

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Monday, April 15, 1991**

2:30 p.m.

Date: 91/04/15

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head:

### Prayers

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

We, Thine unworthy servants here gathered together in Thy name, do humbly beseech Thee to send down Thy heavenly wisdom from above to direct and guide us in all our considerations.

Amen.

head:

### Tabling Returns and Reports

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file copies of the report of the Canada/Mexico solidarity delegation, of which I was a member. It talks about our experiences with the election in the state of Morelos and our discussions on continental free trade.

head:

### Introduction of Special Guests

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce 34 grade 10 social studies students today. They're from Concordia College high school. They're accompanied today by Lloyd Grosfield, a teacher who, by the way, last year won an Excellence in Teaching Award, and Patti Pituskin. I understand they're in the members' gallery, and I'd ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Beverly, followed by Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. EWASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me this afternoon to introduce to you and to members of the Legislature 22 students from Overlanders elementary school in my constituency of Edmonton-Beverly. These are bright, young students who also happen to be my neighbours. They are seated in the public gallery, and they are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Ruth Charette. I'd ask them to rise and be received by the Assembly.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to the Members of the Legislative Assembly 28 students from Elmwood elementary school. They're accompanied today by their teacher Mr. Garth Knudsen, and I would ask that they stand in the gallery and receive the welcome of the members of the Legislature.

head:

### Oral Question Period

#### Economic Development Strategy

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. The recent failure of the Magnesium Canada project putting Albertans on the hook for another \$103 million tells Albertans once more just how disorganized and incompetent this government really is. This, the 31st failure of companies backstopped by the government,

also tells us something else: how essential it is that we develop a rational strategy for government involvement in spurring economic development so we can stop this endless stream of million-dollar disasters; in other words, to have an overall plan and develop mechanisms for the evaluation of that plan. Will the minister agree now to establish an economic council of Alberta, one that will be broadly representative of all Albertans, to publicly – and I stress "publicly" – review projects before public money gets put at risk? This is something that we've been calling for for years.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, let's review the facts for the hon. member, and I'm delighted that he allows me this opportunity once again to review them. Over the last number of years we have created some 107,000 jobs. If we look at economic diversification within this province, tourism revenues have tripled over the last number of years. Advanced technology: we've got some 50,000 individuals directly employed. He's suggesting that we review our economic and diversification policy. One only has to look at the economic strength of this province and recognize that the economic diversification policy of the province of Alberta is working like no other place in North America. To substantiate that, we've got the strongest economy in North America, we've got the highest investment per capita in North America, exports are increasing, and our manufacturing shipments are increasing. We're proud of the economic development that is taking place within this great province of Alberta, and we're going to continue to see that it does take place.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah. Mr. Vander Zalm says the same thing. Maybe the minister can let me know what his answers are the day before, and I'll write my questions so that they have some relation to his answers. I asked about an economic council of Alberta.

It must be clear, minus the rhetoric, that what is needed are rules and guidelines, a framework, if you like, for government assistance, instead of this holus-bolus, ad hoc approach of throwing money behind closed doors at projects to win political favour, Mr. Speaker. The minister avoided the economic council of Alberta. At the very minimum will he not agree to establish an independent – and I stress "independent" – screening process with public participation and clear and sensible guidelines so that we can end these expensive fiascoes?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, there are in place specific guidelines as it relates to our support. I'm happy to refer the hon. member to a number of programs that we have in place. In addition to that, there is a specific process that every loan guarantee or government support for any industry has to go through. These steps are very thorough, and we make sure that all the guidelines are followed prior to involving ourselves with support of any type.

MR. MARTIN: Boy, you must have something going wrong then. I've talked about public participation so we know.

Let's just look at the MagCan failure. It's, as I said, a classic example of this government's incompetence. This company had a shaky technology, poor economic prospects, and nobody can figure out whether the minority partner's head office is in the Cayman islands, Houston, The Hague, or Monte Carlo. Some guidelines, Mr. Speaker. Yet this government gave it \$265 million. My question again: what is this government prepared to do then? If they've rejected the suggestions I've made, what

are they prepared to do so that we end this holus-bolus handing out of taxpayers' money?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member refers to MagCan, and we've had a very thorough discussion as it relates to MagCan in the Legislative Assembly. What I would like to do is file with the House, if it is permissible, a letter from an individual who found our programs very supportive, who created jobs in this province of Alberta, who has bought down and paid down his obligations as it relates to our support, and in addition to that, a news release that was published by the Electronic Industries Association, the Alberta Aerospace Association, and the Canadian Advanced Technology Association commending the government for their involvement so that young people in this province could have meaningful jobs.

If the hon. member wishes to talk about companies, let's look at Adco Power of Edmonton, whereby some 20 to 25 jobs have been created: a very viable company creating jobs for individuals within this province. Let's look at Amtek Testware, another success story, Mr. Speaker, which created some 58 jobs in the city of Edmonton. The European Cheesecake Factory again created some 40 jobs. La Crete Sawmills again is playing a very important part of the component of diversification within the province of Alberta, creating another 70 jobs.

MR. SPEAKER: Now for our just desserts we're going to move on to the second main question.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I don't doubt that if you're handing out money to people, you'll find them very supportive.

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

2:40

### Forest Management

MR. McINNIS: The government has increased the amount of public forest land under the control of the pulp industry from 3 million hectares to more than 19 million hectares, a sixfold increase. At the same time, it has already committed a doubling of the annual allowable cut. Now, public concern over the potential environmental and social and economic impacts of those developments is at an all-time high, which has caused the government to promise strict environmental controls and more public involvement. Well, talk is cheap, Mr. Speaker. The Forest Service is now trying to make do in all of this with less staff than they had a decade ago. My question to the minister is: can he explain why he and his government have signed all of these deals and made all of these public commitments but have failed to back any of it up with the budget resources and the staff that are needed to do the job in the Alberta Forest Service?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I assure the Assembly that I have the resources within my department to meet the challenges that we have in the forest industry.

MR. McINNIS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the record is: you're losing staff. In fact, I'd like to table a copy of a document entitled Impact of Forest Industry Development on the Alberta Forest Service which specifically warns the government of the inability of the Alberta Forest Service to protect forests from, and I quote, "large scale environmental damage." In the absence of corrective measures it also warns that the department is "in violation of both the public trust and our legislated mandate."

This is strong language in support of recommendations which would fix the problem. Now, I ask the minister again: will he tell us what basis he could possibly have as a minister of the Crown for rejecting recommendations which would alleviate large-scale environmental damage and a breach of public trust?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: This member is notorious for quoting things and distorting the facts to a certain degree. I don't know what report he's dealing with at all. We had an expert panel on forest management, the Dancik panel. It made some 133 recommendations. I'm very close now to being able to respond to that.

Mr. Speaker, again I assure the Assembly that we do have the resources within our department to meet the challenges that face us.

MR. McINNIS: But, Mr. Speaker, he can't accuse me of misquoting. I've tabled the entire document. It's in black and white. We have a situation here where the minister's bluff has now been called. If he wants to make the decisions, he has to be accountable for them.

The question is quite simple. Under these circumstances, with the breach of public trust and the warning of large-scale environmental damage, I have no choice but to ask the minister if he will resign his position. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

### Carbovan Inc.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, last week Albertans were told that they need not worry about the investment they had in a magnesium enterprise. It's the same kind of comfort that the minister at least tried to give Albertans on the Gainers enterprise and the taxpayers' involvement in that. The provincial government has provided some \$6.2 million to a company known as Carbovan in Fort McMurray. The company is one year behind in its operating schedule, the staffing level was taken down to a skeletal number and strangely brought back to a greater number this morning, and Agra Industries, a participant in this venture, has written down some \$3.5 million in losses just recently. My first question to the minister of economic development is this: assuming that the minister has followed and monitored this matter closely, will he assure Albertans that there will be no loss, that there is no jeopardy to the \$6.2 million that the taxpayers have put into this company?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, within the last number of weeks – and I'll have to check my diary as to when I did meet with the principals of Agra Industries – we did go through a number of concerns that they did have as it related to the economics of their involvement in Fort McMurray. They have assured me that they feel they can continue on. They've left me with the assurance, too, that our involvement and our support is not at risk, and I'm more than happy to share that information with the hon. member.

MR. DECORE: I take it that the minister is telling us that he has monitoring mechanisms in place and that he has absolutely convinced himself and his colleagues and the members of this Assembly that there is no risk to Albertans. Is that what he's saying?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to reinforce what I indicated earlier, whereby I involved myself in discussions with the principals of this company. In addition to that, we do have monitoring in place whereby senior individuals within our department, as I indicated to the leader of the New Democratic Party, are monitoring on a very close basis a number of our investments and our involvements in backstopping various companies throughout the province of Alberta.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, normally investors are expected to share in risk and to participate in profit. It is our information that AOC moneys were used to pay down or pay out investors' loans, which has the effect of reducing their risk but increasing the risk of the taxpayer of Alberta. Is that in fact the case in this particular company, Mr. Minister?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member should be aware if he's not aware, the Alberta Opportunity Company works at arm's length from the provincial government, thus avoiding any type of political influence. I should share with him that we have great regard and great respect for the role that the Alberta Opportunity Company has played in the further diversification of the province of Alberta and in the creation of jobs. I'm more than happy to refer his suggestion to the Alberta Opportunity Company, and I'm sure that they would be delighted to give him a response.

MR. SPEAKER: Banff-Cochrane, followed by Edmonton-Calder.

### Waste Management

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today the Minister of the Environment unveiled Alberta's waste minimization program. As a result of that announcement, could the minister please outline how this program will assist local municipalities in Alberta to deal with the growing problem of landfill and the growing problem of increased waste in the province?

MR. KLEIN: Basically, the program will have three components to it, the first component being that of providing enhancement to collection and separation of recyclables, especially in the smaller areas of the province where the economy of scale is really tough to bring together. The second component really is an industrial diversification component that will encourage and provide incentives to companies to establish here in this province and to take those recyclables and add value to them and create finished products. The third component really will be a component of marketing, to provide markets for these recycled materials, perhaps through the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services and through government procurement policies that hopefully will extend to those agencies that depend on government for funding, such as municipalities and school districts and hospitals and so on. So we hope to create and close the recycling loop, to enhance the system, to create new industry, and to create markets.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm confident that municipalities in Alberta will take advantage of this program. As a result of that, my question to the minister is: what types of volumes of garbage does he feel will be taken up by this

program? In fact, what types of volumes are we expecting that we will save at the landfill sites as a result of this program?

MR. KLEIN: The overall objective is to reduce the amount of waste that now goes into landfill by 50 percent by the year 2000. Now, this is an objective that not only applies to Alberta; indeed, it's part of a protocol that has been signed by all 10 provinces and the territories and the federal government to achieve a national objective of waste reduction, the amount of waste that goes into landfills, by 50 percent by the year 2000. I'm very, very pleased that this government has seen fit and has again provided the foresight and the commitment to launch a meaningful, comprehensive waste minimization and recycling program. It's to be called Action on Waste, and that's precisely what we plan to do: take action on waste.

### Child Welfare

MS MJOLSNESS: Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the Minister of Family and Social Services. A recent proposal for therapeutic foster parents tendered by the Edmonton region of Alberta Family and Social Services, which I will now table, raises many questions about the quality of care which children in the child welfare system receive. According to the government's document, private agencies will be required to recruit, screen, train, and closely supervise foster homes which will be providing homes and therapy to severely disturbed children. Even though the well-being of these children is at stake, the government has set in place no standards, no accountability, no monitoring, and no backup services if the placement breaks down. Given that the minister has full legal responsibility for these vulnerable children, how can the minister guarantee that these children will be placed in proper care when this minister has not even bothered to put in place proper minimum requirements?

2:50

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, again the member is ill informed. I would want to say and make it very clear that we as a government put the interests of children first and foremost. We put that as our number one priority. In this particular instance, in recognition of the successes that we've had by working with some very good community-based agencies – and I can cite one that I know the member is familiar with, the McMan agency here in Edmonton, and I would hope that she's not casting aspersions on them – I would say that we're able to build on those successes. We're able to make opportunities for highly disturbed children, children with serious behavioral problems, to still live in a family-oriented environment. We think that's very important. We think it's very important to children that they have that opportunity. So, yes, as a government and, yes, as a department we're making every effort we can to work with communities and to work with community agencies to provide for the best possible care and support for the children that need it.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point is that there are no standards in place to ensure good quality care for these vulnerable children, and that's irresponsible. For four years the Alberta Foster Parent Association has been trying to work with the department to develop training standards for foster parents. Now the minister is going his own way and contracting out to private agencies. I would ask the minister:

why is the minister setting up a new bureaucracy and undermining the work of the Foster Parent Association?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, we're not setting up a new bureaucracy. I mean, I know the member opposite is asking for that. She's asking for more regulations. She's asking for more legislation. But we're not interested in building a bureaucracy; we're interested in providing services to children in a very reasonable, a very responsive, and a very meaningful way. I'm happy to point out to the member opposite that I've worked very closely with the Foster Parent Association of this province, and together over the past two years we've been able to work toward and announce some new reforms, some new initiatives. I might point out that those initiatives are going to include the kinds of supports, the kinds of training opportunities, and the kinds of recognition that foster parents have asked for and deserve and are getting thanks to the reforms of this government.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Meadowlark, followed by Wainwright.

### **Waste Management**

*(continued)*

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of the Environment's announced action plan on waste speaks boldly of a 50 percent reduction in waste objective by the year 2000 but provides no time scheduled plan or specific details on how exactly that objective might be achieved. In fact, this long-awaited document is little more than a disappointment and should probably more appropriately be entitled planned inaction on waste. To the Minister of the Environment: how can this minister justify committing only \$6 million to this so-called action plan on waste which would benefit all Albertans if it were done properly when in fact his own department is now endorsing a \$13 million scheme to stabilize Buffalo Lake, which will benefit a handful of cottagers, possibly the Premier, and absolutely nobody else?

MR. KLEIN: Well, I'm not so sure, Mr. Speaker, if the question alludes to Buffalo Lake or recycling. Perhaps he can clarify this in his supplementary.

MR. MITCHELL: In continuing to do very, very little to take positive action to reduce waste in this province, will this minister please explain why he continually avoids essential waste reduction programs, such as commercial and residential composting programs at the community level, regulations reducing packaging, and user-pay garbage collection systems to name but a few?

MR. KLEIN: Well, as usual, Mr. Speaker, this member has been in never-never land. He takes no time to try and find out what is really happening not only in this province but throughout the country. Indeed, there are protocols in place involving this province and other jurisdictions to reduce the amount of packaging that we now see on the store shelves. We've been working very seriously and industriously with the packaging industry to reduce the amount of packaging that we now see on the store shelves. In light of budget constraints this government saw fit to put in place an additional \$6 million to start a brand-new program, a program that will address in a meaningful way the reduction of waste and help us to achieve our objective of reducing that waste by 50 percent by the year 2000. As I

explained before, you don't walk 10,000 miles until you take the first step. We have taken the first step, a very, very significant step that is going to benefit this province in terms of reducing waste and also create new economic development opportunities.

MR. SPEAKER: Wainwright, followed by Edmonton-Beverly.

### **Agricultural Trade**

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture regarding the canola tariffs. You stated in an answer to the Member for Smoky River that under the Canada/U.S. free trade agreement the tariffs would be removed on canola products to allow a free flow of product across the border. Because of the very narrow crushing margins, both our crushing industry and our refining industry in Alberta are extremely sensitive to price changes. What impact will the tariff reduction of \$18 a tonne have on the viability of our crushing and refining industries here in Alberta?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Wainwright identifies another real plus under the Canada/United States free trade agreement. I think it is recognized by those in the canola industry that this goes some way to making their industry more viable but it does not take them over the hump, if you wish. One additional decision that I think we're going to have to reach in western Canada to bring some health to that sector of our value-added agricultural industry is changing the method of payment to get the cash flow that is currently going to the railways into the producers' pockets.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly changing the method of payment hasn't been an easy task for the province of Alberta. How are the other provinces reacting to this proposed change?

MR. ISLEY: I think it would be fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is more and more interest in a change in the method of payment in the province of Manitoba. Recently there has been organized what's called the Manitoba Feed Grain Users Association, an umbrella group that brings in their beef people, their dairy people, their hog people, their chicken people, and their feed grain growers. Last week they did pass a resolution and issue a press release that they supported a change in the method of payment with the payment flowing to the producer subject to the issue of the pooling costs of the St. Lawrence Seaway being addressed at the same time.

### **Municipal Grants**

MR. EWASIUK: Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties passed a resolution calling for more local independence in deciding how lottery grants are used. The community facilities enhancement program, which is funded by lottery money, is an important program, but my concern is that it operates with very few guidelines. My question is to the minister responsible for lotteries. Given that MLAs hand out grants at will without consultation with community leaders about their long-term goals, will the minister agree to renew the CFEP under guidelines that will allow communities to decide where the grant money goes rather than letting MLAs make decisions that throw community planning into total chaos?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member of the NDP caucus for giving such a glowing evaluation of the community facilities enhancement program. The government has not made a decision yet whether or not that program would be continued beyond the stated date of conclusion. The stated date of conclusion is October 17, 1991. That would be a three-year program.

It was three years ago, October 17, 1988, when Premier Getty announced the community facilities enhancement program. It was to assist community-based organizations to deal with community-related and family-related matters, and it has worked very, very well. To date, Mr. Speaker, there have been about 2,100 approvals totaling nearly \$70 million worth of worthy activities for community-based and family-related activities throughout the province of Alberta. The response I get from individuals and groups throughout this province is that they're very, very pleased and happy with the way the program is being administered.

I'm undertaking a survey that has been under way for some period of time now where we've written to all of the groups themselves asking for their comments with respect to this matter. Perhaps by the end of June, when we will be in a position to evaluate the results of all of this, we'll have a better understanding from citizens of Alberta: do they want the people themselves to be involved in working with the government in terms of the program, the delivery of such, or do they want an intermediary, another level of government, to in fact be in place?

3:00

MR. EWASIUK: Mr. Speaker, a program that does recognize local autonomy in allocating grant money for recreation facilities is the community recreation/cultural grant program, but it is also scheduled to end this year as well. Will the minister acknowledge a tremendous need for grant programs to communities and agree not only to continue this funding but to allow the AAMDC's recommendation to redistribute the CFEP money to municipal recreation boards through the CRC program so that the community's agenda not the MLA's is followed?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to in fact speak to the Alberta Association of MDs and Counties at their annual convention held here in Edmonton just a few days ago. I'm in regular consultation, as are all members of the government caucus, with the men and women who make up the Alberta Association of MDs and Counties. The CRC grant program is funded under the General Revenue Fund, and it may very well be that my colleague the Minister of Recreation and Parks would like to supplement the answer. The community facility enhancement program is funded under the Lottery Fund.

There's more than just one of those programs that deals with people directly, and it's extremely important that government be as close to the people as possible. We've heard, in fact, criticism from opposition parties in recent years which basically said that this government wasn't that close to the people. Well, Mr. Speaker, we've responded, and we've reacted, and we've listened to the criticisms that came from the opposition. We've in fact invented programs, like the community facility enhancement program, which allow ordinary citizens in this province to speak to their elected representatives at the provincial level without having to go through an intermediary. It's an important aspect of democracy when citizens can speak directly hand in hand with their elected representatives. For the most part I think it works pretty good when government and the people work hand in hand together.

MR. SPEAKER: Stony Plain.

#### Health Unit Boundaries

MR. WOLOSHYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Health is long on rhetoric about providing accessible community-based health services for all Albertans, yet more than 2,000 residents of the MD of Brazeau not only have poor access to public health services, including home visits, but are actually being denied services at the nearest public health clinic in Drayton Valley. Further, the minister condones in writing this withholding of health services and makes no commitment to rectify the problem. My question to the minister is: how can the minister responsible for health by her inaction continue to foster conflict between health units and leave 2,000 Albertans in a state of confusion and anger because they are being denied access to public health services?

MS BETKOWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to lay the facts before the people of Alberta, because clearly the member's question doesn't do so. There is currently a request before me to have the boundaries moved so that the MD of Brazeau is served only by the West Central health unit as opposed to the Leduc-Strathcona health unit, which currently has responsibility. I've had a consultation carried out with the health units and the municipalities to date to indicate how they feel about that. There clearly seems to be no real objection to adjusting the boundaries because it would probably reflect a more natural service area than the current boundaries. However, the stumbling block to the consensus on the consultation seems to be that those health units that are currently responsible for providing service are reluctant to transfer any of the corresponding funds even though they would be transferring a portion of the responsibility. Just so we have the facts on the table.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Mr. Speaker, this boundary dispute has been going on for years, and quite frankly the people are fed up with the situation. The minister can try to explain the problem any way she chooses. The obvious solution to this problem is the allocation of \$175,000 needed to ensure that these people have access to basic public health services in their community. The other part of the problem is to take the initiative and redo the boundaries accordingly. When is she going to act on the problem to provide the health services needed by the people of Brazeau?

MS BETKOWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to hear the recommendation of the MLA that there should be a reallocation of the resources, because I'm of the same view. Frankly, if we're going to adjust the boundary because there's a reallocation of responsibility for the people within that boundary, I think there must be a corresponding reallocation of the resources. So presumably the Member for Stony Plain is suggesting that we take the money away from the Leduc-Strathcona health unit and give it to the West Central health unit. I have no problem doing that, but I would just warn him that there's not a consensus on that within the local community.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-North West.

#### Magnesium Plant

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The recent MagCan fiasco, following on the heels of NovAtel, Gainers, and Northern Steel, shows the difficulty this government has in

providing a real economic diversification strategy. In fact, the argument can be made that the government itself contributed to the demise of MagCan with irresponsible fiscal management policies. My question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Given that plants such as MagCan have as a high input cost the cost of electricity, can the minister explain why this government chose to withhold \$95 million worth of rebates paid in last year's provincial budget so that, as a result, TransAlta passed on those costs to MagCan, in essence driving the final nail into MagCan's coffin?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, the information the hon. member has relayed to the House is contrary to what the principals of MagCan relayed to us. They indicated to us that the reason for their failure was the increased level of our Canadian dollar, the decreased level of magnesium products, plus higher start-up costs than what were anticipated. It had nothing to do, from the information that was relayed to us, with the electrical costs that the hon. member is referring to.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's not the information that I heard.

On a different line, then, in speaking with the vice-president of MagCan, I learned that the financing provided, the loan guarantee provided, was not the deciding factor in their locating in High River. Could the minister tell me, please: why would they provide a \$102.75 million loan guarantee for absolutely no apparent reason and put Alberta taxpayers at risk?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, as has been explained in this Legislative Assembly on a number of occasions, we involved ourselves because we were going through a very severe period of difficulty as it related to our economic well-being. If the hon. member is suggesting that we should close down Gainers and lose the hundreds of jobs within the city of Edmonton, we're not about to take that suggestion. If the hon. member is suggesting that we put the 140-odd employees working at Northern Steel out of work, we're not about to indulge that suggestion. We're working on behalf of individual Albertans so that we can provide meaningful employment. The 100-some-odd individuals at MagCan we are very concerned with as it relates to their employment opportunities in the future.

The hon. member would have to check the records as to when the project was originally announced in early 1986. I share with him that we involved ourselves because we viewed it as a very important component as it related to job creation within the province of Alberta and to further diversification. All projections indicate, too, that in a couple of years this will be a very viable project because there is going to be increased usage of magnesium products.

### Senior Citizens Programs

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, we heard last week how the government has insulted seniors across this province by making them pay more for basic necessities to balance their budget. When this government says more, it doesn't mean a few percent here or there. No, this government thinks big: 20 percent more for dental and eye care, for example. Now seniors will have to pay more to stay warm. My question is to the Acting Minister of Transportation and Utilities. How can this minister justify an average 22 percent increase in home heating for seniors in this province?

3:10

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I guess the utilization of statistics or figures can be biased to the degree that you want. When the province of Alberta introduced the senior citizens home heating protection program in 1982, it was put in place for a three-year time frame at that time to assist senior citizens in meeting the so-called high cost of heating. That program was continued at the end of its first three years and then was continued again, and it ended on December 31, 1990. This is not something that just happened in the last few days. The Minister of Transportation and Utilities informed all senior citizens in the province of Alberta in January of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should take a look to see what in fact has happened with respect to heating costs. The average gas bill today is 50 cents per gigajoule less than it was in December 1982. The purpose of the program was to assist seniors when heating costs were going up. The reality is that now heating costs have leveled or are going down. I think you have to put it in the context of the commitment the government has made to much needed programs. As an example, recently in the budget there was a 30 percent increase provided to home care not only to senior citizens but to areas of people less than age 65 as well. Our total package of assistance to senior citizens is approximately \$1.2 billion, and it's directed to senior citizens in need.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, seniors groups such as the Alberta Retired Public Employees Society, the Alberta Council on Aging, and the One Voice Action Committee are dismayed and disappointed that this government did not consult with them in deciding to completely eliminate the home heating protection program. In a letter written to the minister on March 22, the Alberta Retired Public Employees Society said that it was concerned that this was, and I quote, "only the start by our government in reducing other senior programs." I would like to table copies of that letter. My question is: how are the seniors of this province supposed to trust this government? They are not consulted about any changes that affect their everyday lives.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm unaware of any other government in Canada that provides a greater package of benefits to its senior citizens than the province of Alberta. The hon. gentleman raised certain issues. He raised issues with respect to pensions. We've all heard that there is an evaluation ongoing. It's been ongoing for some period of time. The hon. gentleman mentioned civil service pensions. They all know that adjustments have been made. Essentially every year in January the Provincial Treasurer has an ongoing review on that. We're listening to what senior citizens are saying. They've addressed and they've put on the table pension reform as one, pension improvement as one.

Mr. Speaker, they've come to the government and said: what can the government do to assist the overall benefits to senior citizens in terms of home care? The Minister of Health has responded and responded very positively with a 30 percent adjustment with respect to that program just recently. Senior citizens have said to the government: what can the government do to make the quality of life for senior citizens improved under the Aids to Daily Living program? The recent budget that came down, the balanced budget that senior citizens are very much concerned about, saw a 30 percent increase under that Aids to Daily Living program. It's a matter of listening to senior citizens in terms of all of the programs they're putting on the table and

basically saying: what programs will benefit seniors to the greatest degree?

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the 30 percent increase to this program and 30 percent increase to that program, the ongoing commitment the government has to dealing with senior citizens, the fact that the senior citizens home heating protection program sunsetting December 31, 1990, after being renewed on two previous occasions, and the fact that heating costs in 1991 are less they were in 1982 when the program was first originated, then you come down to say: well, what is the greatest need for our senior citizens?

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Gold Bar.

### Sex Offenders Program

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This government's refusal to ensure that there will be continuing treatment programs for sex offenders in the province has become a tremendous source of frustration for professionals in the field and the general public. Now we learn that because of the province's hard-line budget with hospitals the Alberta Hospital in Edmonton is forced to compress and consolidate their very successful Phoenix program, resulting in a reduction in patient admission as well as increasing the staff to patient ratio. My questions, Mr. Speaker, are to the Minister of Health. The Phoenix program is the only inpatient sex offender program with community outreach in the province. How does the minister expect the hospital to carry on its responsibility for providing treatment of this kind when budget cuts continue to threaten its existence?

MS BETKOWSKI: First of all, Mr. Speaker, there has not been a budget cut at Alberta Hospital Edmonton. Perhaps we should correct that misunderstanding. I think it's also important to lay before the House the actual facts of the issue. In order to meet the challenge of managing their health resources better, Alberta Hospital Edmonton has thoughtfully and capably put a number of plans in place. The first one is that they will be consolidating beds in two of their nursing units and a third unit over the Christmas period. The consolidation simply reflects a more efficient and effective use of staff given current occupancy rates. The Phoenix program, in the view of the hospital, will not be adversely affected by their organizational changes.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, it's incomprehensible that if the admissions are reduced, it won't be affected; of course it will be affected. One wonders if this has been discussed with the Solicitor General.

Then let me ask the minister, Mr. Speaker: what's going to become of sex offenders in the province? Is it the intention that they'll simply serve their time, then be released to repeat the offence? Is that what we're looking forward to?

MS BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, rather than attempting to stir up or frighten Albertans with respect to the way the program is being managed, I fully acknowledge that the Phoenix program is a program that is unique in the province. Right now the program is being operated on two units with an occupancy rate of a certain number of people. By the consolidation that the hospital is proposing, they will continue to be able to offer the program at the rate of occupancy that it has always been operating at. So it's not a matter of removing the program. That is not, in fact, what's going to happen. It may be that the

patients who will be getting the program will be getting it on one unit rather than two, but that's not the removal of the program. So I think it's very important, given the importance we place on the issue, to point that out to Albertans.

The second one is with respect to consultation with the Solicitor General. In fact, it has gone on. The hon. member is correct that one of the forensic units will close down during the Christmas period. There's a reason for that. The courts are virtually inoperative during the Christmas period, and we believe we can handle the bed load at Alberta Hospital during that particular time. To suggest that the program is going to be abolished or that there's not going to be a capacity in the province to deal with this issue is simply not the case, and Alberta Hospital is acting very capably and responsibly in managing through the issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Avonmore.

### Midwifery

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A year ago the Advisory Council on Women's Issues called for the licensing of midwives in Alberta, and we still haven't seen the results of any action by this government. Four weeks ago the Solicitor General promised to act on the issue of licensing midwives, and we still haven't seen anything proposed. My question is to the Minister of Health. Will the minister now consult her colleague and, if necessary, pressure him to bring down legislation immediately, and will she report back to us as to when we can expect it?

MS BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the question is really one that should be directed to the Solicitor General, and although I'm not the Acting Solicitor General, I'll certainly alert him to the question having been raised in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.  
Supplementary, somehow.

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you to the minister.

In 1990 the Advisory Council on Women's Issues recommended funding midwifery services as part of the health care system. In view of the fact that in 1985 the World Health Organization stated that the profession of midwifery was one of the most important contributions to the health of women and children and in view of the fact that research has shown that it is more cost effective to have midwives working as part of the health care delivery system, will the Minister of Health now commit to funding midwifery services as part of the health care system?

3:20

MS BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is confusing the agendas. Let's look at what they are. The first is the issue of whether or not midwifery should be a stand-alone profession. That issue has been before the Health Disciplines Board, and the Solicitor General has made statements to the effect that he intends to make the report public. The issue as to whether or not that designation occurs and, if it does, what will be the resulting impact on the health system is a very legitimate question, but it is one that will not be answered until we have the response with respect to the health disciplines report. Alberta Health was a presenter at the disciplines hearing, but until we have the decision with respect to professional status, we

have to await what the Health response is to that recommendation.

head: **Orders of the Day**

head: **Government Bills and Orders**

head: **Second Reading**

### **Bill 21**

#### **Rural Utilities Amendment Act, 1991**

[Adjourned debate April 12: Mr. Thurber]

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Drayton Valley.

MR. THURBER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There would just be a very few comments that I would make on Bill 21 at this time. I would draw your attention to the fact that these amendments would provide protection for the public at large and the associations themselves by requiring that rural utility associations register all easements on underground facilities before starting construction. There have been a number of REAs that have expressed interest in the last while in going underground with some of their distribution services, and I think it's important to protect not only the public but the taxpayer and the people that may be using this property so that everybody knows where they're at, the easements are registered, everybody is aware of them, and they're registered with the land titles office.

Mr. Speaker, I think I've covered most of the other main items in previous comments here, and I look forward to going to committee for debate on this.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Questions with respect to Bill 21?  
West-Yellowhead, comments.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill appears to be mainly a housekeeping Bill. I would like the member to explain in regards to the underground buried lines, the ones that are going to be registered: are these going to be primary lines, or are the secondary lines also going to be registered? There are many more miles of secondary lines in the province of Alberta than there are of primary lines. Surely the primary lines must be registered.

One piece is with regards to natural gas and sewage or underground power lines that may be left in the land. I would wonder if any of these were removed, would it then be removed from the plans of the province as to where those locations are?

It says also that the owners of some of these services that do not pay their loans or keep them in good standing can be removed by the utility company. The owners then again may later apply to have the utility service re-established and pay the average installation cost. I'd be curious, Mr. Speaker: if in fact they defaulted on a loan in one part of the province, would they then be allowed to go and apply for a loan in another part of the province? It doesn't specifically lay it out in 3(d).

Also, "the association shall not supply its utility service to the purchaser of the land until the amount outstanding has been paid." That doesn't clearly identify whether they've been in arrears in other parts of the province or in fact they are just dealing with the one rural electrification area.

It says in 6.1:

The Director may reject a lien note if he considers that the person liable under the note is unlikely to be able to meet all the payments under it.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, there were no qualifications as far as ability to pay went. By simply filling out a form with the REA or with the power company responsible for that particular area, as long as the easements were signed and as long as the title was in good standing for the particular applicant, the application went through, and I know of none that were disqualified. It seems pretty heavy handed that a director could just decide. It says, "Is unlikely to be able to meet all the payments under it." How the director would decide that I would have no idea. I don't think the director, whether it be the director of utilities or the director of the REA, should be making a decision like that, because I know of no way that they could find out whether in the future a person would not be able to make these payments. The remark seems a little bit difficult to understand.

Mr. Speaker, I see this mainly as a housekeeping Bill, except for those few changes, and I would hope to address them in committee. I will stand in support of this Bill.

### **Speaker's Ruling Second Reading Debate**

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. I'm sure the hon. member is well aware of the provisions of *Beauchesne* 659 and also *Ersine May* page 473. The Chair did allow it to go on a little bit with regard to references to specific clauses, but I'm sure it would be taken out.

### **Debate Continued**

MR. SPEAKER: May the member respond to wrap up with respect to the question's second reading? Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Drayton Valley. Comments to come in committee one assumes. Thank you.

[Motion carried; Bill 21 read a second time]

### **Bill 22**

#### **Wild Rose Foundation Amendment Act, 1991**

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In moving second reading of Bill 22, the Wild Rose Foundation Amendment Act, 1991, I would like to point out that it certainly is not a Bill of a magnanimous number of words. It's a Bill that comes right to the point, and it's a Bill which has incredible clarity associated with it.

I'd like just to remind all members that the background of this Bill is really found in the 1988-89 annual report of the Auditor General on page 40, where the Auditor General made a statement to the effect that there was no clear legislative authority for the volunteer activities undertaken by the Wild Rose Foundation. I looked at that - in fact, I looked at it several times - and looked at the current Bill that was in place. I suppose one could have the interpretation that essentially the previous Wild Rose Foundation Bill basically says that the purpose of the foundation is to provide funding. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, basically goes beyond that. It basically says that the Wild Rose Foundation can do more than provide funding. It also has the authority "to foster or promote the use of volunteers" and "to foster or promote charitable, philan-



thropic, humanitarian, public spirited or generous acts or to assist those who perform them."

I think Albertans should be very, very proud of the facts. I know that there are some cynics who basically say that sometimes people like myself get up and say that Alberta is a leader, but the reality of it all in the volunteer area is that in many ways we are. It was three years ago that we announced that we would have a Volunteer Week in the province of Alberta on an annual basis to promote and foster volunteerism in this province. April 21 through to 27, 1991, we will have the third Volunteer Week in the province of Alberta. This Bill would make it very, very, clear that that's one of the intended purposes of the Wild Rose Foundation. We will have in Alberta, June 6, 7, and 8, Vitalize '91, which will be the third time we'll have a major opportunity for volunteers throughout this province to come together and to work in the area of volunteerism to promote and enhance and the like. Mr. Speaker, there are just thousands and thousands and thousands of examples all across this province of people who do. One of the things that we want to do to the Wild Rose Foundation is ensure that commitment to people and that commitment to community is kept, and Bill 22 provides that. Nothing in the amendment to Bill 22 will change the dollar allocation to it. It's a commitment and philosophy with respect to it.

I just want to give you one example of something that just happened in the last little while: one volunteer group in Lethbridge called Keep in Touch, a group of individuals, some 70 to 80 volunteers a day, who phoned shut-ins and wished shut-ins well. They're the ultimate volunteers. They do it on a daily basis. They're senior citizens. They just recently had their 10th anniversary. They have in the last 10 years phoned over 100,000 people who are incapacitated at home or in the hospital or someplace else to wish them well, to give them an up.

That's the kind of thing that we want to continue doing through the Wild Rose Foundation: make sure that those opportunities are in place. Bill 22 very, very clearly not only allows that to be continued but allows us to foster, promote, and to enhance that area of volunteerism. I certainly would ask for the support of all members of the Assembly.

3:30

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Highlands, followed by Edmonton-Whitemud.

MS BARRETT: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I'm really glad to hear that the minister has finally started taking advice from the Auditor General and is acting upon it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Always do.

MS BARRETT: A member back here says they always do. I'm not so sure about that. You see, the thing is that if the advice of the Auditor General was always being acted upon, we would have had legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, in the House. Let's stop that back row conversation. Hold it, hon. member. Thank you very much. Thanks.

Edmonton-Highlands, please continue.

MS BARRETT: We would have had legislation a couple of years ago that didn't legalize the spending of lottery dollars from behind closed doors but, conversely, would have put the responsibility of lottery dollar monitoring and expenditure in the Assembly itself.

That said, however – and I know that that constitutes a hint to the minister, who's not so obtuse that he can't pick it up – I would prefer to see different legislation in front of us right now dealing with lottery funds. Given that we have a rule and a law that says that the minister shall be responsible for the expenditure of lottery funds, at least he's expanding the parameters of the expenditure to incorporate past practices. Actually, even if the Assembly itself were responsible for the expenditure of lottery funds, which it will be, by the way, when the NDP becomes government after the next election, even then, Mr. Speaker, I would be supporting this Bill, because really what it does is make it clearer what the funds can be used for.

With that I would also, though, specifically caution – because I don't have any input on these estimates – that the money that primarily goes out in grants continue to primarily go out in grants and not get eaten up in administration, in "to foster and promote the use of volunteers." The minister is nodding his head, and I'd like to have him in his summary remarks make that point and that commitment. That would be worth while. The last thing in the world volunteer organizations need to do is see the money that would be given to them spent in administration. So with that said . . .

#### Speaker's Ruling Decorum

MR. SPEAKER: Forgive me, hon. member. All parts of the House, could you cut down your conversation? I'm sure we can offer you coffee in the lounge, but it is really inappropriate to carry on this level of conversation and turning around and talking to each other, both sides. It's not Committee of the Whole just yet.

Please, Edmonton-Highlands, forgive me for interrupting.

#### Debate Continued

MS BARRETT: That's okay.

I was concluding with a comment, Mr. Speaker, that I really wish that the minister would bring in legislation so that the Assembly could determine the expenditures of the lottery dollars, but if we can't get that, I think this is a tiny improvement, and I'll be supporting the Bill.

Thank you.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I support Bill 22 that's in front of us, but I do have some comments to make on behalf of our caucus.

The Auditor General, yes, has clearly pointed this out, and the minister has followed that direction, maybe taking a bit longer than he should have taken. I would hope he's going to follow through with other recommendations that the Auditor General has made, particularly as they pertain to lottery dollars, because clearly the Auditor General is not satisfied at this particular time as to how those lottery dollars are accounted for.

Now, when we talk in terms of the formal recognition of the Wild Rose Foundation being allowed to be involved in this activity of dollars as it relates to volunteers, that aspect of it is good. We've seen some of the events that have happened in the past where volunteer dollars have been spent by the Wild Rose Foundation. I think it was unfortunate for whoever put the Wild Rose Foundation in that position to spend those kinds of dollars for what I felt were some very, very questionable activities that I don't think should be allowed. I hope they're not carried on: the sweatshirts, for example; the volunteer dollars used to send a delegation, including one member from this House, to Japan, which I think was very, very inappropriate.

I would hope that the minister would respect the fact that the Wild Rose Foundation is there for a purpose. It's there to enhance the community, and the volunteer aspect, of course, is part of that community. I don't think there's any other caucus in this House that recognizes to a greater degree than this particular caucus the benefits, the aspects that volunteers provide throughout Alberta in every sector. Every, every sector, whether we look at health care, nursing homes, auxiliary hospitals, the major projects that take thousands of volunteers like the Olympics in Calgary, the Universiade games in Edmonton, or the Commonwealth Games: hundreds and thousands of volunteers. The summer festivals in Edmonton would not be possible if it were not for the commitment made by volunteers. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the minister does not push more and more and more onto volunteers in the hopes that responsibility that the government has may lessen. In other words, volunteerism has to be a partnership with the different levels of government.

I've made these comments hoping that the minister will take them very seriously and will address them and correct some of the procedures that have been used in the past that I feel have been incorrect and some of the questionable spending that has occurred. I would hope those types of incidences aren't repeated and that no one sees this move as a mechanism to continue those types of questionable expenditures.

MR. SPEAKER: Question? Call for the question?  
Summation, minister.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues in the House for their comments with respect to this. I listened very carefully to the comments both from the Member for Edmonton-Highlands and the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud, and I think I now understand why there may have been some misunderstanding in recent years. I'm probably in a position now to understand why there were some certain questions with respect to some of these expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, under the allocation that is provided from the Alberta Lottery Fund to the Wild Rose Foundation, the various adjustments that have occurred in recent years, those dollars have never been expended for any purpose other than the development of volunteerism in the province. The administration dollars for the Wild Rose Foundation do not come out of the annual grant afforded to the Wild Rose Foundation but come as a result of the interest earned on the original endowment to the Wild Rose Foundation that was put in place. If all hon. members would look at the annual report of the Wild Rose Foundation, look at item 9, Endowment Fund. The original endowment when the province created the Wild Rose Foundation set aside 4 and a half million dollars. The interest earned off that deals with the administration of the Wild Rose Foundation. All of the annual grant of \$5 million currently provided to the Wild Rose Foundation is expended on promotion, enhancement of volunteerism in this province. Having said that, I hope that clarifies a bit of it.

I appreciate the comments that have been provided, and I appreciate the pat on the back, too, that the government does listen and does respond to the comments made by the Auditor General, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that all volunteers in the province of Alberta will be even much happier than they are today after Bill 22 successfully concludes the legislative process.

[Motion carried; Bill 22 read a second time]

## Bill 23

### Environment Council Amendment Act, 1991

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to move second reading of Bill 23, the Environment Council Amendment Act, 1991.

It's appropriate, I believe, that second reading is taking place today, because today, April 15, 1991, marks the 21st anniversary of the founding of the Environment Council of Alberta, which began, as most members are aware, as the Environment Conservation Authority. The last review of the Environment Council of Alberta took place in 1977, Mr. Speaker, when the name of the organization was changed from the Environment Conservation Authority to the Environment Council of Alberta.

The Environment Council of Alberta has undertaken quite an extensive review process, which began with the appointment of Dr. Natalia Krawetz as the chief executive officer of the organization in January of 1990. That review has resulted in a new definition of the mission of the Environment Council of Alberta. The initial mission, which has been continued to today, is to show leadership in environmental conservation.

The second mission, which has come as a result of the review process, is to strive to be at the forefront of environmental trends and thinking to ensure that Alberta is well prepared for the future. Mr. Speaker, this second mission broadens the Environment Council of Alberta and moves its focus to be more proactive and to take a long-term, strategic view of the environment. The Environment Council of Alberta is advisory and informational, and I believe that the amendments will enhance the Act and improve the effectiveness of the Act itself. I trust that all hon. members will support this Bill.

Thank you.

3:40

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will have to say that I and my caucus approach this Bill with a certain degree of skepticism and some level of trepidation. The history of the Environment Council of Alberta is one of an interesting dichotomy. On the one hand, there have been periods in its history when it has been extremely effective, when it has provided excellent advice to this government, and it seems that there is, on the other hand, a direct correlation between those periods and subsequent periods in which the government not only disregards the advice but, in fact, clamps down very heavily on the activities of the Environment Council of Alberta.

We need only look at the lengthy period of time over which the council was without an executive director. Over the same period of time its funding was reduced in such a way as to make the operation of its public advisory committees almost impossible. After a great deal of delay finally an executive director was appointed, and now we are confronted with the efforts of the executive director to restructure the council. Out of that process, it seems, comes this Bill.

Interestingly enough, the Bill addresses the issue of public advisory committees. If we were skeptical about the relationship of the government to the ECA before, then it's very important that we be skeptical about the government's initiative with respect to public advisory committees. Yes, on the one hand one could make an argument that the public advisory committees perhaps are not as useful today as they once had been, particularly in light of the amendment to the council's Act which would allow them to appoint whatever advisory bodies, boards, groups they would like to appoint.

On the other hand, the public advisory committees may well be seen by this government as the source of their problem with the Environment Council of Alberta. It was public advisory committees, for example, that have worked very extensively and very effectively on issues such as conservation strategy, such as the construction of the Oldman River dam, which I should point out was recommended against by the Environment Council of Alberta over 10 years ago. My point is, Mr. Speaker, that yes, on the one hand you might just argue that we could replace public advisory committees by this broader definition of boards and advisory groups and the broader powers that this Act would give the ECA to appoint such groups. On the other hand, given the history of the relationship between the government and the Environment Council of Alberta, one must be extremely skeptical about this particular initiative.

So we do not accept at face value this initiative or the principle that underlies it, by any means. It will take a good deal of convincing by the minister or by the Member for Banff-Cochrane, who is introducing this Bill, before we would be prepared to accept this particular Bill.

While the government seems to be construing this amendment Bill as a way of broadening the role of the ECA, we need only look at section 7 to see that quite the contrary may be the case. The wording is extremely ominous. The Act proposes to add sections which would say, in effect, that the council

- (d.1) may, after consultation with the Minister . . .
- (d.2) may, after consultation with the Minister . . .
- (d.3) shall, on the request of the Minister . . .

What is missing from this particular Bill and the Act that it amends, Mr. Speaker, is the ability of the council to determine what it will do and to pursue that in a public fashion and to present a report publicly, if only to achieve heightened public awareness and enhanced public debate on important issues.

I believe that the Environment Council of Alberta has a very important role to play in environmental policy development in this province. While in certain policy and issue areas an autonomous or independent body might not be necessary, in the area of the environment, given its controversial nature, given the difficulties that many governments have with being objective about it, given the need to alter people's views throughout society about environmental issues, it is extremely important not only to have a body of this nature with a degree of independence to select what it will study and, therefore, those areas in which it will contribute to public debate and, therefore, education, but that it also has the power to act in this way, in a truly independent fashion.

Mr. Speaker, our suspicion is that when the council may do this and may do that and shall do that only "after consultation with the minister" or only upon direction of the minister, what could be an important and effective policy-making advisory role of this group will be greatly jeopardized. That is unacceptable to us. The history of the ECA, the current context within which we find the need to create public debate about environmental issues are two strong indicators that this body must be independent, must be able to select what and how and when it will study and recommend.

The member from Banff . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Banff-Cochrane.

MR. MITCHELL: Banff-Cochrane. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for Banff-Cochrane made something of the alteration of the council's mandate. That is to say, he would argue that the council's mandate has been broadened to provide

long-term advice. Well, what was it providing before if it wasn't providing long-term advice? What would we call an in-depth study on the Oldman River dam if it wasn't long-term advice? That particular study had a tremendous perspective on the future and on what might in fact occur. What I'm afraid of is that that kind of terminology, as difficult as it is to define, becomes a smoke screen, that somehow this government will argue it's enhancing the role of the Environment Council of Alberta. It's using an interesting term to define that it's enhancing: long-term advice. How that differs from what the council was already structured to do is a very great puzzle. Whether the government could actually define "long-term" is a question that I would like to put to the Member for Banff-Cochrane.

Finally, I am concerned that somehow this terminology reflects a desire on the part of this government to extract the Environment Council of Alberta from considering issues that are specifically relevant, intensely applicable today, not just long term but today. There are so many pressing environmental issues that need to be addressed, that require proper policy advice, that to say that the emphasis of the board will be long term is to, one, either say absolutely nothing because it can't be defined, or two, and perhaps worse yet, to extract the board from looking at today's issues and today's problems.

### 3:50

Mr. Speaker, the amendments that we see in this Bill do not amount to very much that is positive and may well amount to very much that is negative. They may in fact reflect and represent a manipulation, a further degradation of the ECA and its role, and we have a very serious problem with accepting exactly what it is that the government has in mind with this particular Bill.

Mr. Speaker, there are some specific things. We believe that the Bill should at the very least have considered protection of the environment in the mandate of the Environment Council, not just conservation but in fact protection. Conservation is a word that doesn't necessarily protect the environment at all. In fact, in the manner in which it is utilized by this government, it all too often means wise use, not conservation as in "protect, to never be offended" but conservation as in "let's just use it a little more slowly."

There are a number of specific points that would more appropriately be brought up in committee, and I will leave those points until that time. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I find that we will not be able to support this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to make some comments on second reading of the Environment Council Amendment Act, 1991. The Environment Council of Alberta has earned a very good reputation, in my opinion, in the province of Alberta, going back to the days when it was chartered as the Environment Conservation Authority under the previous Social Credit government of Harry Strom, part of a very progressive and far-sighted package of environmental reforms brought about in the 1969-1970 period.

The Environment Council got the name it has today in, I believe, 1978 when the government of the day, which was the Loughheed administration, felt that this agency had become an entity unto its own and needed to be reined in a little. It was really at that point that the government decided that it wanted to keep control over that organization's agenda, and in fact it made the name change even though the initials remained the

same, ECA, from Environment Conservation Authority to Environment Council. It really put it in a closer relationship with the government and left the council with the job of approaching the government to make a case for some of the major initiatives, especially public hearings.

Throughout the entire history, under both guises, the ECA has earned a reputation for integrity and for independence, both important attributes when it comes to delving into future environmental policy. If you're going to go out and ask Albertans what should be done about a particular matter, you need to have groundwork laid. That's very, very important. The council has certainly shown its ability to produce top-quality research studies on a variety of environmental subjects. These are preparatory documents to hearing processes.

Our library here in the Legislature and my own library are full of excellent Environment Council publications, which I refer to on a regular basis. Many of those publications come to us, certainly, through the hard work and the good work of the staff of the ECA but also through the volunteer expertise of the people on the public advisory committees and the scientific advisory committees. Despite some of the criticism which has been leveled at those committees by people in government – some of it quite unfair, in my opinion – I think it must be acknowledged here in the Assembly that the volunteer effort of those Albertans over the past 20 years, 21 years now, is deeply appreciated by this member and by a great many members of the Assembly and also elsewhere in the province of Alberta.

I think in a couple of particular cases the Environment Council showed remarkable foresight and clarity in assessing significant problems which have come back to haunt the provincial government. One is the Oldman River project and the Oldman River basin. The Environment Council did hold public hearings on the question of different water management options for the Oldman River basin and found the final option chosen by the government, the dam at the Three Rivers site, to be the most costly option of any, to be unnecessary, and to be the most harmful from an environmental and a historic resources point of view: a recommendation which clearly didn't win them any friends in government but nonetheless has proven, I think, to be a very sound recommendation based on research and based on consultation with Albertans. It's small wonder, perhaps, that the government was itself unwilling to consult with Albertans when it came to their decision to build a dam, and small wonder that the federal Court of Appeal for Canada found that the Alberta process was deficient in that it had failed that very important step of public hearings and also independent reviews. So that's, I think, a point in their favour but perhaps something that hurt them, approaching government.

The second, and the subject came up in question period today: the important matter of the environmental impact of forestry operations in Alberta. Again, this is back in the 1970s, the Environment Council held hearings when there wasn't a whole lot of projects on the table, there wasn't a development agenda looming before the province. They asked some very pertinent questions, prepared some very useful background material, and they asked Albertans, "What are your concerns?" One of the recommendations strikes me from today's point of view as being absolutely right on the money. In 1978 this government was told by the Environment Council: get to work now on pulp technology which doesn't pollute the water. They said: the time is now for us to look at zero effluent pulp mills. That was 1978. Well, here we are in 1991, and as members know, the neighbouring provinces of Saskatchewan and British Columbia are both about to open up zero effluent pulp mills, whereas we have the pulp

mills which are more of the belching, stinking, polluting – especially water polluting – kind. A very farsighted recommendation from the Environment Council back in 1978.

These are some of the strengths: that ability to crystalize issues long ahead of time and to put them forward to Albertans and to come back with solid policy recommendations. I regard that as a major strength of the ECA.

They are not without weaknesses. I don't have any quarrel with those who would say that the Environment Council can be reformed, can be upgraded, can be brought into the 1990s. I think that needs to be done. There certainly has been a problem with lack of leadership over at the Environment Council. I think the government lucked into a very excellent choice of the previous chief executive officer, Mr. Alistair Crerar, who stayed as long as he thought he could do any useful work with this council and did a tremendous amount of good for it. There was an 18-month hiatus during which time no CEO was in place. The staff operated without that type of leadership and waited sort of with bated breath for government to make some indication of when that position would be filled. They pursued and prosecuted their proposal that we get to work on hearings on the idea of a conservation strategy for the province of Alberta. They didn't just sit back and wait. They also proceeded to publish a highly readable and very useful set of background papers covering all of the subsidiary issues of a conservation strategy together with the framework document. A tremendous amount of work was done, guided by the volunteer sector for the most part. Nonetheless, the key recommendation to government, which is that they be allowed to take this material to Albertans to again do the kind of work they do developing a conservation strategy, was simply not responded to by government. It sat and sat and sat, until along comes the present Minister of the Environment, who seems unwilling to even pilot this important legislation before the House.

With all due respect to the Member for Banff-Cochrane, I must say that this is something that the minister says he's worked with very closely with the new chief executive officer of the council, and one would have expected his thoughts to be a part of this particular debate that we're having. That's simply the point that I'm making. Nonetheless, it seems that the present Minister of the Environment decided his public agenda for consultation was much more important to him politically than the council, so the council's long-standing and well-researched request to go to Albertans on a conservation strategy for Alberta was allowed to collect dust, I guess, somewhere in the government. It was at least not responded to.

4:00

Thirdly, I think there is a weakness in that if the target audience of the council is the government, they have not had a very good record in getting much of a response out of government on some of those key recommendations.

So that's the background. Now we get to the organization review, which was announced to Albertans. Well, the first I learned about it was issue No. 1 of a new newsletter that came out of the Environment Council on May 15, 1990, called *Transitions*. It contained a statement from the chief executive officer, stating:

When I accepted the job of Chief Executive Officer, I accepted it knowing that revitalization was to take place. I accepted it knowing that the (Hon.) Mr. Klein wants a *viable* Environment Council.

It then went on to describe some of the features of the review.

The thing I remember taking a double take of at the time was that normal ECA activities had to be suspended during this

review process, which I think led one to believe that there's something very substantial happening here behind the scenes. It was suggested that one of the major purposes of the review was: "to define [the] relationship [of the council] to the new Alberta Round Table on Environmental and Economic Integration." I guess that's an important mandate for the review process, but it turned out within a very short period of time that the Minister of the Environment himself announced what that arrangement was to be by his news release, not the council's. I mean, the government stepped in and said, "Well, you, the ECA, are going to be the secretariat for the round table, and that's the end of that."

So we go on to the actual process of the review. Now, I've suggested that I think this review process is a very important process, as is the appointment of a chief executive officer. I think it's a shame that the government decided to make the CEO a political appointee in the sense that the process that was used was simply an arbitrary appointment by the minister. That doesn't speak particularly to the qualifications of the individual. I think the process was wrong. Probably some of the problems that arise from this review reflect that problem, that fact at the base: that the government chose to act in a unilateral fashion towards creating the review. In stage one of the organization review, which was completed at the time it was announced publicly, it was determined by Dr. Krawetz that "there is no real consensus among staff and advisory committee members as to the actual role the ECA should be playing." That's a direct quote. A very curious finding, in my opinion, because it seems to me that one of the functions of leadership is to work toward that type of consensus; in fact, I heard the Minister of the Environment on many occasions talk about his desire to work a consensus around important environmental issues. I wondered at the time and I still wonder why you could talk to a bunch of people and decide there's no consensus and therefore shut everything down and sort of begin at square one building a new vision. It seems to me that a little more effort ought to have been put by somebody into working a consensus among the people who have done this work for a long period of time as far as what direction they should go in.

That was the first problem. Then we went into phase 2. Now, in phase 2 a consultant was hired by the chief executive officer, the Coopers & Lybrand consulting group, who do a lot of work with the provincial government. Their mandate, it appears, was to develop a mission statement. There were certain people interviewed, obviously, by Coopers & Lybrand. I don't really know who they were because I have not been able to get my hands on a copy of the Coopers & Lybrand report. The most that's been provided to me by the chief executive officer is a précis of the report, which has certain conclusions and certain passages which are in quotations but not the full context of the report, and I have a feeling that some of the gaps which I noticed in the report might be answered by the full report. I wrote the chief executive officer on March 5 asking for a copy of the report. On April 9 I received back a letter which I am prepared to table. The letter doesn't say very much, simply: "In response to your letter . . . enclosed is a copy of my speech notes on 'The Future of the Environment Council.'" So we have a speech given by the chief executive on March 21 to the annual joint meeting of the Environment Council and its advisory committees. This is the speech in which the advisory committees were told that they had been effectively fired as of that date, March 21.

There are some very good things, some strong things in this speech, in my opinion. There is a definition of the new mission

of the council, which is: "To strive to be at the forefront of environmental trends in thinking so that Alberta is well prepared for the future." Now, there's a mission statement for you. That is, I think, a very ambitious and very important role that the council would take on for itself. It articulates what striving to be the forefront is by four roles:

identifying emerging trends and issues, providing informed analysis and synthesis, advising the Government of Alberta and building relationships.

Again, I think very little to quarrel with in that statement. I think the chief executive has concocted a mission statement which seems to fit within the tradition of the Environment Council, a noble tradition, and would probably make for a useful future.

Then we go the next step which is Bill 23. I recall asking the Minister of the Environment: why are we proceeding in this fashion? Why does the chief executive come in, fire the public advisory committees as a prelude to revitalization, I think is the term that was used? Well, I indicated at that time that I thought there must be some legislative amendments not far behind which will clarify these matters, and we have legislative amendments in Bill 23, but there's no clarification: very little clarification in the introductory comments by the member, and I think even less in the Bill itself.

There are a few specific concerns that I have. One is the idea of putting "utilization of the environment" as a major purpose of the council under the Act. How do you utilize the environment? To me, "utilize" involves using up, and I just have a little difficulty with that language. It's not the more serious concern. The more serious concern is when you get down to the changes to section 7, which really in a legislative way defines what the mandate of the council is. This is where we get to the meat of the matter, I would think, and what we have is in the way of elaborating on the mission statement which I've just read, the idea that the council "shall advise the Minister on long-term and strategic matters pertaining to environment conservation." To me that means one thing only: that the council wants to be an advisory body to the minister. That's what the result of all of this deep thinking is and the Coopers & Lybrand report which presumably somewhere has within it this direction as opposed to the one that sounds a little better to my ear that was articulated in the chief executive's speech: to become an advisory council to the minister.

Well, you know, there are all kinds of ministers in the government who have advisory councils. You don't have to take a body with the history, tradition, and the volunteer activity that this one has and transform it with its staff and its resources and, I guess, its budget as well into an advisory committee. I mean, if the minister wants an advisory committee, he can make one, but he doesn't have to take this organization and make it into his advisory committee.

#### 4:10

He referred to one of the people involved in the steering committee. You know, this is a kind of an interesting steering committee that has piloted this review through. It consists of the hon. Minister of Labour; Mr. Vance MacNichol, the Deputy Minister of Alberta Environment; Mr. J. Sherrold Moore, the senior vice-president of Amoco Canada Petroleum; and Dr. Joan Snyder, the chair of the public advisory coordinating committee. Now, in answer to one of my questions the minister said:

One of the strongest proponents of this reorganization and the way it was presented is the policy adviser to the NDP, and she's in full agreement.

I presume that must be a reference to Dr. Joan Snyder, who does advise me on some things and does sit on an advisory committee. Now, I didn't have to transform an external agency with staff and resources and important traditions to create an advisory committee, and I don't really think the minister has to either.

I find there's something of an incongruity between the idea of striving to be at the forefront of environmental trends and thinking so that Alberta is well prepared for the future and the real meat of the matter in this legislation, which is that the council now becomes an advisory committee to the minister. That's where all the long-term and strategic business ends up: as an advisory committee to the minister. I think that implies a relationship which is different than it's been historically, and I think it's not a strong and a positive direction for the council to be taking at this point in time.

Then we get to the major additions to the mandate of the council. These were referred to by the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark: the different things that the department can do, the new agenda, if you like, to

- . . . solicit opinions and information on matters pertaining to environment conservation;
- . . . assemble, analyze, produce and distribute information on matters pertaining to environment conservation;
- . . . provide secretariat services to any board, committee, council or task force.

These are all done in consultation with the minister. Again it's the minister. I call this RIP for the council: Ralph's interesting projects. It may do a lot for Ralph, but it's not going to do a lot for the council, in my humble opinion.

Now, I suppose there is a chance that I could be wrong in my assessment of this. I'm quite prepared to admit that, but it seems to me on the basis of what little we've been told that I have no difficulty at all in saying that this legislation is not a step forward. In fact, I think that at the very best it's a step off to one side, but it's probably a step backward because it really does depend on a relationship with a particular minister, which may take it somewhere or may not. I think for the council to be hitching its star to the Hon. Ralph Klein is a little bit shaky proposition in terms of the long-term future of this council and a 20-year history.

I think that if we look back to the strengths of the council, if we look to its integrity, its independence, its ability to bring forth publications with a fresh perspective, multidisciplinary perspective, to conduct public hearings and achieve farsighted recommendations on important policy matters, it's a step backward. For that reason the Official Opposition will oppose this legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Banff-Cochrane, summation.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly took note of the comments made by Edmonton-Meadowlark and Edmonton-Jasper Place. I will presume certainly that their comments are intended to make this Act more positive and to improve the Act. I certainly welcome any specific recommendations that they may bring forward at committee stage.

I would just like to make a couple of comments in passing. One is on the public advisory committees, which, as most members will know, under the Environment Council of Alberta have served as the major process for public involvement. The review by the chief executive officer, Dr. Natalia Krawetz, has I think identified the realities of the '90s, which realities are that more and more of our public are requiring that they have an

opportunity to become involved in the decisions of government from the very earliest stage, whereas the public advisory committees served a traditional role, Mr. Speaker, of representing the public.

However, today we have many publics, and we have a number of, if you will, public advisory committees that are established by the various publics that we have in this province. So the intention of the amendment with respect to the public advisory committees is to recognize that, yes, public advisory committees have provided very important input to the Environment Council of Alberta over the years and undoubtedly will continue to do so. They are certainly not precluded under the amendment, but there is a recognition, as I say, of the expanding public awareness and the desire for the public to be involved. With respect, Mr. Speaker, I think that the improvements that are suggested in this amendment, which will provide for more public involvement through workshops and task forces, ad hoc working groups and, as well, public advisory committees, will ensure that this legislation is responsive, is cognizant of where we are going in this province, and is able to adapt to the changing realities of the 1990s and the 21st century.

The other comment I would like to make is with respect to the "new agenda" which the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place has referred to. There is a new agenda, Mr. Speaker, and it is intended to give Albertans more opportunity, not less, to input into this very important world of the environment that we all share. I would respectfully submit that the references in the amendment to "after consultation with the Minister," which the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place has concluded mean a loss of authority in the council, reflect just the opposite. It reflects that the council will continue to communicate with the public that we have in this province, will continue to communicate with the minister, and will then move forward into new fields which are contemplated by this legislative package.

I'm confident, Mr. Speaker, that the amendments as suggested will ensure that that public involvement will be more readily available to grass-root Albertans and that those grass-root Albertans will look very favourably on the amendments.

Thank you.

[Motion carried; Bill 23 read a second time]

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

4:20

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I'll call the committee to order, please, this Monday afternoon. Just prior to proceeding with the first Bill, could we have unanimous consent to revert to Introduction of Special Guests.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Please proceed, Calgary-Glenmore.

#### head: **Introduction of Special Guests** (*reversion*)

MRS. MIROSH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to introduce to you and members of this Legislative Assembly a member from the Alberta Association of Social Workers council. He is sitting in the members' gallery: Mr. Walter Coombs. Would you please rise, Mr. Coombs, and receive a warm welcome from this Assembly.

**Bill 2**  
**Forest Development Research Trust Fund**  
**Amendment Act, 1991**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. minister have any preliminary remarks? If not, then are there any questions, comments, or amendments with respect to this Bill?

The Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I have some comments, and I also have an amendment I would like to propose.

The primary purpose in Bill 2 is to broaden the type of research that can be conducted under the Forest Development Research Trust Fund. I certainly subscribe to the view that research is a very important component of forest management in this part of our century. I think we have to find ways to more intensively manage the forest, to ensure that the underlying ecology of the forest is not destroyed by forestry activities; in other words, to make sure that the activity by humanity that takes place in the forest does not kill the underlying ecosystem. I think that broadening the scope of research under this particular vehicle to include the area of ecosystem research and to include such values as fish and wildlife is an important addition to the trust fund mandate, and for that reason we are supportive in principle.

I must say that I have for years had concerns about how the agency is run, the identity of the people who are on there. There is a particular concern about a switch that's been made in the identity of one of the directors under this particular legislation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, hon. member. You made reference in your remarks to an amendment. That being the case, I have to inquire: is it available for committee members so that it might be considered during your remarks and also so that we at the Table might know what it is?

MR. McINNIS: Yes, please. The amendment is being distributed.

One of the amendments that's contained within Bill 2 is to take the chairman of the forest science department at the University of Alberta off the committee and substitute the dean of the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry. Now, I haven't been able to find a clear, consistent rationale for that decision other than the suggestion that that would be sort of an upgrade in the status of the person who is representing the department of Agriculture and Forestry. As most members are probably aware, Dr. Bruce Dancik is the chair of the department of forest science and someone who is quite knowledgeable about forestry issues: the author, of course, of the Dancik report, which is being ignored by government along with the very important material which I tabled in the Assembly today.

Historically, the departments of agriculture and forestry have been together under one roof, but the department of agriculture has been by far the larger component. I can't think of a case recently where somebody from the forestry side has occupied the dean's chair. It seems to me that what you usually end up with in the dean's office is somebody who's from the agriculture side. I really can't see any clear rationale for putting the dean on there as opposed to the chairman of forest science, which is the forestry component of the department of Agriculture and Forestry, so for that reason I put forward an amendment.

There's a second aspect to the amendment, though, and that is that we should have some people who look at these things

from a slightly different point of view. If you look in the most recent annual report, which the minister was kind enough to provide for me, the Forest Development Research Trust Fund committee consists of a representative from Weldwood of Canada, Blue Ridge Lumber Ltd., several government officials, as well as the dean of Agriculture and Forestry and the chairman of the forest science department, the executive director of the Alberta Forest Products Association, a representative of Procter & Gamble, Forestry Canada, and the Alberta Research Council: all government and industry personnel.

The second part of the amendment is that I would like to put some people on there chosen by the Alberta environmental network so that we get some people who have a somewhat different perspective, not a majority but some people who might be able to have some input into the type of research that should be done if you move to an ecosystem point of view. If you start to look at some of the fish and wildlife values in the forest, which I take to be one of the purposes of the Bill, why not have some people on there who are knowledgeable in that area as well as who are knowledgeable from the government policy perspective, from the practice of forestry profession and the forest companies' perspective? It seems to me that not just the research trust fund committee but the government gets all kinds of advice from groups like the Alberta Forest Products Association but not enough from people who look from the other point of view.

I would like to put forward an amendment to section 4(b)(i) of the Bill by taking out (b) and putting in the two items I have mentioned: that the Chair of the department of forest science is on the committee as well as three members chosen by the Alberta environment network.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Speakers to the amendment?

The Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, in my remarks to the second reading of this Bill, among other points that I made I made two points. One was that the chairman of the department of forest science in the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry of the University of Alberta should remain as a member of this trust fund board. In fact, this Bill 2 which would exclude that person from the board was wrong to do so. A second point I made was that the membership on the board reflected industry and government and so on but did not reflect the perspective of what might be termed the environmental community. To summarize in this regard, the two points that I made were: one, that the chairman of the department of forest science should be on the board and, two, that members chosen by the environmental community, as it were, should be on the board as well.

It's interesting to note that during second reading the New Democrats embraced this Bill, made no critical comment to speak of at all, and in fact did not make either of these two points. I am very pleased to see, therefore, that they were listening, that they have pushed the one critic aside and brought in the other to ensure that it would be done right, and that they have embraced the two points that we made. They're embodying them in this amendment. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is with great pleasure that we support this amendment.

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the question on the amendment?

The hon. Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the hon. members, and I want the House to again know that there is absolutely no reflection on an individual in the name of Dr. Bruce Dancik. I think he's a terrific individual and very, very capable, and I appreciate the work that he's done.

In going over and updating this Bill at this time, there were two factors taken into consideration. One is that times do change and the titles of individuals do change, so we wanted to update the titles. As members will know when they go through the list of the ones that are on the council, they're basically all very senior people, and in fact most are chief executive officers. The chairman of the department of forest science in the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry is now changed to the dean of the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry at the University of Alberta, which would put that individual on the same footing as the other CEOs that are there. In the discussions that is the reason for that change.

4:30

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, the comments made about the entire forest ecology: I made those comments in second reading of the Bill in wanting to amend the Act in the scope of forestry research. It was too narrowly defined. If you look at the Bill, it makes it very clear in there. It says, "research programs oriented toward improved forest management and timber production." What we're doing is substituting "programs respecting forest research," which in fact broadens significantly what they can look at or approve with respect to research, because we're improving forest management and timber production. Also, in today's world of integrated resource management, we need the change in wording to "respecting forest research" that will allow, I think, a broad range of studies in forestry particularly and how the forest resources interact. There certainly is a forestry/wildlife interface, and that certainly is an example.

In the list of members you will also note, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that my assistant deputy minister of the Forest Service is a former professor at the University of Alberta and in fact has his doctorate degree in forest ecology. Certainly in his discussion when we put the amendments together, it reflected the goal and objective of making sure that the research committee did what it was supposed to do in looking at a broader range of programs.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the committee not to support the amendment.

MR. McINNIS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I find the minister's argument not very persuasive, particularly on the aspect of putting the dean on the advisory council rather than the chairman of the forest science department. He talks about presidents and chief executive officers being put on the council, but those are the presidents and in some cases vice-presidents who deal with the woodlands and the forestry operations. That's the key point. I mean, in a company like, let's say, Procter & Gamble, we have the vice-president, cellulose and specialties division of Procter & Gamble Cellulose Ltd., somebody who has a specific interest and involvement in the forestry operations, which is why the appropriate person in the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry would be the chairman of the forest science department, because that's a person who deals with forestry, right? I mean, if you were making the argument about chief

executives, you would presumably want the chief executive of . . .

#### **Point of Order Speaking Twice in a Debate**

MR. GESELL: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Clover Bar.

MR. GESELL: The hon. member has moved an amendment, and if I read 25(2) of our Standing Orders, I don't believe there's a reply allowed.

AN HON. MEMBER: We're in committee, Kurt. Wake up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. GESELL: The rules in committee apply as they do in the Assembly, Mr. Chairman. I draw to your attention Standing Order 62, which states that the rules in committee are the same as in the Assembly. I want some clarification from you, Mr. Chairman, on 25(2) of our Standing Orders. It states:

Except as otherwise provided in this standing order, no reply is allowed the mover of an Order of the Day, an amendment, the previous question or an instruction to a committee.

We obviously have an amendment here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, hon. member. There's no point of order because Standing Order 62(1)(a) says "a member may speak more than once" in committee. There's no point of order.

MR. McINNIS: The introductory lesson was two years ago, Kurt.

#### **Debate Continued**

MR. McINNIS: Anyway, I was making the point that the chief executive is the executive who deals with forestry matters. In every case as I go down the list – you've got the vice-president of Daishowa based out of Vancouver, who deals with forestry operations in British Columbia, not somebody in Japan who deals with the whole operation. Or Procter & Gamble: I mean, they sell everything from toothpaste through all kinds of family home items. It just seems to me that if you're going to make that argument, the parallel person is in fact the chairman of the forest science division because that's the group that deals with forestry.

Now, I think the other matter, though, is even more important, that we start to have some people on here who look at things more from an ecosystem point of view, especially related to the broadening of the mandate. Again, not looking for control or domination, just to have a few voices of people who perhaps know who does research in that area as opposed to who does research in the area of productivity and the other things which are part of the traditional mandate.

I do feel moved to respond to the comments of the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, who repeatedly in this Assembly pretends to confuse the difference between second reading and committee when it suits his purposes. I can't believe that he doesn't understand the difference, because he's got a master's degree from a university; he used to be a parliamentary intern and the vice-president of a major corporation. What corporation was that, Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark? I've



forgotten. Anyway, he was a senior official in a major corporation. I am certain that he does understand the difference between second reading and committee. In second reading we deal with the principle of the Bill, and in committee we go clause by clause. That's why it's appropriate to bring in amendments and deal with clause-by-clause items in committee, and he wants to beat me up because I didn't deal with the clause-by-clause in second reading. He played the same game under the Natural Resources Conservation Board Act last fall, where he brought in all kinds of considerations in second reading which were really committee-type considerations and tried to pillory us for following the rules. I expect a little better out of the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, quite frankly.

Back to the Bill. I think it's quite important that we have some people who have an environmental point of view on this council. What about it, hon. minister? Why don't we put three on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the question on the amendment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place, say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

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

4:40

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

For the motion:

Barrett	Gibeault	McInnis
Chivers	Hawkesworth	Mitchell
Chumir	Hewes	Mjolsness
Doyle	Laing, M.	Roberts
Ewasiuk	Martin	Wickman
Fox	McEachern	

Against the motion:

Ady	Fischer	Mirosh
Anderson	Fjordbotten	Moore
Betkowski	Gesell	Nelson
Bogle	Gogo	Oldring
Bradley	Horsman	Osterman
Brassard	Hyland	Paszkowski
Calahasen	Isley	Payne
Cardinal	Johnston	Shrake
Cherry	Jonson	Speaker, R.
Clegg	Kowalski	Stewart
Day	Laing, B.	Thurber
Drobot	Lund	Weiss
Elliott	McClellan	West
Evans		

Totals:	For - 17	Against - 40
---------	----------	--------------

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill 2 agreed to]

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

[Motion carried]

### Bill 3

#### Forest and Prairie Protection Amendment Act, 1991

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments that any member wishes to make?

MR. McINNIS: My comments are really more in the way of a question. This Bill puts forth some, to my reading, extraordinary powers towards some of the government officials. It makes a suggestion that you can enter property without a search warrant, that fire guardians "or any person so authorized by the Minister" - that's pretty broad language - can enter any property with anyone they wish without a warrant, seize property, and conduct any tests that they wish. Failure of the minister to publish orders is removed as a defence for the crime of entering an area closed due to fire hazard, and the level of fines has been removed from the Act and placed in the regulations.

Now, these are somewhat extraordinary powers, to my reading, and I'm just wondering if the minister might give us some rationale as to why it's necessary that fire guardians or any other persons so authorized should be able to enter property at any time. There must be some check and balance on it, but perhaps if the situation that led to this could be described, it might make the need for this type of authority more evident.

4:50

MR. CHERRY: Mr. Chairman, the changes in the Act allow the Act to be more updated. As far as entering people's property, within the legislation now this is a standard procedure in the protection area. I believe that what we're doing here is to make it more aware for the public itself. Although there's that which the member opposite has indicated, there are many more items in the amendment than what he spoke of.

I apologize for my voice today, but I am in a very bad situation with a head cold.

I guess what I'm trying to say is that these amendments are not something that the department has just thought up themselves, but it is through a lot of knowledge and consultation, that they can better address the problem areas within the Act itself.

I don't have any problem, Mr. Chairman, if the member opposite wants to ask a more specific question. I didn't quite hear and understand what he was saying. If he could clarify it, then I would certainly go at it again.

MR. FJORDBOTTE: Mr. Chairman, I'd supplement the hon. member's answer. I personally appreciate very much the comments made by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place in that we want to make sure that we're not overstepping bounds and stepping on people's privacy.

The way the Act was worded before is that a forest officer had the right to enter land or a dwelling to fight the fire but had no power to enter land or a dwelling to investigate the cause of a fire. What the new clauses will do is give the right to enter land, but not a dwelling, to investigate the cause of a fire. About 50 percent of the fires that we have are man-made fires, and about 7 percent of those are by arson. It's important in each of the forest zones that we have the opportunity to go in and see what the cause of the fire was. We're asking for that right in this Bill, except not the right to enter a dwelling.

MR. McINNIS: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I understand what the minister is saying, the authority is there in the legislation presently to enter premises to fight a fire. This is the matter of a subsequent investigation to determine what the cause of the fire may have been. That's where I think we're getting into an area where maybe I do have some concerns. I understand the need. If a fire is raging, you don't have time to petition the courts to obtain permission to enter property and make seizures. But what we've got under this new investigative authority, the new section 30.1, is that:

- (2) Without limiting subsection (1), a person making an investigation . . . may, without a warrant . . .
  - (a) enter on any land or premises at any reasonable time, accompanied by any person or bringing with him any thing that he considers would be of assistance in making the investigation.

It goes on to say that you can perform tests and remove anything from the land or the premises pertinent to the investigation. I appreciate that there's some limitation, but isn't it the case that if you're doing an investigation, the same red-hot emergency doesn't exist? Perhaps there may be a concern about destruction of evidence or what have you, but that's a concern that every law enforcement officer faces. I guess the question I'm asking is: why is it different for a Forest Service officer or a fire guardian than it is for any other law enforcement officer, who has to have reasonable, probable grounds and to provide some evidence to get a search warrant? Why is this case different?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the question?  
The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, the minister was good enough to answer the earlier question, and I, too, would be interested in hearing his answer to the subsequent question by the minister – by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. WICKMAN: Don't call him minister.

MR. MITCHELL: Yeah; what a horrible mistake.

The fact is that as I understand, one of the safeguards to this power, such as it is, is that the forestry officer wouldn't be able to enter land without a warrant if the owner disagreed with the forestry officer entering the land, and I presume that would apply to entering any premises. That works if the landowner is there or if there is a provision explicitly requiring the permission of the landowner. I'm wondering whether the minister could answer the question: what if the landowner isn't there and hasn't given permission? Does that mean the forestry officer could enter not only the land but also a dwelling on that land?

MR. CHERRY: Mr. Chairman, you know, the powers are there with the minister, and he can delegate the powers out. Common sense tells me, for one thing, that you would not go on someone else's property unless the need to go on was there. I don't think anyone from the department is going to chase all over the province in a forest area indiscriminately and go about his duties without having just cause to do such as that. Now, I'm not a lawyer, so I believe that common sense does prevail; at least, I hope it does in this day and age.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, that's still an inadequate explanation, because were you to accept the Member for Lloydminster's explanation now that, well, the forestry officer surely wouldn't go into some premises or on some land without just cause, then you would have to argue that there's no need for warrants in any pursuit of law enforcement. Why would you need them if . . . Surely the police wouldn't go into a place where they didn't have a just cause, would they? No. Well, that's why we have warrants, to ensure that there's a third-party, objective view of that. So I'd still like to hear a more acceptable explanation of these powers, maybe that they're necessary, maybe that there's some particular set of circumstances out there in forests that justifies this. We simply haven't heard that explanation. Could we please hear it before we vote on this Bill in committee?

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Chairman, it's important to realize, first of all, that the forest officers have limited powers under the Act. It's different than fish and wildlife officers that have the authority to investigate and charge under the Wildlife Act. In fact, fish and wildlife officers could even issue a speeding ticket in relation to their work with the police forces, but forest officers don't have that same right. They will not have the right to enter a dwelling, but they certainly will have a right to enter property. Any charges that would be laid or any summonses that would come would have to be laid by the RCMP. It would not be laid by the forest officer in any event. There's that check on the system to make sure that's covered.

5:00

In addition to that, when we look at our fires within any zone that we have, as I said, we have about 50 percent that are man-caused fires, and we want to reduce those because we're paying a lot of these fire-fighting costs. It's important that we have the opportunity to work on our prevention plan and target specific fire causes. It may also mean specific means to reduce those fires. It may be education or whatever; the plan could include anything right from enforcement to education as well. But the forest officers having the right to go in and investigate the cause of a fire, excepting for a dwelling, should really cause no one any real concern. Any summonses that would be laid against people would have to go through the RCMP, who would investigate then as well. It gives us an opportunity to work on our fire-fighting costs, try and keep them down, and look at prevention methods that we have.

MR. MITCHELL: I'm not doubting for one minute the good intentions of the minister and the Member for Lloydminster or the government in enhancing the powers of an investigating forestry officer. We all agree on the severity of the problem and the seriousness of the issue, but the minister's explanation conjures up a very interesting contradiction. He points out that the forestry officer's powers are limited to some extent in that he or she couldn't lay charges; the RCMP would have to do

that. Well, it's interesting, then, that the forestry officer could enter onto land without a warrant, having been accompanied to the edge of that land by an RCMP officer who could not follow him or her onto that land because that RCMP officer would need a warrant in order to pursue that investigation. If I'm right about that contradiction, that lack of logic, then again I would have to say that the minister's explanation isn't adequate. I'm not doing this because I want to see this Bill inhibited in its passage for the sake of inhibiting it, but I do have concerns, which I didn't have so much in second reading, now that we're getting to the root of an explanation and what's behind this. I simply haven't seen an adequate explanation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-*Buffalo*.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you. I think my colleague from Edmonton-Meadowlark has raised a very good point, and upon reading through this section, it appears to be a very complicated mess. First of all, we have subsection (2), which indicates that a person making an investigation may enter a premises without a warrant, and then we find that there is no power, no mechanism for ensuring that right to enter. On the contrary, we find in subsection (5) a provision which contemplates that the landowner will be in a position to refuse entry, thereby stipulating and making provision for an order by a justice of the peace to provide for a warrant. It sounds to me as if the section is providing very confused and conflicting indicia as to whether or not an investigator can enter without a warrant, as seems to be generally the case, or alternately in fact does require a warrant, as is indicated in subsection (5).

I don't think it's sound legislative process to leave such an ambiguous situation when we're dealing with the issue of civil rights in relation to property. I would suggest that it would probably be very useful if this matter could be referred back to the draftsman for a comment and an opinion with respect to just what is intended and perhaps for some redrafting for purposes of clarity. Often one finds in dealing with matters where there is an importance for providing for entry to land in urgent situations that a distinction is made between business premises as opposed to residential premises. Here the investigation element does not imply any element of urgency. It seems to be a matter that is tantamount to a police investigation, and it seems to me that perhaps a warrant process in general is merited unless there is some co-operation. Now, that may be intended, but the opening provisions of the section that stipulate that entry may be without a warrant I believe give a signal that is contrary to the whole tenor of the latter part of the provision. I would urge a review of that section. I think it's in need of revision.

MR. MITCHELL: I would just like to make one further point in that regard to supplement what my colleague for Calgary-*Buffalo* said. If it is that there is some lack of clarity on a legal basis in the wording of this power, if it is in fact that it's in contravention of some feature of the Charter or could be challenged in court, then I would like to make the point to the minister that it might well be that this won't enhance the ability of his department to protect the forests, to discover the reason for a fire, to prosecute, on the one hand, as a deterrent, or to take steps to ensure that whatever inadvertent reason that caused that fire might not occur again. In fact, it might diminish the ability of the department to do that because a given case could be thrown out of court or challenged in court on the basis of an exercise of power that wasn't within the realm of the

Charter. We might be left without an operative Act as a result of that, in addition, for some period of time in which his forestry officers simply would be without adequate power.

I would echo the comments of my colleague for Calgary-*Buffalo* and just ask that the minister perhaps refer this back to the drafters or to the AG's for further legal insight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments or questions? Is the committee ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill 3 agreed to]

MR. CHERRY: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 3 be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### **Bill 4 Social Work Profession Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-*Glenmore*.

MRS. MIROSH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is indeed a privilege for me to bring Bill 4 to this Assembly.

This Bill has been developed in consultation with the Alberta Association of Social Workers. I would first like to take the opportunity again to recognize and thank the representatives of the association for all their hard work and co-operation, which has resulted in this Bill. This Act, of course, is to bring the social workers professional Act up to date. It is also to bring it to accordance with Principles and Policies Governing Professional Legislation in Alberta, which was discussed in this Assembly last spring and tabled in the Legislature at that time.

As with all professional legislation, the fundamental purpose of this statute is to protect the public. It does that in a number of ways. The Act gives individuals who are qualified and registered the exclusive use of the title "registered social worker." This means that consumers and employers will be able to distinguish registered social workers from others who are providing a similar service. Only – only – individuals who are registered under this Act may use the title "registered social worker."

#### **5:10**

There is no restriction to the right to provide social worker service. This is an important consideration because there are many dedicated individuals in the community – some in other professions such as teachers, policemen, clergy, and nurses – who have no professional affiliation with social workers but do provide social work service. This Act allows the Alberta Association of Social Workers to establish standards and procedures which are designed to protect the public. Under this Act the association continues to have major responsibilities for governing their profession. As with other self-governing professions, the association will be responsible for the registration, the discipline, and the practice review of registered social workers. At the same time, this legislation also ensures that the association is accountable to the public and very much accountable to the public.

In this respect, there are certain features of the Act that I would like to highlight. The basic education qualification for registration as a social worker is set out in the statute as an

undergraduate degree from an approved program. As is the case with most self-governing professions, the Universities Co-ordinating Council, known as the UCC, is an independent body responsible for assessing substantial equivalence for this statute. The Universities Co-ordinating Council has been given broader authorities to consider not only academic qualifications but also practical experience when determining equivalencies, particularly in relationship to other provinces and reciprocities with other provinces, so that if a social worker practising in Saskatchewan comes here, that person will be determined for registration by their experience as well as their academic qualifications. In this way, the legislation provides a mechanism whereby individuals who have received field training in social work may also be registered under this Act.

Consistent with the new policy, this Act provides for an increased role for public representatives. There will be a minimum of two public representatives on the council of the association and one representative on the disciplinary committee. These public representatives will be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and will be paid by the government. They will play an important part in ensuring that public interest is kept in the forefront.

There will also be a greater accountability to the public in respect to disciplinary hearings following complaints. These hearings will be open to the public, of course, and there are provisions for closed hearings in certain circumstances. If the complainant requests a private hearing because of confidentiality, or the disciplinary committee determines that the interests of another person may be adversely affected, the hearing will be held in camera.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would once again like to commend the hard work and the dedication of the Alberta Association of Social Workers in the development of this Bill that is before this Assembly. At this time, I'd like to move the acceptance of Bill 4.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Chair has noticed that there are some amendments to be proposed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Avonmore and the hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar. It happens that the hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar's amendments start with section 1, whereas Edmonton-Avonmore's is in section 2. It happens also that they're duplicated. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Avonmore's is included in the list proposed by Edmonton-Gold Bar, but we can work that out as we go along. The Chair feels that Edmonton-Gold Bar should be recognized first because she has an amendment to section 1.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few comments to make about this particular Bill. My colleague from Calgary-McKnight spoke to it in second reading and acknowledged that indeed the AASW has been actively lobbying for this legislation for some time, and we are very pleased that it is finally here.

Mr. Chairman, the social work profession has served Albertans well for many years, as has the Alberta Association of Social Workers as well, who have provided great help to this province and the departments of the province in developing social work standards. They've assisted the government as it has developed social services legislation and of course have assisted in many of our communities throughout the province.

Mr. Chairman, the individual social worker in the day-to-day experiences deals with people as individuals and also with families and with communities as well as with government, and they do provide an invaluable service. They frequently are faced with the responsibility of dealing with very vulnerable people, people who are helpless, who are poor, who are poor in spirit as well as in pocketbook, and it is absolutely essential to me that those who are in this practice, who purport to be social workers, in fact have the requisite education.

Social workers frequently find themselves working with people's lives. The nature of their work is varied, but they are working with people's lives, and I think my one concern about this Bill, Mr. Chairman, is that it does not give right to title. It does grant right of title for registered social workers, but there's no right of title protection for the title of "social worker." That means that anyone in Alberta can go into business as a social worker, free from any legal threat from the government or the association. It's my understanding that British Columbia and New Brunswick have passed legislation that grants right to title exclusively to the title "social worker" to their social workers without restricting it to just registered social workers.

Further, Mr. Chairman, there is no mandatory registration required by this legislation. By not requiring mandatory registration from workers, the exclusive right to title is considerably weakened, in my view. As well, if it's our objective to have control over quality and performance, it seems to me that mandatory registration is vital.

Mr. Chairman, social workers not only perform the function of advocacy and counseling, but we find them involved extensively in social planning, in social organization, and in community development. They serve as private practitioners. They can, in fact, hang out a shingle. They are employed, as we know, in many government services, all levels of government. They work in private and in private nonprofit agencies. I was somewhat astonished by the member who presented the Bill indicating that there are a number of workers who are doing social work. I'm quoting from *Hansard*, page 213:

They don't have . . . qualifications, but they're certainly doing social work just like teachers do social work, preachers do social work, members of the clergy and policemen do social work.

That's exactly the point. I don't understand why the government has declined to expand the terms for right of title as the profession wanted. I question whether or not the government didn't want to include "social worker" under exclusive right to title because of the circumstances in the Department of Family and Social Services, where there are a large number of workers in the department who are holding positions that are classified as social worker who have no academic training in the field. If protection of title were to be extended to social worker, Mr. Chairman, those jobs would have to be reclassified. I don't think that's an impossible task, and it is one that I believe would make it clearer for people who are using government services, or using the services of a social worker exclusive of government, to understand the difference.

5:20

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I've had a written question on the Order Paper asking the government how many employees classified as social workers are actually registered social workers. The question that I asked was rejected last week, as a matter of interest. I don't know whether that's because the government doesn't have an actual reading on the qualifications or they don't want to get into the business of telling us in the House how

many of their workers have received formal training in social work.

Mr. Chairman, it's also absolutely essential that right to title is there to protect the public as well as the profession. The public need to know that a person providing counseling and support to them or to their community has the proper qualifications and training necessary. These are trusted people. They must have a proper education, and the public should have that protection, that AASW has the right to title and that no one without that training can describe himself or herself as a social worker. I also question why AASW, the council, does not have control over equivalencies. Further, I have been concerned about section 61(3) of the Act, which gives the Lieutenant Governor responsibility for making bylaws and regulations. Surely a professional organization qualified to deal with their profession should have the responsibility for doing this and not the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order in the committee, please.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of amendments, therefore, to present. These have been circulated. There are seven in total. The first five are related to the right to title, as you will see, Mr. Chairman, striking out the word "registered" in "registered social worker" in section 1(h) and section 2(1)(a). C and D, the further sections, are bringing those other sections into conformity to make it clear that the title of social worker is contained and given to the AASW council and that no one else may call themselves a social worker nor may any other government body or private organization call an employee a social worker unless they do, in fact, have that proper background.

Mr. Chairman, just to speak briefly, F is the requirement, in subsection 1, to give the social work practice the responsibility to have mandatory registration. Section 61(3) that I've already spoken to is the section related to the Lieutenant Governor making the bylaws and regulations, which I feel properly belong to the council.

Mr. Chairman, I've spoken very briefly to the amendments. I'll look forward to hearing the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore and perhaps have some comments following hers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some general comments, but I will restrict myself to the first five amendments proposed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

In presenting this Bill, the Member for Calgary-Glenmore has stated that no profession has right to title or mandatory registration. Well, I would suggest to the hon. member that she is mistaken. In fact, the profession that I belong to – that is, the profession of psychologists, which is covered by the Psychology Profession Act, on which much of the Social Work Profession Act has been modeled – states in part 1, subsection 2(2):

No person, except a chartered psychologist or registrant, shall use the title "psychologist" or an abbreviation of it, alone or in combination with another word.

That is what the social workers are wanting. That is what constitutes that ownership of title and mandatory registration. That is what this is all about, and it is simply wrong to suggest that no profession has that. That, in fact, is the mark of a profession that is in charge of itself and that is trusted to be in charge of itself. So I would say we have to support these amendments.

In working to define the social work profession, the member opposite has suggested that many people do social work without training and, often, expertise in social work. Again I believe the member demonstrates in this statement a profound lack of understanding of what it is to be a professional person. It is to suggest that doing part or purporting to do something that a profession does makes or constitutes one as a professional. The member opposite seems to be endorsing the fact that people untrained in social work can call themselves social workers; that demonstrates the need for these amendments.

Mr. Chairman, a profession involves a field of knowledge, expertise, competency, and a process of accountability as to competency and ethicalness of practice. That is why people that call themselves social workers need to be covered under a social work Act. Because some people do part of what trained social workers do, their failures and their attendant bad name often go to the profession of social work, because people that do not know and understand what it is to be a professional in fact take that name and that kind of status to themselves. We have in this province many people who have unkind and negative things to say about social workers because people who are not social workers call themselves social workers and say that they practice the profession of social work. Members of the clergy, preachers, teachers, and policemen do part of what the social work profession involves, but I daresay they do not develop case plans. They do not evaluate outcome in an objective way, nor are they bound by standards of competency and ethical behaviour. More likely, instead of doing social work, they are counseling people as to alternatives.

Social work, Mr. Chairman, is much more than that, and I would speak further on this, but in view of the time I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has moved to adjourn debate on Bill 4. All those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain Bills and reports the following: Bills 2 and 3. The committee reports progress on Bill 4. I wish to table copies of all amendments considered by the Committee of the Whole on this date for the official records of the Assembly.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The business of the House tonight will be the Hon. Dennis Anderson defending the estimates of his Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I move we now call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Is my hearing wrong? Did I hear that the motion is that the House stand adjourned until the Committee of Supply rises and reports? The sound system was acting up.

MR. GOGO: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. The motion carries. Thank you.

[The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 p.m.]