

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Thursday, June 30, 1988 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 88/06/30

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

As Canadians and as Albertans we give thanks for the precious gifts of freedom and peace which we enjoy.

As Members of this Legislative Assembly we rededicate ourselves to the valued traditions of parliamentary democracy as a means of serving both our province and our country.

Amen.

head: PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to present a petition to the Assembly signed by six constituents of Edmonton-Norwood who held contracts with First and Associated Investors. They request the government speed up the financial settlement to all Albertans who held contracts with these now defunct companies.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased as well to present a petition to the Assembly signed by 13 constituents of Edmonton-Mill Woods who were contract holders with First and Associated Investors also asking the government to speed up the financial settlement to those Albertans who held contracts with these now defunct companies.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to present a petition on behalf of 33 investors in First Investors and Associated Investors. These petitioners request that the Assembly urge the government to acquire the assets of First Investors and Associated Investors from the receiver/manager, Coopers & Lybrand.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to present two petitions of a similar nature, one of them signed by 13 constituents of Edmonton-Highlands, the other signed by 31 Albertans who also lost money in First Investors and Associated Investors. In both instances, they request the government to pursue a speedy financial settlement on these matters.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to present a petition to the Assembly signed by 11 constituents of Edmonton-Avonmore who held contracts with First and Associated Investors. They also request the government to speed up the financial settlement to all Albertans who held contracts with these now defunct companies.

MR. EWASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I too wish to present a petition to the Assembly signed by 14 constituents of the Edmonton-Beverly constituency who hold contracts with the First and Associated Investors. They request the government to speed up the financial settlement to all Albertans who hold contracts with these two now defunct companies.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to present a petition to the Assembly signed by 22 constituents of Edmonton-Glengarry who held contracts with First and Associated Investors, and they also request the government to speed up the financial settlement to all Albertans who held contracts with these companies.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to present a petition to the Assembly signed by nine constituents of Edmonton-Centre who held contracts with FIC and AIC. They request that the government speed up the financial settlement to all Albertans who held contracts with these now defunct companies.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Calder, if the substance of the petition is the same, perhaps you could just indicate the number from your constituency. Thank you.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure to present a petition to the Assembly signed by 17 constituents of Edmonton-Calder who held contracts with First and Associated Investors.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Edmonton-Belmont, same thing.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to present a petition signed by 22 constituents of Edmonton-Belmont who had contracts with FIC and AIC.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My petition has been signed by 20 constituents of Edmonton-Kingsway, and I guess I say ditto to everything that's been said so far on this side of the House on these petitions.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 62

Free Trade Implementation Act

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to introduce a Bill, being Bill 62. Free Trade Implementation Act.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill will provide for Alberta's recognition of the responsibilities that our government has towards the implementation of this historic agreement.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, right.

MR. YOUNIE: Oh, say, can you see, while they give us away . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. members. It's not really the procedure of the House to be heckling or whatever during first

readings.

[Leave granted; Bill 62 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to table the annual reports of the various pension plans administered by the province for the year ended March 31, '87. They include the local authorities pension plan, the Legislative Assembly pension plan, public service management pension plan, public service pension plan, special forces pension plan, and universities academic pension plan.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce three progressive, dedicated public servants from my constituency. They are the chief of the Peigan Nation, Chief Peter Yellowhorn; Jerry Potts, a councillor; and Dick Burnham, the administrator/comptroller of the Peigan Nation. They're in the members' gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Principal Group

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. It's now been a year since the government finally put an end to the rip-off of thousands of innocent investors by the owners of the Principal Group. Day after day the government-sponsored Code investigation hears testimony of how members of this government kept the operation going over the objection of the staff at that particular time. Mr. Speaker, it's become a bad soap opera, almost, with no ending in sight. My question. When is the Premier finally going to put an end to it and admit that this government made mistakes in handling the Principal Group of Companies?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a remarkably foolish statement for someone to say. We have in place a court-ordered inquiry held by a very respected member of our province in Mr. Code. This inquiry is going on, paid for by the government. The inquiry is hardly near finished. We have ordered the Ombudsman to also do a full inquiry. Both of these were at the government's insistence but also at the insistence of the investors, so having asked for both of these, ordered the one, surely any sensible person would think that we should wait and hear the results. To have the Leader of the Opposition make his judgment in advance surely comes at a time when it would be inappropriate, when we have Mr. Code holding his inquiry.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, that's the point. The point is that we're spending \$20 million or \$30 million, and everybody knows what happened. It's well documented. Not only do the investors face losses, but they're having their assets tied up, you know, by the accountants and the lawyers, and it could go on forever. My question is a simple one. Is the Premier not aware that he personally plays a pivotal role in the process of getting these investors' lives back together again?

MR. GETTY: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, since the hon. member is

wanting to get into the inquiry and the Principal matter in more detail, and if you, sir, feel it's all right when there is the judge-ordered inquiry going on, I should just review the things that the government has done in this area.

We have, Mr. Speaker, as I just said, a court-ordered inquiry under Mr. Code. All the costs of that inquiry are being picked up by the government. We have also picked up all the costs of the Principal investors' own committee; that is, the committee that allows them to work the best strategies in representing themselves. Now we're picking up all the costs of the best independent legal counsel that's possible, again for the Principal investors, to help them. Then we're picking up all the costs of the receiver, and the receiver is working on a plan to maximize the dollars returned to the investors. Already the receiver has said that if there had been a quick bankruptcy and these properties had been thrown on the market, they would have lost compared to what they're going to be able to do because they're going through the program that the government's supporting and picking up the costs for. Now, normally that's always picked up by the investors themselves in any company.

Then, we have ordered the Ombudsman to do a full review of the government's role to make sure that no stone is left unturned. Then, I've done something virtually unprecedented as Premier. I have gone to Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor and asked her to release all members of the Executive Council from their oath of office so that they can all be fully questioned and provide all the information necessary. Then, we have gone even further and opened up the cabinet documents.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I was in British Columbia just recently, I met with the British Columbia group of investors in the Principal matter, and I told them that nobody likes it when someone is hurt, and when people in Alberta are hurt, then obviously I feel it and all members in the Legislature feel it. But those investors in British Columbia said, "If we could only get the assistance here in British Columbia that we're getting in Alberta, we would be happy." Now, that's a fact, and I just say that when the hon. Leader of the Opposition comes up with the kind of nonsense he's giving us today.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, you'd find out how much nonsense if you were out in front of the Legislature today.

Mr. Speaker, nobody's denying that you're spending a lot of money on accountants and lawyers; nobody's denying that at all. But my question now is to the Treasurer, who made a statement outside that was rather unbelievable. He says that it's out of the hands of the government, that there's nothing we can do. Is the Treasurer really asking people to believe that there's nothing this government can do at this time? Does he think we're that naive?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has outlined what in fact is taking place in this very complex and unfortunately long process. Of course, it's out of the government's hands now, in that it's in the court's hands. For us to pre-empt the hearing process to give evidence here in the House which would persuade or change the way in which testimony flows or, in fact, interrupt this process would in fact be a disadvantage to the contract holders. It is they who have asked for a full opportunity to express their views, to talk about the way in which the company affected their investment decisions, and yes, finally to see how the government handled itself over the period as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, it would be, in fact, inappropriate to sug-

gest the government could shorten that circuit. It would not do any justice to the system itself; it would in fact fly in the face of the request of the contract holders. To argue anything else is, in fact, a false assumption.

MR. MARTIN: Didn't you listen to them outside? Did it just go by you?

But my question to the Treasurer. This seems to be going on forever, then. In view of the fact that it's been a year already, Mr. Speaker, I think the Treasurer should tell us: how long are they prepared to wait? Is the Code inquiry going to go another year, two years, three years, or after the next provincial election? When is the deadline?

MR. JOHNSTON: Now, Mr. Speaker, I was on the stairs. It's not a very pleasant process to be involved, but it is a public process and one that this government agrees in. If there's going to be a demonstration, we will face it; we'll talk to the people; we'll explain our position. And I noticed that there was a considerable understanding of the effort that this government has taken place on behalf of the contract holders. There is agreement that the process was one which they asked for, there was agreement that we were giving the fullest possible investigation into this matter, and there was agreement that time is not on anybody's side. It's taking place; it has to run its course. There is agreement that they wanted to have the fullest possible information given to them. It's now happening, and it's out of the hands of this government. It's in the hands of the court.

MRS. HEWES: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. Sure, there's understanding. And there are still petitions coming in by the dozens, and they will continue.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary's to the Premier. A small step. Will the Premier now agree and do what the petitioners are asking for: take that interim step? That's all they're asking for.

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously, the result of the inquiry and the result of the Ombudsman's inquiry -- two inquiries that are going on -- are clearly being conducted in order to assist the government in the direction it should go. That's what the investors asked of us in the beginning. Once we started it -- as my colleague the Provincial Treasurer said, nobody likes the length of time. Nobody likes to have Albertans who are hurt from an unfortunate series of circumstances like this. I meet with the investors every chance I can in this province. They are Albertans who've been hurt, and they have my sympathy, a great deal.

But we've put in place a series of investigations to assist them, and we are going wait and then respond to those investigations. We have taken taxpayers' dollars -- and let's be clear about this: millions and millions and millions of taxpayers' dollars -- and put in place a process. To have the opposition now say, "Because we want to respond in some kind of a political, grandstand way, let's throw it all out the window." have all of that money that taxpayers have put up for these inquiries and just say, "Let's brush it aside because we want to score some kind of political thing," I say is irresponsibility of the worst kind. And if that's unparliamentary, then they're just not being responsible.

MR. MARTIN: There's the old irresponsible Premier again going off, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to designate my second question to the Member for Edmonton-Calder.

Social Services Staffing Levels

MS MJOLSNESS: Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the Minister of Social Services. We have known for some time that income security workers have caseloads that are far too high. Consequently, workers do not have enough time to spend on each of their cases, and this no doubt contributes to errors being made. To the minister. Will the minister explain why, instead of taking preventative action to reduce caseloads and preventing errors from being made in the first place, the minister is hiring 67 welfare police to catch errors after those errors have been made?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's obviously a matter of balance in terms of whether you believe that social workers can be entirely responsible for picking up all the types of interesting things that are going on in the system. I would say to the hon. member: when we have hundreds of people who don't even live at the addresses that they've given, you can't expect a social worker to find that out. We need special investigators.

MS MJOLSNESS: We know that social workers have high caseloads, Mr. Speaker.

A supplementary to the minister. Will the minister explain why experienced front-line income security workers are being recruited to become these welfare police while new, inexperienced workers are being hired to work on the front lines?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, for the most part workers who would be interested in doing this job would be probably in wage positions now without a guarantee that they would have permanent jobs. If the hon. member is suggesting that we shouldn't allow these people to apply for another job, I feel very sad for her.

MS MJOLSNESS: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Well, how can the minister then justify removing some of the best people from the front lines, which will only cause more mistakes to be made so that the welfare police will have more errors to correct? It just doesn't make any sense.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, once again, the hon. member seems to be suggesting that we do not allow people who are interested in these positions to apply, and I would say, in that instance, she is dead wrong.

MS MJOLSNESS: Well, we need the experienced people on the front lines, Mr. Speaker.

Final supplementary then. Will the minister make a commitment to prevent errors in the first place and deal with the real problem by hiring more income security workers in order that they can lower their caseloads?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is well aware of a number of initiatives that have been taken in the department. I believe she is aware that we are automating district offices over a period of time, that we will be splitting some of the administrative workload from the social work component of social workers, and I think that that will benefit all. The hon. member is also well aware that a high percentage of individuals

who come in are not interested in receiving guidance from a social worker. What they want is some amount of income security for a short period of time.

MR. SPEAKER: Vermilion-Viking.

DR. WEST: Yes. A supplemental to the minister. Could the minister indicate how Alberta compares on a per capita basis to the number of social workers that are employed in the department today?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker. I do not have that information, but if it is possible to compare program by program -- in other words, if other jurisdictions have analogous operations -- I'll attempt to get that information.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Gold Bar. supplementary.

MRS. HEWES: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would tell the House what the qualifications are anticipated to be for those 67 new staff people who are now fondly called 'ostercops.' Sorry about that.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I'm glad the hon. member indicated her concern about what she just said.

Mr. Speaker, there are two groups of people that we're speaking about here. One group of people would have some social-work experience, because in a review of files and so on, that does take that type of experience. But there is another component equally important that is really administrative staff who will be dealing with the reporting cards that come in and keying in the information on the specific files each month. Of course, that takes other types of skills altogether.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to assign the Liberal Party's main question today to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Policy for Funding Alberta Businesses

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to ask the same question that I started to ask yesterday, and I'm going to use people's names, and if you'd like to admonish me, please do it before I start so I don't get interrupted.

MR. SPEAKER: Consider yourself admonished.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you.

The government continues to bend its own rules to give money to friends and party faithful with little regard to objectivity and fairness. We have seen this time and time again with the likes of Peter Pocklington and Les Mabbott, and now we have evidence of similar undertakings with respect to Al Olson and Gary Campbell, who are directors of Churchill corporation. To the Premier. Could the Premier please confirm that Churchill corporation in recent years has received \$9 million from Vencap, has received \$2 million from Alberta Government Telephones, and has received the benefit of a \$3 million tax credit for the establishment of its \$10 million small business equity corporation?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that at all.

MR. MITCHELL: Well, it's confirmed. It happened.

Could the Premier please explain how it is that Vencap and the small business equity corporation program could become involved with a company like Churchill corporation, which is largely a real estate development firm, when the guidelines for both those programs, Vencap and the SBECs, state clearly that they are not to be involved in real estate investments?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark knows -- and if he doesn't, then I would tell him once again, because he's raised this matter before in the House -- that Vencap is a company that operates by a board of directors. That board of directors is charged to fulfill the responsibilities of that company, and they make the decisions. The government does not. Whenever you place a company or any entity at arm's length, then you live with their ability to fulfill those responsibilities. In this case the hon. member may have a complaint with Vencap. He should take it up with them.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, going back to the member's earlier comments about giving of money. Now, if the hon. member would provide some examples where government money is given to friends, not for services or supplies or for some type of fee or paid back or something -- if the hon. member has the nerve to go and make that claim outside, I welcome him to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary question.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Was it that this particular special arrangement, extra special funding for Churchill corporation, had something to do with the relationship of Mr. Campbell and Mr. Olson to the Premier's leadership campaign, the fact that they were both very, very significant actors in that campaign?

MR. SPEAKER: This question has nothing to do with this House.

MR. GETTY: No, it hasn't, Mr. Speaker. Maybe that's the way their party would operate.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. MITCHELL: Purely politics. It's who you know.

Given Churchill corporation's financial loss in 1985 of \$4.8 million and a subsequent loss in 1986 of about \$300,000, is the money that they received from Vencap and from AGT and through the SBEC program in any way an investment, or is it actually a bailout of these two firms whose directors, at least two of them, are friends of the Premier? Perhaps the answer could be supplemented by the Minister of Advanced Education, who could tell us how much those two gentlemen have given to the University of Alberta.

MR. GETTY: Isn't it a shame, Mr. Speaker, that someone who aspires to the leadership of what is a reasonable, responsible party in this province, would have to climb up out of the gutter just to get a start in such a campaign.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Kingsway, supplementary question.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Premier would admit that the Vencap arrangement, which he calls an arm's-length arrangement, really is just a convenient way for the government to direct the funds to corporations behind the scenes and then disclaim all responsibility.

MR. GETTY: Well, if that's the case. Mr. Speaker, he's calling the board of directors of Vencap. I gather, to be a bunch of liars or something like that. That's what it would have to be. If he's making that claim, then I challenge him also to step outside and say it or come up with some kind of proof of it, because otherwise he merely casts innuendos on people in our province, Albertans who work very hard to help in the building of this province. If they have been reduced -- I gather because they've run out of their stalling tactics -- to this kind of innuendo, they ought to be ashamed of themselves.

Forage Assistance

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Associate Minister of Agriculture. I'm holding in my hand a news release of Premier Devine in terms of a three-point drought program to try and keep the cattle on the farms in Saskatchewan. I've also, as I said, given a copy to the minister for her information. I note in the news release that the federal government is quite an active participant in the funding of these programs. My question to the minister is: could the minister indicate what benefits the province of Alberta or the farmers of Alberta will have in parallel to the programs announced in Saskatchewan earlier today?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, the member does in fact allude to a news release which was made in Saskatchewan this morning on a three-point drought assistance program. I can share with the hon. member that we've been monitoring the drought situation in Alberta. The Minister of Agriculture, in fact, is at this time meeting with the Hon. John Wise to discuss Alberta's participation in a drought program in the areas in Alberta which are affected. The member must recognize that in Saskatchewan there is a more clearly defined area in which the drought is. Some of the showers that we've had in the past three weeks have certainly changed situations in some areas of the province, but certainly not all of them.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Indications are that farmers will receive certain tax deferral benefits in the province of Saskatchewan, and these are to be announced by the federal Finance minister, Michael Wilson, this afternoon. Could the minister indicate whether those benefits will be available to Alberta farmers in the very same way?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to answer that question because I believe that that tax deferral was probably at the instigation of Alberta at the outset, because we talked to our farmers and they indicated to us that it was imperative -- and I recognize that farmers can't afford to buy cattle back with 60-cent dollars. Our Provincial Treasurer did write a letter to the hon. Mr. Wilson in support of that and made an excellent case on behalf of Alberta farmers. I believe the federal government has responded to it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Indications are that for those cattle that may need alternate

feed sources so that we can maintain basic herds on the farm, in co-operation with the federal government the Saskatchewan government is going to supply \$60 per head for beef and dairy cattle and horses, et cetera. Could the minister indicate whether that same type of program is being considered by the province of Alberta in areas where it's needed? I've indicated those examples about need in the province of Alberta to the minister in an earlier note.

MRS. CRIPPS: I think the member makes a very good point, Mr. Speaker, because we have to recognize that there may be areas where it is needed in Alberta. A few months ago -- in fact, less than a month ago -- we were very, very concerned whether we would have forage at all in the province. The situation with regard to forage and feed for the cattle has certainly changed over the last month, and we will have it. It may not be where we need it, but the Minister of Agriculture is discussing that with the Hon. John Wise this afternoon.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether it is the objective of the provincial government at this time, upon the return of the Minister of Agriculture, to have an announcement in the House following the July 1 weekend that would parallel this announcement for the people of Alberta?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I believe there would be an announcement made, subject . . . I'm trying not to pre-empt that announcement, but I must say that the Member for Little Bow asks some very valid questions in terms of the concerns that we have in southern Alberta with regard to the drought situation.

MR. HYLAND: Supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister can assure the Assembly that whatever is done when the announcement is made, it would be equal for people throughout the province and not zoned and definite borders and all these kinds of things that we've run into many times before.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, one of the aspects of this type of program is to ensure that it's fair and yet meets the needs of people who have specific problems. I might say that one of the things the program will not do is impede the integrity of the crop insurance program. Any program that we might enter into would be possibly administered by crop insurance because we have the adjusters in place, but it certainly wouldn't impede the integrity of crop insurance, and any payments would be over and above any normal crop insurance that people carry.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, while it's nice to see the minister finally considering the \$50 a head for drought that I suggested about a month ago, I would like to know if the minister is also considering some of the other suggestions we've made, such as rebating the grazing fees to ranchers who are now having their cattle sent home, so to speak, because the dry spring did not allow the native grass to get under way the way it should have.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, if cattle were sent home out of pastures, they would not have to pay. Because the grazing fee is a rent, if they're not on the pastures, I would imagine that they would not be charged rent. The Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife may want to respond to that question further, as grazing leases are under his prerogative.

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, we always review, usually in the July period, the level of grazing available and what the carrying capacity has been up until that time and then normally would look at an adjustment if one were warranted. But certainly it's too early to make that assessment at this time, and we would be looking at it towards the end of July.

MR. SPEAKER: Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, my questions were exactly the same as those of the Member for Little Bow.

MR. SPEAKER: Wainwright.

Assistance for Storm Victims

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address my question to the minister responsible for Alberta Public Safety Services. Does the minister have any information on the extent of the damage caused by the series of tornadoes and severe storms that affected a wide area of the province from north-east of Taber to the Irma-Vermilion area?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week there was a series of isolated storms in various parts of the province of Alberta that basically went from the Blood Indian Reserve in the southern part of the province to the Irma-Wainwright area in the north and, in fact, storms on Monday of this week to the west of Edmonton. There were isolated examples of damage: houses ripped up, overturned, grain bins moved, and the like.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. FISCHER: A supplementary. Can the minister say whether a government assistance program will be put into place, such as the one that was announced earlier this month for the tornado damage?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, field inspectors from Alberta Public Safety Services were reviewing damage yesterday and today, and by Monday, Tuesday of the following week I'll be in a better position to answer that question with a greater degree of detail. For the most part the storms that hit Alberta in midweek of this week tended to be isolated. There was a minimal amount of damage. Wherever there are cases where uninsurable damage has occurred, this government will respond in a positive and compassionate way. I should point out that for the most part the damage that would have affected farmsteads is insurable, but we'll have to wait several more days to get a better understanding.

MR. FISCHER: Supplementary, then. What guidelines do you use; how do you decide when a program is needed?

MR. KOWALSKI: The policy is a very clear one, Mr. Speaker. It's an enunciated policy that's made available to all of the local governments in the province of Alberta. Each municipality in the province of Alberta has a disaster assistance officer that that municipality would put in place. Where the local municipal council would have declared a disaster area, then in essence they would be eligible to fit in under our overall provincewide guidelines. Essentially the province will bend over backwards

to assist those people who've been caused damage by situations that are not normal. We would be dealing with items that are clearly uninsurable. Where damage and property can benefit from an insurance program and are eligible for an insurance program, then of course we would not have a disaster assistance related program. But there are events and situations and certain types of equipment and buildings that are available that simply cannot purchase insurance, and until we can have that matter corrected with the insurance industry, the province, of course, has its disaster assistance program in place.

MR. SPEAKER: Final.

MR. FISCHER: Yes. Supplementary to the Associate Minister of Agriculture. This severe storm left many crops completely hailed out, and as the hail and crop insurance regulations forbid the complete adjustment before July 1, how should the farmers who are wishing to reseed immediately address this?

MRS. CRIPPS: Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, that question's very easy to answer, because today is June 30; tomorrow is July 1. I suggest that they call their crop insurance offices this afternoon and ask them for an adjustment tomorrow or any day after that.

MR. EWASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister of Alberta public safety as well. July 31 will mark the anniversary date of the tornado that struck Edmonton last year. Could the minister advise us: are there still outstanding claims relative to this particular tornado, and when we can expect those to be concluded?

MR. SPEAKER: Long way from Edmonton to Wainwright, but if it's a short answer . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, there are no more than a handful of so-called outstanding claims. They are only outstanding claims -- we've now had an opportunity to review them -- because of a minimal of three to five and six reviews on some occasions on these half a dozen claims. It's basically a situation where our policy, the program that we have in place, has been set down. We reviewed the matter, as I indicated, in some cases upwards of half a dozen times. These few individuals continue to be dissatisfied, and I've advised that these individuals should access the office of the Ombudsman to ensure that we can have one final review if there continues to be a difference of opinion with respect to the adjudication of the claim.

Wage Subsidy Programs

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 1988, I wrote a letter to the Minister of Career Development and Employment to explain to him a case that had come to my attention involving an employer who is apparently abusing the wage subsidy programs offered by the minister's department by releasing employees as soon as the next program kicks in. I think it's a serious matter. It's been raised in the House many times over the years. I want to ask the minister now if he's bothered to look into this case at all. And has he determined if in this instance the employer is engaging in a systematic rip-off of the system?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed the hon. member's letter, and the department is looking into it for me right

now. I expect to hear back from them very shortly. At that time I'll advise the member.

MS BARRETT: Supplementary question to the minister, then, Mr. Speaker. I see that the Social Services department has now instituted a policing body, shall we say. Has the minister got any monitoring body within his department to see how many of these employers are ripping off these programs?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the member is suggesting that I employ police to monitor the programs, I'll take that under advisement, and maybe the member can bring it up during my estimates next year. I should say that we do our best to monitor the programs. It's in the contract that if there is abuse of the nature which the member brings forward, the contract is canceled and we demand the money back. It happens in very rare circumstances. We fund tens of thousands of positions in this province and deal with thousands of companies. We do our best to monitor it within the department.

MS BARRETT: The minister looks scared, if you ask me, Mr. Speaker. [interjections] I think so. Will the minister also look into something that's come to my attention today from the employee that was let go so that another one could come onto the turnstile program and tell the Assembly whether or not he approves of that employer, who's on the finance committee of the Alberta Conservative Party, using those employees to do phone rounds and send out 500 invitations on paid time at the workplace to get Tories to come to the Premier's dinner?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, it must be a long session; they're reaching down to the bottom of the barrel for the questions. I must say that the question that the member brings forward -- if it relates to the memo that I received from her, I've undertaken to look into it. If she has other concerns and sees other abuses, then I think that as a responsible MLA and an Albertan she should bring it to my attention and we'll look into it.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't have done so any faster. The lady just came over to the Assembly at a quarter after two. She's up there . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary question, hon. member.

MS BARRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to know if the minister has ever bothered to find out or keep statistics which would show how many of these employers who are getting all this rich formula training subsidy money actually end up hiring people in the long run on permanent employment without that subsidy.

MR. ORMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's something that we monitor on a regular basis. An outside study that we had done for the department indicated that close to 60 percent of the individuals who are hired under the program are retained after the program has expired, either find other jobs or go back for further education. I think that's a very good retention rate. Understand that the individuals are getting on-the-job work experience. We provide the subsidy for the employee. That's who we're concerned about, and that's where the subsidy goes.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Main question, Westlock-Sturgeon.

Mental Health Legislation

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, this question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, who has presented the people of Alberta with a Mental Health Act which has inadequate provision for a mental health patient advocate. This advocate would be restricted in what issues he or she would pursue and who they report to. I'd like to know from the minister if he could inform the House -- this won't be coming up today -- why has the minister specifically removed the Ombudsman's jurisdiction over the mental health patients' advocate?

MR. M. MOORE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is totally wrong about the provisions in the Act with respect to a patient advocate. Secondly, the Bill is now at committee stage and will be fully discussed then.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. Because it's not a matter, in the rule of anticipation, whether it's coming up today. Once it reaches the stage of Committee of the Whole, it's not an appropriate question for question period.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay; I'll ask it as a general question, then. Why is the minister intending to remove the Ombudsman's jurisdiction over the mental health patients' advocate? His proposed mental health patient . . . Why does he intend to do it, over his proposed . . .

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is going to be here, I presume it will be next week when we debate the Mental Health Act in committee study. I'd be fully prepared to explain the provisions in the legislation with respect to the protection of involuntary mental health patients and their rights.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. I'd be surprised to see what . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, has that minister met with the Ombudsman in respect to discussing the whole question of a patients' advocate or where his position stands? Has he met with the Ombudsman?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, no, I have not met with the Ombudsman since the legislation was tabled, nor have I had a request to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Final supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, will the minister be meeting with the Ombudsman before we go into further discussions on the Act?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of whether or not I will be. If the Ombudsman requests a meeting, certainly, but thus far he has not. I would expect that the legislation will take its course in accordance with House business, probably next week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Avonmore.

Services for Immigrant Women

MS LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the

Minister of Career Development and Employment. The Alberta Advisory Council on Women's Issues recently released a report drawing attention to the serious problems faced by immigrant women in this province. These concerns have been raised with the Minister of Career Development and Employment in regard to the membership of the Immigration and Settlement Services Advisory Committee. To the minister. Does he really believe that his recent appointment of two women to a 13-member advisory committee is adequate to represent the views and needs of immigrant women?

MR. ORMAN: Absolutely, Mr. Speaker, and I say that because the two women we have appointed are very capable and able to work very co-operatively with the balance of the board. If I didn't think that the two women we appointed to that board could do the job, I'd have appointed more. They're very capable.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, 48 percent of immigrants to Alberta are women, and I am wondering why this minister has not committed himself to gender representation in proportion to the numbers of people represented instead of staying with the old ways of doing things.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, my view is it's quality, not quantity. I should also let the hon. member know that we are working very hard for immigrant women. During a minister's conference responsible for labour market matters I moved a motion, that was unanimously accepted by all 10 provinces and the federal government, to tie the English as a Second Language levels to immigration levels rather than to labour market levels so that we can be sensitive to the immigrant women who are in the home and don't have the access that the individual destined for the labour force, in most cases the male, gets to English as a Second Language dollars, and the children who get English at school. So we recognize that sometimes the immigrant wives are isolated from learning English when they come to this country, and that's why we moved that motion. I expect an initiative out of the federal government very shortly.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister is really saying that he has only been able to find two qualified women to serve on this committee and if in some sense he's not putting down the rest of the immigrant women in this province by not appointing more of them to this committee.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is putting down the women we've appointed to that board. They are very capable, and they'll do a very good job. I would hope that the hon. member gives them a chance to prove themselves.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, on another tack, then. Inasmuch as we seem not to be able to achieve proper proportional representation, is this minister at this time going to follow through on the advisory council recommendation that the government establish provincial apprenticeship programs geared to immigrant women, and what commitment will he make?

MR. ORMAN: Well, that's a very timely question, Mr. Speaker, because right now within our apprenticeship programs we have mechanisms in place where we are trying to increase the number of women that participate in an apprenticeship program. We have had a great deal of success in that initiative in recent times. I'm actually pleased with the success we've had

in that area, and we will work further and harder in that area.

MR. SPEAKER: Order in the House, please.

MR. ORMAN: I'm sure the women on that committee, Mr. Speaker, will have some very fine ideas as to how we can assist immigrants coming to this province. I should say that the memberships of committees revolve on a two- or a three-year basis, and if there are names that come forward that people feel are worthy of that appointment, I'll consider it. I did not get one nomination from the NDP, so I don't know why they feel that they're taking up this cause.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. MITCHELL: To the minister responsible for the status of women. Has the minister undertaken to do a review of hiring practices for the various boards and committees which report to and are affiliated with our government, to determine whether gender discrimination and gender bias is a factor in those appointments?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, till about a year or so ago the data that was collected in regards to appointments was not collected on a gender basis. We have now been tracking over the last little while the number of appointments, and I'm happy to say that in the last couple of years, since this Premier has led this team, the number of women being appointed to boards and agencies has averaged roughly one in three.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Next main question, Edmonton-Glengarry.

Sulphur Emission Guidelines

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of the Environment, about the long overdue report on the review of sulphur recovery requirements for sour gas plants. We've seen Alberta accept the year 2000 as a target date for starting to reduce sulphur emissions, and we've seen the Prime Minister recently call for an international law of the atmosphere by 1992. Now, today, we're seeing the last day of the international conference on the atmosphere, yet for over a year we've seen no report from this review and no new guidelines for sulphur recovery. When is the minister going to complete the report and tighten up sulphur recovery regulations in Alberta?

MR. KOWALSKI: Two questions in one, Mr. Speaker? Well, we'll give two answers in one question.

MR. SPEAKER: In a moment, perhaps.

Time for question period has expired. Might we have unanimous consent to complete this series of questions?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed?
Minister.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, that's really an interesting question that was raised by the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry today. Surely he must have forgotten that just a few months ago the acid research deposition com-

mittee released reports that numbered more than 12, as I recall, that basically were interim reports. The acid research deposition committee, of course, is a committee composed of representatives from the government and representatives from the private sector. That committee also indicated that this summer they would be releasing their final reports. Just a few days ago in this Assembly the annual report of the Energy Resources Conservation Board, which also was its 50th annual report, was tabled in this Assembly. There were several paragraphs that deal with exactly the type of question raised by the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry. It's really unfortunate that the hon. gentleman does not apprise himself of all the documents that I take the time to table and file in this Assembly, because heaven knows why I'm doing it. The hon. member isn't taking the time to read this very valuable and important information that's being made available to the people of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary question.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had some of the reports he mentioned before he tabled them and did look through them. What we don't have is the tightened guidelines to protect people. We do have plants that can put out 10 tons of sulphur per day. How can the minister justify allowing industry to ignore affordable technology and create avoidable pollution problems? When will he start requiring best available technology?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, in addition to what I just finished saying in the response to the first question, the hon. member knows full well that discussions have been going on now with a number of parties in the province of Alberta about looking at the current sulphur emission guideline that we have in this province, which is 10 tons per day, and there is environmental equipment that's required for any sour gas plant in this province that provides emissions beyond that level. I'd indicated on previous occasions that in fact we were looking as a government at seeing what we'd be doing about changing those guidelines. I would like the hon. member to just sit quietly in his chair for just a little while longer, until we get just a few more little dots on the i's and some crosses on the t's, and he will then be fully expected by me to stand up and pat us all on the back for doing just a whale of a job.

MR. YOUNIE: We'll be knee-deep in sulphur by the time he tables the report.

On another angle. In the Report of the National Task Force on the Environment and the Economy, the president of Dow Chemical said, and I quote, "Environmental and economic concerns must go hand in hand." Will the minister today promise that for every new gas plant in Alberta he will require an environmental impact assessment which calculates the economic costs of the environmental and health damage of sulphur emissions?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, since 1970 this government in the province of Alberta has undertaken certain steps with respect to sulphur emissions. The last major review that we held with respect to sulphur emission guidelines was 1980 and at that point initiated new guidelines. I've already indicated that it's my hope that in 1988 we'll bring forward a new, enhanced version of that. The hon. member, as all hon. members, should rest assured that, in essence, the concept we as this government will

use is the concept clearly defined in the National Task Force on the Environment and the Economy, called sustainable economic development. Our Premier agreed to that in the First Ministers' Conference last fall. It clearly is the position of this government.

One year ago, in the spring of 1987, the emission statement for Alberta Environment was changed to go beyond simply the protection of the environment to the enhancement of the environment, and all new directions with respect to environmental protection in this province now include environmental enhancement.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Final.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. I think the minister has some problems getting reports out of his office, from what we're seeing. I want the minister to tell us what explanation he has for the excessive delay in a report that was promised last August and then promised to people who contacted his office that it should be just another three weeks. Is it that he can't convince industry to accept tougher standards, or is he just unwilling to impose the tougher standards?

MR. KOWALSKI: The difficulty of the question just raised by the hon. member is that it tends to be his last question in this series that he has. Now, he said something about a report that has not been released, but he hasn't identified the name of the report. I want to assure him once again that if he would simply look at the Order Paper of this government over the last two years and would count up all the reports that have been filed or tabled in this Assembly by this minister, he would probably see reports numbering nearly 200. Now, there is no report that is being held. The hon. member surely has a responsibility to identify the name of this so-called mysterious report that somehow was hidden someplace. Mr. Speaker, that just ain't so.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay. Westlock-Sturgeon on . . . [interjections] Perhaps the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry could write the name of the report, send it by page over to the minister.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. I have read the last two reports that his rather garrulous department puts out. But it's still approaching sulphur emissions on a per-plant basis. Could this minister tell the House when he will join the last part of the 20th century and look at sulphur emissions on an area basis and that there will be no sulphur increased unless sulphur is decreased somewhere else and that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. KOWALSKI: I've known the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon for a great period of time. Unfortunately, the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon has a fascinating imagination. Mr. Speaker, the reality is that the last eight years in the province of Alberta, despite the increased number of sour gas plants in our province, the overall emission levels in sulphur emissions in our province have been reduced by nearly 50 percent. We're way ahead of what even the imaginative Member for Westlock-Sturgeon would ask us to do. Once again, unfortunately, he is not as progressive as the rest of us.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Time for question period has expired.

MR. DAY: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Very interesting. Let us have Red Deer-North, followed by Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker. I'd like if you would give consideration to calling to order the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, who was in clear violation of two sections of *Beauchesne* 359; namely (3) and (7).

Section (3) says. "The question ought to seek information . . . and must not suggest its own answer". In fact, after the member asked the main question and the Premier said he didn't have the facts on it, the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark said indeed that it was a fact, that he had the facts. So he was not just suggesting the answer to the question; in fact, he stated very clearly that he had the answer. That particular member has been quite shrill in his shrieking in the past on saying that we as government members consume time in question period, when in fact we only get one out of seven of the first main questions. This is a clear wasting of our time today.

On the second point of order, and it would be (7) of citation 359, that

A question must adhere to the proprieties of the House, in terms of inferences, imputing motives or casting aspersions upon persons within the House or out of it.

It's particularly severe today, Mr. Speaker, in that yesterday you called the member to order on that point. Today he came very close to threatening you as he predicated his question with a veiled threat and then went ahead with it. I would ask that you would consider these points of order and the good graces of your Chair which clearly have been shown disdain and contempt today -- as a matter of fact, coming very close to a matter of privilege, which I'll refrain from putting forward a motion on, but the points of order would be helpful to those of us in the House today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair appreciates the comments with respect to this point of order. As mentioned by the member yesterday, the Chair tried to admonish the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, and again today. It reaches a stage where if some hon. members care to show disregard for the common practice of the House, then it really is much of a difficulty for the Chair. It also is a matter for one's individual caucus to deal with, in the opinion of the Chair. Since the member is not here at the moment to hear the comments, the Chair will just have to hold in abeyance further comment on this point of order.

Additional point of order, Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm rising at the earliest opportunity subsequent to the tabling of Bill 62. I would ask a ruling from you, Mr. Speaker, whether Bill 62 is in order. The reason for my request: first of all, I should say it having been just introduced has allowed very little time to study the provisions of the Bill. But it would appear, at least on first reading, that it requests the Legislature to give to the cabinet power to temporarily suspend or alter any or all laws of the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, under the Constitution Act of Canada, section

92,

In each province, the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated,

and it goes on. My point is this: the framers of our Constitution envisioned that the power for the making or the altering of laws was the exclusive jurisdiction of the Legislature. It would be my view, again based on an early, albeit brief, review of the Bill, that it is out of order to ask the Legislature to give up these powers, because if passed, this law would do something that is not provided for in the Constitution of Canada. One of the sections in the Act, an interpretation section, section 3, does not take away the power, as I read it, of the Legislature in the future to make future laws, so to some extent this request of the Legislature is tempered. But given what seems to be the general tenor of the Bill, it would seem to me to be out of order.

Now, before ruling on this, Mr. Speaker, perhaps you might wish to consider the matter further. It would allow me and other members of the Assembly the opportunity to research the matter in more depth prior to the next sitting of this Assembly, and at that time we could present arguments, perhaps even written arguments, further on this matter. As I say, it's something that is afforded little time, but it seemed to me best at the earliest possible moment to rise in my place and indicate that to you.

MR. SPEAKER: On the purported point of order . . .

MR. HORSMAN: On the point of order, surely the hon. member is simply trying to debate the Bill under the guise of a point of order, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you do give it consideration, the consideration it deserves.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, it's a very serious matter if we're taking away powers of the Legislature. That deserves serious attention, not the scorn of the member there. They may not believe in the Legislature. All the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View is doing is bringing it to their earliest possible attention and having the Speaker look into it. He may not think legislative powers is important, but I can assure him a lot of people in Alberta do.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members, with due respect, the notice of introduction was given. There was no challenge yesterday when the notice was given. The Bill received first reading on this day by the House, and it was not objected to at that time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, it was.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, it was not. [interjection] Order please.

The Bill received first reading; it did not receive it with unanimous consent. Now, the matter that's being raised as a purported point of order by the Member for Calgary-Mountain View raises two difficulties: number one, it is asking a question of the Chair, which is not possible under *Beauchesne* 365; at the same time, it is also in violation of *Beauchesne* 117(6). The simple fact of the matter is that that Bill will come before the House in due course, and it's at that time then, the Chair assumes, that there will be some considerable discussion as to the contents of the Bill and the other aspects therein. So that will take place in due course when it comes to second reading. [interjection]

I'm sorry, hon. member, that's . . .

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is very substantive. We want to get the direction from you . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair has given its direction. This is not discussion period, hon. member.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in dealing with Motion 18 before the House to provide for the long weekend, and in conjunction with Standing Order 4, I realize there could be some confusion as to the hour of adjournment this evening. To clarify any uncertainty, I move that the time of adjournment today will be at the conclusion of the afternoon sitting.

[Motion carried]

head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

208. Mr. Chumir asked the government the following question:

Under what programs does the Alberta government receive funding from the government of Canada for the promotion of bilingualism, and what was the amount of funding per program for the fiscal years 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we accept Question 208.

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I move that Motion for a Return 209 stand and retain its place on the Order Paper for today.

[Motion carried]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, in view of some discussions between House leaders, it is my understanding it is agreed that there can be a continuation of government business for the duration of the afternoon. Accordingly, I would so move.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Carried unanimously.

head: GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (Second Reading)

Bill 40 Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 1988

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 40, Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 1988.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill, as is usual, has been submitted to all opposition parties, and it is my understanding they have agreed to the various amendments which will clear up minor matters in several pieces of legislation.

[Motion carried; Bill 40 read a second time]

head: GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (Third Reading)

head: PROJETS DE LOI ET ORDRES ÉMANANT DU GOUVERNEMENT (Troisième lecture)

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

No.	Title	Moved by
50	Planning Amendment Act, 1988	Brassard
52	Land Titles Amendment Act, 1988	Horsman (for Schumacher)

Bill 60 Languages Act

Projet de loi 60 Loi linguistique

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker. I rise to move third reading of the Languages Act, Bill 60.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill has had considerable debate in the Assembly both during second reading and in committee study yesterday afternoon. During the course of the study of the Bill, it was made clear that the Official Opposition and the Liberal opposition are opposed to the Bill. They had, of course, made efforts to change the Bill, which is their privilege to do, in the course of committee study. They failed to make those changes, but it is clear where they stand in relation to this legislation.

I can say that the government had given careful consideration to all the points that were raised relative to the issue of translating all future statutes of this province and all future regulations of this province into the French language. We'd also given careful consideration to the possibility of providing translation of either all previous legislation or some previous legislation. It was the view of the government, as I indicated briefly yesterday at the end of committee study, that all laws of the province of Alberta are important to all Albertans. Therefore, the process by which it would be determined that some Bills might be interpreted would be very difficult to achieve, and that process would be an unwarranted and unnecessary expenditure of time on behalf of either the cabinet, Executive Council, or the members of the Assembly gathered together in this Chamber. The other alternative, therefore, was to do none of the translation. Because recognizing the reality of this province that for the years since 1905 that this province has been part of Confederation, it has not been necessary, not been required, to provide for the people of Alberta the laws of this province in English only, and that would be and has been a satisfactory situation to exist. That is the position that we would recommend continue into the future.

Now, as to other matters, it is clear that the Mercure decision required us as a Legislature to act, required us to bring forward legislation to deal with this matter, and to do so by the procedures which have been adopted; that is to say, to bring in a bilingual piece of legislation and then to put it through the processes using both languages. That has been done, and up to this third reading stage, we are now in the process of concluding the debate on this Bill. I believe it has the support of an overwhelming majority of Albertans, from every indication I have received

as a member of the Legislature, as a member of the government, from my colleagues, who have discussed the matter with their constituents. After all, Mr. Speaker, that is the role of members of this Assembly: to represent the people of their constituencies and thereby represent the people of Alberta.

We believe the Bill is fair and reasonable and practical and recognizes the reality of Alberta and the distinct nature of Alberta society. I make no apologies to anyone that criticizes this legislation. The government supports this legislation. We believe we support it in the interests of Albertans and as Canadians, recognizing Alberta's particular role within Confederation.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Forest Lawn, followed by Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's very important at third reading to address a few comments towards the Bill. From the point of view of our caucus, of course, we consider it to be an extremely important piece of legislation that has implications not just for people in the province of Alberta but for Canadians as a whole. Although I agree with the minister to the extent that we're here to represent the interests of our constituents and the people of the province of Alberta generally, there are some situations that do arise in which I think we have to take a Canadian perspective, because it may very well be in the long-term interests of not just Albertans and our own constituents to take that perspective.

Now, the first remark I would like to make is that we agree with the Bill to the extent that it's before us. Our concern, though, is that it just doesn't go far enough. Why we think it doesn't go far enough has to do with the very nature of Confederation itself. I recognize that this is an academic issue to a certain extent; there are many different interpretations of what happened in 1867 and whose interests were realized in the Confederation agreement of that year. But there is a view we hold in our caucus that I think contrasts rather sharply with the view the minister just put forward.

First of all, I think it's rather clear -- and I think everyone would agree on this -- that when Quebec came into Confederation or the territory that's now known as Quebec, the province that's known as Quebec, became part of this country, it was guaranteed certain rights by the other founding members of this nation at that time. They were guaranteed rights with respect to language, culture, religion, and education in order to preserve their distinct culture. I think by and large it has worked for the people of Quebec. Anyone who has traveled to Quebec and spent any time there would recognize that Quebec, in fact, is distinct in those ways with respect to language, culture, religion.

But the major unresolved question -- and this is the one that gives rise to the debate and separates us from members opposite -- has to do with the nature of Francophone rights outside of Quebec and Anglophone rights within the province of Quebec. It's pretty clear that historically the province of Quebec has been very accepting of Anglophones within . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, hon. member. There's a problem at third reading. *Erskine May* -- and we might as well quote it now to the House -- from page 577:

Debate on third reading . . . is more restricted than at the earlier stage, being limited to the contents of the bill.

Within the contents of the Bill, hon. member, there is no reference to the province of Quebec that the Chair can find. So

you'll have to phrase the comments with respect to the Bill, please.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just moving in that direction, in the sense that we are now talking about Francophone rights within the province of Alberta, and I think the province has gone a long way with this legislation in terms of recognizing those rights. But it could go a lot further. It could have adopted, for example, the amendments we proposed. I don't want to get into that debate either, Mr. Speaker, and that's not my intention. The point I'm trying to make really is the whole symbolic importance of this particular piece of legislation and the fact that it would have strengthened that view of Confederation I just enunciated -- that view, that is, that this is a bilingual nation and wherever the opportunity presents itself, we should err, if we are going to err, on the side that would strengthen the rights of Francophones throughout this nation. I think the province had a remarkable opportunity to do that with this particular piece of legislation and didn't take full advantage of the opportunity. For that reason, I intend to take a national perspective on this issue, and I think in the long run it would be in the best interests of all the citizens of this province and my own constituents to do so.

Thank you.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaking on third reading, I just want to touch on very few things. One is that this Bill, unlike most Bills that hit this Legislature, is really speaking to Canada rather than speaking to Alberta. When you make legislation that touches on 2.7 percent of the population, you really can't say, even if that 2.7 percent is concentrated in a few areas, that the way of life of Albertans in general is affected. So it is legislation that affects a very small minority group, but it does telegraph a message to Canada, and if not only Canada, maybe the world. And this is a thing that bothers me more than anything else.

One of the marks through the years of any civilization, of how civilized a civilization becomes, is how those in power treat those without power. That is one of the things that bothers me in this particular Bill. It appears -- and it is -- nothing more than summoning up the prejudices of centuries past and taking a poke at a defenceless minority under the guise that it reflects Alberta's reality. Well, I reject that, Mr. Speaker. A born and raised Albertan, nowhere do I think there's a reality that any Albertan feels they have to deny anything to 2.7 percent of the population to feel manhood or feel as if they are doing something. It's nothing more than a bare expression of prejudice raked up from as far back as the Middle Ages and used as a poke at 2.7 percent of our population.

The hon. minister mentions that the MLAs were surveyed, Mr. Speaker -- almost a humorous statement -- 2.7 percent of the population. Most of the government MLAs wouldn't know a Francophone if they came up and bit *em. I mean, they don't see one. They don't know. There's 2.7 percent of the population. There are constituencies after constituencies where one can live, eat, breathe, possibly even die without meeting a Francophone. To say that the MLAs went out and surveyed the constituencies and found that somewhere out there our Anglo-

Saxon superiority was threatened by allowing a few laws to be translated into French is hard to understand. I hope that's the type of survey they run when we come into the next election, because I can assure you we will be able to beat 'em hands down.

Mr. Speaker. I think it's a sad day for Alberta; it's a black day for Alberta. I'm afraid that this . . . We can't turn it around, but I'm sorry indeed that I am in the House to witness such a move.

Thank you.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker. I want to make a few remarks in concluding the debate on Bill 60. I just want to say that the remarks I've just heard are deplorable. What I've heard, unfortunately, in this process is a demeaning of Albertans by the opposition, by the Liberal Party and the NDP.

MR. TAYLOR: That's your words, not ours.

MR. HORSMAN: I've listened to the words from the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, and I've heard him use words like "Anglo-Saxon superiority," that we're trying to force that on a minority. There is no suggestion of that whatsoever, and it is a disgraceful suggestion for the hon. leader of the Liberal Party to make. We are a multicultural province and a multicultural country. This Bill recognizes that very clearly, Mr. Speaker. We want to make sure that all people in this province are treated as Albertans and as Canadians, and that's what I said when I moved the Bill in second reading. That's what I believe strongly in.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with the reality of the fact that the Mercure decision has said that an Act passed in 1886 -- which had never been used in this province, never been implemented, had fallen into complete disuse in the Northwest Territories prior to Alberta becoming a province in 1905 -- is still the law because of a technicality. Any Legislature prior to this one could have dealt with it in any way whatsoever and removed it. We now have been told by the Supreme Court of Canada how we must proceed in order to change that antiquated, unused piece of legislation which was a hangover from 1886.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order.

MR. PASHAK: Under 23(i), it says it's clearly outside the rules to impute "false or unavowed motives to another member," and I don't think there's anything in the remarks I made that would have demeaned Albertans in any way, shape, or form. I'd ask that the minister withdraw that remark.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, there's no point of order. I wasn't referring to the hon. member for . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you the Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is listening to the response to the point of order, hon. members. The Attorney General is speaking this way.

MR. HORSMAN: To the member who just spoke, I was referring to the remarks of the hon. leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it's rather insulting to be considered part of the ND Party.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps great care and attention could be taken as to what the sweeping comments are, and let's carry on with the summation of third reading, please.

MR. HORSMAN: In any event, Mr. Speaker, we have had during the course of the debate what I consider to be an abuse of Albertans in the terminology that's been used to describe this legislation. This Bill does not preach intolerance, this Bill does not debase Alberta or Albertans, and this Bill does not promote prejudice. I can tell you this Bill is being brought in by this government to respond to a law which was out of date and out of use completely and in accordance with the process outlined clearly by the Supreme Court of Canada in the Mercure decision as to the process by which this situation could be remedied. But it was done after careful consideration of all the alternatives that were available to us. For anyone to suggest that it would be an easy thing to bring in a complete translation system of all legislation or that it could be done with a minimum of disruption of our ordinary proceedings is laughable.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are proceeding with this legislation in the best interests of Albertans. We are not doing it in any way to demean the French-speaking minority in this province, and anyone who suggests that is just appealing, I believe, to an unfortunate instinct. We are not -- I repeat, not -- bringing in this legislation to any way exert, as the hon. leader of the Liberal Party, Anglo-Saxon superiority. Anglo-Saxons account for about 43 percent of the population of Alberta. Eighteen percent of the population of Alberta are people of German origin. Eleven percent of the people of Alberta are people of Ukrainian origin. We have a diversity in this province, and we are recognizing that in this legislation.

I would ask for the support of members of the Assembly on third reading, because we believe, as I said in my ministerial statement, and I will just quote from the concluding remarks . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Repetition.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members, with due respect, we have a Standing Order that talks about not interrupting members unless it's on a point of order. Surely to goodness, given the importance of this particular issue, there could be greater care and attention given to just listening to what is being said, in all quarters of the House.

MR. HORSMAN: I'm quoting from my ministerial statement of June 22.

Taken together, the initiatives announced today are a strong reflection of our multicultural heritage and the diversity on which this province has been built. This language policy takes into account the reality of Alberta and the distinct nature of Alberta society.

As I said, again, I believe this Bill will have the support of Albertans of all backgrounds, those of both English and French origin and all those other Albertans and Canadians who are equally Canadians and Albertans and have equal rights with those of us of either English or French origin.

[Mr. Taylor rose]

Mr. Speaker, I conclude the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The minister has not concluded the debate until such time as the point of order is dealt with.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I would ask whether the hon. minister would permit a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would welcome a question.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member. Would he quote as his authority that if a right is not used in society, it stays with the state rather than the right residing with the individual, if it is not used?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that this is a legislative matter. It was a legislative matter in the North-West Territories Act. It is clear from the Mercure decision -- if the hon. member has not read it, he should -- that the legislative procedure which we are following today is perfectly in order. It is constitutional according to the Constitution of Alberta, and therefore we have in this Assembly every possibility and every right to deal with this matter according to the terms of the Supreme Court of Canada decision.

MR. SPEAKER: Sur la motion de l'hon. Procureur général pour que le Projet de loi 60, Loi linguistique, reçoive une troisième lecture. On the motion of the Attorney General that Bill 60, Languages Act, be read a third time. En faveur de la motion, dites oui. For the motion, say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Contre la motion, dites non. Against the motion, say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: La motion est adoptée. The motion is carried.

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung. Plusieurs députés se sont levés et ont demandé la mise aux voix. La sonnerie annonçant la mise aux voix a retenti]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided. Huit minutes s'étant écoulées, la Chambre a procédé au vote]

For the motion:

En faveur de la motion:

Adair	Fischer	Oldring
Ady	Getty	Orman
Betkowski	Heron	Osterman
Bogle	Horsman	Pengelly
Bradley	Hyland	Reid
Brassard	Johnston	Rostad
Campbell	Jonson	Shrake
Cassin	Kowalski	Sparrow
Cherry	McClellan	Webber
Clegg	Mirosh	Weiss
Day	Moore, R.	West

Downey	Musgreave
Drobot	Musgrove
Elliott	

Young
Zarusky

Against the motion:

Contre la motion:

Barrett	Martin	Roberts
Ewasiuk	McEachern	Sigurdson
Gibeault	Mitchell	Taylor
Hawkesworth	Mjolsness	Wright
Hewes	Pashak	Younie
Laing		

Totals:	Ayes - 40	Noes - 16
Totaux:	Oui - 40	Non - 16

MR. SPEAKER: La motion est adoptée. The motion is carried.

CLERK: Troisième lecture du Projet de loi 60, Loi Linguistique. Bill 60, Languages Act, is now read a third time.

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

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

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

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

Bill 55
Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1988

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or debate on Bill 55?

Hon. minister.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I thought it would be important to respond to a number of points that were made the other night. I obviously sat impatiently as I listened to some of the debate because it covered the same points over and over. As minister, it would have been nice to have had an opportunity to answer those points so they wouldn't have had to have been made over and over. But now I have that opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, a lot of note about including the best interests of the child in the Bill, and I appreciate those comments. We believe that obviously, inherent throughout the Bill, that had always been there. But it was important in terms of the way the situation had been addressed in a legal sense to do that. The best interests of the child, of course, relate to the child after it has been established that the child is in need of protection.

Also, the Children's Advocate came under a tremendous amount of discussion. I would say that all the points the hon. members raised -- all of them, I am pleased to say -- are addressed in the role that we see for the Children's Advocate and the type of responsibility he or she will have, as well as the type of authority he or she will have. This is going to prevent what is now a tremendous amount of duplication. We have two streams, both streams responsible for the same thing, and that is planning for the best interests of the child. Obviously, the Children's Guardian in his present role is feeling that he must create this second road down the same trail because ultimately he has

to make a decision. We have placed one individual in the situation where he literally now has the responsibility of being the parent for about 2,000 children, and that's an impossible situation. I will, in a few moments, read some of the words of introduction of the Child Welfare Act that spoke about what the Children's Guardian would be doing, and the word "advocate" is used many times. So I think all hon. members should feel satisfied that, in fact, all the roles mentioned are precisely what it is that we have in mind for the Children's Advocate.

Another area, Mr. Chairman, would be -- I believe it was the Member for Edmonton-Calder that mentioned again a concern about taking away authority. The Children's Advocate will have access to all the information and will be able to participate at any stage of the process with respect to an individual child or with respect to advocating in terms of changes for the entire system. The Children's Advocate is going to be appointed by an order in council, and certainly will be independent and will be reporting to the minister. As I see it, it would seem reasonable that on an annual basis at least the Children's Advocate could sum up to the minister the type of situations dealt with, much like the Farmers' Advocate does now. The minister could present that to the Legislature, and I believe that would be an important role to play.

In respect of the consultation, Mr. Chairman, particularly one group was mentioned, and that was the Association for Youth in Care. I can tell hon. members that in fact they played a very vital role. There are several of those young people who have walked through all the perilous courses with respect to being a foster child and have certainly presented us with heartfelt advice and information that has played a vital role in the addressing of this particular issue.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona mentioned one particular legal case. First of all, I would say we're very cognizant of that case. I think there was some concern that possibly legislation had been drafted in the complete absence of an understanding of that decision. In fact, right up to the last we were holding certain points, awaiting what the comment might be. I would say that obviously that reinforces our concerns about the present role of the guardian, as it's been legally interpreted, and if in fact we were to leave the situation as is, we could have a constant round of legal battles. It is our view that this is not in the best interests of children and that in fact a strengthened appeal panel and the types of appeals to go there will be far better.

Again, the Children's Advocate can play a role in that, and this, in our view, will provide a mechanism. While it may be formalized to some extent, the atmosphere surrounding such a panel is more informal and invitational for everybody to express themselves in their own way and so on in a much different atmosphere than the court situation, which, I hope we would all agree, is going to provide a much better scene for children.

Just to reinforce, to sort of sum up this area, I want to remind everyone about what the former minister had said -- and these are quotes from *Hansard* by the hon. Dr. Webber, which go back to May 8, 1984. The quote is:

Mr. Speaker, another important aspect of the Bill relates to the provision for the separation of the role of the children's guardian from that of the service provider, and establishment of those offices in legislation. . . . The children's guardian would be playing an advocacy role with respect to looking after children in care, with respect to medical consents. They would receive court notices, would be involved in decisions that are made with respect to children being moved from one foster home to another.

We are trying to separate the advocacy role from the

administrative role . . .

Obviously, because the Children's Guardian ended up with the sole responsibility, it is natural that he would then commence to have his own bureaucracy and we would have two streams, both dealing with the same child. An advocacy position, Mr. Chairman, we believe, as I said before, is going to be by far and away in the best interests of the child.

Again, comments that the Children's Guardian will be an advocate of the child and so on, and it is constantly reinforced. I believe that hon. members who followed the evolution of that legislation will recall this was a new concept that did not come out of a recommendation from the public and all the elaborate process that had taken place to bring views forward. This concept came out of government and was heartily supported in the way that it was described at the time. The discussions we have had -- certainly far and away all of those consultations, right through to the academic community, which sometimes we have a bit of a problem with in terms of their clinical approach -- have supported the type of reframing to meet the original intent of the Children's Guardian, now to be called Advocate.

The adoption area. Very interesting terms were used, which I would say I don't agree with at all, obviously. If the government thought that in any way, shape, or form we were not acting in the best interests of the children of this province, you would not see these amendments: plain and simply. Because all of us have the same thing at heart. Now, we may have a different view as to how we achieve that, and it is our view, obviously, that with 50 percent of the adoption placements currently in Alberta being handled this way without benefit of reasonable regulation, we must provide the framework and the safeguards for that. A number of areas that hon. members mentioned, you didn't see in the legislation. Those are the areas in terms of detail, like qualifications of the people who will do home studies, for instance -- all of that will be in regulation, and I can assure hon. members that we believe this area must be dealt with by professionals.

I think that to summarize the situation right now in terms of the so-called private adoption area now, we do have private placements, and that is not at all the same as privatization. What we're talking about here is private placements. And while one hon. member suggested there was a concern about fees, we believe, with the type of regulatory control we have, that certainly those fees will be kept well in line, and with them being nonprofit organizations, indeed they will be working for a minimal amount and will only charge what is reasonable and what professionals would charge in a reasonable manner.

Counseling: one area I almost forgot to address. There will be mandatory counseling of the birth mother, and that will occur by the department. I think that is a very important aspect, so that we assure ourselves there is no undue pressure placed on a birth mother, particularly where we're dealing with youngsters: the kids who are having kids.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, I've answered most of the questions. In my view, looking at the questionnaires that were sent out, the type of work that was done through an initial study in the department, soliciting the views of all the people who are working directly with children in the department, we have an exhaustive amount of detail pulled together in terms of staff impressions and then academic impressions, foster parents' impressions, and so on and so on, of the operation of the Children's Guardian. I just want to assure hon. members that we believe there was an exhaustive consultation process, and with all the information that has gone out, there is general support for

the legislation. The minister feels very comfortable in terms of information thus far received with respect to the legislation in its detail.

Mr. Chairman, I have a handful of amendments. I think it's important that I quickly outline them, because they are not matters of principle, and I know that maybe other hon. members might still have the odd question. One of the areas we had spoken to in legislation was the need to put the treaty number of the Indian child in the adoption process. We have found that this may identify a birth parent because of the way the numbering system works. We don't believe that is appropriate and so are amending that section. We have added a provision that extraprovincial adoption consents will be allowed. That information will be allowed and acceptable for the purposes of adoptions in Alberta.

We have a rather interesting amendment that deals with the court of jurisdiction, and that is predicated on what will occur pending the proclamation of certain sections of the Act. Another area that was raised by the Provincial Court judges, as I understand it, dealt with a lack of clarification, which we hope we have now rectified, in terms of the best interests of the child and when that is considered. And that, of course, deals with when a child has been judged as in need of protective services.

Mr. Chairman, that basically covers the area that I wanted to, that I hoped would address the number of matters that were raised the other evening.

MR. YOUNG: On a procedural matter I would recommend to the committee that it deal with the government amendments first, get them before us, and if there are questions, then get them disposed of. Then I know there are other amendments in the House. That way we'll know what amendments we're on, or at least we hope we'll know more clearly.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable to the Assembly?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MS MJOLSNESS: Just a clarification, Mr. Chairman. The amendments have been moved, I take it? [interjections] Right. Okay.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: My understanding is that the members of the committee have the amendments on their desks. They were dated June 28.

MRS. OSTERMAN: And if I didn't make it official, Mr. Chairman, I'm moving those amendments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Right.
Member for Edmonton-Calder.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to say that the Official Opposition would accept the amendments. I'm a bit disappointed, however, that they don't address some of the areas that we had brought up in second reading debate on Bill 55 which we thought were weaknesses in the Bill, weaknesses in statements in Bill 55, especially when it pertains to the private adoption.

However, having said that, Mr. Chairman, we would accept the amendments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS LAING: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have just one question. I'm not understanding for sure, or I have some concerns. It's in amendment (b) of B. It's in regard to extrajurisdiction or outside the jurisdiction of Alberta. The concern that I'm raising is -- I'm not sure what's going on here, but I'm wondering if it moves it beyond provinces to other jurisdictions, does that mean other countries? I raise that in the context of some reports that babies may have been bought in the United States and then brought back to Alberta to be adopted. So that's my question: exactly if this allows for that or has any influence on that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes. Mr. Chairman, we're talking about consents here, and where a consent has been taken in another jurisdiction, it would be recognized. When it comes to other countries, obviously there would have to be close scrutiny of the country that it came from and what type of framework they had for taking consents there. But it could potentially recognize consents taken from other countries.

[Motion on amendments carried]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of Bill 55 as amended . . . [interjections] Oh, I'm sorry. Member for Edmonton-Calder.

MS MJOLSNESS: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I would like to say at the outset that I do have a number of amendments to introduce to Bill 55, and I would like to introduce them as a package.

But before I do that, I understand that one of our amendments has been looked at by the minister, and I'll deal with that separately from my other amendments, first of all. This particular amendment deals with advertising. Now, advertising in Bill 55 was totally absent, and it is found under the current Child Welfare Act. This amendment that we have drafted has been taken virtually word for word from the Child Welfare Act, and we feel it is very important that Bill 55 does have some type of regulation or some type of statement, control over advertising when it comes to the adoption of children. I know that I've already stated in second reading that when we move into the private adoption area -- well, I believe strongly that we're setting up a competitive market. I think that if advertising is not prohibited or at least controlled, then we are only serving to encourage that competitiveness.

So I would move my amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I'm quite certain that the Assembly is going to support this particular amendment.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would thank the hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder and particularly the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, because indeed he did pick up an oversight. It was my intention to have this same prohibition. I thank the hon. member, and I'm sure that all government members would be pleased to support this amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chair doesn't have the amendment, so . . .

MS MJOLSNESS: Mr. Chairman, I have copies for all members here. I would like to thank the minister too.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The amendment has been approved by Parliamentary Counsel.

[Motion on amendment carried]

MS MJOLSNESS: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I understand that our time is very limited this afternoon and that this would perhaps be the last opportunity the minister will have to speak to the other amendments that the Official Opposition would like to introduce this afternoon. So I would like to give an overview of what those amendments are, Mr. Chairman, after I give them to the pages to be delivered. There are six amendments in total. I look forward to the minister's comments after I do in fact give an overview.

Mr. Chairman, it's our opinion in the Official Opposition that this Bill is lacking in several areas, especially when it comes to the private adoption. Now, I think our amendments attempt to fill in some of the gaps that are missing. A lot of the concerns were raised at second reading of this particular Bill. I think this government has a responsibility to ensure that certain statements are made in this Bill so that we know exactly where we're going with this Bill. I don't believe this Bill provides adequate regulation, if you will, and I think we need to fill in some of these gaps. When we compare the statements laid out in Bill 55 to the recommendations of the 1986 report that was made on private adoptions to the department, it's very easy to see that there are indeed a lot of inadequacies and a lot of gaps. Now, Mr. Chairman, with these amendments we have identified several areas that need to be tightened up, if you will, and I think they're focusing in on areas that are very important and very serious.

Now, if we're examining Bill 55 and if we're considering that the child is what's most important in all of this process, I think these amendments will be quite acceptable indeed. Mr. Chairman, without these amendments I think Bill 55 in some cases would place children at risk. Now, I'm referring here to the private adoption area. I think these amendments will clearly help guarantee that the child is placed first and foremost in this legislation, and I would say that this has got to be our objective. We must never forget that the health and well-being of the children that are being adopted under these circumstances must be paramount at all times. I would hope that once I go through some of these amendments very briefly, we would have some comments by the minister.

The first amendment, Mr. Chairman, has to do with the Children's Guardian, and . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I wonder if the hon. member could just pause for a minute until all the members have copies of the amendments.

Edmonton-Calder, you can now proceed.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to just briefly describe what each amendment does then. The first one deals with the Children's Guardian. I think that in Bill 55 we see a drastic change to the office of the Children's Guardian. When we look under a certain section of the Bill, we will see that the duties and the functions of the Children's Advocate are listed. Now, it's quite easy to see, Mr. Chairman, that a lot of these duties and these functions are very

different from those that related to the Children's Guardian. For example, monitoring is not seen as a function under the Children's Advocate as it was under the Children's Guardian. So that's one area that has been deleted.

Now, Bill 55 gives us the Children's Advocate. An advocate, as the minister explained earlier, would do advocacy work on behalf of the children that are in care. When we take a look at one of the sections in the Bill -- and I don't want to get into specifics at this moment because I'm trying to give an overview; hopefully we will go back to the specific sections of the Bill -- it excludes the Children's Advocate from being a part of a court hearing if for some reason or other a child's case has to be heard in court. Now, the terminology of the Children's Guardian was included in the current Child Welfare Act but is being excluded and not being substituted by the Children's Advocate. So the first amendment, Mr. Chairman, that I introduce would deal with that and would include the Children's Advocate in that part of the Bill.

Another area of the Bill that I think needs to be addressed, Mr. Chairman, is when we move into the private adoption sections of the Bill. I think there are some serious absences in the Bill when it comes to regulations. These amendments, as I've said before, will help to tighten this Bill up. The second amendment that I'd like to refer to deals with a three-day leeway before consent can be valid in terms of a birth mother giving consent to give her baby up for adoption. So it would give a three-day leeway there. The second subsection of this particular amendment would require that a home assessment must be completed before a child is placed in a home; a very important principle there, Mr. Chairman. The third one places a time limit on when adoptive parents must petition for adoption. Currently there is no limit on the time, and indeed it can go on and on and on. This particular amendment would ensure that an adoption petition is heard within six months of placement of that child.

When we look at Bill 55, there is a section in that Bill that outlines very weakly certain guidelines under which persons are not allowed to give or receive money for a child. Section 69 outlines what the penalty will be if any persons are in violation of this particular section. Although it's weak, Mr. Chairman, we do have a section that refers to the penalty, but unfortunately the next subsection states that the only time prosecution can take place is if there is written authority by the minister. Now, one of the amendments that I have moved here would just delete this section that gives the minister authority. I think that anyone who violates this section should be subjected to prosecution. It should not be left up to a minister to decide whether or not that person would be prosecuted or whether or not, in fact, the laws would even be enforced. So I would be happy to hear some comments on that on behalf of the minister.

Another amendment, Mr. Chairman, deals with the fees that are going to be charged. Now, in this particular area of the Bill we see that fees do not necessarily come under regulations. We don't know what those regulations will be, but I think it's very important that we are assured in this Bill that the fees will be, in fact, subjected to regulation. As the Bill stands right now, it doesn't guarantee that they will be. So I think that this is a serious section of the Bill that needs to be corrected. We have pointed out, the Official Opposition, in second reading of the Bill why fees are objectionable, and I think that if this government does want the fees and they feel that they are acceptable, then we must ensure that these fees are subjected to regulations. It should be a strong statement, and it should guarantee that they are. This amendment would ensure that not only agency fees

are subjected to regulation, but it would also guarantee that medical fees, legal fees, and home assessment fees are also subjected to the regulations.

Mr. Chairman, the next amendment deals with the home assessment. Bill 55 puts no time limitations on how long a home assessment is valid for. So currently what you have is children being placed for an extended period of time in a home and not applying for adoption until two or three or four years later. Now, we all know that once a home assessment is done, there should be some type of time limitation on that particular home assessment or it is no longer valid. Circumstances change in a home, and I think it's important that there is this particular time limit.

Now, the other thing this amendment would do, Mr. Chairman, would be to ensure that the home assessment is done by Alberta Social Services. I think that's an important part of the amendment as well, because if we have the adoption agency doing the home assessment, I think it's quite clear that this is indeed a conflict of interest. In the 1986 report that was done for private adoption on behalf of the department, it was made clear that home assessments should be done, in fact, by the department. I find it hard to believe that if an agency were to do a home assessment on prospective adoptive parents and those adoptive parents were paying for that home assessment -- I think it's clear that there is a conflict of interest. Mr. Chairman, we have to always be sure that we are acting in the best interests of the child, and I think that our legislation should reflect that principle. When these types of things are missing in the Bill, then I think it is serious and we need to fix them up.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the last amendment is quite lengthy because it deals with a lot of different issues. I would like to say that one area that I feel is missing in the Bill is guidelines in terms of the adoption agency. Surely they are the main focus in all of this: the adoption agencies that will be able to operate. When it comes to the guidelines in terms of how they're to operate, well, there are hardly any in the Bill that really relate to that. So I think if we're going to privatize and we're going to allow these private adoption agencies to operate, then the government has a responsibility and they have an obligation to spell out exactly what the expectations are for these agencies.

The minister has said that under regulations qualifications for staff will be dealt with. Mr. Chairman, we don't have access to those regulations right now, but I would think that in a Bill such as this, qualifications for those who work in an agency should be spelled out. I think they should be embodied in the Bill so that we know for sure that this is what's going to be expected. Again, in the 1986 report there was a recommendation that the minimum qualifications for a worker in an adoptive agency would be that they have their master's in social work and three years' related experience. I think it's very important that this be set out very clearly in this Bill. This is one thing that this last amendment would do.

The amendment would also require that no child shall be placed in a prospective adoptive parents' home without a home assessment being done first and that it be done by Alberta Social Services. This is another very important principle, Mr. Chairman, yet it's missing in this Bill.

Again, I talk about the amendment providing preplacement counseling and postadoption counseling to not only the adoptive parents but also to the relinquishing parents. Now, the minister did make reference that mandatory counseling would be in the regulations. I'm not sure if that's where it would appear. I'm not too clear on that, and I would appreciate clarification on

where the mandatory counseling for the relinquishing mother would appear, if in fact it would be in regulations or where. Because there's nowhere in the Bill that it refers to counseling. Again, when we talk about the amendments, Mr. Chairman, in this particular section it does clarify very specifically that there should be mandatory preplacement counseling. This is also something that was recommended in the 1986 report.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, the amendment refers to monitoring, because nowhere in the Bill does it talk about monitoring. I think that anytime we're going to set up a system like this, that has to be clearly enunciated in the Bill. Who will be responsible for this? Now, there was some indication, Mr. Chairman, that the director would be responsible for revoking licences, but there are no clear guidelines or there's no clear statement in terms of a monitoring system. I think that that, again, is very important.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate some comments on behalf of the minister. Thank you.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd be pleased to make some observations on a number of the amendments that have just been introduced and to say that I believe that I, in general, would have made some comments already that touch upon the concerns by the hon. member, but just to possibly elaborate a little bit more.

With respect to amendments proposed here to section 35 -- and section 35 has been touched on on several occasions -- the hon. member touches on the point of the time frame here with respect to the timing of the relinquishing and the revocation of consent and so on of a prospective adoptive child. We have, rather, prescribed a period during which the consent is invalid. Rather than doing that, we have opted for the approach -- I believe it's in section 57(1) -- which provides for a revocation of the consent within 10 days of giving it. I think the important time here is the time frame after having given consent, that there is an opportunity for the birth mother to change her mind. We believe that's much more clear and straightforward. In addition, we intend in policy and regulation to provide that a consent will not be accepted or signed until three days after the birth. That is, I believe, also an important time frame.

Mr. Chairman, regulations will provide that a child will not be placed until a home assessment of the prospective adoptive parents has been completed and approved and screened through the department's information systems, because, again, that becomes important in terms of what it is that we may have on file with respect to particular adoptive parents, especially in the case where there's been any question in the past of a charge of abuse. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that that will certainly go a long way. It is even more protection, I believe, than the hon. member may have recommended here.

Section 14, and I did speak to the hon. member about this, has to do with the power of the court. Her understanding is, I believe, incorrect, as I'm listening to her speak, about the Children's Advocate being excluded, because either at the request of the child or the court, in any number of ways, the Children's Advocate will be able to attend at a hearing. I think the hon. member maybe is not fully understanding or appreciating the kind of responsibility the Children's Guardian now has in terms of standing in the stead of the parent. That will change with respect to the Children's Advocate. We believe that if you look at all the provisions and activities that the Children's Advocate will be entitled to do or admonished to do and so on, her concerns will be very well met. We anticipate that his advocacy

would take place much more at the decision-making, case management level and not necessarily at the court process. This has been the problem. I think we've had a number of streams leading to a court process without the type of appropriate consultation and advocacy leading to that, should it come to that. We believe that for the most part it will be prevented, because there'll be a much better process in place.

In terms of the concern that the minister has to give authority with respect to prosecution, there is the question of some fees that may exist, that may be charged, which the minister has to look at. This, from my understanding of the legal advice, is a very hard section to handle. You could get into a situation where somebody is at risk of a criminal charge, and it may be something that should not bring any kind of a charge. So I believe it's an important provision to have, particularly in a matter where there could be some gray areas with respect to the operation of this section and it being a new provision.

We intend, as I said before, by regulation to handle any number of matters. Of course, if we have a problem with fees, then regulations can be framed, bearing in mind that we cannot necessarily set legal fees, but they can be taxed. We believe that it will be very easy to ascertain what the average fee should be in respect of a transaction in terms of the paperwork and so on to be done, because that is happening now. Most people, whether it is a department sort of sanctioned adoption or whether it's private, usually have more comfort in the fact that they have retained their own legal counsel.

In the home study area, Mr. Chairman, obviously professionals will be operating here. I do not see the conflict of interest that the hon. member raises, and I feel fully reassured in terms of the professional aspect of this. Home studies will have to be updated. It is certainly possible that a home study could be on file and circumstances change. I don't think that it can be done and then forever be the one that is accepted for a court process. I believe it will probably be a 12-month period that we would require an update of the home study.

The other area is, again, section 35. The hon. member has mentioned a whole host of specifics here, the first with respect to section 71.2, or that area under section 35, I guess I should be addressing. The hon. member has put points (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), all of which will be done by regulation. Certainly with the interest there is in this area, I will undertake a commitment to circulate them, because this must be done with a great deal of consultation and a long lead-in process to make sure that we have appropriate regulations in place. With the kind of interest that there is in this particular area, Mr. Chairman, I believe it's appropriate for the minister to circulate regulations ahead of them being passed.

Policies being developed now in terms of postplacement support services: also a very important area, again to be done by regulation. In the case of providing postadoption counseling, it is going to have to be part of the agency's service. "Keep records of all services provided and all fees charged, which it shall provide on request to Alberta Social Services": these will be disclosed to the department in court as a part of every application. Again, a very important matter.

The other (a), (b), and (c) are under 71.3, Mr. Chairman. "Complete and pay for a home assessment conducted by an adoption specialist within ninety days of notification": the applicant pays the agency in this particular area. "Provide and pay for mandatory pre-placement counselling to the relinquishing birth mother at the time of the decision": in fact, Social Services will be taking the consent, as I mentioned earlier, and will

provide information and counseling at that time.

The last point, Mr. Chairman, (c), that will be done as part of the licensing/monitoring process. In other words, there will have to be a tight framework that will have to be addressed and complied with in order to achieve a licence, and on an ongoing basis that agency will be monitored to see that, in fact, they are complying with the conditions of their licence, which will be spelled out

Mr. Chairman, I would move adjournment of the debate.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It's been moved by the hon. minister that debate on Bill 55 be adjourned. All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Opposed? The motion is carried.
The hon. Government House Leader.

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration Bill 55 and reports progress thereon.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly concur in the report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

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

Bill 22
Labour Relations Code

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker. I move that debate on Bill 22 shall not be further adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion carries. Division.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Fischer	Oldring
Ady	Fjordbotten	Osterman

Bogle	Getty	Pengelly
Bradley	Heron	Reid
Brassard	Hyland	Rostad
Campbell	Johnston	Shrake
Cassin	Jonson	Sparrow
Cherry	Kowalski	Stevens
Clegg	McClellan	Webber
Day	Mirosh	Weiss
Downey	Moore, R.	West
Elliott	Musgreave	Young
Elzinga	Musgrove	Zarusky
Against the motion:		
Barrett	McEachern	Sigurdson
Ewasiuk	Mjolsness	Taylor
Hewes	Pashak	Wright
Laing	Roberts	Younie
Totals:	Ayes - 39	Noes - 12

[Motion carried]

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Minister of Labour.

DR. REID: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I haven't spoken yet on the amendment.

MS BARRETT: Neither has Edmonton-Strathcona.

DR. REID: I haven't spoken yet on the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and members of the Official Opposition have. I would like to make some remarks about this amendment.

The amendment put forward by the leader of the New Democratic Party opposition shows what I would regard, with my history of having lived in Britain for 25 years, as being typical of the arrogance of the philosophical socialist. The concept that the state is more important than the individual citizen, that the union is more important than the individual member or potential member, I find objectionable.

Mr. Speaker, if you can believe it, this amendment would refer the Bill back to committee for introduction of an amendment that would limit the instances where an application for certification would result in a secret ballot vote by the employees. In other words, it would be an undemocratic process. Society has changed. No longer do we believe in the concept of mob rule, and no longer do we believe in the concept of dictatorship.

The proposal in Bill 22 that the hon. leader of the NDP opposition would change is that in all cases the very important decision as to whether or not the union should represent the employees would be made by the employees alone and by secret ballot. That secret ballot would be a vote by the very employees who would be represented by the union if the certification vote were successful. It would be a vote by majority at a secret ballot. I emphasize the secret ballot because much has been said by the New Democratic opposition throughout debate on Bill 22 about coercion and intimidation, allegedly only by the employer. The whole idea of the secret ballot will be to make threats, coercion, and intimidation impossible. They will be ineffective and, in actual fact, will probably become counterproductive, knowing Albertans.

I would remind members that the decision to form a union and to start dealing with your employer in the collective sense through a union rather than individually is a decision for the

employees. It is not a decision for the employer; no more is it a decision for the union. It is a decision for the employees who are going to be represented by the union, if that is their decision, and their decision alone.

Now, obviously the New Democratic caucus in this parliament in Alberta does not believe the decision should be democratic or by secret ballot, and they are completely out of touch with Albertans in that regard. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, they and their communist affiliates here appear to be out of touch with socialist central in Moscow. In case they haven't noticed, I would remind them of the recent initiatives by Mr. Gorbachev to introduce the concept of a secret ballot in the U.S.S.R., admittedly still in a single state society, but at least a secret ballot. Apparently, the local affiliates have been unaware of that, and they obviously feel that they are going to go in the opposite direction.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to remind the Legislative Assembly of the process, but throughout the development of Bill 22 and its companion legislation the government has persistently tried to develop fairness and equity. It is represented in Bill 22 from the preamble right through to the consequential amendments. Those provisions have concentrated throughout on making the employee/employer relationship as fair and equitable as it can be; in the particular instance, the collective bargaining relationship. That is well represented in the proposal for a secret ballot on the decision whether or not to have a union.

In the past, and we all know of examples on both sides of the fence, there has been coercion sometimes by the employer, sometimes by the union. There have been attempts to persuade people to vote one way or the other by purchasing a membership in the union or not purchasing one. We have seen the results at the Labour Relations Board of what happens with quarrels and quibbles about who should be in the bargaining unit, whether an individual employee is a supervisor, part of management or not what the bargaining unit should be.

MR. SPEAKER: Order in the whole House, please.

DR. REID: We have seen all of these things in the past.

In the future because of the secret ballot concept in the certification ballot -- and don't forget that it says in the legislation that it should be held as soon as is possible -- there will not be the friction, the bad feeling, and the grievances carried forward in people's minds into the future relationship in the collective process, if that is the decision of the employees and the employees alone. As a result, the relationship will not be soured from the beginning, and the bargaining will not start off with a load of lead hanging around the neck of the parties. The purpose is, and I will emphasize it again: if the employees and the employees alone make that decision, if the employees decide that they will have a collective relationship with their employer, then it will start off on as good a footing as possible so that the relationship and the future bargaining will proceed with a minimum of friction and a minimum of dispute.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to emphasize that Bill 22 is aimed, as is Bill 21, at having an excellent employee/employer relationship for employees in the province who decide to be represented by a union by secret ballot. That relationship is crucial to the success of everyone involved, the employee just as much as the employer. The better the relationship, the better the entity will be either for the employee to work there or for the employer in relating to his employees. It will be to the benefit of both parties and, indeed, to the benefit of all Albertans.

That's what we need, and that's what Albertans want. I can assure the House of that.

I commend this piece of legislation for third reading to the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Speaking to the amendment, Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: I remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment substitutes, after the formal words, that the Bill be recommitted to the Committee of the Whole to enable the committee to consider adding a new section to the Bill which would limit those instances on which an application to the board for certification would necessarily result in a certification vote.

Now, the fact is that under the proposed legislation every application will result in a certification vote. So it is not, in the first place, the case, as misrepresented by the hon. member, the Minister of Labour, that we would say there should never be such a vote. It is to limit the number of times. We have never heard one word yet why the present system is unsatisfactory. To suppose, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Minister of Labour did, that such an idea, to continue with the present system, is undemocratic, is somehow behind the Soviet Union's present concept or present proposals for voting, is just a silly form of red-baiting and one of the absurdest things we've heard for a long time.

These safeguards under the present system are adequate. If the hon. member, the Minister of Labour, or any other members think it's easy to obtain certification for a union under the present system, then they know nothing about it. There are very strong safeguards, but those safeguards go in both directions. They go in the direction of making sure that the union's representative has a reasonable chance to contact members of the unit sought to be organized, but equally it makes sure that the employer does not have unreasonable chances of intimidating the members of the proposed bargaining unit.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment simply asks us to consider whether we have given sufficient thought to the process here, this central process, which, if passed into law, will effectively gut the certification process and, therefore, the union movement in this province. Is that what members really want? I see the hon. Member for Red Deer-North feigning disgust, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. In accord with Standing Order 21 we will now put the question with regard to the various issues before us.

With regard to the amendment as proposed by the Leader of the Opposition with regard to third reading of Bill 22, those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is defeated. Division.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed the House divided]

For the motion:

Barrett	Martin	Sigurdson
Ewasiuk	McEachern	Taylor
Hewes	Mjolsness	Wright
Laing	Roberts	Younie

Against the motion:

Adair	Fjordbotten	Oldring
Ady	Getty	Osterman
Bogle	Heron	Pengelly
Bradley	Hyland	Reid
Brassard	Johnston	Rostad
Campbell	Jonson	Shrake
Cherry	Kowalski	Sparrow
Clegg	McClellan	Webber
Day	Mirosh	Weiss
Downey	Moore, R.	West
Elliott	Musgreave	Young
Elzinga	Musgrove	Zarusky
Fischer		

Totals: Ayes - 12 Noes - 37

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. SPEAKER: Government House Leader, is there some arrangement?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would move that in the event of further divisions this day, the bell ring for one minute only.

MR. SPEAKER: Are we all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you. Now, with respect to third reading of Bill 22, the Labour Relations Code, those in favour of third reading, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

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

[One minute having elapsed the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Getty	Osterman
Ady	Heron	Pengelly
Bogle	Hyland	Reid
Bradley	Johnston	Rostad
Brassard	Jonson	Shrake
Campbell	Kowalski	Sparrow
Cherry	McClellan	Webber
Clegg	Mirosh	Weiss
Downey	Moore, R.	West
Elliott	Musgreave	Young
Elzinga	Musgrove	Zarusky
Fischer	Oldring	

Against the motion:

Barrett	Martin	Sigurdson
Ewasiuk	McEachern	Taylor
Hewes	Mjolsness	Wright
Laing	Roberts	Younie

[Bill 22 read a third time]

[At 5:42 p.m., pursuant to Government Motion 18, the House adjourned to Tuesday, July 5, 1988, at 2:30 p.m.]

Totals	Ayes - 35	Noes - 12
--------	-----------	-----------