

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Monday, June 3, 1974

[The House met at 2:30 o'clock.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

Select Committee on Alberta Regulations

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Select Committee on Alberta Regulations established by a resolution of this Assembly on May 10, 1973, I beg leave to make the following report:

The committee has received an overwhelming number of submissions [for] its deliberations. At this time the committee is unable to complete its final draft of what has become a large and comprehensive report. The committee, therefore, seeks the approval of this Assembly to continue its studies and report its final conclusions during the fall sitting of the Third Session of the 17th Legislature.

Select Committee on Foreign Investment

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Select Committee on Foreign Investment, I would like to report that the committee is working on its final report and expects it will be completed some time before the fall session.

The committee is studying the possibility of perhaps even forwarding, on a confidential basis, completed copies of the report to the members sometime before the fall session, but in order to extend the life of the committee, I beg leave to make this report through the Assembly.

The Select Committee on Foreign Investment, established by a resolution of this Assembly on April 21, 1972, is unable to complete its work at this time and recommends that the said committee, as constituted in the resolution, be authorized to continue its deliberations and report again at the 1974 fall sitting of this Assembly.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 225 An Act Respecting the Right
of the Public to Information Concerning the Public Business

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being Bill No. 225, An Act Respecting the Right of the Public to Information Concerning the Public Business. This bill would

enable an individual who has requested information from the government, with relation to public business, to get a judge's order to obtain the information he wishes, Mr. Speaker.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 225 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 243 The Return of Unsafe Products Act

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce another bill, being Bill No. 243, The Return of Unsafe Products Act. It would deal with the right of an individual to return to the vendor an item purchased and to demand a refund for the purchase price of the article within one year from date of purchase if either the federal government or the provincial government declare the item to be unsafe.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 243 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 244

An Act to repeal An Act to Confirm an Agreement Made Between His Majesty the King and The Canada Land and Irrigation Company, Limited

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being Bill No. 244, An Act to repeal An Act to Confirm an Agreement Made Between His Majesty the King and The Canada Land and Irrigation Company, Limited.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Way to go.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 244 was introduced and read a first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly, three young Canadians from Newfoundland who have chosen, as their project to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of Newfoundland's entry into Confederation, to cycle across Canada from Victoria, B.C. They have arrived in our city from B.C. and they tell me they were sure glad to get out of the mountains and see some flat country.

I would like Miss Frances Cook, Mr. Graham Wood and Mr. George Garner to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, it's indeed a pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, Mr. and Mrs. Adam Boyd of Glasgow, Scotland who are here enjoying the beauties of our province today. They are accompanied by Mr. Scotty Boyd who lives in Edmonton. I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted today to introduce a class of 60 lively and alert young elementary students on behalf of the Member for Calgary West, the hon. Premier of the Assembly. These students, some 60 strong, are from Westgate Elementary School, Grades 4, 5 and 6. They are in the members gallery. They are accompanied by Mr. Alexiwich, Mrs. Curtis and Mrs. Samuels. I would like to ask them to stand at this time and be recognized by the Legislative Assembly.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you, sir, and to the Assembly, 26 students from St. Gabriel School in the constituency of Edmonton Gold Bar. From Grades 4 and 5, they are accompanied by Mrs. Gadowski, their teacher.

I know it is very difficult for them to sit for too long. I am going to ask them to stand and be recognized by the House.

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, 40 Grade 7 students from Horsehills School in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Kolodychuk, and their bus driver. I would ask them to stand and be recognized.

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to table a reply to Question No. 169, asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition on May 2, 1974.

And further, sir, I should like to table reports of statements to be made to the Legislative Assembly, as required by the Statutes of Alberta, with respect to The Electrical Protection Act, The Gas Protection Act and The Welding Act.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the information requested in the Motion for Return No. 118 pertaining to ethane feedstocks.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the reply to Question No. 174, and also while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, to table the 62nd Annual Report of Alberta Government Telephones.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest previously displayed, I wish to table a newsletter going out to all school systems about conversion to the metric system in the schools of the province. Copies are available for all members. The document demonstrates the gradual and phased approach we are taking to metrication in Alberta.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Department of Transport

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to describe our city transportation policy. This policy forms an important part of the Progressive Conservative government's commitment to the people of Alberta in an area of transportation and communication.

In Alberta, our two large urban areas are among the fastest growing in Canada. Their rapid growth has resulted in public awareness of transportation problems that are a part of large city life. This government is committed to providing a program tailored to the needs of our urban areas, not only Edmonton and Calgary, but the smaller urban centres as well.

Our commitment is for [\$220,200,000] over the next six years. This money will be provided to substantially expand provincial government support of the city transportation systems. We want to ensure better, more convenient and improved transportation systems for the people living in Alberta cities. Mr. Speaker, \$220,200,000 is a great deal of money. Let me describe the ways in which it will be spent.

The Alberta government supports a policy of orderly growth across the province. We will not encourage growth merely for the sake of growth. However, we recognize the vital role that responsive transportation services provide in our cities by allowing citizens to move, with a maximum of convenience, back and forth between residence and employment, and around the city.

There is one key word that describes this program, and that is "responsive". For us, responsive is a word that refers to meeting the right needs, and to meet those needs of our urban areas we will provide assistance in three areas: public transit systems, arterial road systems, and planning and research for both of these items.

First, we will provide support for public transit systems suited to those parts of our cities that are best served by public transit. We include here buses, rail systems, light rapid transit, dial-a-bus and so on. These systems must be developed with a view to future expansion and flexibility. An example of this kind of flexibility would be the extension of a transit system to a satellite town. Our commitment for public transit is \$102,600,000 over six years.

Second, we are providing support for arterial road systems for the effective movement of goods and people. The economic life of our cities is dependent upon an ample network of roads to carry traffic rapidly into the core of our cities. For arterial roads and urban highways we will provide \$18 million every year for six years. This totals \$108 million, Mr. Speaker.

The third part of our program may be the least visible, but in many ways the most important. Studies and planning of major transportation problems in our urban areas will be undertaken. We are committing \$9,600,000 over six years for planning. These funds are to be equally divided between research on highways and parkways, and research on rapid transit systems.

That is our three-part program. Over six years, we will spend \$102,600,000 for public transit systems, \$108 million for arterial roads, and \$9,600,000 for research and development in both these areas. Thus our total commitment, Mr. Speaker, is \$220,200,000.

Now I would like to describe our general philosophy in developing this urban transportation policy. Then I will outline each part of this program in a bit more detail.

Just as we are committed to the large sums of money I mentioned, we are also committed to developing our policy in a way that is responsive to the needs of Albertans - social, environmental and economic. Responsive public transportation requires fresh thinking, innovative planning and a rational evaluation of many different alternatives.

Important criteria in selecting any given facility for urban transportation are flexibility and extensibility.

All our Alberta cities are still growing - in fact, their biggest growth is probably yet to come. Thus we must find solutions to their transportation problems that can grow. We must consider transportation within the central core. We must consider linkages between the central core and the suburbs. In all of this, it is our objective to work closely with the various local authorities in our cities and surrounding areas.

Mr. Speaker, we know that we face problems of great magnitude and complexity, and potentially huge financial commitments. Thus, it is our responsibility to carefully evaluate every transportation system proposed for every urban area. We must ensure harmony with overall provincial transportation objectives.

Cooperative planning between the urban municipalities and the provincial government on metropolitan transportation systems will be essential. It is therefore our intention to establish an organization for joint cooperation, planning and approval between the urban governments and the provincial government. The joint planning and approval organization will be established after consultation with and the concurrence of the urban municipalities.

Now let me describe our commitment in the field of public transit systems. Our support of public transit systems falls into three parts: funds for research, development and prototype studies; capital assistance for new construction; and subsidies for operating deficits.

The province will support the development and construction of public transit systems which will provide effective services for city residents. We will do so when, in the opinion of local councillors, such services can best be provided by a publicly [operated] system. We will supply funds each year over the next six-year period, and then review the requirements.

For research and development, the government will pay two-thirds of the cost of each of the following types of work: first, public transportation and transit usage studies specifically designed for the individual urban areas of the province; second, environmental impact assessments of proposed public transit systems; and third, the purchase and operation of experimental or prototype transit equipment in an acceptable evaluation program. The level of annual assistance from the province will be in the neighbourhood of \$800,000 per year.

For new construction and development, we will provide support wherever a publicly operated transit system appears the most effective solution to urban transportation problems. This support will be subject to the approval of the joint planning organization.

Our maximum capital funding will be: \$7,500,000 each year for the Edmonton urban area; [\$7,500,000] each year for the Calgary urban area; and \$1 million each year for all other urban areas of the province having public transportation systems.

These funds, Mr. Speaker, are cumulative. If they are not spent in one year they may be carried forward in a trust fund and interest earned will belong to the municipalities. Over the six year period, \$96 million, plus possible interest, will be provided for construction.

Mr. Speaker, suitable expenditures would be: land for right of way, for stations and for parking lots at stations; construction of roadbed and trackage; road or street preparations; subway lines or overhead carriageways; transit station structures and supporting [parking] areas; rolling stock, construction or widening of exclusive bus lanes; maintenance shops and so on.

We will set our guidelines from time to time as may be necessary, so will the joint planning organization. Among the general requirements imposed by the government are the following:

First, all practical methods of transportation must be given analysis and evaluation.

Second, studies must consider the extension of new and existing public transit systems into the fringes of metropolitan areas and into satellite communities such as St. Albert, Sherwood Park, Leduc, and even Cochrane or Airdrie, Mr. Speaker.

Third, the potential use of versatile and responsive bus systems for a short or long-term period should be given careful study.

Further, the government will require certain specific guarantees before approving the [northeast] leg of the Edmonton rapid transit system. Should the City of Edmonton not wish to proceed with its existing rapid transit plans, it will then be governed by the general requirements listed previously.

The third aspect of our support of public transit systems is a system of grants for operating deficits. We recognize the likelihood of operating deficits. We will provide an operating subsidy of up to 50 per cent of the deficit [for] approved transit systems. The subsidy is limited to not more than \$3 per capita per year for the urban population served.

These subsidies will be provided for two years and then will be reviewed. It is estimated that the cost of this assistance will be \$6,600,000 for the first two years.

Let us now consider, Mr. Speaker, the major arterial roads program contained in this city transportation policy. The arterial roads program falls into two parts: capital assistance for construction, and studies and research involving route planning.

For capital projects we will provide funds for two-thirds of the cost of construction and development of arterial roads within urban areas. For this purpose \$18 million per year has been set aside - a total of \$108 million over six years.

This may be spent in the following ways, again with the approval of the joint planning organization: purchasing land for right of way; removing buildings and obstructions; construction of roadways and related [structures]; relocating or adjusting utilities affected by construction and environmental reclamation.

The arterial road projects that will qualify for assistance are defined in this way. They may be primary or secondary highways, or extensions or continuations of highways, within the corporate city limits. They may be radial roads leading to and from the city centre. They may be zonal connections providing cross-city routes and continuity. They may be major spot improvements, including railway and road separations, intersection improvements, or major bridge construction.

The other aspects of the arterial roads program is money for route planning, involving: major continuous provincial highways; parkways and inter-regional and inter-urban routes. Here the government will pay the total cost of long-term route planning of highways within urban areas. Annual assistance will be \$800,000 or a total of \$4,800,000 over a six-year period.

Among our specific objectives are the following:

1. We wish to provide assistance to the joint planning organization for the evaluation of route alternatives, including public reaction and environmental impact.
2. Studies are required to coordinate urban transportation systems with continuous provincial highway development.
3. We wish to study the right of way and land assembly requirements.
4. [We wish] to examine inter-urban and metropolitan transportation systems.
5. [We wish] to coordinate our planning with that of subdivision planners and developers.
6. We are providing here for such other studies as the joint planning organization may require.

We hope the cities, under this transportation policy, will provide methods for the movement of senior citizens and the infirm. The cities will be encouraged to develop methods to help overcome the problems faced by our handicapped and senior citizens in moving about their communities. Assistance to handicapped and senior citizens has been a high priority, Mr. Speaker, of this government since assuming office.

That is our policy, Mr. Speaker. As you can see, we have tried to make it as flexible as possible.

I do not have to tell you that \$220,200,000 is quite a large sum of money.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. COPITHORNE:

But this sum, big as it is, is only a widow's mite when compared to the economic advantages that will flow from this investment. Rapid and effective transportation systems are essential to the vitality and quality of life of our urban areas.

DR. BUCK:

Who writes your stuff?

MR. COPITHORNE:

It is our belief that by providing sufficient funds in advance, and over the span of six years, the transportation systems in our cities can be developed sensibly and rationally. We hope by this policy to prevent a piecemeal approach.

We also hope that by involving the municipal governments in our planning we will make this policy as responsive as possible. We intend to involve the municipal authorities both through direct consultation, and through cooperative planning in the joint planning organization which will be established as a part of this policy.

Finally, let me say a word about environment protection. Those who build highways, rail lines, and indeed any form of large construction, are often accused of being insensitive to environmental problems.

This government is very much aware that our province was not given to us by our fathers. It is borrowed from our children and we must look after it. The decisions we must make in implementing our city transportation policy will be made with that in mind.

MR. CLAFK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to comment on the gigantic announcement by the minister, both in terms of \$220 million and also in length, might I say that we on this side of the House welcome the announcement the minister has made today.

I thought it was very appropriate that he set a very high tone to the announcement when he said at the outset that this program is tailored to meet its needs. I think that's a rather appropriate reflection upon my colleague to my left.

Getting into the core of the announcement, Mr. Speaker, let me say this, that the real test of the \$220 million is going to be how successful this joint planning organization is. I'm pleased to see that the minister has taken an initial step in this direction, but it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, from the announcement - which I hope to look at more fully in the future - that this joint planning organization which the minister referred to will have a great deal of bearing upon the long-term benefit of the \$220 million applying to urban transportation.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, might I just caution the minister and the government [about] becoming involved on an extended basis on grants to urban transportation systems in the field of picking up operational deficits. This province has had a number of experiences with the federal government and the Canadian Transport Commission. I recognize the minister indicates that this will be reviewed every two years, but we all know the experience the Canadian Transport Commission has had in that particular area.

The last comment I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is simply this. We're pleased to see that the lessons the minister and the government learned from the Kananaskis Highway have borne much fruit. When we see the rather significant mention in this announcement concerning environmental impact studies, that's another step in the right direction.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Government Aircraft - Guidelines

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the acting Premier, the Minister of Agriculture, and ask if the government has written guidelines for the use of government aircraft, namely the Queen Air and the King Air?

DR. HORNER:

I'm not aware whether or not there are written guidelines, Mr. Speaker, but I'm sure that I am aware of the allusion that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is about to make.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question to the Deputy Premier, Mr. Speaker. Could the Deputy Premier tell us who is responsible for the implementation of the guidelines?

DR. HORNER:

In a general way, Mr. Speaker, the aircraft is under the operational direction of the Department of Lands and Forests and is available for Executive Council use.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister of Lands and Forests then responsible for the administration of the guidelines, whether written or unwritten?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the use of the aircraft by the Executive Council, the responsible office would be the Premier's office.

Brucellosis Control

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a second question, also to the Deputy Premier, but in his capacity as Minister of Agriculture, regarding the epidemic of brucellosis.

Is the government giving serious consideration to preventing or holding cattle at the Alberta-Saskatchewan border for testing prior to the cattle being released into the province of Alberta?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I think we dealt with this particular question at some length in a previous question period. I would say to the hon. leader, though, that surely the onus is on the cattle buyer to make sure that any cattle he has coming in from suspect areas are blood tested before he accepts them.

I might point out again that this is a federal program which crosses provincial lines. The stepped-up program by the Health of Animals Branch of the Canada Department of

Agriculture is very welcome because we'd like to stamp out [brucellosis] as quickly as possible.

While the write-up in the newspaper might be a little bit overdramatic, there is compensation payable in addition to the market value of the animals that are ordered to be slaughtered.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is there financial assistance from the Government of Alberta for farmers who have been ordered by federal authorities to have their cattle slaughtered, as far as the farm clean-up itself is concerned?

DR. HORNER:

We'd be quite willing to give consideration to that in our general programs, Mr. Speaker, because that might put a farmer in a difficult position. I would suggest that the farmers involved in that area should be in touch with their district agriculturists and the livestock specialists in the various regions to see how we might assist them in a meaningful way.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. As a result of the investigations by the Alberta Department of Agriculture in seeing what is going on, do your surveys indicate that the comment made by federal authorities over the weekend that, in fact, brucellosis is spreading further into the cattle industry in Alberta is an accurate reflection based upon the surveys done by the Alberta Department of Agriculture?

DR. HORNER:

It certainly isn't, Mr. Speaker. I thought most of the report was fairly accurate until the federal veterinarian made some comment as to his opinion of how it spread. Pretty obviously, Mr. Speaker, it spread because of a lack of continuing observation and study by the federal Health of Animals Branch people to make sure it was in check.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary to the Deputy Premier. Is the Department of Agriculture satisfied that the outbreak is not spreading further in Alberta at this time? That comment was also included in this article, one paragraph below the one you just alluded to.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question could perhaps be brought within the scope of the question period by being put in such a way that it might ask the hon. Deputy Premier whether that information is available in the department. But if it requires an expression of government opinion, then, of course, it's outside the scope of the question period.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, the question is asked as a result of the monitoring the department is doing, whether it is further spreading in the province or not?

DR. HORNER:

If my honourable friend had read further he would understand that the disease is one that is sometimes difficult to pick up without blood testing. Even at that stage you can have an infected animal and if it hasn't developed the antibodies, this test is not going to be positive until it has had the disease for a certain length of time.

It's a difficult disease to detect early. I think it behooves all farm operators and indeed, all our veterinarians, in both the service of the government and private practice, to continue their vigilance in regard to brucellosis. That is the only way we will control the disease and stop its spread.

MR. CLARK:

One last supplementary question to the Deputy Premier, Mr. Speaker. Has the government given consideration to having the provincial lab give priority to tests for suspected cases of brucellosis?

DR. HORNER:

I think that's a matter of fact at the moment, Mr. Speaker. But I'll check and make sure it is being done because it is a matter of some priority at the moment, to make sure we can control any outbreak as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Sheet Metalworkers Dispute

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. It concerns the sheet metalworkers dispute with two subcontractors of C. F. Braun.

My question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister, is, can the minister advise the Assembly whether it's true that inspectors from his department confirmed violation of regulations governing the trade of sheet metal mechanics?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, our inspectors and other members of the department have taken a close look at it and have made a judgment which will be further discussed in meetings with the insulators this afternoon. The matter of violation is likely beyond the scope of the judgment that they made, but they did make a judgment indicating what their view was with respect to jurisdiction.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the hon. minister advise the Assembly whether or not an official of his department wrote the two subcontractors concerned asking them to rectify the situation?

DR. HOHOL:

It's my understanding that there was a contact - I don't know whether this was the case - in writing or some other way.

I should like to point out again that gentlemen of the insulators local and my own staff are in the galleries, and will be meeting later this afternoon.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether or not it's true that the Deputy Minister of Manpower and Labour advised an official of the sheet metalworkers union that he'd take the matter of jurisdictional dispute to the national disputes board in the United States?

DR. HOHOL:

No, I don't have this information, although I've been close to the situation for some days. That doesn't mean that he may not have pointed out that the final appeal procedure in a two or three-step appeal process would be the international appeal board as a last resort set down by the unions themselves, before the Board of Industrial Relations would be eligible to hear the case. We're working on it now in a kind of partnership way trying to work it out.

MR. NOTLEY:

Just one final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether or not the government has developed any overall policy with respect to the referring of jurisdictional disputes to the national disputes board in the United States?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to discuss this very important matter in the estimates. In the question period I would just briefly like to say that the appeal procedures open to the unions are set down by the unions themselves. We have respected

this and then required them to follow the procedures set up by themselves before we, as government, looked into matters that are within, among and between unions themselves.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Hog Industry - Assistance

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. In light of well publicized protests regarding the high costs and low returns of bringing pigs to market, is the hon. minister exploring the possibility of assisting hog raisers in the province?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the hon. member has been in the last several months if he doesn't understand that we have been exploring assistance in a variety of ways with regard to the hog producers in Alberta, [such as] the production incentive program by which we are paying out approximately \$1 million a month as additional payments to hog producers in Alberta and the substantial amount of work we have done with regard to the export market.

The question, of course, the hon. member is referring to is the problems we have had in regard to labour conditions and those affecting the market. I would hope he would appreciate that's the major situation at the moment. We are hopeful, of course, that the mediation, which I understand is continuing, will resolve that problem. I would expect an improvement in the hog marketing situation.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I have already commented in the House with regard to our views on the federal stabilization program and we have already contacted the federal government in that area to try to improve that stabilization program.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Interim Capital Replacement Fund

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Is the government now shelving its plan to introduce what has become known as a second budget?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think we could refer to it as the second budget, as the hon. member referred to it. But it is true we had intended to introduce an interim capital replacement fund during the course of the spring sitting of the Legislature which would have largely dealt with - at least on an interim basis - the allocation of funds as opposed to the actual expenditure of those funds which, as I have indicated several times in the House, requires a great many complex and very important long-range policy decisions for the province of Alberta in the utilization of these funds.

Since that time, I think all hon. members are aware, an academic federal budget has been proposed in Canada. We think that combining both factors, which are that we certainly shouldn't rush the policy decisions on the long-term use of these funds and the fact that we would like an opportunity to assess (a) what final federal budgetary policy may be, and (b) what effect that policy might have on Alberta's particular economy, we would like an opportunity to do that before proceeding with a capital replacement fund, either on a short-term or long-term basis.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary to the hon. minister. Has any portion of the estimated \$900 million been received by the province this fiscal year?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is yes. Basically it would fit under the investment powers of The Financial Administration Act in the interim.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary. Will any of the money which has been received be used as operating expenses since it was not included in the budget?

MR. MINIELY:

No, Mr. Speaker. The intent would be, as I indicated, that, although on an accounting basis in the interim the funds would accrue to general revenue, our intent would be that when the final or interim capital replacement fund is introduced, we believe we can set it up retroactively so that, in the interim because there is no legislative authority to so do, they would, on an accounting basis, accrue to general revenue. Our feeling would be that we can pick it up retroactively.

The physical placement of the funds in the interim would be invested under the powers of The Financial Administration Act which any interim bill would have been subject to in any event.

MR. TAYLOR:

One further supplementary. Is it the plan of the hon. minister to introduce the bill of which notice was given on Friday - which I now understand has been withdrawn - at the fall session?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I'd like to tie myself down to any particular time at the present time. I think with the factors that have arisen, we will have to consider whether or not we have an interim bill on a first basis or whether or not we introduce a bill which would be applicable to the long term. That could be the key decision as to whether or not it proceeds in the fall or subsequently, as well, of course, as isolating the revenues between general revenue and a capital fund in the current year. I just would prefer not to tie [in] a specific time at the present time.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker. Why was the announcement of the decision not to proceed on this issue made outside the House rather than in the House at a time when the Legislature is in session?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is inviting the minister to debate.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Can the Provincial Treasurer advise the Assembly whether any subsequent announcements dealing with this matter will be deferred until the fall session of the Legislature so that they are made during the session of the House?

MR. MINIFLY:

I think, Mr. Speaker, both of the last questions have had some kind of innuendo or insinuation in them.

I think we should make it clear that all the way through both the Premier and I have indicated that there were some very complex and important policy decisions that needed to be made. Any bill would have been on an interim basis only.

Certainly I think the hon. members of the Opposition had the same prerogative as anyone else to ask why the bill was dropped from the Order Paper. It was not because in any way we felt it would be overly significant. As I indicated earlier, whatever bill we put in would have been on an interim basis in this spring session because of the tremendously complex and long-term discussions that have to take place on government policy for the use of the funds in the longer term.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary to the hon. minister. Does the hon. minister have an estimate of the approximate amount of revenue that has been received this fiscal year?

MR. MINIFLY:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to get the details on what has actually been received up to the present time which might have been applied to the capital replacement fund. But I

have to put a caveat on that, Mr. Speaker. That is that, not having made final decisions as to what would accrue, you can't really say that this - you could say additional incremental revenue - but not necessarily what might apply to a capital fund.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary to the hon. minister. Does the hon. minister anticipate any "problems", since this money has not been dealt with by the Legislature?

MR. MINIELY:

No, Mr. Speaker. Basically, as I indicated, really the introduction of a bill would have been to set a policy for the first time in Alberta that funds were set aside out of the normal general revenue context of the province and put in a separate capital fund.

Now basically, in the interim, the mere fact that legislation in itself was not passed for that, does not mean that the funds still come in, they will still be invested at the best return, pending the introduction of a final bill, at which time we can pick up these funds retroactively as far as an accounting basis is concerned. It has no effect, as far as I'm concerned, on the actual utilization of the funds under the broad powers of The Financial Administration Act for their investment.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Can the Provincial Treasurer advise, in light of his weekend statement, whether or not the government has already developed the contingency plans dealing with some kind of concession to the industry - the oil industry - or alternatively, whether or not there are now ongoing discussions with officials of the industry relating to his weekend press announcement?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I think the use of the term "contingency plans" would not be appropriate. However, I would like to repeat again that we would like the opportunity to assess whatever the federal budgetary policy may be and what effect that policy may have. I think it is an open question in terms of the oil and gas industry. Basically that opportunity - because we have debated in this Legislature up to this time, and I think we are faced with the uncertainty again, of (a) what is going to be a federal budget, and (b) what effect that might have on an important part of the Alberta economy.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, for clarification. Are discussions now taking place between officials of the Alberta government and either IPAC or the CPA concerning the very hypothetical budget which was voted down? Are discussions now taking place on the impact of that budget as a basis of discussion?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I think that question would be more appropriately addressed to the Minister of Mines and Minerals.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, we have ongoing discussions with representatives of IPAC, CPA and the drilling contractors. They have voiced some of the concerns that they see in the budget. I would, however, like to say that there are no discussions going on with the revision of royalty rates. There are discussions going on with respect to certain aspects of the royalty regulations, but not on the rates.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary to the hon. minister. Would the money then be considered capital or would it be considered revenue for cost-sharing with the federal government?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, the first part of this question I understood. The second part, as far as cost-sharing, I don't see that it has any application at all, so I'm not really clear.

MR. CLARK:

Equalization.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands followed by the hon. Member for Whitecourt.

Civic Inquiry - Appointment

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Attorney General if the government has yet selected a commissioner of inquiry pursuant to a request made last week by the Edmonton City Council?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be able to say that over the past few days I've been able to make arrangements to have the Honourable Mr. Justice Morrow of the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories conduct the inquiry requested by the City of Edmonton Council.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Whitecourt followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Cornation.

Government Aircraft Use

MR. TRYNCHY:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Deputy Premier and it's a follow-up to the question put by the Opposition House Leader in regard to the use of government aircraft.

Can the hon. minister advise if the hon. Premier had the use of the government aircraft to fly to or from Calgary last Wednesday?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier used the aircraft because it was deadheading to Calgary in any event for servicing.

In addition to that, the Premier spent a full day in the Premier's office in Calgary. He also spoke to a graduating class, I think in the Ernest Manning High School, at their graduation.

[Interjections]

So, Mr. Speaker, instead of the innuendo that's been going on, let's put it right on the table.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, could the Deputy Premier tell us which was arranged first, the Calgary Bow nominating convention or the lubrication job for the aircraft?

DR. HORNER:

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the servicing of the aircraft is an important part of its continuing operation, as is the commitment of the Premier to speak to a graduating class in this province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

High school students are pretty important.

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In light of the fact that the taxpayer does pay for these ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order.

Cabinet Tour

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Deputy Premier. In the proposed cabinet tour which will be taking place this spring, in light of the fact that some of the Opposition constituencies ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Question.

DR. BUCK:

... will be covered, will the Opposition members be asked to go along on the tour?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we will be making a cabinet tour and if we're in the hon. member's area and he would like to make representations to the cabinet at that time, I'm sure we would be delighted to hear him. It might make up for some of his absences from this Legislature.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Premier is up to his usual game of skill and science.

[Interjections]

He talks about innuendo, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to ask a question, Mr. Speaker.

[Interjections]

I would like to ask a question, Mr. Speaker, to the deputy minister.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Deputy Premier.

[Interjections]

AN HON. MEMBER:

He will be a deputy minister ...

DR. BUCK:

I've got lots of time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Deputy Premier. Has the Deputy Premier advised, by letter, the areas that are affected and the members in the areas, when the tour will be taking place?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier the other day in the Legislature committed us, once our schedule is firmed up, to informing the honourable gentleman. I am hoping that his time can be delegated to that tour.

Government Aircraft - Guidelines (Cont.)

MR. NOTLEY:

I would like to direct a supplementary question to the hon. Deputy Premier, relating to the first question directed to him by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I believe his answer was that he wasn't certain as to whether guidelines had been prepared.

My question is, if guidelines have been prepared, is it the intention of the government to table them in the Legislature? Secondly, if guidelines haven't been prepared, is it the intention of the government to prepare them?

DR. HOFNER:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first hypothetical question would be yes. The answer to the second hypothetical question will be taken under consideration.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Oil Spills - Killam

MR. SOPENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. In the recent investigation carried out by the Department of the Environment into pipeline breakage in the Killam area, can the hon. minister confirm that, in fact, some 42 miles of pipe in the Killam region is of inferior quality?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the in-depth investigation, in terms of pipelining in the area the hon. member is mentioning, is being done by the Energy Resources Conservation Board. When those reports are available I shall certainly view them and report to the House, if necessary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Welfare System

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. What action does the minister intend to take as a result of the Edmonton Social Planning Council proposal for a financial incentive policy which was recently submitted to the minister?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the brief received from one of the committees of the Edmonton Social Planning Council is one of a number that have been received on that and related subjects over a period of time.

I indicated to them, as I believe I have indicated to the House previously, that probably within the next several months the government will be making public a policy in regard to changes in the welfare system. Items raised in the brief would be included in the consideration given prior to that time.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister advise if Alberta currently has the lowest work incentive position in Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Possibly the hon. member might do his research elsewhere.

The hon. Member for Whitecourt.

Forest Fires

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Can the hon. minister advise the House if there are any forest fires burning in Alberta and if any of them are out of control?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the good weather, we do have some forest fires burning in Alberta at the present time. The largest fire is in the Whitecourt area, some 90 acres in size. But it is under control, as are the other fires I know about, up to this moment.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. minister. Can the hon. minister inform the House what role the King Air and the Queen Air are playing in the forest fighting detail?

DR. WARRACK:

I would be very pleased to do that, Mr. Speaker. All of the aircraft within the jurisdiction and responsibility of this government have, as an absolutely first priority, are available for forest fire fighting use on any occasion that is necessary.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I asked in what role they are being used presently in fighting forest fires.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to elaborate. At times the members of the House feel I elaborate too much, but I see they welcome some elaboration at this time.

Within that first priority use of all aircraft are included the King Air and the Queen Air aircraft. These aircraft fly ...

[Laughter]

... and move people and supplies very quickly around this province, as is absolutely essential in the effective fire-fighting effort that we make each year. The King Air and the Queen Air are, on a first priority basis, used for doing just that.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister advise if the nominating convention in Calgary was a real burning issue?

AN HON. MEMBER:

... An inflammatory statement.

Strip Mine Proposal

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. I'd like to know if the hon. minister can inform the House if any coal company has made a firm proposal to open a strip mine in the area of the Cardinal Coal Company's operation?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I'd like to ask unanimous leave of the Assembly to revert to Notices of Motions for a moment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Can the hon. Government House Leader have the required leave?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

MR. HYNDMAN:

I'd like to give notice, Mr. Speaker, of two government motions to be moved tomorrow. The first one is for receipt and concurrence of the report of the legislative committee on regulations made by the Member for Drayton Valley today.

The second, again, is for receipt and concurrence of the report of the legislative committee on foreign investment, made by the Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to advise that [on Friday], when I said the fall session of the Assembly would start on Friday, October 25, I was wrong. It is Wednesday, October 23 at 2:30 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Supply will come to order.

Department of the Environment (Cont.)

According to the records, Mr. Strom, you had some questions?

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned on Friday ...

[Interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

May we have some order in the committee, please.

MR. STROM:

I was about to ask the hon. minister if he could advise as to what is actually happening in Medicine Hat. I understand that his department has given at least a couple of orders to the meat packing plant in Medicine Hat with regard to emission control. I'm wondering if he could elaborate as to what the actual problem is in that area?

MR. YUFKO:

Mr. Chairman, many or most of the meat packing plants or houses have received emission control orders during the last couple of years. The Alberta Western Beef Company of Medicine Hat has also received one. They have been asked to upgrade their plant with respect to odour control and the particular plant in question has been asked to install the oxy-flow odour control system, as well as a system of vent collection. The anticipated expenditures involved are between \$200,000 and \$250,000 and it is anticipated that they will be installing this equipment shortly.

I might say that the packing plant, I understand, is now owned by the Burns Packing Co., so that it is anticipated there will be no difficulty with regard to the expenditure of this type of money. My understanding is that they're certainly going ahead.

MR. STRCM:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, that clears it as far as I am concerned. I did find out later that there is a new company there and I think it will make a difference.

Mr. Chairman, the other question that I had is in regard to the Capital City Recreation Park, as I believe it's known, the new park that was announced just recently. The announcement followed our committee study of the estimates. My question to the minister is: are any funds allocated within the current budget for any project within this particular development?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, there are no capital funds appropriated at this time. The park will proceed this year on the basis of an interim allocation of funding which as yet has not been worked out.

MR. STRCM:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could give us just a rough figure as to what they are looking at. I appreciate what he has said, that there is no firm figure, but I would be interested in knowing, in general terms, how much the minister is expecting would be spent on current projects for this year.

MR. YURKO:

I had the opportunity to discuss this matter with the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests today. We tentatively envision that, if we are to meet the deadline or the commitment by having the park ready when the Commonwealth Games are going to be held, we will need a budget allocation of something like \$5 million this year, an interim allocation, and approximately \$10 million for the subsequent three years.

MR. STROM:

What is the nature of the project that will be involved in the expenditure of \$5 million?

MR. YURKO:

The majority, I believe at this time though it's not that closely specified, will be land purchases. There is a brick company to be purchased in the Strathcona site. Most of that land in the Strathcona site is privately owned so that most of that land will have to be purchased.

MR. STROM:

Will there be any studies conducted into development projects - and I'm thinking of some of the development on the river itself - the weir, for example, which will be a fairly major structure? Are there any studies contemplated in regard to that development as to its effect on river flows and so on?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, there will be a large number of studies conducted. Studies will be conducted on bank stability at some points, studies will be conducted on fill at other points in terms of providing the useful bicycle and promenades along the river. In some areas we will fill rather than cut into the bank. At the same time major programming will be done over a period of four years and these studies will all be programmed at the right time in terms of eventual implementation. I might say that the various departments involved are now looking at an overall plan in terms of not only planning and development, but implementation on the longer term.

We would anticipate, with the concurrence of the City of Edmonton, perhaps the establishment of a model of the entire development at the earliest opportunity, so that changes in what is planned can be seen by people in a very understandable way. We have some examinations in a number of areas going on right now.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister if he's in a position to elaborate or extend upon the comments he made during the study of his department's estimates in subcommittee. We had at that time rather extensive comments concerning the proposed water line from the Red Deer River down to serve Innisfail, Bowden, Olds, Didsbury, Carstairs, Crossfield and Airdrie. The minister indicated at that time that they were then waiting for the consultant's report and that once the consultant's report had been received, the matter would then receive some rather more in depth consideration by his department.

I wonder if the minister is in a position now to indicate exactly what the status is of the line and what kind of timeline we might be looking at as far as some final decision by the government is concerned on the line serving the whole area?

MR. YURKO:

I think, Mr. Chairman, I might answer the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition as follows.

When the consultants first gave me a preliminary report on the cost estimate, they indicated the cost of the major line going south to be in the order of \$7 to \$7.5 million. On this basis I requested that the consultant do an immediate detailed analysis. That detailed analysis has been completed and the costs that have been projected are considerably higher than the initial estimates that were given - in fact, to the order of \$13 million.

Because of the fact that the finalized estimates are that high and really reflect to the order of \$1,200 to \$1,300 per capita, which is very high indeed at this time on a per capita basis, I have requested the department to re-examine some of the other proposals to see that, in fact, we are tied in to the most economical proposal, as well as an assurance of supply on a long-term basis.

The department is now busily engaged in examining a number of alternative proposals. We anticipate that we will be able to resolve the matter and bring it up before cabinet by some time this summer unless we run into some major difficulty. However, I don't anticipate any major difficulty at this time.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Minister, you indicated that the initial cost you were looking at was between \$7 and \$7.5 million. When the consultants did the report, what was the figure they came in with? Did you get that?

MR. YURKO:

The initial figure the consultant gave me was of the order - this was the consultant's figure - the order of \$7 to \$7.5 million which, projected on a per capita basis, looked like a reasonable expenditure on the part of the province. Subsequently, after the detailed analysis of the initial project they had proposed to us, the cost escalated to the order of \$13 million. I consider this to be too high on a per capita basis. As a result we have had to go back and take a look at the various alternatives involved.

MR. PUSTF:

Mr. Chairman, to the minister. This spring I think we have seen an unprecedented run-off in many areas, and you have large amounts of water which have been sort of locked-in. I wonder if the department or the minister has been looking at any way of trying to extricate these because of the fact that if this goes on into another spring run-off like we had this year, you are going to have more serious flooding than ever.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, on various occasions in this House I have attempted to indicate to the House the fact that we have initiated some very substantive and major policies in regard to water management during the last several years.

One of them is Policy Position No. 5 and this is a very specific policy. It identifies the type of assistance and responsibility in regard to water drainage. On what we consider to be minor drainage programs, we will fund these programs on a formula basis with the municipalities, with the initiation on the part of the municipalities. If any municipality comes to see us in terms of assisting us to fund it, we have found very little hesitancy in regard to assisting the municipalities.

I might give you an example. Under the PEP program we have had a \$1 million program each year, almost entirely directed towards, or to a large degree directed towards, local drainage problems or municipal drainage problems. I should say about 50 per cent of it was based on 50-50 agreements with the municipalities in terms of solving local drainage problems.

Many municipalities have come forward with considerable relish to take advantage of this policy. Some have been very hesitant, trying to argue, in fact, that the province should undertake all the costs of some of these drainage systems. In other words, they wish to have the responsibility for management, yet they don't wish to absorb any of the costs.

Those municipalities that came forward with their programs have found very little resistance in terms of going ahead with them. In fact, we have used every possible means of revising the rules or adopting the rules to fit their particular situations, even to the extent of programming their direct monetary involvement over a small number of years. Some municipalities haven't come to us and they do have problems.

In addition we have several other policies. The policy of 50-50 sharing with the drainage districts has been in operation for a couple of years now and some of the drainage districts have taken advantage of 50 per cent funding by the province.

Also, in low-lying areas where flooding happens frequently, we have offered the farmers in the area the opportunity to sell back their land to the province and lease it on an annual basis, recognizing that, in fact, the land may be flooded one out of two, or one out of five years.

So we really have moved very substantively in this area. We do recognize there is a role to be played by the municipalities. We're willing to back up any municipalities and enter into any joint agreement program that they, in fact, wish to sponsor and put before us.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, further to what the minister said. I recall earlier in the session - I believe the Minister of the Environment and his counterpart, the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Agriculture, made joint announcements about assistance to areas where there was flooding. What I was getting back to were the extra ones that were put in this year because of the unprecedented run-off and the problems created by it. That's what I was trying to get at.

MR. YURKO:

The program?

MR. RUSTE:

Yes, the announcements that were made earlier this session by the Deputy Premier and yourself, of assistance in flooding conditions. I'd just like to have those spelled out. What amounts of money have been involved in that part?

DR. HOFNER:

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could answer that question. We won't know how much money is involved until we get the completion of the damage assessment done in three areas that are involved: the crop damage, the personal loss damage and the municipal damage to highways and roads. That is in the process of being compiled now, and then a claim will be made to the federal government for assistance under their cost-sharing program.

MR. YURKO:

I'm not aware of any other program we've announced except the payment for damages.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, to the minister. In the event of a landowner having land that is bounded or the river runs through, we'll say - I'm thinking of the Battle River in particular where there is an erosion of banks - who does he go to for assistance or to take the steps necessary to get assistance?

MR. YURKO:

Basically that's also included in our Policy Position No. 5. If it's considered there is a provincial input and it's not purely a local matter on his part, then there is an input on the basis of the Policy Position No. 5. It's called River Training. If there is a serious erosion problem of the river bank on a farmer's property, for example, then we will go in there and fund, and in some cases, undertake the program on a provincial basis. They have to come up and see us, we have to go and assess the problem and see what the provincial interest is.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Are you ready for the question?

The resolution as moved by the Chairman of Subcommittee B:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$24,928,062 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975 for the Department of the Environment.

[The motion was carried.]

Department of the Solicitor General

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, Subcommittee C has had under consideration Vote 34, the estimates of expenditure for the Department of the Solicitor General and begs to report the same. I therefore submit the following resolution:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$26,704,350 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975 for the Department of the Solicitor General.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, just a question to the Solicitor General. It follows some of the Check Stop announcements which were made not too long ago.

This goes back to what I consider is subtle, deceptive advertising done at this time on radio and TV by one of the breweries in relation to fresh water. I certainly object to that type of advertising. Our young people today are looking at the emphasis placed on the environment, on the purity of fresh water, our parks and all this, then to have [such advertising] included in programs which come on at unexpected times, at prime TV viewing time and on the radio as well ... I would like to know whether the minister has looked at this with the possibility of removing it or having a study made to see what effect it has.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I am not too sure about the exact brewery the member has in mind or if he is inquiring whether or not the advertising is correct. There was a question in the House during my absence recently and I did have a report on it.

Apparently one of the breweries - I am not sure which one the hon. member is referring to - but one of the breweries does indeed have its own spring water inside. The report I have is that they do have their own spring water within their own boundaries. They have supplied certified material indicating they obtain a great deal of their water from their own wells on the site of the brewery. A check with the City of Calgary water department confirmed that the majority of the water used by the brewery is from their own wells. So I don't really believe that they are [conducting] false advertising.

The Alberta Liquor Control Board is charged with the responsibility of monitoring and it is from them I obtain my information.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, this goes back, of course, to the result of the statements made and the effect it has on people who may not investigate as far as maybe you and I have. But certainly a lot of people expressed concern about this coming in about the same time that the Check Stop program was inaugurated and the result it has on our people.

MR. SORENSON:

I would like to make just a few comments on alcoholism and liquor advertising which is being employed in our province.

Certainly we were all behind the Check Stop program which the hon. Solicitor General introduced. While she didn't say so in so many words, she certainly intimated that the hand that lifts the glass of cheer should not attempt to shift the gear. We were behind that. It was sad that the very same week this campaign was introduced, we opened new avenues of liquor advertising in the province.

We, as a family, have always enjoyed the Saturday night hockey broadcasts. It has been a family tradition to sit and watch. We have enjoyed Imperial Oil and the Ford Motor Company sponsoring them. They have great products and great finished products as far as we are concerned. Now there is a brewery which is also helping as sponsor and I don't view their finished product in quite the same light as Ford Motor's. Their product is a product which is finished as far as I am concerned.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Not a full bottle left.

MR. SORENSON:

The Readers Digest for January, 1974, has some interesting statistics under the heading, Staggering Alcohol Facts:

For every heroin addict in the United States today, there are at least 15 hard-core alcoholics. Alcohol plays a major part in half of our highway deaths - about 28,000 each year. Drunkenness accounts for one third of all U.S. arrests. People who abuse alcohol shorten their lives by an average of 10 to 12 years.

There are extensive studies on alcoholism going on. The Public Health Service in Missouri is working with the university in Missouri in studying alcoholism. The hog is the victim in this research - the pig. The director of the project states that "Pigs and people are the only two creatures that voluntarily will drink the juice." A few pigs will drink just enough to maintain a mild state of intoxication, but most pigs were binge drinkers, going on a drinking spree for one to three days at a time, then laying off for a few days. A pig going 'cold turkey' is a pitiful sight. Withdrawal takes from five to six days. It will jump from an imaginary object - there is nothing there, but they have hallucinations. And then they will run pell-mell into a stone fence.

The director of the study feels alcoholism is a disease and this study can benefit mankind by finding ways to treat the disease.

We have many descriptions of drinkers today; pie-eyed, soused, canned, stoned, to name a few. Now we can dream up a few more, drunker than a pig or, instead of higher than a kite, higher than a hog.

But there are some personal reasons why I don't feel my community needs any more liquor advertising or any more outlets for that matter. They increase the highway traffic toll and that was the reason for Check Stop. Evidence all over the country indicates that half our traffic accidents point to the involvement of liquor.

The second reason is that liquor and crime are pretty closely associated. Now, not everyone who drinks will commit a crime, I realize that. However, many a would-be criminal drops into a bar at night, drinks until he has developed enough courage to go out and commit a crime. Warden Lou Clapp of the Idaho penitentiary made this statement recently: "Ninety per cent of the men tell me they were drunk or had been drinking when they committed the offence that sent them up."

In a survey which was taken some years ago - and I believe the hon. Solicitor General has a copy of it - they studied many cases, types of crime. In fact, of 20 who had committed forgery, 60 per cent had been imbibing; of 138 who had stolen cars, 70 per cent had alcohol content; larceny, 141 cases, 73 per cent; burglary, 181 cases studied, 71 per cent had been drinking. So the list goes.

Of course, of traffic fatalities, I suppose half can be traced back to alcohol. More liquor advertising means more social pressures on our young people today.

I am reminded of an illustration of a young man who, on his way to work, stopped at a store. There were animals and birds for sale. The clerk showed him a particular bird and told him that the bird would speak five languages. "It's \$1,000 but it will ..." - and it truly did - "... speak five languages." The young chap had a hard time digging up the \$1,000 but he bought it and told the clerk to send it to his home because he was on his way to work. That night when he came home he said, "Dear, where is the bird?" And she said, "It's in the oven." He said, "In the oven? That bird could speak five languages." "Well," she said, "then why didn't he speak up?"

I think someone has to speak up as far as liquor traffic is concerned because many of our young people especially are going to get a roasting if they take heed of all this slick gimmickry they read and see concerning liquor today.

MISS HUNLEY:

I would just like to comment, Mr. Chairman, on some of the observations made by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Corcoran.

In reply to the question he directed to me the other day, I have made some inquiries. We don't have, to our knowledge, any research on crimes related to alcohol. The Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission keeps statistics on alcohol-related crimes where a pattern of criminality and alcoholism appear to be related. But there is no report prepared on the basis of the statistics. Our search, to the moment, has not revealed any research pertinent to this province or to this nation.

Regarding the location of outlets, the Alberta Liquor Control Board does not go into communities on its own. They are petitioned, and sometimes quite vigorously, as my copies of correspondence directed to me have indicated, by residents of the area requesting them to come in. They don't thrust themselves upon an area, but rather they are asked, pressured in fact, in many cases to come in.

There are a couple of thecries abroad. The hon. member has referred to the fact that the number of outlets in an area leads to more highway fatalities. But there is also another thought - I don't know whether it is valid or not, I can't substantiate it, so I'll just place it before you. In fact it was raised by one of the members. The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake raised the issue, feeling it would reduce the amount of driving on the highway if outlets were closer together.

I don't feel inclined to take a position one way or the other because I don't think I have the information that would necessarily confirm or deny that statement.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, to the minister, dealing with the RCMP agreement in the province. There is a point where a community gets to, I believe, 1,500 - beyond that they are responsible in certain degrees and below that they are policed by the province.

Has there been any contemplation of a change there? Because I have one community which is right on the border, where the population one year was below and another year it was above. This altered the structure. That gets back again to financing and so on.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I'm sure it does. At the present time we do not have that under consideration, that is, the 1,500 guideline.

What, of course, we will be considering is the renewal of the RCMP contract which comes up in 1976. I'll be attending a meeting this month at which the RCMP contract will be discussed with other provincial ministers who are using the police on a provincial basis.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, to the minister again then. In the vote dealing with air patrol, is this going to be stepped up? I notice there is quite an increase in the amount, about 114 per cent, tying it in of course with policing grants, inmate pay and air patrol.

MISS HUNLEY:

No, we've not increased the budget for the air patrol this year. There is an increase in that. Part of that is incentive pay to inmates. Then of course there is a grant to municipalities which undertake a contract with the RCMP for the first time.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I have a few comments I'd like to make with reference to this department, first with reference to the sale of Bowden. This issue has received tremendous coverage in the press within the last year. There is some concern by the people of this province as to what will be the alternative to what we had. I know that Bowden was not exactly a model facility for handling young offenders. Nevertheless it was the best we had in Alberta at the time.

I would like the hon. Solicitor General to give us some detail as to what specific programs are presently being implemented or are in the process of being implemented to deal with this specific problem of confinement of young offenders. I wish to repeat the position I have taken before, that nothing is to be gained by confining young offenders in correctional institutions where they are obliged to mix freely with the more hardened type of offender. I'm not saying that to a certain extent this is a practice throughout Canada and has been a practice in this province before. However, the reports on these issues indicate that this is not a good thing.

I am taking the position that the sale of Bowden, without immediate provision for an alternate course of action, was a step in the wrong direction and was a mistake, primarily in view of the fact that the government was not all that hard-pressed for the purchase price of Bowden. I also believe that some cooperation could have been obtained from the federal government as to the date of turnover of the building. Perhaps there is a valid explanation as to why this was done in the manner it was.

I would like to see on record in this Legislature the rationale behind the sale, and the alternatives. I would appreciate the hon. minister being as specific as possible.

The other point I wish to raise has to deal with the Calgary correctional institution, namely Spy Hill.

I'm quite satisfied after reviewing the transcript of evidence of the Harradence commission, particularly in relation to the evidence dealing with James Francis Jackson, the warden at the time - and I'm referring to pages 723 to 731 inclusive. I'm quite satisfied that the whole inquiry dealing with Warden Jackson, and in particular with the transcript of pages 723 to 731 inclusive, indicates that someone was trying to advise Mr. Jackson with reference to the inquiry, and that "someone" was from Edmonton, some senior official of the government.

The hon. minister may well take issue with me, and if she does I will read the transcript I have before me to let the hon. members themselves decide. But I went further than that. I went beyond that and had a discussion with some of the witnesses involved. I am satisfied that there was an effort made to inquire whether Warden Jackson had, in fact, briefed the witnesses.

This is rather a flagrant departure from the normal manner in which these inquiries are conducted - strictly arm's length, particularly between the commission and the witnesses and the minister in charge. But once a thing like this happens, there has to be a very positive move made and a full inquiry. I know it's easy to state that something happened, but when there is a preponderance of evidence that something like this did happen there has to be a specific inquiry launched immediately to determine what the motive was, who did it and why.

To date, nothing came out of the inquiry, or from the hon. Solicitor General, as to who was the party who discussed this issue with Warden Jackson, although Warden Jackson has indicated that he had discussed this with someone. For some reason, the name of the senior official was never revealed.

Revealing the name itself will not give me or the public any satisfaction. The situation is that I'm stating, in my opinion, on reviewing the evidence, that it was obvious that something had gone wrong. And for the issue merely to be dropped and forgotten is not good enough, Mr. Chairman. I'm saying that an Opposition member, if he is to discharge his responsibility, has no business letting a thing like this be forgotten. It could well be that the whole thing was not too consequential. It might have been immaterial to the inquiry, but the suspicion has been roused sufficiently to do something about it.

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman, if anything is raised I will read the eight pages of evidence I have with me. If they wish to, I will. Here is the transcript.

I think I prefer to take my cue from the Solicitor General, if she wishes it, or I could table this particular portion. But if the Solicitor General wishes to take issue with me, I will be obliged to read it. I'm saying that I was not satisfied when I got this transcript that there was, in fact, something wrong until I spoke personally to the party in question. I'm satisfied now that perhaps this whole issue was not aboveboard as far as his immediate superiors in the corrections field were concerned.

I also wish to remind the hon. Solicitor General that when the inquiry was in progress I took a very firm stand on the question of the future of Warden Jackson, who has tremendous respect among the citizens in Calgary. I stated that if he should be demoted or should be removed from his job we would be making a serious issue out of it. Well, he resigned. I'm convinced he resigned as the result of the inquiry and perhaps some differences of opinion between himself and senior officials, leading from the inquiry, so that his position became untenable in the job. He gave up, I understand, some pension and he gave up a very good job in his latter years because, as I have heard, his position became untenable.

Now I would like to know if any inquiry was made to determine why Warden James Francis Jackson's position became untenable? This allegation is made as a result of a direct source inquiry by myself. I would be very disappointed if somebody questioned the reliability of these remarks because I would then be obliged to reveal who told me.

But in any case, I think I have said enough on this issue. I was not satisfied. I believe the minister has an obligation to clear this matter to the satisfaction of all concerned.

The next question I'm concerned about, Mr. Chairman, is the question of Check Stop. I'm quite satisfied it is a step in the right direction and it has perhaps had a very beneficial impact on the serious problem of driving while impaired.

[Mr. Diachuk resumed the Chair.]

I pose a question to the hon. Solicitor General requesting statistics. Sometimes facts and figures say quite a lot. I would like to get, not percentages - sometimes percentages can be as misleading as ever - but I would want to know, from the date of the implementation of Check Stop, how many charges there were throughout the province on a monthly basis? How many charges of impaired driving? I'm concerned about that particular issue because I believe that was the main reason Check Stop was implemented, although there were other problems in the driving field which could be taken in and improved as a result of Check Stop.

If we get an example of the number of charges, not only from the date of implementation but for the 12 months previous on a monthly basis and since then, we could see if there was any kind of decline in the number of impaired drivers being picked up. This would be an indication that the program is soaking through or filtering through to the people who are driving.

I'm also anxious to know if there is any real effort made to provide a training program, or at least a pamphlet of some kind to all the new drivers advising them of the serious ramifications of driving while impaired, not only from the point of view of getting picked up and charged and having a criminal offence against you, but from the point of view of cost, the point of view of personal safety and all the other factors which come into the serious issue of driving while impaired.

This has to be emphasized because it is a problem that no jurisdiction - at least none in the North American continent to my knowledge - has solved to the satisfaction of the public. This isn't something that, if the minister does this, or this, or this, we'll be happy because we will be home free. I'm not saying anything like that can happen, nor have I got the answers to the problems.

I have one suggestion to make which I made as long as 20 years ago, that it is too late to solve the problem once a person who has had a few and feels a bit buoyant, perhaps not impaired but buoyant, gets into his car. Nothing has been done to intercept him between the fourth, five or tenth drink in a saloon or pub, and the automobile. It might be too big a field to cover, but I think if it were known by those who drink that there may be a stake-out, at closing hours at least, to determine whether anyone who drives may be impaired - it might be politically tough to handle this way, but it might be the sensible way to handle this situation.

This business of catching thousands of drivers who have been drinking on a night is like herding rabbits with a horse. They are all over the place. Some of them may well be impaired and may drive in a straight line and nobody will ever suspect them. I have acted in one case where a man who was very impaired was followed by police for two blocks and he drove in a very commendable way. He drove right down the centre line and never veered an inch. So sometimes it isn't easy to catch up to these people.

I wonder if the minister could really be bold and really be seriously concerned to see if an experiment could not be tried on getting these people before the key goes into the ignition. Once an impaired driver gets into a car he is a potential killer, in my opinion. Even though none of us is without fault, society does, to a certain extent, condone this. I know we condone impaired driving. Many people will have a party - many serious, responsible people will have a party and permit the guests to drive after they have had a few drinks. This is done all the time. This is condonation of the problem, and that makes the remedy all the more difficult.

So, in this particular area, Mr. Chairman, I would like the hon. minister to advise us just what educational program is going on over and above the advertising we see? Some hon. members have expressed in this House that you have a Check Stop advertisement and then after that you have a very tantalizing advertisement to drink beer made from pure spring water.

In my opinion, this advertising does induce people to drink, otherwise the companies would never advertise. They are not advertising just to spend money. They are advertising because they are influencing some people to buy their particular brand of beer. On the other hand, it's a very, very enticing type of advertising. Somebody is thirsty. You see a cool beer poured and the thought is put across very, very unmistakably that a beer would be a nice thing to have. Maybe I'm wrong in the fact that advertising of alcoholic beverages does encourage drinking, but in my opinion, it does.

I think, Mr. Chairman, with those remarks I would appreciate a response from the hon. minister, in particular to the alternates to the Bowden program. This question has been raised in committee and it is not a surprise to the hon. minister. The hon. minister is well aware of the concern of many people, and many people in the corrections field about the lack of alternate facilities.

The second question with regard to Bowden is, I would like to be satisfied that the matter of transfer of employees has been completely settled. Even when one employee has

been aggrieved in any way, the minister has a responsibility to move in and see that right is done.

Another ongoing problem which the hon. minister has is the staffing of correctional institutions. It is no longer a satisfactory answer to say that we are considering this. There has to be a decision made. We have prompted the hon. minister. We have complained. And if money is the difference, then we have to make that move. It isn't sufficient to say, well, we are trying, we're advertising. Good, but not good enough as far as I'm concerned. The problem has to be solved.

One of the main reasons the Harradence inquiry was called was that there was a serious situation at Spy Hill - I use the word Spy Hill, it's the Calgary Correctional Institution - of staffing. There were allegations of a shortage of staff, allegations which were accepted by the commission, and a recommendation made in that regard. There was a recommendation made to upgrade the staff.

Now when the situation was so serious that it required public spending on an inquiry, then the findings were serious enough to merit or to warrant immediate action. Merely taking everything in stride along with a great number of other problems is not good enough. We saw an urgency. We felt there was an urgency. The government moved, quite properly, and set up a commission, an inquiry. The findings were made - I don't think anyone took too much issue with the findings - and now, several months later, we want to know, has the right thing been done?

If we have not taken action, if we are treating this as just a routine problem, then it's a different situation. If this is a routine problem which exists in other correctional institutions under the jurisdiction of the hon. Solicitor General, then we must take a different approach. We must even take a more serious approach to the situation and act quickly.

I am urging the hon. minister to no longer coast along with the attitude that we are doing something. The announcement we have to make is what has been done. It's no longer satisfactory that we are thinking about it. We're moving. We're advertising. If the hon. Solicitor General says no one is available to fill these positions, the problem has to be raised in the Legislature and perhaps recommendations made to make some drastic changes.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of items that the hon. member dealt with. The matter of Bowden was discussed at considerable length during public accounts. I felt that an adequate explanation was given, but I don't mind giving it again if you will bear with me.

Bowden was disposed of when it was felt that it was not serving a very useful purpose and was required by the federal government. It was not being used to capacity. Many people keep referring to juvenile offenders. They look right beyond the facts or conveniently forget them and refuse to accept the fact that every institution in this province always had as many or more young offenders than Bowden did - if you want to talk of 16, 17 and 18 year olds. There were more in Peace River, more in Lethbridge, more in Fort Saskatchewan and so on. So I would like once and for all to clarify the fact that that was not the only place where there were juvenile offenders.

There are many cases when juvenile offenders or young offenders have more serious records than those who are older. Quite often they have. Quite often they are not even first offenders. They have already been through the Department of Health and Social Development at the youth development centre. While this is very sad, and we must try to turn things around, I think it would be a mistake if we decided that Bowden was the be-all and end-all and would automatically do that. I don't think it has.

The thing we are doing as an alternate - and I do not foresee any institution as a replacement, that is, a large institution - is that we are presently negotiating with social agencies - the John Howard Society and we will be in touch with the Salvation Army - with a view to using their services along with Health and Social Development, which already partially funds them as far as room and board goes. But we would like to make use of them for those who are on day parole.

It's a very real problem in the Calgary Correctional Institute where there are at least 25 on day parole, which I think is a very valuable rehabilitative tool. It gives them training employment and so on. The acting warden at the Calgary Correctional Institution has said that it would really be a great advantage if these people could live downtown. We have quite a real transportation problem to get them back and forth to work. Yet we think it is very important that they be allowed to do so. This was recommended in the Outerbridge Report and we believe it has some merit. We think it could be used not only for young offenders, but [for] anyone who lends himself to day parole in which he

could take a little less security than is required by the major institutions. So we will be moving in that direction. We are moving in that direction at the present time.

The forestry work camps have always been accepted publicly and do very useful work. We are sometimes restricted by the number we can motivate to go to the forestry workcamps. In an attempt to change that situation and turn it around this year, we are doubling the incentive pay that inmates may get. It still isn't a lot, but it's twice as much as they were getting before. We think this might be helpful.

Many inmates do not wish to go to a forestry workcamp. It might all be very well to say, after all, they are in prison because they have done something wrong, therefore if you want them to go to a forestry workcamp you should make them go. I don't think it's quite that simple, Mr. Chairman. I think that if they don't have the motivation to go, and many of them don't trust themselves in an open setting, if they went against their will they could readily leave. It's quite difficult to retain them if they don't wish to stay when they are working under the circumstances in which they work in the forestry workcamps.

I believe in the forestry workcamps. They do a lot of very useful work and they serve a limited number of individuals. But not everyone is suitable or eligible for forestry workcamps.

We are increasing our skills in the classification system. I think it is extremely important that when an individual arrives he be received and classified as thoroughly as possible in a non-adversary setting. We have, in this year's budget, increased personnel and social workers in most of the institutions. This is one of the things we wish to work towards so we can indeed assess an individual and decide which is the most suitable location and type of work program; whether or not this individual looks as though he is suitable for day parole.

Of course, hon. members will realize that that parole comes under the federal government. We are limited (a) as to how fast we can get them paroled because of regulations, and (b) as to how quickly they are paroled when they become eligible, because of the fact that we do not operate our own parole system. It is one of the things we asked for.

We asked the federal government for an umbrella act and we were promised that. What will happen to it now, I'm not sure, but we were promised last December that legislation would be brought in which would give us authority over our own parole board. Hon. members will be aware that our act permits us to do that. It was designed, I suppose when the act was rewritten, to allow for the fact that people at that time felt that the Alberta Parole Board would be a desirable way to go. And I support that concept.

By using community residences, Belmont is more or less a community residence. There is a good number of people now who go back and forth from Belmont on day parole. They take advantage of jobs or training. Training, I think, is particularly important and wherever possible, I think, it should be done in the community. I am very anxious that the inmates be plugged in to an AVC wherever possible. When it's not possible to take them out to an open setting on a day parole or temporary absence basis, I think they will have to receive some type of either meaningful work or training which is useful inside the institutions.

The institutions, as such, do not lend themselves readily to a factory setting. I think that's one of the things we should be looking at in the creation of a new Fort Saskatchewan. I have instructed the officials that now we are in the planning process of Fort Saskatchewan, they should keep in mind a factory type of setting which could be leased to private enterprise at the regular rental value for which we would provide the labour force. This is an ongoing program at the moment. It's something we are just studying. I've talked about it before in the House. It isn't anything that can happen readily, but it is one of my long-range objectives so that we can indeed do meaningful work and work for which the individual will be suited when he comes out.

Many of our inmates have not held steady employment. Many have, but many have not. I think they need to learn a work habit. I am a great believer in the work ethic, and many of them need to learn what it means to go to work at a regular time. I think that that type of industry in which he does have a future - there is a limit to how many people we can employ as gardeners probably and so on. We have those maintenance jobs that they do. They are make-work but they do not lend themselves necessarily to a good occupation when somebody gets out. If they can't get work then they have indeed a very difficult time re-establishing themselves.

I would like to comment on the Harradence Report and the reason for Mr. Jackson's resignation. To my knowledge, Mr. Jackson resigned because he wished to take advantage of a new position. I have only talked to him once since the Harradence Report - I think that's right - when I went down in December. No, I have talked to him twice. I met him twice, once at a meeting of the wardens. Our meeting was amiable. I don't know whether

Mr. Jackson has indeed given the information to the hon. member. If he has, then he has more reliable information than I.

To the best of my information, I believe there's a letter on file advising that he wished to obtain another job as director of the John Howard Society because it had recently become vacant. He was interested in it and had been a long-time member. I expect to be working with Mr. Jackson again because of our interest in the John Howard Society and the services it provides.

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View had a number of questions but I really feel they will have to go on the Order Paper so I may be sure I answer them correctly. There is one question on the Order Paper but I don't know whether that will give the information or not. I would like to have the exact wording so the information can be provided exactly as it's wished.

I don't know whether the new drivers manual provided by the Department of Highways and Transport contains information about drinking and driving because I've not yet had time to read it. I accept the endorsement of the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View when he talks about creating an awareness of the Check Stop program because that's exactly what it was trying to do. We were trying to convey an impression. We were trying to alert people to the problem.

Drug and alcohol abuse have ongoing programs. I think the Minister of Health and Social Development could probably elaborate on that much more than I, but the reason for Check Stop is exactly as the hon. member said. It is to try to make people aware that they shouldn't be drinking and driving. That's the sole aim of the program and I think it's been effective. Everywhere I go people talk about it and they tell me it has made them think twice.

As far as talking about a stake-out - we designed that program in consultation with all the police forces. I'm sure the city police and even the RCMP, although, of course, we work more closely with them in the rural areas, would find it very difficult if I were to decide to instruct them to go on a stake-out. The very nature of the program was left so that the police [could] fit it into their schedule the best they could.

The question arose during the Attorney General's estimates about whether additional police had been added. They have not. It was designed in consultation with the police forces as to what they could do and how it would fit into their programs. Any time I've met with them, even casually at various functions, not only the officers in the police forces and the chiefs of police of various cities, but also the constables or men who are actually doing the work have endorsed this program. They think it has helped.

Perhaps I should just comment because once again the question of advertising has come up. I'm not very expert on any television advertising because I seldom watch it, but I would refer hon. members to the fact that cable television is beamed in to our major cities from the United States. There is no way that we have any authorization or any authority whatsoever on what cable television beams in to the audience in Alberta. We have checked that out and we find it is not possible. We have tried to monitor the advertising that originates in Alberta and ensure that it follows the guidelines as laid down by the CRTC.

I believe that deals with the matters the hon. members raised.

MR. GRUENWALD:

I have one very brief question to the Solicitor General with reference to Check Stop. I know there is much emphasis, and rightly so, on the problems we have with drivers impaired because of drinking. I noticed in a periodical I receive once a year from the United States that they are now doing an equally thorough check on drivers who are impaired because of drugs.

The effects they are finding now are rather devastating and frightening because they really hadn't thought too much about this drug business. The emphasis has always been on alcohol. I would just like to ask the Solicitor General if there is any way in which you can determine if someone has had drugs within, say, the last 12 hours, or something like that, because the results of irrational driving because of drugs, according to this information, are much more devastating and longer lasting, particularly, than from drinking alcohol.

Is there any way in which they can be tested as to whether they've been on drugs? Is this type of check taken into consideration at all during the Check Stops when they are checking particularly for drinking drivers?

MISS HUNLEY:

I thank the hon. member for that question because it also reminds me to refer to the latest report on Check Stop for the week ending May 19. I receive the reports. They are compiled on a biweekly basis and I received the May 19 report only recently.

As far as drugs go, of course, it's against the law to drive while under the influence of either drugs or alcohol, but I'm sure drugs - and I'm not an expert in this - are harder to determine. The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View and the Attorney General mentioned very well, and clearly talked about, the problem. If you wait until someone shows visible signs of impairment, which is what they've been using, such as weaving across the white line - the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View referred to that today as being an obvious sign - then it calls for the police to stop them because under the Criminal Code it leads them to believe there is probably something the matter. The whole thrust of Check Stop was not to wait until there was an obvious sign of impairment, and that's the difference.

In one they had to be almost certain there were reasonable and probable grounds. If there were no reasonable and probable grounds, somebody could be stoned out of his mind and able to drive the two blocks, or whatever it was that the hon. member referred to, and get home safely. Had he been caught in a Check Stop and not able to get his wallet out to show his pink card, he or she would have come under the surveillance of the officer and if necessary either have had their licence temporarily suspended, have had charges laid, or have been asked to take a breathalyzer - whatever the police in their good judgment thought the situation called for.

I agree with the hon. member that drugs are also a problem but they are harder to detect. Perhaps I could just refer to the latest report. They found 615 drivers who were driving while their licences were suspended. All in all, there have been 215,673 vehicles checked up to May 19. Warnings were issued which could be, get your headlights fixed, or some such thing. Violations to other statutes were 4,161, but the details of the specific breakdown are not provided. Failures to produce a pink card [numbered] 2,047. I was interested in that and asked for a report. I found that in most cases they were able to produce a pink card within 24 hours; they had just left them at home. Some of them were not charged, but in other cases and in a report I had, the police did lay charges for driving an uninsured vehicle.

So they do pick up a number of things as well as impaired driving. But our major thrust, and I'd like to repeat this again, is an educational thing and a consciousness raising effort in order to make people a bit more responsible in their attitudes towards it.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Just in conclusion then, I am assuming that detecting whether someone is under the influence of drugs, even in a mild way, is much more difficult or almost impossible as compared to liquor because of the breathalyzer test. There's no such test like that which you could use for drugs. Is that correct?

MISS HUNLEY:

No, not that I'm aware of, Mr. Chairman. I would have to check to be sure that it was authentic. I think they look for other visible signs of impairment. I have not discussed with the law enforcement officers what all the signs of being under the influence of drugs are, but I suppose if there are any signs and there is any doubt they would take the necessary action.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, could I indicate that I've been asked if we would hold this vote until Mr. Taylor returns. Even if we finish the questions and so on, we could perhaps hold the vote until Mr. Taylor returns because I agreed to do so.

MR. CLARK:

I might just comment on the point made by the Solicitor General. Mr. Taylor, unfortunately, is away at a funeral. He will be back before 5:00 o'clock. He assured me he has two short questions and he'd appreciate it very much if you'd just hold the vote open if we are finished.

If I might, I'd like to make just two or three comments on the statement made by the Solicitor General as far as the Bowden institution is concerned. I don't expect the Solicitor General to particularly agree with my point of view. Nevertheless, I think it's important that the point of view be expressed here when we're studying the estimates.

I think if we recall when the legislation for the Solicitor General's department went through last year - I believe it was in the fall - I indicated that I thought the real test for the Solicitor General's department as far as this year was concerned would be

what kinds of programs and frankly, what kinds of priorities the Solicitor General would be able to get as far as rehabilitation programs were concerned.

The greatest criticism that I would have of the Solicitor General's department since the fall until now would be not so much the selling of the Bowden institution, but, in fact, the way it was done and what is being used to take the place of the facilities there. I am under no illusion that the Bowden institution wasn't being used to 100 per cent capacity. And I'm under no illusion that the Bowden institution didn't do a 100 per cent job as far as rehabilitation was concerned. But let me say this also, we're never going to have an institution in this province that is going to bat 100 per cent either, just because of the individuals involved. We need a wide variety of opportunities in the field of rehabilitation - at least that's the way I view it. I think some of the steps made in the field of day parole are worth while.

But in saying that, let me also say that I think the Bowden institution has been the victim of a rather shabby bit of workmanship on this research done by Dr. Downey's group. In fact, I almost get the impression - and on this point I know the Solicitor General won't agree with me - but I rather get the impression that this follow-up study of releasees of two correctional institutes, as far as Bowden was concerned, has been used by some people - not the Solicitor General - to justify the selling of the Bowden institution.

I'd have to say very frankly that if you talk to some of the senior people on staff of the Bowden institution, they were never consulted before this study was designed. They were never asked, in the course of getting the information, if they could tell the researchers where they could go to find some of the students or some of the people who had been at the Bowden institution. A number of the senior people on staff at the Bowden institution could have told the people doing this research where a number of the people who had been at the Bowden institution were now and whether they were using some of the skills that they developed there.

Now I don't lay the blame for this at the feet of the Solicitor General, but I certainly do lay the blame with the people in charge of corrections in this province. It seems to me that in the course of getting the information for this report, a sizeable effort was made to show Bowden and Belmont not in their best light, rather than at least giving them a fair chance. As I say, I've talked to Mr. Venner who was the superintendent of Bowden. He tells me he was not consulted in any way, shape or form as far as the design of this. He and some of his senior people at Bowden could have told the people doing the research where they could have found a number of people who had been to Bowden and who had been quite successful using the skills they developed there. No effort was made to do this.

Now, there's no sense in my becoming involved in a long harangue about that at this time other than to say that frankly this is a very shabby piece of research as I see the work done. I would hope that in the future, when research is being designed to look at the effectiveness of the various institutions, the Solicitor General would have the decency to consult the senior people involved in the institutions. That doesn't mean you have to design the programs as they want them, but at least they should have some input into the kind of work that's done.

As poor as this report might be, I'd have to say that it recommended that the programs at both Belmont and Bowden should be strengthened and expanded. We know what happened to the institute at Bowden. It has been sold. So that's water under the bridge. I think it was a wrong decision at this time primarily because we had no institution to take its place. What we did was to send the young offenders and the other first-time offenders who were there back to the other provincial institutions.

I'm sure the Solicitor General will agree with me that during the course of Public Accounts, the Director of Corrections for the province indicated that it was very difficult to have segregation at the large provincial institutions, that there isn't really effective segregation there. That's really the point that I want to make. We closed down Bowden, we put the people who were at Bowden, both young offenders and first-time offenders, back into the other provincial institutions. At that time there were something like 140 to 150 people in the institution, that's the average daily population of the Bowden institution, about 140 to 150 as is reported in the Corrections Branch Annual Report 1973. At this time we don't have the capacity to carry on some of the kind of work that was being done at Bowden. I just think that was a serious mistake.

The other point I want to make is that the Solicitor General indicated today that the classifications system was being strengthened. I commend her for that. From talking to a number of people at Spy Hill, some at Fort Saskatchewan and some at Bowden, they say one of the biggest problems they have is in not getting the classifications done quickly. Under statute, I believe it's 21 days, isn't it, for the classification to be done?

These people at both Spy Hill and Fort Saskatchewan tell me that one of their problems is that the classification doesn't get done for some time, and the individuals involved

make friends, acquaintances at the institution and they're not very enthused about leaving. If the classification were done the day after or within one, two or three days right after sentencing, you would find many more inmates would become involved in some of the rehabilitation programs. So if the Solicitor General is going to strengthen considerably the classification program and have it done hopefully within two or three days if that's possible, at least that as a target, once a person, a young offender, a first offender is sentenced, I think we would have a great deal more response to the rehabilitation programs that are presently involved.

In conclusion, I recall that during the study of the estimates in committee, the Solicitor General said they are looking at other institutions or new institutions. Might I just make this suggestion, that you not overlook the possibility of a series of institutions fairly close to Calgary and fairly close to Edmonton, perhaps in the rural areas, but close enough so you can get people to Calgary, but where you have, shall I say, a house arrangement with 8, 10 or 15 people on a program in a particular house or in a particular unit. You have your social worker and other people who live right in the unit with them.

From talking to the former warden at Spy Hill and to some other people involved in the department, I think there's a great advantage in that kind of approach for those people who are prepared to be seriously involved in rehabilitation programs, especially if the classification is done quickly so they don't develop bonds within the institution itself. Because, as I understand the situation, that's one of the real problems and the real drawbacks to young offenders especially, committing themselves to rehabilitation programs.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition for his remarks. I did refer to community residences and that's exactly what you were talking about. The instructions I have given my department, and for which they're negotiating at the present time - we want to try some and see if they work. But that's what they are. They're locally located. They are not in rural settings. We have our forestry camps and I think those fulfil certain needs in rural areas. But we do need those who can get back and forth for either training or day parole. That creates a problem when they come back. But I still believe that they must be given every opportunity. I have instructed the department to carry on negotiations with agencies - not that we're going to run them - because I would like to see who can do it best. The Department of Health and Social Development is involved already in paying rccw and board in many cases.

It has not been a policy of the department to get involved in aftercare and I think we should. That's the very area in which I would like to move. When Fort Saskatchewan is rebuilt I can't imagine it being built on a massive scale such as any other institution that exists at the moment. In fact, I favour a cottage style. I think we probably have enough maximum-security cells in this province to take care of all those needs for the future. But I do think we must have a variety so they can progress into an open setting where they eventually end up.

If I could talk just a moment about classification. I think it's incredibly important. I think that we misled the Committee on Public Accounts when we talked about 21 days. There is no statutory requirement that they must be done within 21 days, but I agree it is desirable that they be done the same day.

I want a policy established whereby they have their medicals, they have their assessment and they have classification; and not in an adversary role, but in a counselling role. That is the philosophy which I have dictated to my deputy and in which he concurs. It will be the kind of thing that we'll be reflecting [on] as we select our senior staff who will administer the various institutions.

All inmates are classified within 21 days, but I agree with the hon. member that to do it faster would be better. It is not a mandatory requirement that they be done within 21 days. The law says that anyone serving a sentence of longer than 21 days must be classified.

MR. CLARK:

I would just follow the Solicitor General's comment along and say that as far as the correctional institution at Peace River is concerned, I'd hope you would look at some program outside that particular institution. I agree with you - the projects in Edmonton and Calgary, if you're going to get involved in these units - but as far as Peace River is concerned I would hope you would have another look at that so you wouldn't apply the same philosophy to Peace River.

MISS HUNLEY:

I'm not sure I understand the hon. member. You mean you don't think they need community residences, or ...

MR. CLARK:

No. I'm saying, at Peace River I think you should have. If it's going to be in Peace River, it's going to have to be in the town of Peace River or rather close by. The point I was trying to make is, don't by-pass Peace River from the community residence just because it is in the city.

MISS HUNLEY:

No. We'll be looking at all of it, but I think we have to walk before we can run. I wouldn't like to rush headlong into this because in some areas - there is nothing that we know of that proves it will work. But on the other hand, nothing has proved it won't work. I believe in it and I'm prepared to try to make it work.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word or two about abortions, arising out of quite heavy mail and also the fact that it was raised at several of my presessional public meetings.

In 1969 the Criminal Code amendments prohibited abortion except when necessary to save the life of the mother. A further amendment required a certificate from a therapeutic abortion committee composed of not fewer than three doctors set up by an approved or accredited hospital, stating that continuation of the pregnancy would likely endanger the mother's life.

In 1969 also, it was medically impossible to abort a child after 12 weeks. Now, however, under the saline method, an unborn child can be aborted even after 40 weeks. The saline method is lawful at the discretion of the abortion committee.

The 1969 amendment also passed the responsibility for the abortion law on to the provincial jurisdiction. No hospital is required under the law to perform abortions, and the conscience of medical personnel who refuse to take part in abortion operations is to be respected.

There has been a number of allegations and possibly two of the outstanding ones are: first, it is alleged that abortion committees are interpreting the health of the mother so broadly so as to provide for abortions on demand which, of course, is prohibited by the Criminal Code of Canada. Second, it is alleged also that the abortion committees are simply rubber-stamping all requests. A nurse at one of my presessional meetings referred to a '49 cent day' for abortions at some of the hospitals in Alberta.

On May 27, 1973, the Hon. Otto Lang spoke on a national television program and made the following statement, and I quote:

We ought to make clearer to medical committees what their obligations are and that such things as social and economic circumstances and the fact that the woman wants an abortion now because her birth control devices didn't work or she forgot them -- that's not good enough grounds for an abortion. That is not what was intended by the law, and that they ought not approve such an abortion.

The Calgary Pro-Life Association has appealed to the boards of directors of all the Calgary hospitals asking for a number of items. I quote six.

1. That the Board of Directors use the power to ensure that the Therapeutic Abortion Committees are properly set up according to law and are operating according to the spirit of the law.
2. That the Board of Directors check into practices and correct any abuse that may exist in their hospitals by ignorance or laxity in the interpretation of the law. This should include a check to see if the chairman or members of the Committee are performing abortions in the said hospital, to see if the Committee is meeting to discuss all cases before abortions are approved, to see that medical staff who refuse to perform abortions are not discriminated against, to see that abortions are not performed for socio-economic reasons as requested by the Minister of Justice, and to see that doctors are performing abortions on minors without parental consent.
3. That the saline method, if being used, be abolished. This cannot be used until the later months of pregnancy when the child is viable.
4. When an abortion results in the birth of a living child that the child be treated as a patient and every effort be made to sustain the life. It is alleged that such child have been treated as a "tumor" and have been left to die without medical aid.

5. That medical experimentation using living babies who have undergone abortion be prohibited in all of our hospitals.
6. That young women and girls seeking abortion be informed of the process and the risks to their own health, both physical and mental, and that the alternatives to abortion be discussed with them. That the Board set up directions as to what conditions actually justify a decision for an abortion under the law.

The matter of Medicare has also come into the consideration. There is considerable concern in the province over the cost to Medicare. In a return tabled by the hon. minister, at my request on March 22, 1974, the following is noted: that Medicare paid for 3,271 abortions in 1972 with Medicare paying \$210,809.86. Medicare paid for 3,618 abortions in 1973, costing Medicare \$239,419.21. There appears to be a tremendous amount of concern over the abortions that are taking place, as to whether or not they are within the law. There is also considerable concern about Medicare possibly paying for abortions that are illegal in our country.

In view of the information I have given to the House in this brief form, it appears that the public is entitled to the facts in regard to abortions and also as to who is paying for them.

I am consequently asking the hon. minister and the Government of Alberta for a judicial inquiry with full authority given to call doctors, nurses, abortion committee members and others to ascertain if the spirit and the intent of the Criminal Code of Canada is being flouted or otherwise; also with authority to secure accurate information on who is paying for the abortions, whether or not Medicare has been and is now paying for illegal abortions, and to make recommendations on same.

I make this request to the hon. minister in view of a great deal of public concern, but more so because human life is involved. If we are to have abortions on demand in Canada, the Criminal Code should be so amended. As long as the Criminal Code is in its present form, namely, that abortions are permitted to save the life of the mother, then all hospital committees in the province should see that that law is carried out.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of areas which the hon. member has touched, all of which are extremely important and not to be overlooked.

I would not like to comment on the legal interpretations since I don't feel competent to do that. I feel sure the hon. Attorney General may perhaps comment in that regard.

I think it's an extremely sensitive and touching problem. It is not one that we should really be talking about, in my view, in the light of who pays for what. Many of us, if we had our druthers, perhaps when we look at our Alberta Health Care premium would like to select certain things that wouldn't be paid for out of it. Some of us don't believe in one thing, some don't believe in another. Other people don't believe in doctors at all. They would rather go to faith healers or something, yet according to law they are required to pay their premiums. I think if we start tainting it with the value that you are going to put on to a medically required treatment - and this is what it has to be assessed at. I have talked to many doctors concerning whether or not the true intent of the law is being carried out. At this time I am not prepared to say, as the hon. member has raised, whether in some cases there are abuses.

There are the hospital committees and there are also individual doctors who are concerned. They understand what the legislation is. The hospital committees review them and so, for that reason, I would not imagine that they in their estimation permit anything illegal which the hon. member refers to, because it is rather serious whether you pay for it or not. And certainly they are paid for it. They are paid for it by the Hospital Services Commission and by Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission, as a medically required treatment.

It is not a matter to be taken lightly. I think it is probably a very traumatic experience for anybody. And I am sure it is for the doctors as well as for the individual who takes that particular route.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, if I could just add one comment. Certainly the hon. minister is right when she says the life is more important than the cost. I agree with that, and that is why I endeavoured to deal with that aspect first. It is largely on that aspect that I do ask the government to consider setting up a judicial inquiry in which the facts can be known as to whether or not these things which are being alleged by organizations and people in the province are actually so. When, according to the return, there are 14 abortions per working day, it's difficult for the average person to think that number is

necessary to save the lives of the mothers. If it is so, then the judicial inquiry would bring it out.

In connection with paying, I don't think there is so much concern about the paying as the fact that payment may be being made contrary to the Criminal Code of Canada. And if that is so, then I think it's bad. I would not want to be in a position of urging that we go back to the old practice of girls going to 'butchers' and endangering their lives. I think it should be done by medical men. Who pays would possibly be a recommendation of the judicial committee. But I do think there is a responsibility on the part of Medicare to not simply accept the statements of the hospital committees, when there is so much concern about those statements, but rather to carry out some investigation on its own. I believe a judicial inquiry at this time would be advantageous to the people of the province and would give us the actual facts and do away with a lot of allegations and rumours which presently exist.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like, at this time, to echo support to the hon. Member for Drumheller because I have brought this issue before this House for the last three years and the situation is not improving. As a matter of fact, we are getting greater concern not only from the average person on the street, but the concern is being expressed by the medical profession itself. I think it would do nothing but good to investigate this whole situation. But primarily what I am interested in is that I believe everybody is entitled to life, even the unborn. And if there is any abuse, it certainly should be stopped and stopped quickly. I would urge this government, through the minister, to do everything it can.

We hear reports today from eastern Canada that in a Toronto hospital last year there were 2,900 abortions to 2,200 live births. If this trend continues, we are in trouble as a nation. There is no way, by any stretch of the imagination, that you could ever class all these abortions as a medical need or medical treatment. I think the intent of the act originally in the Criminal Code was to make it legal for a physician or medical personnel to carry out an abortion if the mother's life was in danger. But we have been carried a long way from that.

Canada's population growth is at zero now. A lot of people say, well, you can bring in people from other lands. This is fine. Most of us came from other lands. I still think there is nothing wrong with having our own Canadian children. It seems rather ridiculous to many people that we'll spend so much money in the other medical fields to keep life and sustain life but at the other end, with abortions which apparently are so free and easy today, they are becoming concerned.

I have never had so much mail as I have had recently from concerned people regarding this very issue. I am sure other members have and I am sure the minister has, as she so ably pointed out.

So I would urge the government to set up a committee to look into this, not only from the medical practice, but also from the fact of what we are doing to our population. Is abortion going to be the serious threat so many people think it is, so far as birth of our own people is concerned? A lot of people, Mr. Chairman, are of the opinion that the World Health Organization rules as far as abortion is concerned should really be applicable to other countries, but not to a country like Canada which has a small population; a large country well able to take care of any children who may be born. Then it seems ridiculous to the extreme - I am sure the Minister of Health and Social Development can tell us today - that there are many, many people who would love to adopt children. So I say we should do just as much work to encourage people to go through with their pregnancies so the many people in Alberta who are looking to adopt children will have the opportunity to do so, even if the parent of that child is not anxious to keep it herself.

There is nothing new in asking the minister in charge of Medicare to look into the payment of fees for abortions because the Minister of Health for Ontario is advocating the same thing. He can see no reason Medicare should pay for abortions, particularly those abortions which are covered where the mother's life is not in danger.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do urge the government - there are many letters, many arguments I could put forward - to support the fact that this be looked into. But most of all, I would like to see a trend the other way. Instead of the tremendous increase we have seen in abortions over the last four years, since they have been made legal in Canada, let us see if we can't do something to turn it the other way and have fewer abortions and more live births in a country as great as Canada and in a province as great as Alberta, where we want young people and will need young people in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Chairman, I have listened this afternoon with great patience to various experts in many fields, authorities on drinking driving who have never taken a drink and experts on abortion who have never had one. I express my personal concern. To me it is a most serious thing, a traumatic thing and one which has not very much humour in it.

In the science museum in Chicago, there is a fetus from day one to the final gestation day. It would be pretty hard to look and say there wasn't life there at any time.

However, I do not believe it is within the ability of any lawmaker, any lawman or any legislators to determine whether a woman will or will not carry a fetus. Abortion is as old as the human race. If the implications of a witch hunt pushed in the direction of the medical profession mean that a working girl who requires an abortion has got to go to a back alley 'butcher' and those who have money can go to the states of New York or Nevada, I question it very much. I think what we are looking at here is the responsibility of the doctor.

If the doctor is irresponsible, and in the case of one particular doctor in Montreal this was the case - the doctor has a responsibility to himself and to his patient, and if he is going to be flogged through the market place by some committee, it is a very major and serious decision in my view for any doctor to say to a woman or to authorize a woman to have an abortion.

He knows that somewhere he is going to have to answer to his maker and he has to answer to himself. He has to live with himself, and he has to live with his conscience. Therefore, I question very much the tenor of direction that people should be hauled up, patients and doctors, before a legislative committee. I think the role of the Legislature is in the direction of guidance and education and in the environment of an unwed mother and her child.

Regardless of that, it is my firm belief - and believe me I have searched my soul on this very long - that it is not a place you can use might and power and call it justice. There are two types of justice which will result, one type of justice for the poor working girl and the other for someone who has the bucks to go anyplace, to Sweden or across the world. These are my thoughts, and I urge the hon. Solicitor General to take them into consideration.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to prolong this, but I would point out that we did not ask for a legislative inquiry. We asked for a judicial inquiry. In a poll in Canada a very large number of the people did not want abortion on demand. If we want abortion on demand, let's change the Criminal Code. But while the Criminal Code is in the condition it presently is in, surely the doctors should obey the law the same as everybody else, if they are breaking it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Are you ready for the resolution? The resolution as presented by Mr. Young, chairman of Subcommittee C:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$26,704,350 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975 for the Department of the Solicitor General.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I have a note here that Mr. Taylor wanted leave of the committee to introduce some visitors. May he have that?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (CONT.)

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman; thank you very much, members. I would like to introduce a former page boy, Jan Pierzchajlo, who is in the gallery with his friend, Kevin Mangan. I'm sure we're glad to have the ex-pages back with us for a visit.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (CONT.)Executive Council (Cont.)

Appropriation 1460 Human Resource Research (Cont.)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Under the estimates of the Executive Council 1460, Appropriation 1460 was held. May we continue with that?

MR. CLARK:

I asked that this be held until we had a return tabled in the House dealing with the number of research commitments the government had taken on last year. I'm not sure, I guess it's the Solicitor General. I wonder if she would outline to us the general approach the government takes, as to which of these reports are made public following their completion, and which, in fact, aren't.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I've checked most of the reports and nearly all of them have been tabled or incorporated into another report. For example, the one on matrimonial property was done at the request of the Institute of Law Research and Reform and it becomes part of that and I think a very useful document.

On checking them I find that nearly all of them have been tabled. There are some which are not tabled and they have been done at the request of various departments. It would be up to that department to determine whether or not it was for their own information, an interdepartmental working document, or whether they would be tabling it. I'm not able, at this moment, to answer that, though I think most of the ministers are in the House and they could probably answer that.

MR. CLARK:

Just following that along, has the government any general policy - let's say overriding policy - that outlines which of the reports are to be made public and which are not? Let me put it this way then, under what conditions does the department not make a report public?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I don't have that information because I don't know that much about all the reports. Reports are done - and I'm a coordinator really of this particular fund although I have had a hand in allocating some of them because of some specific interest such as the matrimonial property one. Reports then become, whether they're interdepartmental which they want for their information and structuring policy or whether they feel they wish to table them - that policy was not determined when I assumed responsibility for coordinating these particular types of research.

MR. CLARK:

Following that along then, is it fair for me to assume that the intradepartmental ones are, in fact, used for the determination of policy within the department and that there is no compulsion on the department to make those public?

MISS HUNLEY:

To my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, there is no compulsion. I don't question the ministers when I get a request from them to consider it, on the allocation of priorities for doing the various research projects. It is not one of the things I use to measure whether or not they get priority. I merely try to fit them in, find out whether there is any duplication to my knowledge and whether or not they can be considered for that particular year. But as for determining yes, if you have it you have to table it, I don't really think it's my responsibility.

MR. CLARK:

Then could I just go into the second area and that deals with the procedure you use as far as coordination within the government departments?

MISS HUNLEY:

Yes, for this particular vote it is. But you are well aware from Return No. 150 there are many other areas being done, many other studies being commissioned.

MR. CLARK:

What approach do you use in the coordination? In other words, if a request comes from, let's say the Minister of Manpower and Labour in the field of manpower studies which would affect a number of government departments, what approach then does the government use in coordination? Is it done through the Human Resources Research Appropriation 1460 or, in fact, does the minister take the approach to the manpower committee of cabinet? Does it simply go to cabinet? What is the procedure used?

Because of the very real concern as far as duplication is concerned, when the Research Council was operating, despite its good and bad aspects, one of the things it did try to do was to deal with this question of duplication and overlap of research, not just within government departments but also to try to ferret out what was going on at the universities because, in fact, it is all being paid for by public money. In light of the fact that you have wiped out the research council now what mechanism is the government using to coordinate the research going on?

MISS HUNLEY:

The particular mechanisms - we are also establishing a policy for all research. We have greater consultation with one another over the various research things that are being done, whether they are social, educational or economic. These are aired and were discussed on the number of cabinet committees that I've been on, as to various research projects that will be undertaken.

Whether or not it's possible to, what I call piggyback by adding a couple more questions onto, for instance, a public questionnaire - a couple more questions can reveal information that is very useful - once again, I have to refer to some of them that have been done on behalf of the institute of law research. We did some of behalf of the Department of Health and Social Development because they were dealing with an area of human concern. We were attempting to tie them in together so that all the basic questions could be asked only once. Then the additional questions could be added on, what I call piggybacking, and could provide the information we want.

MR. CLARK:

Can I just follow along on this specific example. Going back to the Minister of Manpower and Labour again and one on, say, manpower training needs - let's take apprentices of boilers, pipefitters and so on - the Minister of Labour wants to do some research in this particular area. What approach is taken to coordinate that? Does he simply approve the research himself and does it go on like that? Does he fund it out of his own department? Does he have to get approval from your office or from the Premier's office or what's the coordinating mechanism?

MISS HUNLEY:

The attempt that I have made to coordinate is for one particular vote, but there is a great deal of other research which goes on. It's research that is either more massive or they wish some other company to do it.

For example, the Minister of Lands and Forests had a very expensive study done, but it was on reforestation and so on. The skills were just non-existent in Downey and Associates which is doing more educational and social research. I do not attempt or pretend to attempt to coordinate all the research which is going on in all the departments. The Minister of Manpower and Labour was the one referred to, and I don't know if there is a specific study going on on that or not.

DR. HORNER:

Perhaps I could make a brief comment here which might resolve the situation. We do have a cabinet committee which is specifically charged with the coordination of the variety of research the government is doing, because the concern over duplication is very important of course, in the kind of research which might be happening in our universities, our other institutions of advanced education, the research in our Research Council, the research which a variety of departments might be doing. That cabinet committee is chaired by the hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. CLARK:

Can I just follow along on that particular matter then. Would the minister lead us through the procedure which is used? For example, once the budget is approved here and the minister has money in here for research, does he bring the general area to the Minister of the Environment?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. We are in the process of structuring more - what would you say - more rigid guidelines in relation to it. Our first attempt was to get some overview in relation to who was doing research first, then to try to bring some coordination into the area. The outline, as you suggest, is in fact what is being followed now and what will carry on. Various research trusts, of course, are involved, the universities; and so those ministers involved in those areas are primarily concerned with that cabinet committee.

MR. STROM:

Just to further clarify then, the Department of Highways and Transport, through the minister, announced some research in highways related to transport. That issue is covered now and will not come back to the cabinet committee for any further coordination and he will proceed to hire consultants to do that study?

DR. HORNER:

Not necessarily, because the Minister of Industry and Commerce, of course, also has some concerns with regard to transportation as do other ministers who are involved in a variety of areas. So that the cabinet committee would have some input into how that research was done.

MR. STROM:

So that the money set aside in each department does not necessarily mean that they proceed with research and that it has been cleared. It goes back for coordination again even though it is covered within their budget.

DR. HOFNER:

That's correct.

MR. DIXON:

Regarding a report which was released by the Department of Highways and Transport which they claim we are going to keep confidential, Mr. Chairman, there was some criticism in Calgary that the people who had made up the report were working on another project and were using government information which was not made available to the Legislature or to the general public of Alberta. I refer to a council meeting of some two weeks ago in the city of Calgary where the mayor and some of the aldermen were complaining that for all the research report had not been made public, the people who had been hired by the government or appointed by the government to do the research were using the information they had gained on another project. To me this is ridiculous. What do we use as guidelines to these people when they bring in a report and the government says, we are going to hold it confidential? Does that extend that they won't give it to the Legislature or are we going to say to them, you can't use it until we have made it public, even if we've hired you? This is what happened. I'm just wondering if the minister or the Minister of Highways ...

DR. HOFNER:

Mr. Chairman, pretty obviously, once the government has paid for some research, the government, and therefore the people of Alberta, own that research. I am sure it is quite obvious to all hon. members that there are certain reports which can be tabled quite easily and there are certain reports that have to await tabling, waiting developments they might interfere with if they were prematurely tabled. The reports are generally for the guidance of government in the development of policy and, as such, are treated as government property.

MR. DIXON:

I wonder if I could carry that on a little bit further, Mr. Chairman. My point is though, what do we do as a government, or what do you do as a government? What is the general practice? Where we are not going to make a report public, what moratorium do we put on the people, the company or the individual researcher? What do we say to him when we give him the contract? Is there anything in the contract which says, you cannot use this report if we deem it to be confidential?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, in regard to the transportation study the hon. member is referring to, this isn't really considered as research. It's an evaluation study rather than a research study.

MR. DIXON:

I wonder if I could ask my final question to either the hon. Deputy Premier or the Minister of Highways and Transport.

I was wondering then, in view of the fact that much of it has been given out now, would the government reconsider its decision and make public this report which was paid for by public funds?

DR. HORNER:

We'll certainly give it some consideration having regard to timing in relation to a variety of activities that are taking place in the city of Calgary.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Deputy Premier or the chairman of the committee, what kind of base line or criteria do you use in deciding whether you are going to use in-house research or - well, I wouldn't say outhouse research - but research ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Environment.

MR. CLARK:

... outside the government? In other words, what kind of criteria do you use in taking on consultants?

DR. HORNER:

I would think the criteria would be an evaluation as to, number one, where it could best be done; number two, having regard to the costs of getting it done, and number three, the kind of research that was involved. I think it has become pretty obvious that on occasion it's better to have an outside consultant in certain areas than doing it in-house. On the other hand it may well be, and I can think of certain areas, where in fact the knowledgeable people in a particular area are in-house. So a variety of factors would be taken into consideration, and, indeed, the question of whether or not we have the capability in our institutions of advanced education, et cetera - all those factors would be taken into consideration.

MR. CLARK:

What kind of arrangements have been finalized or worked out between the government and people on staff at the universities with regard to the amount of time they use at the universities and the amount of time they use for research, piling one salary on top of the other in related areas? Just what is the situation there?

DR. HORNER:

That situation at the moment is under consideration, Mr. Chairman, because it is of some concern to us, and is one of the areas that the cabinet committee will be looking at very hard. But no decision has yet been reached in that area.

MR. CLARK:

Two further quick questions. What time line are they looking at as far as a research policy or research position is concerned? Are we looking at this fall? Is that a reasonable - I take it the ncd means yes.

Secondly, to the Solicitor General or the Deputy Premier or to the Minister of the Environment. Could you outline the specific arrangement the government has with Downey and Associates? When I look through the list, they have done the real bulk of the research under 1460. So would you outline to us the arrangements there are between the government and Downey and Associates?

MISS HUNLEY:

Yes, that specifically is that particular vote. The odd figures in it are - the \$8,585 go to Dr. Baker who was on staff with the Human Resource Research Council when it was phased out. Because we had a firm contract with him, it was a matter of deciding whether to use or pay. We decided to use. We made an arrangement with The University of Calgary whereby he would return to the university in Calgary and they would pay part of his salary and we would pick up the balance. That's the odd figures. The \$200,000, was announced in November 1972 as being the amount we were prepared to invest with the firm of Downey and Associates, as a retainer or whatever you want to call it. We announced it and from that I allocate the research as requested by the other departments.

MR. CLARK:

Is there any kind of firm commitment to Downey and Associates for another amount next year?

MISS HUNLEY:

As announced November 1972, Mr. Chairman, we undertook a three-year contract which will be expiring next year.

MR. RUSTE:

The Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs isn't in, but I ask ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ruste, it would appear there are some more questions here and I see Mr. R. Speaker wishes to ask something too, so maybe at this point we could adjourn. Is this okay, Mr. House Leader?

The committee therefore stands adjourned until 8:00 o'clock tonight.

[Mr. Chairman left the Chair at 5:31 o'clock.]