government.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Premier. On balance, could the Premier indicate what is really the point in having a special western diversification fund when at the same time we have a diversification fund located in Quebec? We also have one in the Atlantic provinces. It seems like it neutralizes what was supposedly a special benefit and consideration to western Canada. Has the Premier considered that, and if so, have any discussions gone on with the Prime Minister?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may be drawing certain conclusions as to whether or not the economic development fund in Quebec is in fact a duplicate of the diversification efforts which we are attempting to carry out in western Canada and in Atlantic Canada. For my part if Quebec is working with the federal government on greater economic development I say great. I'm glad they are. I would like all parts of this country to strengthen their economic base.

However, the diversification efforts that we are pushing in western Canada really have to do with broadening our economic

base beyond just agriculture and energy and rather having a much broader base to bring in forestry, tourism, the service sector, upgrading of our resources. So I frankly feel that the diversification efforts both of the provincial government and those through the Western Diversification Office are having an impact. It's true that the federal program is slow, but we think we are going to get it speeded up considerably. We are making great strides in diversification. But I do not try to take something away from another part of this country if they are making progress as well.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In view of the fact that we've recently had another right-wing Premier elected in western Canada, is there any possibility that besides the fund being slow, because of the necessity to keep that Premier in power there will be less funds for Alberta to be diversified with?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to know how to respond to that kind of a question except to say that because of the activity of the private sector in this province being so aggressive and vibrant I believe that the people of Alberta and their companies are moving very, very dramatically with the Western Diversification Office. There are plenty of proposals there, and now we have to speed up the decision-making process.

I should point out that in Manitoba, where there was a government that did not believe in the free-enterprise sector of the economy, they were trying to flow the funds to state operations, to either municipal governments or provincial government operations, rather than to small businesses. That was absolutely contrary to the intent of this diversification program, and therefore it was very slow in Manitoba. But I think that now with the new Premier that will speed up.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Mountain View, a supplementary.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Premier must be aware that western Canada's percentage of funds from the federal government for regional economic development has dropped since the Mulroney Conservatives were elected in 1984. Can the Premier indicate when western Canada will start getting its fair share of regional economic development grants from the federal government?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's something that we are working on constantly with the federal government and various ministers of our government. It is a matter of one of the communiqués which was issued, unanimously supported by all Premiers in western Canada and as a result of initiatives of the Alberta government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Vermilion-Viking, final supplementary on this issue.

DR. WEST: Yes. To the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Many constituents and people have voiced concern on the vagueness of the western diversification fund, as to the application and the type of help that will be brought forward. Could the minister indicate if in his communications it has been stated whether these are loans, loan guarantees, grants, or a combination of them? Nobody seems to have a direct idea on that.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the Premier had outlined the fact

that the generation of proposals to the Western Diversification Office from western Canada has been led by the private sector in Alberta. In fact, the hon. member would, I'm sure, be interested in knowing that about 40 percent of the applications have originated from western Canadian companies out of Alberta, which reflects the nature of our province.

The information we have received indicates to us that the western diversification program is prepared to do a number of things, including loan guarantees, direct loans, grants, or deferred repayment programs. So there are a variety of mechanisms that the Western Diversification Office has available to respond to these applications.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Grande Prairie, followed by Edmonton-Meadowlark.

#### **Assistance for Honey Producers**

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Minister of Agriculture, and the topic is the Alberta beekeepers' disaster assistance program. I was wondering if the minister would comment. Since northern beekeepers were and are unable to find quality colonies, has the minister considered waiving the repayment of the \$10 per colony beyond the July 1988 deadline as communicated by his departmental staff?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is aware, we have been sympathetic towards our honey producers in the province, whereby we're the only province that implemented a program to offset the low honey prices. In addition to that, we also participated with them in the establishment of a promotional campaign so that we could increase awareness in the nutritional value of honey. I should share with the hon. member, though, as it relates to his direct request to defer the refunding in the event that they have put in application for a greater amount of hives than what they will be using for production, that we will defer that until October 1.

DR. ELLIOTT: A supplementary. Mr. Speaker. If they're unable to find quality hives between now and October 1, would the minister consider waiving that until July 1989, for another production year?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the hon. member, we will work very closely with our honey producers with the hopes of locating appropriate colonies for them. But I must share with the hon. member that I would have difficulty in further extending that beyond the time frame I suggested to him earlier.

DR. ELLIOTT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister making any progress with our federal minister in determining ways to reopen the border to make mite-free United States bees available to our Canadian producers?

MR. ELZINGA: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We've worked very closely with the federal government and in conjunction with our Alberta bee producers, especially those from the north country, but I should share with the hon. member that the probability of having the border opened earlier than what we had hoped has been decreased in view of the fact that the U.S. Department of Agriculture itself has removed its quarantine borders from the 13 states that were participating. So the probability of having

that border removal sooner than what we had originally projected is very slim, but I want to leave the hon. member the assurance that we are working with the Alberta Beekeepers' Association with the hopes of developing some type of a certification process in conjunction with the federal government so that we can somehow do our level best to offset a harm that has caused serious concern amongst our honey producers.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, Westlock-Sturgeon, followed by Vegreville.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Would he share with the House whether he is considering a system whereby certain American producers that have shown mite-free exports over the last five years will be granted special licences to be able to export into Alberta?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I answered that in a previous question from the hon. member for Grande Prairie, whereby now that probability has decreased substantially because the U.S. Department of Agriculture itself has removed its own interstate regulations as it relates to the role of the mite, and because of that, it is going to cause increased concern amongst our honey producers in Canada.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, bees are like Liberals: you can't predict where they might fly from time to time.

I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he's taken any action on my suggestion that he ask the federal Department of Agriculture to offer an indemnity to beekeepers who were unable to get bees from any source this year, who were unable to access the provincial government's \$10 per hive support, and who will be put out business by the border closure decision?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, we've made constant representation to the federal government, and I appreciate the hon. member's suggestion. I have in a verbal way indicated that to our federal counterparts. As he is aware, the federal government did include under their special grains program a provision for our honey producers, which was not in the previous program, to take into account some of the depressed honey prices.

MR. SPEAKER: Vegreville, main question.

#### **Water Supply Assistance**

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the five weeks that have passed since the Premier announced the water supply assistance program, most of the drought-ravaged areas of the province have experienced nothing but hot dry, and very windy weather. At the same time as the Premier was making plans with other western Premiers to lobby the federal government for some additional drought assistance, his Minister of Agriculture was saying no to requests from farmers in northeastern Alberta to acreage payments or interest-free loan types of assistance for this serious situation. I'd like to ask the Premier what specific form of drought assistance he's asking his cousins in Ottawa to provide.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, in the communiqué which I tabled today the number one item that the Premiers dealt with was the need to have an emergency meeting of their ministers of agricul-

ture with the federal Minister of Agriculture, to meet and consider every possible way of assisting. I hope that we will be able to come up with a comprehensive, effective program that will assist our agriculture producers. Then I hope that we'll be able to take that plan and put it on the shelf because we will have a good rain in this province, which is really the answer to our problems. A government cannot balance out nature in any meaningful way. We'll do everything we can to help, but we obviously cannot balance out nature.

So having made the request, I followed it up with a discussion with the Prime Minister, and he has ordered his Minister of Agriculture to immediately call the meeting, and I understand that a date has now been set in less than a week when that meeting will take place.

MR. FOX: Well, I asked the Premier for specifics, and he's specific in a general way, Mr. Speaker.

Recognizing that the drought is not only having a serious impact on crop producers, but there are hundreds of thousands of cattle that may be sent to market because they can't be sent out to pasture, I'm wondering if the Premier will tell us then: is this one week the deadline? If there are no firm announcements from Ottawa about what kind of assistance is coming forth from the federal government, will the Premier then be announcing what specific additional assistance is forthcoming from this government?

MR. GETTY: I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is missing the point. The federal government is going to meet with the agriculture ministers from the west, and they are going to develop the program. We don't want a program announced from Ottawa. We want to have this period of consultation in advance.

Frankly, as is the usual case in western Canada, conditions are different in various parts of western Canada, and they are experiencing flooding in Manitoba and in parts of British Columbia. While we were there, the news was carrying complaints, and valid complaints obviously, by the farmers in British Columbia that they could not get on their land because of the amount of rain they were experiencing. So obviously it needs to be a comprehensive, co-ordinated package, and that's why we want our ministers of agriculture to develop such a program.

MR. FOX: Well, Mr. Speaker, a firm commitment from the Premier to hold additional meetings isn't the kind of assurance that farmers in the province need when they're making these difficult decisions.

I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture -- he stated that one of the reasons for his saying no to the request from farmers in northeastern Alberta for additional support was that it's difficult to draw specific boundaries for aid programs and that they should be provincewide. I'm wondering if the minister is saying that any additional programs would therefore apply to all areas of the province whether they've been affected by drought or not.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, first let me correct the record as the hon. Member for Vegreville has put it, whereby we have not said no to all of these suggestions that were brought forward to us when we met with the farmers when I was joined by my colleague from St. Paul and the minister of public works. What we did do because of the strong representations of the farmers in that area was increase the retroactivity of all of the water pro-

grams that were announced by our Premier to January 1 so that those individuals who did put in dugouts or wells could have that money available to them.

In addition to that, the hon. member says that he's looking for a firm commitment. Our Premier gave a firm commitment of a \$20 million water program some weeks ago so that the farming population would have that commitment to work with while we analyze what further support is required, under the chairmanship of the hon. Minister of the Environment. We also extended the forage insurance north of Highway 16 so that the individuals could participate in that. We are going to be meeting, as the Premier indicated, in Calgary next Tuesday with the federal Minister of Agriculture, whereby we can review such things as crop insurance and the applicability of or alterations to those programs to help offset some of the seriousness of the weather conditions.

In addition to that, I want to share with the hon. member that we are on a continuing basis conducting an inventory of hay and feed supplies throughout the province so that we can again communicate to the federal minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board the possibility of curbing our export shipments so that we will have feed supplies on the prairies.

MR. FOX: Well, final supplementary to the Premier. I'm sure he realizes that recommendations from a number of sources have indicated the need for an established disaster assistance program that could make per acre or per head payments in the event of, you know, serious cases that are too widespread for basic crop insurance programs; in other words, a program that wouldn't be ad hoc or politically motivated. I'm wondering why the government hasn't taken action on this proposal so that these important programs are in place and ready to respond.

MR. GETTY: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, if we're talking about a disaster program to handle problems in western Canada, we are going to want to make sure that the federal government is fully involved. That is why we are taking the action we have. That is why this meeting has been called. That is why we want to have a comprehensive plan. I don't think it's particularly helpful at all to have some program suggested from one small part of Alberta and say, "That's the answer."

We want to make sure that we have a fully comprehensive program that fits all parts of Alberta, and our desire is to make sure that all of western Canada participates regardless of what their problem is. That is why the number one communiqué dealt with agriculture, dealt with the drought situation, called for urgent assistance for the livestock industry, reaffirmed the need for the 1988 deficiency payment, and -- I must say that I'm quite pleased -- for the first time unanimous support that we have the Crow payment made directly to producers in Alberta and British Columbia rather than to the railroads. All of these are methods of helping our farmers and ranchers.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of the Environment in his special task as chairman of the drought committee. While it's nice that the four western Premiers could all agree that Ottawa should solve the problem for them, has the minister, in his chairmanship position, looked at any special aid to preserve the brood cows or the basic herd for the mixed farmers of this province?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Premier appointed me to chair a water supply action committee, not a drought-related

committee. Both the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture have just now gone through a litany of new improvements that we're making in our province with respect to this matter, and the matter that's raised by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is one of many considerations that the Minister of Agriculture is looking at right now.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the Associate Minister of Agriculture. It's with regards to the cutoff date of planting crops under crop insurance. Could the minister indicate what progress she has made in her discussions with the federal minister in terms of possibly delaying the cutoff date, for example, for seed peas?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, that's an excellent question, because it's of great concern to many farmers in the province. I did phone the Hon. John Wise on May 18 to talk about the crop insurance agreement that we've got and how we can change it so it is responsive to the drought conditions. I've recommended that we extend the late seeding deadline, and we will be meeting in Calgary shortly with the federal minister and other ministers.

In terms of the forage supply in particular, I would hope that we can seed later and insure it. If it makes grain, fine; that's great. If it doesn't make grain, then at least we are ensuring that we've got some forage supply, in relation to the Member for Vegreville's question.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the ministers of Agriculture and the Environment. Would they give consideration to a longer term five-year program of drought-proofing which would see the construction of medium and smaller sized reservoirs throughout Alberta, including projects like the Milk River project, the Pine Coulee project, and the Clear Lake project?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are currently some 140 dams, reservoirs, and weirs in the province of Alberta, and there's absolutely no doubt at all in my mind as the Minister of the Environment that if we are going to preserve, conserve, and manage water, we need more dams in our province.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Might we revert briefly to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

#### head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, 15 grade 6 students from the Glendon school, located in the village of Glendon in the Bonnyville constituency. They're accompanied today by their teacher Thelma Watrich. They are seated in the members' gallery, and I'd ask that they stand and receive the

recognition of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of the Environment

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce to all colleagues in the Alberta Legislative Assembly, some 52 grade 6 students from Onoway elementary school. Onoway is some 40 miles to the west of Edmonton. These young people are accompanied today by their leader Mr. Terry Slemko, principal, and teachers Mrs. Colleen Jackson and Mrs. Pat White. I'd ask our friends to kindly stand, and my colleagues will acknowledge your presence by thumping their desks.

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

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

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Committee of the Whole please come to order.

#### Bill 4 Energy Resources Conservation Amendment Act, 1988

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or proposed amendments to this Bill?

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Red Deer-South responded to most of my questions, actually, during debate on second reading, but he left me a little bit confused over the destruction of the records. I'd like him to go into that in a little detail.

If I just turn to his remarks for a moment, he said:

So the repeal of this section of the Act allows them to destroy records that are no longer required.

My question would be: what would be the criteria for determining whether a record was no longer required or not?

It says:

I should note that all records of meetings, hearings, et cetera, will be retained indefinitely... and will not be destroyed.

Then he goes on to say something about redundant records being destroyed. Well, what is a redundant record? He suggests that it's just basically something that's "taking up space." What assurance is there that valuable information wouldn't be lost in this process?

I have a question relating to the last section that's being amended, which, as I take it authorizes the court to enforce judgments under this Act. Although this is not directly related to this section, I would appreciate any comment he might make on measures that might be taken under this section or related sections of the Act that would make it easier for individuals who are not experts to appear before the ERCB; that is, to have financial resources made available that would allow for more effective representation, perhaps by interest groups, consumer groups, and that kind of thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member for Red Deer-South.

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to respond to the member opposite, again, the records retention will be brought into line with the existing policies under the Public Works, Supply and Services Act and the public records regulations. So that Act and those regulations are already in place for other boards and committees and whatnot, so this is just to fall into line with that. They are referred to a committee before any can be destroyed.

In response to the concern about simplifying the process for individuals to appear in front of the ERCB, I can't say that any of these changes is going to assist in terms of the requirements and the procedures that are called for to appear in front of the ERCB. What they will do, however, Mr. Chairman, is assist those individuals who have gone to some expense, and where the board rules that they should receive reimbursement, it will allow those reimbursements for costs to be enforced by the judicial process in the event that the individuals involved aren't willing to pay. Up until now there wasn't a guarantee through the judicial process.

MR. PASHAK: My question with respect to the destruction of the records was the criteria under which those records would be destroyed. Perhaps the hon. member could elaborate on that.

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what more I can say. I can only reiterate what I've said already, and that's that the practice follows under the Public Works, Supply and Services Act and the public records regulations. Again, all records of meetings, hearings, et cetera, will be retained indefinitely by the board and will not be destroyed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[The sections of Bill 4 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. OLDRING: I move that Bill 4 be reported.

[Motion carried]

## Bill 7

### Tourism Education Council Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 7 is a money Bill, the Tourism Education Council Act, the hon. Minister of Tourism. Are there any comments, hon. minister?

MR. SPARROW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We are very fortunate to have a very hardworking and able chairman with us today: the chairman of the Tourism Education Council, the MLA for Red Deer-North. I've asked him to lead our discussion on the detail of the Act and the progress the council has made. He can report on and maybe provide some of the answers to the questions that took place during the last discussion of the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Red Deer-North.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to the minister. Just some brief background comments to give an understanding of the importance of this particular piece of legisla-

tion. First, I think it's important to acknowledge and recognize the past work of former ministers of tourism -- namely, the Hon. Boomer Adair and the Hon. LeRoy Fjordbotten -- in working with the industry in the province, getting this off the ground, and moving in the direction that we're moving, and certainly the present minister, who has not only grasped the vision for this but has grasped the torch and is running with it in terms of the importance of having not just this Act in place but tourism and hospitality training and education firmly entrenched in our province and made available. So full marks go to him for his quick grasp of the importance of this, the vision, and running with it.

With this particular Act, the government is making a statement. As we know, we have recognized the fact that we're presently looking at the tourism industry as about a \$2.3 billion industry employing about 100,000 people both full- and part-time in the province. The projection by this government, both from the Speech from the Throne of a year ago and also through the various ministers, is that tourism is to be one of the growth industries as we approach the 21st century. We're looking and speculating in the next several years at an industry of some \$10 billion employing over 200,000 people both full- and part-time. So obviously that puts some requirements in terms of making training and education vitally available.

The function of the Alberta Tourism Education Council, through this Act, is to bring together government, industry, and the education community to co-ordinate the development of appropriate education and training opportunities and to facilitate and co-ordinate that whole area. What this Bill will do is establish the council as a legal entity or corporation, as it were, and provide a mechanism for the tourism education fund through which funds would come both from the private sector and from government itself in terms of supporting the ongoing activities of the council. It provides that mechanism for this Legislature to direct funding to the council if it so chooses and as it chooses. Mr. Chairman, that's clearly in keeping with the partnership arrangement that's established through the council and is vital to the long-term viability of the council.

Enacting this particular piece of legislation demonstrates the government's commitment, going beyond just words and actually demonstrating the vision and the commitment that is there and the importance of providing education and training to the tourism industry in this province. This Act will legitimize the role of the council with respect to its co-ordinating role in co-ordinating the design and development of tourism education and training programs. As we look to the formation of the council, we look back with gratitude to a number of people in the industry throughout the province. If I can just quickly list them, because their names should be recorded, as they were vital in the formation of this Act, we think of people like Leo Blindenbach, Mr. Herb Pickering, Walter Urquhart, Jim Hansen, Gordon Tocher, Ivor Petrak, Gerry Webber, Elizabeth Kuhnel, Ekkehart Kolesch -- just a number of the people who were key and instrumental in the development that has led us to this legislation today.

As you look at the Act, you see the actual layout of the council and the fact that certain members are appointed from certain areas. That's really the secret of the Act and the importance of the Act resulting in a successful council. For instance, you'll notice nine representatives from industry. That includes industry groups such as TIAALTA, represented by Leo Blindenbach. The Motel Association is involved represented by Leslie Muza\*; the Alberta restaurant and food associations, by Mrs. Elizabeth

\*This spelling could not be verified at the time of publication.

Kuhnel; the Alberta Hotel Association, represented by Mr. Bill Fowler; the Alberta Chamber of Commerce, represented by Mr. Reuben Hamm; the Alberta Culinary Arts Foundation, Mr. Maurice O'Flynn; and Bev Berenson\* from Calgary park and Dick Fulks from Peace River. This council is industry weighted. That's the key and will be the key to success of the particular council, and that's why the Act has these positions laid out so that we always have that industry weight on council, because the industry has to tell us what the needs are.

Then to show the co-ordinating effect, we have different government departments represented: Career Development and Employment with Dr. Earl Mansfield; Tourism, of course, is represented by Mr. Bernie Campbell, deputy minister; and Advanced Education is represented by Mr. Bill Workman. That's the government side. Then, of course, we're talking about working with the educational community, both private sector and public sector, throughout the province. So there's representation from the Universities Co-ordinating Council, Dr. Brent Ritchie; the Alberta Vocational Centre, Dr. Glen Ingalls; and the council of presidents for colleges and technical institutes, Gil Johnston.\* As you can see, we've got a broad range of representation. Really what we've got here is for the first time government, industry, and educators working together and agreeing on the approaches that should be taken to tourism in education and training. Now, keeping a council like this together is a major task for an executive director, and I'm happy to see that we have the executive director of the council with us here today, and also our project manager. I would ask if Susan Dowler and Rick Baker would stand for a moment and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

We have unanimous support, Mr. Chairman, from all three groups in terms of the council being a priority as well as the activities that are currently being undertaken and that we're involved with. We've made a number of significant steps in terms of progress. The council is working with the industry associations to build an appropriate set of standards for various occupations within the tourism/hospitality industry. As an example, the council has endorsed and developed an appropriate set of standards that has been recognized and validated by the industry in the whole area of food and beverage service. So what we now have, Mr. Chairman, and what we need the validating and legitimizing role of the council to back up: in one particular area already, we have developed as a first project standards which have been validated by the industry for training and education in a particular and specific area of the industry. Now we take those standards that have been validated and challenge the various institutions, either public or private, in terms of developing their training along the lines of the standards the industry says are needed.

In that particular area, with that we are developing a provincial exam. People in the industry or those going through the educational centres take their studies based on the standards, write the exam, receive a certificate, and people in the industry know that these people coming to them as potential employees have received a certain level, a standard, of training that has been acceptable to industry. Then the people themselves, with their certificate, have a sense of pride and achievement, knowing that they've achieved a certain level. They will be able to deliver a service that is exemplary. That's just one area that we've moved in and have been developing.

Also, in response to the council being present, there's been an incredible level of interest expressed by educational institutes

\*This spelling could not be verified at the time of publication.

around the province. We've received applications from postsecondary institutions and also a wide range of other training sources, private consultants, et cetera, in which the council, again represented and weighted by industry and with government and education, is able to look at the proposals, identify needs and training gaps in the province, and then is able to share with these various groups what needs need to be met and how they should be met. What we're developing through that is an efficient, streamlined, and co-ordinated training and education system throughout the province.

The Act will also give the council the ability to operate the Alberta Hospitality Resource Centre. The resource centre is a very popular program. In that particular centre, which is housed under the auspices and under the roof of the council, industries around the province are able to contact the council offices and have made available to them training films, education films, in a wide range of areas and expertise. That's a very popular and very much in demand program. The benefits of having the council in place also include the development of a skilled and motivated tourism labour force and an enhanced hospitality image of Alberta as a world-class destination. The work of the council is going to be a key element in those developments.

We've also met with people in the Department of Education, in curriculum design, to be able to initiate and introduce people, our students, in the education system, K to 12 -- not just postsecondary, but K to 12 -- to the possibilities of development and career in terms of the tourism industry: what are the requirements, what are the rewards, what are the things they can look forward to? The council also co-ordinates and is involved in attending career fairs and industry exhibitions. We're involved in going to schools and colleges and universities at their particular career days or to speak and address various classes, and developing a speakers bureau of individuals around the province who are available to open the eyes of people right across this province in terms of the benefits and potential of this particular industry. Word is out, Mr. Chairman, and it has begun to spread rapidly that the tourism and hospitality industry does offer a career that can be rewarding, exciting, and satisfying.

We've had significant contact with other provinces and other states; other jurisdictions have approached us for input and information. Because we believe we're on the leading edge. We want to work with other provinces, territories, and states in developing, in a co-ordinated way, beneficial training and education packages for the industry. Mr. Chairman, we are excited about the developments that have been ongoing to date. We vitally need this Act to empower and legitimize the council in its role and to continue to create quality education and training opportunities for tourism right here in this province.

Mr. Chairman, I know there may be some questions and some suggestions about development along this line, and we'd certainly be willing to entertain them at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed, the Chair would remind hon. members that if they wish to introduce individuals or groups in the gallery, they'll have to get concurrence by the House to revert to daily routine.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to ask a couple of questions specifically about section 5 of the Act. The Member for Red Deer-North went through the content of the Bill, and it's a Bill that, quite frankly, we wholeheartedly

support. I have a couple of questions, though, that are about the education fund. I'm somewhat curious to know whether or not postsecondary institutions are going to be the recipient of those dollars, or has the government yet decided whether or not the postsecondary institutions will, in fact, be offering programs for advanced hospitality industry management? I'm not sure what title one might want to use on such a program, but I see that in the section, subsection (2) says:

The Provincial Treasurer

(a) shall hold and administer the Fund . . .

So I have some concern about institutions being able to access that money to support their programs.

The Department of Career Development and Employment has had a task force going around the province looking at apprenticeship training programs, and I'm curious to know as well whether or not these kinds of programs are going to be recognized by that department. We currently have proficiency trades. Now, certainly those involved in the hospitality industry wouldn't have to have a mechanic's ticket or a plumber's ticket but there are people in the service sector currently that do, in fact have proficiency trade certificates. People that are involved in providing services such as hairstyling, salon work, that kind of thing, do require proficiency certificates. I'm curious to know whether or not the tourism education program for the hospitality industry is going to also provide some kind of certificate or diploma. Will it be a certificate of proficiency? Will it be a degree? There are some institutions currently that do, I believe, offer degrees in hotel management and management of other kinds as well.

Those are my questions, Mr. Chairman. There may be other questions as we discuss the particular Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to congratulate the government on their idea here. I think this is an excellent direction in which to move. I'd say that if we're going to turn this industry into a \$10 billion industry -- I think by 1995, which was the aim of the government -- certainly one needs to look at the education of the people involved in the industry and bringing new people into the industry.

I have some concerns I'd like to raise. Talking to, I believe it was, a vice-president of one of the local TIAALTA organizations some time back, he expressed the concern that he was afraid the committee could end up just boiling down to being a fairly high-prestige committee spending a fair amount of government money and sort of giving a local boost to tourism, supposedly, as it travels throughout the province but not really being much help to the people on the ground, the people that really need it. I guess he's thinking of small businesses in the tourist industry and maybe even new businesses, and I suppose it will take a while for the council to develop its role there. But even if they just act as a sort of reference or clearing house a little bit at times until they get some programs in place, there is quite a lot of help available to small businesses in the province in departments like Economic Development and Trade. So it seems to me there are some questions there that need to be addressed, and I'm sure the council will develop some policies as they go along and hopefully will have policies that can get down to helping people in the field that really need the help to do a better job.

I'm wondering also if the council will end up taking on -- maybe not in its present form, or maybe only some subgroup of it later -- a sort of self-regulation function. They certainly

could, or at least somebody needs to in the tourism industry. I suppose maybe the department provides that function and maybe that's not a role of this particular council, but it's one you might consider. The government is moving toward self-regulation in the insurance industry. They did so in the real estate industry last year with a Bill. So I think it's something you might consider: what role, if any, the council could develop. Or certainly some branch of tourism needs to develop some self-regulation functions, set some standards.

I'll give you a couple of examples from my own experiences. They're from quite far back, like 20 or 25 years ago, but I think they illustrate the point. I worked one summer as a driver on the Columbia Icefield. There were 14 of us, two swing drivers and 12 machines, and we used to take people up and down the glacier. The stories we told them varied from driver to driver so incredibly, and in fact I know some of the stuff my colleagues were telling them was pretty farfetched and not consistent with the real world we were operating in, and yet nobody ever got around to worrying about that. You know, you could take people's money, take them for a ride, and tell them anything you wanted.

By contrast not too far from that same period of time, I had a chance to take a trip to Greece. A tour guide picked us up at Munich. We drove across Europe. She had a degree in anthropology, I believe, and had certainly taken some particular training for the tourist industry to be a guide in Greece and knew an incredible amount about Greece. I mean, she obviously was even licensed.

I'm not suggesting that tomorrow you go and insist that the drivers on the Columbia Icefield have to have a licence. And I would say, by the way, that I've been back there a few times, and the modern drivers know a lot more about it than most of us did. I guess in my own defence I will say that I spent a lot of time studying a couple of different studies -- one was given to me by the deputy park warden -- and a couple of other documents I was able to get my hands on, and I found out quite a lot about the place. It's the most fascinating geological wonder in the world. One didn't need to exaggerate or make up anything to tell what was going on there. But I've got to say that a lot of my colleagues didn't know the half of it and told a lot of good stories with the idea of getting tips. I'm just contrasting that with the European situation, that I've run into anyway, where the people that are actually talking to the tourists have some kind of licensing mechanisms and do know what they're talking about or else they're not allowed to be a tourist guide. So I just raise that question; I don't say that tomorrow this council has to have an answer at all.

So with those questions and comments, I would commend the Minister of Tourism and the member that introduced this Bill and say that I think you're moving in a direction that's important. If we're going to build this industry into a \$10 billion industry, we need to do something like that.

I would also say, though, that you need to take a look at the kinds of wages paid in the industry and the whole business of tipping and how that fits or doesn't fit, what kind of rules you have for the rights of workers in the tourism industry to unionize and that whole area. It tends to be an area where people work very cheaply because they need a summer job to try to get back to university. Actually, the minimum wage in the province isn't high enough to guarantee that they could make enough money to really help substantially toward getting back to a postsecondary institution anyway. So I think I would recommend to the council that they have some consideration for those kinds of ques-

tions and take a look at Bill 21 and Bill 22, for that matter, and see if any of the people working in the industry might think about unionizing, which would be one way for them to try to get a salary they could live on and save a little money on. I guess at this stage I'm raising it more as a question rather than having any answers on it.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Red Deer-North made some very good comments about Bill 7 and the various industry representative groups that are involved in the council, and I was glad to hear that. But I would like to ask him if he might explain why the Act itself, Bill 7, in section 2(1) simply says that the council is established and consists of "no fewer than 9 members appointed by the Minister." It doesn't say: one representative from the Alberta Restaurant and Food-services Association, another from the Alberta Hotel Association, and so on and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, while this particular member as chairman of the council and the Minister of Tourism might have good intentions, I'm always nervous about open-ended clauses like that. I like to call them the patronage clauses. They're just wide open. They have no restrictions on the government, who they can appoint to the boards of these various councils and bodies that are created. Although overall I think Bill 7 has much that is meritorious, I'd have a lot more confidence and feel much more comfortable in giving it my support if, in fact, we had section 2(1) delineate exactly who those representative members are on the council. If they're representative members of the various industry sector organizations in the province, that's good; that's excellent. Let's put it in the Act so that we, in fact, guarantee there will be industry organization representation on this board and it will be done in a legitimate way by the organizations themselves and not by friends of the government who may happen to have some involvement as a sort of tertiary characteristic in the industry. So that's the first thing.

I'd also like to ask if the Member for Red Deer-North as the new chairman of the Tourism Education Council might want to elaborate further on section 5, as my colleague for Edmonton-Belmont had asked, and give us some indication of where the tourism education fund will be going. Is the idea to enhance some of the programs that are currently in place for tourism education, like the excellent hospitality training program at SAIT, or is it to provide funding to students to acquire programs wherever they may? Would it be the intention or the thought that the council might create its own tourism education institute perhaps? The Act is really very unclear about that in section 5. If the hon. Member for Red Deer-North could clarify those two items for me, I would be grateful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Red Deer-North.

MR. DAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to briefly deal with some of those questions. The Member for Edmonton-Belmont talked about postsecondary institutions receiving dollars, and actually the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods alluded to the same situation. The council is working to encourage various departments when departments can be included; for instance, Advanced Education or career development. It's part of our mandate to actually bring to those departments the needs as they've been expressed to us and then to say to them, "How can we work to see these needs being met?" So in fact there may be cases where an institution itself would actually receive dollars, not necessarily from the council but on recommendation

from the council. For instance, Advanced Education might then direct some dollars to a particular institution for a program or work with an institution to see how they could reallocate dollars from a program that maybe wasn't much in demand to the higher and more priority tourism programs that are upcoming.

Under program 4 of the Canada/Alberta tourism agreement, there are also dollars available for research and for development in programs. What happens there: those proposals are brought from institutions, either public or private, to the council. The council will look at those and from advice received from the members around the table -- industry, education, and government -- looking at the gaps around the province, may then pass that on to CATA and ask that funds be directed to that particular institution for development of the program.

So those are some ways in which dollars would be channeled, as it were, to the program. The dollars right now that come out of the Department of Tourism are for the operation of the council itself, basically the day-to-day operations. So we see ourselves as a conduit, but right now not in a place where we're actually sitting on that pile of dollars. But yes, we would be recommending dollars being directed to various programs where the need is and where the need can be met.

The Member for Edmonton-Belmont also mentioned career development's task force that did go around the province. Our council did make a representation to that task force, recognizing that the demand for apprenticeship in some areas is falling off and there could be some ways in which we can work with the apprenticeship people in terms of looking at career development. We don't see at this point that certificates, for instance, that would be given to an individual because they wrote the exam, let's say, in the food and beverage server program to enhance their own skills would be a requirement for them to work in the industry, as may be a requirement, let's say, for a journeyman welder. By the same token, however, we have asked industry: if somebody comes to you, having met these standards and having received this certificate, would they find themselves in a more favourable position than somebody who has no training at all? And we've received from the industry people we've talked to a commitment that they would start those people at two or three increments higher than they would start somebody coming in with no training or experience. So we don't see it being as ironclad as some of the apprenticeship requirements, but we're exploring the possibilities of how we can work together there: "We believe there may be some openings."

The Member for Edmonton-Kingsway talked about concerns about the council being a high-prestige council touring around and maybe not doing a whole lot of work. I would invite that member, or any member, for that matter, having this concern, to not only sit in on some of our council meetings but to follow the council members month by month as they give of their time in committee meetings exploring the various areas to which they've been assigned. Believe me, the industry people on this council, and, for that matter, the government and education people, would not ever dare let that happen, even should somebody get in there, let's say, in the position of chairman who would like to see the council just be a high-prestige item. There is virtually no possibility of that happening because of the drive, the commitment, and the dedication of the members who are there and their vision to see the hospitality and tourism people in this province receive adequate training. There is no way that could happen in terms of this just being a profile committee. It's a hardworking, dedicated group who are churning out an incredible amount of work.

Just as an example of that, the whole process of program proposals coming in, being reviewed, passed from us to the Canada/Alberta tourism agreement for approval or not for approval, as the case may be -- our members of this council asked that that whole process be drastically reduced, and we've got it down to a 23-day process from what was originally a longer, more bureaucratically entangled process. The request for the time lines in that has been reduced.

In terms of the council having a self-regulating function, we don't see the council regulating other aspects of the industry. We do work with all parts of the industry to co-ordinate and standardize certain things. During the Olympics, however, we got a very clear demonstration of how the various industry associations can work to regulate themselves. We saw that in the Alberta restaurant and food association program through the Olympics, by which they went to individual members in the Calgary/Canmore corridor -- and this was way back, months and months before the Olympics -- and asked that they would agree to a code of ethics and also agree not to raise their prices beyond a certain percentage as the time of the Olympics came forward. Every property that agreed to that posted a sticker on their door signifying that, and one thing you did not hear from this Olympics were accusations of price-gouging by people out to make a fast buck off the tourist industry. To me that was just a fabulous example of how the industry is sensitive and sophisticated in those things and can, indeed, regulate itself. We would work with any industry association in terms of ideas in helping that process along.

In terms of more standards in that the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order in the committee, please.

MR. DAY: The member talked about his experiences in the ice fields. I guess all of us have a tendency to try and wow people with wonderful stories of the excitement that surrounds us, and the Member for Edmonton-Kingsway will have to live with whatever he told those tourists; I don't know if they've gone home thinking there are monsters in the ice fields or whatever. But again it shows what we have evolved in today is a highly competitive tourism industry worldwide, not just in Alberta. The people in the industry know that if they're going to survive and be successful, they have to deliver quality and they have to deliver a good product to their consumers. That force alone is going to put in regulations, as it were, to make sure that tourists aren't gouged or misled.

As far as the aspect of wages and unionization: one key aspect of this industry, especially in the food and beverage server end of it, is the fact that anybody who is successful at that particular level knows that their tips far exceed what they make in their wages. The other point to be familiar with as you talk about minimum wage is that most of the people, the property owners I've talked to in the industry, never did have their people working at minimum wage anyway. They always started them higher and moved them up quickly. So contrary to maybe popular opinion, we don't have a situation throughout the province where you have restaurant owners, hotel owners, slavishly working people to death at minimum wage. In fact, you have them starting significantly above that and complementing their wage with the tips that come in. We've got people in this province who are earning \$50,000 and \$60,000 a year as a waiter or a waitress because they've developed their craft to the place that people appreciate that, and they respond financially.

The Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods talked about the fact

that it's not laid out in section 2(1) in the Act that there actually have to be certain members from certain associations. That's true, and that's done to give the flexibility that's needed in a constantly competing and challenging marketplace: to be able to have people on the council who are expert in their fields, and especially ones that may be in demand at one time or another above another one. That flexibility is important, and believe me, the possibility of patronage appointments on this -- and I appreciate the somewhat cynical view that's expressed from members opposite. However, all of these members were brought to the minister, all these were recommendations from the industry. These were not government inspired recommendations, nor will there be. We are looking to the industry to say: "Who are your best people out there? Who are the ones who can give the time and are dedicated enough to give the time to work on this?" So believe me, that is not a fact and will not be a fact, because we're overwhelmed with the realization that we have to make this succeed, that our training and education has to be the best in the world, and it's going to happen with the best people. That is happening, and I'm encouraged about it.

I think I've addressed most of the questions. One last one on the council creating their own institution -- an absolute and flat no. We're not, number one, into empire building and, number two, into building an institution operated by the council for the purposes of training and education. We're a facilitating, co-ordinating body, and will continue to be so.

I think that addresses most of the questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I would like to commend the Member for Red Deer-North, certainly for his enthusiasm. I hope I didn't misinterpret his opening comments about getting youngsters in kindergarten to begin looking at careers in the tourism industry. But anyway, he was talking something about "K to 12" as a proper milieu to begin carrying out the work of this education council. I don't think he was really saying that's where we want to begin with kids.

Mr. Chairman, like others before me, I'd like to commend the concept of the Tourism Education Council. But having commended the government on the concept, I do have some serious reservations about Bill 7, which at least I'd like to express by stating them publicly this afternoon. The Member for Red Deer-North made reference to a number of individuals. He made reference to a number of organizations in the private sector that would be naming members to this council. He also mentioned that universities, colleges such as Alberta Vocational Centre, technical colleges, technical institutes also would have a role to play in appointing members to this council. I hope I heard him correctly. If I didn't, I'm sure he'll stand up and clarify for me.

But I couldn't honestly find anywhere in the Bill any of those institutions, organizations being made reference to. All I can see from the Bill is that the minister appoints "no fewer than 9 members." It doesn't give the minister any mandate to consult with anybody before making those appointments. It says nothing about a partnership between the private sector and the educational institutions of the province. That may be the practice of this minister or the intended practice of this minister, Mr. Chairman, but all we can do is look at the words in the Bill, and the Bill does not give the minister or anybody any mandate other

than what he might choose to exercise to create a partnership. There's no reference made to appointments of members from those other areas, those other organizations. I'd like to ask the member introducing the Bill and speaking to it this afternoon: is that the way it's going to stay? Is it simply going to be for us to expect that the minister now and in the future will make those appointments on an informal basis and that we're simply being asked to approve the Bill as written in front of us, which makes no reference to any partnership or anybody other than the minister?

Now, I'm also concerned about the powers of the council, Mr. Chairman. All the mandate does -- and this is an important section of the Act in what it tells the education council they can do -- is to (i) "identify the needs of the industry" -- that's good, and I think that's important -- "develop and conduct programs" -- well, that's pretty broad and general, but I presume you need something fairly broad as a mandate. But then subsection (iii) talks about "make recommendations to the industry on the development of programs." Now, it would seem to me that if we're talking about some kind of partnership between industry, government, and the educational institutions of the province, we would be serious about that and talk about government in addition to industry, talk about the role of universities or colleges or the technical institutes in the province on the development of programs.

I want to know why in subsection (iii) this council is to make recommendations only to the industry. Again, I'm working from the words in the Bill, not the comments of the member. Why is there what appears on the surface to be an oversight by failing to mention those other two partners in this so-called partnership?

To "act as a broker for innovative program development." Now, I don't know what... I have my idea of what "broker" means, but nowhere is it particularly defined in the Act. So I'm not entirely sure what subsection (iv) means. A broker between whom for innovative program development? I presume it may be between government and industry. Or it might simply be between different sectors of the industry. Or it might be to act as a broker between colleges and universities "for innovative program development." It's not clear who this council is to act as a broker for in terms of the partners, and I'm wondering why something couldn't have been added in that subsection: to act as a broker between the provincial government, the industry, and colleges and technical institutes in the province of Alberta for innovative program development. There just seems to me to be some fault here in the way this Act has been drafted. It's not as clear in my mind as it could be.

Then I come further in this section, Mr. Chairman, "Powers of the Council," to 3(1)(b), in which it talks about

give advice and provide resources about the tourism and hospitality industry to the industry and to the public generally.

Well, this is fine; I'm happy it goes this far. But surely, Mr. Chairman, we're not wanting to set up an organization here that simply tells industry what it thinks industry should be doing. I would like to think that if it's a partnership, it tells the members of the partnership what each of those members could be or should be doing. So I'm wondering why again the minister is not mentioned in this subsection, or the provincial government, or again coming back to the educational institutions, why they're not mentioned. All that seems to be here is telling industry what to do.

Now we come down to subsection (d):

... any other activities relating to the tourism and hospitality

industry that the Minister considers appropriate.

This allows the minister to be proactive when it comes to tourism education. And that's fine; I think that's quite appropriate to have within this Act. But where is it that the Tourism Education Council itself can be proactive -- sort of a catchall provision in the Act where they could carry out activities relating to tourism and the hospitality industry and bring to the attention of the government or the minister as they consider appropriate? Again there's nothing here from this council to provide advice, information to the minister. I think that is a remarkable oversight, Mr. Chairman, given the importance, I would hope, that this council is going to play in providing communication between the different parties. But without giving that council the specific mandate, I don't know whether the council is ever going to do that. And by limiting its powers in the way it is, the council may feel that it can't be proactive because the Legislature hasn't given it that mandate.

Going on further, Mr. Chairman, questions have already been asked about the tourism education fund, and I think the member dealt with some of those concerns.

I come down to the "Annual report," which is section 7(1), in which "The Council shall submit to the minister..." We finally get to the point in the Bill that identifies the kind of communication the council is to have with the minister. It says:

The Council shall submit to the Minister an annual report of its activities in a form acceptable to the Minister.

Now, I don't know if this is the usual provision in these Acts. I don't know why the Bill doesn't simply say "an annual financial statement and a report of the activities carried out by that council over the previous year." But it says that it has to be

in a form acceptable to the Minister containing the information required by the Minister.

It leaves me with an uneasy feeling that the council comes to the minister and says, "What is it out of all these things we've done that you will allow us to put into our annual report?" It leaves me with a very uneasy feeling that the minister is being granted considerable leeway here in telling this organization what they can and cannot publish in their annual report. It would seem to me that all that's required of this council is that on an annual basis they give a financial statement and give a report summarizing the activities of that council over the previous year, and leave it up to the council to tell the Legislature and the minister what it is they've done.

Throughout this Bill, Mr. Chairman, I'm getting an uneasy feeling that, first of all, from the first sections, where the minister and only the minister is given the authority to appoint members -- nothing is said about the other partners in this so-called partnership. Nothing in the "Powers of the Council" allows them to be proactive: none of the powers give them a mandate to advise the minister or institutions funded by the government of Alberta. And finally, we see at the end of the Bill a statement which gives the minister, I think, tremendous latitude to dictate to the council what they can tell the public in the form of their annual reports. Now, maybe that final provision is a standard one in keeping with other legislation we deal with in this Legislature, but it sure leaves me with an uncomfortable feeling, given the context of the entire Bill where the minister is virtually above any sort of participatory role or is above receiving advice from this council and above being constrained by this Act to consult with those other partners.

So, Mr. Chairman, I leave these comments with the hon. Member for Red Deer-North to respond to. It leaves me with considerable unease that really what we're setting up here is not

an education council partnership in the true sense of a partnership but simply a council that has a mandate to tell industry what to do but really nothing to tell the government or the minister what things it considers appropriate for the minister to do. I really think if the government is deliberately setting out to set up a council that is cut off from providing that sort of advice to the minister, it robs the minister -- this one and future ones -- of a lot of valuable input. I certainly hope that was not the deliberate intention of the drafters of the Bill, and if it was not the deliberate intention of the drafters of the Bill, I would hope that sometime before we're done dealing with this Bill some amendments or changes are made in the powers and the wording contained in this Act.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, a good Bill in principle, but this government seems to have an unerring way of putting the odd fascist touch to otherwise good things.

I'm looking at section 7 of the Bill, which says:

The Council shall submit to the Minister an annual report of its activities in a form acceptable to the Minister containing the information required by the Minister.

Well, why doesn't the minister just write the report and have done with it?

Mr. Chairman, two points on section 7. There is no time limit for filing of that annual report, and it seems to be customary in annual reports of departments of government and boards not to get at all alarmed until the report is more than a year overdue; that's to say, past the end of the reporting period. Just at random, Mr. Chairman, I picked up the first statute that I thought might contain a reporting section for a body. It was the Public Utilities Board. The relevant section there says:

The Board shall, on or before March 31 in each year, transmit to the President of the Executive Council for the year ending on the preceding December 31, a report . . .

So if a board that has as much to do and as much of a complicated job as the Public Utilities Board can be restricted to a three-month delay, why can't all government departments do it within three months -- and certainly this? So that's the first suggestion: that the government turn over a new leaf on this and start with this Bill to put in a time limit within which the report could be made.

The second thing is the excessive ability of the minister to direct the form of the report in a form acceptable to the minister. Well, surely the council should be required to make a report of its activities and also it should be required to have a certain amount of information specified by the minister. But beyond that it should be silent. So the case can properly be met by amending 7 to say, "the council shall submit to the minister an annual report within three months of the end of its year, of its activities, including the information required by the minister." Just a fairly minor point, I suppose, but why mess up a good thing by putting unnecessary directives in the reporting mechanism?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just had a couple of points I wanted to make and perhaps just have the Member for Red Deer-North consider again.

In his response in the first round in this -- I hope we don't get into 15 rounds, but you never know -- the member did note that some people involved in the industry were making \$50,000 and \$60,000 earnings due to tips. But there are also, Mr. Chair-

man, a number of people involved in the hospitality industry at a much lower level than those on the frontline. People such as dishwashers, buspersons, and food preparation persons do not share in the tipping in a number of establishments. They're working at wages that are barely above the minimum wage rate, and as we well know, the minimum wage rate is well below the poverty line.

So again, just to underscore the importance of having some kind of certification or certificates that are given to people that involve themselves in some training program in the industry, I think is vitally important. The member noted, and I quite concur, that industry has responded favourably by saying that if we do have people that are holding certificates of whatever kind, from whatever institution, they would be willing to look at incremental jumps in the starting wage rate. I think that's vitally important. To start at \$3.80, or soon to be \$4.50 as of September 1, I believe, with the increase in the minimum wage, is not going to be an exciting income for people who enter the industry. And while the skills at that end are not necessarily as great as those who are preparing the food that goes onto the plate or serving the client and customer at the table, still and all, those skills are required, and I would hope that we do have some kind of program that's going to ensure they're going to receive an adequate income for the labour they perform.

Also, the Member for Red Deer-North will recall that at last year's TIAALTA convention in Red Deer -- I'm not sure if there was a convention yet this year. There was? Yes, thank you. One of the sections involved in that convention was addressing the topic of the high turnover rate in the industry, and a lot of employers admitted full well that the problem with the turnover rate was the lack of wages being paid to the employees. Now, when you've got that high turnover, obviously you're not going to increase any skills; you're going to have a constant retraining program that takes away from the employer's time to retrain new employees who only stay for as long a period as necessary to accomplish their particular end.

So, Mr. Chairman, only to say that I think it is vitally important that we get into the certification process so that we can ensure that people who work in the industry also get some benefit of the industry. Here we have the potential for a large industry, and with the wages that we propose to pay, that are being paid today for a good number of folk in the industry, they would not ever be able to turn around and expend the money on the kind of holiday that they serve others at their facilities. So I think it is important to recognize that we don't want to create an industry that ghettoizes certain labourers in the work force.

MR. DAY: I'll just quickly sum up, Mr. Chairman, on those concerns. I think we could belabour for hours the semantical points that have been brought out and I certainly don't intend to do that. So for the Member for Calgary-Mountain View to suggest there's nothing in here that suggests partnership or that the council can't be proactive, I'm just failing to see how from a semantic point of view that isn't obvious when you look at operative words like "develop . . . make recommendations . . . give advice . . . conduct . . . increase public awareness . . . carry out" I think the Act is sufficiently full of operative words that it should be readily obvious there is tremendous power to be proactive. The whole Act is proactive in itself, so I won't belabour that point. If the member had written it himself, he might have used other words. He was concerned about the word "broker." *Oxford* defines broker simply as "a middleman"; that's *Oxford's* word. If anybody's sensitive to the fact it does-

n't say "middleperson," I apologize for that. But simply that: a middleman. A co-ordinating aspect is simply all we're referring to.

On the one hand, the member said the minister doesn't seem to have leeway; on the other hand, he seems to have too much leeway. So I think the balance is there. Mr. Chairman, the minister and powers of the minister are mentioned a number of times in the Act. There is sufficient leeway for the minister to take action, should he so wish.

The Member for Edmonton-Strathcona seemed to be concerned, as was the Member for Calgary-Mountain View, on the whole aspect of the report in a manner "acceptable." The Member for Edmonton-Strathcona said it would be acceptable if it said, "including the information required by the minister." Well, saying "information required by the minister" or else, as it's written here, "a form acceptable to the Minister" -- I think we're splitting semantical hairs. But I appreciate his input on that. I'm satisfied that this is not intrusive but is mainly allowing for certain information to be made available.

Also, I won't belabour the point with the Member for Edmonton-Belmont on wages. We're looking at upgrading the whole industry, the attitude, the image the public has of the industry, industry which is going to result in longer periods of employment and cut down the turnover time. All these things are going to be addressed. So I think that fairly represents, as far as I can see it, the concerns brought forward, and I would defer further comments to the Minister of Tourism.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

[The sections of Bill 7 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. SPARROW: I move that Bill 7 be reported, Mr. Chairman.

[Motion carried]

### Bill 9

#### Alberta Research Council Amendment Act, 1988

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or proposed amendments to this Bill?

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest decided to take no action on my suggestions from our earlier reading of Bill 9, so I am going to follow through. At this time I'd like to move an amendment to Bill 9, and I have copies for all members, if the pages would distribute those for me.

Bill 9 is amended, in section 4(a), in proposed section 5(2),

- (1) in clause (c),
  - (a) by striking the numeral "1" and substituting the numeral "2,"
  - (b) by striking the word "may" and substituting the word "shall,"
  - (c) by striking the words "Calgary and" and substituting the word "Calgary,"
  - (d) by inserting the words "and Athabasca University," between the words "The University of Lethbridge," and the words "but must not be," and
- (2) in clause (d), by inserting the words "have direct personal experience of a relevant research, technology, business or labour sector," between the words "employees of the Government" and the words "and are not described."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods prepared to proceed while the Chair determines whether the amendment is in order? Please proceed.

MR. GIBEAULT: As I mentioned in our earlier discussion of Bill 9, Mr. Chairman, there were several sections that had given us some concern, particularly on page 2 of the Alberta Research Council Amendment Act, 1988, where section 5 is proposed to be amended regarding the boards of governors. As I mentioned before, it caused us some concern that the new amendment was going to reduce to one the members selected from the Alberta universities compared to the current proposal, which suggests that two persons ought to be nominated by the universities of this province. So the amendment goes on to propose to deal with several of those deficiencies, Mr. Chairman.

The first one indicates in the amendment that we would strike the numeral "1" and substitute the numeral "2" in clause (c) -- that is, to maintain the present composition on the board of directors of the Alberta Research Council, having two members from the universities and not just the one -- and striking the word "may" in that particular clause, which currently says that "1 or more members may be selected from persons nominated" by the universities, because we think the word "may" is just too wishy-washy. Universities are key to research in this province, and we really ought to have a word that acknowledges the importance of the universities there, that it is not just something that the government may, in their whimsy, decide to have a token person from the university on the council but something that has a bit of teeth in it, something that says that the government "shall" have on the board of governors or the board of directors of the Alberta Research Council two members from the universities.

The third amendment that we're proposing there, Mr. Chairman, would also correct a very serious oversight, in our view, that has not been corrected by the present amendment, and that is to acknowledge that we do have in this province four universities and not three. In the existing Bill and in the amendment that's brought forward today there is no acknowledgment of Athabasca University. As the critic for Advanced Education and Technology, Research, and Telecommunications, which has the responsibility for the Alberta Research Council, I and my colleague the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche are really quite shocked that the amendment did not rectify this previous oversight, I would call it, Mr. Chairman. If we're serious about the role of Athabasca University as part of the advanced education and research system in this province, why have they been left out, and why has this Bill not been amended to include that? So to try to help the government along on this, Mr. Chairman, we are proposing to insert Athabasca University in that particular section, 5(2)(c), which according to our amendment now would be: two or more members shall be selected from persons nominated jointly by the Governors of the University of Alberta, The University of Calgary, The University of Lethbridge, and Athabasca University, but must not be persons described in clauses (a) or (b) above.

So we accomplish by those particular amendments several important things, Mr. Chairman. Just to reiterate, the first is that we are going to maintain the current level of representation of the universities on the board of directors. We believe that is important. We believe the amendment is compromising that and is really not helpful and also a step backward. The amendment will ensure that the universities continue to have those two representatives on the Alberta Research Council. And we tighten

up the clause by making it say that there "shall" be two representatives from the universities on the council and not just "may," which, as I said before, is very iffy, if you like, and also by the fact that we're introducing Athabasca University into that particular section, which has been overlooked before.

The other thing, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will accomplish is to enhance what I call the patronage clause, 2(d), which says:

no fewer than 8 members must be persons who are not employees of the Government and are not described in [the earlier clauses.]

That has no other limitation than that. It could be anybody the government chooses to have on there, and I would like to hope and believe that in the past the government has tried to make some effort to have people from various appropriate backgrounds on the council. But why not tighten this up so that it says that? This is what item (2) in our amendment does in fact propose, that in clause (d) we insert the words:

"have direct personal experience of a relevant research, technology, business or labour sector," between the words "employees of the Government" and the words "and are not described."

So what we're saying there is that it's not good enough just to have some eight people selected in some unknown, mysterious way that the government, in its own wisdom, decides will be on the board of governors of the Alberta Research Council, that it's too important to leave it that open-ended, and that we have to put in there some provision so the public can judge and be assured and have some confidence that the people who are on the board do in fact have some legitimate basis for being on that board and that they have some experience in the technology sector, in doing some research, from the business community, or from the labour sector.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that if these amendments are adopted by the government, we would be pleased to give this our wholehearted consent and support. But if the government chooses not to give it their support, then we would have a great deal of difficulty, because we think these amendments are going to strengthen it in a very helpful and serious way. It would be difficult for us to understand why the government wouldn't accept such helpful amendments that would strengthen this particular amendment, the Alberta Research Council Amendment Act, 1988.

I'm looking forward to hearing what the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest has to say, and I hope he will be endorsing these amendments wholeheartedly, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, the amendment is in order. The Chair would encourage, if not request, that amendments proposed to any statute, but particularly to any amending Bill, be submitted to the Chair so the Table may be in a position to rule on these amendments. Now, in many of the cases it necessitates the Table consulting the statute, not just the Bill before the House, because the majority of the Bills are amendments. The hon. members can do that in confidence, so they don't have to fear, prior to them introducing those amendments, that anybody else will know. The Chair would make that request of hon. members for the future.

Hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, to the amendment

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. It is not the government's intention to accept the amendments which have been proposed. Referring to the first amendment it was felt that with

the reorganization of government with the establishment of the ministry of Technology, Research and Telecommunications, it would be appropriate to have that minister sit on the board of the Alberta Research Council, and that it was sufficient only to have one member of Executive Council on the Alberta Research Council as being mandatory. It still provides in section 5(2)(b) to have more than one other Member of the Legislative Assembly on the board of the ARC. If the government so chooses to have other ministers, they may be included in 5(2)(b).

With regards to the amendment (c) relating to the universities, the current universities that were listed in the proposed amendment to the Act being the University of Alberta, University of Calgary, and University of Lethbridge, all have significant research facilities at their universities. It was felt appropriate that we should request nominations from the boards of those universities through their university co-ordinating councils, and it has been the intent and will continue to be the practice that we will have three members from the university community on the board of the Alberta Research Council, one from each of the universities which have been named. We have not to my knowledge, had representation -- or I have not had representation -- from Athabasca University that they feel they would wish to have representation on the Research Council board of directors. But we certainly have room in 5(2)(d) to consider such recommendations if they come forward. It is the intent of the government to continue to have three members of universities, the three specified in the Act, as members of the board of the Alberta Research Council.

With regards to the last amendment, I think the amendment which is before us and included in the proposals in section 5(-2)(d) gives us the broadest flexibility with regards to appointments. The amendment which is proposed I think would limit those whom we could choose as members of the Alberta Research Council board. We've been very well served in the past by the public members on the board. They have been representative of various areas of research and business and technology development in the province. They've served us well, and I think the method of appointment has served the citizens of Alberta very well. So I would urge hon. members to reject this amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ready for the question on the amendment?

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question on the Bill?  
Hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to make a couple of points. I had an individual in my constituency come to my constituency office. He's involved in scientific . . .

MR. R. MOORE: Does anyone ever come there?

MR. SIGURDSON: You're invited anytime, hon. member. Come on over. I've always got the coffee pot on, and if you would like to come over for coffee on a Saturday morning, I'd be pleased to have you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, the Chair has trouble finding that in Bill 9.

MR. SIGURDSON: I was just responding to the hon. Member for Lacombe, sir. I duly note your concern, and I come back to the point.

AN HON. MEMBER: Get on with it.

MR. SIGURDSON: Indeed. Thank you.

I did want to point out the fact that he had a couple of concerns about the role of the Research Council related to the free trade proposal that is now before the House of Commons, and no doubt will come before us, and patents. Because I would suggest to the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest that if the mandate of the Research Council is to conduct research in a variety of areas that is going to enhance the quality of life of Albertans, Canadians, and indeed all members of the world, perhaps we're going to have to look at increasing the number of patents that are owned by Canadians. Currently, I don't know if the hon. member is aware, Canada only enjoys 4 percent of the patents that are filed in Canadian patent offices. Part of the problem, as it was explained to me, is that the cost of getting a patent through is incredible, that it's about \$10,000, and for many people that are involved in technological developments . . . [interjection] That's cheap, my hon. colleague from Edmonton-Strathcona says, and being in the legal profession, he would well know, because a lot of those costs are legal counsel costs that they can ill afford. People that are involved in the field of technology and research and development, a good number of those folk have no capital with which to patent their discoveries. They have the intellectual property. They enjoy the intellectual property, but they're not able to patent that kind of discovery that they've made.

Now, I'm wondering. The concern that was expressed to me was that if the government is going to foster this kind of a development program, if we're going to have some kind of an incubator for intellectual research, are we also going to provide some dollars that would assist Albertans getting patents through the patent office? Mr. Chairman, if we are going to do that, has there been any consideration to how that may violate the spirit or the intent of the Mulroney trade agreement which says that we cannot have subsidies to certain areas? Clearly this may be seen as a subsidy.

[Mr. Musgrave in the Chair]

Just to point out, Mr. Chairman, the American ownership of patents in Canada amounts to 57.6 percent. Canada happens to be fifth in line, behind West Germany, Japan, and the Netherlands. I support the kind of program that the council attempts to do, the kind of program that the council attempts to offer, but I'm truly concerned that we're not providing enough dollars to ensure that our intellectual property is being properly regarded. With only 4 percent of the patents going to Canadians, I think we've got a long way to go to try and increase the number of patents that come through. And they are out there. It's just that the costs are so terribly high that inventors, researchers, and developers are not able to secure that kind of capital to go fully ahead with the patent process.

I would like some comment if possible, from the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest on this particular issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is being called on

Bill 9.

MR. SIGURDSON: The member wants to respond.

MR. BRADLEY: We'll just wait and see if there are any other comments on the Act prior to calling the vote.

The member raises some very good questions with regards to patents. That's under a federal area of legislation. He might also have raised this matter with the minister of technology directly.

I should note that recently there was a national conference on innovation and technology hosted by the Prime Minister in Toronto in early January, at which there was a national commitment to technology and innovation in this country and some \$1 billion committed towards achieving that goal that Canada must set as one of its national goals and priorities: technology development encouragement of scientists, many of the things which the hon. member suggested. There is a commitment, I believe, amongst the provinces and the federal government to move in this direction. There are a series of scholarships that have been set up for scientists, academics, people studying in that area, and there is a national commitment to upgrading Canada's role in the scientific community and graduating more engineers and scientists to resolve some of the problems and statistics which the hon. member has identified.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question has been called on Bill 9, the Alberta Research Council Amendment Act 1988.

[The sections of Bill 9 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Bill be reported.

[Motion carried]

## Bill 11

### Motion Picture Development Amendment Act, 1988

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As indicated in both second reading and committee study of this Bill, the opposition New Democrats are pleased to lend their support to this Bill. What this Bill does is increase the amount of money going to the Alberta Motion Picture Development Corporation from \$3 million to \$10 million.

The minister has been fairly co-operative in answering my questions in both second and committee stages of this Bill, so my only comment, to conclude, prior to passage of this Bill is to again urge the minister to use the clout that he has in cabinet as a senior cabinet minister to encourage his colleagues to take the same sort of support that they're indicating for the motion picture industry in Alberta and lend that support to the other arts in Alberta. My reading of support for the arts in Alberta indicates that slightly more than \$4 million a year is given out in grants directly to artists or their organizations from the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism and, in addition, through the foun-

dations an additional \$4 million approximately to the same sorts of organizations and individuals. Eight million dollars a year in grants to artists is not very much when you consider the size of the arts sector in the economy and its important contributions to the educational and aesthetic qualities of life here in our province. I've mentioned before that I believe the experiences of Alberta are unique, and they're wonderfully expressed through indigenous artists of Alberta.

The arts in Canada grew from our 11th largest industry to our 10th largest industry. Recently, Mr. Chairman, I have been told that the arts in Alberta are the sixth largest industry. I've not been able to check that; I've looked through statistics and can't find support for that comment, but one does know that clearly it is a very large economic sector here in the province. Its contributions to the quality of life for all Albertans simply can't be tallied, they are so large.

So in concluding with support for this Bill, I congratulate the minister on this endeavour and ask him once again to please remind his cabinet colleagues that artists aren't just there for votes every four or five years; they really are an important part of our society and economy. And maybe he'll get the Premier's ear for next year's budget and see that the grants going to Alberta artists be made through the foundations and through the department are increased substantially to match that new commitment that is being demonstrated for the motion picture industry in Alberta, which I hope, along with the minister, will become an ever growing industry here in the province.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question to the minister. If he could clarify, and he may have mentioned this earlier -- I hope he won't mind repeating it, if he did. In terms of projects related to the motion picture industry, does that allow the corporation to help fund facilities; i.e., buildings, equipment, the acquisition of equipment, and that sort of thing? Or is it simply intended for the corporation to make investments in companies that are making a film, and then it's up to them to pay for the costs? So what I'm wondering is whether money can be channeled directly into production facilities in the province which would then be available for use by filmmakers throughout the province. That's the one question that was unclear to me.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, yes, I'd like to just ask in committee stage, given our support for this Bill and for the foundation and the motion picture industry, and we want to see it flourishing in the province of Alberta, just what the assessment is of the minister in terms of the Mulroney trade deal on just how the motion picture industry might well be hampered in the future. Certainly we know how the Hollywood industry and Americans generally are big in terms of not only the production of motion pictures but in the distribution and sale. For them it's a worldwide industry and market, and they're in every country making films for the American taste. It's very difficult for countries other than the United States to try to develop their own flourishing motion picture industry. I'm wondering, with the trade deal in place, what implications . . . The minister might

feel that increasing grants to the motion picture industry in Alberta might well be hampered and seen as unfair competition or some form of Alberta local procurement or something that's going to interfere with the big Hollywood industry wanting to be at the helm of the motion picture industry and development and distribution.

I know the minister is going to say there is no effect at all and that it's going to be just fine and tickety-boo. But we know that in Ottawa Flora MacDonald has had some degree of difficulty with trying to chart a course for the motion picture industry federally. Whether it's the trade deal or what, she has had to really walk some very fine lines with respect to funding development of a motion picture industry in Canada vis-à-vis the Americans.

So certainly we want to continue, as we've said, the growth and exciting area of AMPA and the AMPA awards and all that goes with Alberta motion pictures. But we'd hate to see it go down the drain, as so many of our brains have gone down the drain to the U.S. and so many of our talent and actors and actresses have gone down to the U.S. -- to see whether or not those in the production of the motion picture industry, too, are going to be undercut by the current proposals in the trade deal.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the contributions of the members of the committee on Bill 11 at committee study. One of the really terrific things, opportunities, that MLAs have when they serve their constituents and serve the province is that they have an opportunity to be involved in and be aware of what Albertans are involved in. Certainly the Member for Edmonton-Highlands is correct in that Albertans are outstanding in terms of their involvement and love for the arts. There is so much evidence of that interest and talent throughout the province, whether it's in moving toward developing facilities for theatre or for art or for libraries or for filmmaking. I have always been impressed by the kind of talent and contribution, and I think it -- well, there are a number of reasons that we can attribute that to, and it's an historic thing in that Albertans and people from the prairies have for decades been outstanding artists and musicians and have displayed talent in a number of areas. An extension of that talent has resulted in a contribution toward facilities, whether it's performing arts centres in Calgary or the Shector Theatre in Edmonton or the development of libraries and film and art galleries and so on.

The government continues to be conscious of how important an aspect of our entire life the artistic part is, not in the purely economic sense but in the cultural sense, in the manner in which it improves the quality of life for Albertans. And we continue to maintain and will continue to provide the appropriate support to that aspect of our life.

The question that was asked with respect to the Bill's provision for providing capital assistance. It's not intended to provide for buildings, to build buildings. The idea of the program is to provide top-up venture capital for indigenous filmmakers and not for capital works, either for filmmakers or otherwise. As members are aware, the private sector has moved pretty aggressively -- Allarcom, in Edmonton and also in Calgary -- in developing the kinds of facilities that are really going to be helpful to Alberta filmmakers.

The question from the Member for Edmonton-Centre with respect to the free trade agreement. On a recent mission to California and my meetings with leading filmmakers and producers in the United States, one of the issues I raised was the one that he alluded to, and that is the difficulty that Canadian

filmmakers have in accessing markets in the U.S. through the theatre system and so on. Often outstanding Canadian films do not get the kind of play that all of us think they deserve. And so raised that point, because it's unrelated to the free trade agreement; it's simply a matter that exists in terms of the profile. A couple of filmmakers and producers provided me with some really useful ideas that we have passed on to Alberta filmmakers on how they can penetrate that market. And so through our film development branch, Mr. Marsden, we're communicating that information to Alberta filmmakers to assist them in their planning and their progress toward a better opportunity to access that market. The member is correct that we don't expect, in the reading of the fine print of the free trade agreement, that there should be any negative effect. As a matter of fact, we believe that there's a growing capability of Canadian and Alberta filmmakers to penetrate not just U.S. but other markets, and one of the reasons we're doing Bill 11 is to improve that capability.

So I look forward to the progress of Alberta filmmakers over the years, because the improvements won't occur instantly. There's been tremendous progress in the last 10 years, as the hon. members are aware, in terms of that filmmaking capability and the quality and the skills of the people who are involved in his terrific and exciting industry. There's no doubt in my mind, knowing the talents of Albertans in this field and others, that we will be more successful than we have been. This legislation, I think, will provide some useful assistance to Alberta filmmakers.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One more question for the minister. He mentioned the support for the capital projects of Allarcom in Edmonton and Calgary. In discussions when we were last in committee stage on this Bill, I had asked if the AMPDC had earmarked any of the funds -- the allocation of the \$7 million, basically, that's new -- and the minister had indicated that that was not at this point the case. Does he know if the production studios sponsored by Allarcom are in pursuit of further dollars from this fund?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of any request either to me or the Motion Picture Development Corporation for financial assistance.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any further comment or discussion on the Bill?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question has been called on Bill 11, the Motion Picture Development Amendment Act, 1988.

[The sections of Bill 11 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 11, the Motion Picture Development Amendment Act, 1988, be reported.

[Motion carried]

## Bill 12 Professional and Occupational Associations Registration Amendment Act, 1988

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Question on Bill 12, the Professional and Occupational Associations Registration Amendment Act, 1988, has been called.

[The sections of Bill 12 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 12 be reported.

[Motion carried]

## Bill 17 Municipal District of Brazeau No. 77 Incorporation Act

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I recall, my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Beverly in his comments at second reading of this Bill posed a question, the nature of which I can't specifically recall, but I wonder if the minister had a look at those comments and was able to answer this one question that the Member for Edmonton-Beverly had put to him.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, subject to checking with *Hansard*, I recall several questions from the hon. member which I thought I answered in second reading, in closing the debate. If not, I'd be glad to find the answers for him personally.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is being called on Bill 17.

[The sections of Bill 17 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 17, Municipal District of Brazeau No. 77 Incorporation Act, be reported.

[Motion carried]

## Bill 19 Marriage Amendment Act, 1988

MR. ADY: Mr. Chairman, during second reading the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona put forth a question which I committed to respond to during Committee of the Whole. The question had to do with the section of the Marriage Amendment Act that's being changed, pertaining to the mandatory blood test that has been in effect for a period of time -- from 1943, I believe -- and it's being removed.

The hon. member put forth a question that it perhaps should be replaced with premarital AIDS testing; in other words, a

blood test for AIDS. I'd just like to respond to that by saying that such a test really wouldn't contribute to the overall control of AIDS, since it's such a low-risk group. Less than 2 percent of the cases and less than 1 percent of the positive blood tests have come from the heterosexual group.

Also, another reason for not using a premarital blood test to determine AIDS is that in such a low-risk group the number of false positives would outnumber the real positives by severalfold, perhaps as many as five to 10 times. I think we can all appreciate what would happen in the case of a young couple going to get a marriage licence and having a blood test and a few weeks after they're married, one of them gets a report back that they have a positive test. I think we can understand what would happen to the relationship, to the family. It would be something that would be very difficult to deal with and may cause a lot of problems for them.

I think the benefit to the community would be marginal at best and the contribution to the control of infection spread would be practically nil. It would be very costly to the government to administer this test, and it really just would not be functional.

I might add that having listed all of the reasons why it wouldn't work, I hasten to add that there is a program put in place to alleviate the spread of AIDS, and that was announced last summer by the Hon. Jim Dinning, the Minister of Community and Occupational Health. There is some \$2.2 million being put into that fund on an annual basis. It has 10 components, and among them are education, information, and research, in an effort to alleviate the spread of this deadly disease.

With those few remarks I would like to end my remarks, unless there are others coming from members of the Assembly.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to concur totally with the Member for Cardston in his comments with respect to the reasons that any mandatory premarital testing for AIDS or any other blood disease or infection or virus is really unnecessary. We've seen how this test itself has been unnecessary and costly, and it's nice to finally have it out of the way in this amendment.

As I raised at second reading, though, I'd like to just even in committee, if I could, Mr. Chairman, ask what they're going to do with the money saved from not having to do these blood tests or not having to have clergy renew their certificates every year, I don't know how much money will accrue to the coffers because of those changes, but it might be a nice, tidy sum which could be put to better and more progressive uses.

Again, as I suggested at second reading, what consideration the member has given or the government caucus or cabinet has given to trying to encourage couples who are about to get married to enter into some kind of mandatory premarriage counseling. . . . It seems, as I said, rather biological to have premarriage blood testing that was mandatory when in fact the issues, both emotional and psychological and personal, of involving oneself in the holy estate of matrimony would well require some kind of preparation. It's interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that in the province of Alberta, as in most other provinces, we have far more education and counseling in preparation to get a driver's licence than we do to get a marriage

licence. I know we don't want to have any more motor vehicle accidents than we already do, but nor do we want to have any more divorces or broken marriages than we do, either. It seemed to me just a thought to pass on to members opposite in the government the consideration that more could be put into that. Even if it were universally available through various means, to have couples who are about to enter marriage, whether it's through a church or through a justice of the peace or however they want to get a marriage licence, that they do so with some preparation, that at least avenues for that be made available to them through community health or whatever.

We also were wondering whether the Member for Cardston was going to bring in amendments to this which would have some jurisdiction over how many wives a certain spouse could have, but we thought we'd leave that one alone, and I think it has been left alone in some respects.

So with those comments we certainly agree with the intent and concur with the purpose in the amendments of this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADY: I will just respond briefly to a couple of questions he asked. The hon. member said that he wasn't sure how much money would be saved through this. It will range between \$250,000 and \$280,000 per year, and I can only assume that that funding has been funneled over into the \$2.2 million annual program that's being initiated to try and halt the spread of AIDS.

As far as counseling is concerned, I don't suppose any of us has any objection to couples contemplating marriage embarking on a program of counseling, especially in view of the rate of divorce in our province. However, I think it would be beyond the government's jurisdiction to mandate that so I don't think the government would be interested in making that a part of this Bill.

As far as any type of amendment on the number of wives, we really aren't going to enter into that, but we may have to check on the number of children that some of the hon. members are having.

On that basis I'll end my remarks. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question has been called on Bill 19, the Marriage Amendment Act 1988.

[The sections of Bill 19 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. member.

MR. ADY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that Bill 19, the Marriage Amendment Act 1988, be reported.

[Motion carried]

## Bill 20

### Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 1988

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question has been called on

Bill 20, the Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 1988.

[The sections of Bill 20 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 20, the Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 1988, be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration the following Bills and reports the following bills: Bills 4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the report, does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to find sponsors for Bills, which seem to be in short supply, so we'll call Bill 37 please.

#### head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS** (Second Reading)

#### **Bill 37** **Soil Conservation Act**

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill 37, the Soil Conservation Act.

The intent of this Bill is to provide a framework for encouraging sound soil conservation practices in the province so that we may sustain current levels of productivity and preserve our agricultural land base. The consequences of soil degradation are widespread. The loss of one inch of topsoil can reduce wheat yields by as much as 1.5 to 3.5 bushels per acre. Beyond the farm, reduced yields impact on secondary and tertiary industries such as food processing and farm implement manufacturing. Soil drifting also results in increased water treatment costs and recreation fishing losses. During the '30s we witnessed the devastation that follows long-term land mismanagement. It seems few lessons were learned from that era, and once again deterioration of our soil resource threatens agriculture in this province. This spring history seems on the verge of repeating itself.

The changes being discussed today are aimed at reducing these unacceptable losses by both clarifying and strengthening the Act so that soil loss and deterioration may be prevented and stopped. Prevention is the major thrust of this Act.

I want to add that most farmers do not knowingly practise poor land management. I understand that the complex area of

soil conservation can get very technical. It isn't realistic to expect every farmer to keep abreast of all developments. That's why Alberta Agriculture offers a wide range of services throughout its soil conservation section and district agricultural offices, which assist farmers in protecting their soil. Last year Alberta Agriculture signed the Canada/Alberta Soil, Water, and Cropping Research and Technology Transfer Agreement with the federal government. Over the next five years \$3 million will go towards establishing demonstration projects so that farmers may observe the latest in soil conservation techniques. We strongly recommend that farmers take advantage of these excellent services. Education, together with a better, stronger Soil Conservation Act, will go far towards remedying what has become a very serious situation.

Unless we recognize the soil's fragility and modify our behaviour accordingly, little of this precious resource will be left for future generations. It must be remembered that we are merely stewards of the land. As such we must care for it to the best of our ability. I would therefore ask for the support of the Assembly in second reading of this Act.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise and speak in second reading to the Soil Conservation Act. In so doing, I would like to commend the Member for Chinook for shepherding this Bill through caucus. I know that's not an easy process.

I do think it offers some improvements over the existing Act. Certainly the experience I had traveling with members of my caucus and some other interested people in the province on our agricultural task force tour -- I noted with some surprise and certainly with pleasure that at virtually every hearing we held in communities around the province, there was a concern expressed for the soil as a resource and the need to come up with better legislation to protect that precious resource. Because I think people in rural Alberta recognize that soil is our heritage; it's something we borrow from our grandchildren, if you will. We have a responsibility as government I think, to try and help people resist the short-term economic pressures that cause them to engage in practices that aren't that good or healthy for soil in the long term.

Certainly this Bill being introduced this year is a very timely one. We see in various parts of the province, indeed probably all over the agricultural portion of this province, land blowing and land drifting and land eroding and its productive capacity being taken with it. So I do rise to support the Bill. Basically, what it says is that we attempt to treat the soil as a valuable resource. That being said, it provides for the hiring of soil conservation officers who can enter and inspect parcels of land, issue orders to cease abuse if abuse is occurring, and order people to restore the land to its previous condition. I think the process in the Bill for serving notice and appeals of procedures is fairly straightforward and good.

The one concern I have, though, is that the Bill in providing for the hiring of soil conservation officers doesn't say anything about funding for those officers. I suspect this will be a concern of the municipalities. If the minister were, for example, to make a commitment to help municipal jurisdictions with the costs involved in hiring someone to act as a soil conservation officer, then I think it would be a much more effective procedure. If it's

expected that people who are acting as agricultural fieldmen or weed control officers for the counties would assume these extra duties, then I suspect that the ability to perform the function that this Bill envisions is going to be reduced somewhat. So I'd like to get some response on that from the Member for Chinook and the minister in future debate on the Bill. Because there is provision, Mr. Speaker, that if a local municipality doesn't appoint a soil conservation officer, the minister might appoint in that case, to make sure the job gets done. I just wonder if by not committing funding to municipalities to hire these people, he is in a way encouraging them not to hire people because they think the province may come along and appoint officers who would do the job on their behalf.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

In speaking to someone who works as an agricultural fieldman about the implications of this Act and what it would mean for them doing their job, they did raise a concern that I think all hon. members ought to be aware of, and that is the difficult politics that are involved in enforcing legislation like this. The most well-meaning agricultural fieldman can go and inspect a parcel of land, determine that it's being abused, and urge that some remedy be taken. However, that may or may not be a very popular thing with the particular municipal councillor who represents the area in which that parcel of land is located, and there can sometimes be a considerable degree of local conflict generated by that sort of thing, which may be a disincentive for the municipalities to enforce the Act, however well meaning, or perhaps cause them to be a little lenient in their interpretation. I just wonder if it wouldn't be more appropriate if there is provision in the Act for the minister to appoint people to act as soil conservation officers, if that might not be a more appropriate way of doing it because that removes the sensitive local politics that are involved in enforcement of this sort of thing.

So I do think it's a good Bill. I expressed the concern about

-- it's not in the Act; there may be a commitment of funding somewhere else or in the minister's long-term plans. I would appreciate hearing some comments about the implications of the Act being enforced by local officers who act as soil conservation officers as opposed to soil conservation officers that may be appointed by the minister of the Department of Agriculture.

MRS. McCLELLAN: I'll just quickly respond, because we will go into more detail, I know, in committee.

You raised a couple of very good questions, Member for Vegreville. It does state that each municipality "shall appoint" soil conservation officers, and I think that statement speaks for itself, understanding that ag service boards play a role in soil conservation and in many municipalities that is the person who is designated. It has not been raised to us that there may be a requirement for more funding for that duty, at least not to my knowledge, and the minister may wish to add to that.

Also, as to the disincentive, I do believe -- and I understand the politics; I live in a small community and in an area of probably high need for conservation -- the provision is there where a municipality may ask for help from provincial officers. So I would leave that at that for the moment.

If there are no further questions, I would move second reading of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a call for the question.

[Motion carried: Bill 37 read a second time]

MR. YOUNG: By way of work for tomorrow evening, Mr. Speaker, it will be the intention to deal with Bills at third reading and, if there is time, then to revert to second readings.

[At 5:28 p.m. the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]

