

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday Evening, June 4, 1974

[Mr. Diachuk resumed the Chair at 8:00 o'clock.]

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (CONT.)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Supply will come to order.

Treasury Department (Cont.)

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the hon. leader and I had five minutes together after we adjourned in order to review some Alberta statistics, and I think we both qualify as professional statisticians now.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Would you like the Chair to get agreement on the resolution now?

MR. MINIELY:

We both agreed that we're sure when we retire from public life we should get jobs from a variety of governments in Canada in order to publish statistics.

I would like to acknowledge that it is true that if you took the December, 1972 consumer price index for Edmonton and Calgary and compared it to the December, 1973 consumer price index, the increase would be 8.1 per cent. The comparison in the budget is based on the annual average for 1973 as compared with the annual average for 1972.

MR. RUSTE:

I think just as we adjourned for dinner tonight the Provincial Treasurer was referring to playing with statistics or credibility of statistics. I would just refer him to this publication, Alberta Statistical Review of March. On page 6 there is one here which gives an indication [with] an asterisk, and it says, over 100 per cent. When I add the two figures, 456 against 912, it's 100 per cent, so they have over 100 per cent designated there. That's playing with figures too.

MR. BENOIT:

I was going to ask the minister if it is his intention to pass Resolution No. 2 on the Order Paper with regard to program budgeting system during this portion of the session?

MR. STROM:

One other question. In light of the admission that the Provincial Treasurer made to the hon. Opposition House Leader, would he now also agree that pensions should have been increased just a little more than they were?

MR. MINIELY:

Well, [regarding] government Resolution No. 2, Mr. Chairman, it's our intent because of the spring sitting - I think all hon. members would probably like to conclude before too long - to hold it over till the fall. I hope that at that time we can devote some reasonable amount of time to properly debating it because I think it is important to the longer-term presentation of budgets in Alberta.

Just in reply to Mr. Strom's question, I guess I have to say again that while I acknowledge the credibility of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's statistics, the hon. leader and I agreed on another item. That was that it would depend on how you compared them and that, in fact, statistics by themselves don't mean anything unless you present the context within which they have been compared. I think that the hon. leader and I agree, and most statisticians would agree as well.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Would the hon. minister advise what boards of the Government of Alberta which have employees are not listed in the Estimates of Expenditure for 1974-75?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I think we tabled a motion which would include most of the boards. I couldn't name them off the top of my head, but I believe with minor exceptions the motion for a return, I think requested by Mr. Dixon, would indicate the boards which would not be included in the Estimates. There might be one or two exceptions, but generally speaking I think that would be true. The Estimates include all the employees who are paid out of public funds.

Again, Crown corporations such as Alberta Government Telephones that are not paid out of public funds but are in effect self-sustaining and paid out of their own revenues, and then a net amount paid to the general revenue fund, would not be included in the figures presented in the provincial budget because they are not paid out of provincial funds.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I have the answer to Motion for a Return No. 120, but it isn't really complete. Part of the reason is, the one the minister advances, that they are not wholly paid out of public funds.

Perhaps we could approach it from this angle. Would the minister advise if the government keeps any record of the number of employees who are working for government boards, committees, commissions, Crown corporations or other miscellaneous organizations of the government which are not wholly dependent upon the government for operating funds? In other words, some of them have sources of funds other than the government and under those kinds of boards, commissions, et cetera, does the government keep any record of the number of employees?

MR. MINIELY:

Well, we have, as I have indicated in the last two to two and a half years, been trying to keep a record of all employees, whether they are included under the civil service act, as my colleague has mentioned in the House and in the Public Accounts committee, or whether they are outside The Public Service Act, such as the example I have mentioned, Alberta Government Telephones.

I believe we can obtain [such a record] because at the present time we do keep a record of all employees. I'm not sure we can go back three or four years. But I think, for the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, there is a motion for a return which the hon. leader didn't present until near the end of last week. We would hope to prepare an answer to this motion for a return, but I doubt that we would be able to have it completed until the fall sitting of the Legislature.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. The minister will recall that on April 30 I wrote to him and indicated his department could not supply the list of all the boards, commissions, agencies and so on because the minister had instructed his department not to give any information to anybody as the answers had to come through him. So I wrote to the minister and he referred me to Motion for a Return No. 120, which certainly doesn't carry anywhere near a full list of all boards, agencies, commissions, departments, institutions, Crown corporations and things of that nature.

Mr. Chairman, would the minister tell us how we can go about finding the total number of employees in all agencies, boards, commissions, committees, Crown corporations,

councils, companies, foundations, special contract authorities, treasury branches, colleges and others funded directly or indirectly by the Government of Alberta?

MR. MINIELY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I have had several discussions with Mr. Wilson on this matter. Very simply, take Return No. 120, which I believe is an answer to Mr. Dixon and indicates all the employees working for the government or working for Crown corporations, boards and agencies that were included in the first return tabled in March, I believe, of this year. It also includes the number of employees working for Crown corporations, boards and agencies who, in total, were not included in the first return. If you add the two figures together you have the number of employees who are included for all Crown corporations, boards and agencies.

Now at no time, Mr. Chairman, did I tell the hon. member that I could not provide him with a comprehensive list of all the Crown corporations, boards, agencies, et cetera - as he rattled them off. Certainly we can provide him with a list of those. Certainly at the present time we can inventory the employees of each one of those. But basically the answer to the motion for a return from Mr. Dixon gives the number of employees other than one category, and that of course is the number of employees on part-time wages who are presented in the budget in terms of full-time equivalents.

But the number of all the employees is in the answer to Motion for a Return No. 120, which I believe is the question Mr. Dixon asked.

MR. WILSON:

Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister refers us to Motion for a Return No. 120. I have it here and it refers specifically to "government boards and agencies".

Would the minister advise if his term "boards and agencies" includes all of those other institutions or whatever that I referred to earlier, like Crown corporations, colleges, foundations, authorities and so on?

When you use the term "boards and agencies", does that include everything funded directly or indirectly by the provincial government?

MR. MINIELY:

It should include the whole works, all Crown corporations. For instance it would include NAIT and SAIT.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's included in the book.

MR. MINIELY:

It would not include universitites. Universities have never been included and are not part of the public service of Alberta either in direct government or quasi-government fashion. As far as those that are considered Crown corporations, boards, agencies, commissions, they are all included in Motion for a Return No. 120.

MR. WILSON:

Well, Mr. Chairman, the minister has under Motion for a Return No. 120 for the year 1973, people employed by government boards and agencies, a total of, it looks like, about 22,000 people. If we add that to the total in this year's Estimates of 24,183 plus the number in the Capital Account, do we then have the total bureaucracy, so to speak, of the provincial government in Alberta?

MR. MINIELY:

No, Mr. Chairman. I think the hon. member has doubled up on Motion for a Return No. 120. I believe that the motion for a return as I recall it, and I don't have it in front of me, asked for the number of employees employed by Crown corporations, boards and agencies which were not included in the return that I tabled in March of 1974.

I believe the figure was 10,000 and some that had not been included in the initial return that I tabled. So what you would add approximately would be the 10,000 and some to what was in the budget, not 20,000 and some. As I recall the motion for a return the growth in the employees employed by Crown corporations, boards and agencies has also been very small since 1971. In other words, it might have been 10,602 for the 1973 figure but in 1971 it was 9,900 and something, as I recall the figures. So the growth had not been excessive in the Crown corporation, board and agency sector any more than it was in government proper. As I tabled an answer in March originally and during the course of a

debate with the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, the growth had been about one-half the rate in the general civil service than it had been in the earlier years. If you also compare the growth in the Crown corporation, board and agency sector it's not excessive either.

I don't know what the hon. member is leading to.

MR. WILSON:

Well, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. minister says that the growth hasn't been excessive in the other boards and agencies, let's deal just with the Estimates. In the 71-72 Estimates, I think at that stage there were 19,035 civil servants in Alberta; then using the same criteria, we now have 26,854 or a 41 per cent increase.

MR. MINIELY:

The hon. member can play with the figures all he wants to but when we examine the answers to motions for a return prior to the time we were in office, when the members on this side who were then in the Opposition requested the number of civil servants employed by the government of Alberta, what they got from the civil service commissioner's office was the full-time, salaried civil servants, who are the only ones classified as civil servants under The Civil Servants Act. So as I say, this is no different than statistics. You can't compare apples and oranges. You have to compare apples and apples, and you have to compare oranges and oranges.

One of the objections that the other side took to my figures tabled in March was that they were presented on the basis that they had always historically been presented in answers to motions for a return. So if you wanted a proper comparison, that's the way it had to be compared. It's the same thing now, if you are going to talk about the employees presently employed by Crown corporations, boards and agencies, let's have the figures for how many more were employed by Crown corporations, boards and agencies in 1971. Let's add them to the 19,000 civil servants existing in 1971.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, referring to Return 114, in which I asked for the number of males and females in the employ of the government at two specific times, did the answers include only full-time civil servants? They did not include any - it said "in the employ of the Government of Alberta."

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I don't think I have had the chance to say it in the House, but I know in Public Accounts I have said that in the wage category one of the reasons they are presented in full-time equivalents is that they include people who are sometimes with the government during the summer for one week, two weeks, three weeks, four weeks. You know, there is a tremendous turnover in the wage category of the payroll. My honourable colleague prepared the one on the breakdown between male and female employment, and advises me that that would include pretty well the full-time people because the records with respect to people who are here part time for one week and two weeks are more difficult to trace. They would be employees under The Public Service Act.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, the minister has said salaried employees, and just so I understand it clearly, that of course refers to people who are on contract as well. They would be counted as salaried employees?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, in the budget the budget figures include people on contract. The answer I tabled during debate in March would include salaried employees. Basically in terms - did you say, Dr. Hohol, that the people on contract would be included as ...

DR. HOHOL:

Salaried.

MR. MINIELY:

... salaried employees in our statistics at the present time?

MR. STROM:

So in the comparison that was being made, it was dealing with salaried employees only, not contract workers?

MR. MINIELY:

Are you referring to the answer I tabled during debate in March?

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I am referring in part to the discussion that we had in Public Accounts. I thought I had a clear answer as to what it was that we were comparing. If I recall correctly - I certainly don't have the record before me - I thought the hon. minister said that the salaried people included, or let me put it another way, the civil service, as counted, included those who were on contract.

MR. MINIELY:

That's correct, and also in the budget. I think I indicated during Public Accounts that in the budget figures which are tabled here in comparative figures at the beginning of the Income Account Estimates on page 5, do include people on contract. Under the civil service act they are also included as employees, so my colleague advises me.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, there is one other point that I would like to have clarified. In the Estimates book of 1972-1973, I think it was, we had a number of departments which listed part-time workers. I think the hon. minister will recall that I raised the question with the Provincial Auditor as to whether or not it would be possible to reduce them to - what's the term that we use here - salaried man-years. He said it could be done, but it would be very difficult.

Now my question to the minister is: in making the comparison that has been done from time to time at the time of change-over from part-time employees to salaried man-years, there was in fact an inability to make a comparison between the last year that method was used and the method presently used. It would give a wrong picture as to the actual increase in the number of people on the payroll.

MR. MINIELY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, Mr. Strom, probably also recalls during the course of debate on Public Accounts that we did ask the Provincial Auditor for his view of what was the most reasonable way of presenting salary information at the present time with the number of wage employees in modern government and the fact that this group has become a more important part of the civil service. I'm sure the hon. member, Mr. Strom, would acknowledge that the Provincial Auditor said he felt the most reasonable way of presenting it was on full-time equivalents or salaried man-year equivalents.

I have also, several times during the last two and a half years, reviewed what transpired when we first took office in terms of looking at the civil service, and with our desire to control the numbers growth of the civil service, what we had done and what we had tried to dig up relevant to the past. I acknowledge that in certain Estimates in previous years the total number of people on wages had been included. I'm advised by both the Treasury Department and the Provincial Auditor that these records were incomplete at that time. They did not have complete records of the number of people on wages. They had them in certain appropriations and for certain departments. I'm also advised that because of the incomplete records of people on wages, we could not go back and pick up the actual number of people on wages in 1971 and transpose them into full-time equivalents.

Therefore, I think we're in a ball game now where we have to carry on comparing an annual growth on a full-time equivalent basis. Basically this is the first budget where we have a basis upon which to compare on a consistent basis. The 1973-74 budget was presented on full-time equivalents, including all people on contracts other than those not under The Public Service Act. And 1973-74 was also on full-time equivalents.

Now the first year the communication problem started, the first year of conversion, you couldn't compare them adequately. We didn't have complete records of people on wages going back to 1971. I appreciate the, perhaps, communication difficulties that have existed but nevertheless I felt that in modern government today with growth of the wage factor, on the advice of my department and on the advice of the Provincial Auditor, who is a servant of all members of the Legislature, this was the most informative way of presenting it if it's to be used. I have no willingness to compare with prior situations. I'm willing to drop the ball game now and say, let's compare the growth on an annual basis, we have a system set up. I believe that the growth on a comparative basis with earlier years has been distorted. Therefore the only way that I could compare was to table civil service figures during the course of debate on the same basis as they had been tabled in previous years. I think that would only be fair.

MR. STRCM:

Mr. Chairman, let me say to the minister that I have no disagreement with the system he is now using. I want to point out that I think the previous government was just as concerned about growth as the present government. I think any government will have to be concerned about growth.

The matter of concern to me, and I want to make it very, very clear, Mr. Chairman, is that there have been times when an attempt has been made to demonstrate the growth of the present government as compared to the growth of the previous government.

All I'm saying, and have said consistently, is that there was a change in the method and that it did not necessarily give a true picture. In some departments it would. But where we have the part-time employee or we listed a number of wage employees, this certainly could lead to some problems. All I'm saying is that the Provincial Auditor very clearly admitted that it became a very difficult exercise to make a comparison after it was changed.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am not disagreeing with the method the Provincial Treasurer has explained to us he is now using, and consistently using. Certainly it makes it much better just by looking at the statistical information to watch what is happening. I think we will both agree that there was a transition period which we both may just as well drop. I don't want somebody coming along and telling me that on the basis of those figures something happened that didn't actually happen, and that is my only point.

MR. MINIELY:

Yes, I agree and I will just very quickly say that we now have, and I think the budget for this year [shows], an adequate comparison [to which] the honourable Mr. Strom would agree, which indicates and lays out the growth of the manpower. It is a system we intend using consistently.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I did want to get into this debate because I am getting concerned as a member as I get these returns. The latest one today was actually an extension of Sessional Paper No. 120 which we've heard so much about in the last few minutes.

As I look at the number of people, between 100 and 200, who have been hired under contract at very high wages - I can understand why they want their high wages because some of them are very active Conservatives and they are used to big money - I am wondering if the minister is going to [ask] the Provincial Auditor to look at this contract-awarding. It must be very disturbing to the regular civil servants who are working in the department when they look at some of the salaries that have been given under contract compared to those that are not under contract.

I'll point out one or two. I noticed a man with the International Trade Director - \$2,340 a month. His assistant is getting, it looks like, about \$1,100 and something a month. And I can go on and on. I noticed one or two up here in the \$25,000 to \$40,000 bracket. I notice there are quite a number of professional people too, psychiatrists and others who are working in the mental health field. I'm not talking about that group of people because that would be their ordinary salary, but I notice here in big figures - and I'm sorry, I don't know the Japanese term. It is too bad the government doesn't use dollars. I see they are paying somebody 400,000 yen a month, whatever that is. It sounds like a lot of money. Maybe it isn't. I notice the next one in Japan is only making 80,000 yen a month. Anyway, maybe the Provincial Treasurer can break that down for me.

I think we should become concerned, and I have mentioned this in the House before. We had the Premier in the last election telling us that they were going to cut down on bureaucracy, they were going to cut down on staff. The very opposite is happening. It is so, Mr. Minister. I just can't go along with your figures. As I look at this there has been a definite increase. What concerns me is the morale we are going to have within our own civil service if we keep these contracts that were covered under Sections 46 and 47 of The Public Service Act.

I see one gentleman here who is getting part of his wages paid by his company and part by the government. I see a direct conflict of interest when I look at that. I think we should look at this situation. I would like to do something about it now and I would like to help the minister out. I don't want to see it get out of hand. I think he should turn it over to the Provincial Auditor.

I wonder if the minister could make a few remarks on what he plans to do. Are we going to increase the awarding of contracts under Sections 46 and 47 of The Public Service Act? Because some of the people I have talked to in the Civil Service are becoming concerned. They say it would be better to get laid off and go to work under a special contract. Surely to goodness our people in the Civil Service should be rewarded for

loyalty and good work, but it must be very discouraging when somebody can come along and for doing practically the same job - surely we must have somebody in the same department we could appoint to some of these positions to encourage our regular civil servants. That's the only way any company I know of, or have been associated with, tries to work with the staff it has. If we haven't got them we can hire new ones, but we don't bring somebody in under a special contract to annoy everybody.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Are there any amounts of money in the budget for the charter of aircraft which aren't covered under the Department of Lands and Forests for executive and government staff use?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, in answer to Mr. Ruste's question, I believe in the course of examining Executive Council there was an amount under Premier's Office for the possible charter of aircraft. I forget exactly what the amount was, but I think the hon. member was here when that was discussed.

The rest is all under the Department of Lands and Forests but there was a small amount of around - don't tie me to the figure - \$30,000 to \$50,000 to charter jet aircraft, where necessary, to travel to Ottawa or this type of conference.

The other matter, Mr. Chairman, I think we have hopefully debated adequately and I don't really want to get into it again. The hon. members have the option of presenting motions for a return and at that time we will present the statistics, both on an accurate basis and on a properly comparative basis because I think that is important.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have one problem, one major issue, that is being dealt with very lightly in this debate and it concerns the question of budgeting and the question of raising funds for the budget. I believe that is our main purpose in this Legislature.

The hon. minister hung rather tough on the question of gasoline taxes by saying that his main purpose in life, it appears this year, is to be the lowest in Canada. I wasn't at all impressed with that kind of approach because it isn't fair. We are not making fair comparisons. To say that as long as we are the lowest we are doing our job - it is politically nice to say we are the lowest. Most politicians will use that when it suits their purpose. But there are other matters concerning taxation and spending in this province.

I am not too worried about the defence thrown up that if we reduce taxes we are fanning [the fires of] inflation. I know that all governments combined have quite an impact on inflation. That's all levels, municipal, school boards, provincial and federal. But the fiscal policy of the province alone does not have such a major impact on inflation as far as the country is concerned. You can't measure it too well.

I think when the minister is so keen on stating that we want our gasoline tax to be the lowest in Canada, we have to accept it. That's the approach he uses. I think the press panned him a bit on this attitude and the logic of this approach escapes most people, I believe.

But there is one important matter concerning taxation that the minister is rather anxious to avoid and that is income taxation. I wonder whether the minister can explain to us why he is not concerned about having the lowest income taxes in Canada. Why do we not take a good look at income taxes in this province to determine whether an adjustment ought not to be made in that regard?

I am sure the government must always be looking at all facets, levels and forms of taxation in this province. When the province needs money for its programs it must resort to taxation if it can't get the money elsewhere. But this province is getting rather generous sums, in fact very generous sums of money, other than through taxation at the present time, at least not in the common usage of the word taxation. It is not taxing the public directly for some of its revenue. So it is getting additional funds, and this is a proper time for the Legislature to look at income taxes.

It might appear that it is an insignificant problem, but I would like the hon. Provincial Treasurer to give us some indication of how we rate with other provinces with regard to income tax. Even then, I am not going to be too impressed with the different levels because most provinces with high income taxes must have them because they need the revenue, they have no other source of revenue. So with the revenue of this province as great and as buoyant as it is then, if we are going to discharge our responsibilities properly, we must look at the question of income tax to see whether we ought to make an adjustment at the present time and not wait for the initiative to come from the hon.

minister. He may want to keep a good margin of money over spending and so he is not the person to initiate tax reductions.

I believe that in this case one of the responsibilities which falls upon the Opposition is to raise the matter and let the hon. minister explain just what his purpose is in maintaining this level of income taxation in the province, and whether it would not benefit all the people to have a reduction at this time, not a year down or when it suits the hon. minister's purpose.

I don't believe the hon. minister can justify the high level of income taxation in this province at the present time.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, on the matter of income tax, it's rather interesting that when you get into the homeowner's tax discount, or whatever you want to call it, let's say a resident in the city of Edmonton qualified for a \$1,500 government payment. You get out into a rural area and you would qualify for \$1,500. In one case it's taxable under income tax and in the other it isn't.

The point I'm raising is that if those same two people held shares in General Motors or something, they would be handled the same way. I submit that we as individual shareholders in the province of Alberta are the same, and I wonder if the minister has any comment on that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Ready for the question?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I believe that I posed a legitimate question to the hon. minister. If the Deputy Premier wishes to flaunt his arrogance he hasn't got far to go. Everybody knows his attitude, it has never changed in years.

I believe when we are dealing with income taxes, and it's a problem before this body, that the hon. Provincial Treasurer ought to at least stand up and make a comment as he did on gasoline taxes. I know he wants to be the lowest and he doesn't have to creep as low as the Deputy Premier. But let's get rid of some of these taxes, if we can't show that we need them, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, isn't the minister going to reply to what was asked?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I believe that when the hon. minister can sit there in contempt he is not in contempt of any MLA in this House, he is in contempt of the people of this province. That arrogance does not in any way reflect on any MLA who stands up here and asks the hon. minister to comment on the reason for the high level of income taxation at the present time and why he doesn't wish to discuss it.

I'm sure that the Deputy Premier, who has certainly shown that he is more interested in politics than in people, influences the attitude of this government. It is not a good influence on the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I certainly feel that it is a contemptible attitude. His face shows it and his attitude shows it, and if we accuse a government of arrogance we have a fine example of it facing us right now. Certainly, when he just wants to go along and ignore our request of an explanation on income tax, he is asking for someone to hang tough to see whether we can get it or not. It's easy to feel that it's not important.

Taxation is important, and this body has very little else that is as important as taxation and budgeting. That is our prime purpose here, and if the Provincial Treasurer can ignore this issue it means that he is more interested in playing politics and playing the game in cabinet rather than coming clean, as is expected of him, and giving us an explanation why he feels that at this time we cannot or don't want to reduce income taxes, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The resolution before us, moved by the Chairman of Subcommittee D, Mr. Ashton. It is resolved ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I don't believe we should let this thing go that lightly. I don't intend to. I've seen the Deputy Premier wave down some of the hon. members. I know that their obedience training was quite effective.

But I didn't expect to see the Deputy Premier wave down the Provincial Treasurer. He certainly has something to say and can say something on this issue. He has a responsibility, unless he wishes to show that he can be as irresponsible as some ministers I have seen in this Legislature from time to time.

I certainly don't feel that he can just shrug this issue off and say, well, I don't feel like answering. If he doesn't feel like answering let him stand up and do so. I think he is displaying contempt. As I have stated, it is not contempt against any MLA in this House, it is contempt against the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Be it resolved that a sum not exceeding \$78,836,805 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975 for the Department of the Treasury.

[The motion was carried.]

Department of Manpower and Labour

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Chairman, Subcommittee D has had under consideration Vote 17, the Estimates of Expenditure for the Department of Manpower and Labour and begs to report the same. I therefore submit the following resolution:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$49,689,860 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Department of Manpower and Labour.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, there's just one point I'd like to mention. It's based on a return in connection with groundsmen, which I am raising in this vote. I trust that the hon. Minister of Public Works will also listen to the comments.

In the return it is indicated that there are 30 groundsmen in the province of Alberta. Twelve of them are in Edmonton, so there are not very many.

The groundsmen do such work as gardening, running machines, shovelling snow and general labour. Then in addition to that there is the maintenance service worker 1,2,3, who is a general labourer. There is also the gardener who is classed 1,2,3,4. These are probably the people you might call the outside workers around the building, et cetera.

Now the beginning pay of the groundsman is \$2.71 per hour. After one year the groundsman gets \$2.81. After 10 years he gets about \$3.49 per hour, whereas the maintenance service workers start at \$3.34 and much of their work overlaps. They both run machines, shovel snow, garden and do the general work that has to be done.

The gardener might be in a little different category, if he is required to have some horticultural or gardening training. He starts at \$3.19 an hour, which is under Maintenance Worker 1. In most cases I think they are cutting the grass and gardening without any particular training, at least in the early stages.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'm submitting that this groundsman category is really a trumped-up category. It is most unfair to the 30 men who are in that category. They are doing the labouring work. It's hard to tell which is labour and which is groundsmen. It was

something that this present government inherited. I am not blaming you for the category. But I am submitting that these people are not being treated fairly when you consider that the labourer in the city starts at \$4.51 an hour whereas the groundsman for the Province of Alberta doing exactly the same work starts at \$2.71, a \$1.17 difference per hour for that type of work.

I think possibly that might explain why there is quite a heavy turnover of groundsmen. I would suggest it would be in the interest of the people of the province and certainly fair to these people if groundsman was eliminated as a category and these men were transferred to the maintenance service workers in their appropriate category.

All I am asking at this time, Mr. Chairman, is for the ministers in charge to review this category and see if something can be done along that line.

DR. BACKUS:

If I may answer this, when we made that return we actually gave the classifications and the steps in the classifications as provided to us by central personnel. Now, in fact, when we do take on groundsmen we normally take them on about three steps up. In fact I don't think any of our groundsmen come in at the \$2.71 figure, they come in at about three steps up the ladder already. Those figures I gave are actually the figures provided for the basic classifications of them.

The other thing is that there is a little bit of difference between the groundsman and the labourer or the maintenance worker. Generally the maintenance worker does have rather heavier work to do. Groundsman work is a classification which is a bit of a different category. Groundsman work can consist quite a bit of just going around and stringing out hoses, running power mowers and so on, whereas your maintenance worker may be doing heavy cleaning jobs and so on.

MR. TAYLOR:

I appreciate what the hon. minister says. I have seen groundsmen operating machines, I have seen groundsmen doing some of the heaviest work. I think there is such an overlapping. All I am asking is that this category be reviewed to see if it can be eliminated, and if so, you will be doing a service to these workmen.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister about three questions regarding the Human Rights Commission and my questions are these.

Number one, are the complaints increasing?

What is the most frequent complaint that is brought before the commission?

How many cases investigated last year were found to be justified and would be an abuse under The Human Rights Act?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Any further questions?

MR. RUSTE:

Well, I have some comments. Do you want to answer that first or...

[Interjections]

It's on a different subject, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A different subject.

MR. CLARK:

While the minister is getting ready to answer the questions on the Human Rights Commission, perhaps he might put these in the hopper and respond to them too.

The Motion for a Return No. 167 asked about the number of investigations carried out by the commission. The answer indicates there were 212 complaints investigated. Then it says:

Of the 212 complaints, 64 were found, upon investigation, to be unsubstantiated; 7 were terminated due to lack of response on the part of the complainant; 3 were withdrawn;

and 2 were found after inquiry to be outside the jurisdiction of this agency. This leaves 72 cases in which positive results were obtained.

Now if you add up 64 and 72, and 7,3 and 2 you'll find that there are 64 cases that you have lost in thin air. So if the minister could find those while he is responding in this particular matter it would be much appreciated because, in fact, there are 64 cases that seem to have vanished as far as this return is concerned. Out of 212 you account for all of them except 64.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, just while the minister is preparing some answers, I would like him to perhaps answer a question I raised in the question period yesterday dealing with jurisdictional disputes between various trades. On what basis was the proposal made by the government or government officials with respect to having the National Jurisdictional Disputes Board in the United States deal or rule on these jurisdictional disputes?

Also, while I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to advise whether he has discussed this matter with other jurisdictions in Canada, and whether or not at meetings of various provincial labour ministers any discussion has taken place on what their role should be in referring to an American disputes board, in large measure, matters of jurisdiction in Canada.

DR. HOHOL:

I should like, Mr. Chairman, to apologize for not being in the House on one or two occasions when my estimates were called. It is not because I was not aware that I should have been here, but events were such that I missed each time they were called.

I should like to support the comments of my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, and say to the hon. Member for Drumheller that the point is well made. Nothing should be read into this by the particular group of people other than in fairly and squarely.

Answering a good question I will say this: we will, from the Public Service Commissioner's office, review this particular category as requested, and see if it has a relevant place in the classification system of this government. If it does not, we will move it out and make such adjustments as have been inferred or implied might be made if there is an unfairness here.

With respect to the human rights proposition, I had the page and I inadvertently closed it. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition had the right answers, except for 64, if he can close the gap on those

Does anyone up in the gallery remember what appropriation number it is?

[Laughter]

I haven't had a laugh since this afternoon.

AN HON. MEMBER:

There's not much to laugh about.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Nothing like being honest.

DR. HOHOL:

That's right.

As I read these, the complaints received, I hope to cover both the questions of the hon. leader and the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

The formal complaints in 1973, that is the year we are speaking of, were 329; and informal, 437, for a total of 766.

I have to say that I haven't got the document the hon. leader has.

The areas of complaints are broken down as follows: employment, 249; services, 152; accommodation, 68; equal pay, 32; job advertisements, 238; notices, 4; retaliation 4 - it looks like somebody hit somebody after being hit first - union, 2; and others, 17, for a total of 766. I suspect that that doesn't follow the breakdown in the particular return.

So to answer the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, the most frequent are in employment, 249; followed closely by job advertisements, 238, and services, 152. Grounds of complaint will be of interest I am certain: race, colour, 145; religious beliefs, 12; sex, 332 - I was going to say that's a lot of The next item is age, 88; sex and age together, 14; marital status, 19; ancestry, 19; place of origin, 26, and others, 111 for a total of 766.

Those are the figures, Mr. Chairman. If the reply to the motion for a return is incorrect, I will examine it tomorrow and correct it.

With respect to jurisdictional disputes, I want to be as clear as I can. I've spoken on this matter two or three times in the House, Mr. Chairman. The matter of jurisdiction deals between or among, but usually between, two unions which are in dispute with respect to which of two unions, by jurisdiction, has the right to do a particular job on a site or in a shop.

I have said, and we have said as government, and we had agreement with the unions - in fact the representation at the time we had public hearings on the matter of amendments to The Alberta Labour Act - we viewed this as a matter for unions between themselves. The kind of misunderstanding we have with respect to this is unfortunate because the unions themselves set up the approach for settling their own problems with respect to jurisdiction. Usually the unions involved are international unions. That is to say the ones in Canada, therefore the ones in Alberta, are affiliates, direct associates or direct members of unions which are international.

The term "international" is somewhat deceiving because really they're only continental or North American.

The unions have to set up a procedure to settle jurisdictional disputes. They go, in the first instance, to their own apparatus provincially and thereafter nationally - this could be in Vancouver, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal or Halifax. If they don't get a settlement, then they go to what they call the international disputes apparatus. This happens to be in Washington.

Now it seems to me if the choice had been to have this particular body in Ottawa, there would be no misunderstanding. This is a procedure set up completely by the unions themselves. If through this procedure a union, one of two or both, is unhappy with the conclusions of the disputes board at the international level, it can then revert to its own province, whichever province it be, and reach the equivalent of our own Board of Industrial Relations, at which time the board would hold hearings, hear the evidence and make a judgment.

For example, yesterday or today in discussing this matter, it was in the context of that kind of procedure that I tried to give the information.

MR. CLARK:

I'd like to ask the minister one question on his response and then one further question.

I assume that the minister is going to check the mathematics in Question 167 and then report back to us tomorrow. It's especially on page 2 - the answer to the question there.

The other thing I'd like to ask the minister deals with the complaint the Member for Spirit River-Fairview was talking about, about the refinery being built here. It has been brought to my attention that a contribution in the contract is being made by the employer for manpower training programs and that, in fact, this money is making its way back to the international union headquarters. Is the minister aware of this? Has it been checked out and is that factual?

DR. HOHOL:

This is my first information on the second part of it. If that is the case, the remaining funds would be cut off completely if some of those are for training elsewhere. If I understand the hon. member correctly, this would be a misuse of any arrangements that you would have with any employer with respect to training.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, early in this session we had tabled under The Public Service Pension Act, 1973. On page 20 it showed a summary of pensions being paid as of March 31, 1973. The reason I raise this now is that earlier this evening in [debate on the] provincial treasury I think we had some figures unveiled that showed the cost of living index. I think this ties in with the increase to these pensioners.

It is kind of interesting that there are 1,455 out of a total of 2,668 pensions that are under the \$200 class. It is rather interesting that the lowest pension is \$17.61 a month. With the increase of 5 per cent that, to me, adds up to about 88 cents a month.

I get some information from the Department of Health and Social Development, and in here there is reference made to sample social allowance benefits. This was tabled last year. It shows the present, and then the increase as at February 1, 1974. For a mother with children whose ages are two, four and seven years the increase was about 8.5 per cent. When you get down to a mother with children ages three, eight and thirteen, the increase was 11.14 per cent. Then you get down to still another category of ages nine, fourteen and seven with a mother and the increase was 13.5 per cent.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, that he should review the increase of 5 per cent that was given in light of such figures as this and in light of the cost of living that really has gone up a lot more. I think if you look back into the agreement [with] the civil service there is a proviso for compensatory increase. I think it should be greater than what was given at 5 per cent.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Any further questions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The question has been called on the resolution.

Moved by the subcommittee chairman, Mr. Ashton:

Be it resolved that a sum not exceeding \$49,689,860 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Department of Manpower and Labour.

[The motion was carried.]

Department of Education

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Chairman, Subcommittee D has had under consideration Vote 13, the Estimates of Expenditure for the Department of Education, and begs to report the same. I therefore submit the following resolution:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$311,789,500 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975 for the Department of Education.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, a few brief comments on these estimates. First of all, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the incentives to stimulate voter interest, I wonder if the minister would respond as to what discussions have taken place with the trustees' associations on this particular proposal. The reason I raise that is because, while I agree with the objectives of the program, Mr. Minister - I think most of us do - and I think by and large the proposal was well thought out, it would seem to me that it would be a much better approach if the government did the advertising in conjunction with the trustee organizations.

The reason I say that is because if we are talking about encouraging better people to seek public office, while that is a worthy proposition in general, I suspect there are more than one or two different jurisdictions where voters or trustees could look upon this as being an indirect slap of the face, even though it isn't. We recognize that it isn't, but it seems to me there is that danger, and if the advertising could be done in conjunction with the two organizations I think it would probably be more useful. That is the comment I wanted to make on that.

The second area deals with the question of retired women who had been teaching for many years and now - I think this is several years back - there is a slight discrimination on their pensions compared to male teachers. I realize that the minister

is looking into that. I would just like to ask him whether or not in the last few days the department has been able to discover any additional information from other provinces as to their procedure. I am sure the minister will agree that while we have all received letters from various groups in the province supporting their case, by and large it has been a pretty well-considered effort on the part of those people advancing the change. Compared with some of the pressure groups which we all have to deal with from time to time, the retired teachers have been more than tasteful in their approach to this particular issue.

I think it is an important one and if there is some way of dealing with it - I realize the actuarial problems involved - I would be interested in the minister bringing the Assembly up to date on that score.

The third point, Mr. Chairman, is that while I welcome the half a million dollars being budgeted this year for rural school divisions to deal with the special problems of the smaller school divisions, particularly those divisions with declining enrolments, I would hope that next year a substantial percentage of the windfall is allocated to the Department of Education - and that we increase that grant substantially. Half a million dollars is a start but, in my view, in discussing this with a number of the trustees in the divisions in my particular constituency, it still leaves a very real problem.

I think there is a danger, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, in trying to equalize the yardstick in any formula for grants, whether it be in education or what have you, especially in education. I think what we are trying to achieve is not so much an equalized formula but the end goal, which is equal access to education for youngsters wherever they live, whether it is in the rural areas or the urban areas, at least as much as is reasonably possible within the ability of the province.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I just feel that we have to do a little more than [grant] half a million dollars. This isn't going to remedy the problems of some of the rural areas which right now are facing fairly serious deficits. Admittedly, they can requisition more money, but this is going to mean the petition for a plebiscite and there is, no doubt, a very real chance that it will be turned down.

I think there is just no more important investment that we can make, if we are serious about developing rural Alberta, than the investment in education. So, Mr. Chairman, I would just conclude by saying that we have got a start this year, it seems to me, with the half million dollar fund. But I would hope that next year at the very least we would be increasing that substantially, so that we move towards the more important goal of equal access to education, rather than an equal yardstick in allocating grants.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks too regarding the estimates of Education. First of all, Mr. Minister, I wonder to what extent you intend to relax the restrictions - you don't like to call it a freeze - on new buildings in fast and new-growth areas. I believe there are a couple of areas - I think there is one right here in Edmonton known as Mill Woods. I've seen a lot of press releases showing it is a fast-growth area. They do indeed need schools quite badly.

I think Calgary has one that is coming up also in the northeast area known as The Properties. Every time I go home it seems, when I come back, like there are 50 houses more than there were the week before. That's just how rapidly that area seems to be growing. There are areas in the larger cities where I'm sure this is the case. I'm just wondering how soon the minister will relax and make it possible for these areas to build schools within those new-growth areas.

Also, what would be of interest I think to a lot of people in the province of Alberta is - I've had them ask me and I can't answer them - what criteria were used by the minister when he established, I think maybe this was last year, that there were 100,000 empty places in schools in the province of Alberta? What we would like to know is - I think the figure is correct, it's a round figure - was it actually seats, desks or was it what we call approved space, ancillary space like stages and things like that which are used to build, say, a certain school of 400 pupils, for example, and certain qualified square footage? In other words, this builds up. It could look like there is a lot more space there than there are actual desks. In other words I think it would be interesting to know, are there really 100,000 actual desks or spaces empty? No matter what they are, what was the criteria used?

What would also be of interest, has the minister or his department ever considered doing a survey over a long period, say 20 to 25 years, projecting and trying to compare which would be more economical, to build a school in an area or bus kids over that long period of time for several miles? In other words, consider the cost of the school and its operation and the cost of a bus, its depreciation and how many buses you need, and compare the two over a 25-year period. Just where would we come out as far as the straight

dollars and cents, the economics of it, are concerned? I think it would be an interesting bit of information. It would be interesting to know what is the economical distance to bus kids to school. You know, should it be one mile, two miles - something to go by.

Also, now that the education tax has been reduced, taken off the tax, and the municipal governments have their restrictions taken away as far as their guidelines are concerned, has the minister any intention of taking the strings off the school trustees so that they in fact can be the masters of their own destiny and have the right to tax and spend as they deem necessary. I think, Mr. Minister, it is time that we tried to accept the fact that school trustees are no less responsible than county or city councillors. It always amazes me. You take the example of a councillor, or take a reeve in a county. He sits one day as a county councillor, sits around a table, makes all kinds of decisions related to municipalities and sets his own salary, wages and all the things that a county councillor naturally does.

Then next day he comes back to the same place and sits around the same table, but this day he comes back as a school committee person in that same county and makes the same types of decisions. But all of a sudden, according to the criteria we use he suddenly becomes irresponsible. The minister has suggested that he should now - he has withdrawn that - be accountable for the salary he pays himself. He can only levy certain taxation. The day before he could do what he wanted to, but today, because he is on school business, he can't do these things. He is restricted as far as the guidelines of the school budget are concerned. This seems to be something that is kind of hard to understand and rationalize.

I think, too, that in the school system we want to create interest. I was just glancing quickly through your sheet here from the department in ... [Inaudible] ... to upgrade the status of school trustees. But we still have to do more to create an interest and competition within our educational system. I know I have said that a lot of times. I believe in it as much as I ever did. I think it's a necessary procedure if you are going to separate the good ones from the bad ones, in other words, the better ones from the not so good ones. You are going to have to provide competition. And I really think it's not unreasonable to expect that type of program.

I think too, as has been mentioned, that we have to place a lot of emphasis on the value of our educational system. In any country in the world, I am totally convinced, and I have said it before, that the natural resources are not the greatest asset that country has. It is not the capital investment of a country that makes it great, but it is the quality of education within that country. I believe we must keep this in mind. I think it's important and it has to be high in priority as far as our system of education in this province is concerned.

Now, just briefly on the little paper that you sent - I didn't have a chance to study it closely - you mention some of the facts in your first paragraph that much of the decision-making power in education lies not with the provincial government but with local trustees reflecting the community viewpoint. I would say that this is the way it should be. It isn't always that way because sometimes the minister doesn't allow this to happen. It all depends on how convenient it is. But I mean that's the way it should be. He should be allowed to do that.

Paying \$50,000 for advertising for school trustees - I think if I were a committee of one I'd put that into education in some area and I wouldn't waste it [by] giving it to the media to try to urge people to vote, because I just don't believe that's going to work at all. I mean, your motives are good. I don't question those but I just don't think the program will work.

The short courses for new trustee candidates I can't buy at all because, you know, you don't have to - and again, why trustees? What's the matter with your municipal people, hospital board people? What's so wonderful about those guys? Why shouldn't we educate them and smarten them up a little bit?

[Interjections]

Yes, advanced education. Have you appointed the ...

MR. FCSTER:

Boards of governors.

MR. GRUENWALD:

... boards of governors. Sure. Have you appointed the new ones yet, by the way?

[Interjections]

That's right.

But the point is, you know, you keep talking about how we want to upgrade them and we want to make them locally responsible. We want to do all these things, and now we want to educate them even before they're elected. I think what we must do, though, is encourage groups ...

[Interjections]

... will you please be quiet - like the Alberta school trustees who do a commendable job in putting in short courses for new trustees. Every year they do that, and it's being supported tremendously.

But for goodness' sake let's worry about educating and informing the trustee after he's elected, not just in anticipation of his being elected, because there are a lot of people in this province who have a bit of a disappointment every year on election day. So why should we plough our money into preparing someone to do something that he probably won't be asked to do in the first place?

I think the upgrading of trustees is a good idea. But upgrading candidates - I'm not so sure about that because you don't even know for sure what a candidate is. It's just someone who's hoping to get elected, eh? Let's worry about the people who are in fact elected.

Those are some of the points that I think we might consider.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I just looked around the House and discovered what the minister means by his little paper. I could only count nine members who were paying any attention to my honourable friend who is an authority on education. I just thought that if we had a bill here to legalize prostitution, everybody would listen. But when it comes to education, nobody listens. Maybe there are some reasons.

I'm going to deal first with the minister's proposal. We do need to upgrade school trustees. But what do you mean by upgrading them? Do you want them to be college graduates? Do you want them to be businessmen? What do you want?

Well, in the main I think you have to have a combination of these qualities, and maybe we want it. But I'm not so sure that paid advertising will have any effect. Anyway, I'm not going to object to a try.

When it comes to referendums, they aren't worth a hoot unless they cover a contentious issue. If you can stir up a contentious issue then a referendum will bring people out to vote; otherwise it doesn't.

My honourable friend said about all that you need to say about schools for candidates. Out in the rural [areas] people just aren't going to go for that. There won't be candidates if they think they're under pressure to go to a school, 'just in case'. Then, when you send them there and the teachers, as this suggests, are going to be some old fogey trustees, there won't be much inspiration. I repeat what I've said till it's almost a phobia, that all the training in the world won't make them good trustees. It can help if they have the right motivation.

There are some suggestions which probably will create a new interest in education and, I would presume, some better education. The first one is to get the school boards directly responsible to the people. They have to collect the money for every program they suggest the people are going to be interested in whether they do it or whether they don't. When you make the contributions from the provincial government totally unconditional so that the school board can say, I want to do this, and the people can say, well, we're not going to go for that, then you'll get some interest in school matters.

When you get the province out of the capital program - when a school is built it becomes the property of that school area and it has a distinct value, it belongs to those people. As long as the province will pay the bill and as long as we tell them whether you can build it or whether you shouldn't build it, and whether we approve the plans or not, all you do is create an urge on the part of every school district to get every new school that it can justify enough to get the minister's approval. Many a good school has been deserted long before its usefulness was worn out simply because of this.

I say again that in the cities where you have had to abandon schools, many times the site of that school is worth enough to build a new one out in a newly-housed area. It would not be out of order at all to say to the people in capital affairs, you decide, you pay for it, it's yours and do what you want to do with it. You'll get away from a lot of

finery, perhaps, in some school districts, but at least if the people want it they will pay for it.

Another thing that we have to do is do away with tenure for teachers. As the system is today, our people have just given up any hope that they can have any influence on who is going to be Jeannie's teacher. In every community, if you want to go snooping or listening, you will find they know they have a certain number of teachers who should not be teaching but nobody can do a darn thing about it. It takes some courage in the first place, and in the second place they have no authority. I would suggest that you do away with some of these items and you leave the people free.

I think another one to which we ought to give some leadership is the kind of salary schedules that are negotiated. Today they are tied principally to two things, first, the years of training of the teacher, and second, the years of service of the teacher. One of my old school inspectors told me that he didn't think I had had five years experience, I had only had one years experience five times. I agree with him now that I look back, but at that time I was concerned about it because my salary was tied to five years, not one five times. I think that is an important aspect.

This gives me another good whack at some of the programs. I recently had reason to look into a particular one which most of you probably have never heard of, that is the program for autistic children. These are children who live in a fantasy, they don't relate what's going on around them one bit with life. They get to be 15 or 20 years old and they are not bathroom trained. They pay no attention to you when you call them. But there is a program developed which is doing a remarkably good job with them. You have nine such children with a little association in Edmonton struggling hard. Maybe under this program, if we have so much money that we can send special teachers all over the province searching out the deaf, maybe we can get to do something for these autistics, because it is they who become institutionalized if we don't do something for them.

Now to get back to my special crusade. One of the reasons that we have so little interest in education in the school divisions is because they are too big. You go to a school board meeting and half the time is spent arguing the school on this side of the division against the school on that side, where the children are going to go. Now if you could adopt the rural-urban county idea, if you took a town with its school and the area it serves for library, for health services and everything else and put it under one government, then every elected member of that council or board is concerned with that particular area. He is close to those people. I suggest that that would create a very distinct interest in education.

The other thing which I would like associated with the crusade is complete recognition of private schools. I don't mean by that that they would necessarily have a right to tax. If the province were to say that anybody who wants to run a school, who will hire qualified teachers and follow our base curriculum, can have the full student grant - the grant that is tied to students or, if we were to adopt my full plan, give them an unconditional grant - then you are going to get the only thing that will ever get better education in the province, or at least the factor which will be the biggest, and that's some competition in the school system and some choice for the parents. I don't think you can do it best by a voucher system. I know the real recognition of these, Mr. Chairman, creates some problems. If you suddenly said we will do it, you might have some more vacant rooms. I think you could overcome it by saying to these people, you can start a private school but we do not want to waste facilities. If you like we will make some rooms available to you within the school system, but you run it. The parents will have some choice where they send the children.

I think most of you are quite aware that when it comes to world recognition Alberta is pretty good, but not a bit better than many countries who don't spend one-tenth as much per child as we do and whose school programs lack a lot of what we would call enrichment. But they have other things. They have motivation for these youngsters. I am pretty concerned that if we want to get our dollars worth we have to go back and do some of the things that I have suggested. The minister, I am sure, is as interested as anybody else. I know many people in his department personally, and they are interested. So I make these suggestions honestly believing that they could make some improvement in our system, and at least get some interest on the part of the people.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Just one further question. I wonder if the minister would give consideration at some time when you feel that within your department you want to do a survey in a certain area regarding education, on almost anything - I refer to school board buildings versus school vans or any new programs - would you consider assigning that type of project to a group like, let's say, the Alberta School Trustees' Association which is really set up and quite qualified. Rather than have your own department do it, would you have a group like that accept an assignment like that?

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to express some concern from the rural areas as to equality in education. I appreciate this year that the minister has a sum of money for some of the smaller schools. But certainly when you compare the facilities available in our large urban centres to those many young people in the rural areas have to contend with, I think it bears looking at pretty carefully in budgetting to provide for these services.

There is one thing that was brought to my attention, and this goes back to earlier in the session when we as representatives tried to get information out to different elected bodies. This is from the ASTA Leader of May, 1974, and I would just like to quote it here:

The government's Bill 28, dealing with amendments to the School Act, was proposed and given first and second reading last month, with only four boards in the province aware of the contents.

Information from the office of the minister indicates that copies of the bill were sent to the four metro boards. Other boards in Alberta, who are vitally concerned with the contents of the bill, were unaware that such a bill was proposed, what it contained, and its stage of progress.

The ASTA has obtained a copy of the bill and sent this to all board chairmen.

Now I just bring this to the attention of the minister because I believe he will recall that earlier in the session this is one of the bills that was mimeographed and we were unable to get additional copies at the time. I hope this doesn't happen again.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make two quick comments. I'm not going to elaborate on the points raised by the hon. Member for Cardston in connection with private schools. I do think that parents who are so interested in the education of their children that they not only pay toward the education of the boys and girls in the public school system or the separate school system, but also pay the major portion of the cost of their own private school, do deserve more recognition than they are getting today. I know they have the choice of doing it or not doing it and I believe that if they are reaching the standard of our separate and public schools they should receive a pretty equitable amount of grant, the same as the other schools.

I believe we can all be very proud of the standards we are achieving in our private and separate schools. I don't think anyone can listen to the program Reach For The Top and see the boys and girls from the various high schools in the province without recognizing the tremendous advances education has made in the last few years. These young men and young women are versed in almost every line of culture and education and they're a real credit to the education system as well as to their teachers. I believe that also applies to the private schools and I would like to see the department take another view of contributing larger amounts to the private school system.

The other point I would like to mention - and I do this because I know a number of the teachers personally, having taught with some of them a few years ago - is in connection with the lady teachers who retired after July 1, 1970. This has already been mentioned and I notice there's a bill on the Order Paper, or notice of it. Previously, pensions paid to lady teachers were automatically discounted by 13 per cent on the understanding or on the feature that lady teachers would outlive men. Now, by 1970 they found that wasn't so. The ladies were not outliving the men so the Act was changed and the discount was discontinued in 1970. But there is no provision made to pay the teachers who retired before July 1, 1970 and this is something I think will not involve too much money. There are fewer than 300 in this category, I believe, and I would certainly ask the hon. minister to consider placing them in the same category as the men who taught side by side with these women.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister, if he would, to give us a little bit of history and answer some questions on the innovative projects which are comparatively new, to determine whether special projects and innovative projects are synonymous. Roughly how many kinds of innovative programs are there? Have they been going long enough so that they can be evaluated, and if they have, who evaluates them and determines whether they will be continued or discontinued? Roughly how many school divisions are now implementing some type of innovative project? Who is responsible for implementing an innovative project in a school division? Is it the Department of Education or is it the local school board? Who does the financing for these innovative projects and on what basis? Are they financed entirely by the province or are they shared with the local school board? I

should probably ask the question, under which appropriation do these innovative projects come? I supposed it was 1329, but I'm not sure?

Probably that is enough for now. At the time that is being discussed I might have some other questions to raise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, just four very quick comments. I suppose one might say, a rather rare experience, admitting I think, one made a very serious mistake. I do think that the lady teachers who retired prior to 1970 are in a difficult situation. By saying that, I admit that the former minister made a mistake. I've made more than one but I made one on this particular issue, I might add.

I recognize that I have a private members' bill on the Order Paper but I am not so naive as to think that it may be passed at this session. But I would hope, in light of the comments that have been made here this evening, that the minister would be prepared to reconsider his situation on that.

I'd like to ask the minister also to comment in just two other areas. One is the question of the arrangements that have been worked out between the public school boards and the separate school boards in the two large urban areas, Edmonton and Calgary, over this question of the assessment of industrial or non-residential property as it applies to the supplementary requisitions. If I recall the discussions in the subcommittee I believe the figure of \$11,000,000 was tossed around as the amount which the government may be prepared to put into the pot to equalize this particular situation.

Just one other comment. When we are looking at this question of excess school facilities, especially in the urban areas, has considerable thought been given to the possibility of using those excess schools themselves for civic and municipal government purposes or, in fact, in some occasions selling them outright; recouping the money involved and then perhaps being able to build more modular schools out in the more newly-developed areas?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add a couple of comments concerning the busing of students in the cities. I'm particularly concerned about east Calgary. I think this is a good night for statistics. I'd like to quote some rather simple figures. I hope the hon. minister will go along with what I have to say.

I think that in determining whether students ought to be bused or not I get the impression sometimes that the time of the student is not taken into consideration, at least not to the extent that I would like to see it taken into account. What I mean is, if you bus 10,000 students in the city to other schools, on an average of one hour taken per student to go back and forth and wait, that is 10,000 hours a day. Using round figures of 200 school days that is 2,000,000 student hours taken in busing.

If you take an average five-hour school day for each child - it may be more or less, I'm not just sure, but I think five hours is fairly close - you're looking at a complete year of studies taken up for 2,000 students. When you look at 2,000,000 student hours taken in travelling, that is a very important factor; a lot of time and energy is used up in this particular aspect of getting back and forth to school.

This is not so bad if the students are older. These figures are not all that accurate because many students have to walk anyway, so you could say, well, rather than walk four blocks they might bus four miles. When you take these large figures into account, the big concern is small children. I've yet to meet a parent who just somehow would not like to see a son or daughter in elementary school attend school closer to home. It is a natural instinct. There is always a bit of anxiety about safety, about supervision, about being able to come home if something is not quite right or if the weather is bad. They are concerned about their little son or daughter. This is a natural problem.

The problem of community activity is something which has been hashed over so often that I need not add to it. I think that an effort ought to be made to minimize busing. I know that you can save money, that there are vacant classrooms which are not used. But the city is growing and the population is shifting in such a way that you will never cut it so nicely even with busing that you will be able to use up all the space, although I know you can economize.

I think that in attending meetings - I have one problem in my own constituency now, Balmoral School, where, because further east some areas have not enough classrooms, they are disrupting other areas. This has a tendency to sort of escalate. Because there is a shortage of a couple of schools in east Calgary, then we have to disrupt other areas and you are creating resistance.

It is very hard to talk economics and logic to people with two or three children who have lived in that district all their lives or most of their lives, and they want their children to go to Rosedale or to Balmoral, whatever school you have.

There are other very tragic instances where someone buys a house. Some young couple with three or four children buys a house in a district close to a school for the sole reason of having a local school. They get there and two years later they find out that their son and daughter, or at least two or three of them, have to move, have to be bused.

These are serious concerns and economics notwithstanding, I believe something has to be done to minimize this kind of thing. I have no hesitation in meeting with these people and asking them to resist where possible. Sometimes they win out and sometimes they are overridden. But the concerns of a great number of people have to be listened to and I feel that the minister would be well justified in perhaps providing a little more money for building schools where it is a toss-up, should we go or not. I would like him to lean more favourably towards more construction.

Somehow, schools can be put to other uses. There is never a need in this day and age to have too many classrooms go vacant when we are developing other programs. Something can be done. I do believe that society would support the construction of more schools, even though many classrooms are vacant.

Another concern I have in education is something that has been a problem ever since the system started. I am sure that the hon. minister is more aware of it than I am or anybody else. This is the question of communication of students. The universities always keep complaining. All universities throughout all the countries that we hear about complain that the students come to university with an insufficient background in English, the language they communicate in. They have to learn how to spell, write and speak. This is a serious problem.

I believe that no matter what else we neglect, or sort of play down a bit, the question of expression and communication is foremost. There are many capable students, good intelligent students, who can't succeed because what they know they can't communicate. This starts right at the beginning and goes throughout university. Many graduate and become professionals and still cannot communicate effectively. This is often found even in high offices, even among the judiciary sometimes, that some can and some are not able.

So I think that in the vote under Curriculum some emphasis should be placed by the minister - I believe the hon. member Mr. Hyndman has an inclination to look at things in this manner - and perhaps we could do something which will be of great benefit to all the graduates in Alberta. I don't want to emphasize this problem. It is well known. But universities often complain that you are giving us a bad batch. The students are good, they are capable, but they can't speak. Everybody talks about it, school boards, teachers and politicians, but nobody seems to be able to do anything about it.

I think that a good example can be had from the common grammar school in Britain. One can look at these schools as the hon. Member for Cardston stated. They don't teach everything in these schools, but they certainly teach how to communicate, how to speak. You can tell.

I used to marvel at high school students in Britain, how they spoke much more effectively than many professional people from Canada or the U.S. This is a serious problem and I think that the leadership in attempting to solve this problem ought to come right from the top. It's perhaps a matter of opinion but very few people, very few professional people, are really capable of expressing themselves ably, I mean in such a manner that they make good teachers. All of us have had the experience of a teacher who is not able to communicate properly. The students at best could not be much better than the teacher unless they do some extra training or get some extra help from home. I am making this plea to the hon. minister to lay some emphasis, and I believe that a word from the top would be a good indicator as to which way this particular issue ought to go.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I believe a number of members opposite posed quite a number of intriguing and mostly helpful questions. Others were intriguing but not so helpful. However, I would like to try to answer briefly and respond to some of the items raised.

First, with regard to the proposal relating to the document which I passed around, there certainly has been consultation with ASTA. I have met with various members of their executive committee on three occasions. Members of my department have done so, and we intend to develop this plan in conjunction with them over the course of the next four or five months since they are the people who are being elected.

Secondly, the question of teachers who retired before 1970 was raised by a number of hon. members. I think it was gracious of the hon. Leader of the Opposition to admit that that was perhaps an error which he made. I make errors myself. However, the point is not whether an error was made, the point is the equity of the situation with regard to these ladies. The question was asked as to whether there was a precedent. It appears that there was a precedent in Manitoba. We are following that up in more detail now, and before too long I hope we can arrive at a solution which will be satisfactory to the group, but which will not prejudice existing and other pension plans in respect of the actuarial realities.

On the small-school grant, I would agree that it is a start. It's meant to be simply a start. I could see a possibility that it would increase in future years as we gain experience as to whether it is doing the job in assisting the rural school divisions which need it most. Certainly the question of declining enrolment is perhaps an input which we would have to increase in that grant as the months go by.

On the question of building regulations, it was asked as to whether there are any special allowances with regard to new and fast-growing areas. Those have been allowed and are present in the new regulations which have been available for the past few months. For example, if an area can show growth of, say, 10 per cent - and there are very few areas in the province which have that growth rate, some of them are up to 20 - then it has an extra measure of relief and can apply for and secure approval for a school much more quickly and more easily than a normal school division. Quite properly the suggestion was made that we should allow for that, and we have done so.

[Regarding] the question of the number of spaces available, the figure of 100,000 spaces in my recollection refers, in effect, to desk spaces available. If we wanted to educate [students] with some degree of administrative organization we could educate in this province in the schools existing today 520,000 students. We have 420,000 students, and that's dropping to 391,000 students in 1978. This is why we find members of the public saying, well, if it's dropping by 30,000, why are you building any schools at all? Admittedly one can't go to that extreme. So that's why the situation in school buildings - a judicious balance we are trying to maintain is being carried forward.

On the subject of school trustees and the question as to whether they are or should be masters of their own destinies, I think if members opposite and trustees read The School Act as it now exists they will find that there are many powers there which, really, they haven't used as yet.

I think the record shows that since 1971 we have been moving gradually towards a reduction of the restrictions in terms of supplementary requisition that trustees have had. One fact must remain though and must be remembered, and that is to ask ourselves the question, who is accountable and who is considered accountable by the people of this province in major matters concerning education? There is a feeling among a million or more Albertans that when something goes wrong, occasionally when something goes right but particularly when something goes wrong, it is the Minister of Education primarily and with great frequency to whom people come. So I think the question of accountability is one which we have to remember.

In that connection, though, of trustee independence, there is one suggestion I would like to see trustees take up. That relates to the question of separate tax notices. It seems to me that the body which is going to spend public tax moneys should be raising public tax moneys and should be personally, or should have delivered to the people who paid the taxes in a direct way the notice that says that such and such a group is raising taxes for a certain purpose.

At the moment that is done usually through the municipal body. In my view, trustees would be wise to consider issuing separate tax notices - and I think they could still use the administrative procedure of the municipal authority - so that there is a very direct link between the body that spends the taxpayers' money and the body that raises it.

On the question of competition within the public and Catholic systems, this is allied in a way to the suggestions made on private schools. I think that what we have seen in the last few months is really the development of alternatives and choices within the public and Catholic systems. I think traditionally these were thought to have been fairly rigid. We have now in Edmonton two schools that are alternative schools which are following a program very different than any we have known before, emphasizing academic excellence and discipline. This is being carried on now in Calgary; the program was recently announced. As minister I would like to encourage this all over the province, these kinds of alternatives within the existing systems.

Mention was made about private schools. Perhaps I should just outline the fact that we are certainly not forgetting them. The increases for elementary students in terms of funding were \$172, up 20 per cent for elementary students, 32 per cent for junior high students and 93 per cent for high school students. It's still not equal, but it certainly does provide a degree of relief.

On the question of autistic children. I think the suggestion by the Member for Cardston of being sensitive to the very special problem that is undergone by the parents of these children is one which we have been looking at and will continue to keep as a priority in respect of children who have handicaps.

The other suggestion made by the hon. member related to the size of school divisions. It was suggested that smaller ones would be more useful. My recollection of educational history in this province is that it was Mr. William Aberhart who in 1936 found the province with over 500 school divisions and decided they should be telescoped down to what now, I think, 145 and about 45 that we call dummy school districts. It's hard to decide or exercise a judgment as to what the right size is, but certainly we wouldn't see making any moves towards consolidating them or making them any bigger. There have been moves by the boards in the area of Drumheller to perhaps consolidate on a certain basis and a gradual agreed upon consolidation, if there is to be one, is what we would look for.

The Member for Wainwright raised the question of the extent to which rural and urban students are receiving equal treatment. I think, perhaps, the best indicator which comes to mind is the fact that very recently an Alberta rural public school won the national Canadian award on the Reach For The Top program, as mentioned by the Member for Drumheller. It is, I am sure, coincidental that that was a school from Barrhead, but I think that does indicate - it's hard to judge - that the quality of program delivery which we are aiming for is the same for urban and rural. There is certainly a way to go. We have certain programs that are specifically for rural areas. For example, the learning disability program is very largely in that area, but there's more to do there.

I would have to take issue though with the hon. Member for Wainwright in his suggestion that there is perhaps some obligation on the Minister of Education to send out to every school jurisdiction in the province a copy of The School Act. I think it is one of the responsibilities of the Alberta School Trustees' Association to get and to follow up any legislation or regulations and then pass those out to the various member school boards around the province. I know the ASTA wants to grow and become more of a feature and have more of an impact on education life in Alberta. I think they have been doing this increasingly over the past two or three years. So it does seem to me that that is essentially their obligation and I am happy to have them do that in future.

The hon. Member for Highwood raised a number of questions about innovative projects and I realize there is one in his area which has drawn some comment. These projects were started essentially under my predecessor. A number of them are ongoing. As to the number that have been implemented, I am not sure - I think somewhere in the range of 50 or upwards. But they are initiated by a request from the local school board. They are not imposed by the department. The parameters of a study and its purpose are requested by the local school board just as has occurred in the Foothills School Division in the honourable gentleman's riding. So the local school board implements [them] after having asked for and received approval for the program.

The funding is shared. In respect to the one in the High River riding, about 60 per cent is paid by the government, approximately \$45,000 I believe, and the balance in a direct and indirect way by the local school board. They are evaluated by the department and by the local board. My understanding is that the program in the Foothills School Division will be ending in the spring of 1975 and there will be an evaluation then, the final one of the ... [Inaudible] ... year program. Certainly I am sure that is something which should be shared with the hon. member.

The hon. Opposition leader raised a question concerning the government's approach on public [and] separate school board assessments. This is a situation we are looking at on a phased-in basis. What will essentially happen is that the corporate portion of the supplementary requisition, the revenue there, will move towards equalization by essentially administrative changes and the injections of provincial dollars. We don't know exactly how much that will be, because we don't have any information as yet from various divisions on assessment. But it could be in the range of \$11 million, if one is going to move into that in 1975. This would in effect extend the principles of equity and fairness that have been developed and have been increasing in the School Foundation Program over the past two decades.

The hon. member also suggested the use of excess school facilities. I am just completing a document to send to school boards suggesting alternative uses of school buildings, which I might be able to table tomorrow. We've been moving in this direction. For example, hon. members know that the Agricultural Development Corporation in Camrose is housed in a school. A number of other recreational facilities, the J. Percy Page Centre in St. Albert, were a school. This is one of the areas where we're trying to make it clear to all jurisdictions that these schools are available, can be used and are in the community.

On the question of busing, concern was expressed particularly for small children. That is our priority. We try, with regard to the children from an age of four and a half - early childhood programs to grade 4 - to insure they will have a neighbourhood

school, preferably within walking distance. With the core concept, the portable school concept, this is possible. We are not likely to approve permanent older design schools, for example, in the higher grades unless the school board has demonstrated it has looked at busing as an alternative. But for those lower grades, the hon. member is right in suggesting they should have priority in having a school in their nearby community.

We haven't been suggesting that boards should simply move from school construction to busing en masse. We simply said that those two alternatives, plus six or seven others like redrawing of attendance boundaries, should all be looked at with a view to judicious balance, in terms of the use of these facilities, because tax payers are wondering why there is still a need to build new schools with this 30,000 drop we are going to experience over the next four years. I think it is settling down with the new flexible programs of core schools and portable schools, and that with the experience which is now being gained the programs will now settle down. But they will bear watching over the next few months.

The other point raised was one about communications, the question of being able to read, learn and inwardly digest the English language. That is an area where we detected a soft spot in 1972. It is for that reason that the \$12 million program to upgrade the basics of reading, writing and arithmetic in the first six grades was started by the government as an initiative last year. It may be some time before the results are known but I think it is an area that we are sensitive to and we will continue to work on.

As to the priority of that in the school system, one of the problems is that society, over the past 20 years, has really dumped so much on the school systems and required them to do so much more than the basic concept of education 20 years ago, that they are having a very great difficulty in trying to do all the jobs at once. In my view, some of those jobs should be returned to the parents. The question of parent education is one which we will be moving into in Early Childhood over the course of the next few years.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The resolution as moved by the chairman of Subcommittee D, Mr. Ashton:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$311,789,500 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Department of Education.

[The motion was carried.]

Department of Health and Social Development

MR. LEE:

Mr. Chairman, Subcommittee A has had under consideration Vote 25, the Estimates of Expenditure for the Department of Health and Social Development, and begs to report the same. I therefore submit the following resolution:

Be it resolved that a sum not exceeding \$227,961,790, chargeable to income account, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Department of Health and Social Development.

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Chairman, if I could start the minister's department off on a soft tone and make a few comments on Cow Camp.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. MANDEVILLE:

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that we are on estimates and to my disappointment there is no vote for Cow Camp in the estimates. However, I think that I could ask the minister to take the appropriation out of the minister's appropriation. I am sure we are not going to ask for that much that he will refuse it. About all we need, I think, is an eight-cent stamp to get the project rolling down there. I would just like, Mr. Chairman, to see if I can get some support to describe the Cow Camp to the committee.

First of all it is - I don't know what you could call the camp. You can't really call it a school. It is a vocational centre. It is a training centre. But it really is a centre to rehabilitate kids who are in trouble. I have talked to many of the students in the camp. I have read letters that have come to several of the ministers on the front bench here, to the ministers and to the immigration department from the parents of these students who speak very highly of it. Every student I have talked to is very interested, very concerned and has accepted the program very well.

Since the hon. minister visited the camp - I think that when he was down there they indicated that a Canadian student would be coming in the next day or the same day. That student is in the school at the present time and he was brought from a mental hospital. He didn't come directly from the mental hospital, but he was in the mental hospital. He is 13 years of age and they now have him down there in the training centre. They also have another Canadian student, 15 years of age, in the training centre. The instructor is charging them nothing. It is free. He feels that it costs around \$4,500 per student and that is what he is charging the American students who are there now.

At the present time there are 14 enrolled in the program and, as I said, the two Canadians. There are three staff members. But [the instructor] is set up to handle 25 students, and he is prepared to take in Canadian students if he can get some approval on this.

The program is hard to describe. He has a curriculum to a certain extent, our school curriculum, but he also has training in many other areas in the form of how to survive on your own, and how to do different types of work and so on.

The reason he has picked this Cow Camp, and, as I say, he's from Maine and they do have a school like this in Maine, is because it's an 80,000-acre ranch. They've got this old Cow Camp out there and it's isolated. It's out there in isolation. You can take a student out there and it's pretty hard for him to get out of the school. They pretty well have to stay right with the school and with the instructor. Also, the owner of the V-Bar-V Ranch was a good friend of the instructor there, Jeff Smith, and that is another reason why he got started here in Canada.

The instructor did tell me that he taught in a prison. When he taught in the prison he saw a need for getting our young people out of the hardened criminal institutes and getting them into some place where they could be rehabilitated. That is the reason he has got into this.

As I say, he's got a school in Maine and now he's trying to start one here. He's not really running into this real stiff competition but he's trying to get over the hurdle. It is not the immigration officers he's trying to get by. The immigration officers have told him that if he'll get permission from the provincial government they will try to work out an exchange student program or something to let them stay in Canada at the present time.

I listened with keen interest to the [discussion of the] money we're spending on drug centres and on our drug commission. I think it would be wise to send the chairman of our drug commission down there to have a look at the school because these students - I've talked to them - have been on drugs. They have broken right away from drugs. Being in an isolated area, there's no way of [their] getting access to the drugs. I think it would be worth while to have the chairman of our commission or some of the commission members have a look at the school. I think it is a down-to-earth program and I do think that we're treating it too lightly.

The people in my area support it. I've talked to the town council, I've talked to the county council, and I get support for the program from them. I also get support from many of my constituents, many of the people who are in or near the area. I think we could maybe start it as a pilot project, as I said, for exchange students. I certainly don't think that we have this much to lose.

In conclusion, I would just like the minister to end his estimates. I understand it's the last estimate. [I wonder] if he'll end his estimates on a soft tone and possibly give this Cow Camp a letter of approval to operate. I would like to ask the minister if he would be prepared to give them a letter to approve their program in principle, providing that they take more Canadian students into the program.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make just a few remarks for the minister in this department.

I refer in particular, Mr. Minister, to the area which I discussed with you privately, the information that goes to the birth control information centres within this province. I recognize, and the minister has pointed out, that these are what you might consider local centres, but nevertheless they are financed 80 per cent by the provincial government. While the approval for the program comes locally, nevertheless, [because of] the fact that the government or the Province of Alberta finances these centres up to 80 per cent, I think there's no way it can say that it doesn't have a certain responsibility there.

What I really want to do, Mr. Chairman, is endorse the suggestion the minister made to me privately, that possibly the information that goes to these birth control information centres should be evaluated. Possibly the minister, within his own department, could set up and accumulate information that would be suitable.

I think this would be a worth-while project. I think you could get people like doctors, maybe some clergymen, people who are prepared to instruct people and not forget that there are values when it comes to this. It isn't just a matter of telling how these young people can engage in premarital sex and not get someone pregnant, and if they do, what they are going to do about it. The information and the booklets that they are circulating in these centres - I showed the minister some, I have some that he hasn't seen - are close to pornography. They are pretty raw and crude. I think there must be much better, more suitable periodicals that could be used to instruct these people than what is now being used.

I think we must remember that not only are they teaching them there [but] they indicate that it's okay to have premarital sex as long as you don't get caught at it or as long as you don't get someone pregnant. Let's recognize that there are many more very serious consequences to this type of life and this type of behaviour than just those mentioned. After all, the psychological consequences and many others are pretty serious and have to be dealt with as well.

I think it should be pointed out to those people that human beings - after all we are humans, have bodies and souls that are sacred. Certainly they shouldn't be used solely to satisfy their animal instincts. I think this is where I have a real quarrel with those places. They absolutely have no values whatsoever and no morals.

I would hope then that we would ...

[Interjections]

Oh, thanks. Good idea. You should be listening because you might learn something.

I think these types of things would contribute greatly to these types of social services, Mr. Minister.

There is another thing I'd like to point out very briefly. I know the minister is not with me on this one at all, but my position has never changed to any great extent on the concept of day care centres.

I believe that day care has a place in the province of Alberta. I recognize that we have a lot of single parent families where there is a need for uncared for children to go while the father or the mother, whichever the case may be, goes out to make a living. But as the Minister of Education pointed out just a few moments ago, parents have a certain responsibility too. Now I'm not so much worried about the type I just explained but we have a lot of people who are demanding day care service, where the father and mother both work, not of necessity. I know that necessity is a value judgment; it's a matter of degree, whether you get the second car, the second colour TV or what you get. I think that some personal sacrifices have to be made in favour of the children. I believe firmly that if we're going to go into day care, then it should be a private enterprise operation. Those people who desperately need it, I believe should get assistance to pay for day care out of social assistance. I still think this is the way in which it should be handled.

I'm very much opposed to the government becoming involved in day care centres just for the convenience of people. I think there is a necessity, as I mentioned earlier, but even that should be done through the private enterprise area. I believe this is a better way for it. I think those mothers or fathers who need the use of them should, of course, be subsidized through social assistance.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, in rising to participate in the debate in the Department of Health and Development and the commissions and so on, I'd just like to say ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Wilson, not the commissions, just the Department of Health and Social Development.

MR. WILSON:

During the estimates in subcommittee, we found that the hon. minister was very cooperative and helpful and tried his best to provide us with the information in the best form.

One of the things we find going on, perhaps not to the minister's liking, certainly contrary to the minister's stated position, and desire, and in that regard, to the government's position as well, is the contradictions that occur with regard to the government's and the minister's stated position of being very much in favour of encouraging private sector involvement in the delivery of stated social goals. We find that the minister is being frustrated by some within his employ. Whether he would care to mention it or not is certainly up to him, but the evidence is there.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would have to ask for your ruling, because some of the evidence I want to submit deals with one of the commissions. Some of it is general. Now, would you like me to take it all now, wait for the commissions or what?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

In fairness, Mr. Wilson, I think we should try to keep our presentation and discussion on Health and Social Development. The commissions are the next estimates to come up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Carry on with your presentation or any submission you have, but make it pertain to the Department of Health and Social Development.

MR. WILSON:

All right, Mr. Chairman, if it is the wish of the House and the minister in particular ...

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. To talk about the principles within the Department of Health and Social Development in the Health Commission, I think we could move things a little faster by doing it all at once. If you could move the other motion with regards to the Health Commission, particularly the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, we could deal with that all at the same time, clear it up and have it over with.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Would the members of the committee wish that both resolutions be dealt with at the same time? I can call the chairman of Subcommittee A to move the next resolution.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Chairman, Subcommittee A has had under consideration Vote 24, the Estimates of Expenditure for the Health Commissions and begs to report the same. I therefore submit the following resolution:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$348,769,497 chargeable to the Income Account, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Health Commissions.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Wilson, please continue.

MR. WILSON:

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The example that I would like to refer to is the Calgary Drug Information Centre, Mr. Chairman. I think it was about March 8, 1973, that they made their first communication to the commission regarding renewal of their budget. Just keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, where the stated policy of the minister and the government is being frustrated by the bureaucracy. We see that on March 21 a memorandum from Dr. Nutter to Mr. Anthony signed "Butch" says in part, "On their proposal, the D.I.C. plans to be virtually all things to all people".

A little further on Dr. Nutter says something to the effect that he wonders what the commission people are doing in Calgary if they haven't been performing the functions that were indicated by the Calgary Drug Information Centre. He says then, and I quote, "It seems to me that most of the services which the D.I.C. is offering to perform should be performed by the Commission." So there is a clear indication at that early stage that one high up in the commission organization is desirous of taking over the role served by the private sector. That was on March 21. Then on March 30 we see that the same private sector organization receives a letter from the minister. This is a very short letter and I think a very good letter wherein the minister says:

I was pleased to receive a copy of your budget submission to the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission. I thought you had spent considerable time arriving at such a clear, concise presentation. The Centre plays a vital role in the Calgary community and I'm sure that the Commission will take this into consideration.

That's signed by the Hon. Neil Crawford. I think that it's a good letter. It's constructive, it's encouraging to the private sector that is trying to deliver social goals, and I see that this sort of thing backs up what the minister has said is their policy. But we still find the bureaucracy frustrating the situation behind the minister's back, because on July 5, 1973, we see that the Chairman of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission writes to the same organization and says in part:

... I am not impressed by the methods by which you and your group have handled the situation regarding your particular grant-in-aid request, and if you do not realize it now, the Commission is an autonomous agency of the Government, and if the Commission decided not to fund the Drug Information Centre, it is doubtful whether the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development would be in any position to alter that position. Therefore, the letter you sent to the Honourable Minister on the 25th of May has done little to enhance your image in the view of the writer.

That is signed by the chairman of the commission.

Here we see the chairman stating that the commission is an autonomous agency. He is being critical of the private sector organization which uses a lot of volunteers doing a tremendous job in the community, and then they get chewed out by the chairman of the commission in writing them. The chairman of the commission says that the commission is an autonomous agency. Yet the terms of reference for the chairman of the commission, as tabled in the Legislature by the minister, defines the situation thus, and I quote:

This is a Senior Executive position implementing the governments' policies and advising the Government regarding the needs of the public concerning alcoholism and drug abuse in the Province of Alberta.

Well, it doesn't sound like an autonomous agency in that light.

So then on November 28, this poor, frustrated, private sector organization, that has been doing a good job and is just trying to get their budget approved, gets a letter from the chairman again stating in part:

... no money has been allocated to the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission for purposes of making grants to Community agencies for the fiscal year 1974-75.

Yet when we go to the budget we are considering tonight, we see that on page 136, Vote 2452, there are grants there in the round figure of \$201,000. Yet in November they were told there are no grants.

Then, in subcommittee we find, Mr. Chairman, that what really happened ...

[Interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Wilson, excuse me, may we have a little more order in the committee, please?

MR. WILSON:

... the minister says to the commission, in something like these terms, okay, the commission is going to have a budget next year of \$3.7 million. Then we envision the bureaucrats in the commission, the empire builders and people who want to do everything with paid employees, rather than using private sector volunteers, cutting up the \$3.7 million pie, and once they all get the piece of the action they want, they total it all up and what's left - \$8,000.

Now that's what is left to carry out the stated goals of the minister, the stated goals of the government to carry out the encouragement of private sector involvement in delivering social goals. All that's left out of \$3.7 million after the bureaucrats get done is \$8,000. It would be reasonable to expect that the private sector portion of the budget would have been one of the first things the commission would have considered, but it didn't turn out that way.

In subcommittee we started asking questions about this and the chairman of the commission said, well, we've got a "B" budget. What's the "B" budget? Well, that's something which I guess is pulled out of the air, it isn't produced in writing yet, but there is roughly \$400,000 that is intended to be spent by order in council. Because it isn't in the budget we don't have an opportunity to examine it and presumably some of that funding would go to private sector involvement in delivering social goals. It seems to me, at least, Mr. Chairman, that the minister has got a real tiger that he is going to have to cage, because the commission is not going exactly the way many of us are led to believe, and not going the way the minister has stated that he would like to have things go.

Mr. Chairman, I think that we should just review the original terms of reference of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, which were along the lines that it was initially designed to utilize community services, that is, utilize existing medical facilities, to use existing research facilities, voluntary groups and organizations, concerned individuals and, generally, all financial resources and materials that existed in the community. Instead, the commission, under the present chairman, has completely ignored the concept and is determined, it seems, to set up its own bureaucratic structure over which it would have 100 per cent control.

It doesn't appear, Mr. Chairman, that the commission has a policy as to its objectives or goals on a broad scale, and the method of achieving these goals. It seems that the commission merely reacts to problems as they arise. I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, that there is no input to community and volunteer involvement. There doesn't seem to be any policy paper on this subject. It seems the commission has dismantled most community involvement programs and replaced them with paid staff. It seems that this anti-people philosophy is certainly contrary to the minister's stated objective regarding community input and volunteer input.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister has a problem area here that he's well aware of. In the event that he would like a constructive suggestion, perhaps the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission and the Department of Health and Social Development [should] set up a meeting encompassing all community leaders and organizations - including service clubs, social services, minority groups, medical professionals in the field of rehabilitation and others - with the purpose or objective of establishing an objective goal in which the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission would act as a catalyst in involving the community in meaningful awareness and programs of lay involvement, so that people might not only have a broader understanding, but might become involved in the rehabilitation of excessive users of drugs and alcohol.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few general remarks with regard to the estimates that we covered some time ago.

The minister indicated in his summary in the committee that he was continuing the programs that we started during our time and [had] continued some of the objectives. I would certainly like to see the minister review some of those objectives at the present time, particularly with regard to the one that was raised by my honourable colleague.

I think we have indicated our concern with regard to the commission's relationship between its activities, its programs, and the programs that could be handled by the private sector or by semi or non-profit groups. We considered the actions in the committee, considered the questions and the answers that we received, and our conclusion, I think, was that maybe we should ask someone to resign. We thought first of all, well maybe it should be the minister. Secondly, we thought maybe it should be the employee or the chairman of the commission. Our final conclusion though is that if we leave the employee in the position, we will take care of both of them. I think that is the position we are in at the present time. I think the minister can certainly assess that on its merits.

There are some other goals I certainly would like to see the minister pursue with a little more haste and action. Certainly the coordination of health and social development services at the local level needs his attention, and certainly some activity. I don't feel the whole case for citizen participation was clarified, nor was the real feeling that the general population should be involved in the programs. The minister could certainly exert more effort in that area.

The program of decentralization: I felt in examining the programs and the trends we are on, that certainly in the department at the present time there is a feeling of wanting to bring the control, the planning or the decision-making into the central level. Then, through the bureaucratic process or through the civil service, put it back at the community level.

One of the questions I asked during committee studies was with regard to the regional offices for the social development services. I felt we should give more autonomy or more responsibility for those services at the local level, and that we should have discussions with local government and local municipalities to take over such responsibilities and bring in that local level of government. Take a chance. Give them funds and take a chance they spend them responsibly and take care of the needs of the people.

I think at this point in the growth of government and the maturity in the whole area of public assistance, we have built a consistency in policy across the province as a whole. At this point in time I think we should be able to return these responsibilities to the local level.

A number of years ago, when public assistance was taken from the local level to the provincial level, there was a fantastic and unbelievable inconsistency from one municipality or county to another. That was one of the reasons it moved in a centralized direction. I think at this point in time we have reached the stage where we can move back again.

The other comment I have is with regard to an item that was raised in the 1971 election; an incentive program for public assistance recipients which would make them independent and self-supporting. That was kicked around in both and most likely by all the parties in the election at that time. What concerned me very much about this is that an incentive program hasn't been brought forward by the government.

But I became even more concerned when on March 5, in a half hour interview on television with the Premier and I think it was two or three newsmen, the Premier said very clearly to the people of Alberta, my Minister of Health and Social Development has a policy paper and a program ready to be placed before cabinet so we can make a decision on an incentive program for the social development people in the province of Alberta. He very clearly said, we haven't been able to bring it before the cabinet table because we've had to spend so much time working on the resource program, our oil resources, our crude oil program in Alberta and our negotiations with the federal government.

Well, in the committee I asked the minister very pointedly if he had finalized and prepared his incentive program to be presented to Executive Council. The answer was in two parts. One, we have some working papers - whatever working papers are - but it was very clearly said - and I have placed the quotes here in my estimates book that the minister said, no, not yet.

I think it is very alarming that the Premier and the minister did not communicate on the matter. Whether it was just a lack of time to talk to each other or whether it was for some other reason, what has occurred, in the minds of the people of Alberta, is a deception. The Premier says we're looking after it, we're looking after all of these social needs. But at the same time we look into the background and find the program is not there.

I don't think that's fair to the people of Alberta. Certainly I think the minister at this time should account for that and place his reasons before the Assembly so we can establish that. It is unfair for the Premier to make a statement for which he hasn't conclusive evidence. When he made it he was very confident that it was right. In the study of estimates the minister said very confidently, no, not yet have I got a program to present to cabinet. There is an unbelievable inconsistency there. I think that should be a lesson for some of the other ministers.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that these are some of the things that the minister should come to grips with. Certainly in 1974, and when we study the estimates again in 1975, real clear progress should be indicated rather than just some general comments, yes it is moving ahead, yes we are doing something, and we should see that this new expenditure of money for social services in the province of Alberta is certainly of benefit and certainly producing a good return.

MR. GHITIER:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks, a very few, relating to the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission. I don't intend to vote on this particular appropriation. I don't intend to vote against it. I think that the work that has to be done in that area is very important, but I don't intend to vote in favour either. There are certain areas and directions from the point of view of the movement of this commission that concern me very drastically.

I would hope between now and the next time we come to deal with this department, we shall have the opportunity of seeing some very needed changes with respect to this commission. I say that knowing that the members who are on the commission are highly dedicated and honourable people trying to do the best job they can within the very limited legislation which is available to them.

I really want to deal in terms of some specific recommendations in a very positive way this evening for the minister to take under consideration in the hopes that this very important agency and commission will have an opportunity to thrive and do the job and deliver a very vital health service to the tremendously needy people out there in Alberta who need help in this particular area.

The first recommendation I would submit for the hon. minister to consider, Mr. Chairman, is that the legislation that created the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission is too limited. It requires, for example, in the event that the commission wishes to make outward grants, that they must come to the minister or the cabinet for approval. It is really a rubber stamp agency. It is not allowed by the nature of its legislation to be innovative, policy making, but merely it is an ex post facto type of commission in the manner in which it is operated. It is not innovative in any manner whatsoever.

In fact I think in this particular area there is a great discrepancy between the attitude of the minister as stated at the subcommittee hearings when, in response to whether his attitude was that the commission would be innovative and policy-making, the minister stated most affirmatively that that was his view. But when the chairman of the commission was asked the very same question he stated, and I quote from his statements when he referred to the members of his commission, "they are not ones who can design or generate programs. They are not ones who can create innovative programs". In other words, the attitude of the very chairman and director of the particular commission is one merely, with respect to that commission, that it cannot by its very nature be innovative. It cannot by its very nature be a policy-making organization, but is merely a rubber stamp organization.

I think that is very unfortunate. I think it is really contrary to the attitude of the minister from the point of view of how he feels and, for that matter, [of how] I feel this commission should operate. I think that the legislation should be changed. I do not believe that the chairman of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission should be the same person who is the director of the administrative side and of the operation of the programs themselves. Surely, when the person who is in charge of the administrative end brings that to the commission and then changes his hat and becomes the chairman of that commission, it strikes deeply from the point of view as to the operation of the commission. I don't believe the same person can wear both hats. I think for a beneficial operation of a commission of that nature, you must have a chairman of the commission, and under the commission you must have the people who take the directions from the commission. You must have the administrative wing through your department, Mr. Minister, and that administrative wing will take instructions from the commission.

I think the job of the commission is just too important to have that difference where the administrative end becomes confused with the policy-making end, resulting in unfortunate situations like we have seen in this last year with narcotic control agents working in "detox" centres, where we have seen guinea pig experiments, where we've seen the situation of the Calgary Drug Information Centre, all of which really, if you analyse them, were decisions made at a lower level which at a later stage were brought before the commission for decision after they had occurred.

I think it's topsy-turvy. I think it should be the other way around. I think the legislation should be changed. We must look in terms of legislation saying this is just as important a commission as the Human Rights Commission. The Human Rights Commission was set up on a basis whereby the Human Rights Commission sets the policy and the department takes the policy and implements it. Right now that isn't the way we are operating.

May I also suggest, from the point of view, hopefully in a positive vein - and this deals in the same vein as the hon. Member for Calgary Bow was discussing - that for governments to think, through their bureaucratic approaches, that they can deliver a health service in the alcohol field is foolhardy.

As one would read for example the statements that came forward from the B.C. Alcohol and Drug Commission in their report, they state in most categorical terms, and I'm quoting from their report:

There are no miracles in the drug abuse field, and our Commission doesn't expect any. Dependency problems can only be handled where they originate -- in the home, in the heart. We will be useful when people begin to take responsibility for their own actions, and not before.

In this context, the impulse to "let the government do it" is completely foolish. Government can do nothing effective unless whole communities take initiative, and private people want help.

In other words, may I suggest in a positive vein, Mr. Minister, through the Chairman, that what this commission should really be doing is going into the communities where there are all kinds of expertise willing to work in these very important fields. Encourage them, assist them, provide them with the research, redirect them and, through the community, come forth with these programs where they really count. I just don't believe that you can set up government agencies all over the province of Alberta in this particular field and then let the government do it by conveying the program to the people who are in need.

I think one could well argue that the success of Alcoholics Anonymous is that they work from the base up and they are dealing with their peer group. Through that peer group they have achieved great success with certain elements in our society who have had this problem.

I think that is the proven way to move along from the point of view of the delivery of this particular and very critical health service, and I would hopefully recommend for the consideration of the hon. minister and the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission that instead of a pittance \$8,000 which is going in direct grants out of a budget of \$3,600,000, the approach of the B.C. government and their commission, where two-thirds of their budget, over a million dollars - pardon me, I think it's over \$2 million - is in direct grants to communities. They have learned from experience through their chairman, Mr. Stein, who is highly respected in this field, that the way to do it is by getting out into the community and letting the communities do it with all the backup, assistance and research that is required.

This is the B.C. approach. This is the approach that is seen elsewhere in Canada, and I note with pleasure that Mr. Donald Bruce, who was with the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission and who has worked in various other capacities in the province, has now just accepted the position of the chairman of the Northwest Territories drug and alcohol abuse commission. I know that his approach is identical to Mr. Stein's and you will also see that approach in the delivery of the service.

I think this is vital to this programming and I would hope that the commission would very seriously take this approach under its wing in the hopes that next year, when we come into subcommittee and look at the budget, we will see a considerable degree of community involvement and grants to communities with the backup research from the commission.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that these brief comments will be taken in a positive and constructive way, with the attitude that the work of this commission is so very important to this province and in the hope that they will be able to convey to the public at large a much higher degree of credibility than has been the case in the past years, so that next year it will not be an issue in the House but we'll all be able to stand proudly for it and say that some real progress has been made in a most difficult and a most complex field, one that we just can't shut our eyes to and [toward which we] think we solve the answers by just merely increasing the budget each year.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, first of all I do want to thank all hon. members, in particular of Subcommittee A, for having afforded me so many opportunities to expound on the various programs and policies of the department, during the subcommittee hearings, and again today. There is no question that I've had every opportunity on many, many occasions to explain myself fully. Of course, the fact that that has not met the entire satisfaction of some of the honourable gentlemen opposite is to be expected and is entirely fair.

I want to deal, if I can, with the remarks in the order in which they were tendered, and then maybe make a few generalized remarks. I don't want to underestimate the importance to any individual or any hon. member of any of the issues that have been raised either in the subcommittee or here this evening.

I think the hon. Member for Bow Valley knows that up to the present time, despite all the activity in the area of the Cow Camp directed at asking the Department of Health and Social Development to take a particular step in a particular way and grant a particular sort of recognition, actually, no real request for anything specific has ever been made. It is interesting to note the degree to which some of these subjects can gain attention when that is so, but those are the facts.

The hon. member was fair enough to say that the only grant being asked for by the people at the Cow Camp was an eight-cent stamp. In other words, he wants me to simply be in touch with them, and that's all there is to it. Well, all they are asking for of course is a special, unique kind of seal of approval so that they can use that in the necessary discussions with the Government of Canada. I have consistently declined to do that.

I would have to say to the hon. member that, from the point of view of the treatment philosophy that's expounded there, put forward by Mr. Smith and those with him, I recognize it for what it is - it is a contemporary attempt to deal in one of the accepted ways with extremely complex issues involving disturbed adolescents. It is, indeed, one of the accepted ways. That has never been the issue.

If the issue was whether or not we want adequate facilities for our young people in Alberta, the answer would be a resounding, yes, of course we do. If the question was, is there anything more that we can do, the answer would be, of course there's more that we can do. But if the question was whether or not this particular individual from the State of Maine should - and I don't make a big issue out of the fact that these people are not Canadians - all I'm saying is this: return to the point. The point is, what do we need for young adolescents who are in trouble in Alberta today?

What facilities do we have? We have many. They are spread from border to border. Many are excellent. The people who serve in them are experienced, competent, all of them doing the best they can. I would say none, but some of the agencies might say that we could spend more money in some areas, but all of them are being funded adequately each year.

So those aren't the issues. The willingness to help the children is not the issue. The only issue is whether or not this particular gentleman and the small group of people that he has brought with him or had sent up from south of the line should receive my approval to do what they are doing. That's all.

I have taken the attitude, and the hon. member will remember this in a conversation that he and I had, that most people who come to Alberta don't ask me whether they can be here or not. Why should these people ask me whether they can be here or not? The very simple answer to the thing is that they have had certain difficulties with the federal immigration department, and a little bit of political pressure, a little bit of time on television, a few little angles like that should be a satisfactory way to get the good old Minister of Health and Social Development to write a letter and say they are a good bunch of fellows.

I haven't done that yet. The record of the program is that, as of the only statistical period I am aware of, there were nine people involved in the program and four of them had failed in one way or another. Again, I am not criticizing that statistic. All I am saying is that there were five left and if they succeeded in all of them that would be a good record. The chances of succeeding with all of them I don't know.

Three of them were subject to police investigation in Canada shortly after their arrival and were immediately dispatched back to the United States. One other, in an accident on the premises, gravely injured himself, is no longer in the program, is in the Foothills Hospital crippled and, I believe, in due course is to be returned to his home for medical treatment there.

With five remaining the program could carry on, and so it did. But to say that what has been demonstrated by that is such an outstanding piece of work that I should give my personal endorsement to it, is something that I am not yet persuaded of.

In concluding that one I just wanted to say that I still have no quarrel with the fact that what is being attempted is valid. Success may yet come, but my view has been that it is not in the best interests of the responsibilities I have to discharge to act in a particular way at this particular time as requested.

Now another subject, the one raised by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, related to in his and my view, looking over the material that he presented to me distributed by a service in the city of Lethbridge which counsels in family life education, a rather ugly couple of pamphlets and rather seamy material. There is no doubt of that. He made the suggestion in the course of a conversation that he and I had that the intent was valid enough, to provide information to young people on the subject of birth control, venereal disease and the like, but that it could be done in a better way.

I was inclined to agree with him and I still do. It, is my intention to look further into that and see if maybe our department might not be useful in upgrading the standard of that type of material. Then it would be available to anyone in the field in Alberta who wanted to use it. I look forward hopefully to making a contribution in that respect.

Now, much of the rest of what was said related to two issues. One was the question of welfare incentives that the hon. Member for Little Bow raised, and the hon. Member for Calgary Bow and the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo raised again the issues of the alcoholism commission. I would like to remark on those two areas.

I think that at the heart of the discussion over the Calgary Drug Information Centre there was the issue of the involvement of the private sector, and yet that wasn't a precise definition of the issue. It was a convenient and I suggest a careless definition. I say that because it relates, in the whole field of private sector involvement, to a very, very wide range of patterns you might find as soon as you start to discuss that subject.

I don't think private sector involvement is as accurate a way of speaking as to say that you really mean when you raise the issue is non-government involvement, because it would be stretching things a great deal to refer to some agencies that trade under the name of private sector as actually being such.

Once again, I subscribe as enthusiastically as any member present to placing in the hands of the private sector everything that it can do best. But we have people coming to us, and always have had in my experience, where the most emotional claims will be made on behalf of the work being done by a group of volunteers. You will find that there may be volunteers involved or there may not, but the citizen board you are dealing with is all on salary, anywhere up to \$1200 or \$1300 a month. You will find the total budget - they say, oh, we only need so much for our budget, just a proportion of it is all we need from government. You'll find the other agencies are other governments, municipal, federal and one private agency - a very, very militant group of people.

To be honest with you, we ended up helping them, where we knew that 97 per cent of their funds were government funds. I wanted to know by what classification they became a private agency. I would certainly admit this much, I can see that there are certain duties that can be performed which, even if all the money has to be public funds, may be performed better by a group of citizens rather than by a bureaucracy. I can see that. I can also acknowledge that I fully understand the argument put forward by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow and the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo is that, with the Calgary Drug Information Centre, that is precisely the case, even though the funding is public and even though the people who work there are paid, some of them quite well. There is a fringe of volunteers. They may be fairly numerous. The actual input of hours, based on the fact that they do get paid something for the volunteer work - which they do - is perhaps minor to that part of the issue. That may be the sort of function that can be better performed by a group of citizens than by a government, and if so, I think they should be supported.

I would have to say that as the issue finally resolved itself it was not to me lacking in clarity. The Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission had concluded, rightly or wrongly, that this particular agency was not fulfilling an objective consistent with the overall policies of the commission at that time.

I suppose, and some people remarked upon it at the time, that when the government found an alternative way of funding it was taken as a rebuke to the commission. But I don't think there is any reason why the commission, if its judgment is that a certain area of activity is outside of its proper scope, shouldn't say so. If the function is useful and if, as happened in that case, another agency came forward and said, we'll give you the support because we believe in it even if the other people don't, what's so striking about that? What is so remarkable if that happens - the Calgary Social Service Department came forward and said, we think the alcoholism commission is wrong, we'll support you. That is really the way the matter was resolved, and we've spent so much time talking about it since.

I think the public commitment I made at the time it was resolved was that a thorough evaluation would be done and that all parties would welcome that, as I was sure they would. We have in the meantime explored in a couple of directions to locate a consultant for that purpose. One has not yet been named, but it is something that will transpire very shortly. That issue will perhaps still be with us for a while, but I think it's one that will be workable.

In fairness to the alcoholism commission too, I want to say two things to the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo on his views in regard to the legislation. One is - and he may think I am arguing against my commission at this point - the letter of the law seldom determines whether or not an agency of government or a program succeeds. That is seldom the real reason. The real reason is the ability and resources of those who are put into the fray to resolve the particular problem.

But before going on to discuss that, the second thing I wanted to remark upon in regard to the suggestion about legislation is that some very, very good points were made, in particular the one suggesting that maybe the commission could have a role similar to the Human Rights Commission. I was interested in that suggestion and I know that would change the character of the commission. I will certainly speak to the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo further about that, and it will be my intention to consider whether or not legislation should be either amended or re-enacted in due course to achieve that, if the examination of that alternative would appear - after more thought than I have given it at this point - to be an improvement.

But coming back for a moment to the commission itself: the statements that were made about reducing grants, for example, to \$8,000 out of a budget of \$3,700,000. I think hon. members who were on Subcommittee A heard the explanation of the chairman on that. In fairness to him I will now repeat in substance the explanation.

He indicated that the giving of a grant is one way to fund a private agency or a non-government agency. That much is obvious. He also said that for the serious question of recovering contributions paid, recovering a portion from the federal government of programs paid for, a grant was not a workable system. He said that you could still support the private agency by purchasing its services, either on a per diem system or on a contract type system.

He acknowledged that this often involved at least a liaison between the personnel of the commission and the personnel of the agency, which would bring it into the area of qualification for cost sharing and then provide to all hon. members the impressive list of private agencies - and if I'm not mistaken that was distributed at the subcommittee - where moneys were indeed paid; not \$8,000 total in grants, but grants and purchase of services where the commission makes payments to the society to carry out a function that is within the intended area of involvement of the commission - in other words, consistent with the purposes of the commission, but not being directly performed by the commission. That's the way of funding which is similar to a grant but is an alternative to it.

Then he listed the Riverside Villa Association, Poundmaker's Lodge, the Women's Overnight Shelter, Community Corrections for Women, the Hobbema Detoxification Centre, Standoff Native Counselling Program, Bonnyville Indian-Metis Rehabilitation Program, Trinity Industries, Collingwood Acres, the Drug Information Centre, Alberta Native Training School, Alberta Native Action Committee McDougall Society, Halfway Recovery Acres Society, Project Recovery, Saddle Lake Drop-in Centre, and then a reference to an individual Indian counselling service at High Prairie. I think that information was filed with members of the committee, but for those who were not there I thought that that might be put on the record for tonight's proceedings also. I suggest that is a respectable record of contribution to societies which are non-government agencies and carrying out responsibilities in this field.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on now to the question of the incentive program and, I suppose, a few of the other items that I wanted to deal with that were not specifically raised in remarks of other hon. members.

I would want to say that if I were asked to state the areas where I thought the department had made its greatest contribution in the past year and probably can again in the next year, I would refer to the top government priorities which are well known. I won't go into detail regarding them, but I would have to say that the sense of service to the people of Alberta that I have enjoyed and that my colleagues and the people in the department who deliver the service have enjoyed, has certainly been in areas such as senior citizens services and, without even referring to the programs of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs in respect to housing and so on, I refer to the program for extended health benefits and financial support. These are the new ones in addition to programs that had previously been in the hon. minister Miss Hunley's programs in regard to Blue Cross coverage again this year. The indication that I have recently been willing to give publicly [is] that in due course, even more will be made known, some of it no doubt during this year, in regard to programs that are at present in the development stage through my office.

I would have to say again that the programs relating to the disabled have been one of the things we have been most attentive to. Just one in particular, the massive changes, [both] physical and in programs that are taking place at the two Red Deer institutions, [are] long overdue.

I can't fail to mention mental health, the attention that the Blair report has again recently got, and the fact that we were honored, I would say, to have Dr. Blair accept the role of chairman of the Provincial Mental Health Advisory Council - to have that council working now, working hard since last August and going carefully over recommendations relating to the field and relating those to me for implementation in due course, or consideration for implementation in due course, by government.

Then we had the whole area of health sector funding, which changed the base of operations in particular for the health units so that the viability of these local services in the communities was greatly increased. Specialized services were injected as a direct result of provincial initiatives, for example, in regard to speech therapists.

Then we have the important decision to take the question of child battering very seriously during the last several months, going back to about a year ago; legislation last fall and then the registry in January of this year. The public relations program has gone on in respect to that.

Then knowing the agonizing statistics of accidental deaths, I think the first and probably only commission of its type in Canada is operating under Dr. Walter MacKenzie in regard to an in depth study. We estimate that about 18 months will have to be spent to try to bring some ideas to government that might help, if implemented, to slow down the agonizing - I use the word again - rate of deaths related to suicides and accidents of all sorts.

I was looking at figures tonight which disclosed to me that for males between the ages of 5 and 35 years of age in our country, the leading cause of deaths is motor vehicle accidents. You probably knew that but the second leading cause of death was all other accidents. The third leading cause of deaths for males in that group, if I remember correctly, was suicides. So this is an area that we wanted to give attention to. The steps that have been taken under the leadership of retiring Dr. MacKenzie and Dr. Cochrane, we hope will show us the way.

In concluding, Mr. Chairman, on the question of incentives I have been working through the spring with certainly the department people and with the chairman, Dr. Paproski, and other members of the task force on needs, opportunities and responsibilities of the individual. I would have to say that I have recognized the difficulty, after reviewing the attempts that have been made elsewhere, of trying to solve the difficult question of incentives. I have noted that in Alberta this is maybe not such a great statistic as it is elsewhere because of the very low number of unemployed and the buoyant state of the economy. This has been an historic fact in Alberta and it is more so now than ever. Therefore the whole issue, as many troublesome cases we may uncover from time to time of people who could have done better with a little incentive, does not involve a very large portion of those people who are receiving assistance.

We have given our attention in the area of assistance to the people who are in the greatest need. The people who have been in the greatest need referred to before mean primarily those who have been disabled in some way, sometimes on account of age and sometimes for other reasons. The policy on incentives will come. Whether or not it will make much change, I don't know. We would only bring forward the best effort we can come up with in that respect and apply it as diligently as we can and hope to see at least as good results as any other incentive program that exists elsewhere.

The expectations for these shouldn't be too high. Other jurisdictions know from experience. We have observed of course from reviewing their material, going back into the 1960s possibly even into the 1950s, some jurisdictions found it necessary that long ago to try such programs. They are not famous for succeeding. I say again that in due course the incentive program will come forward. It will be the best that we can come up with.

So, Mr. Chairman, with those few remarks I will ask the hon. members to give their support to these estimates and thank the hon. members for listening so patiently.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be very lengthy, but I wish to commend the minister on an excellent job he did in defending a situation in the department. I doubt whether we have heard a better stand made by any minister in this House since this government took office.

I was pleased with the fact that the hon. minister mentioned he is looking seriously at reform in the welfare field. I have, as time goes by, taken the position that the program we have now is a 'disincentive' to work and that it is anti-social. It's not in the interests of anyone to pay people to stay off work and, in fact, forbid them to work at the risk that if they do they will lose support. People have a tendency to become dependent and it's easy to get on welfare. But when they're afraid to try their wings and try to work and earn a living, we have a problem that's perhaps government created.

I also believe that if there is corruption in welfare, it's the responsibility of the government and it's induced to a certain extent [by] the system. I believe that not only this minister but others have recognized that there has to be a break made with the [previous] way of handling welfare. I believe the reason we haven't moved in that way in any government in this country, including the federal government, is that the politicians are afraid of the political backlash they may face if the program doesn't work. The people believe any reform must be completely effective, it must be 100 per cent. I

believe that if we can get a change made, even if we are 15 per cent successful in rehabilitating people, it would be a worth-while risk.

I believe the hon. member, Mr. Crawford, has certainly the ability and the desire to bring in some worth-while reform, but also perhaps has the courage to risk being panned if the thing isn't entirely successful. I can't believe that anything can be worse than what we have now. We've had this for decades and we seem to be getting in deeper and deeper. The Hon. Marc Lalonde is trying to move in a certain way, but I think he will need some leadership and help from the provincial sources.

I think this province ought to take the lead in an experiment, perhaps not a local experiment, but a province-wide experiment in a new approach to welfare. We can afford to take that risk. I don't think we want to be tied indefinitely to a program that keeps getting us in deeper and deeper and deeper. We're not even beginning to solve the problem of people on welfare. It's degrading, not so much to those on welfare, but to those who have to watch and see this thing get larger and larger.

I would like to commend the minister for at least his indication that he'll move in that direction, but also to offer any support that we on this side can to a program that may have some pitfalls, because nobody can calculate the success of these matters when it's an entrenched system. I think it's overdue and I think the minister has displayed the ability and the courage. Perhaps if he can get the support of his government, something worth while can be done. I believe we can go no other way but up from the position we are [in] now.

Now having commended the minister and having expressed great confidence in him and the fact that I believe he has a department that ought to be split - it's a thankless job. It's way too large and although this minister can handle the situation, I don't think too many men can. I think it's just too hard to be in charge of such a broad and demanding department. Even this one phase of the department, the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, is in itself a large field.

Having said all those things about the minister and the department, I would like to voice a grievance from my constituency. I believe no MLA discharges his responsibilities adequately if he cannot present a case for a group of people or large group of people to the minister, because this is the place to do it. I have done it before, but I believe it requires some emphasis. Although the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission has a large job and a lot of worth-while projects in mind, one must not rely entirely on someone who's dedicated and determined to carry out his task to be the spokesman for people when there are elected representatives in the field.

I want to lodge a complaint to the minister about the detoxification centre in Renfrew. That kind of service may be needed and a lot of people feel, if it is not in my constituency it is not significant. But when you have working people complaining unhappy about something, there has to be some elected official to speak for them. I believe that in this case it is my responsibility.

When we have the mayor of a city, when we have the elected aldermen, when we have the MLA lodge a complaint with the minister that this issue ought to be reviewed and perhaps a decision made over and above the head of the chairman of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, then the minister has a responsibility to take a look at this problem personally.

While it is easy to point a finger and say, someone is making political hay out of this issue, I would like to challenge that view and say that one incurs a great amount of opposition when one takes a stand on a point like this. Outside the local people involved, the rest of the people would like to see this thing simmer down and be settled.

I would like the hon. minister to review this situation. When you get a petition of 400 people and a spontaneous one, then there is a problem beyond that which could be explained easily and off-hand by the chairman. Now the chairman has a responsibility, I know, and he has a worthy cause but it happens to be the only centre of this nature, of this kind, in a totally residential area or perhaps in any urban area.

Perhaps the residents, the neighbours, can be educated to accept this kind of institution, but no effort was made to do that. The public, the people in that area feel, for whatever reason, that this thing was literally shoved down their throats. I know the chairman will deny this. I entirely disagree with the chairman when he states that he represents the people on this issue. He does not. He might represent a certain group of people who have certain problems. But to state that he represents the people in that particular area is wrong. It should never happen that those who are elected have to be placed in the position that they feel they have been put in a subordinate position by an employee of the government.

I'm not faulting the minister for this because, as I have stated, he has a tremendously involved department. He can't be running off investigating these matters,

running to every little grass fire that starts to personally supervise it. In this case, I think I would like him to review the situation and speak to the people. Perhaps they will listen to him because they have listened to no one else so far. It is easy to get into a clash with a commissicn, especially one with a chairman who is quite dominant. To say that Mr. Anthony is a dominant personality would be an understatement perhaps. So for that reason I would like to urge the minister, notwithstanding his involvement in so many other important issues, to have a particular look at this one and talk to those many people the elderly, the young and people with families who feel aggrieved. There are many grievances that could be dispelled and done away with by perhaps a good listener, by someone in authority, who will tell them that we must go this way, would you give us a chance, instead of saying you're going to have it, we've decided what's good for you, we're in authority and goodbye.

I have been close to this issue. I know I'm taking time at a late hour to voice a grievance, but in my opinion there is no greater responsibility in this House than to listen to grievances. Although the practice of legislation, listening to grievances of individuals has sort of fallen by the wayside, in my opinion it has not disappeared. I feel that the hon. minister, Mr. Crawford, who is certainly a concerned minister, ought to take a look at the situation in Renfrew.

MR. DIXON:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I failed to bring up a point, earlier with the minister. so. It will only take a minute.

I was wondering, Mr. Minister, when we look at your statistics in your annual report, in the Child Welfare Branch where the [number of] babies surrendered for adoption is dropping almost 100 per cent per year, drawn from 1970-71, from 1,284 down to 717.

What efforts does your department make to try to counsel the many people who are having abortions, between 3,000 to 4,000 a year here in Alberta. What does your department do in light of the fact that people now have to wait at least 12 months in many cases to adopt a child, and in many cases are told that there is no hope for them because there aren't that many children up for adoption.

When we have so many Albertans who are willing to provide a good home and a good family for an unwanted child, is there any program in your department that can work in conjunction with the abortion committees throughout our province to let the people who are undergoing these operations know that there is an alternative, that if they do go through with the childbirth, which I personally would favour, even if they do not want that child, you have many people knocking at your door to adopt children who are unwanted by others.

Are you planning any programs? Are you planning any cooperation? Because the abortion practices in Alberta and elsewhere in Canada are getting out of hand. I think we have got to find a constructive way, at least, of trying to prevent many of them that are going on, especially in light of the fact that there are so many people waiting to adopt children, and they have been dropping so drastically in the last two or three years right here in our own province.

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few more comments or have a clarification. The hon. minister indicated that there were nine students in the camp and that four of them were sent back. Well, on April 28, I had a letter from Cow Camp and it says that there are twelve students and three staff members. I indicated, Mr. Chairman, that there were fourteen. The reason I indicated this is that I know two Canadian students were taken into the camp since the twelve students of the letter of April 28.

What I would like the minister to do on this is, if possible, take a look at the program and ask this instructor, or the staff down there, to make whatever changes he thinks should be made to make the program acceptable to a rehabilitation program that would fit into the provincial rehabilitation programs as they have them.

Mr. Chairman, I didn't ask the minister to really endorse the instructor - I mean I just don't know. I was just wanting him to endorse the program. What changes would they have to make for him to see fit to endorse the program down there?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make brief comments on what the three hon. members have just said.

First, in regard to the question of the Renfrew site, I have certainly discussed that many times with the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. I think that I will take his representations this evening, if I might, under advisement and treat that as being the only practical answer that I can make in this respect at the present time.

I wanted to say to the hon. Member for Calgary Millican that it would be simply inaccurate for me to say that we had a proposal even for the type of counselling that he speaks of, although I acknowledge that he and I have discussed it outside the House, probably last fall. I indicated to him at the time that I was not unsympathetic with that sort of approach if it could be achieved. I am not sure how it could be done. It is certainly more easily said than done, but the area of concern that he has referred to is certainly an area of concern for many people in and out of government. So I suppose all I could indicate to him is that I will attempt to come to a fair conclusion as to whether or not the suggestion is practical, and will treat it as being an important matter.

On the other reference made by the hon. member - just by the way, Mr. Chairman, I've just been passed a note and there is no way I'm going to read it until I'm through, because these things usually make me laugh. Too many hon. members are subjected to that.

The concluding reference then, the hon. Member for Bow Valley had raised in regard to Cow Camp. When I referred to the nine and the record I was referring to a specific statistical period which I acknowledge has now ended. I am not surprised to learn that other children have since been brought in. Be that as it may, I felt that we had to look at the record for the statistical period that the documentation I received is based on. At the time it was prepared it was accurate. That's the explanation I would give him, and I suppose simply repeat the other remarks I made a few minutes ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed. Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Ready for the resolution? Two resolutions are before us:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$227,961,790 chargeable to Income Account be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Department of Health and Social Development.

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$348,769,497 chargeable to Income Account be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Health Commissions.

[The motions were carried.]

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that all resolutions be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

I move the Committee of Supply rise and report.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Diachuk left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain estimates and the following resolutions:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$43,018,260 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Agriculture Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$20,014,050 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Attorney General Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$311,789,500 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Education Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$19,785,217 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Executive Council.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$186,832,355 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Highways and Transport Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$9,864,473 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Industry and Commerce Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$49,689,860 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Manpower and Labour Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$38,922,970 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Lands and Forests Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$9,033,095 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for Legislation.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$7,300,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Mines and Minerals Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$124,556,213 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Municipal Affairs Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$348,769,497 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for Health Commissions.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$227,961,790 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Health and Social Development Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$129,409,560 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Public Works Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$78,836,805 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Treasury Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$21,476,580 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Culture, Youth and Recreation Department.

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

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$204,551,535 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Advanced Education Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$769,099 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$27,987,703 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Telephones and Utilities Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$3,090,174 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975, for the Consumer Affairs Department.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has also had under consideration supplementary estimates.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$12,113,822.75 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Agriculture Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$203,605 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Executive Council.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$5,280,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Highways and Transport Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$264,600 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Industry and Commerce Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$16,843,465 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Manpower and Labour Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$2,412,309.14 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, for the Lands and Forests Department.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$183,075 be ...

MR. CLARK:

I wonder if I could raise the point of order. In fact the supplementary estimates were not studied in the subcommittees and have not been considered by the committee. In light of the fact that the hon. member is now reporting them, I would like to ask the Government House Leader where, in fact, these supplementary estimates were studied. I don't recall any occasion when they were studied.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, as I recall, the procedure was that the chairman of the subcommittees moved both resolutions at the time they were put to the committee but I'm not sure the chairman called the votes with the committee.

MR. DIACHUK:

The point raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition would be right. These were not placed. I thought these were placed before the subcommittees.

MR. HYNDMAN:

In that event, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could proceed with the first resolutions on the general estimates and then tomorrow we will go back into committee and consider the supplementary estimates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Under the circumstances would the Chair be correct in assuming then that the hon. Deputy Speaker would wish to add on to the report a request for leave to sit again?

MR. DIACHUK:

If so, the Committee of Supply wishes to beg leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, disregarding the supplementary estimates, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move the Assembly do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the motion for adjournment by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 11:57 o'clock]