

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Thursday, October 28, 1993**

1:30 p.m.

Date: 93/10/28

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **Prayers**

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

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

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

Amen.

head: **Introduction of Visitors**

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the Legislative Assembly Mr. Robert Wenger, consul general of Switzerland based in Vancouver. Mr. Wenger was appointed to his post in June of 1992, and he is making his first official visit to Alberta at this time. He is accompanied today by Mr. Erwin Baumann, the honorary consul of Switzerland, based in Edmonton. Alberta and Switzerland have enjoyed a mutually beneficial relationship with a number of Swiss companies active in Alberta primarily in electronics, tourism, and the food processing industry. Alberta's agriculture producers are now looking to Switzerland as a potential market for food products such as dehydrated mustard powder, beef, and honey. The Swiss community in Alberta numbers approximately 12,000 individuals with several Swiss-Canadian organizations active in Edmonton and Calgary. I would ask that Consul General Wenger and Consul Baumann now rise in the Speaker's gallery and receive the warm and cordial welcome of this House.

head: **Presenting Petitions**

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for St. Albert.

MR. BRACKO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present a petition signed by 22,948 concerned Albertans demanding that the government cease and desist its privatization of Alberta liquor stores, consult with Albertans, and continue to "manage the ALCB as a revenue-generating arm of government." These are a few of the many that will be coming.

head: **Notices of Motions**

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

MR. HENRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise under Standing Order 30 to give oral notice and to advise the Assembly that I plan to move a motion to adjourn the ordinary business of the Assembly at the end of question period today to discuss the urgent matter of the government's consultation process on education and the reactions of students and parents of Alberta to this process.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise on a question of privilege. I had arranged passes for four individuals to attend . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. This is not the appropriate time to raise a question of privilege.

head: **Tabling Returns and Reports**

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This morning I had the opportunity to speak with 1,000 students at Bowness high school, and I would like to table today with the Legislature 90 copies of 14 questions and concerns that were raised with me this morning by those students.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to return my pumpkin and also say that if that's the best pumpkin a Tory can grow, I understand why our agriculture industry has problems.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MS LEIBOVICI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table four copies of three letters regarding the extension of Alberta Liquor Control Board part-time employee termination dates.

MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 23 and section 25 of the Conflicts of Interest Act I am pleased to table with the Assembly the report of the Ethics Commissioner's investigation into allegations involving the Hon. Dianne Mirosh, minister without portfolio, October 28, 1993, as submitted to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. Copies of the report are being distributed to the members.

head: **Introduction of Guests**

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Roper.

MR. CHADI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to members of this Assembly this afternoon two special guests. First is John Loney. John is the newly elected Member of Parliament for Edmonton North. Previous to that, during the '60s John was a Member of Parliament in Ontario. I'd like everyone in the Assembly to please give John Loney the warm welcome of this Assembly.

My second guest is an associate of mine and an associate of John Loney's, a businessman from Edmonton: Mr. Rod Verrier. I'd ask that he please stand and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly a delegation from Tianjin, China. Tianjin is the third largest city in China. This delegation represents Tianjin International Trust & Investment Corp., which is a major Crown corporation there, and Tianjin Pharmaceutical Administration. They along with an Alberta-based company called Tianson International Trade & Investment have formed a joint venture to promote Canada and China trade and investment. I ask that my good friends Mr. Liu Xing Wu, Mr. Yang Jin Sheng, Ms Li Na, Mr. Wang Gui Qing, Mr. Song Ping Nan, and Mr. Yang Zhou, who is their Canadian representative, stand and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Vegreville-Viking.

MR. STELMACH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the hon. Members of the Legislative Assembly a young constituent of Vegreville-Viking, an active volunteer, and a participant in community affairs: Mr. Reg Cruickshank. Would he please rise and receive a warm welcome from this Assembly.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora.

MR. SAPERS: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and to all members of the Assembly a number of grade 6 students who as a fundamental part of their education are visiting the Legislature today. James Cheng and Kyler White have brought along 55 of their classmates from Laurier Heights school in grade 6. They're accompanied by teachers Mrs. Woodrow and Mme Audet-Hanson as well as parent Heather Laing. I'd ask them all to please stand – they're in the members' gallery – and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for St. Albert.

MR. BRACKO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the Legislative Assembly Sharon Ward. Sharon is vice-chair of local 50. They represent the ALCB workers. I'd ask that she rise in the public gallery and receive the warm welcome of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 53 outstanding grade 6 students from the Daly Grove school in my constituency, Edmonton-Ellerslie. They are accompanied today by their teachers Mr. Eldon Wyman, Mrs. Mary Grant, by Mrs. Andrea Giroux*, and by one of the parents of the students Mrs. R. Sohi. I ask that they stand and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: **Ministerial Statements**
1:40

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

Government Appointments

MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today the Alberta government has introduced a comprehensive policy on appointments to more than 90 agencies, boards, and commissions, a policy that follows through on our commitment to accept the recommendations of the Auditor General in his report to this Legislature. This policy will give us an unbiased view of candidates' qualifications, candidates who are seeking a spot at the table when these agencies, boards, and commissions are making decisions that affect the economic and social well-being of Albertans.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, review panels will be appointed by the ministers responsible for these 90-plus agencies, boards, and commissions. Those review panels will use the expertise of the Public Service Commissioner's office, the department's human resources office, or private search consultants. Wherever possible, however, we'll want to use the knowledge and experience of the public, technical advisers, and/or key stakeholders.

It is a flexible and efficient policy as well. Ministers may wish to consider appointing one review panel for an entire year if there are a number of similar appointments to be made. As well, it may be appropriate for the minister to apply the policy only to the chair of the agency, board, or commission, because the Auditor General pointed out, said in his letter to me: if the agency or commission is of a significant nature.

I think we need to look no further than the Department of Environmental Protection to see an example of how well these

review panels work. When a chair for the Natural Resources Conservation Board was needed, it was a review panel that assessed the qualifications of candidates. That particular review panel included the Public Service Commissioner as well as the president of TransAlta Utilities from the private sector.

Albertans, Mr. Speaker, want a fair and efficient appointment process. They want open and accountable government. This policy delivers on that.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. deputy Leader of the Opposition.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We welcome and applaud this initiative from the Premier. It has long been Alberta Liberal policy. Our only question is: why did it take so long? The Auditor General recommended changes of this nature in his September 1992 report on NovAtel. He told the government then, over a year ago, to improve the process of making appointments to agencies and Crown corporations. The Premier, however, indicated that he didn't know which appointments the Auditor General was referring to.

Alberta Liberals presented a detailed plan for implementing these recommendations, a three-tiered process, in the Mandate for Change paper, that we released in the spring. Of concern, Mr. Speaker: the Premier released a letter that he sent to all cabinet ministers on May 25 of this year indicating that they should use review panels for appointments. Since then, however, and up until now there have been 57 appointments made without the use of any public process whatsoever.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many?

MRS. HEWES: Fifty-seven. Count them.

Mr. Speaker, while we welcome this announcement, there are, however, some questions that need to be answered. We need to know if there will be public advertisements of these positions. We need to know: what are the 90 agencies that have been identified? Will a list of these agencies and boards and corporations and commissions be released, including for instance the women's advisory council? Will the review panels be responsible for making those appointments?

It's very important I believe to all of us that the review panels are objective and are seen to be objective in themselves. Therefore, I hope that the Premier would want to make public the names of the persons who will be appointed.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we'll be watching and monitoring this new process to ensure fairness and propriety.

head: **Oral Question Period**
Education Funding

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, yesterday thousands of students demonstrated in Calgary. In response, the Premier threatened students, teachers, and parents. Today hundreds of students were outside the Legislature. They're understandably frightened about their future. My questions are to the Premier. Why didn't the Premier go out and talk and listen to those students today? Surely that's got to be a priority.

MR. KLEIN: Surely education is a priority, and surely kids who stay in the classroom to receive an education are a priority. Mr. Speaker, I've said before: I don't go out in front of mobs. You

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

know, "shall take abuse" is in my job description, but I'm not going to go out of my way to do it.

Now, if these people want to come in and talk about these issues in a reasonable, responsible way – the Minister of Education has put out a public call and has invited the leaders of student groups to come and sit down and meet with him and offer constructive ideas, ways in which we can work together. Mr. Speaker, I am – well, I will say it. These kids who are outside the Legislature today and outside McDougall Centre have been excited by a lot of bad, bad information.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, that's a shocking statement from the Premier. These are not kids. These are responsible students, and they wanted to talk to you.

Mr. Speaker, will the Premier now agree that this has become a volatile out-of-control situation? Mr. Premier, will you now take personal charge? Will you stop packing your bags and deal with this crisis?

MR. KLEIN: Last week her hon. leader was saying: Ralph, go; it's good. As a matter of fact, yesterday after the poppy ceremony he said: Ralph, when you're there, say hello to my friends in Harbin. Then he has an entirely different story in the Legislature. I would say that there's a certain amount of politics being played here. It is not shocking. It is not a shocking situation at all.

Mr. Speaker, when members of my family who are of school age and members of my colleagues' families who are of school age come home and say that their teachers are telling them that they're going to lose all their sports programs, that teachers are telling them that they're going to lose all their arts programs, that they are going to have to go to school six days a week, that they are going to be limited to math and English, that is bad information.

MRS. HEWES: You've got to understand that you're fooling around with peoples' lives here, Mr. Premier.

In reality, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has already made the decisions. Will the Premier now tell Albertans what in fact is going to be cut in education so that everybody's grandchildren will know the future of their education?

MR. KLEIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, what is shocking about this situation is Liberals standing out there and inciting these kids. That is shocking, and that is shameful.

Mr. Speaker, the roundtable process is to find out in a very reasonable way, in a straightforward way how we can restructure the system, how we can better deliver services with less money, how we can be more effective, more efficient, and find new and better ways of doing things. We invite the participation of the students in helping us to find these solutions. That is the responsible way of going about things. The irresponsible way is of course to listen to that terrible political rhetoric that comes from the other side.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for West Yellowhead.

1:50

Education Roundtables

MR. VAN BINSBERGEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rather than falsely accusing teachers, why doesn't the Premier admit that this process is totally flawed? I have some proof of this. The Minister of Education has constantly referred to sending out 75,000 roundtable discussion workbooks. As of this morning we couldn't find one constituency office that has any of these copies, including

the Minister of Education's office and the Premier's office. My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier now come clean and admit that all these consultations are just a sham?

MR. KLEIN: No, Mr. Speaker. Quite the opposite is true. This is a very worthwhile, meaningful, I think, productive process, and those people who participate in the process come out feeling quite good about it. It's only those people who want to block the process for political reasons who are upset that it's working so well really. It's only the Liberals.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I find it so strange that all this is coming from a group of people who said before the election: in the first year we are going to make \$1.1 billion in brutal cuts.

MR. VAN BINSBERGEN: Never from education, Mr. Speaker. Never.

Once again to the Premier: will he now commit himself to hold truly public consultations so that people don't have to go out into the streets and protest?

MR. KLEIN: Well, people don't have to go out on the streets and protest at any time. As a matter of fact, I'll tell you what that gets them. You would be very interested, and I would gladly table the letters if I had them here. Something magic started to happen. The silent majority out there, when they saw what was going on in Calgary yesterday, started to phone like crazy. Our phones were going off the hooks. These people saying: we are disgusted at this kind of behaviour, and we're disgusted with the Liberals. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order. [interjections] Order. Hon. members, there are several people who want to ask questions.

Final supplemental.

MR. VAN BINSBERGEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Education: will the minister agree to postpone the deadline for input of these workbooks so that the exercise at least appears to be somewhat meaningful?

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wish the member across the way would provide accurate information in terms of what other members of the Assembly have said. I have indicated that there were 27,000 workbooks that were out and we were printing more.

Secondly, with respect to the distribution of workbooks, you have to ask in order to get them. Copies were sent to all the offices here in the Legislature of all the MLAs. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Hon. Member for Redwater and the hon. deputy Leader of the Opposition, the hon. Minister of Education is trying to answer the question.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, recognizing that people want to see these results compiled, they want to see reports on the results that come in, I've also indicated that we're working hard on getting the facilitators to have the report on the roundtables. I have said that, yes, I would like those responses in by November 1 so we can get working in a more concentrated manner and have that very important information out for further consultation and discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

MR. HENRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes I feel that all the tea in China wouldn't change the Premier's mind once he's made it up.

There's obviously a problem. You can't blame teachers; you can't blame students. We have a problem. Whether you like it or not, lots of people in Alberta don't feel they're part of the consultation process. All I've been asking and all I'm asking the Premier today is: will he agree to delay decisions on education funding and host a series of public meetings around the province so that people aren't forced to be on these Legislature steps demonstrating and they're not forced to hold their own roundtables in Calgary? Would the Premier please agree to have public meetings around this province so Albertans can have their say?

MR. KLEIN: First of all, before I turn this over to the Minister of Education, because I think he will tell you that indeed that is happening and it has happened, I want to make it abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, that nobody – nobody – is being forced to demonstrate. Nobody has ever been forced to demonstrate.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, first of all, we've made the information, the accurate information, which I hope people will use, available to people all across this province through the workbook process. Secondly, I have said in this Legislature that I welcome the local meetings that are being held. We look forward to those discussions and the recommendations that arise from them. I don't know if the hon. member opposite is saying that we should ask those to be shut down and have another round of consultations and meetings. Those meetings are important too, and we look forward to the response from those meetings.

MR. HENRY: I wonder why the minister or the Premier weren't at the meetings with 1,600 other Calgarians last night. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Is that the question?

MR. HENRY: No, that's not.

I'd like to ask the Premier if he could allay some of the concerns that have been expressed by parents and students and educators. Rather than talk about the projected \$369 million cut out of education, exactly what are the plans? What's the plan for cutting in year 1, year 2, year 3? Please answer.

MR. KLEIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. member hasn't been listening or refuses to open his ears and pay attention. We have said that over the next four years, by fiscal 1996-97, we will eliminate the deficit. As a matter of fact, we put in place a Deficit Elimination Act to achieve that. We know that we have to find new and better ways of doing things to make those savings. The three-year business plans will be tabled in very short order. The results of the roundtable process will come forward with solid recommendations, and I fully suspect that those recommendations will attack not the students, not the kids, because we want to provide good, quality services for the kids . . .

MR. HENRY: You're already doing that.

MR. KLEIN: Just a moment.

. . . but will attack the administrative side of the educational system and the health care system and so on. Those are the areas where we are trying to achieve savings: in the administration of these services, not at the line level and certainly not at the patient level or the student level.

MR. HENRY: I wish students and teachers believed the Premier.

I'd like to ask the Premier: instead of hightailing it off to China with his tail between his legs, why doesn't he . . .

Speaker's Ruling Parliamentary Language

MR. SPEAKER: Order. [interjections] Order. That is inappropriate language to be asking a question in, and it will be disallowed.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw. [interjections] Order. [interjections] Order on the government side also. You have a member who wants to ask a question.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw.

Public Employees' Wage Rollbacks

MR. HAVELOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It would appear that a majority of union representatives, including the ATA, have rejected this government's request for a 5 percent voluntary wage rollback, though it should be noted that some unions and members in the health sector have expressed that they would consider such a rollback. Regarding the education sector it has been suggested that some teachers have gone so far as to consider strike action and encourage students to protest budget cuts. My question is for the Minister of Labour: if teachers and other public-sector employees do not accept voluntary rollbacks, assuming this government has the authority to do so – and I believe it does – would you legislate such rollbacks?

MR. BRUSEKER: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

2:00

MR. DAY: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, it wouldn't be a minister legislating any rollback. It would be a decision of government. Quite frankly, we're not asking people to come to that conclusion. We're saying to them: quit saying, "what if we don't" and think about what if you do; think about the possibilities of voluntarily looking at the type of compensation reduction that would be the least burdensome on you. That's where we're at, and that's what we are continuing to ask.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplemental question.

MR. HAVELOCK: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again to the Minister of Labour: would you consider deeming teachers to be an essential service, thereby rendering a complete removal of services by the ATA through strike action illegal?

MR. DAY: Well, Mr. Speaker, at times like this when there is contention as we've seen over the last couple of days, we do hear in a more consistent way from Albertans who are suggesting that very thing, that one of the elements that should take place is a removal of the right for teachers to strike. However, one minister can't just unilaterally bring about a piece of legislation, so I would suggest to the member that if he feels that's what people want, he needs to take that to his constituency and get a sense of that. That type of proposal would have to go through a number of steps, including the standing policy committee and government and public consultation. So if that's what he feels is needed, then I encourage him to follow those steps.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplemental.

MR. HAVELOCK: Yes. Thank you. This one is to the Minister of Education. Will you investigate the allegations that teachers

have been encouraging student protests to determine whether such actions contravene the teachers professional code of ethics or the Teaching Profession Act?

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I will be in contact with the chairmen of the major school boards and be discussing the whole issue of the student protests and will inquire with regard to that certainly. Also I'd like to indicate that as a professional association the Alberta Teachers' Association does have a code of professional conduct and it does have disciplinary procedures and bylaws. I'm sure the association is interested in ensuring that accurate information is provided to everybody in the education sector, including students, and that representation on various matters is made in the appropriate way. That is the avenue that is open for any conduct of this type that is alleged by the member.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Beverly.

Liquor Stores

MS HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inner-city communities are facing enough challenges already without the proliferation of liquor stores. Many of these neighbourhoods are already struggling to revitalize themselves and their communities in the face of considerable social challenges, including problems associated with alcohol. My question is to the Premier. The Premier is gone. The Deputy Premier, please. Mr. Deputy Premier, why did your government not take time to conduct a social impact study on the consequences of privatization of liquor sales considering the devastating effect that it could have on some of these communities?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'll ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs to deal with that, as he is the lead minister with respect to this matter. Certainly there have been numerous discussions and debates in this Legislature with respect to that. It seems to me that the operative word from the hon. member was "could," and we should put the word "could" in parenthesis in terms of responding to the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

DR. WEST: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In working on the privatization model, we recognized that for decades there have been certain areas within our society that have more social problems than other areas. On the alcohol-related basis, not long ago there was a store in a certain area in Edmonton where we actually worked with various groups and agencies and the city and opened that store at 8 o'clock in the morning in order to offset some of the potential purchases of Lysol products and other products that individuals were using which were damaging their health. We have certainly recognized that, and as each city and municipality addresses those areas within their city, they must go to their bylaws and regulations on zoning. If they feel that there's a social impact to that, they have the full force of the Municipal Government Act and the rights to set bylaws in this area and to look at the zoning.

There are areas in the city – and I'll expand one more time – where the advance of class D licences will not be the worst thing that's in there socially. I mean, there are a multiplicity of hotels in some areas that are already there and have been entrenched in that zoning for the last 30, 40 years, and some of them rate in high numbers in local areas. Therefore, the essence of a class D

licence, many of which were going to those hotels, doesn't increase or decrease the access or the social problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplemental question.

MS HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Why won't the government place a moratorium on privatization with appropriate consultation with different communities, not just downtown communities but neighbourhoods where there are no hotels, and talk to the people there about the implications of the liberalization of alcohol that's occurring?

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, again I say that it's a municipal bylaw issue. It's not an issue of privatization; it's an issue of zoning. I might add this at the end of this answer: in Canada and in the province of Alberta since 1982, we have seen a 26 to 30 percent overall decrease of alcoholic products. Let me give an example: a 40 percent decrease in Alberta since 1982 in spirits sales with an increase of 400,000 people; from 1982 to 1994 a 40 percent decrease with 400,000 more people. Let me put it this way: for every 10 bottles of whiskey that were sold in 1982, there are only six sold in Alberta now with 400,000 more people.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplemental.

MS HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, will you meet with a group of community leaders, a particular group from the downtown, at their request to discuss the impact that privatization will have on their neighbourhood?

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, I think I've answered that. I would say that first they will meet with the municipality, the city of Edmonton, which you're referring to, because therein lies the answer to their concerns on zoning and the various bylaws and business licences that go with these class D licences.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Vegreville-Viking.

Rural Hospitals

MR. STELMACH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rural hospital boards are meeting this week in Red Deer at their annual conference. One of the concerns discussed is that as government reduces operating grants across the board for rural hospitals, some rural hospitals will simply not be able to operate because they won't have the funds available. Does the minister have a plan for a funding system for rural hospitals that will recognize differences in services offered and, as a result, will be equitable and fair?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, we have a unique funding plan in Alberta today for acute care hospitals. In that funding plan hospitals are measured for efficiency as to how they provide care and indeed are funded therefore. This has enabled us not to put new dollars in but to reallocate existing dollars based on an objective performance criteria. There are 53 hospitals that are currently excluded from that hospital performance index, which is the basis of the plan. These are indeed the hospitals that the member refers to, as well as five speciality hospitals which are excluded. We have been looking at this issue with the rural hospitals and would hope that we can address these seeming inequities in the very near future.

2:10

MR. STELMACH: Mr. Speaker, what criteria will be used in establishing the fair and equitable formula for rural hospitals?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, we would expect that we would use criteria to establish a formula for rural hospitals similar to what we did for the total acute care funding plan. Some of those were that we should provide similar payment for similar work, that the system should encourage hospitals to use alternative mechanisms to reduce the length of stay, that it should promote cost efficiency and cost reduction, and that it should limit the disparity between hospitals of the same case mix and volume. It should provide a budget that will ensure access to health care in the communities. Those are really the five principles that we have used. I think the funding reform is imperative, and we want to ensure that our funding incentives match where the system should go in the future. I should say that Alberta is certainly leading the way in this initiative.

MR. STELMACH: Final question to the minister: are there any special considerations that rural facilities are looking at in terms of developing this formula?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, rural hospitals themselves have been very involved in the formulation of a plan to fund rural hospitals, as were the larger hospitals fully involved and still are today in the hospital performance index. Suffice to say that when you introduce anything new, it takes some period of adjustment, and not everybody will be happy with what occurs. The system was asked to design a system that would reward efficiencies, and obviously if you fall on the other side of that, you're not going to be especially happy with the formula. Therefore, it's extremely important that the rural hospitals themselves, and a good cross section of them, be involved in the design of this formula. That is who sits on the committee today, and that is who will design the formula. The formula for larger hospitals was not designed by Alberta Health; it was designed by the hospitals themselves. The formula for rural hospitals will be designed by rural hospitals not by Alberta Health.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Liquor Control Board Employees

MS LEIBOVICI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is not rhetoric. The treatment of ALCB part-time employees is just another example of this government's noncaring, nonblinking attitude. This time it's towards its own employees. While this government tries to fine students for not attending school, it's attempting to break its own labour laws. My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Why are part-time ALCB workers being forced to take casual positions where they lose all benefits and have only day-to-day job security?

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, I think if you understood the component that makes up the work at the ALCB stores, you would better understand perhaps why the terms part-time, casual, and full-time carry different benefits under the collective agreement. "Casual" can mean anything from those that do work two or three days a week to those that come in at Christmas during the rush times to help out at the stores to unload the trucks and the pallets and to help shelve the product. If we were to address all casual employees in the same reference to full-time or to general service part-time employees, then we would indeed be setting a precedent that I don't know would be right, let alone feasible, for any business whether it was government or those in the private sector.

I would just say that in looking at this, the general service part-time employees are permanent and receive all benefits including

position abolishment and severance position under the collective agreement. But as you roll it all into the 1,500, you leave the impression with Albertans that 1,500 people were of a nature that were in the collective agreement as full-time except that they were just named casual. That's not true, and I don't think that anybody in any place would say that common sense prevailed when somebody working two or three days, albeit for a long time – they had made a choice in their life, and they were supplementing their incomes from other sources. I sympathize, because that was part of their income, their livelihood, but it can't be addressed under the collective agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplemental question.

MS LEIBOVICI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My first supplemental. You've evaded the question. Are you prepared to rescind these original termination notices and give proper notice as is required?

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, the personnel department of the ALCB has carefully worked with the union and with the collective agreement and to the best of my knowledge have met the full requirements in serving notice.

MS LEIBOVICI: My second supplemental is: will you at least write a letter to the Unemployment Insurance Commission to confirm that these job losses are not voluntary?

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as a matter of notice and check with the department and the Department of Labour, which is working with this situation, and see how that follows through with the unemployment insurance commitments.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Wainwright.

North American Free Trade Agreement

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism. Alberta exports approximately 70 percent of everything it produces and depends heavily on trade arrangements with other countries. In his first news conference since the election, the Prime Minister said that he may not implement the North American free trade agreement law passed recently unless key changes are made. The Liberal campaign platform promised to change or abrogate the deal. What impact will that have on Alberta's economy?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, comments were made in the Assembly on Tuesday with respect to this particular matter. The hon. member is absolutely correct. Trade and the exportation of goods out of this province are paramount. There's a direct relationship between the nearly \$19 billion a year of exports we have out of this province and the magnitude of job participation that we have. Every \$1 billion worth of trade losses that we have relates perhaps to 18,000 jobs.

The Premier will be leaving very shortly to go to the Far East to help maximize our export, but here in North America that's our number one market. It would be very, very sad for the Canadian economy and it would be very difficult for the Alberta economy if in fact we were to go backwards rather than forwards with respect to the signing of the North American free trade agreement. We sincerely hope that the words coming out of the mouth of the new Prime Minister are simply nothing more than rhetoric in this regard.

MR. FISCHER: Will the minister or the Premier be in touch with the Prime Minister to let him know what an extremely negative impact this would have on Alberta?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, when this Assembly dealt with a congratulatory message, part of the message that would be forwarded to the newly-elected leaders was a question with respect to expectations. On that very day the Premier conveyed a congratulatory message to the Prime Minister to be, and we'll be following up very shortly with conveyance of other documents to Prime Minister Chrétien. I suspect that by the end of next week we'll have a pretty good understanding of who will be in the federal cabinet, and one of our first contacts, should there be a cabinet minister appointed from the province of Alberta, will be an early arrangement with that particular individual to convey to him as well as to all of our other Members of Parliament from this province the importance of Alberta's participation, the importance of Canada's participation, with a signature to the North American free trade agreement. We're a little worried these days that these messages coming out of Canada may in fact cause difficulties with the American administration in Washington, D.C., and have some of the opponents of the North American free trade agreement become more aggressive and would in fact put pressure on President Clinton himself with his efforts in this regard.

Trade is vital to the economy of Alberta. Jobs are needed for our young people. We want our young people to have opportunities, and they're directly related to manufacturing and exportation of products out of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplemental?

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford.

2:20 Driver Training and Testing

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister responsible for Municipal Affairs has maintained a very, very firm position that driving schools and driver examinations should not mix. My question to the minister responsible: is the minister aware of any situations within the province where such a conflict could arise?

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, I'm not at the present time, but if the hon. member is making notation of something that he knows that I don't, then please bring it to my attention.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring to the minister's attention a situation in Drumheller where an individual who owns 25 percent of a driving school has been allowed to take the five-day driver examination and I expect will shortly be giving driver exams. I'm asking the minister: if I send the information over to him, will he investigate the matter?

DR. WEST: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, my last question to the minister: is the minister prepared to table in this House a copy of the findings of his investigation?

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, until such an investigation took place, if it does take place, one would have to say that because of confidential information that may be revealed during that, I can't commit to that here. You're making an allegation against certain individuals that may or may not be true. That will be weighed, and I'll certainly respond to you.

Let me just say that there is a history in the province of Alberta of the driver schools having had examination rights at one time, and it was removed because it got into arm's-length dealings that were viewed not to be in the best interests of examination. Therefore I take what you say seriously. We had stipulated to the people in the registry process as well as the motor vehicles that they not be involved in a driver training school, and they had to divest themselves 100 percent from any driver training school in order to go for either examiner or one of the registries in the city. So, indeed, bring me forth the information. We will look at it and follow up from that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Lethbridge-West.

Ambulance Service

MR. DUNFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm about to ask a question of the Minister of Health about who pays, but I want in my preamble to recognize that of course with hospitals being 100 percent funded, it's obviously the taxpayer. I would like the question answered in the sense of who directly pays. It deals with ambulance service. When we have a patient that is transferred from a regional hospital or a rural hospital into a hospital in Calgary or Edmonton, if they are transported by ground transport or air transport, who pays?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, as I understand the question, it is paid by the government or by the insurance program or by the program for ambulances. I think the key to the question is that if it is a transfer from a hospital to a hospital, then it is paid by the Alberta government.

MR. DUNFORD: My understanding was that ground transportation might come out of a hospital budget. If that is the case and if air transportation comes directly from Alberta Health, what are the relative costs between ground transportation and air transportation?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, that clarifies the first question quite a lot. I'm sorry. I apologize to the hon. member. Alberta Health does pay in both cases, because we provide the hospital budget as well as we provide the air ambulance budget. But, indeed, they are separate, because the hospital in their budget has funding for ambulance transfers, whereas if it is an air ambulance, it is paid directly by Alberta Health. So I hope that clarifies it. We do pay in both cases.

The relative expense: air ambulance is much more costly in most cases than ground ambulance. I think that's obvious by the very nature of the machines. However, they are used for critical cases, and I do not think you can measure a cost against the necessity to move somebody in a very fast way in a critical situation.

MR. DUNFORD: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that hospital boards are discharging patients, moving them to emergency, and then air transporting them to a hospital?

MRS. McCLELLAN: No, Mr. Speaker, the minister is not aware of that, and if that is indeed the case, I would appreciate any substantive information that would qualify that being passed to me.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-McClung.

Health Services Work Force

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Liberal MLAs are receiving literally hundreds of letters and calls from members of the Health Sciences Association expressing their outrage at the multiskilling, deskilling, and professional downgrading initiatives which are literally eroding their professionalism and taking their jobs. This group includes, of course, dieticians, pharmacists, X-ray technicians, respiratory technologists, and many other such health care professionals. Will the Minister of Health please confirm that multiskilling and deskilling are really just code words, euphemisms meaning that health care professionals trained in one area are being forced to perform functions in another area, functions for which they simply are not properly trained?

MRS. McCLELLAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I would not confirm that at all. I think all of the professions in health are disciplined by Acts. The member responsible for the professions and occupations Act might want to comment, as well as the Minister of Labour who is responsible for the administration of a number of Acts that health workers are under, as well as I am.

I think the issue is more whether we are matching skills to jobs and in fact that jobs are changing. The skill level required to meet those needs is changing as well. Let me assure the hon. member that I believe the adherence to the Acts these workers may be under in health disciplines is being adhered to today.

MR. MITCHELL: Does the minister not understand that it is her across-the-board, arbitrary, unplanned cuts, forced initially on hospitals, which in turn is forcing them to implement these code word initiatives – deskilling, cross training, professional downgrading – which ultimately means that the cuts are being borne yet again by another group in the health care industry, Health Sciences Association workers?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, I would say no. First of all, the \$122 million in cuts that I announced on October 4 of this year is 2.8 percent of my budget. Secondly, I would say that today, even with the slash and burn that we have heard from across the way, we are still funding health at the same degree that we were two years ago. Thirdly, I do not believe that hospitals, who have the reasoned and reasonable and responsible authority to govern patient care, would in any way jeopardize patient care by any of the tactics the hon. member has outlined. I have to reiterate: if there is a concern within a discipline, there is an appropriate way to look at that and to follow through on it. I think these are rather serious allegations, and the member should consider substantiating them.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour wishes to augment.

MR. DAY: Yes, supplementary. I spoke with about 150 members, as a matter of fact, of the Health Sciences Association last Friday. They didn't raise this as a particular issue. I'm not saying that it's not an issue with them. The member said that they've received hundreds of letters. If he could get those to me this afternoon, I'd be happy to respond. But this afternoon, because I know you've got them sitting on your desk.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the member should drag himself into the 20th century before we get into the 21st century, because, in fact, more and more union groups are coming and talking about the fact that they need to be multiskilled so that their workers can move across a variety of sectors. Get with the 20th century here.

MR. MITCHELL: Get with the Health Sciences Association professionals who are writing the letters, Mr. Labour Minister. Maybe you should read your mail, and maybe you should listen to what is being said. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order. [interjections] Order. Does the hon. member have a final supplemental?

2:30

MR. MITCHELL: The Minister of Health in the answer to her first question alluded to this amorphous idea or this vague idea that somehow health care professionals are being restructured and their jobs are being changed for some legitimate reason. If that's the case, could the minister please table here and now or shortly after, as soon as possible – I'm sure it's sitting on her desk – the health care plan, the labour force deployment plan that shows us exactly how many of what kind of health care workers we will need in what areas of this province, in what institutions, in five years and in 10 years?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, the hospitals, who are responsible for patient care, have an ongoing commitment to patient care. I should say that a great many of our hospitals, in fact I think most, work with their staffs to ensure that they are meeting the needs of the patients in those hospitals. That is the responsibility of the individual hospitals in this province. I take great exception to the member alluding to the fact that our hospitals are not carrying out those responsibilities. Those are the things that I would want to hear about. I would want to hear that hospitals indeed are jeopardizing patient care. I do not believe that is the fact today. The fact is that skills and jobs are changing, and I believe our work force is changing with that. I think that has to continue, and we should work together to that end.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Bow.

Bow River Dredging

MRS. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Environmental Protection. Some of my constituents have expressed concerns about a dredging operation in one of the main channels in the Bow River near Canmore. Mr. Minister, could you tell the Assembly if your department indeed approved this project and why?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Environmental Protection.

MR. EVANS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Yes, indeed, a Water Resources Act permit was issued for the dredging work in the main channel in Canmore, in the Bow River. What happened is that back in 1974 there was a major flood in Canmore. At that time the department assisted in opening up the main channel and also prepared a secondary channel to improve the flow. Over the years there has been gravel buildup along the main channel, and a number of the residents along the main channel are concerned about flooding and about the fact that the water flow through that channel has decreased considerably. So back in June people from my department met with the town of Canmore and proposed a plan. The plan was endorsed by the town in July of this year, and in August there was a public meeting in the town to give the people of the town an opportunity to learn about what was going on and to input into that decision.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplemental question, please.

MRS. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, will the siltation which is caused by the dredging affect our fish resources such as the brown trout and the Rocky Mountain whitefish, which are currently spawning?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The process that is being conducted in order to dredge out the main channel has been used a number of other times along the Bow River, the Saskatchewan River, major rivers. It involves the preparation of a cofferdam and literally drying out the main channel so that the work can be done, to minimize any kind of siltation. That was done. In fact, additional siltation capture basins were built into the system, and then at the very lowest water level time the water was allowed to go back into that main channel. My fish and wildlife officers and in fact the river engineering branch are quite confident that there is a minimum amount of siltation and that there should not be a negative impact on either of those species of fish.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplemental.

MRS. LAING: Thank you. Mr. Minister, will this minimum siltation have an effect on the great water quality that we now enjoy in the beautiful city of Calgary?

MR. EVANS: Well, that's a very relevant question. I'm sure there are a number of Calgarians who are concerned about this. As I say, though, given the techniques that have been used and the great concern and considerations for siltation, I do not believe there will be any siltation problems even downstream from Canmore, but certainly not into the city of Calgary.

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

head: **Members' Statements**

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Egmont.

Adolescent Recovery Centre

MR. HERARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last Friday the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View and I attended a graduation at the Alberta Adolescent Recovery Centre located in my constituency. This was not the usual graduation for academic achievement but a graduation into personhood and a new life for a lovely young lady and her entire family, formerly torn apart by the ravages of substance abuse, addiction, and child prostitution. We listened as staff, peers, family, and Jennifer, now only 17, described the pain of a former life where 15 months earlier she was being beaten by the pimp who was feeding her addiction. We heard from her then dysfunctional family that is now back together again. We felt the positive effect of Jennifer's success on the 24 adolescents and their families who are currently at the centre fighting for a second chance at a meaningful life.

Mr. Speaker, AARC not only treats adolescent addicts but involves the siblings and parents whose lives also take on new direction and meaning. We heard from a school counselor who spoke of the tremendous asset these adolescents become in our high schools as role models and their exceptional academic achievements. We learned that many of these graduates return to the centre for training as peer counsellors to share the pain and the love that nurtures the program's success. This is not a 9 to 5 program. We learned how clients live with families who have

successfully gone through the program and now open their homes so other families can function again.

What is incredible, Mr. Speaker, is that this centre receives no government funding. Why are we the stewards of a justice system that can afford to incarcerate adolescents, with very questionable outcomes, but we can't afford at least in part to pay to return adolescents and their families to a loving and meaningful life?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

Education for the Disadvantaged

DR. MASSEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Within walking distance of this Legislature one can see shining high-rise buildings, posh private clubs, and well-heeled executives scurrying to and from their offices. Also within walking distance one may see slum housing, deteriorating neighbourhoods, and schools filled with students who have a better than average chance of being undermotivated, undereducated, and members of an underclass. Alberta neither morally nor economically can afford this underclass becoming permanent. Our schools, colleges, and universities have a special obligation to help this at-risk population to move into the mainstream of Alberta life. What might be done? Allow me to make a few suggestions.

Urban colleges and universities should move into these neighbourhoods and provide a full range of services to students at risk. Unique, high-quality degree programs need to be offered to accommodate the distinctive needs of these young Albertans. Secondly, urban colleges and universities need to develop programs to serve two unique student bodies in these neighbourhoods: one for the 18 to 24 year olds as they leave area high schools and a second for the 25-year-old-plus students. Third, colleges and universities need to start working with the students in these areas on programs beginning at the fifth and sixth grade levels that will carry them into our postsecondary school system. Fourth, employers: employers need to turn to colleges and universities to identify, educate, and re-educate the employees they need from these areas.

Students in these communities present a special challenge to our education system. Public education is designed to ensure that each Albertan fulfills his or her potential.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Bow.

2:40 Substance Abuse Prevention Magazine

MRS. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to profile a new substance abuse prevention magazine called *A Conversation About Substance Abuse*. This magazine was done in a new way of doing business. It will provide the public with the information they need to know to protect their family, friends, and the community from alcohol and drug abuse. This magazine is the result of the efforts of AADAC and a number of major sponsors from the private sector, such as Golden West Broadcasting, Monarch Broadcasting, Canada Safeway, and Coca-Cola Ltd. In total 135,000 copies of this free magazine will be distributed through Canada Safeway stores, from AADAC offices, and by request to senior and junior high schools. The magazines will be distributed in Calgary, Medicine Hat, Grande Prairie, Red Deer, and Lethbridge.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to acknowledge and congratulate the Calgary AADAC staff and community education services who spearheaded this project with the private sector. I would also like to commend the sponsors for their participation and their demon-

stration of caring which will help to address this very serious problem. AADAC's contribution to this worthwhile project was its staff and its internationally recognized expertise in the addictions field. The private-sector sponsors provided the funding. This partnership is an excellent model of doing business in a new way, which is exactly what Premier Klein has promised Albertans.

I'm pleased to file four copies today with the Assembly, and copies of the magazine will be delivered to all members of this Assembly.

Once again, sincere congratulations to all participants on this new partnership, truly a new way of doing business. Thank you.

head: **Projected Government Business**

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Opposition House Leader.

MR. MITCHELL: I was just going to ask what he was going to answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. EVANS: I think we've sped up the process somewhat, Mr. Speaker.

The projected government business for the week of November 1 through the 4th. On Monday in the afternoon Government Bills and Orders for Second Reading, Bills 17, 18, 11, 12, and 10; Committee of the Whole, if we have time, 17, 18, 11, 12, 10, and 8. Then in the evening Committee of Supply, Alberta heritage savings trust fund, capital projects division.

On Tuesday, Private Bills for Second Reading and Committee of the Whole if time permits. That would be between 2:30 and 4:30. At 4:30 Government Bills and Orders for Second Reading, as per the Order Paper, and Committee of the Whole, as well as per the Order Paper. In the evening, Committee of Supply, the capital fund.

On Wednesday next in the evening we would have Committee of Supply, the capital fund, with the vote to be called on the capital fund estimates.

On Thursday in the afternoon in Committee of Supply, the lottery fund, and the vote to be called on the lottery estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Chair could inquire with regard to the order of business for the Bills that were mentioned. They did not seem to be numerical. Did that indicate that the government will be calling them in the order listed or amongst those?

MR. EVANS: That's correct, Mr. Speaker. The intended order is as I indicated.

MR. SPEAKER: Before proceeding to the points of order that are to be raised, the Chair would recognize the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre on a point of privilege which he gave notice of.

Privilege

Admission of Guests to the Gallery

MR. HENRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise under Standing Order 15(1) and (5) and as well under *Beauchesne* 92, 114(1). The substance of my question of privilege is that earlier this afternoon I met with four individuals in my office, and they asked if they could come and view the proceedings this afternoon. I arranged for passes to be available for them, and when they actually came to be seated in the public gallery, they were refused admission. I believe that restricts my ability to operate effectively as a member. I don't see any reason why these people were

refused. They were in an orderly manner; they were dressed appropriately. They wished to simply view the proceedings because they had visited my office earlier today. I would ask that the Speaker investigate the matter. If indeed my information is correct, I believe I have a question of privilege that I think the Speaker should rule on.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, then the Chair will certainly take this point under consideration and will report next week.

The hon. Member for Calgary-North West on a point of order.

Point of Order **Allegations against Teachers**

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My point of order today stems from the question as put forward by the Member for Calgary-Shaw. I rise under Standing Order 23(h), "makes allegations against another member" and Standing Order 23(i), "imputes false or unavowed motives to another member." In his question the member talked about teachers inciting students to leave their classroom. Now, at last count – and it may not be a correct count – there are eight former teachers in this Legislature, none of whom, as far as I am aware, were involved with inciting students to leave their classroom yesterday. So the point that I suppose the member was attempting to make is inappropriate.

If the member is casting his net a little broader to include all members of the teaching profession, I would cite *Beauchesne Parliamentary Rules & Forms*, sixth edition, protected persons, 493(4). Quote:

The Speaker has cautioned Members to exercise great care in making statements about persons who are outside the House and unable to reply.

Mr. Speaker, the comments made about teachers, whether they apply to those within the House or those outside of the House, are inappropriate and should be withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. EVANS: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've heard the argument by the hon. member opposite. I certainly would take issue with his assertion that the hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw was making reference to individuals in this House who are from their backgrounds, by earlier profession, teachers. It is quite clear that it is improper to speak of anyone in this House other than as an hon. member and in their capacity as an hon. member. I believe the Member for Calgary-Shaw is well aware of that, so I am quite certain that that was not the intention, nor do I feel that it is a reasonable conclusion for the hon. member opposite to have come to.

His reference on the larger issue, to teachers in the province of Alberta, and his reference to 493(4) of *Beauchesne* I think are incorrect as well, Mr. Speaker. Clearly (4) is talking about persons, speaking about a reference to individuals, although it doesn't name individuals here. It's clearly a reference to individuals, not a group of persons. I believe that's the reference which is intended to be protected under that particular section of *Beauchesne*. I would ask for your comments on both of those positions.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw.

MR. HAVELOCK: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to set the record straight, I would like to reiterate what I did state in

question period. I believe the words which the hon. Member for Calgary-North West may have found offensive were as follows:

It has been suggested that some teachers have gone so far as to consider strike action and encourage students to protest budget cuts. I believe that is the statement which is under consideration. In no way was I attempting to suggest that any member of this House had certainly done that. I think, too, it's quite clear that I was simply relaying what I had heard not only through the media but from my constituents, and then I followed up with a question to the Minister of Education to investigate those allegations.

MR. SPEAKER: In response to the point of order raised by the hon. Member for Calgary-West, and after hearing the . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: Calgary-North West.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-North West. The Chair apologizes. I've got a block. I don't know what it is.

. . . contributions by the hon. Deputy Government House Leader and the hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw, the Chair believes that the context in which the words were used certainly didn't apply to anybody in this Chamber. Certainly no individuals were mentioned. I guess the only comment the Chair would make to all members of the House: you must be careful not to offend sensibilities. Certainly the words were not in any way out of order.

Might we revert to Introduction of Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

The hon. Member for Red Deer-South.

head: **Introduction of Guests**
2:50 (reversion)

MR. DOERKSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 24 students and five adults from the Red Deer Christian school who are seated in the members' gallery. The teacher that accompanies them is Mr. Bob Barthel, and there are four parents Mr. Ken Quaife, Mrs. Marcella Barthel, Mrs. Arlene Deacon, Mrs. Donna Nelson. When I was talking to them before coming up here, I asked a group of them: why do you think these students are out here protesting? Young Mr. Deacon, I believe . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair has ruled that there will not be political statements of any kind made with reference to the introduction of guests.

MR. DOERKSEN: I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

We'll ask the students to rise, and please give them the traditional welcome of the Assembly.

Speaker's Ruling Answers by Nonministers

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre in response to a Standing Order 30 request, the Chair feels compelled, seeing this is the last day of the week, to give the explanation with regard to a previous ruling. During question period previously the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud put a question to the Provincial Treasurer which was answered by the Government House Leader. The Member for Edmonton-

Whitemud then posed a supplementary question, which was answered. The member then asked his second supplemental question, to which there was a reply. After the reply the Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan rose as chair of the Public Accounts Committee and asked if she could supplement the last answer given by the Provincial Treasurer.

The Chair would not allow the Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan to supplement the answer. The Opposition House Leader asked the Chair for an explanation of his ruling pursuant to Standing Order 13(2). The Chair did explain but said that it would undertake to see if there was any precedent for chairs of Legislative Assembly committees to supplement answers to questions which were asked of government. As the Chair explained at the time, the principle of question period is to allow a brief question seeking information about an important matter of some urgency which falls within the administrative responsibility of the government or of the specific minister to whom it is addressed. See *Beauchesne 409*.

Beauchesne also states in paragraph 410(5) that the primary purpose of the Question Period is the seeking of information and calling the Government to account. Finally, *Beauchesne* states in paragraph 410(10):

The subject matter of questions must be within the collective responsibility of the Government or the individual responsibilities of Ministers.

This Assembly has over time developed its own variations on these principles. Some of these are as follows. One, questions may be directly put to members who chair committees of the Assembly. See, for example, *Hansard* of March 26, 1991, and *Erskine May* at page 286. Such questions would have to relate to the committee as it is "directly concerned with the working of the House," to quote *May*.

Two, questions may be directly put to members who chair the standing policy committees of the government but only on procedural matters and agenda of the standing policy committees. See the previous ruling of the Chair of October 7, 1993. Such members may supplement answers given by members of Executive Council but only – and the Chair emphasizes "only" – within their narrow range of responsibility.

Three, questions may also be directly put to members who by virtue of chairing some statutory bodies, although not members of Executive Council, perform certain executive duties. Such members may also supplement answers given by members of Executive Council but only – and the Chair again emphasizes "only" – within their narrow range of responsibility.

The present issue is whether the chair of a legislative committee can supplement an answer given by a member of government. The question was put to a member of Executive Council. Information was sought of government about a matter within the responsibility of government or of the particular minister. This is in accordance with the principle set out above.

The Chair does not see how the chair of a committee of the Assembly could add to information offered by the government with respect to a matter within the responsibility of government. It is fundamental that the Assembly is not the government, nor is the government the Assembly. While the two entities sit together in this Chamber, they are quite distinct. Chairs of committees of the Assembly would not be privy in that capacity to information possessed by government relating to governmental responsibilities. If information is required of a member who chairs a committee of the Assembly, a question may be put directly to that member. Members who chair committees of the Assembly cannot supplement information given by members of the government. No previous case of such supplementary information being given by a committee chair has been found.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

head: **Request for Emergency Debate**
Education Roundtables

MR. HENRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise, as I said earlier, under Standing Order 30(1) and (2), et cetera, to move that we adjourn the ordinary business of the Assembly to discuss the urgent matter of the government's consultation process on education and the reactions of students and parents to this process in Alberta. Speaking to the urgency, often in the Assembly positions are taken, and with the excitement back and forth sometimes things seem a bit inflamed. However, there are some facts that I think are important for us to look at when we're discussing whether we should go ahead with adjourning our business to discuss the education consultation process.

It's very clear, Mr. Speaker, that many Albertans are not feeling a part of this process. I point out demonstrations in Calgary yesterday of several thousand students as well as demonstrations here. There are roundtables. I don't want to go into the details; that can be saved for debate. Sixteen thousand parents met yesterday. The government's consultation process includes the meetings that were held prior to the current model as discussed in the workbook being presented. What this has led to is a lot of excitement on both sides of the House and anxiety on all sides of the House and all throughout Alberta. Even today we've heard that there were demonstrations of law-abiding students outside this Legislature, and we heard suggestions that teachers were actually inciting these. I think it's a dangerous situation when we start making allegations that affect people outside this House.

The Premier indicated today that he was inundated with phone calls. I believe our side has been inundated with phone calls. I believe we will not have another chance in this Assembly before we adjourn to debate the consultation process prior to a budget being tabled. The consultation process deals not only with budget matters but with fundamental restructuring and changes to the education delivery system. Outside of asking questions, there is no opportunity to actually debate the process with regard to the discussions around the province on education.

It is very clear that there appears to be a lot of misinformation, and I've heard government members suggest that some people – implying several others, implying members on this side as well as members of other professions – are providing misinformation. From attending the roundtables, I've also heard allegations. People believe the decisions have already been made, and they question the validity of the process. I think it's very important that we take the time now to debate and to get on the record exactly what is the process and what are the options before we see a further escalation in the Alberta public. I don't believe we should be holding teachers responsible or any individual member responsible, but there is a situation out there where a lot of people are concerned.

3:00

I think it's unprecedented in the history of this Legislature to have students leave their classrooms. These are good students who have left their classrooms to come and try to send a message. I met with several of them today. They feel that they are not part of the process. We need to talk about the process and about how we can open up that process. In Calgary last night again 1,600 parents and other persons interested in education met, and the same message came through. There have been meetings around this province, and people are concerned.

I'd ask the Speaker to rule that there is a matter of urgency here. We don't want to see this situation escalate to where we have 10,000 people marching on the Legislature or where we have

all sorts of unfounded or ill-tempered allegations made on either side of the House. Let's discuss the process today. Let's get it on record in terms of what the options are for people to be involved in the process, and let's try to put an end to the panic and fear that surrounds us in Alberta.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. EVANS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre is referring to Standing Order 30, and his argument is that there is urgent public importance to justify an adjournment of the ordinary business of this House in order to discuss the government's consultation process on education and the reaction of students and parents to the process.

Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the arguments that the hon. member has used is that there is not an opportunity in this House to deal with the public consultation process. Quite frankly, we have been in the House now since the latter part of August. There have been a number of opportunities during committee to discuss these types of processes. There is an opportunity every day in question period to discuss the process. The hon. Minister of Education is here in the House today. He could have been questioned during question period on this very issue. I don't recall that having been the focus of any of the questions from the opposition side today.

I think even more importantly, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the way the Standing Order 30 request is framed, the urgency is argued to be that there is some concern with the government's consultation process. Well, certainly the demonstration by students yesterday in Calgary and, as I understand, the demonstration today has nothing whatsoever to do with the government's consultation process. Rather it is a perception that cuts have been made to the education system.

Speaker's Ruling
Relevance

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. This is always the danger of a debate on the question of urgency, because we tend to get involved with what's concerning people in this subject. The Chair has suggested that there would be two people participate, pro and con, so that we will not have an afternoon's debate on the urgency of this. Therefore, the Chair would ask the hon. Deputy Government House Leader to really stick very closely to the question of urgency.

MR. EVANS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate you bringing that again to my attention.

Debate Continued

MR. EVANS: The point I'm trying to make is that the question that is being raised by the hon. member opposite is on the consultation process, and he is using as justification demonstrations in the city of Edmonton and the city of Calgary. I don't believe those demonstrations have anything whatsoever to do with the consultation process. Thus I do not think there is any urgency to debating the government's consultation process. The Minister of Education has had roundtables recently in the city of Edmonton and in the city of Calgary, and there may be follow-up that the hon. minister will be attending to. Certainly there is no urgency to the consultation process that the hon. minister is undertaking, and I would ask you to rule accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre gave the required notice as required by Standing Order 30. The

request for consideration of a motion is properly before the Assembly. The Chair has heard from the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre that there is a great deal of excitement and anxiety, phone calls, communications to Members of the Legislative Assembly over the consultation process. The hon. Deputy Government House Leader has pointed out that there has been nothing unlawful happen. He does not dispute the fact that there are these demonstrations and questions of concern.

It has been pointed out that there may not be an opportunity to have a full-fledged debate on educational matters in the remaining days of this Legislative Assembly, but that is rather difficult to ascertain. At the present moment the Chair is wondering. While the business scheduled for today brings the 25 days of budget estimates to a close, there is still legislation flowing from the budget that will be coming forward.

What impresses the Chair the most is that we are having a request for a debate on a process that started several months ago and apparently has several months to go yet before it is finally implemented. The Chair must say that perhaps what we're seeing by visits by high school students to this building is perhaps another method of consultation. Clearly, there is nothing unlawful that has happened. [interjections] Order please. With attitudes like that the Chair really feels that perhaps if there was a debate on this matter things would be further exacerbated, the attitude of members on both sides of the Assembly.

The Chair does not feel that in these circumstances, from what has happened in our province today – there has not been any type of natural disaster or any physical danger or any unlawful activities that are taking place that justify the adjournment of our regular business.

3:10 Orders of the Day

head: Committee of Supply

[Mr. Tannas in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. I'd like to call the committee to order. For the benefit of those in the gallery, to explain the process, we're going into committee stage, Committee of Supply. Committee of Supply is much less formal, as you can readily see, than the regular session in order to permit the maximum coverage of the individual items.

head: Main Estimates 1993-94

Justice

MR. CHAIRMAN: At this time we'll ask the Minister of Justice to give comments and perhaps answers to questions asked when this department was considered earlier. Mr. Minister.

MR. ROSTAD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First, before we start, I have four copies of answers from two previous sessions. I might note for the record that we have already had five hours of supply on Justice, and I'm delighted to have the opportunity to have another three hours. As I noted commencing the second time, I think this is the most important department within the realm of government. I'm delighted to see that everybody else thinks the same, because you want to spend so much time on it. So I'll file with the House the copies. Other than that, I really don't have any opening comments. I will listen to the questions. Again those I don't answer today, I will undertake to get answered in writing and provide.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Minister. In view of the fact that there are other ministers here, we won't enter into a debate on the comment of the minister about the importance of his worthy department.

MR. ROSTAD: Actually, I'd welcome at least an hour's debate on that, because frankly without law and order you don't need the rest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is true too.

Inasmuch as we are debating the estimates, we will ask the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo to make his comments and amendments, if there be some.

MR. DICKSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It may be no surprise to you to hear me say that I'm happy to second the suggestion from the hon. minister that there is no more important department, no more important aspect of this government.

I was going to start out actually by gently chiding the minister simply because I had not received responses. It seems to me that the first of these three instalments was, I think, perhaps September 20, and then we had done it again on October 13. I know we touched on some 58 different issues over the course of those two sessions, but I think other departments where I've been involved in Committee of Supply – we've received detailed, comprehensive responses in a much faster time period. I know the minister is competent. I know he's got competent senior staff working in the Justice department. I guess I'd simply hoped that the responses could have been somewhat more timely. It would have made it substantially easier to prepare for this third go-around, because we could be sure that we weren't covering old ground. In any event, we have them now.

MR. ROSTAD: If I could just interject on that one. That is my fault. In fact, the last time I undertook to have, I think, within a matter of days the answers from the September 20 meeting. They were in fact prepared and inadvertently left on my desk and not tabled. I apologize. The ones from the 13th I just received today, and that's when I recognized I had not put in the other ones. My apologies.

MR. DICKSON: I appreciate the customary candour of the minister in that respect.

I wanted to also make a second observation, and it's this. I've experienced a certain amount of frustration with this review of estimates process, this Committee of Supply process. I had the opportunity in I guess it was February or early 1993 when we reviewed some supplementary estimates dealing with legal aid funding. I saw some aspects of the process that I thought weren't very satisfactory. I thought it was just me and the fact that we were only dealing with supplementary estimates. I thought once we got into the regular budget process that I might find it to be more satisfying or more useful. I'm sad to report, having been involved not only in Committee of Supply with this department but with other departments, that it strikes me that this is a process that can and should be improved substantially. This idea of private members lobbing questions at the minister to which the minister will give at the time some general responses – sometimes they're very responsive, sometimes not so responsive. There really isn't much opportunity for a genuine dialogue about the important issues involved in this department and other departments.

I sometimes find that this kind of a process, Mr. Chairman, really invites the development of two solitudes. I think the kind of process that we engage in sometimes does invite and reinforce

a sense of two solitudes. I think there's not enough responsiveness both ways. I suggest this to the minister, assuming that he's still the Justice minister when we do this in a year's time: it would be tremendously helpful if all private members had the opportunity to meet not only with the minister but with senior members of his department. I think one of the suggestions in the Liberal Mandate for Change paper, that I think all members have read, was that to facilitate the budget review process there should be an all-party committee that would be responsible for certain departments that would have the opportunity to meet with the minister and departments in the summer when the budget preparation process starts. There might be opportunities there to have input as the budget is being developed and to be able to identify concerns, to raise proposals, suggestions. It strikes me that that would be a more constructive kind of process than what I view, at least in my experience, as being a fairly stilted, archaic, ritualistic exercise.

In fact, sometimes I'm reminded of – what's that game? – Concentration, one of those things where you ask a question here and you ask a question there, and sometimes when the letter's turned over, it turns out to be something important or useful and sometimes not. Sometimes I think this process could result in a more productive exchange, more meaningful responses and more meaningful questions, if we were able to review that whole budget process and get involved at an earlier stage.

3:20

I'm going to attempt to avoid covering ground that's been touched on before, and we'll focus on some things that I think have not been dealt with at all or dealt with very briefly in the past.

One of my concerns has to do with locating the new remand centre in Calgary in the northwest corner of the city. In discussions with officials of the city of Calgary there is a substantial concern here. I assume the minister is aware, but I want to tell him that the city of Calgary has budgeted \$500,000 for a half year only. That is what they estimate is going to be the cost attributable to the move of the remand centre from the core of Calgary to the northwest outskirts: \$500,000 for a half year only. If you project it for a full year, it would probably translate into something in the order of \$800,000. Now, that's money that now has to come out of the Calgary Police Service budget. That's \$500,000 for sure, potentially \$800,000 in the course of a year, that's not available to put policemen on the streets of the city of Calgary, that's not available for community policing initiatives, that's not available for making sure that policemen in Calgary in the training program they have get the very best training and instruction we can give them. That's a concern to me, and I expect it's a concern to every Calgary MLA in this Chamber.

I guess I'd like some response from the minister in terms of, firstly, whether he recognizes that substantial cost that's being off-loaded or that consequential cost that's going to be dropped in the lap of the city of Calgary and specifically the city of Calgary Police Service and what he proposes to do to ameliorate, mitigate that cost off-loading. My understanding, just so we're clear, is that there's \$500,000 projected for the half year. This is a capital cost to convert the old remand centre. It's the cost in terms of transporting prisoners on weekends, when the regular prison transport service is not in service and not available to assist.

Moving on from that, I've been concerned for some time with the fact that at EYOC, the Edmonton Young Offender Centre, we have three very different groups of female young offenders. We have female young offenders who are there on remand, we have female young offenders who are there serving a closed custody disposition, and then we have female young offenders who are

servicing an open custody disposition. The last thing we want to do is put more and more Alberta young people through a crime college, yet surely that's exactly what happens if there isn't adequate segregation of these young offenders in those three very different categories. It seems to me we're developing a tremendously efficient crime college. For all members – and I know there are many members opposite that are concerned about juvenile crime – here's a specific example where we're missing the boat. I'd like the minister to respond in terms of how he proposes to avoid that.

What particularly brought this to mind the other day was I heard a further report about a case I've been following with some interest in Nova Scotia. It involves a gentleman named Mr. Findlay in, I think, Moser River, Nova Scotia. This is a man who was found dead in the cell 90 minutes after having been put in the cell. He was serving, I think, a couple of months' sentence for dangerous driving. The background was that in the small town in Nova Scotia there was a bunch of bullies. There's no police presence in this town, and these bullies had attempted to run his daughter, while she was riding a horse, off the road. This father, emotionally irate, then took his car out, chased after these youths, these gang members, smacked into the back of their vehicle, and was charged with dangerous driving. He went in to serve his time, and he asked when he was admitted to the jail to be segregated from the other offenders. In fact, he was not. He was put in with the general population, including members of the very gang that had been involved in this feud. He was found dead 90 minutes later. I'm not trying to suggest that I expect there's going to be an enormous range of loss of life because of what we're doing with our female young offenders. I think it underscored and brought home to me the importance – there are reasons why we try and segregate different types of offenders. It just isn't good enough to say that they're serving some kind of a disposition, so we lump them in the same facility. So I'm interested in the minister's response in that important area.

Motor vehicle accident claim fund. I don't think this is anything that's been addressed at all in the previous two sessions dealing with Justice estimates. I have a number of concerns there: the fact that the amount of the awards hasn't changed in a number of years, enormous difficulties. Any lawyer or more importantly any plaintiff who has cause to try and access the motor vehicle accident claim fund will tell you that there are an awful lot of hoops and hurdles. I want to invite the minister to consider if there aren't ways of streamlining the administrative process to ensure that litigants or Alberta motorists who are caused to suffer loss as a consequence of the negligent wrongful actions of an uninsured motorist are not so frustrated in terms of trying to achieve some measure of satisfaction. I've had occasion to talk not only to lawyers and the Insurance Bureau of Canada but to just a number of people who have experienced frustration with the system, and I know that one of the biggest problems seems to be with tort-feasors who are both uninsured and unknown. I understand that that seems to be the biggest problem area. So I guess one of my questions is: is there something that can be done to expedite, to streamline the administrative process in dealing with those kinds of situations?

Some Albertans are concerned that the \$200,000 claim limit should be reassessed. Now, my understanding is that for most claims the \$200,000 ceiling is adequate and there's no problem. The figures I've been given are that we're looking at something in the order of 15,000 to 20,000 motor vehicle accidents on an annual basis, only a small number, perhaps 1,500 to 2,000, being dealt with under the Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act and fund, and

the vast majority of those wouldn't come close to the \$200,000 limit. But my understanding is that we have perhaps in Alberta 150 to 200 cases a year where the liability limit becomes a problem. If we look, for example, at where there are jaw involvement injuries, these are things that aren't ordinarily covered by Alberta health care, and unless the minister responsible for Alberta health care is prepared to do something differently – you know, some of these injuries can run as high as \$40,000 to \$70,000. General damages, pain and suffering reach a maximum of \$245,000. In a case of permanent disability lost wage claims can easily exceed \$500,000. I wonder if the minister has given thought to some sort of flexibility at the top end of the ceiling for these kinds of claims so that in certain cases there's some potential to go past the \$200,000 limit. Then the other comments – and I think I've made the point before: the process itself is frustrating and time consuming.

I have a concern with respect to the move by the Justice department young offender branch to reduce the fee schedule for a psychologist. I want to say that I'm married to a psychologist, but I come at this through independent sources. Having declared my potential conflict of interest, I want to say, Mr. Minister, that I think psychological counseling is enormously important when we're dealing with young offenders, and I'm concerned when your department, in effect, requires a 19 percent decrease in the established rate for individual therapy. It's been suggested to me by arm's-length, nonrelated psychologists that the 10 hours inclusive of consulting, testing, and report preparation is a travesty. It simply isn't adequate to deal with young offenders with particularly difficult problems.

3:30

Mr. Minister, dealing with family violence, there had been an initiative undertaken by the department of the Attorney General before the two departments were rolled together, and part of the review was to look at criminal justice initiatives, including the Winnipeg family violence court, in order to develop a criminal justice response for Alberta. There was a further initiative in terms of designating a specific prosecutor in each chief Crown prosecutor's office. That was done I think in 1991 to focus on family violence. I'm wondering if we have a report. I assume that there's been an assessment done to determine if this has made a difference, how it's working, if it ought to have benefit from additional resources. If it's not working, I'd like to know why not and what the minister proposes to do next.

There were a number of family violence policing initiatives introduced in October 1990. At that time it was described as a three-year strategy to address the crime of spousal assault. I assume, firstly, that a report is being done to measure the effectiveness of that program over the span of three years. If that's the case, I'd like the minister to share with all members the results of that particular study.

Another issue which has come to my attention has to do with the issue of loaded firearms in vehicles. This is a particular concern in rural Alberta. My understanding is that there's a conflict between the federal legislation and provincial law, this business of the extent to which hunters can drive around with ammunition and magazines. I'm interested in hearing if the minister has some plan to change the provincial legislation so that it's congruent with the federal legislation. As things now stand, we've seen the situation earlier in the fall of 1993 where the RCMP issued one policy and then I guess with some embarrassment had to resile from that position because they found that there was this conflict. I'm interested in what the minister proposes to do to address that particular concern.

I just give notice now – I'll speak to it later; I know that some other people have questions – that I'm going to circulate an amendment which, I'd advised the minister, I was going to propose to the Justice estimates. I guess I'll speak to it later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's certainly once again a privilege to speak to the Justice estimates. Some of the points I'd like to raise with the hon. minister I certainly have touched on before. They may be a bit repetitive, but my concerns in some areas have increased since the last time I spoke to them and, acknowledging that I haven't had time to read the answers to the questions yet, might also seem repetitive from that perspective.

The area that I'd like to address is specifically in the young offender area. I was really moved to listen to the member's statement by Calgary-Egmont today. I reflect back to Motion 202 and see what I would acknowledge is a significant growth in support for what I was putting forward when I was speaking to the estimates previously. We have to ensure that we do everything through our justice system to ensure that young offenders who have previously been victims and have victimized someone within our society do get the appropriate treatments, that they are indeed held in the appropriate facilities. Like my colleague from Calgary-Buffalo, I get very concerned when I hear that the professional support systems may indeed not be available for these young offenders. It would be very shortsighted, and it would be penny-wise and pound-foolish if we continued along that path, if we were not ensuring that the appropriate support systems are there, whether it be sex offenders, whether it be drug addiction, whether it be alcohol, or some other form of drug addiction. I think it's important and imperative that we catch them at that age rather than allowing society to see them move on and continue to victimize other people within society. So to the minister – and I'd raised it before – I'd like to know what has happened within the area of funding Counterpoint House. I had a concern that happened after the first time I spoke to the Justice estimates, inasmuch as it was my understanding that money was actually available through the Health budget that could have been moved to the Justice budget through supporting that young offenders program.

So I'm stressing once again that we have to have co-ordination between our health system, our social services system, and our justice system to get the best value for our dollar. I find it appalling that I'm standing here today in this Legislature saying: "Where is this co-ordination? Why is it not happening if people have taken the time to identify dollars that could be shifted?" I've been hearing this for the past decade – it's not something new – where we're acknowledging that funds could be moved from a Health area into another area to give the appropriate clinical support systems. So I'd urge the government to please move quickly to ensure that that co-ordination indeed happens so that we can see a decrease in the cost to society when we're dealing with young offenders.

The other area that I have some questions to the minister on is in the area of senior management within the Justice system, whether it be within the correctional centres – if we're talking about 5 percent rollbacks – whether it be for Legislative Assembly members, or other members of society. I'd like to know: what are the other benefits that senior members in the department get? In other words, how many cars are still part of the benefit package and any other things that indeed may not be appropriate as we move forward in these financially difficult times? Is it

appropriate for a director of an institution in these days to indeed have a vehicle? Is it necessary?

The other area that certainly has been brought to my attention is an ongoing concern about the lack of appropriate training and education for correctional officers. Indeed, we're going to more part-time than full-time correctional officers. Is there going to be any shift to ensure that indeed we have the appropriately trained people within the justice system?

Also, a concern that's been expressed within my community – and it's in relation more to the Edmonton Remand Centre – is that we seem to have overcrowding. I'd like the minister to comment why that indeed has come about. Indeed, how many people held in remand are actually sharing a facility that really should house two, not three? Are we going to see an increase in that happening within our Remand Centre?

3:40

Also, going back to our community programs or our young offenders programs, is there a plan in place to ensure that if indeed, as we move on, society starts to see an increase in the growth of crime – and I am fearful that indeed that could happen, because the one thing that concerns me is that we people in authority don't always give the respect to the youth. I've seen examples of that happening over these past few weeks. In fact, today I was quite disturbed in this House when four adolescents, or young adults, were with me and they were being questioned as to whether they had been part of a parade. Indeed, it was being suggested they be restricted from coming into question period in the gallery. I don't think that that's society or adult behaviour being responsible back to our young adolescents. Indeed, if we get into such a tight economy that there are not jobs and there are not places in our educational institutions for our young adults, I'm fearful that what's happened in Britain could indeed happen right here in Alberta. So I'm asking the justice system: have you got plans in place to ensure that we've got the appropriate programs in place to support these young people when they do fall by the wayside and get themselves into conflict with the law? I think it would be most appropriate that we look to the future and ensure that we don't allow these young people, once they've fallen into conflict with the law, to continue on that path for the remainder of their lives. They're too valuable a resource to allow that to happen.

With those few comments, Mr. Chairman, I welcome reading the responses from our hon. minister and hope that I may have an opportunity to raise some other points further.

Thank you.

[Two members rose]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Glenora.

MR. SAPERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Redwater. I'm pleased to have the opportunity to ask the Minister of Justice a few more questions about his budget at this point. I'm very concerned about the administration of justice in this province, and I'd like to ask the minister a couple of questions. I'd like to know about cuts to many agencies. Right now cuts to community agencies, which have always played a major role in the administration of justice in this province, have seen the elimination of halfway house beds, the elimination of antishoplifting programs, public education programs regarding the administration of justice, the administration of counseling programs, prison support programs, community support programs, victim/offender reconciliation programs, and fine options programs. I'm concerned about

all these cuts and the sum total of their effect on the quality of life in Alberta communities and, in fact, on the confidence people have in their justice system.

I'm also wondering why it is that this budget proposed for the department this year has allowed all of these cuts to happen. What kind of careful analysis has led to the scrapping of cost-effective community corrections programs in favour of expensive institutional corrections programs? Where in this budget can we find the commitment to crime prevention? The overwhelming majority of the dollars to be spent in the Department of Justice budget this year are all being spent reacting to crime. Your budget, Mr. Minister, falls short even of the measly 1 percent target identified by the federal Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General that should be earmarked to be spent on crime-prevention activities. Why is it that the Department of Justice is taking over programs previously run in the community by community agencies? Now, this is going in the opposite direction from the rest of your government, which is of course falling all over itself in a rush to privatize. Why aren't more options being pursued that would see not-for-profit agencies and organizations delivering much-needed and cost-effective, community-based criminal justice services? This would make more sense than just putting these agencies in jeopardy, the way that this minister unfortunately has by insisting on across-the-board 10 percent cuts to their budgets this year with the promise of many more cuts to come.

Moving to another topic, inmate pay has been cut in Alberta correctional centres. Now, I'd like to know how much expenses have gone up for toiletries, for stationery supplies, for postage, further taxing the already very thin and overburdened administration budgets in correctional centres as a result of this move. Furthermore, I'm hoping the minister will be able to inform the Assembly how much additional cost has been borne by other departments, most notably Family and Social Services, as a result of inmates now being released from Alberta correctional centres absolutely penniless.

Mr. Minister, when will your department make a commitment to public awareness about the administration of justice in Alberta? When will there be a fully funded, fully operational public awareness program about crime so that Albertans can become fully informed, so they'll know that crime in this province has actually gone down, so that they'll know that youth crime has actually remained relatively constant over the years, so that they won't be fearful and made paranoid by the unfortunate headlines that we see from time to time? When will the minister take responsibility for countering this misinformation so that Albertans can have some peace of mind about their criminal justice system?

Now I want to turn my attention and the attention of the minister to the final report of the Edmonton Mayor's Task Force on Safer Cities and ask about several of the specific recommendations to be found in that report. Number one, a recommendation dealing with family violence was that Alberta Justice should provide counseling for perpetrators of family violence before and while they are on conditional release or parole. I'm wondering what progress has been made in regard to this specific recommendation. Furthermore, it was recommended that there should be an increase in the services for abused women and children and for perpetrators of family violence to eliminate waiting lists for the few programs that are available to these Albertans.

Turning to some of the recommendations regarding employment, institutions were recommended to involve youth in setting personal goals and to aid them in developing employment competencies. I'm wondering what specific action has taken place in this regard. Correctional facilities and programs were directed to explore such

things as mentorship, especially for aboriginal young adults. There is absolutely no evidence that this has happened, and I'd like to know why.

There were also recommendations to enhance and develop strategies to keep young people out of correctional facilities in the first place and to help them instead obtain and then maintain employment. Again, we've seen precious little action in this regard.

The budget also doesn't address the recommendation that there should be improved community alternatives to incarceration as a way of integrating both high-risk and offending young adults back into the community. There were also recommendations to expand the eligibility for alternative measures programs beyond first offences and particularly in regard to aboriginals.

The Minister of Justice was also asked to establish pilot youth justice committees in the major urban centres, and this has not been done.

There is also a recommendation to specifically fund outreach workers to support youth coming out of jail. Again, this has not happened.

Returning to family violence again momentarily, there were recommendations coming from the task force that talked about a co-ordinated effort throughout the justice system to pursue all cases of family violence to their conclusion; in other words, not to have these cases bargained away or somehow lost in the shuffle.

It was recommended as well and I'd like to know what action has been taken on the provision of opportunities for officers of the court and police to develop awareness programs so that the professionals within the justice system would better understand family violence and the disastrous effects it has on families throughout Alberta. There was a recommendation to expand the mandate and the resources of the family court to include family violence cases. I understand that this recommendation was rejected out of hand. I would like to know why, particularly when this could become a very cost-effective way of dealing with family violence issues. It was recommended that special assistance should be provided to support and prepare victims and witnesses so that they can appear in family violence cases. Again, this recommendation has not been acted on, and I'd like to know why.

It was suggested that mandatory counseling be made the highest priority and the first option for perpetrators of family violence and to use temporary incarceration when necessary and only when necessary to ensure the safety of victims. Instead, what we've seen is just the opposite: incarceration used as the first response and counseling hardly made available at all. I'd like to know why the budget hasn't addressed this very worthwhile recommendation.

3:50

It was recommended that a special court or a board or authority be set up under the minister's jurisdiction to handle violations of minimum standards in housing and accommodation. This should be done in a timely manner, and I submit it would add greatly to the overall safety and security of Alberta communities.

It was also recommended that there should be an enhancement and further strategies developed to keep people out of correctional facilities and to help them maintain employment as part of their prerelease program, if they should be incarcerated. This has not been acted on in any meaningful way.

There was a suggestion as well that the minister appoint Crown attorneys who would specialize in youth court and have those specialized Crown attorneys receive ongoing training in the needs of Alberta youth. I'd like to know why this has not been acted on.

There was a suggestion, as well, that the minister immediately review the overuse of pretrial custody of youth in Alberta. I think

it's shameful that up to 70 percent of the population of our Calgary and Edmonton young offender centres are young people who are innocent of crimes. They have simply been accused, and for some reason or another they find themselves in jail and often in the same centres as those youths who have been found guilty of crimes. Of course, the ones in pretrial custody can't even take advantage of the programs that would otherwise be made available to them. This is expensive both in human costs and of course in dollar costs.

There was another recommendation that the alternative measures program be expanded immediately, and we've already talked about that briefly.

The sum total of these recommendations I submit, Mr. Minister, would not only lead to a more efficient and more effective criminal justice process, but it would also lead to safer communities not just in Edmonton but throughout Alberta and would save taxpayers money as well. I was very distressed to see that there was no evidence of these recommendations or of their impact reflected in your budget estimates. I'm hopeful that you'll be able to respond quickly as to when we might see some evidence of these recommendations being taken seriously.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have several people on the list.

The hon. Member for Redwater.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to concentrate mostly on the Cawsey commission's recommendations and ask some specific questions. Before I go into that, I want to tell the minister that I believe that some of the community programs now run by the Mounties through our rural areas are very valuable indeed. I find that Crime Watch, for instance, which the police are involved in, is very widely accepted. I think it really accomplishes a lot. I also think that in general the interface that now exists between the Mounties in a community – for instance, the other day I was at a Mountie ball in Radway. There were 323 people at a policeman's ball. I don't think that would have been possible 20 years ago or 10 years ago. They all had a great time working together. The police are very involved in the community, and I'd be very concerned if we cut any of those funds. I think that a dollar that goes to helping the community feel that they're identified with policing and community policing is worth \$10 in direct policing, because that's the best policing you could get, if you have the community involved working together. I can't speak highly enough about the Mounties' side; I think they're doing their part. I sometimes wonder whether we're doing our part – maybe chiselling a little bit too much on the funds – to help programs that interface between the community and the mounted police.

Now, to get on to the Cawsey report. I'm going to go right through fairly fast. I'd be interested if the minister could report any progress on:

The R.C.M.P. and municipal police services in Alberta establish and maintain liaison and communications with the Indian and Metis organizations.

I'm wondering if we've made any progress on that. That was task force recommendation 2.8, to make it easy.

Task force 2.16 was an interesting one too.

When . . . a municipality has a significant number of Aboriginal residents . . .

and that would certainly qualify any of our major cities

. . . [Aboriginals] be represented on the Police Commission.

I wonder what progress we've had on that.

The other was recommendation 2.30.

That foot patrol programs be established in urban [areas and] districts with large Aboriginal populations.

I wonder what progress could have been made on that or on 2.37.

That Indian Bands consider making Band Constables accountable to a body external to and independent of the Band Council.

I'm afraid that many of our band policemen are sort of political adjuncts to the band council. Have we made any progress in sort of divorcing band policing from the band council?

The other was 2.85. I think there's been some progress in some areas but not too much.

That police forces retain the services of one or more Indian or Metis Elders as a method of providing support to Aboriginal police officers.

Not necessarily aboriginal but any police officers. I don't think our elders are being employed. I think the elder in a native and Metis community has much more sway, you might say, than in a nonnative community.

One area that impinges particularly on women that get sentences is 2.89.

That police services, in addition to the usual factors, take into consideration the residence of an Aboriginal person when determining the option of release with a Notice to Appear or arrest, to ensure that undue hardship does not result.

Now, many of our native women come from the north into the cities, and I don't think proper notice is taken of that. The court case usually proceeds here rather than bringing them back to their original community.

Recommendation 2.90 is also tied to that.

When Aboriginal persons are arrested, removed from a community and transported to another community, and then are released from custody, the police agency assume the responsibility for making arrangements for their return to the community in which they were arrested.

That's if they wish.

One that's always been very dear to my heart. As a matter of fact, I believe I was the only MLA to make a representation to the Cawsey commission, but this was one. I don't see us progressing on it.

That a position of Aboriginal Advocate be established within the Aboriginal Justice Commission, independent from the police and that this position have a mandate to accept and advance police complaints on behalf of Aboriginal people.

That's right, Mr. Chairman, tell them to shush, because I can talk even louder than they can. They won't even hear themselves think. Not that they think.

That was recommendation 2.99, the position of an aboriginal advocate. I wonder if he's made any progress on that or if they junked the idea.

[Mr. Sohal in the Chair]

I'd also like an update on 2.108. This is on the national scene.

That Canada and Alberta meet formally to outline a comprehensive policy framework to guide the development of policing programs.

Here we're talking about a federal Inter-Departmental Task Force on Indian Policing Policy, as set out in 1990. There's been no follow-up on that.

4:00

Here's another one, Mr. Chairman. It's recommendation 3.5: That Legal Aid only take bail money from Aboriginal clients to cover fees when written consent has been received from the person who posted the bail.

In other words, the present bail procedures discriminate against our aboriginal people.

Next, Mr. Chairman, is recommendation 4.6. This would come dear to the heart of the representative from Lesser Slave Lake. It says:

That government support the Lesser Slave Lake Indian Regional Council initiative for the training of Indian Justices of the Peace

through a certification program, developed in collaboration with the Faculty of Law, University of Alberta, that will apply province-wide.

That was one of my main recommendations when I appeared before the Cawsey commission. There's also the Lesser Slave Lake Indian Regional Council. There seems to have been a deafening silence from the Justice Department on this item, and I think it's very important.

Next is 4.8:

That, when Aboriginal lay persons are considered for appointments as Justices of the Peace, they be fully trained and empowered to hear summary conviction offences in the communities in which they live.

[interjections] Blow in his ear and he'll follow you anywhere. Sorry, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to break up the tête-à-tête before it became indecent; that's all.

Recommendation 4.11:

That Aboriginal people be appointed to fill all positions necessary to operate an Aboriginal Provincial Court (Criminal Division) to go on circuit, for example, in . . . Slave Lake

or other areas so we have an aboriginal one that goes on circuit.

[interjection] Yeah. They're starting, but they're very fumbling at it. Lesser Slave Lake says that you're making progress, but it's a little bit like the minister of the environment, very much like the Lake Louise glacier: it barely moves. You have to put a stake in the ground to see if there's movement.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs wants to privatize the whole process apparently.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should be addressing the Chair, sir.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. Okay.

Recommendation 4.33:

That the Government of Alberta address the problem of the unavailability of appropriate facilities in rural and remote Alberta, to permit the carrying out of intermittent sentences which have a disproportionate [effect] on Aboriginals.

In other words, maybe back to what the former minister and some people have talked about, the work camps or anything else, but they would be closer to where the aboriginal people live. [some applause]

It seems so unusual, Mr. Chairman, to get some applause on my right. At least it's coming from the right.

Recommendation 4.37:

That cash bail requirements not be applied to poor Aboriginal accused persons, in particular not to those who are living on welfare.

Telling somebody on welfare that they have to have cash bail is tantamount to a sentence.

Mr. Minister, I hope your gremlins are keeping track of this. I think they probably are.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not necessarily, Nick.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Not necessarily? You don't look up to the gallery as often as most ministers when they cross examine, so I didn't know if you had them up there or not.

Recommendation 5.1:

That, in view of their apparent lack of knowledge about Aboriginal culture, Judges, lawyers, and Prosecutors receive cross-cultural education immediately, intensively, and on an on-going basis. The person in charge of education for each group should be given this responsibility.

That, Mr. Chairman, means lawyers on both sides of the House.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, also recommendation 6.20:

That the Correctional Service of Canada and the provincial Solicitor General's Department establish liaison with the Aboriginal community groups who [are interested] and are willing to become involved in the

parole or temporary absence program, to facilitate the involvement of Aboriginal communities in, for example, supervision or sponsorship of release.

This is quite dear to me too, Mr. Chairman. I made the representation to the committee when I was the only MLA to prepare for that.

Some years ago when I worked in Japan and in China, in old Chairman Mao's China – yes, I was a teenage communist – I found that communities quite often took over the parole; a whole community would. As a matter of fact, I was so interested in it, Mr. Minister, that later when I came back to Calgary in the mid-70s, I talked the Rotary Club of north Calgary into becoming one group that would take on a parolee. We did, quite successfully too. I made representations federally, and we took out a number of people on parole consecutively from the Drumheller Institution. It worked quite well for about 10 years. Then I think one of the parolees bounced a bunch of cheques off all those old Rotarians, and they thought they'd rethink it. Nevertheless, I thought the process had worked quite well, and I was quite disappointed that just because we got one bad apple – you can expect to have more than that on parole. That gave a feeling – this is what I noticed in Japan particularly – to the person coming back into the community that there were friends and people rooting for him or her to succeed, whereas too often when you're on parole, you go back to your old friends and the people you met in crime and nobody from the law-abiding community really gives a goldarn whether you succeed or not. So if a community – and this could start with the aboriginal communities – wants to take somebody on parole and supervise their parole, why not let them? We can't do any worse than we're doing now when we turn them loose.

I'm probably getting near the end of my trail. Oh, yes; recommendation 6.95. Right now if you look through our youth courts, there's no question there's a high proportion of aboriginal people. Recommendation 6.95 says:

That the length of time it takes to finally resolve a matter in youth court be corrected by the Province of Alberta. At present, the delays are intolerable and deplorable.

As far as I can see, there's been little or no progress made on that. If you pick up an aboriginal youth, it goes on and on and on before there's any settlement. If there is any purpose served, it has to be in a quick application of justice, especially to youth. This doesn't only apply to aboriginal youth; it applies to nonaboriginal youth. There has to be a very quick and immediate connection between a misdemeanour, sentencing, and a disposal of the charge and what you do. In our youth courts now, young people can turn into old people, or at least middle age, before they finally get it settled. I know lawyers think it's a good gimmick, fighting it on and on. A delaying tactic is a reasonable legal defence. I've used it myself in civil cases. If you can keep delaying and delaying and delaying, it goes. But I don't think it's proper in the case of young offenders.

That, I think, fills my full request, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Leduc.

MR. KIRKLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We're talking about the estimates here, so I'll try to keep it in line with expenditures of dollars. When we talk about that, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Justice in regards to efficiency. I've had the occasion to be in youth court several times in the last five or six years of my life. One observation I had was that many youth appeared there without their parents and would appear before the judge having no idea or any indication of how they

would like to proceed, with a guilty plea or a not guilty plea or a reserved plea. It would strike me that when we are dealing with and attempting to tie time to money and efficiency, there's a method to streamline it. Certainly I understand there's a duty counsel available. Unfortunately, it seems that too often the youth would stand before the judge and be asked the question, "Have you spoken to duty counsel?" and when the answer became no, the proceedings at that point would stop and the young offender would have to leave the courtroom to chat to the duty counsel, which of course was a disruption and prolonged the proceedings. I saw that occur many times. I wonder if there is not some charge we can direct at the young offenders and their parents as well to ensure they have explored exactly where they intend to proceed with the charge prior to actually standing before the judge.

4:10

The other thing that I thought was very obviously lacking in many instances – perhaps there is no way in today's world of human rights, but too often there are young offenders appearing in court without an adult giving them direction. In some instances I can understand the frustrations of parents not attending, but if we're looking at attempting to find efficiency and accountability, it should be demanded one way or another that those parents also appear in court with their young offender.

I know this certainly is out of the minister's jurisdiction in some instances, but that experience in the Leduc provincial courthouse – it struck me as very ironic that that particular building has no restrictions as far as no smoking is concerned. I understand that's a municipal matter, but the irony of the situation is that a lot of the young offenders smoking there certainly weren't of age to purchase cigarettes. It struck me as a great irony that they sat in a building that represented law and justice and yet were able to smoke in that particular building.

An area that is of large concern, not because I'm a great collector of speeding tickets but I look at what we deal with – I'll use an example, although it's out of the jurisdiction of the city of Edmonton. We all read recently where they had acquired some \$700,000 through the issuance of speeding tickets, and we're into a bit of a dispute with the city as to whether it should go to policing coffers or city coffers. I would suggest that when you analyze that and realize a goodly percentage of it was probably garnered from the photo speeding tickets, one would have to ask whether there's any meaningful law enforcement taking place when there are no demerits associated with that particular process, and if it is simply a matter of generating revenues, does it have any place in application of justice? If we are to carry on with it, then I think we have to clearly define and separate where the funds of that particular undertaking are directed to ensure there's not, I guess, a distortion of justice itself.

I would stay on that line just for a minute and move into provincial jurisdiction. I speak to the highway between Edmonton and Calgary. I don't think there's a person that's been on that road traveling at 110 kilometres per hour who doesn't realize they're being left behind. That tells me that that speed limit probably is somewhat inadequate for the ability of the road to carry, and I wonder if the Justice minister has given any thought to reviewing speed limits of roads of that magnitude and whether, in fact, they should be more in line with what the traffic actually travels.

I would also just like to pitch one more time the alternative measures program for young offenders. I think there's a tremendous community opportunity to establish the youth justice systems, ensure that the young offenders that have the potential to be subjected to sentencing through the alternative measures stand

before a committee of local citizens. I think it will have more impact, as I indicated last time, than the nameless faces and judges. If they are people they have to bump into on a regular basis, I do believe there's merit there. I think the alternative measures is a classic opportunity, and I know it's implemented and utilized in some jurisdictions or areas, not to the degree I would like. We hear of the 4-H effort every year to clean up the highways in this province, and it's a commendable effort by the 4-H group. I certainly think we could utilize our young offenders, particularly with alternative measures or community hours, more so on our provincial highways. I would like to see more of an impetus coming from the department itself to ensure that happens.

I have not as much concern or as large a concern as I've heard expressed in this House in regards to the Young Offenders Act itself. It would be my submission that though it has some areas of deficiency, a large part of the problem with the Young Offenders Act is the sentencing judges themselves. When I say that, I would relate an example of somebody that is given open custody as a sentence, and when that individual can be AWOL or leave that open custody situation some 20 times, it tells me that in fact there is a serious flaw in the sentencing aspect. Again, we talk accountability. Again, we have to drive the point home to the youth. If in fact they are to walk away from an open custody situation without any sort of meaningful consequence, we're losing sight of exactly what was intended there. I understand that certainly the judge could levy a further sentence for being at large unlawfully. I think when you have your one opportunity of open custody, it should be very clear that you do not mess that up. That case is in fact one that has happened, and I know of many others where five or six absences from open custody continue. There's something lacking or missing there. I would certainly like the Justice minister to have a look at it.

All in all, I think I will conclude my comments on that particular note and turn it over to other hon. members who would like to address the matter.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Mayfield.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to address, through you, the Minister of Justice and direct his attention to the Alberta Gaming Commission. No; sorry. We'll start with the Alberta Racing Commission. Sir, I wonder if you could explain to me what is a lack of information. There's one page, one number. It's rather difficult for any member of the public to call into question any kind of program your office is administering when there's \$7.58 million on one line of the estimates on basically a blank sheet. Going back to last year's numbers, that certainly brings a number of questions that will be handled in Public Accounts, I should imagine. In those expenditures, you'd think that if you're going to have a budget that in last year's Public Accounts on page 1.176 has a full accounting, when one line is titled, curiously enough, 1993 Budget – well, surely, sir, if there's a budget, and then we go to what a budget document is, i.e. an estimate, you'd think those lines could be repeated with the appropriate numbers filled in. Presumably, the department does just that.

The other item these estimates bring up, and one that eludes me as to logic, is how the Alberta Racing Commission can go from public works to your department. I think perhaps it's wiser that it be with your department, some control of Justice. But neither department, in my view, would be appropriate. Probably the most appropriate would be Community Development in that it is dealing with all these things. Perhaps all of gaming should be dealt with

there along with recreation, which it's closely associated with, particularly as recreation is associated with a great number of the fund-raising elements of the other commission you're charged with the responsibility of overseeing, the Gaming Commission.

Before we leave the Racing Commission, in view of the fact that there's a drop in what is called "the total take," I understand, in the racing business – from the '91-92 year to the '92-93 budget year, there's a drop in the take. There doesn't seem to be any indication that there's going to be any difference in management. Is there something your department should know about in the dropping of that take? If there is in fact that dropping, does it have anything to do with the other department that manages part of gaming, the VLT? If the advent of the VLT is to affect this, is there something that could and should be done?

Moving on to the Gaming Commission, sir. Again, the same questions arise as to: where is the information? There is absolutely none as to the cost of issuing licences, save one number. There doesn't seem to be any information on two pages other than \$410,000 worth of expenditures, two typewritten lines and one single number. That number does indicate, though, that there is a dropping of expenditure in the estimates, which would indicate to me that one of two things is occurring: either the department or this commission is becoming much more efficient in their managing of issuance of licences, or there are in fact fewer licences being applied for. I would like the minister to respond to the question that arises. If in fact there are fewer applications for licences for bingos, casinos, raffles, pull tickets, and the like, if in fact that is the case, does the advent of the VLT, the video lottery terminals, have anything to do with that?

The last question, and perhaps the minister may be able to provide some information. This side has been after some information for some time, and we're told that only the minister's office can enlighten us as to this. Does the minister have and is he willing to part with the list of the '92-93 issuance of licences for bingos, casinos, raffles, and pull tickets? If so, we'd be pleased to receive that, and thank you very much in advance for that information, sir.

4:20

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. DICKSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just touching on some other matters I didn't get to before we ran out of time earlier. The Justice minister, I'm sure, will remember well that at the Shunda Creek young offender camp there had been an incident where a couple of youths took a camper in which two elderly people were sleeping in the back, and no doubt they were taken for the ride of their lives in a particularly harrowing experience. My recollection is that the Minister of Justice announced subsequent to that that there was going to be a review of the circumstances surrounding how those two young offenders got out of Shunda Creek and got access to the van and so on. I've heard nothing further about that, Mr. Minister, and I'm wondering if you can share with us particulars of the investigation, the review that was done by members of your department.

[Mr. Tannas in the Chair]

While we're speaking of Shunda Creek, I don't think I asked this before, but I'd raise it now. Last year the Shunda Creek camp was run out of the budget of CYOC, the Calgary Young Offender Centre. My concern is that as the numbers increase at CYOC, particularly with the closure of the Strathmore facility and more

young offenders serving open custody dispositions now being moved into the young offender centre, if we've got an overcrowding problem, I'm interested: what are the budget implications? Is Shunda Creek going to be dealt with as a separate item? I'm not sure I noticed it in the estimates. If it's still going to be funded out of the CYOC budget, what impact is that going to have on the range of programs provided there? I think I mentioned before that another one of my concerns is alternative measures. What happens to alternative measures in the city of Calgary now that the government has terminated the contract with that municipal corporation? Instead of the four city of Calgary workers that were running the Calgary alternative measures program, now the volunteer co-ordinator at CYOC has this responsibility. I have difficulty understanding how these additional responsibilities can be piled on the people at CYOC without a diminution in the comprehensiveness or effectiveness of the programs carried on by that facility. I suppose that begs a further question. If that slack can be taken up by the people working at CYOC, then it would follow, surely, that there was some considerable inefficiency that existed there before. That hadn't been my impression, but I'd like clarification from the minister.

I've been following, Mr. Minister, with some interest what's been proposed in Ontario. They are looking at legislation to ensnare money that goes to convicted criminals upon the sale of their stories. Now, my understanding is that there was a private member's Bill in that province that passed second reading. The minister will appreciate that there are all kinds of constitutional problems with the province moving in this direction, but it strikes me that it's an area where a lot of Albertans have a keen interest on seeing that offenders not be able to reap financial rewards through the sale of books and articles to periodicals and so on after the fact. I'm wondering if there's been some analysis of that done by you, Mr. Minister, or by officials of your department.

There's also a considerable concern we've seen in both the cities of Edmonton and Calgary – in Calgary this happens right in my constituency of Calgary-Buffalo – in terms of safe houses or drug dens. This has been a source of considerable frustration to the Edmonton and Calgary police services. I'm wondering if you, Mr. Minister, have had any discussions with the Minister of Municipal Affairs to determine if there are constitutional changes that can be addressed in the enabling legislation, the Municipal Government Act, which would give municipalities some additional arrows in their quiver, some additional recourse and strategies to be able to deal with this vexing problem of fortified homes in the middle of our cities which are used as sources for drug trade in both those centres.

I've also been apprised of a particular concern that interview facilities in the Edmonton Young Offender Centre are significantly inadequate. I wonder if this is a matter that has been raised with you before, Mr. Minister. If so, what are your plans to address this complaint or grievance that the interview facilities are inadequate?

Now, the other thing I'm interested in. You'll remember the interesting initiative by your predecessor – actually, I guess it was when the current Minister of Municipal Affairs was responsible for the department of the Solicitor General – and the experiment in terms of having young offenders working on the roads beside the major highways, particularly outside Edmonton and Calgary, with the large signs on buses declaring these were offenders working for a better Alberta and so on. Actually, as I think about it, they were adult offenders, not young offenders. I guess my question, Mr. Minister, would be: I assume you still have a work program for offenders, which I assume all members in this House would support, but I wonder if we still have the large signs on the sides

of buses and so on, which simply make a spectacle of these people working alongside the road.

Now, at this point, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move an amendment. I've circulated an outline of the amendment already in written form, and I understand it's been distributed to all members of the Assembly. What I am proposing to do is this: to delete 15 percent from the budget in Institutional Services, vote 8.2. Now, I understand that it is not appropriate for me to then attempt to move those moneys into a different category. My understanding is that it's not appropriate to do that. My understanding is, though, that it is appropriate to delete funds in a particular vote.

Now, in speaking in support of that particular amendment to delete 15 percent of the budget for Institutional Services, then that would work out to I think \$12,956,460. I have a couple of thoughts. The first one is that I think the minister well understands . . .

4:30

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member.

MR. DICKSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you move your amendment, and then if you're going to delete some part, move that it be deleted as well? Then we'll speak to the amendment.

Institutional Services

Moved by Mr. Dickson:

Be it resolved that 15 percent of the budget in Institutional Services, vote 8.2, be deleted.

MR. DICKSON: That works out to in my calculation \$12,956,460. I expressly am not moving what follows in the letter I've circulated to members. Is that clear, Mr. Chairman? Does that satisfy your requirements?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just so that all hon. members who are following your amendment realize that after you say "(vote 8.2)," then you would delete all of the rest of that part.

MR. DICKSON: Correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Okay. You're moving it then as . . .

MR. DICKSON: As an amendment to vote 8.2. Is that sufficiently clear, Mr. Chairman? I'd proceed to speak to my amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess the only other part is that perhaps if you're saying 15 percent, you might add in then, as you've mentioned in your preamble, the dollar amount so that those without the benefit of calculators could reckon the magnitude of your amendment. [interjection] On this point?

MR. EVANS: On this point, Mr. Chairman. For the purpose of clarity, the hon. member should redraft his amendment and circulate it, because it's difficult for hon. members to follow the logic if we're talking about taking some parts out of the amendment and leaving others in. I agree with you that there should be a reference to the dollar amount, because it makes it much easier to understand what's going on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken. Counsel has advised that under *Beauchesne* 955(1) it does indicate:

A proposal to reduce an Estimate is expressed in the form, "That (the Estimate) [whatever it be] be reduced by \$. . ." The amendment takes the form of the original motion.

Is that okay?

MR. DICKSON: I appreciate that direction. I understood that my office had received a different direction from the Parliamentary Counsel. Certainly I'll be happy to attend to that, Mr. Chairman, and have a new amendment prepared before the end of the afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the meantime, you can go on with your other comments.

MR. DICKSON: Okay. Well, I think I'll surrender the floor and get busy in terms of getting the amendment done, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mayfield, and we also have Edmonton-Norwood.

MR. WHITE: Yes. It's unfortunate that some minuscule procedural matter would interrupt this very important amendment, sir. You'll understand that it's been handed out to everyone. The intent of it is purely and simply to make a reallocation of funds. I mean, in any other forum in the land people understand exactly what it is. I'll speak to the intent of it, because it is in fact in general debate in any event. The intent is really quite simple. It is to take the matter of all those things that are punitive in nature, the taking of the items that one would normally concern . . .

Point of Order Amendments

MR. EVANS: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order is called. Hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. EVANS: I'm not sure how we can deal with an amendment when the amendment's not before the committee.

MR. WHITE: Sir, I heard no citing whatever. If I could just speak on the point of order, the point is quite this: any amendment to a main motion is in fact always available to be spoken of because the main motion is the full breadth of the entire department. An amendment that is yet to come – that will be coming but in fact isn't here – you can still speak to the principles of it, whether in fact you're speaking of the specific amendment or not. Certainly, sir, I'd look to your ruling, and there is definitely no point of order here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I will make the ruling on whether there's a point of order by saying that we gave the appropriate instruction to the hon. member in terms of his motion. The original one is in the form of a letter, as you perhaps noticed. The comment was going to be that the executive, the Crown and the government, propose and ask for funding from the programs, and our duty as a committee is to review that. We do not have the prerogative of increasing it, and that was recognized by the hon. Member for Calgary-*Buffalo*.

However, the second part of it is that we're dealing not in percentages here; we're dealing in dollar bills. We're talking about dollars, and so the amendment – it was drawn to my attention literally as the member was speaking that it must be quoted in dollar amounts. The quote was given, *Beauchesne*

955(1). I think the point of order was just a reinforcement of what had already been said.

Now, if the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mayfield wishes to speak on any other matter, then please do so. When the hon. Member for Calgary-*Buffalo* has the appropriate amendment, then we can go back and debate it. We have, as you can see, 52 minutes or thereabouts – I guess that's not true; how about 37 minutes? – to carry on debate. So if you'd carry on the debate, but not on the amendment, which is not before us.

MR. WHITE: That's where I'm having difficulty. If there's no amendment before us, then certainly the main motion, the length and breadth of the main motion, is on the floor for discussion. The point of order was well taken the first time the hon. member brought forward that percentages cannot be quoted, and actual real numbers. That we agree with and concur with, and my colleague is certainly in preparation for that amendment. Surely you're not ruling that any mention of the subject matter that may or may not come before this House is out of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess there's a fine line here, hon. member. What we're talking about are the main motions or any part of our estimates. I was having some difficulty, because I thought you were going to talk about the amendment, until we finally got the printed amendment before us. I think if you could confine yourself to all the rest of the estimates except the one that's going to be amended, that would be appreciated. Do you wish to speak to the . . .

MR. WHITE: With respect, sir, unless there is something before this House that specifically limits one to speak only for the remainder of the estimates, surely you cannot restrict one from speaking to any part of it. I don't mean to differ, but this is a point of order that really has to be clarified.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly. If you wish to speak to 8.2, fine and dandy, that's open, but not in terms of the amendment, because we don't have one here in form.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, sir. That's precisely the point. Sir, I shall then on your advisement take my place and allow that to happen and speak to it when it does come up here.

Thank you, sir.

Debate Continued

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

MR. BENIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to take this opportunity to raise some issues in the Department of Justice field. As the minister is aware, a good portion of . . .

DR. L. TAYLOR: Are you aware?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could we let the hon. member speak, please, without interruptions or interjections.

Edmonton-Norwood, please.

4:40

MR. BENIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat wishes to interrupt, I will continue to sit down as he does his interrupting.

My comments are, of course, directed to the Minister of Justice. My riding, as the minister is aware, encompasses part of the inner city. Of the 40 polls that had been part of the original Edmonton-

Norwood, 39 are still part of it. In that area certain issues are of very great importance. Half of the voters in those 39 polls are 55 years of age and over. Many fear walking down certain streets, especially in the evening. Just to show how serious the situation is, my nomination, for example, was on a Sunday afternoon, because in the evening many people would not have come because of concern for their personal safety. A prime function of government, a prime importance of government is to make sure everybody is safe and their property secure. The issue has to be discussed in this Legislature at the present time.

Let me just backtrack here. People, when they're afraid to walk down the street to visit their neighbours in certain parts of my riding – I have to stress “certain parts,” because in other areas this problem does not exist – enter a period of isolation during the summer, and this is compounded during the winter because of weather. When some of their property, like a television set or a radio, is taken away by a break-in, they become more isolated. The situation now develops that when the person who has committed the crime is taken to the courts and even is sentenced, it does not remedy the problem faced by the victim. The courts, as the minister is fully aware, have two parts. You have the criminal, where the power of the state comes against the individual committing the crime, and everything is done to make sure that the person that has committed the crime is proven to have committed it. On the civil side the government simply provides the structure for individuals and companies to have a forum to resolve their problems. When property is taken, the criminal goes to prison. The victim still remains without the property, and if there is physical violence against the person, that also is not resolved. So you have two systems, one dealing with criminal and one dealing with civil, but in the middle are the people who are the victims. I would like to hear from the minister how he feels the justice system deals properly and adequately with this problem. I don't believe it does. I believe there is a vacuum there that has to somehow be dealt with.

Another part which I would like to raise. I've talked to the police in that area. When I canvassed the area, I had many discussions with the victims, as well as some of the people that had not yet become victims but may shortly. A handful of young kids are apparently responsible for most of what might be called the youth crimes. I'm told that you can count them on one hand; at the most, on two hands. Okay? They're very few. I was also told by the police that they know who these people are. Now, I dismiss totally the suggestions to just change the Young Offenders Act, because that does not resolve the problem. It's not all young people; 99.9 percent of the young people are not the problem. It's a handful of people. I don't believe changing a word or a sentence in an Act is going to change that. What I would like to know from the minister is: why does he feel that a dozen or two dozen of these young people can continuously get away with committing certain crimes, especially when the police know who they are? They pick them up, they bring them to the police station, and then they release them. It impacts on the whole area. I've already mentioned the impact on seniors and others when their property is taken away.

In part of my riding, on about 124th Street, there is the Yellowhead Youth Centre, I believe it's called, or something like that. When I was canvassing that area, I think the minister might be interested to know, I was told that in the evening, especially on weekends, if you want to find a car that may have been taken for a joyride anyplace in the city, you go into that area, because that's where they are left as many of the young people go back. I would like to know how accurate this is, in statistics that the minister may have, and what can be done to prevent this from happening.

[Mr. Clegg in the Chair]

One of the serious problems in the inner-city part of my riding is the prostitution problem. Now, it's one thing to say that federal legislation comes into play, but the reality is that prostitution was concentrated in certain parts of the city. We know it was on Jasper Avenue and about 107th or 108th street. It was on 101st Avenue, and it just kept moving. One of the policies apparently being carried out is that if it's concentrated, you get rid of the problem by putting pressure on and it's sort of dispersed throughout the city. It's being dispersed more and more throughout the whole city.

This is impacting on other communities. I have been told – and I would welcome the minister to go down to a particular school there and just see for himself – that needles and used condoms lie in school yards, and they're picked up. I was told by the police that on certain days parents virtually go in front of their children before they go to school to make sure those items are picked up. I'm referring once again to certain parts of my riding, not to the whole riding.

These are very serious problems. If they were in other parts of the city or in some of the small rural towns, the outcry would be such that action would be taken. Because it's the inner city, there appears to have developed, most unfortunately, a perception that it's acceptable. I don't believe it is acceptable, as I'm sure the minister doesn't, for we have to treat everybody equally. We are not doing that if we allow a negative situation to remain in certain parts of the city or of this province which would not be tolerated in others.

I don't believe that throwing people in jail solves the problem. It has to be looked at in a positive light. Obviously, certain people have to go to jail for the crimes they commit and be there for a long time, if not forever. But the majority of people, the majority of crimes should be dealt with in such a fashion that it would have a positive impact on the victims. In other words, if a person has committed a crime against an individual, some sort of compensation should come into place, whether it's by the state or by the person committing the crime. I mean, we cannot ignore the fact that people who are victims of crimes live in pain, if they were victims of physical violence, or in isolation because their property was taken away or because their living standard dropped dramatically because of loss of property.

There are a number of other areas I'd like to raise, but I would zero in right now on one particular part here. Now, I'd also like the minister to respond to this. Bank accounts. A person that lives in poverty usually does not have a bank account. So what you have is that when a cheque is received, whether it's a Canada pension cheque, whether it's a cheque from Family and Social Services, it is cashed. First, it may be cashed at these chequing places that charge 2.9 percent, I believe their sign says, which means that automatically close to 3 percent of the value of the cheque is gone. They can't afford that loss. The second part is that they have cash in their possession. When the person has cash in their possession, they become vulnerable. In many cases, I am told by the police, the cash soon vanishes because they're robbed or, alternatively, for five days, 10 days they feel very rich and the money is spent very quickly. Instant millionaires for 24, 48, or 72 hours, and then poverty for the rest of the month. Perhaps, you know, some sort of mechanism has to be placed to ensure that people would be able to have bank accounts in credit unions or other. As they don't have the funds, maybe some sort of legislation may have to be brought in to help get this process going.

4:50

DR. WEST: Communism.

MR. BENIUK: Is he speaking, or am I speaking?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure. Go ahead, hon. Member for Edmonton-Norwood.

MR. BENIUK: Thank you. I'm not too sure occasionally, if the Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat is continuously speaking in this Legislature.

**Point of Order
Imputing Motives**

DR. L. TAYLOR: Point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Point of order, Cypress-Medicine Hat.

DR. L. TAYLOR: He's imputing motives. I certainly didn't make any of those last comments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. There's a little disagreement here.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Norwood.

MR. BENIUK: Everybody is allowed to make a mistake once out of a million regarding who makes a comment from across the aisle, and I just made my one out of a million.

Debate Continued

MR. BENIUK: I'll leave my comments at this point, but I must tell the minister that my comments were sincere. They are very serious problems. I would like him to take a look at these issues and see if there is some way that some of these problems can be resolved.

I'd just make this one comment yet. The liquor licences being issued are going to have a major negative impact. If you go to 118th Avenue, you will find about 60 pawnshops, which in themselves are having a negative impact on the area. Now I believe the rumour is that six to eight liquor stores are soon going to be between 82nd Street and 95th Street, which is further going to negatively impact on an avenue that the businesspeople there are trying to revitalize and the neighbours in that area are trying to revitalize.

So there are many problems which I've raised, and they're very serious problems. When people live in fear and their property is insecure and they have very little assets, the system really works against them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. member.
The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Beverly.

MS HANSON: Thank you, sir. I had spoken to the Assembly a few weeks ago during the earlier estimates, but there are just a couple of things I would like to go back to. My theme at that time was social justice.

At this point I would like to speak a little bit about coming up with more creative ways to deal with nonviolent offenders, particularly young, nonviolent offenders who are in jail because they can't pay the fines. I think that in order to do this, we need to divert some funds to community programs and co-operative programs between government and community.

I was reminded of this whole issue last week when I attended one of those grade 6 classes that are taking government in school. It was the fifth or sixth class that I had attended, but this one particularly impressed me. It was in a community that's not inner-city. It's got a lovely location out on top of the river valley, but it is a large public-housing development that has fallen into disrepair over the last few years. It's not crowded conditions, but there's a lot of crime and a lot of vacancy and substandard housing.

They're a really bright group of kids. Some of them are temporarily housed with their mothers in a nearby women's shelter, and they come to the school for awhile. Others live in a housing development where there are nightly fights and drug dealings and where toddlers aren't allowed out in the morning until the broken glass and the used condoms and the needles are picked up by their mothers. In this development last year a little girl was abducted from right outside her back door and was subsequently murdered.

The children in the development still talk about being afraid. The main avenue is just about two or three blocks from their school – and it's a very good school; they have an excellent teacher – but these kids band together in groups of five, six to 10 to go up to the avenue to the small grocery store during the noon hour because there are so many attacks by older girls and boys involving knives, stealing their jackets, that kind of thing.

I looked at those kids and thought: you know, without some sort of intervention there's about at least a 75 percent chance that the majority of them are going to end up involved with the young offender system within the next 10 years, sometime in their middle teens, given the violence that's present every day, given the anger that can be seen in those children. The teacher tells me that she generally spends about an hour in the morning trying to get those kids to look at their day in a positive way because of what happens to them in the rest of their lives. I think that unless we get some sort of community and government co-operative initiatives together, this is just a small symptom in a small place of a very large problem.

There's a booklet that was put out I believe in 1992 or '91, Mr. Minister, under the previous minister, called Working Together to Prevent Family Violence. It was a collaborative effort between the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Health, the minister responsible for women's issues, the solicitor general, and a variety of other people. The idea was to try to get the community and the government and agencies involved in this whole issue of family violence. I have 20 years' experience in the field, and juvenile delinquents, as we used to call them, kids involved in aberrant behaviour that is not acceptable, nearly always seem to come from troubled homes, perhaps not really violent, but they don't have any sense of belonging or any reinforcement for attending school. Their lives are unstable, and it's very difficult.

I would ask that you might perhaps look into this book. I know the initiative started, but for some reason, perhaps changes, whatever, it didn't go any further. It has some really practical suggestions, not just ideas or philosophies. Wife abuse, the criminal aspect of family violence, breaking the pattern of violence, elder abuse, all of those things: bringing those to the fore in communities. I would appreciate it if you might look at that again.

There was an initiative in Saskatchewan a few years ago. I don't know the details, but I know it was an early intervention program for children from poor families or children who were at risk. It was apparently very successful. The recidivism rate was very low. If you are interested and can't find out anything about it, I could probably find some information for you.

I also have some concerns about women and the law. It's different in a way. In the whole business of prostitution and relations between men and women the responsibility is put on the woman. Either in court cases in judgment of prostitution or charges of rape and that kind of thing, it always seems to be the woman who, most believe, has to take responsibility as to whether or not there was consent or whether or not, in the case of prostitution, the prostitute was the active party.

Also, women in prison. While the fines options program is a very good idea, there are some problems with it for women because of babysitting problems, sometimes lack of experience as far as being afraid to get out in the world, particularly women who have been at home for a long time and found that they've got themselves in difficulty. If they end up in jail, I think the effects on the family are often worse than if it was a male in jail, because unfortunately men do not stay home and look after the children. The children of women in jail very often end up in care, which as we all know can be a pretty bad experience.

I would ask the minister if he would look into those problems. Thank you.

MR. DICKSON: A couple of further questions now that I've had an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to look at the written responses from the hon. minister. He indicates that the CASES system doesn't have, quote, a full-blown case management component developed within it. I guess my question is: is there an intention to look at that?

Secondly, in terms of young offender community sentencing panels, section 69 of the Young Offenders Act, will he advise us which are the 22 communities that have either implemented or are in the process of exercising that provision?

In terms of the question asked about shock incarceration programs, I'm wondering if the minister will tell us how he thinks those are going to be helpful given the relatively short duration of provincial sentences and the fact that the way the programs work in other places, it's usually posed as an alternative, and offenders either opt in or opt out of it. I mean, it's not a mandatory kind of program.

5:00

The other thing I see in his written responses when he was asked by Lethbridge-East about maintenance enforcement – and I see his response there. I still don't have a clear indication from the minister and this government in terms of whether they're seriously looking at what's happened in Ontario, what's happened in Australia in terms of making child support an automatic deduction at source. He's talked in his written response to the Member for Lethbridge-East about some additional directories and search data bases they're going to use, but to me that is going to put a small dent in what is a big problem.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, what I want to do now is attempt for a second time to move an amendment to the Justice estimates: that 15 percent of the budget in Institutional Services, vote 8.2, be deleted, reducing the amount by \$12,956,460.

I will move on, Mr. Chairman. [interjections] Well, I'm relying on the inherent wisdom of all members of the Assembly. Recognizing the context within which we're dealing, it's clear that we're not dealing with jelly beans and we're not dealing with inmates; we're dealing with dollars. This is a wonderful Chamber. There's never any shortage of volunteered assistance, and I always appreciate the help from members on the government side.

Speaking to the amendment, Mr. Chairman, there are two reasons I've put this amendment before the House. The first one is that we hear a lot of talk in the course of an estimates debate about principles and so on, but I haven't seen us have an opportu-

nity to take some action in dealing with one of these things. What I'm proposing to do is this. I think all members in this Assembly understand, firstly, that there are a lot of people serving time in expensive correctional institutions who are there because they can't afford to pay the fine. These aren't people who represent a threat to the community. One of the things that I find frustrating and what we know is that having people in institutions costs us about 10 times what it costs to have these people released in the community on some kind of a conditional release program. It seems to me that as long as you have these large, expensive institutions, which are costing us well over \$45,000 a year per inmate, there's no incentive to come up with better alternatives. I want to create a financial imperative where the Justice Minister and the Justice department have to become really creative in terms of finding ways of dealing with nonviolent offenders outside of these large, hugely expensive institutions.

The second reason I've proposed this amendment is that I've been impressed with a book which I understand is virtually the bible for the members opposite, and it's the text *Reinventing Government*, authored by David Osborne and Ted Gaebler. In fact, this is such a good text, my recollection is that the members opposite at their last party convention had developed as a theme through a number of their policy sessions this notion of reinventing government. One of the things that has happened in Massachusetts and places like that, where they've decided to reduce the amount of money they spend on large institutions, is they basically issue a call for tenders. They say: "There's a lot of creativity in the bigger community. You come and tell us, you as a private agency or a for-profit agency, you come forward with a program in terms of how we can deliver a correctional service to nonviolent offenders. You tell us what you can do." It doesn't have to look the same in Taber as it does in Fort McMurray. We want to harness some of the creativity, some of the energy, some of the good ideas that we all know exist in our own communities. The only way to do that and make it happen is to say, "This is where we stop just building and building and building jails we can't afford anyway." Let's focus on dealing with the violent offenders. Let's get them out of the community. Nobody disagrees with that. But what's the point in leaving all of those other people who don't pose a threat to you or me or our families or our neighbours in these great big institutions, particularly since we can't afford to keep on putting people away and we can't afford to keep on building institutions?

So just in summary, the two reasons I am proposing this amendment. Firstly, we have a unique chance here to say to the creative people in the Justice department that we're just not going to go on building jails anymore. We're saying to you: "Here's the challenge. Come on; sit down. Come up with a strategy that tries to harness some of the creative energy we have in this province; come up with some alternate strategies to deal with nonviolent offenders, either young offenders or adult offenders." And we'll provide money for that. I'm not able to do it under the rules, but what I'd say is: instead of rolling these moneys into general revenue, invest moneys recaptured under this amendment in community corrections, invest them in contracted services. I think that's a way of not only rationalizing a government but providing an effective community service in a cost-effective fashion.

Point of Order Questioning a Member

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Point of order? Sorry.

DR. WEST: A point of order. Would the hon. member entertain a question in debate under *Beauchesne 492*?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, I guess it would be up to the hon. member.

MR. DICKSON: The short answer is that we're short of time, and I'm interested in hearing debate on the amendment. If the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs wishes to address it at that time, he'll have his opportunity, but I'd like us to deal with the amendment I put forward, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

Debate Continued

MR. ROSTAD: Speaking against the amendment, I recognize that the hon. member has a bent for and a feeling that by allowing perpetrators on the streets, they will in fact behave and be good. That's been his proclivity and part of his preoccupation prior to being in the House. In many instances that's true. In fact, it is a significant part of our department, community corrections. In fact, in this budget we have not reduced the community corrections aspect of our department. We have, in fact, converted some of the agency contracts to in-house duties, but we have not lessened the amount. Obviously the member has a philosophical difference that the agencies he worked with and knows can do a more effective job than those in-house, and I guess he can be of that view if he so wishes. By no means do I mean to denigrate the effort of these agencies. They are significant, but we can also, through cost efficiencies, deliver the same.

[Mr. Tannas in the Chair]

I'm also quite surprised that he would suggest that we could take the \$3 million out of this particular vote and that that would not affect 240 people who are employed in those particular things, which may not necessarily convert to his desire to have community corrections. But the main issue is that we do not as a department designate who will be in those institutions and who won't be in those institutions. It in fact is the court, who in a very independent manner analyzes the incidents, all aspects, the disposition and such of the accused, listens to representations on both sides in terms of a court case, and then also is sometimes mandated by the law to do certain things. They are the ones who put these people into the institutions or not into the institutions.

I don't know if I'd call it our party's or our government's bible, but the book *Reinventing Government* has a lot of good ideas, not only relating to perhaps the way we might handle criminals but a lot of good alternatives as to government doing certain things. We have been looking at a number of initiatives that might be used to keep track of nonviolent offenders, and the hon. member might be surprised that a number of those may come along. I'm pleased to hear that we would at least have his support if those come forward.

On the basis of taking this money out of institutions when frankly we don't have control of who's in those institutions, the idea that just by taking them out and putting them on the street they'll be cared for, I speak against the amendment.

5:10

MR. KIRKLAND: I would speak in favour of the amendment. I don't think . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, can you just hold for thirty seconds, please.

Hon. members, if you wish a vote on the amendment, then do so now. Otherwise, it's going to be lost in two or three minutes.

The hon. Member for Leduc.

MR. KIRKLAND: I'll be brief. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would speak in favour of the amendment. One thing we can't lose sight of. The Member for Calgary-Buffalo indicated that a good percentage of the patrons or clients in our institutions are there because they were unable to pay a fine. I think that's the wrong reason to keep people incarcerated. There has to be more innovation, and there has to be more application of some of the ingenuity in this province to ensure that in fact they have some other way to pay society back.

What really is being attempted here is to force the issue to some degree. I think we've all stood and pleaded and suggested that in fact there has to be a new approach to justice in the province. It doesn't seem to be working as well as we would like to see it, and I view this as being one more little push to try to step forward and force somebody into some new thinking and a new method of doing business.

So I would support the amendment on that basis, Mr. Chairman.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, pursuant to Standing Orders 58(1) and 59(3) I must now put the following question. Those members in favour of each of the resolutions not yet voted upon relating to the government estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1994, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that the committee now rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. TANNAS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports that each one of the resolutions not yet voted upon relating to the main estimates of the government and the Legislative Assembly for 1993-94 have been approved, and requests leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to file a list of those resolutions voted upon by the Committee of Supply pursuant to Standing Order 57(9). I wish to table copies of documents filed by the Minister of Justice this date for the official records of the Assembly. I also wish to table copies of all amendments considered by the Committee of Supply on this date for the official records of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly concur in the report by the hon. Member for Highwood?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed. Carried.

[At 5:17 p.m. the Assembly adjourned to Monday at 1:30 p.m.]