

Title: **Monday, February 23, 1998**

Date: 98/02/23

8:47 a.m.

[Ms Haley in the chair]

Des.subcom: Justice & Attorney Gen.

Designated Supply Subcommittee – Justice and Attorney General

Haley, Carol, Chairman
Burgener, Jocelyn
Dickson, Gary
Friedel, Gary

Graham, Marlene
Hierath, Ron
Hlady, Mark
Massey, Don

Olsen, Sue
O'Neill, Mary
Pannu, Raj
Stevens, Ron

THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome to the designated subcommittee of supply on Justice and to Minister Havelock. Being the first one of the five of these this year, we get to set the pattern for how this will work.

In conversation with the critic from the Liberal opposition, we have a tentative agreement on how this morning will proceed. I would like to run that by you in the form of a motion. If I have unanimous consent, we will move ahead in this way. It would read in this way:

We will have the hon. minister speak for 20 minutes . . .
He's allocated 20 minutes.

. . . the Liberals would have one hour and 48 minutes thereafter, and the New Democrats to follow with their 12 minutes, completing the opposition allotment of two hours as per the DSS agreement, and the committee will then adjourn.

I need unanimous consent for this motion, so we'll see what happens.

All those in agreement in with this, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anyone opposed? Thank you. That's how we will proceed then.

So, Mr. Minister, we will turn it over to you. We do have a timer here. We will start with you. You have up to 20 minutes if you choose to use it all. Please begin.

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, thank you, Madam Chairman and committee members. It is a pleasure to be here to present the ministry's estimates and business plan for the period 1998-99 to 2000-2001. Our plan is not just a report about what we think might happen in the future in justice administration. Rather, our plan builds on certain assumptions and reveals the activities that we will undertake now and over the next three years in order to create an enhanced future for Albertans. I am confident that our business plan fulfills the expectations that Albertans have of this government for the delivery of an effective and accessible justice system.

The Committee of Supply debate on the estimates is an important exercise in public accountability. The justice system must be understood and supported by Albertans to ensure its continued effectiveness, and this process assists in achieving that goal. In this regard I invite all members to feel free to address their concerns to me both inside and outside this forum.

The mission of the Ministry of Justice is "to ensure equality and fairness in the administration of justice in Alberta." This is our guiding principle, and it identifies the business that we are in. Indeed, justice is so fundamental that no civilized society can exist without it. Our core businesses support this broad purpose and are also in keeping with the Alberta government's vision and mission. Maintaining law and order and building safer communi-

ties contribute directly to the superior quality of life that Albertans enjoy. I am sure you agree that all Albertans perceive and appreciate the many benefits of an effective system of justice.

Madam Chairman, starting with the global financial picture, the ministry's 1998-99 gross operating expense estimates to be voted total \$349.8 million, which represents a net increase of \$12.4 million, or about 3.7 percent, from the comparable 1997-98 estimates. Capital investment to be voted is relatively unchanged at \$1.58 billion in 1998-99. In addition, the ministry's 1998-99 estimates also include a further amount of \$27.35 million for statutory requirements. Of this amount \$27,250,000 relates to funding required for motor vehicle accident claims. In the context of manpower rates that are increasing across the public service, I believe these increases are modest and reflect that Alberta Justice has continued to exercise fiscal restraint without compromising public safety.

This year we have restructured our business plan so that our strategies are directly linked to each goal, and we have specific initiatives in place to support each strategy. For example, to achieve our goal of having safe communities, one of our strategies is to focus the resources of Alberta Justice on serious and violent crime. This has been an ongoing strategy for the ministry, and we will continue to monitor its impact on our operations. Another initiative that we are planning to undertake is to identify provincial strategies to combat organized crime.

For our second goal, to "facilitate the rehabilitation of offenders and to help victims," we have included a strategy to enhance the responsiveness to victims of crime. Our initiatives in this area include monitoring and evaluating services to crime victims provided by the new Victims of Crime Act and developing legislation to enhance protection for victims of domestic violence.

To achieve our third goal of "access to criminal and civil justice," we have strategies that will enhance opportunities for Albertans to obtain appropriate dispute resolution mechanisms. This includes the establishment of a provincewide small claims mediation program. We will also work with the judiciary and the bar on establishing dispute resolution processes for civil litigation in the Court of Queen's Bench. Because these dispute resolution mechanisms are fairly new to our system, we will investigate the feasibility of developing a performance measure to assess the effectiveness of such mechanisms.

The government remains concerned about the disproportionate number of aboriginal people involved in the justice system. The Ministry of Justice, in partnership with the aboriginal community, will continue to develop culturally sensitive programs that recognize the needs of the aboriginal community while ensuring public safety. In this regard I have asked Mike Cardinal to review and evaluate the support of the First Nations police projects in Alberta from the community perspective. A second review that is under way is chaired by the hon. Karen Krcyzka and is studying and making recommendations in relation to the establishment of a tribal court as proposed by the Tsuu T'ina/Stoney First Nations. Both these reviews will assist the Ministry of Justice in developing more appropriate models of service delivery for our aboriginal citizens. In addition, we have

developed other initiatives relating to aboriginals in the court system and their involvement in the administration of criminal justice. In the coming year we will also work with the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics to develop an appropriate indicator that represents aboriginal involvement in the criminal justice system.

Our business plan for 1998-99 to 2000-2001 includes the goal "to ensure access to justice services for persons in need." This goal is met by providing maintenance enforcement services, Public Trustee services, victims' assistance, and support for legal aid. In the coming year we intend to increase public awareness and meet with community groups and stakeholders and pursue innovative approaches to service delivery.

In the Public Trustee's office we will extend our service to include the administration of government benefits for dependent persons having nominal assets and who are in need of trusteeship, while streamlining the administrative and financial process of estate administration.

Members are also aware of the MLA review committee on the maintenance enforcement program and child access chaired by my colleague the hon. Marlene Graham. I am looking forward to receiving her committee's recommendations and reviewing them for implementation over the next few years.

Our last goal is "to provide effective legal services to the Government of Alberta." We achieve this goal by providing legal advice to government, representing client departments and Crown agents in litigation and other dispute resolution processes, and providing advice in lawmaking and drafting of policy and legislation. In the next year we will support the government's regulatory review plan and work with our client ministries to ensure our services remain at a high level.

Each of our strategies is designed to meet our goals. If they do not accomplish that objective, we will know from the results of our performance measures and we will restructure our operations accordingly.

There is another matter that is not in our business plan that I would like to discuss, the Justice Summit I recently announced. I believe this important initiative will go a long way in improving the administration of justice in Alberta. The reason the Justice Summit was not included in our business plan was that in the fall of this year and after our plan had been completed for the standing policy committee review, we completed a survey of public opinion about the administration of justice in the province and were disturbed to find that the low degree of public satisfaction in the justice system evidenced in earlier polls continued unabated.

I have spoken publicly about my concerns, but to reiterate some of the major findings both in our survey and in a recent Angus Reid survey, there was poor public confidence in ratings of the courts, prison, parole, and young offender systems. Forty-seven percent of Albertans were not satisfied with the job that Alberta Justice was doing. While 73 percent felt that the criminal justice system makes the right decisions about guilt and innocence, only 25 percent felt that sentences matched the crime, and fewer than 20 percent indicated that individuals convicted of a crime spent enough time in jail. And despite five consecutive years of decreases in measured crime, 90 percent of Albertans thought crime levels in their communities had either remained constant or increased over the past several years.

Accordingly, I have initiated a process that will lead up to a Justice Summit sometime in early 1999. The summit will examine public confidence in the justice system, victim rights and involvement in the justice system, youth crime, policing, aboriginal justice, barriers to justice, and other issues raised in our discussion.

I will be chairing a steering committee establishing the summit, and it will consist of members representing the bar, police, aboriginal and Métis organizations, and government. Our judicial colleagues have generously offered to act as a resource to the summit. I have available for you copies of the summit terms of reference if you so wish.

8:57

A crucial part of this summit is the involvement of Albertans from outside the justice community. In order for the summit to be successful, it is important that all Albertans have an opportunity to voice their concerns regarding the administration of justice. Accordingly, in preparation for the summit a consultation document will be developed and distributed to enable Albertans to familiarize themselves with the issues and express their views. I have asked my colleague the hon. Richard Magnus to chair an all-party committee of MLAs to travel the province to identify the concerns of the public and make constructive recommendations towards improving the justice system. It is expected that the public, along with key stakeholders, will play an important role in determining the eventual format and issues of discussion at the summit.

While the relatively modest cost of this review has not been specifically identified in the business plan, it is anticipated that the benefits of this approach will far outweigh these costs and will result in useful changes in the administration of justice that will be reflected in subsequent business plans.

Madam Chairman, in closing, I am aware that we have a responsibility for a critical public trust. The ministry is committed to a process of improving services to the public. I believe our approach in the coming year exemplifies this commitment. Along with the Justice Summit, I am confident that this process of renewal is well represented in the estimates and business plan for 1998-99 to 2000-2001.

I would now welcome questions from the committee and take the opportunity to address any issues or concerns my colleagues may have concerning the ministry. I should note that for any questions I can't answer here this morning, a response will be forwarded to you as soon as my staff and I can put one together.

So thank you for your time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Our first questioner will be the Justice critic, Sue Olsen. Just for clarification, while you're going through your questions – you have a block of 20 minutes, and then it will switch to Mr. Dickson – my question to you is: do you want the minister to answer you while you're questioning? Do you want to have basically a conversation directed through the chair, or would you rather ask all of your questions and then have the minister have an opportunity to answer?

MS OLSEN: I'd rather ask all of my questions so he's able to answer them. No. I'll ask my questions, and then if you want to answer them when we're done, I think that's what we did last year.

MR. HAVELOCK: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. I just wanted to make sure we did it in a way that you were comfortable with.

MS OLSEN: That would be great.

MR. HAVELOCK: One small favour though. Don't ask them in

blocks of 10 or 15 because it does get to be a bit cumbersome for me to try and respond. If you could somehow apportion them in such a way that I have a reasonable chance . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: I could really get into that, but I'll just let it go with that "cumbersome" word.

MS OLSEN: Do we want to have that conversation, Madam Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: It's probably not a great idea.

MS OLSEN: No. That's fine.

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, I'll do whatever you want.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay; we'll begin. Thank you.

MS OLSEN: I'd like to thank the minister and his colleagues for agreeing to our two hours. I know it would be a little cumbersome to sit here for four hours. So we'll fire away.

I guess the first thing I want to discuss is the justice review and the Judicial Selection Process Review Committee. I'm to understand it's not part of this budget and it's not in this particular document. I'm just wondering: what are the anticipated costs, and what is the process? In terms of public consultation, what will the consultation document look like? Are you looking at sending out information in relation to the justice system by way of a questionnaire, a survey? I'd be interested if the minister would look at the deliberative democracy process, which would be an extremely valuable tool, and that process allows for a survey to go out to get the input of the public. In those communities where we meet, the public would bring their document plus you would have a panel of experts in different areas, give them information and then break down into groups, come back at the end of the day, so to speak, and have them do the survey again and see what changes. I think that would be a great way to help work through some of the issues.

A concern I have. You talked about the people that have been appointed to the steering committee. Although there's First Nations representation through the Métis community and through the reserves, there are no urban aboriginal groups represented, and there are two large groups operating in Edmonton and Calgary from the urban aboriginal perspective that would probably be of value to this committee. I also want to note the absence of the Crown Attorneys Association, the Criminal Trial Lawyers Association, groups such as the Social Planning Council. I noticed on page 283 of Agenda for Opportunity that you want to "foster a multi-disciplinary justice system." Part of that would also be balancing the steering committee with people from places such as the Social Planning Council. When I talk about where is the community representation, I'm not talking about the public input; I'm talking about grassroots representation from the larger centres, the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. Calgary also has a similar system where there may also be some folks with some good input or at least representing sort of the grassroots community levels. So those are some of the concerns I have in terms of the review.

The key measures by the department use surveys which are conducted by the department, and I'm just wondering if we can see a copy of the survey which is used so that we can see the exact wording of every question that is asked and the answers participants are required to pick from.

Also, looking at the key measures in terms of the number of

Alberta communities participating in justice initiatives, you have a target number of 200. Does that refer to 200 separate communities, or are there communities involved in a number of different initiatives within one community? Are we counting communities twice, or are we counting the initiatives separately? If you could clarify that.

I am pleased to see a couple of the key performance measures. One of my concerns last year was that they didn't seem to target the broad perspective, and I'm happy to see there have been some changes made there.

We'll move to the income statements. Over \$24 million in transfers from the federal government. What are the five largest transfers received from the federal government? What are their amounts, and what would they be for? The income statement estimates for maintenance enforcement will bring \$10 million in '98-99. Does this sum represent money that is being paid over to recipients, or is this all money that goes into general revenue? And what is the percentage collected by maintenance enforcement that's paid directly to the recipients?

MR. HAVELOCK: Do you want me to answer some now?

MS OLSEN: Sure, if you want to take a couple of minutes and do that.

MR. HAVELOCK: It might take more than a couple of minutes, but I'll try. The judicial review committee: we anticipate the cost to be minimal. They haven't been split out in the budget itself. Do you have a specific number?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MR. HAVELOCK: No. Okay.

With respect to the public consultation associated with it, it really is up to the committee to determine how they wish to approach it. I know they have recently run some ads in the paper. I don't believe they will be looking at it from a deliberative democracy perspective, and I'm not entirely sure whether they will be putting together a survey or not, but I will tell you that the intention is not to send out the committee much like we're intending to do for the Justice Summit. Nevertheless, I fully anticipate that there will be a good response. It's been an issue that's generated quite a bit of public discussion. I'm also relying on all members of the Legislature to ensure that they get out to their community members that this review is ongoing, and if they wish to have some input, then by all means do so. But it is not as elaborate or as expensive or as extensive as what we intend to do for the Justice Summit.

9:07

Regarding the summit and the steering committee, that's a good comment you make about urban aboriginal groups. The difficulty we were faced with on the steering committee was trying to keep it to a level that was manageable from a number of perspectives. I fully anticipate that through the working committee where there will be an aboriginal designate, if members of the urban aboriginal communities wish to have some input, they can feed in that way quite directly.

The Criminal Trial Lawyers Association and the Crown Attorneys Association. The former I think will be adequately represented by the Law Society and the CBA because they'll speaking on behalf of all lawyers, and again, they can feed in through the working committee and put their input in. The Crown attorneys will be, again, I think represented adequately the by

department, and I'm well aware of the position the Crown attorneys have on a number of issues, so I don't believe their input will be missed. We're looking forward to it in fact.

The Social Planning Council, some of the other groups, the grassroots: again, we tried to set up a working committee where input can be received even outside of the public consultation, which I believe you'll be involved with. So I feel there's going to be ample opportunity for people to prepare and put in and for us to evaluate it appropriately.

You asked about the survey. We actually did release the results of the last justice survey at the CBA speech I made in January, where we announced the summit. In fact, I think I distributed a copy of the speech and the entire package to all members of the Legislature, so you may have that already. If not, we can certainly get you another copy. I don't believe we have any other surveys that we do other than that one. Is that correct?

DR. PETRUK: This other one.

MR. HAVELOCK: We are doing some other work, for example, with the maintenance enforcement program committee. They are doing a survey, and the intention is for that document to be made public. The committee looking at aboriginal policing: the report is still being worked on, so that will likely be public also.

Your concern about the 200 community initiatives. Those are 200 different initiatives. Now, there may be five initiatives in one community, but that's the way we're counting them.

The transfers from the feds. I have that somewhere here. We received approximately 6 and a half million dollars for legal aid. They do support a portion of the legal aid associated with criminal charges. Child support guidelines: \$1,955,000. Exchange of services for corrections: we take care of a lot of prisoners on behalf of the federal government. That's a little over \$3 million. The federal firearms program fees are about \$720,000. [interjection] Oh, the cost sharing. That's right, yeah. There is also cost sharing with the young offenders of around \$12 million, which is mostly there, which is, I might add, significantly less than the 50 percent which they committed two years ago to fund in this province. The Young Offenders Act agreement is expiring, and what we have done is put in the budget 90 percent of what we received before. We're just being conservative, because of course we're experiencing federal government downloading their problem on to us at the provincial level. So perhaps you could talk to your colleagues in Ottawa about that.

The MEPs. The information I have here is that the \$10 million is what we get through subrogated claims when we're covering off for the individuals who are collecting welfare. When we get the \$10 million in, we simply keep that and offset it against what we have paid to those recipients.

MR. MCCRANK: That's per year.

MR. HAVELOCK: Okay. We are looking at about \$100 million per year, then, that we are collecting from creditors, and about 70 percent of the files that we have open have received funds in the last 90 days.

MS OLSEN: Okay. We'll move on to support services. In the '96-97 budget there was no money budgeted for the internal audit which had been conducted one of the five preceding years. When the annual report came out for that year, however, it indicated that \$312,000 had been spent on an internal audit. Is this budget there again? There's no internal audit line. So how much is budgeted for '98-99 for the internal audit and which vote is it

included under, and will we be able to review the completed audit?

If you go to lines 1.0.6 and 1.0.7, when the '97-98 budget came out, there was \$3 million budgeted for financial services and \$751,000 budgeted for corporate support services.

MR. HAVELOCK: Excuse me. Because I'm trying to follow the numbers, if you could point me to the pages, it would be a little easier for me.

MS OLSEN: I made a little chart for me.

MR. HAVELOCK: You have your own special chart? If you could refer to the document I'm working from, that would be quite helpful.

MS OLSEN: Lines 1.0.6 and 1.0.7.

MR. HAVELOCK: I'm sorry. What was the question? I managed to get your corporate services question down.

MS OLSEN: Okay. We'll start again here. When the '97-98 budget came out, there was \$3 million budgeted for financial services and \$751,000 budgeted for corporate support services. In the right-hand column of this budget you indicated that the comparable '97-98 budget for financial services and corporate services was \$2.9 million and \$911,000 respectively. This has the effect of making it appear that every vote under program 1 has decreased. Why was \$160,000 apparently switched from financial services to corporate services? What does this \$160,000 pay for?

Move to program 3, legal services.

MR. HAVELOCK: Sorry. You're where again now?

MS OLSEN: Program 3. I noticed there was no increase for the law reform commission.

MR. HAVELOCK: Right. We just signed I think a five-year arrangement at the same level of funding. They did ask for more.

MS OLSEN: I'm sure.

Okay. The budget for Legislative Counsel has been increased by a bit, over \$100,000. Will any of this increase be directed towards improving the salaries of Legislative Counsel in accordance with the recommendations of the Price Waterhouse report? What percentage of the Legislative Counsel have received raises since that report came out, and what is the average raise received?

The budget for the civil law division on line 3.3 is over a million more than budgeted for in '97-98. How much of this million dollar increase will be directed towards improving the salaries of the division's lawyers to comply with the recommendations of the Price Waterhouse report? What percentage of the lawyers have received raises, and what was the average raise received? How many lawyers are currently working in this division, and what is their average salary? How many of these lawyers have more than five years' experience at the bar?

MR. HAVELOCK: Would you like me to maybe answer some of these now?

MS OLSEN: I'll give you two more. How much of this budget will be used to contract outside private legal counsel to provide opinions to the government and represent the government legal disputes? How much of this budget is slated for the gun control

challenge, and how much is targeted for the prisoner voting challenge?

MR. HAVELOCK: Good try.

MS OLSEN: Well, we never quit asking.

THE CHAIRMAN: If I could just interrupt for one second. I wanted to let you know that there are four minutes left of this first 20-minute block, so try and keep your answers to that.

9:17

MR. HAVELOCK: That's just fine. Okay.

Getting back to the \$312,000 for the internal audit, that has been moved to part of the corporate support. It doesn't turn up as a separate entry. The internal audit is just that. It's internal and we examine how we are operating. We will not be releasing that publicly. The \$160,000 which you mentioned was again a transfer of costs associated with the internal audit, and that represented three positions.

Legislative Counsel, which you mentioned: virtually all the increase there relates to increases in salary. What I'll have to do is have compiled for you the number of people that have received an increase and, so long as it's something that I feel comfortable releasing publicly, the average increase also, just because of the sensitivity associated with negotiations.

Item 3.3.3: virtually all of that increase is again as a result of Price Waterhouse. In fact if you look at the general increases throughout legal services, it's all virtually related to us implementing Price Waterhouse.

The outside counsel question regarding the budgeted amount: it is less than a million at this stage. Okay. It's not separately identified. What would it fall under? It would be under criminal justice generally, just the general prosecutions for example?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just general prosecutions.

MR. HAVELOCK: And the civil also would be. Okay.

With respect to your specific question regarding the costs associated with the firearms control and some of the other questions you've asked in the past both publicly and here, I am not prepared to disclose what we spend on specific files when we retain outside counsel. Part of the problem is that if we waive privilege with respect to the fees, it may be interpreted as we're waiving privilege with respect to other portions of the case. I was anticipating you asking that question, and I anticipated giving the same answer I gave last year.

MS OLSEN: That's okay, as long we ask and you answer.

MR. HAVELOCK: That's right.

MS OLSEN: Okay. I just want to talk . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: One minute.

MS OLSEN: One minute? Time to trial. I'll get back to that.

MR. HAVELOCK: Okay.

MS OLSEN: I'll let my colleague here carry on.

MR. DICKSON: Thanks very much, Madam Chairman. Good morning, Mr. Minister. You have focused a lot in the time

you've been minister on your concern about lack of public confidence in the system. I'm wondering whether you're prepared to invest some of the resources of your department or provide some leadership in terms of giving Albertans more information about their legal system. We've known for at least 20 years – there's a criminologist named Dr. Tony Doob at U of T, who's done lots of work that demonstrates that most Canadians still get their information about their justice system through American TV programs. We know that to the extent that it would appear people are fearful, it drives a whole set of other expectations and demands.

So I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, what responsibilities you see that you ought to take as the Justice minister in this province, and I'm wondering whether you're prepared to follow some of the initiatives that have been adopted by Perrin Beatty or Bob Kaplan when they were Solicitors General nationally, Ian Scott when he was the Attorney General in Ontario. Each of these ministers had at different times made commitments in terms of public information campaigns simply to try and give Albertans more accurate base information about the way particularly the criminal justice system operates.

We find that certainly in the area of young offenders and in the area of sentencing, people are often responding to misinformation, and we have some very substantial myths that continue to be perpetuated. My general question is: what responsibility, Mr. Minister, do you take for trying to address some of those myths, and what concrete steps or plans do you have to address some of those things?

Now, I think we've provided Mr. McCrank with a copy of some of the key questions that we're going to be asking, but I'd just alert Mr. McCrank . . .

MR. HAVELOCK: Is he going to answer them?

MR. DICKSON: We were sure you were going to be able to share with your deputy, Mr. Minister, and we knew you wanted to focus all of your attention on the solid questions you're being asked, so we didn't want to distract you.

I'm interested in the further position of the department with respect to the proposal that's been put to you before; that is to have a video record of trials so that the Court of Appeal has the benefit not only of the written transcript but now, because technology permits, also is provided a video record. Now, I've raised that with you before. I'm not talking about public television of court proceedings. This is an item that's been raised by some senior lawyers in Calgary, well experienced in civil litigation. Their argument to me has been – and I find it a persuasive one – that it may do a lot in terms of in fact strengthening appellate decisions to have the video record available. My question would be: is your department prepared to undertake that, at least on a pilot project basis, to determine the extent to which it may be helpful?

Also I notice in just looking at the latest notice I got from the Law Society that effective April 1 Rules of Court are going to be produced and circulated by the Queen's Printer. I'm wondering what sort of cost saving or impact that has on your budget now that the Rules of Court are being produced by the Queen's Printer and not by the Justice department. I know they're going to be available via the Internet. So my question would be: is there going to be a cost to people accessing Rules of Court through that medium?

Now, with respect to elements 3.4.3., 3.4.4, 3.4.5, I've been impressed, Mr. Minister, with the 1994 report of the Ghiz-Archibald commission that looked at how you establish genuinely

independent prosecutions. I'm interested in the Nova Scotia model that has existed since 1990, where in fact they've made their prosecution branch more independent and, in fact, their independent prosecutor can only be removed by motion of the Assembly in that jurisdiction for cause. I know the view of your predecessor on that issue, but I raise it with you because I think once again this speaks to public confidence. I'd like to know whether Alberta is contemplating that sort of move with respect to a more independent director of public prosecutions, and if not, why not?

I wanted to raise another specific item. There is a trial decision that's cited in the 1994 *Alberta Law Reports*, third edition, page 65. It's Duncan estate and Baddeley. I think there's an appeal pending; I don't know whether it's come down. It addresses the whole question under a claim under our fatal accidents legislation, the extent to which a claim in tort for future earnings should or ought to survive the death of a victim. It seems to me, Mr. Minister, that there's an important public policy consideration here. As somebody who's always believed that it's the Legislature that ought to set public policy decisions, not the courts, I'm interested in whether there's any current expectation of a legislative initiative to address that very fundamental public policy question of the extent to which that kind of action should survive a victim's death.

Now, Mr. Minister, with respect to court services, I've got a number of questions.

MR. HAVELOCK: This seems like a reasonable bundle. Can I respond to what you've asked thus far?

MR. DICKSON: Certainly.

MR. HAVELOCK: Okay. With respect to public confidence in the system, there's no question: I feel I have a very important role to play and a key role to play, not only myself but everyone around this table. The courts also have a role to play. Lawyers do too. In fact, I had lunch with the Chief Justice not too long ago, and we discussed this very issue. I suggested to her that – and she was very receptive to getting out there to the extent she can and pointing out to people what's good about the system and how it's working.

9:27

The fundamental reason that the summit was called was to address the issue of public confidence, and I see it not only being an information-gathering process but an information-dissemination process. We are going to be producing a document so we can get out to Albertans specific information and accurate information on how the system is working. So we see it as not only information gathering but educational. It may well be that some ideas come out of the summit which can further enhance the process so we can continue to ensure that we get information out. To me the summit is critical and this is one of the reasons that we decided to hold it, so I do take that responsibility seriously.

Video record of trials. Thus far we have not had a strong expression of interest from the courts on that. I will indicate that getting it started would be expensive, but we'll certainly take a look at it and review it. I will tell you that it's not included in this budget, so if we were to consider doing it, it would have to be next year.

The Rules of Court being circulated by Queen's Printer, the cost savings accruing to us through that: we'll have to get back to you on that.

The Ghiz report, independent prosecution. I'll throw this out

for consideration. While it can enhance public confidence, I don't believe that in this province we have had a concern with respect to how prosecutions are being handled. As you know, I am ultimately responsible for prosecutions as Attorney General. Nevertheless, we'll watch how this program is implemented. I believe it's being implemented in Nova Scotia, you mentioned? If it makes some sense, we'll certainly take a serious look at it, because again that may well enhance public confidence. I don't want to refer everything to the summit, but you're raising some good ideas, and these are things which I think we can discuss down the road.

Duncan and Baddeley: that actually is being reviewed by the Law Reform Institute. We want to await their report, and we'll react according to that.

MR. DICKSON: Thanks for those responses, Mr. Minister.

If I can now refer you to the document I handed to your deputy a few moments ago. I've got some questions relative to program 2, court services, and I'm talking about element 2.1.5. There is a reporting question. In past years we had the sheriff, civil enforcement budget being split between the Calgary and Edmonton regions. Those are now gone, and we have \$497,000 budgeted under management services. If you can indicate the reason for combining those two: is it simply an accounting change? In fact we've got people moving from one office to the other.

Another question. I have corresponded with your office in the past. I have received some individual complaints from people aggrieved by something a private bailiff has done. I think it would be important to note how many complaints have been received in terms of the private bailiff service since that changed. [interjection] How many complaints have come to the attention of the sheriff's office, and then I guess how many of those have required some sort of remedial action, some intervention, some I suppose disciplinary response? It's sort of the ongoing question: what sort of monitoring is your department doing to determine the level of satisfaction people have in the private bailiff system? I note that that isn't one of your performance measurements, so I'm wondering on what other basis you assess that.

Moving to element 2.2.9, there's a curious thing in terms of the treatment of court operations at Canmore. It used to be included in court operations, southern region. In the '96-97 budget Canmore was moved to court operations, Calgary region. When the annual report for that year came out, Canmore had been moved back to the southern region. In this budget it's in the Calgary region. Why is the budget for Canmore placed under the Calgary region when the annual report places the actual expenditures under the southern region? Where can we expect those expenditures will appear in the next annual report? What, if any, effect does this accounting practice have on the day-to-day court operations in the community of Canmore?

Looking in the budget, I'm unable to find expenditures for the Judicial Council, so perhaps you can identify in which element we might find those.

There is a capital investment of \$1 million in the core business services plan. I'd be interested in terms of what that relates to, some particulars of that capital investment.

I have particular interest, Mr. Minister, in the role of your department in freedom of information hearings. These are hearings in front of Mr. Clark, the Information Commissioner. I'd be interested in you reporting publicly on the cost to Albertans of your unsuccessful intervention, your unsuccessful judicial review application. I'm not sure what the order number was, but it was an order made by Commissioner Clark related to a

correctional officer trying to access some records. Mr. Clark, as Information Commissioner, ordered that the information be provided. Your department undertook an unsuccessful judicial review application, so I'm asking you to tell Albertans what the cost was of that failed adventure.

Your department has been, I think it fair to say, very aggressive in making representations in inquiries before the Information Commissioner. I'm asking you to tell us what the cost has been of your department's intervention or representations in freedom of information inquiries in front of the commissioner. I can't think of an inquiry I've had anything to do with where there hasn't been very vigorous advocacy on behalf of your department by members of your civil law section. I'd be interested in terms of what kind of cost that translates to.

MR. HAVELOCK: Could I . . .

MR. DICKSON: Sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just before you start, Mr. Minister, I would like to caution everyone that we're here to discuss the estimates. So when we start getting farther adrift from those actual estimates, then we're off target. I just would ask for some caution and some discretion in the way the questions are worded and the way they're answered.

MR. HAVELOCK: I'll certainly exercise discretion in the way I answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know. I was counting on that.

MR. HAVELOCK: Your first question, relating to 2.1.5. We haven't received many complaints and we do monitor it, but what we'll have to do is get back to you with more specific information on that.

On 2.2.9, it's interesting you raised the question about Canmore, because I raised the very question yesterday of department officials. The answer, I would have to say, was probably not the best one I've ever heard. Nevertheless, we'll take . . .

MR. McCRANK: They didn't know.

MR. HAVELOCK: They didn't know. So we'll try and get you some further information on that.

You asked a question about – what was the one relating to expenditures in the Judicial Council? Okay. That's part of the Chief Judge's budget under 2.1.3. Can we break that out for them?

MR. McCRANK: Sure.

MR. HAVELOCK: Okay; we'll get you the detail on that.

The million dollars under 2.1.2: that's basically for computer integration with CJIS and the CAP system so we can have a better flow of information.

The employee relations challenge which you mentioned was handled internally. We did not seek outside counsel support on that, but we'll be able to give you ballpark on the type of expenditure that involved. Similarly, we will try to get you some information on the costs of our intervening in FOI applications. We'll give you some breakout on that too.

MR. DICKSON: Thanks, Mr. Minister. In your performance measurements and your goals, which is part of your business plan

– and I'm looking at page 283 – you talk about the number of Alberta communities participating in justice initiatives. We have a target of 190 in '97-98 and 200 in '98-99. What I want to be clear on is how many of those groups are alternative measure committees under section 4 of the YOA and how many are properly constituted youth justice committees under section 69 of the YOA. So if you can differentiate those two items.

I join my colleague in applauding what appears to be a significant change in your department's treatment of the maintenance enforcement program. If I read this correctly, with perhaps a bit of a general nudge from Ottawa and other provinces it looks like we're now going to start dealing with the proportion of recovery rather than simply collecting a dollar on a \$10,000 claim and treating that as a success. So I salute that initiative. Similarly, I think it's extremely positive that you're looking at measuring stakeholder satisfaction with MEP, because as every MLA can tell you, it's a source of considerable concern.

9:37

MR. HAVELOCK: I think we have a few letters on that.

MR. DICKSON: I thought you might.

In terms of element 2.1.4, law libraries, there was a great deal of effort that went into trying to rationalize integration, better management of our law libraries provincewide. What I'm interested in knowing is whether your department has fully accepted the report that was prepared. Your department was involved along with the law libraries, the Law Society, and so on. I'm interested in knowing whether that report has been fully accepted or what elements have been rejected. I see a modest increase in the law library provision, but there were some pretty major changes proposed there, so I'm interested in what's happening with that.

There is discussion in terms of some capital renovations in Calgary. The concern I hear most about has always been the building that houses family and youth court in Calgary, the security issues. Perhaps you can tell me where that is cited in terms of the list of capital requirements in the Calgary region, because that is and has been a major concern.

In terms of the three young offender camps, if I can call them that, we've now had a number of years' experience with Shunda Creek, which has been operated out of the Calgary Young Offenders Centre. I'd like to know what plans there are to expand Shunda Creek or replicate it in other parts of the province. The last announcement was targeted specifically to aboriginal youth. From the fact that there's been nothing further done along the lines of Shunda Creek, my question would be: have you concluded that you're not getting full value for the money that's being expended? Has it been determined by the department that there are better custodial sites and arrangements than Shunda Creek affords?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dickson, that would wrap up your first 20-minute block. Perhaps the minister could take a couple of minutes to respond, and then we'll go to Ms Olsen.

MR. DICKSON: Thanks, Madam Chairman.

MR. HAVELOCK: Regarding the first question you raised, youth justice committees, I think we have about 65 through the province. We'll have to get you some further breakdown on which are not youth justice committees but rather are alternative measure types of approaches.

The law libraries. The judiciary apparently is considering it at

this point. The report has been directed at the Law Society libraries only. All I can suggest to you at this stage is that we're just waiting for further direction, in particular from the judiciary.

The Calgary courthouse. As you know, this is an issue that is of some concern to the Calgary legal profession, in particular family and youth court. You may be aware that we're expending approximately \$3 million at this time to address some of the security issues that have been raised. That's in the Public Works budget, and I think we'll have that completed by the end of the year. For the long term, Public Works has hired a consultant to take a look at Calgary courthouse needs. That consultant right now is working with the legal profession, Public Works, our department, and the judiciary to see where we might like to go at this stage.

Young offender camps. From a department perspective these are very successful. As you know, Wabasca-Desmarais, an aboriginal youth camp, was opened recently. But we opened one subsequent to that, the Enviro youth camp outside of Calgary, and that one's been operating for about six or seven months. In fact, I was just chatting with one of the individuals involved with the camp the other day, and he said it's going very well. So we think they're very successful. One of the reasons they're so successful is that we carefully screen the young people we put in there to make sure they can actually benefit from the program.

Shunda Creek. I was out there a month and a half ago, I think, January. They actually were not at capacity, one of the reasons being because of the diversion of youth from custody and also because we do screen the youth very carefully to make sure we are getting the right ones into the program. There aren't any plans to expand it at this stage. It seems we have sufficient capacity to handle the demand right now. Philosophically, we're very supportive of them, and if we see a growing need for them, most definitely I would support putting more of them in place.

I think that's it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'll go back to Sue.

MS OLSEN: Thank you. I'll go back to time to trial and key performance measurements on page 276 of the lottery estimates. You've identified time to trial as a key performance measure, and you've said that this time "measures availability of Provincial Criminal Court for trial in Calgary and Edmonton." Then on the last line it talks about this being "a measure of access to civil and criminal justice." I'm wondering where this is a measure to access civil justice.

I guess my concern there is that you're targeting criminal courts, but there's also a huge backlog that's continually reported to me in family court provincial, where there's up to 24 weeks for some people to get a four- or five-day trial set down. So I'm just wondering if you're considering in the future also identifying the family court trial times as one of your performance measures, because I think that's as essential and as critical as the criminal court trial.

MR. DICKSON: And Court of Queen's Bench civil.

MS OLSEN: As my colleague points out here, Court of Queen's Bench civil as well. So it would be nice to see that as a performance measure in the future, because I think those are causing some concern to some of the professionals.

I'm going to move to the criminal justice division, where there's an increase of \$2.2 million.

MR. HAVELOCK: Okay. Where are you now?

MS OLSEN: Program 3 still, 3.4. Okay?

Who are the current members of the board of review? How are they chosen? How many cases did they review this year? What functions are served by the executive office with a \$900,000 budget.

General prosecutions has been increased by \$1.7 million. I certainly won't complain about that. I'm glad to see that's up. How many general prosecutors are currently employed in the division? How many of these prosecutors have less than five years at the bar? How many general prosecutors will be hired this year? Were the 18 replaced last year? How many of the new hires will be hired at the entry level? How much of the \$2.2 million will be used to increase salaries in accordance with the Price Waterhouse report, and at what percentage level did you come in on that report? There was a range between a needed increase of 10 and 40 percent, so what was the variance there? How many prosecutors have received raises since that report came out, and what was the average raise?

9:47

Support for legal aid, program 4. The business plan indicates that a performance measure for legal aid is the number of eligible persons receiving legal aid, and that number appears to be decreasing. The budget is still at the lowest it's been since '92, and the income cutoff for legal aid hasn't changed since that day. What assets can a low-income client possess and still be eligible for funding? Has the cutoff level for assets changed since 1992, or is the same level still being used? What percentage of legal aid funding is recovered by the department? I've had many concerns in my office in relation to accessing legal aid, and I think I have more so from the family law perspective. So there are some concerns about access.

MR. HAVELOCK: Would you like me to answer some now?

MS OLSEN: Sure.

MR. HAVELOCK: Okay. The access to the courts - it's in particular family and youth. We have not heard an overwhelming number of concerns raised by the judiciary with respect to that issue. Nevertheless, we would like to see these matters handled quickly. We're working closely with the judiciary in the area of case management. Quite often some cases are not moving forward simply because the counsel determines that's the way they would like to proceed. Also, as you know, we're looking at trying to get further expansion of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms in place: mediation, et cetera. We're pushing and working with both the judiciary and the bar in that regard. It's also an item that we have specifically carved out to be looked at in the Justice Summit, eliminating barriers to access. So for us that is an important issue.

The Board of Review. You asked a number of questions. We will get back to you on that, but I can tell you the members are Dan Pahl and Harold Veale. The chairman is Judge Michael Stevens-Guille, and it also has two psychiatrists on it. We'll get you further information on that.

The executive office question. Actually one of the reasons that went up as it did was that was implementing the Price Waterhouse report with respect to salaries. It has about six to eight people in there right now.

Regarding your general questions pertaining to increases for the Crown prosecutors, you've asked some very specific questions. We'll get back to you. Our intention is to have the Price Waterhouse report recommendations implemented by the end of

the year, and we have budgeted in accordance with that.

Legal aid. As you are probably aware, legal aid had an unfunded liability for quite a number of years, and they have now managed to have that handled. They are talking about expanding eligibility criteria so more people can actually apply. It's interesting to note that they have not changed their eligibility criteria during the past few years, yet the number of certificates has gone down. One of the reasons may well be demographics, because the at-risk group, especially in the criminal area, 16 to 26, is moving through. Now, we anticipate that may well start increasing again in the future, but part of it's related to demographics.

The department recovers \$6.4 million in legal aid from the federal government, as I mentioned earlier, and the Legal Aid Society itself receives approximately \$2 million annually in contributions from its clients. That apparently is the highest cost recovery in the country. Actually I'm quite satisfied with the way the legal aid is operating with the exception of some instances where unfortunately one party is able to acquire funding and another party is not, and sometimes the system operates undermining the ability of the individual who has not received legal aid support. We're cognizant of that. In fact, I have raised it with Legal Aid.

You need to look at some of the comparable numbers across the country. British Columbia spends \$100 million a year on legal aid; Quebec, over \$100 million; and apparently Ontario, \$250 million to \$300 million. The Legal Aid Society helped us get a grip on the amount that was being expended in legal aid. Some years ago they were running at substantial deficit, and they've managed now to balance. Quite frankly, I think we have a model in the country that we should be proud of. We're still handling 80,000 cases a year, which is a significant amount.

MS OLSEN: Okay.

Just one question about the Public Trustee, program 5. The budget for this division is up about half a million within the actual numbers from the '96-97 annual report. Why has this division seen an increase in the funding?

Down to program 6, fatality inquiries. Where do the expenditures of the Fatality Review Board appear in the budget? Who are the members of that board, and how many public inquiries have they recommended in the last year? What are the costs of conducting public inquiries listed in the budget? Under which vote can we find them, and how much are they?

Due to decreased funding in the past, the medical examiner's office has not produced an annual report, so I'm wondering if there's going to be a requirement, given an increase, to produce an annual report. That's based on some of the issues that we've identified through Social Services: the tracking that's not been done, the cause of death sort of left open ended, those kinds of things. So I'm interested to know whether there are going to be any improvements there.

Moving down to public security under program 7. Alberta's major cities have some of the lowest police per capita ratios in the country. Does the minister have any control over how much a municipality must spend to maintain a municipal police force? Does the minister recommend funding amounts? I know that the Canadian Police Association put forward a resolution in November 1997 addressing the need to increase funding across this country, including this province, in relation to police funding. Much of that results from the officer safety perspective and a concern for the lives and safety of police members and, of course, those people they're dealing with on a daily basis. The problem isn't just in this province; however, what are we doing to address that?

Twenty-five thousand dollars for crime prevention: what exactly does that cover?

MR. HAVELOCK: Not much.

MS OLSEN: Well, that would be my concern. Crime prevention as a whole – I mean, we can look at many, many initiatives, but what does the line \$25,000 exactly do for Albertans in crime prevention funding?

The business plan highlight is that Alberta Justice will work with the RCMP to identify provincial strategies to combat organized crime. Where would I find the funding for the fight located in this budget? There's been some discussion. I think last year there was talk of \$500,000, and the issue of organized crime goes unfortunately much deeper than this. It's a very expensive initiative to undertake, so I'm wondering whether the funding is going to coincide with the actual costs of running the programs. Covert operations are extremely expensive. With the movement of Hell's Angels into this province – we see what's still going on in Quebec and Ontario – it is a concern for me if we don't address the problem adequately, and unfortunately the dollars for doing this are much higher than other types of policing. So I think this has to be addressed.

9:57

Also, some of the concerns that have been brought forward to me are in terms of targeted funding, not necessarily going back to police grants but looking at some of the initiatives and looking at targeting specific types of funding dollars to specific initiatives such as the organized crime, such as dealing with child prostitution. Interestingly, the \$500,000 allotted under the Social Services budget this year is half of what was anticipated for a full fiscal year. However, none of that money appears to be going to the police to help them take this on as an initiative that they can target. Again, it's all covert operation, it's all undercover operation, and it's all expensive. That's the expensive side of policing. So I'm just wondering what the ministry is looking at in relation to assisting police agencies in that respect.

MR. HAVELOCK: Do you want me to answer some now?

MS OLSEN: Maybe I'll just get through some of the policing questions here.

MR. HAVELOCK: How many are there?

MS OLSEN: Well, I have some others.

MR. HAVELOCK: I'm just trying to make sure I can keep track.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have an opportunity when she's done.

MR. HAVELOCK: It's just that it's so much more difficult to respond when I'm 10 questions in.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know you can handle it.

MR. HAVELOCK: Thank you for your indulgence.

MS OLSEN: Any that you don't answer I'm sure I'll receive answers to in writing.

MR. HAVELOCK: Right away.

MS OLSEN: I knew that.

What percentage of the budget line pertains to funding of special police forces on reserves through tripartite agreements with the federal government? How many new tripartite agreements have been signed? What will the minister be doing to ensure that those funds are used by the reserve in strict accordance with the agreement?

Some of the concerns that I raised last year have been heightened to some degree. I asked last year about the initiatives undertaken in terms of training of the aboriginal police members. Some of the concerns that have been brought to me throughout the past year are in relation specifically to training, from the ability to do sensitive investigations to things which should be deemed as minor, through practice, such as the collection and storing of evidence, that could really have some great effects on a trial. Those concerns have been brought forward through the policing community in general. I know that again an initiative and a resolution put forward through the Canadian Police Association is to address some of those concerns. I think it's imperative that police members on reserves are as qualified as those off reserves, and a standard should be met in relation to that.

Under the goals section of the business plan the minister indicates that he plans to work with stakeholders to improve the administration of justice by transferring "the responsibility for the administration of the federal Firearms Act to the federal government." In this budget \$425,000 is allotted for administration of the federal gun control program, which is higher than the actual figure spent last year. If the minister plans to spend more in '98-99 on gun control administration than he did in '96-97, when is he planning on transferring this responsibility? How much of the \$425,000 will be recovered from the federal government under the federal/provincial firearms agreement? What indeed are the plans of the minister should the initiative fail in the courts? Are you going to undertake to participate in any of the programs? Are you going to be at the table? Albertans probably would like to know.

I want to just go back to the aboriginal policing initiatives. How do you measure the performance of these departments? What criteria are you using when you enter into the agreements, and how are you tracking the success of the aboriginal policing program? There's no budget line this year for victims programs administration, compensation to victims, or the Crimes Compensation Board. In the past five years between \$1.3 and \$1.8 million have been allotted for these programs. The highlights section of the business plan indicates that the services provided to crime victims by the new Victims of Crime Act will be monitored and evaluated. Is there any direct funding from the general revenue for administration, monitoring, and evaluation of these programs, or is it all funded through the victims surcharge? I want to move forward to correctional services.

MR. HAVELOCK: Okay.

MS OLSEN: You want to speak?

THE CHAIRMAN: All I wanted to do is interject here, Mr. Minister. She has one minute left in her 20-minute time block, and you can, you know, conversely, take 20 minutes to answer these questions. Just so that you know. Keep going, Sue. Oh, sorry, time's up. We're up to 10:01.

MS OLSEN: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

MR. HAVELOCK: You raised your first question, I think, about two hours ago, relating to program 5, the Public Trustee's office.

That increase is simply due to implementing the Price Waterhouse report. Again, we have a number of counsel there, so that's where that's coming from.

The Fatality Review Board. You asked a number of specific questions. I will get you some detail on your questions. Just so you know, though, the honorarium and travel expenses for the board are included in the head office number there. But we'll give you a further breakout on that.

The medical examiner's office. Oh, the annual report, yes. There is no obligation for the medical examiner to actually produce an annual report, but it might make some sense to impose that obligation. So we'll take a look at whether or not we should make that mandatory. I recognize that there are some very public issues out there relating to some inquiries either being held or not being held, and it may well make some sense to have a report.

Program 7. Municipal policing: we have no intention through this department of funding municipal operations directly. As you know, some years ago there was a \$30 million grant which we provided directly to municipalities. That grant was cut by \$15 million and then transferred to the Department of Municipal Affairs, and that is rolled into their block funding. So it's up to local municipalities to determine how they use the block funding. As you know, we do cover all the policing costs through our provincial policing agreement with the RCMP for communities of, I believe, 2,500 people or less. Is that right? [interjections] Okay.

Crime prevention. Oh, yes, the \$25,000: you're right; it doesn't go very far. However – and this is our fault – what we need to do in next year's budget is more appropriately allocate and show a line which demonstrates what we're actually spending in this area. In the public security division there is a total of \$280,000 specifically allocated to crime prevention. The First Nations policing budget has an allocation of \$197,000 in funding which supports programs in Tallcree, Kainai, Tsuu T'ina, and the Yellowhead aboriginal communities. There is also approximately \$68,000 in program support services dedicated to assisting communities in the delivery of their crime prevention programs and initiatives. We most definitely next year will ensure that that's an appropriate entry in the budget.

Vote 7.2.2. You raised a question about organized crime. We've allocated approximately \$400,000 to \$500,000 in this year's budget. We are reluctant to get into directly funding police operations, one reason being that as the Attorney General I need to maintain some degree of independence from police operations, especially when these charges are brought before the court. Nevertheless, we do feel we have a role in assisting police agencies throughout the province in establishing a provincial strategy. We do have a role in assisting them on a provincial basis, and we will do so. Our thought was to carve out some dollars and establish a group of three or four people and pay all the costs associated with that group and have them take a look at what the extent of the problem is, develop some strategies to address the problem, and tell us really what it's going to cost to address that problem.

To date most of the chiefs of police have been supportive of that direction, although they would have preferred that we simply write them a cheque. Just as I am going through a budget planning process and have to justify where we're spending our dollars, I feel the same should apply to any organized crime strategy. I've made it clear to the chiefs of police that there will not be any direct funding considered unless and until we go through the process of identifying the problem and the costs associated with addressing it.

10:07

You mentioned the tripartite agreements, 7.2.3. Those are the dollars associated with the program: \$3.695 million. You're probably aware that I've asked the Member for Athabasca-Wabasca, Mike Cardinal, to review the operation of all aboriginal police forces in the province. I anticipate having a report back from him shortly.

You raised some good points regarding training. We have just as much interest in ensuring that aboriginal police officers are as qualified as nonaboriginal police officers. There have been some concerns raised on specific reserves. You're well aware of some of them. We have been trying to handle this in as sensitive a manner as possible. Nevertheless, these are public dollars, and we feel that the aboriginal police forces must be accountable for the way those dollars are being spent. I anticipate Mike's report coming out in the near future.

You mentioned also how we evaluate the performance of the police forces. There is a committee which includes, I believe, some RCMP. They are evaluating how these forces are performing, and they provide us with their reports on a regular basis.

Firearms. When will the transfer happen? Well, the transfer will happen when the act is proclaimed. I can assure you and assure Albertans that this government has absolutely no intention of getting involved in the administration of the licensing and registration provisions of the act. That position hasn't changed, nor do I see it changing.

The funding for victims of crime. Which page is that? [interjection] If you could turn to page 280 in the budget. All the administrative expenses associated with the program will be covered by the surcharge and the revenues that are generated. Prior to bringing in the Victims of Crime Act, we actually had to vote separate expenses to cover off the administration under the old program. That administration will also include monitoring. It's interesting that you raised that. I had a constituent pop into my office not too long ago and ask how we do monitor these programs. I've put a request to the department to give me a little bit of a breakdown on that specifically, but part of this will be to ensure that these programs are delivering services to victims. We anticipate also because of the surcharge that we will likely be able to fund more of these programs throughout the province. Prior to the surcharge coming in, I think our budget was – what? – about \$2.4 million. Now not only will we be able to fund more programs, but we have put together probably one of the best compensation packages in the country for victims of crime.

I think at that stage your time ran out because I interjected.

MS OLSEN: It did, and I have so many questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Life is so interesting; isn't it?

Okay. We will now go to Mr. Dickson.

MR. DICKSON: Thanks, Madam Chairman. There are still a few questions left, Mr. Minister. What I wanted to ask: will you make available the report that ensues from Mike Cardinal's review? I think people are particularly interested in what's happening with aboriginal justice initiatives. I think it's important that report get as much currency as possible, and I'd ask you to undertake to table it in the Assembly.

That also, I think, brings up the question – certainly it's been put to your predecessors. The Cawsey recommendation to have an aboriginal justice commission is something that did not find favour with your predecessors. Instead what's happened within the Department of Justice is that you've had an aboriginal

initiatives co-ordinator. I don't remember the exact job description. But I'm wondering, Mr. Minister: would you provide us with whatever sort of review has been done to determine the impact that that office has had, the degree of success you've had? You've got a remarkable young woman running the program, and I've heard her speak. I'm assuming there must be some empirical data. There must be some backup statistical information. Presumably that's been done in the form of a report, and I'm looking for that report to be made available as well.

Now, just going back to goal 3, your performance measure dealing with length of time. I'm not sure I heard your response to the query: why would you purport that this is a measure of access to civil and criminal justice when it only deals with the criminal side? But I'll go further and ask whether you'd give us information on at least three key indicators I can think of on the civil side. One would be: how long does it take in the regions in this province currently to get a special chambers application? How long does it take to get a special chambers application in domestic cases? How long does it take to obtain a trial date from the date a certificate of readiness is filed? And I'm hoping we can get this breakdown by region so we're able to see where we've got problems and where we're ahead of the game. I'd be interested in knowing how long it takes to get an appointment for taxation in the different districts. Those, I think, would help Albertans better understand how smoothly and how quickly things are moving through our civil system or the extent to which we have backlogs and where they might be.

Now, I just want to go back to 3.5, maintenance enforcement. We've talked about the \$1.5 million increase, and I want to come back and, I guess, raise an issue that I've asked before. From my own experience as a family lawyer, it's very disappointing. The default hearings that are held in front of a master in chambers tend for the most part to be fairly unsuccessful. What happens is you have a lawyer for MEP cross-examining a defaulting payor spouse who is brought in at the last minute, some financial records usually incomplete. Not surprisingly, after the cross-examination of the defaulting spouse there's no clear outcome.

The suggestion has been made to me and I've relayed this to your predecessors: why wouldn't we make available at least to masters in chambers for the MEP program some special investigators who would be able to do some workup to ensure that when MEP counsel start cross-examining a defaulting spouse, there's the opportunity to distill what's going on and provide the judicial official with the resources to be able to make the kind of decisions that I think Albertans want made? I'm specifically interested in what other plans you have, Mr. Minister, to make those show cause, those default hearings work. I have to tell you that I think we're not nearly capturing what would be available through what should be a valuable process.

Now I want to turn, Mr. Minister, to program 8, correctional services, and I want to ask you a specific question. I'm not sure what element this would be in. I know that the Calgary educational consortia had a lot of frustration. I think it was about a year ago. This is when there had been a change in correctional practice that effectively prevented any anger management programs, educational programs being provided to inmates during the day. It was seen as something of a political gesture that inmates should be working during the day and that upgrading courses, educational courses would only be provided in the evening. The reality has been that a whole lot fewer inmates are taking educational programs, anger management programs, things that I think many Albertans would think would be absolutely vital to the successful reintegration of offenders. So I'm interested in terms of whether in fact that's still a policy of the department.

What evaluation has been done to determine whether there in fact has been an attrition systemwide of people taking those valuable kinds of life skills programs, educational programs? If so, what are you going to do about it, Mr. Minister?

10:17

The administration of correctional services received a \$1.3 million increase. Can you give us particulars? With respect to 8.2.1, the Edmonton Remand Centre funding, given all the complaints that members have heard and that certainly you have heard and your office has heard with respect to the safety of correctional officers and the Edmonton Remand Centre being compromised by inadequate staffing levels, the question would be: how is it that we see \$1.4 million less for the Edmonton Remand Centre than had been available in the annual report of 1995-96? Similarly, why is the budget for the Calgary Correctional Centre .4 million dollars less than the 1995-1996 actuals? The concern, of course, Mr. Minister, is that if this translates into a reduction of staff or a de-skilling of staff, then there's concern that that translates into heightened tension and a greater risk of problems in those key facilities.

Why is the budget for the Peace River Correctional Centre .4 million dollars less than the 1995-1996 actuals? There have been numerous complaints from correctional officers that their safety is compromised because of problems with respect to meals, so there's certainly that question. This is a more general question than the specific thing I started off with when we were talking about program 8, correctional services: what amount of the budget that you've put in front of us is spent on treatment, education, and life skills programs for inmates?

Just a parenthetical observation, Mr. Minister. If we're really looking for performance measurements that tell us whether a correctional system is doing the job instead of working to spend the lowest amount per inmate anywhere in Canada, maybe what we should be doing is determining how many inmates are employed six months after discharge, after the end of their warrant of committal. How many have reoffended within the province of Alberta? That's information that should be readily available. That would be enormously helpful in terms of determining what sort of success we have there.

You might tell us, Mr. Minister, where the funding is in this budget for supervision of prisoners and house arrest community sentences. There's been a lot of concern in terms of the new Criminal Code sentencing provisions as to how we're monitoring those people who are on conditional release or serving time in the community and the appropriateness of the kinds of offences and the kinds of inmates that have been released. Those concerns come up, and the budget doesn't help us understand what your department is doing to monitor that.

There have been questions in the past about work facilities. The facility I'm most familiar with is Calgary Correctional Centre, but there is also Lethbridge and other correctional centres. We've encouraged you in the past to find ways, in terms of prison industries, to make the correctional facilities more self-sufficient, whether it's greenhouses, gardens, shoe repair shops, that sort of thing. I'd be interested in knowing what changes have been undertaken in the last year with respect to institutional work programs for those inmates where it's determined that they cannot successfully or safely be involved in a community work program.

The other item would be . . .

MR. HAVELOCK: How many more minutes are there?

THE CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister, he can go for the full 20

minutes, at which time you would have a full 20 minutes to respond.

MR. DICKSON: Thanks, Madam Chairman, for protecting my time, but I'd be happy to invite the minister now to have a go at trying to respond to some of these issues.

MR. HAVELOCK: Thank you. Perhaps when you're asking your questions, you could keep that in mind so that I don't always get in trouble with the chairperson.

You asked about the report that our colleague is doing with respect to aboriginal policing. Yes, we will make that public and table it in the House.

You also raised the Cawsey report. We have implemented a number of the Cawsey recommendations, and the office which you referred to was obviously involved in that implementation. I don't have a problem with us getting further information to you on what we feel that office has done and what impact it has had.

Goal 3. That was about time to trial. You're right; while the reference is to civil and criminal, the statistic relates only to criminal. We recognize that, and we'll take a look at that for next year. It's going to take quite a while for us to put together the information that you've asked for with respect to time to trial, et cetera, so please don't expect a response in the next week or two. But we will get you the information.

Maintenance enforcement default hearings. It's probably an issue that the Member for Calgary-Lougheed would also have some interest in, because of course you're making a good suggestion with respect to ensuring that default hearings actually work better. If there's a shortage of resources, then we'll need to take a look at that. So what we'll do at the very least is refer your comments to the committee working on that, and hopefully they'll incorporate some suggestions in their report.

You made mention of the department's decision to eliminate the educational program component in our institutions from the day period and put them in the evening. Well, it wasn't a political decision. It was a decision to better reflect, quite frankly, what happens in the real world. Most people work during the day, and if they wish to upgrade their skills, they will attend courses during the evening. Also, Albertans, quite frankly, expect those who have committed a crime and are incarcerated to be performing work, either in the community or, for example, in some of the gardens and/or facilities we have on-site. We will take a look at getting you some information on whether there has been some attrition with respect to the people taking those courses. We cannot, as you know, force them to take those courses. Nevertheless, we feel that having prisoners work during the day is therapeutic and that it does give them some sense of self-worth and value. I believe that's what Albertans expect from the program.

Correctional services. You asked specifically why the administration has gone up over a million. That is simply due to reallocating system and communication costs from central administration to this area. In the central administration we took a million out and put it in here, so it's just reflecting that change.

Edmonton Remand. As you know, we have engaged an expert to review some of the difficulties we've had out there. They are working with the staff and with management, and I understand some progress is being made. We have not reduced the staff component. Why you see the cost decreasing through correctional services in a number of instances is because we have fewer prisoners, and that's partially due to some of the alternative measures we have in place. If there are fewer prisoners, for example, there's going to be less overtime. If there are allega-

tions that we haven't done anything at all as a department to compromise safety, those allegations are taken seriously and investigated by the department. I have every confidence that the department ensures that we do not compromise safety.

The amount for education: we will have to get you that number. I don't have that off the top of my head, the amount that we allocate to prisoners for their educational programs.

You raise a good issue about recidivism and whether we should be measuring that, not just looking at the fact that we run a very inexpensive prison system, although one of the reasons it is so cost-efficient is because we have some of the best facilities in the country. We also have a couple that aren't the best; nevertheless, I guess going to prison was not supposed to be like going to a Holiday Inn. So I think our facilities overall operate very effectively because of the dollars that were expended some years ago by, I believe, a Conservative government.

We are looking at developing a national standard to measure recidivism. The difficulty with simply saying, "Well, this individual served their time; they've gone out, and they've reoffended" – I don't believe you can simply blame the justice system for that. The problem is that we haven't resolved the problem prior to those individuals actually getting to the justice system. We need to work much more closely with Health, Education, and Social Services to ensure that resources are there to preclude these individuals from turning up on our doorstep.

The house arrest program. Those dollars fall under the remand centres. As you know, we implemented a number of changes last year because of concerns raised publicly with respect to individuals breaching the conditions of their sentences. So we've toughened that up.

10:27

Enhancing self-sufficiency in our facilities. I don't believe we've implemented over the last year any new programs at any of our institutions with respect to ensuring they're more self-sufficient. Lethbridge, as you know, produces a lot. At Alsike, which I visited some time ago – and if you have a chance you should get out there – they run a farm and provide food to a number of other institutions. But I don't believe we've expanded anything at Fort Saskatchewan. We'll take a look at whether or not it will be possible for us to expand, because we certainly support those programs.

MR. DICKSON: Is there still some time left, Madam Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: You have three minutes.

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, then, let me continue.

MR. DICKSON: You'll get your turn, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, I'd be interested in what statistics you keep in terms of the number of violent incidents in the correctional facilities under your responsibility. I think that in fact maybe that's something we should track as a key performance measurement. The things we really want to know: are correctional officers safe in these facilities? If there's an increasing risk, we should know that.

The Solicitor General's college, as it used to be known, was a really useful tool in terms of training correctional officers. I think the 1991-92 annual report was the last time that was discussed. I'm interested in terms of how you're measuring the training that you now provide correctional officers. There's always a concern about de-skilling when governments become focused on the bottom line, some important areas that can translate into increased

and unacceptable danger levels or risk. So I'm interested in terms of how you're managing that all-important issue of training correctional officers.

Just to go back to an earlier response. I'm troubled by this solicitor/client privilege argument that you raise with respect to not being able to release the cost of retaining outside counsel with tax dollars to do advocacy work for you. This isn't the forum to argue privilege and how it's determined how broad or narrow it should be, but with all of the bright, intelligent resources you've got in the civil law section, I'm confident, Mr. Minister, you'd be able to find a way of releasing the core information in terms of how much is being paid: how much Alberta taxpayers are paying for the gun challenge, for the Vriend decision . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: It's 10:28, hon. member, and your time is up.

MR. DICKSON: Well, that's a good note to end on, Madam Chairman. Thanks very much. Thanks, Mr. Minister.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, did you want to respond briefly?

MR. HAVELOCK: Absolutely. Statistics on the violent incidents in our prisons: we can certainly get that for you. There aren't many, and making it a performance measure I'm not so sure would be helpful. We used to have a performance measure which showed the number of escapes from secure custody. Well, if you're in secure custody, it's pretty tough to escape, so each year it would show zero. So we're doing a heck of a job. Nevertheless, we can get you the number, but I'd question whether or not it's a valuable measure of how we're doing in the institutions.

Regarding the training, our training program now for security officers in our institutions is much more extensive than it used to be. We still have the justice college just outside of Edmonton, and certainly I'd encourage you to visit it sometime and spend time out there. We'll make sure you have a very strict program so you don't do anything you shouldn't when you're out there. So de-skilling for us is not a concern, because we feel we've actually expanded the program and it's better than it used to be. I can't emphasize enough how important it is to the department for our security officers to work in a safe environment. That's why we're trying to address some of the concerns that we've chatted about before regarding a particular institution.

Solicitor/client privilege. I have listened to the bright, intelligent lawyers in my department and that's the advice they've given me, and no one's ever accused me of a lack of confidence. So that's it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that everything, Mr. Minister? Okay.

Just so you know, Sue, you have right now about 16 minutes, at which point we will go to Dr. Pannu for the conclusion of that block. So please go ahead.

MS OLSEN: Okay. I just want to go back to maintenance enforcement.

MR. HAVELOCK: Where is that then?

MS OLSEN: At 3.5. The budget for the maintenance enforcement office has been increased by \$1.5 million. Will this budget increase allow for maintenance enforcement to put resources into skip tracing and investigating the diversion of property by so-called deadbeat parents? I guess that's a huge concern, you know, as my colleague talked about even accessing that information.

There's been a lot of discussion and a lot of complaints received in most constituency offices about the hidden funding that one parent may have and this kind of thing. So it's something that I think needs to be dealt with.

The business plan indicates that the department's performance in providing access to justice through maintenance enforcement will be measured by the amount collected by the maintenance enforcement program on court order as a proportion of the amount the program is legally entitled to collect. Will this performance measure be published in the annual reports?

I'm just wondering if maybe we could know when we can expect the maintenance enforcement review to come about so we can . . .

MR. HAVELOCK: You mean the report.

MS OLSEN: That's right.

MR. HAVELOCK: Because the review's come about.

MS OLSEN: Well, the entire report from the review. So if we can find out that.

Going back to the victim surcharge, do I understand that the entire budget is based on the collection of the surcharge? If that's the case, do you not foresee a problem with the variances from year to year on that surcharge? There's no dedicated funding from the budget. So how would you cover the shortfall? Will anything that's not used through the collection of the surcharge remain with the program?

I have another question for you, if we go to 5.0.1, Public Trustee. The minister spoke of the expanded jurisdiction. How many more Albertans will benefit from that expanded mandate?

If I can just go back also to the courts. I think that last year I had asked about - there had been a reduction in the number of Provincial Court judges in Fort McMurray. Have you seen a need to increase due to the population increase in Fort McMurray? I'm just wanting to know about that.

10:37

You talked about the domestic violence initiative. I'm wondering how the Department of Justice is going to work that whole initiative in with the reserves. I guess my concern is that outside of the larger centres it doesn't appear that through the whole process the smaller centres and the reserves have been addressed in terms of how they would pursue the initiative and what we hope to be proposed very, very soon in terms of legislation. I am concerned about the programs. You take somebody off the reserve and his very small, very familial environment, and I'm concerned as to what the Justice department has done to address the concerns there in the aboriginal community.

How is it that the QB Court proceeded with the separation counseling program despite the bill being defeated? The parenting after separation course?

MRS. BURGNER: Didn't you guys do that?

MS OLSEN: Defeated it?

I'm just wondering how that program went forward despite the bill being defeated and it's not legislation. What have you undertaken in regards to that other than support the expanded practice now?

I think that's pretty well it.

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, I'll go through this briefly. Notes flying all over the place.

The entire budget with respect to victims of crime is based on the surcharge. You mentioned whether or not it will create a problem if the surcharges go down one year. Well, while it's not dedicated revenue out of general revenues, the fund can and will accumulate any surplus from year to year. So it may well be that we don't expend it entirely. Nevertheless, we would prefer spending it simply because that means the dollars are getting out into the community to support victims of crime programs. If for whatever reason there aren't as many tickets written one year and the surcharge revenues decrease, we'll have to cut back funding of the programs accordingly. Likely the victim of crime programs would be cut, because we would have to also maintain the legislated compensation levels in the Victims of Crime Act for those who are victims of a crime.

The Public Trustee's office: how many more Albertans will benefit by an expanded mandate? I think they'll have to get me that answer.

Provincial Court judges. With respect to Fort McMurray, as you know we just appointed the Hon. Stan Peck to take the full-time position, and we have the retiring judge, who will stay on as a supernumerary. So we'll have one and a half judges up there.

Domestic violence. You raise a good point with respect to the aboriginal communities. This is an implementation issue for future business plans, no question. Also, we need to work closely with social services and the federal government, because as I've argued time and again publicly, the federal government is primarily responsible for what occurs on the reserves. Of course, domestic violence being a criminal matter, we then become involved through the prosecutorial side. We're going to work closely with the feds and the RCMP. No question, we'll consider it in our future plans.

The parenting after separation. You raise an interesting question, although I'm surprised that you would want the Legislature and the Attorney General to somehow step in and undermine the jurisdiction of the courts. Defeating the bill which you refer to I don't believe sent the message that we did not want the course to proceed. All the Legislature was doing was simply indicating that, one, it did not wish to legislate and, two, it did not wish to make it mandatory in legislation. I believe and the advice that I have received from department officials is that the actions of the court are entirely within their jurisdiction, and far be it from me to interfere in judicial independence.

MS OLSEN: Far be it from you. How far?

MR. HAVELOCK: Really far.

MS OLSEN: Do I have . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: You have a few minutes left, yes.

MS OLSEN: Great. On page 274 you talk about the initiatives under ADR. Can you detail the new '98-99 initiatives to promote alternative dispute resolution?

MR. HAVELOCK: I don't believe I have that detail sitting in front of me, but most definitely I can get you a list. One of the things we've noticed is that the province, Alberta, is probably leading the country in the number of initiatives we're looking at. The difficulty is that there's a little bit going on over here and a little bit going on over there, and we need to somehow bring it together. The department is committed to working again with the judiciary and the bar to bring this together so that we have an extensive program.

We're also looking at and we have implemented on a pilot basis in Edmonton a mediation program which we fund. The Better Business Bureau in Calgary had a mediation program in place. They are now coming to us for some funding in that regard, and we will consider that. So again that's an area that we're specifically concentrating on. But we'll get you a detailed list on that.

MS OLSEN: I guess if I could come back very briefly to the parenting after separation course. That course is mandatory. So has the court not done what the Legislature chose not to do then?

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, this is within the jurisdiction of the courts to so order, and I'm not going to dispute that.

MS OLSEN: I'm sure you're not.

MR. HAVELOCK: That's right. As I said earlier, the Legislature did not say you couldn't do it. The Legislature just simply indicated that it did not wish to do it.

MS OLSEN: Fair enough. When we're talking about alternative dispute resolution, you chose – you set the precedent. When will the ADR bill be proclaimed?

MR. HAVELOCK: The ADR bill?

MS OLSEN: Well, that was the private member's bill on contract dispute resolution.

MR. HAVELOCK: That was by Grande Prairie-Wapiti if I'm not mistaken. When will it be proclaimed? I think Public Works is the lead ministry in that regard, so it's probably a better question for that minister. [interjection]

MS OLSEN: Better turn his mike off. I think he's getting to that point where he's going to get himself in trouble.

My colleague is just asking me what sort of feedback you are getting in terms of the privatized land titles registration?

MR. HAVELOCK: Personally, none.

MS OLSEN: Departmentally?

MR. HAVELOCK: I wasn't aware that it was an issue. Municipal Affairs again handles that area. So if there are any concerns, probably that'd be the better area to direct them to.

MS OLSEN: I'd just go back to 3.4.6, and you talked about the CJIS and the increase in the funding. I'm assuming the Department of Justice is also moving towards the Imagis system? Is that correct?

MR. HAVELOCK: Yes.

MS OLSEN: Yes. The answer is yes. That's good.

So I'm wondering how far along you are with the implementation of that particular system. Is this money in the criminal law division – you spoke of it going to computer systems. Is that part of it, and have you been able to implement the financial portion of that Imagis software? I guess my concern is – I know it's an overall project, but what impact has that had on the budget of the Justice department?

MR. HAVELOCK: It's not related to the CAP/CJIS issue at all.

It is separate. So far as I'm advised, we are on schedule with respect to what's been established by Treasury. I can't give you much more of an answer than that. It's been implemented by accounts payable in the general ledger systems modules. It's on track with other new modules; i.e., human resources payroll. Unfortunately, computers are not my strong point.

10:47

MS OLSEN: Okay. So I'm assuming, then, that that particular portion, which will I think put this department in a line in terms of where the department of Treasury is going with the quarterly budget reports, will help you with your budget through quarterly reporting in terms of seeing if you're in line with where you're headed.

MR. HAVELOCK: Absolutely.

MS OLSEN: These questions just keep popping up in front of me here. How many successful appeals to the joint legal aid committee from Albertans denied legal aid initially?

MR. HAVELOCK: Interestingly, I don't have that off the top of my head, but we'll get that for you.

MS OLSEN: You know, I would say that doesn't surprise me, but that's okay. That's another question for you.

In relation to corrections, a huge number of issues have been brought forward, and I'm just wondering what the ratio is of women to men in the institutions – guards and not inmates, so staff. Also with CAP, what are the ratios there? How many women in senior positions? How many women in promoted ranks? Are there any targets you have to ensure some equality there?

THE CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I'm sorry, but as per our agreement, we now have 12 minutes left in our time. We're going to go to Dr. Pannu.

MR. HAVELOCK: We'll get the answers to those questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can write them down.
Please begin.

DR. PANNU: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Mr. Minister, good morning. You are still functioning at good capacity?

MR. HAVELOCK: You tell me.

DR. PANNU: Well, after two hours of questions and answers, I guess I have to call on my ingenuity to raise some more questions. I'll try to do that in the very limited time I have.

One very general question. On page 279 in your departmental revenues, in the income statement, there's \$11.688 million – last year it was \$12.491 million – under other revenues. If you would take time later on, you know, when I finish my little thing, to tell me what that's about.

I was looking, Mr. Minister, at your business plan summary, the mission and then the goals, and then trying to relate the goals to the budgetary allocations to see if there is a good organic connection between those. For example, under the first goal, "Prevent crime through community policing." That's program 7. If I take you to program 7 there: crime prevention, \$25,000. If prevention is one of the important commitments of the department, then how come such measly resources are being allocated

to prevention programs: \$25,000 across the province over the year? Similarly, looking at the next goal there: "Facilitate the rehabilitation of offenders and help victims."

Going to program 8 on page 269, there is obviously some increase in allocation, about 4 percent I guess roughly, in the budget item dealing with correctional services.

On page 276 in your KPMs, the performance measures, there is: "Percent of Offenders Involved in Meaningful Activities." Obviously, you are aspiring to increase the percentage of those who engage in meaningful activities: 95 percent in '97-98 and the current year. On one hand, you're expecting a considerable increase in the involvement of offenders in meaningful activities, like for the purposes of rehab and whatnot. I wonder if you can give us an idea why you think the resources allocated under program 8 will be adequate for you to accomplish that goal. It seems to me that either there's a decrease in the number of offenders and the people who are inmates or that you are going to yet again get more with less from your employees: correctional officers, jail guards, others in the system. If, on the other hand, part of the increase in the budget is going to be used to increase compensation for people who are working for the system, where is the money for increased educational training opportunities for offenders in custody? How much of the increase is anticipated to be used to achieve that objective that you have stated on page 274; that is, "provide offenders with opportunities to be rehabilitated"?

Another minor observation under goal 4: "ensure access to justice services for persons in need." That question has been asked before, but I may try to phrase it slightly differently so that we can get more information on that. Page 265 I think is what I want to go to, the legal aid plan. The allocation, again, is the same as last year. I hear here and there that the legal aid that's available to people who need to go to court to seek justice one way or the other is of a relatively – and I want to be very careful about this because I don't want to impugn any incompetence to those who in fact carry out those services, who provide those services – low quality, that people with less experience, people who can't find other kinds of work in the legal community are the ones who end up doing this work. Not increasing this allocation either implies that the overall demand for legal aid assistance is declining – and I think you'd certainly hope to see it decline – or that in your judgment the existing rates of compensation, which I guess are negotiated with the Legal Aid Society – I'm not sure; I don't know the process and the procedures in that regard – are adequate to secure good quality, sound legal service for those who need legal aid. I'd hope you would enlighten me on that.

A few other questions. I guess I have five minutes, roughly. Two of your key performance measures are very curious. One, of course, has to do with the time to trial. I asked you that question last year as well, and I'm going to repeat it. You seem to be seeking to increase the time to trial, an interesting measure of performance. What evidence do you have from your departmental surveys that that's what Albertans want: having to wait longer for their time before the courts? I'm really very curious. What will the effect of this target be on workloads or caseloads,

you know, for people who deliver these services in the courts?

The second similarly rather confounding target that you have is on the next page, page 277, "Stakeholder Satisfaction with the Services of the Public Trustee's Office." You are seeking a lower level of satisfaction. I again find it profoundly puzzling, coming from a man as brilliant as you, to think that a lower level of satisfaction is a better goal to have rather than having increased satisfaction. Delivering justice under the regime of our present Attorney General, which entails these kinds of things, makes me kind of wonder what exactly is going on.

10:57

The number of eligible persons receiving legal aid: I think I made that point.

One other point in the time remaining, if I may rush through it, Madam Chairman. On the Justice Summit, that you plan to have early next year somewhere, a question was asked, I guess, by my colleague. At the risk of repeating, let me ask again. There must be some sort of notion of anticipated costs of this process. If you'd tell us at least what you anticipate to spend on it, not what you will spend on it. I'm going to be participating on your invitation in part of this, so I guess I'm concerned about what it might cost the Alberta taxpayers to go through this process.

I'm seeking clarification – I guess it might be appropriate, Madam Chairman; you can tell me if it's not – with respect to the summit. The role of the members of the Legislature certainly is confined primarily, as I understand it, to public hearings.

THE CHAIRMAN: This would not be really appropriate at this point.

DR. PANNU: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I will, then, not proceed with that. I have one or two other things that I can throw at the Attorney General, hopefully.

Public security, Mr. Attorney General, is another key concern of course of Albertans. Under program 7 the allocation would suggest to me that in terms of allocating resources to public security, the priority of this goal hasn't changed in your plans, a very small increase when inflation and population changes are taken into account. The allocation under program 7 to policing programs, for example, is relatively minimal in my view. How do you account for no substantial increase in resources to achieve this goal that you have, I think, informed us at the beginning is high priority among Albertans?

Oh, yes. Program 3 . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: One hates to interrupt, hon. member, but as per our original agreement, the time for this segment has expired. So I would ask that the minister please respond in writing to any questions that he wasn't able to address.

I'd like to thank all of you for your participation and tell you that this meeting is now adjourned.

[The subcommittee adjourned at 11:01 a.m.]