

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Wednesday, March 31, 1976 2:30 p.m.**

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 27****The Land Surface Conservation  
and Reclamation Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 27, The Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Amendment Act, 1976. This being a money bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the prime purpose of this bill is to establish the regulatory authority for the establishment of regulations which would provide for reclamation security in cases of land disturbance. It will also provide for the regulations necessary to establish the surface reclamation fund.

[Leave granted; Bill 27 introduced and read a first time]

**Bill 34****The Pharmaceutical  
Association Amendment Act, 1976**

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 34, The Pharmaceutical Association Amendment Act, 1976. The purpose of this bill is merely to change a date in Alberta legislation so that it will accommodate a change in the federal legislation when and if it comes to pass.

[Leave granted; Bill 34 introduced and read a first time]

**Bill 215****An Act to Amend  
The Environment Conservation Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 215, An Act to Amend The Environment Conservation Act. Mr. Speaker, the twin purposes of this act are to require the Environment Conservation Authority to monitor pollution emissions in the oil sands on an ongoing basis. The second feature of the act, Mr. Speaker, would require the tabling of an annual report in the Alberta Legislature.

[Leave granted; Bill 215 introduced and read a first time]

**Bill 33****The Civil Service  
Association of Alberta Repeal Act**

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, The Civil Service Association of Alberta Repeal Act. Mr. Speaker, this bill will provide for the repeal of The Civil Service Association of Alberta Act. It will transfer the rights, assets, duties, and obligations of that association, including its membership, to the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees incorporated under The Societies Act. Among the responsibilities transferred will be those of the CSA as party to all collective agreements to which the CSA is now a party.

Mr. Speaker, this bill clearly establishes the independence from government of the bargaining agent representing the employees of the Government of Alberta. It also reflects, Mr. Speaker, the wish of the CSA, and more clearly and truly reflects the relationship existing in 1976 between the Government of Alberta and its employees.

[Leave granted; Bill 33 introduced and read a first time]

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 33, The Civil Service Association of Alberta Repeal Act, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, we're indeed honored in Alberta today, and in this Legislature, to have visiting us His Excellency Charles Kerremans, the Ambassador for Belgium to Canada. His Excellency is here to make some preparations for a visit to Alberta of his Prime Minister in the early weeks of May. All of this is a direct result of our Premier's visit to the European Common Market and to Belgium particularly, and is a follow-up of that. So I would like to introduce to you, and to the House, His Excellency and his two consuls: the Consul-General, stationed in Vancouver, Mr. Thimester; and the Honorary Consul, stationed in Edmonton, Mr. William Henning.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group sitting in the members gallery. First of all is Miss Lourdes Avila from Mexico City, who is sitting in the front row. She is attending school in Canada, and is visiting friends in Alberta at the moment.

Also, I would like to introduce to you eight members of a group from Zambia. They are: Mr. Mutale, Mr. Nyirenda, Mr. Sumaili, Mr. Bwalya, Mr. Kaweme, Mr. Kabaso, Mr. Simooya, and Mr. Mwanza. Seated in the members gallery as well, they are attending school at NAIT, and are extremely interested in our educational system and how they can upgrade themselves, bearing in mind the limited availability of educational facilities in Zambia.

The Minister of Transportation should know they are extremely fascinated with the courtesy of the

drivers in Alberta. The Minister of Business Development and Tourism should be well aware that they are fascinated by our cold weather. Would they please rise and be recognized by the members of the Assembly?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Legislature, a distinguished guest who is seated in your gallery, Miss Raynell Andreychuk, the president of the National Council of the YMCA for Canada. Mr. Speaker, Miss Andreychuk is a graduate of the University of Saskatchewan College of Law. She holds a number of distinctions really too numerous to mention, but I would like to mention two or three if I may.

Miss Andreychuk was chosen to receive the 1975 Vanier award as one of the five most outstanding young people in Canada. Miss Andreychuk also has the distinction of being the first woman to hold the post of president of the YMCA National Council of Canada. Aside from having served on the Moose Jaw city council, Miss Andreychuk is presently a practising member of the law profession in Moose Jaw, and chairman of the National Advisory Council on Voluntary Action. I might add she also sits on the MLA salary review committee for the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, Miss Andreychuk is in Edmonton to attend the sixth annual meeting of the Edmonton YMCA and is accompanied today by Mr. Bill Rees, vice-president of the Edmonton YMCA, and Mr. George Singleton, general secretary of the Edmonton YMCA. I would ask that they stand and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege to introduce to you, and to members of this Assembly, 10 visitors from Uranium City, Saskatchewan. The group includes eight Grade 10 students and their teachers, Roxanne Johnson and Robert Lindsay. I'd like the House to give them the traditional welcome now.

MR. KIDD: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, four school board members from School Division No. 41, who are here today on school division business: Mr. Hurt, Mr. Oberhoffer, Mr. Walls, and chairman, Mr. Hodgson. They're seated in the public gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

#### head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the answer to notice of Motion for a Return 109, requested by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table with the Legislature Library two copies of the CSA green paper called *The Red Deer Issue 1976*.

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to file for the Legislature Library two copies of the Electric Utility Planning Council report for 1975.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the progress report on the Pilot Alberta Restitution Centre in Calgary, which was foreshadowed by remarks in the Speech from the Throne.

#### head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

##### **Department of the Solicitor General**

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government, I have a statement to make on what is called the fine-option program.

A pilot project by which offenders may perform community work service in lieu of fines when unable to pay, and through which efforts are made to collect fines before imprisonment becomes mandatory, has been commenced by the Government of Alberta. This follows recommendations of the Kirby Board of Review, which drew attention to the large number of offenders held in correctional institutions for failure to pay fines.

The fine-option program has been launched in Edmonton. Since the startup of the Edmonton Fine Option Program on February 6, 1976, 362 cases have been handled. Ninety-four persons responded with cash payments totalling \$5,416, and 15 persons participated in the community work service program to work off a total of \$1,450 in fines.

A recent nine-month study at two provincial correctional institutions revealed that over 46 per cent of 3,587 admittances were for default-of-fine payments. The average fine for which time is being served in correctional institutions is approximately \$172. Fines ranged from a low of \$10 to a high of \$3,600. Days in default being calculated on a concurrent basis, rather than consecutive as in the case of fines, ranged between two days and two years, with an average of approximately 33 days.

It is intended that the fine-option program will provide a reasonable and positive alternative for individuals faced with incarceration.

This initiative is part of a three-pronged attack on the problem discussed by Mr. Justice Kirby. The three thrusts are these: (a) restitution: a pilot program is in operation in Calgary, and I have just filed for the Assembly the first progress report; (b) the work-for-fine option announced in this statement today, which is now under way as a pilot project in Edmonton; (c) collection of some fines by civil process.

Amendments to legislation to permit a start on this initiative will be introduced later in the session. These amendments will offer judges the option of making a fine a civil judgment, if they choose in some cases not to use the imprisonment penalty for default. It is planned to bring all three methods together eventually as a combined strategy to solve the problem of too frequent incarceration for non-payment of fines for minor offences.

However, imprisonment in the case of default of payment of a fine may still be required in some cases. These may include those where the offender obviously has the ability to pay, where he has shown gross irresponsibility, and where the fine-options may be considered by the judge, in the interests of discipline, to be conditions on a suspended sentence.

The projects are part of government policy to increase the range of options open to the courts at time of sentence.

Individuals who participate in the fine-option program will be involved in community projects which will not take existing or potential work away from people employed or seeking employment in the community. The program will also extend to institution programs already tested in Calgary.

#### head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Whitecourt Business Development

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Business Development and Tourism, and ask if he is in a position to indicate to the Assembly the progress being made with regard to Simpson Timber's project in the Whitecourt area? Is the proposal in fact moving ahead?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, as I understand the situation, it appears to be moving ahead fairly well. However, I think perhaps the question should more appropriately be made to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, or perhaps that is who it should be . . . [interjections] He doesn't have to be there. It is, as I understand it, proceeding. If there are any details regarding the project which the hon. member would like to know, I would be happy to furnish them.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the matter is under the responsibility of the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, who unfortunately — or fortunately, as time will tell — cannot be in his place today. I'll take notice of the question, as has the Minister of Business Development and Tourism, and refer it to him so he can reply in the House.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. Would the minister be in a position to indicate very briefly to us the view of the department as far as the town of Whitecourt itself is concerned? Does the department see that town moving ahead?

MR. DOWLING: Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, of course. The hon. Leader of the Opposition will understand that our program of decentralization and making certain that all parts of the 245,000 square miles of Alberta participate in economic development — bearing in mind that philosophy on policy, he will know then that Whitecourt is a part of that policy. He will also know that of some 512 or 518 projects, manufacturing in nature, that have been developed over the last two years, some 310 have been developed in rural Alberta.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but I'm sure I'd take up the entire question period.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I think that will be good enough to establish the point.

##### Whitecourt Hospital

MR. CLARK: I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care and ask, in

light of the answer from the Minister of Business Development and Tourism about the bright future for Whitecourt, why the Whitecourt hospital board is going to have to cut back several beds in the Whitecourt Hospital in light of budgetary problems?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated to boards in growing communities like Whitecourt, there are certainly — as the hon. leader will know — many communities throughout the province that are growing. We recognize that during this period of growth for many communities, and Whitecourt is certainly one of them, the potential growth is anticipated. Nevertheless, we do have an overall policy this year, during a year of restraint, that each community has to share equally in dampening the cost escalation in the hospital system.

Generally speaking, we have tried to provide as much flexibility as we can during a year of restraint to accommodate the kind of situation a community like Whitecourt may have. But certainly our flexibility, when we have overall restraint during this particular year, is not as much as we would have in a normal year.

I would add another point, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. leader, and that is that relative to the real situation of a growing community like Whitecourt, that is a longer term problem and longer term analysis, not one which is just directly associated with a year of restraint.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister, in light of the glowing future of Whitecourt, as outlined by the Minister of Business Development and Tourism, and the difficulty of getting professional medical staff in rural portions of the province.

Is it the position of the Government of Alberta that hospital boards such as the Whitecourt hospital board, with a growing population, should be forced to cut back their professional registered nursing staff by at least five positions during the course of this year of restraint?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, that's certainly a question of detail. In fact, every hospital in Alberta is having to look at its internal priorities. As I've indicated in the House, it's up to a board to decide how they will live within the budget. But I would say that every hospital board in the province is co-operating with the overall policy of dampening the annual cost escalation in the hospital system. As I've indicated, each hospital in Alberta does have the right of formal appeal if it feels that the mechanics or application in its case is one which turns out to be inequitable.

But I think we've said, Mr. Speaker, several times in this House — I have said, and I know the Premier and many of my colleagues have said — when you do have an overall objective of expenditure restraint in Alberta and during an anti-inflationary period in Canada, it does create at times these kinds of difficulties. We do have to recognise that in pursuit of the overall objective, perhaps certain kinds of inequities may exist. As much as possible, we will try to deal with those inequities. The general overall co-operation we've received when we've communicated with boards, as with Whitecourt, is one that they

certainly want to pursue the overall policy of the government.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister prepared to become involved personally in the Whitecourt situation? I'm pleased he's admitted the inequity there.

Will he, in fact, do what he can to remove the inequity, as far as the Whitecourt situation specifically is concerned?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, my meetings with the hospital boards to this point have been very clearly informal, for the purpose of my getting an overall view of the hospital situation on the broad provincial basis. I think, as the minister, I should not, in any way, get involved in the formal appeal process which is one of mathematics or arithmetic as to how particularly it has been applied.

I would say, too, the hon. Member for Whitecourt, Mr. Trynchy, has of course indicated the problem of the Whitecourt hospital to me very strongly. I do appreciate the concern that Whitecourt and certain other communities may have, when they're growing during this period of restraint. But the formal appeal process and the application of the mathematics to a particular hospital situation is one that I feel, as the minister, I cannot become formally involved in.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister, dealing with the comments about the hon. Member for Whitecourt. Did the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care advise the hon. Member for Whitecourt that, in fact, he should not attend, when the Whitecourt hospital board met with the Alberta Hospitals Services Commission yesterday?

MR. MINIELY: No, as a matter of fact, the hon. member for Whitecourt indicated to me, that he felt, [regarding] the formal appeal relationship, he was in a position similar to that of a minister, because it's an application of mathematics and technical discussion as to what in fact may happen. That is something that should be between the board of the hospital and the Alberta Hospital Services Commission.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary question to the minister. What is the status of the new hospital proposal as far as Whitecourt is concerned? Is it the same as the status for the Grand Prairie Hospital: wait, wait, and wait?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I really think the hon. leader is leaving a very false impression. As I've indicated, in terms of trying to dampen annual cost escalations on the operating side, this year of restraint does not have an effect on the long-term planning for facilities in a growing community like Whitecourt. In fact, as the hon. leader knows very well, in the budget presented by my colleague, the hon. Provincial Treasurer, we provided the highest amount we've ever had in annual capital budget allocation to construct hospitals, emphasized on growing communities in rural Alberta. [That] is exactly where that \$50 million a year will go.

MR. CLARK: Where's Whitecourt?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. leader wants to listen, we must bear two factors in mind. We have an overall objective of dampening this year's annual operating cost increases. That's not just in hospitals. That's in public expenditure generally in the province. But that does not interfere with our long-term capital planning of facilities for growing communities like Whitecourt. The two should be separate.

MR. CLARK: Where does Whitecourt stand?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister for clarification. Is it the intention of the minister or the government, in taking the action they have with regard to the MLA, to indicate it is not proper for an MLA to sit in on mathematical discussions with regard to hospital budgets? Is that the kind of thing we're talking about?

MR. CLARK: Hospital budgets?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I thought I'd answered the hon. leader. Now I will answer the hon. Member for Little Bow.

It was the judgment of the MLA. I know the MLA has come to me a few times and emphasized the problem of the Whitecourt hospital. I've indicated to him, and I've indicated in the Legislature today, our concern that sometimes during this particular year it does create certain kinds of difficulties.

But certainly in terms of the actual formal appeal process, it's the MLA's judgment. I think he's right in this. That detail, that technical application, and the application of the arithmetic should be worked out between administrators: on the one side, the hospital; on the other side, the administrators in the Hospital Services Commission.

The hon. Member for Whitecourt will be working with me very closely on policy matters in terms of longer term development of hospital facilities for Whitecourt.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a further question. It's my understanding that, as an MLA, you're here to represent the people of your constituency and not particularly the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. CLARK: Touchy boys.

MR. R. SPEAKER: My question is: does the hon. Member for Whitecourt have a vested interest of some kind through a position with regard to the commission or . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. It is not within the duty of the minister to disclose vested interests on the parts of the members.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. First of all, I'd like to thank the opposition for trying to help. But they're not going about it in the right way.

DR. BUCK: You don't seem to be having much luck.

MR. TRYNCHY: I wonder if the minister is aware of the appeal board meeting held last night with the hospital board and the hospital commission. What were the results of this hearing?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that an appeal was heard by the Hospital Services Commission last night by the Whitecourt hospital board. I'm not aware or have not yet been advised what the outcome of the appeal is.

#### **Rental Damage Deposits**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change the pace a bit and direct my question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and ask whether the government has received any complaints from tenants about landlords demanding substantial additional amounts as damage deposits on short notice, even though a damage deposit has already been given to the landlord at the beginning of the occupancy.

MR. HARLE: Not that I am aware of, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member has any specific instances, I'd certainly appreciate it if he'd bring that matter to my attention.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'll certainly bring the instances that have come to my attention to the attention of the minister.

But I would ask the minister whether the government has given any consideration to changes in the legislation which would prohibit increases in the damage deposit during occupancy that has already begun during the period of the controls.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have an opportunity to consider that matter. My recollection is that there might be something in the present statute that applies to damage deposits. I would certainly be prepared to take that matter under consideration.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question on this matter. Is the government considering any amendments which would prevent landlords from evicting tenants who refuse to pay additional damage deposits?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, again, I would be prepared to look into the matter and see whether any amendments are necessary.

#### **Rent Control Advertising**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. A very short explanation is necessary first. In the *Edmonton Journal* today there is an ad by the rental control board which is 14 x 14, a little over half a page. There is 9 x 3 inches in which there is absolutely nothing, and another 14 x 4 in which there are some funny-paper characters.

My question is: is this the way the rental control board is practising restraint?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, The Temporary Rent Regulations Measures Act is designed to help the citizens of the province. We have had some experience with that program so far. There are many, many tenants. It is difficult to reach the tenants in the province to advise them of their rights and what they can do without making an advertisement which will be spotted by tenants generally, and which states in simple terms what a tenant can do if he feels a landlord is exceeding the permissible increases set out in the legislation.

I have to say that we quite rightly turn this matter over to the professionals. They design the material which will come to the attention of tenants. That is how it is done.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I agree with all the hon. minister says, but I would ask a supplementary.

In what way does a 9 x 3 completely blank space assist in doing what you are suggesting?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not a professional communicator. [interjections] That's right. As to that method of communicating, a blank space is a method of communicating.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who's doing the advertising?

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary. I would suggest to the hon. minister that an appeal be made to the *Edmonton Journal* not to have the gall to charge for that empty space.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Is this ad only appearing in the daily newspapers of Alberta, as indicated in the release, or is it also in the weekly papers?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I would have to inquire on that. I think this particular advertising series is in the daily papers, but I will check to see whether it's in the weeklies.

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I will have to preface my remarks with a few statements first if I may. It is obvious that the ad has attracted the attention of some hon. members. But more important, I am wondering if the hon. minister could advise us whether his department is preparing any contingency plans so that upon the expiration of 18 months, there will be an orderly transition when we remove the rent control legislation in the province.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, not at this time.

#### **Wage and Price Controls**

MR. KIDD: Mr. Speaker, my question, at least initially, is directed to the hon. Premier. A brief word. Although the period since the inception of wage and price controls has not been long, it is still almost one-third of the 18-month period this government is committed to.

Therefore, can the Premier or the appropriate minister comment as to whether there is any evidence that such wage and price controls are being effective in regard to the private sector in this province.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it is a question which I think I should take as notice for the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs who has been charged with the responsibility. I think that, because of its nature, it's a question that requires some element of notice. I'll pass it on to him and have him report to the House.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier — and I raised this earlier. Has the Premier or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs arranged for a monitoring system, or some kind of indicator survey, to come up with a judgment that the hon. member is asking about?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I believe that a very similar question was asked of the hon. minister by the hon. member. I'll have to check *Hansard* to be sure of that matter. I believe the hon. minister answered it on the basis that the private sector was the jurisdiction of the federal government, that they were involved in that matter, and it would be not a monitoring basis but just an overview. I took it as a question from the Member for Banff. But I'll pass on both questions to the hon. minister when he returns to the House.

#### **Foothills Hospital — Kidney Transplant**

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. I have had several inquiries, Mr. Minister, in regard to the situation as to the kidney transplant in the Foothills Hospital. I wonder if the minister is in a position at this time to bring us up to date with the situation there.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, in my last conversations with the board and the administration of the Foothills Hospital, they advised me they've been actively recruiting a physician to round out the kidney transplant team. I understand, too, from a recent conversation between my office and the administrator of the Foothills Hospital board, that they have interviewed several potential applicants, and they are at a stage where they feel they're making very good progress in filling that situation and reinstituting in due course the kidney transplant program at the Foothills Hospital.

MR. KUSHNER: A supplementary question to the minister. I understand that in the city of Calgary we have an organization being formed now. I wonder if the minister would favor the idea of supporting, financially or in principle, a private team that's being put together.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is referring to financial support from the province, I'm not sure whether in fact that retains the private flavor that the hon. member is referring to.

MR. KUSHNER: Yes, I am. I wonder if the minister would favor such an organization putting a team together.

MR. MINIELY: Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly I feel that that which is totally financed by private sources

operating within the hospital system in Alberta is something we encourage, private involvement generally. But certainly where any operation, any health care delivery area, becomes dependent on substantial provincial funds, we would have to analyse that in terms of the overall provincial policy in the health care field.

#### **Oldman River Dam Sites**

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. I would like to ask him, at what stage are the surveys and studies of the dam sites on the Oldman River for storage of irrigation water requirements?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, subject to checking the final date of completion, my understanding is that the technical reports have been done and completed. They are now in the department, and the report is in the stage of final preparation. Hopefully, we should receive it about the end of May.

#### **Government Decentralization**

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister Without Portfolio responsible for rural development. Could the minister advise whether a study has been made, and whether mobility from rural to urban centres has been stabilized, or maybe even reversed, because of the programs of decentralization of the government?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, I'm not aware of a study going on at the present time.

#### **Influenza Vaccine**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health is with regard to the flu vaccine program of this fall. Has a decision been made yet by the minister or the provincial government with regard to who will pay for the vaccinations, whether it will be the government or the individual citizen?

MISS HUNLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not directed our minds to that particular issue.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Is the minister preparing an advertising program with regard to this flu vaccine program?

MISS HUNLEY: My information is that it's already well advertised, according to the questions many of us have been getting concerning it, Mr. Speaker. I doubt that an advertising campaign will be necessary. But if it is, we will surely do that. Our main intention is to take care of the health of our citizens, and we'll do whatever we need to in order to do that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary to the minister. Has the minister at this point in time determined how the program will be administered? Will it be through nurses, doctors, group clinics, or in industries? What type of approach will be used?

MISS HUNLEY: As I've said before in this House, Mr. Speaker, we'll be working closely with the committee that advises us on immunization. Of course, we'll also be working with the health units, the branch in my department, and with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Alberta Medical Association, in order to determine the most effective manner of immunizing our citizens.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Will the charges connected with the inoculations be paid for by Alberta medicare, or will it be an extra fee charged to the patient?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, I believe that question has been asked and answered.

MR. TAYLOR: Not in that form.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, could I perhaps put a supplementary question to the hon. minister and ask whether she has held any discussions with Mr. Lalonde as to the extent of the inoculations, whether it will be a uniform inoculation for everyone 16 to 50, or whether it will be on a selective basis.

MISS HUNLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken to Mr. Lalonde personally. I am under the impression that that's our responsibility as a province. We're prepared to undertake that responsibility. We have recommendations, of course, working through the federal government's department of National Health and Welfare, and our own officials keep in close contact with them.

As a matter of fact, Dr. Dixon, who is chairman of the joint advisory committee on immunization, is with the provincial lab, and it was part of his input into our decision-making last Thursday that made us decide to purchase the vaccine. So we'll be working with the federal government, but accepting our own responsibilities as required.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question for clarification. Was the financial commitment to purchase the vaccine based on the contingency of universal or partial inoculation?

MISS HUNLEY: No, the initial basic study — and it was done quite quickly, as hon. members can appreciate — was not based on a universal immunization program.

#### Education Tax

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Could the minister indicate whether communal farms qualify for the education tax reduction on property?

MR. SPEAKER: If this question relates, as I suspect, to information which is public, I would doubt that the question period would be the vehicle for giving it further publicity.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Has there been any application from communal farms for the reduction of the tax on home-owner's property?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to communal farms, maybe the hon. member might re-define what he means by that. Does he refer specifically to the Hutterian Brethren?

MR. MANDEVILLE: That's right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, from time to time we have many requests for abatement of the school foundation program fund levy, which is applicable to farm property, and indeed we have had applications on this basis.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have there been applications approved for particular communal farms?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there have.

#### Milk Market Quota

MR. FLUKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Is the minister able to inform the House of the total amount of Alberta's milk market share quota?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, yes. Although it has not yet been announced by Ottawa, information I've received from Alberta's representative at the meetings of the Milk Market Sharing Committee of the Canadian Dairy Commission in Ottawa on Monday is that Alberta's industrial milk market share quota of 23.9 million pounds of butterfat has been confirmed for the 1976-77 dairy year. This compares, Mr. Speaker, with a production of 25.9 million pounds of butterfat in the '75-76 dairy year.

Mr. Speaker, we were able to obtain through negotiation about 6.9 per cent of the industrial milk quota in Canada for the '76-77 dairy year. This compares very favorably with the production in the year just ending, equal to about 6.9 per cent of the total Canadian production of industrial milk.

MR. FLUKER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The concerns of some of my constituents and producers are, how will this be divided among Alberta producers?

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, in a normal situation we would like to have had worked out and developed at the end of the dairy year, which is today, a formula under which we could advise our industrial milk producers of their share of Alberta's quota. Unfortunately, however, without the knowledge, before today, from Ottawa as to what our provincial share would be, we were not able to finalize those discussions.

I'll be meeting with the Dairy Control Board, and the advisory committee to that board, within the course of the next two or three weeks. I'm hopeful that by the end of April we might be in a position to advise producers of the various methods we will be

using to make sure there is a fair allocation of that industrial quota among all milk producers.

#### Trade Mission

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Premier. In light of the fact that this is a period of restraint, can the Premier indicate to the Legislature the status of the proposed mission to the Middle East?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I can't. That's really a matter that at the moment is within the jurisdiction or responsibility of both the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. I'll refer the question to them for reply.

#### Oil Recycling

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of the Environment, but first I would like to give just a word or two of clarification. Presently it's estimated that 10 million gallons of used lubricating oil are disposed of, either by dumping on the ground or into landfill areas, or by putting them on the roads to control dust.

My question is: would the government, through your department, consider the establishment of collection depots throughout Alberta so this oil could be collected and be re-refined?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I believe that's an excellent suggestion. We have had some preliminary work done with respect to the studies and analysis undertaken by the department when the application by Turbo Resources, which included a process for re-refining used oil, was being considered. Not being an expert, I'd have to say it's my guess that this will become more important and more economically attractive as the price of energy increases throughout the world.

#### Rent Control Legislation

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. It's really a follow-up to a question posed today by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, who asked the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs whether any contingency plans were made once the rent review period is over.

Mr. Speaker, my question is: in light of the very sharp increase in housing prices — especially in Calgary, but also in Edmonton — does the government have any agency by which it can assess the impact this huge increase will have on the rental market once controls are over?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it's a question I'd refer to the Minister of Housing and Public Works.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, to answer the second part first, I've indicated — and will indicate again during the course of discussion on The Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation Act — that with respect to the reorganization of the Department of Housing and

Public Works, there is sufficient money in the estimates to establish a policy, a program, and a data division within the department which will relate, to a large degree, to the housing situation, both rental and purchase, and the type and condition of housing in Alberta. We hope to establish at the earliest opportunity a data base from which we will be able to make decisions with respect to a number of matters affecting both rental housing and home ownership.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first part, I think the hon. member should have read The Temporary Rent Regulations Act. He will notice that a number of features within the act itself provide the government considerable flexibility in the manner and timing used with respect to extricating itself from the rent regulation program; for example, excluding, if you wish, certain types of housing from rent regulation at the appropriate time. So the act itself does provide considerable flexibility in this regard and establishes a basic plan of extrication at the appropriate time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. It seems to me the issue is not the extrication but whether, if we've had a huge increase in the retail value of homes, one of the contingency plans the government will be considering will be adding additional time to the rent review program in this province and extending the program.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, the entire thrust of the provincial government is related to housing supply and affordability. I've already made some statements on housing supply as related to the massiveness of the budget with respect to housing in Alberta this year.

However, I should indicate to the hon. member that if he would read the act again, he would recognize a possibility within it to remove the government's responsibilities with respect to rent regulation on a gradual basis if it so decides, or on an immediate basis. This flexibility is within the act.

Such considerations will certainly be taken under advisement at the appropriate time, depending on the supply and vacancy rate in the apartment industry. This, of course, is related to the department's programs of bringing supply in substantive quantities at the appropriate time. We will see how these matters develop over the next year. Then we'll be able to formulate a plan on the basis of data available to us at that time rather than guessing now.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question to the hon. minister. I think we're finally getting at the government's position.

I really want to know whether any contingency plans are available for extending the rent review act if an extension is required in view of marketing conditions. I take it from the hon. minister's answer that in light of the data base, the rent review legislation will be extended if conditions warrant it.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I've indicated the extent of flexibility within the legislation. The hon. member can draw his own conclusions as to the extent of the flexibility.

MR. GHITTER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. I'm wondering if the minister would



comment as to whether he agrees or disagrees with statements made recently by members of the Urban Development Institute that in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary the supply of multifamily dwellings and rental accommodation may well meet the demand within the next year. I would appreciate your comments as to whether you agree with that view.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. With great respect to the hon. member, I think perhaps once in a while we should refer to 171 of Beaufort. Perhaps the hon. minister's comments might be sought on a more informal occasion.

#### Nursing Aides

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Labour, and a very short explanation is necessary first. Mr. Justice MacDonald recently made two recommendations regarding certified nursing aides and nursing orderlies. The first was in connection with equal pay. The second was a restructuring of the bargaining unit that would include both these groups.

My question is: is the government recognizing the restructured bargaining unit containing certified nursing aides and nursing orderlies?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the question the hon. member is asking is actually fairly complex in its ramifications, and could involve the question of either legislation or regulation. It hasn't yet. Up to the present time, units which consider they might be appropriate units for certification have been making applications to the Board of Industrial Relations, and have been having their cases ruled upon individually. At the present time, in the sense of the particular recommendation that Mr. Justice MacDonald has made, no action has been taken.

#### Mobile Homes — Airdrie

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. Is the minister in a position to indicate what progress is being made with regard to the mobile home area just south of the town of Airdrie?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, very good progress has been made over the last eight months with respect to possible development of a mobile home subdivision in the town of Airdrie. It would be expected that this would be a subdivision of the town of Airdrie. There are still some difficulties being encountered. The foremost problem at this particular time is in relation to the supply of educational facilities. I don't anticipate that this would be an insurmountable problem, and the park will be under way shortly.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate if the problems have been overcome among the department, the town, and the city of Calgary with regard to the sewage situation and the additional effluence, as a result of the subdivision?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, that matter has not presented an insurmountable problem up to this moment. The main problem as I indicated in the House the other day, was one of establishing the finance formula with respect to the distribution of costs between the town as it exists, the existing highway centre that was established there by the government, and the mobile home subdivision. Nevertheless, this formula of distribution of costs cannot be established in its definitive form until such time as final approval of the mobile home subdivision is obtained. So, in fact, the two are to some degree related.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Might I just take a moment of the House's time to refer to the rather obvious improvement in the *Hansard* format which started at the beginning of this session. I think it would be appropriate if I were to mention this so that due credit might be given, in that excellent publication, to those who were particularly responsible for an effort, which extended over possibly three years, to achieve a two-column format in *Hansard*, to make it more readable and to add other improvements in the style and type.

In particular I'd like to mention senior editor Mary Alyce Heaton; Barbara Deakin, the supervisor of the transcription staff; Donna Bennett, core staff editor and supervisor of the night transcription; senior editors Robert Bubba and William Lander; and finally, Mr. Bruce Natrass, the systems analyst from the government data centre.

I would like to express publicly to the House my sincere appreciation for the very devoted efforts which were made, the long hours spent and the great number of problems overcome, in achieving the present format of *Hansard*, which I think is equal to any in Canada.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. While we're speaking about *Hansard*, I would like to make a correction in yesterday's [unofficial] edition of *Hansard*. The blame, of course, does not lie with the *Hansard* editors but with myself. It was a slip of the tongue.

I refer to line 917 where, in answer to a question posed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I answered as follows:

The province can choose to set the spring break during the regular Easter holidays or choose a fixed break as the needs and demands of their local electorates require.

Now, from the tense and the meaning of the sentence, you can imagine I meant that the school boards could do this, and not the province. I would like that correction to stand in *Hansard*.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. When corrections are made in the manner in which the hon. Minister of Education just made them, will that correct the original in the bound copy?

MR. SPEAKER: My understanding of the standing order which governs the production and editing of *Hansard* is that a change in the meaning of what was said may not be made. We go as far as we can in accommodating the wishes of hon. members. In each instance, it's a matter which is usually dealt with by an hon. member and the Editor of *Hansard*. However, the hon. minister has made the necessary correction. Anyone reading through *Hansard* will undoubtedly, especially with diligent use of the index, be able to relate the two remarks.

MR. TAYLOR: On the point of order, if I may pursue it. I wonder if the hon. Speaker would consider, where it's simply a slip of the tongue, correcting the error in the bound copy. Otherwise, people reading the bound copy may readily come to a wrong conclusion.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll be glad to discuss that with the *Hansard* Editor and see if that can be done. We are able to do that in some cases, as I say, before the *Hansard* is bound. But of course it's almost impossible to do it once the *Hansard* has been sent out.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair]

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**  
(Committee of Supply)

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will now come to order for consideration of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Minister, did you have some comments with respect to this department?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Chairman, as hon. members know, the Provincial Treasurer is attending a finance ministers' meeting. He asked me to respond, during his absence today, to some questions raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition generally with respect to program budgeting, not with respect to any particular department.

The hon. leader asked for clarification of where final authority lies on transfers of funds. The indication I have is that there is a vote for each program, and the amount voted for the program cannot be exceeded without a special warrant. Movement of funds within the programs, that is between subprograms within a program, is accomplished through transfers which are subject to Treasury Board approval. So the actual movement within the program requires Treasury Board approval.

The existing situation is that Treasury Board approval is now required for movement between existing appropriations. Movement of funds between elements of a program is the responsibility of the individual minister.

With respect to the question regarding public accounts, the format for the public accounts will be determined by the Auditor. He has retained the historical codings, so the public accounts will be on an actual comparative basis.

The leader raised a question with respect to expenditure codes. The fact is that the new expendi-

ture codes that have been implemented just happened to be coincidental. They do not arise as a result of program budgeting. The Auditor and the data centre were going to change the expenditure code system in any event, whether program budgeting was instituted or not. So it is not a result of program budgeting, but simply a new coding system with some of the new computer development that has taken place in the data centre.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might respond to the Acting Provincial Treasurer and initially thank him for the information. I think that's a step forward as far as the transfer situation is concerned. So there can be a transfer within a program itself, but there can't be a unilateral transfer throughout the department. I think that's one of the plus sides as far as program budgeting is concerned.

On the other side of the coin, Mr. Chairman, we now have had the opportunity to look at the new format and to sit through one afternoon's deliberations here in the Chamber and two evenings of discussion in subcommittee. I must say that from our standpoint, the kind of information we have had to now is certainly wanting. I have some suggestions I want to make to the Acting Provincial Treasurer. I recognize that he may not be able to respond this afternoon.

I must say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to members of the Assembly that as far as the opposition is concerned, it's very important that we are able to get included in the object of expenditure information, that has been made available to us, meaningful comparisons as far as the '75-76 Estimates are concerned. That's an absolute minimum.

I raise that, Mr. Chairman, because last Tuesday night when we started the deliberations for the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, we were presented with that kind of information from the department. It got to us at 8 o'clock, which you can appreciate is complicating, to say the least. But when you start to look at the information, we only have a small portion of the information coming from the '75-76 Estimates. When you start to add up the portions of the '76 Estimates in the various codes of expenditure, you'll find they don't add up to anything like the amounts in the control groups. So it becomes impossible for us to draw comparisons in a number of areas.

If we are not able to get this kind of information by means of having it included in this object of expenditure information, then pretty candidly, Mr. Acting Treasurer, we are going to have to ask for basic information about the details of the grants, a breakdown of the grants, in each program. We are going to have to ask for the details of personal service contracts. We are going to have to ask for details on travel and relocation expenses. We are going to have to ask for details on hospitality expenses and on professional, technical, and labor services.

The grants basically are in the 700 series of codes. Personal service contracts are code 130; hospitality expenditures are code 510; travel and relocation expenses are code 200; and professional, technical, and labor services are code 430. I leave it pretty candidly with the Acting Provincial Treasurer, recognizing he may not be able to respond today. But unless we are able to get this information for each

program — and it isn't an unreasonable request, because basically that information was available in the old budget format. So it isn't a matter of asking for more information than has ever been available before. We simply have to have this kind of information if we are going to do meaningful kinds of comparisons.

Candidly, Mr. Minister, we think that where this government has not tightened the belt is in these areas that we mention: consulting contracts, travel, hospitality, and professional, technical, and labor services. If we are going to do our job on this side of the House, we have to have this kind of information before we can make the kinds of judgments that are necessary.

So I say, Mr. Minister, in light of the experience we've had now for one day of these estimates, it's that kind of information that will enable us to do an effective job.

I might make one other suggestion. That would be if we could have the objects of expenditure in our hands even a day or two before each department, preferably if we could get them all and then in fact be able to work on them. But it's extremely difficult when we get the object of expenditure presented to us as we start the deliberation of that particular committee, especially when we recognize the government has been working at this new budget approach for some months.

As far as we're concerned, to hoist the information on us as we start the deliberations just makes our job extremely difficult. I have no hesitation in saying that the estimates are going to have to take a great deal longer, because it's essential that we have that kind of information before the estimates for each department start. If we could have that kind of information, we could make some of the judgments we feel are essential to see whether the government really has tried to pare down expenditures in these areas or, in fact, has just carried on like we suspect it has.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Chairman, I will respond very briefly. Certainly without the Provincial Treasurer here, it would be my intention to recall discussions between him and me on the matter and to recall statements he has made on it before to the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Certainly we will provide the opposition with all the information, as quickly as we can. I've made a note of what the hon. leader has indicated with respect to details of the object of expenditure. I believe the Provincial Treasurer said that he saw no problem with that in the current '76-77 Estimates and, as much as possible, in the '75-76 expenditure, going back and picking it up historically. With the switch in votes that's indicated, there may be some problem there to put it totally on a comparative basis.

We have indicated, Mr. Chairman, that we realized there would be some pangs during this transitional period. Nevertheless, we will provide the opposition with all and the best information we possibly can on the details of objects of expenditure. We will try to provide that as early as possible prior to the examination of each department.

Having said that, and realizing and recognizing — as the government does — I do want to say, though, that this is a transitionary year and that in future years it will be more easily comparable.

Nevertheless, I don't think the hon. leader should overstate the situation. Basically, we have certainly a new system, but the objects of expenditure in total are provided in the Estimates. He refers to consulting contracts and manpower. The manpower in every department, and the total basis which includes manpower on contract, is in every departmental estimate. That information is basically there for the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

While we recognize there are some difficulties, and while we will provide all the information and details that are reasonable so that the opposition can do its job, and this House can do its job, effectively, I also think it's incumbent upon all of us to recognize that there is a lot of information in the *Programme Estimates*.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd just make one further comment, in light of the comments made by the Acting Provincial Treasurer. When the Treasurer says they're difficult to break down, I'll acknowledge that. The fact is, the government has broken down the old appropriations into various programs. What it calls for is simply to take the amount of money expended in that program from last year, and the estimates and the forecast, and to place them in the objects of expenditure.

It isn't a matter of it being impossible to do. As I see it, it's simply a matter of getting on with the job and getting it done so we can move along with the estimates.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. leader would send me a copy of the document he's having difficulty with, I could have it checked. It may be that something is missing.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, it isn't a matter of sending the document. It's simply a matter of all the object of expenditure documents we've received. If we could have the 1975-76 estimates in those broken down in the new expenditure code, and the actuals for '74-75, then we've got some meaningful comparisons. In the information we're getting, we would like the last two columns filled in completely: the '75-76 estimates and the '74-75 actuals. If we could have that kind of information, we could go over the last two years and see what's happening in these various codes. That's the information we need.

#### **Department of Agriculture**

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have completed to the end of 1.2.1. However, we left 1.1.5 on hold. Mr. Minister, do you have the answers to the queries on 1.1.5?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I provided some information with respect to Vote 1.1.5, Communication, to members of the opposition. Mr. Chairman, I believe I left half a dozen copies of some other information with you, if other members would like to get that information. I'll go over it very briefly.

The question simply was, why the increase of 137.3 per cent in communications? I indicated on Monday that it was because of transfers from other areas. We've now outlined what those areas are, and the exact amount of the transfer in each case. There was a transfer into communications of display funds,

amounting to \$237,000; publications from various branches and divisions, amounting to \$375,000; transfers from various branches and divisions of the library fund, amounting to \$67,000; centralized postage, in the amount of \$150,000, was transferred from financial services and accounts for the largest decrease in that area; the *Farm and Country Today* TV program, \$40,000; *Agriculture Week* and *Hall of Fame*, transferred to communications, in the amount of \$75,000; TV [program] *Market Place* transferred from the marketing division; and one position equalling \$25,000 transferred from the financial services vote. Mr. Chairman, that indicates an increase this year in the communications section of 6.26 per cent over the forecast figure for '75-76.

Mr. Chairman, while I'm on my feet let me go on to indicate I provided some information as well with respect to Vote 1.2.2, Ag. Societies and Research, which indicates a variety of areas in which grants out of that vote are being paid. In answer to the hon. Member for Drumheller, who questioned the amount of research being done, I might say this budget is about equal to what was done in the last fiscal year. It's difficult to pull totally from the budget what percentage of the total is spent on research, because a lot of it is done in-house. For example, we could contribute part or all of the operations of the horticultural research centre to research. At any rate, we're still in the area of about 3 to 5 per cent of the total budget being spent on agriculture research. Mr. Chairman, I think those would answer the main questions asked on Monday last with respect to the communications vote, the ag. societies and research vote, and the decrease in the financial services vote.

Going through the department expenditures, I know there are a good number of votes where there's not the problem just outlined by the Leader of the Opposition, in terms of changes being made. For example, on the Farmers' Advocate and the Land Use Forum, the comparable [figure] for '75-76 is a real figure. There's an explanation of why they're up or down. As we go along, I'll try to indicate the reasons for substantial decreases or increases. Although I do not have written copies that I could pass out for some things, I do have most of the information with respect to grants, fees, commissions, and other things in various votes.

MR. THOMPSON: I'd like to ask the minister if he feels a lot of these agricultural publications are really necessary.

MR. MOORE: I'm sorry, I can't hear you.

MR. THOMPSON: I know there's a small group in each area which reads these publications. But it seems we get so many of them out in the country all the time. I was wondering if he feels that maybe we could cut back in this area.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I've had some real concern about whether the extension information contained within the Department of Agriculture is getting to the people who need it. I've reviewed a lot of it. I have to say I feel the information is good; but what we do with it is another thing. We've done a number of things in that regard. Hon. members who read farm papers will notice that we now have a

four-page section in the middle of the *Country Guide*. I believe that's costing us in the neighborhood of \$70,000 a year. But after doing some pretty extensive surveys, we found that paper went to more farm households by far than any comparable magazine. We felt that was a good way to actually save money while getting to producers the kind of information we think is timely for them to receive. In addition to that, we've developed some weekly and monthly reporting with respect to markets and so on, and we're trying to find a better way to get that out.

Mr. Chairman, it would be my opinion that the question is not whether that information is useful, but how effective we in Alberta Agriculture can be in distributing it to the people who really need it. If one were to be critical of any area, it would be the area of what we do with it. If we put it on the rack in my office or in DA's offices and it gets dusty, it isn't of very much use. But we'll continue trying to improve that area.

MR. KIDD: Mr. Chairman, regarding research, I was wondering if the minister could comment on the progress or status of the hail suppression program.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, we're just beginning the third year of a five-year program under the Weather Modification Board, which is supported by and works closely with the Alberta Research Council people who've been involved in that area. The program was based on a five-year program paid [for] entirely by the Government of Alberta, with a view to achieving some results, hopefully in both a scientific research and practical sort of way, that would give us some indication at the end of that five years as to what we should do from that point forward.

At the end of the second year — and I've not yet received a full report on the second year's results and activities — I suppose it has to be said that we're a long way from knowing whether we would go into a practical hail suppression program at the end of the five years, or just what we might do. Indeed, there have been indications from other areas, particularly the United States and the U.S.S.R., that some of the results they felt they were getting in 1972, when the select legislative committee here in Alberta studied hail and crop insurance and weather modification, are not as good today as they were at that time. So there is indeed a lot of work to do yet.

As a matter of fact, earlier today I met three members of the Alberta Research Council who have been working with the Weather Modification Board in assembling those results. Next week I'll be meeting the members of the Weather Modification Board to review the program for the coming hail season, 1976, and trying to ensure that we are continuing on the basis of a program that will give us, hopefully, some kind of results and a direction to go at the end of the five-year period.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister as a suggestion. There's one communication bulletin that comes out. I think it's called *AgriNews*. Is that correct? I notice I get two copies, and I know other people in my constituency are finding that two copies are coming in. As a suggestion, I think maybe the mailing list should be revised. Maybe on one of the next news bulletins that comes out, you could take

the front page and just put on there that if they wish to continue on the mailing list they could ship the front page back. That would eliminate a lot of postage expense, I think.

MR. MOORE: That will be done, Mr. Chairman. If you've got any other mailings that go out that you suggest we could do that with, we'd be pleased to hear from you.

Agreed to:

Appropriation 1.1.5	\$1,836,321
Total Departmental Services	\$3,133,838

#### Appropriation 1.2.2

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, with regard to 1.2.2, I'd like to ask the minister to give us a bit of a run-down of the situation agricultural societies find themselves in in the province today. I'm sure the minister is well aware of the problems that a number of ag. societies are having with regard to some of the programs they've got themselves involved in. So, pretty candidly, I'd like to know from the minister the situation; specifically, if there are a number of agricultural societies in serious trouble, what are the plans of the department as far as that's concerned? What's the situation with regard to some of the structures that they've got themselves involved in? How does the minister see this being, perhaps, implemented or co-ordinated with his colleague, the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife — that area to start with?

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Chairman, during the course of the last three years or so, something in the order of 65 agricultural societies have taken on some projects of a capital nature to assist in recreational activities and ag. society fairs and that kind of thing in many rural communities in Alberta. Particularly in my position, sometimes the ones having difficulty overshadow the ones which have done very well and we don't hear from. In fact, the percentage having some problems is very, very low. I have been really pleased with the successes of many of them in building multipurpose buildings, providing a community recreation facility, in some cases curling rinks, arenas for skating, and so on that are utilized in the summer in a different way.

There's no question that perhaps half a dozen are in some financial difficulties. Those difficulties arose from about three different things. The first and major difficulty was rapidly escalating construction costs. I don't have to quote to anybody what has happened over the last two or three years. They came in two years ago, say, or three years ago, with a plan, started in with the building, and found themselves caught with very, very rapidly rising construction costs.

The second problem — and all three problems are prevalent in some cases, to some degree — was simply not good enough planning before they started a particular project, in terms of knowing what it would cost and how much it would cost to operate.

The third problem prevalent in some areas — I went so far as to go out and chair meetings between ag. societies and towns and counties or municipal districts — was the problem of people within the

community not being able to sit down and work together and put all their resources into one project. However, I'd have to say that I think we've come close to having resolved most of those problems. They've taken the form of sitting down with municipal governments which, were it not for the ag. societies, would be charged with some of the responsibilities of supplying recreation areas and so on, and getting, I might say, from a number of them some substantial commitments for support in repayment of capital and operating costs.

In one or two instances, some school authorities are also involved. Where a facility was built by an ag. society right next to a school, the school authorities who make very extensive use of it have come in with a commitment to pay part of the operating costs or part of the capital. So I've been encouraged, and indeed we've had a very, very close working relationship between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife in utilizing the capital grants that Recreation has, based on \$100 per capita in some of these agricultural society facilities. Very definitely, when you see an arena-community hall-curling rink type of thing built by an ag. society in a small community, there's no need in most cases for the funds from Recreation to be channelled into some other thing. They really have about all they can handle and afford to operate. So we've had good co-operation there, and with the co-operation of municipalities and the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, I think we'll be able to resolve most of those difficulties. Indeed, in all of rural Alberta many, many communities are going to be so much richer because of the kind of thing our ag. societies took on in providing those facilities to a great many rural Albertans and farm families who in no other way would have received them had it not been for this program.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I might ask the minister very directly, is the minister familiar with the situation at Mannville, and can he give us some indication as to what kind of progress he's making in that area?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I'm acquainted with it. As to the details, I simply don't have all those with me. But I would say that from my point of view we've been getting very good co-operation from municipal authorities and from the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. I'm not sure exactly what stage it is in now, in terms of resolution of their financial problems. But that is one I had in mind when I said I was confident we would be able to resolve it and the facility would be completed and of service to the community, as was originally intended.

MR. CLARK: Just to follow that up, Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The minister is really saying that he's confident that that facility is now going to be finished, that it's going to be able to be placed on a sound operational basis and not be an unreasonable, shall I say, cost to be borne by the local governments, both the town itself and the surrounding rural area. The concern that's been expressed to me is that, one, as things stood a short while ago, the facilities were not able to be finished. So one is the problem of getting them finished. Second was the problem of operating

them after they got them finished. Thirdly, who is going to pay for the operation?

MR. MOORE: Well, I can only say again that the determination of the people in that area is such — for example, it was my understanding that some \$40,000 was required to finish the swimming pool. I simply said to the group involved that we do not have any more grants to cover that. We don't have any more guaranteed loans to cover it. My understanding is that in the space of two weeks a couple of individuals in that area went out and raised half the funds required to finish that facility, and they're confident that they can raise the balance in a very short time and have it in operation.

As for there being a burden on the local municipality, that depends on how councillors, either in the town or the municipality, view their spending. If they feel that such a facility is going to be a service to that community and it's worth X mills, then it is no burden. I happen to be one of those who think that many rural municipalities in years past have not really spent and paid the kind of attention they should have to recreation. That comes about from the old idea that young people and young farm families today will simply go without any kind of facilities, like we used to do many years ago when your father and mine first homesteaded, or whatever they did.

Today, those young farm families with growing children want those kinds of facilities. It's been my feeling that they're prepared to pay a little more on their taxes, a little higher mill rate, to ensure that they have the same kinds of things in a rural community that they do in urban Alberta. I grant you, depending on the size of the community — a covered indoor swimming pool may in fact not be what's needed everywhere. We're being pretty tough about how many of those go ahead without full assurances of covering the operating and capital costs. But in my view, that should not detract from the program that was started, is in full swing, and has been a real benefit to a lot of communities.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word in connection with agricultural societies and the Department of Agriculture. I would like to commend the department for the tremendous help it is giving to communities through this agricultural societies grant. I can't overemphasize this. The other day, I was in one of these multipurpose arenas that could not possibly have been built by the community without help from the Department of Agriculture through an agricultural grant. In my view, every dollar the department contributed was well spent. That's a multipurpose arena. While I was there, there was a hockey game in one section, two curling games in another, a meeting of a women's institute upstairs, and a mass of people enjoying themselves in the main lobby. This was just one hour of one afternoon. Everyone there was very, very emphatic that this is the type of thing where the department or the government helps people to help themselves. It's not a handout. It's helping people to help themselves.

I want to commend the hon. minister for the way he looks at these and the support he is giving to communities in the province. I refer specifically to communities in my own constituency, because I know best about those. But there has been really tremen-

dous help to Morrin, Hussar, and Rockyford, areas which have qualified under the provisions of the act. I think this is an excellent program, and I hope the government keeps it up.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I can only say I appreciate the work of the department with regard to the grants. One thing in observation of the mechanics of supplying these grants, I was wondering just who attempts to co-ordinate the different departments. I know the personnel in your department look after the agricultural society grants, the people in recreation look after theirs. They do get together to have meetings. They do telephone back and forth to try to co-ordinate the information.

But there are also other areas that get involved. For example, in the project at Vauxhall at the present time where we're collecting money from the insurance for the arena that burned down, the local authorities board became involved, the insurance people, one or two other bodies — I just can't think of them right at the moment. We found that what we had to do was contact each one of these individually. Each area was unaware, in a sense, of the other. I know, from local government, they become very frustrated. They say to me, how do we do this? So I'm sort of on the hook to try to get around and pick up the loose ends.

How has government tried to come to grips with that sort of [lack of] co-ordination? Is there some person who is really heading it, or is there a cabinet committee which tries to come to grips with this?

MR. MOORE: Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, it's probably the job of an MLA to do that kind of thing from time to time. I can only speak for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife where, indeed, the minister and I had a number of meetings with respect to how we would co-ordinate. We have an individual in each department who's responsible to contact the other one, and vice versa, where there is a joint grant or a joint effort on behalf of those two departments to assist with the development of recreation or multipurpose building facilities. Beyond that, I don't believe there is any one area in government where you can go and say, we want to do this, will you research how many departments might have grants and that kind of thing, and put it all together for us. It may be useful to have that kind of function, but I think generally the MLAs are able to perform it and are pleased to do so.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think it's true that a good part of especially a rural MLA's job is to run around, trying to collect an inventory of all the grants and loan programs available. I would suggest, however, it might be useful for the government — and I just raise this now, because the matter was brought up by the Member for Little Bow. We had an inventory two or three years ago, I believe, of government grant programs and loan programs. I'd like to suggest to the government that that be updated, because a number of new programs, new federal-provincial agreements have been worked out. And I think there's a lot of merit in having an inventory of programs available, not only because it makes it easier for us as MLAs to get this information

out, but also it's the sort of thing that we could, through our MLAs' columns in local newspapers and what have you, keep bringing to the attention of people.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, a very good suggestion. For example, I know we in the Department of Agriculture have just updated the sources of farm credit that are available. We don't just include our own. We include the sources from chartered banks, the federal government, and so on. I see no reason we couldn't upgrade, as you suggest, an inventory of all the available grants, although it may be on a department basis, because some may have upgraded them recently. It wouldn't just be to agricultural societies or anything, but such things as DREE grants and so on.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, a question to the minister. I see there's a 38 per cent decrease in this particular vote. Will that be a decrease in grants to agricultural societies, or will that be in the research side of it?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I explained that on Monday last. One particular figure in total made up the entire difference. I'm just trying to think what. There was no decrease at all in grants to ag. societies. As a matter of fact, there was some increase as a result of the new grants to ag. society policies.

There was on total — if you will just carry on, I'll get it to you later. One particular one-time expenditure reduces that by 38 per cent.

MR. PURDY: Another question, Mr. Chairman, to the minister. This year, are we oversubscribed by the number of communities and agricultural societies applying for grants, or is there still money available for 1976-77?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, yes indeed, we're oversubscribed. We had requests for something like \$1.5 million in grants to ag. societies. However, during the course of the last four months, we've had three people working almost full time in the department, reviewing those requests with the organizations concerned. I've just sent letters to all ag. societies, with copies to MLAs, indicating who would be receiving grants this year. In this fiscal year, we were just able to spend the amount of funds in the budget. Cheques are now being drawn on the '75-76 budget.

So we will have new money that is not yet allocated, as is indicated in the schedule, some \$670,000 for the next fiscal year in those one-time maximum grants of up to \$50,000.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I could just qualify that. I assume that applications from ag. societies that aren't going to be dealt with this year will hold their place on the priority list. How will that be handled? In other words, I'm thinking of groups who made application last year, were given an indication that it might be this year, and they find out that this year is next year. That's a problem with next-year country, when it comes to some of these grants. I'm wondering to what extent they are going to hold their

place. Would they have to surrender their place to a subsequent application made by somebody else?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, generally all applications we have on hand now will hold their place. Any new applications will be treated as coming after those, bearing in mind that last year we went through the total that came in over a period of several months. There were some in which the planning was not sufficient or the method of financing was not adequate. Those are still being held in abeyance while we may have assisted people with grants who submitted applications later on.

But all other factors being fairly equal, those who submitted applications will hold their place, no question about that. But we have to consider the whole area of what they're doing in a capital way: if they can pay for it, how they can operate it, and so on.

Agreed to:

Appropriation 1.2.2

\$2,726,330

Appropriation 1.2.3

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on 1.2.3 I notice we have a slight reduction of 5.9 per cent from the forecast last year. There will be a slight increase over the estimates of 1975-76, but a reduction from the forecast.

I'd be interested in knowing what in fact is involved in that reduction. It would seem to me that the work of the Farmers' Advocate's office — by the way, I've always felt this is one of the better services provided by the Alberta government. I've had a number of cases brought to my attention, and I'm sure other members have as well, especially dealing with surface rights questions where the Farmers' Advocate is probably the best expert we have, or the most knowledgeable person we have in the province, at least from the vantage point of looking after the farmers' interests. I've found that the Farmer's Advocate's office has always been extremely co-operative and does a first-rate job. It seems to me that a reduction this year is a little puzzling.

Now, there's one other question I'd like to ask while I'm on my feet. I'd like to obtain from the minister his assessment of what service the Farmers' Advocate's office can provide to farmers in the Dodds-Round Hill area, for example, where they're obviously concerned about this particular project. The Department of the Environment can make available technical individuals for purposes of advising the people in question, but I think most of the people directly concerned would find that working with the Farmers' Advocate would be more convivial and probably more productive in terms of stating their case well.

There are really two questions. One, why is there a drop over the forecast? Two, what role does the minister see for the office of the Farmers' Advocate in dealing with the whole Dodds-Round Hill question?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, first of all, if I could respond to the question with regard to the decrease in the agricultural societies and research area. That is accounted for by the fact that we provided \$1.8 million to the Veterinary Infectious Disease Organization in Saskatchewan for the development of a joint

project between the Governments of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Saskatoon veterinary college, or the university there. That was a one-time expenditure for capital costs involved. That's the entire decrease in vote 1.2.2.

With respect to the Farmers' Advocate, the decrease of 5.9 per cent is explained by the fact that the Farmers' Advocate had, during the course of the fiscal year just ending, a law student assisting him part-time on matters of law. That, as well, accounted for the increase in the comparable for '75-76 as compared to the forecast. The Farmers' Advocate will be drawing those services he requires in that area from other legal staff within the department. Indeed, there may be occasions when he would resort to personal service contracts, or some such thing, for specific help from time to time, which would not be charged to his votes. There's really no decrease in his ability to serve the farmers of Alberta in the manner he has in the past.

The second question is with regard to his involvement in something like Dodds-Round Hill. Really, the office of the Farmers' Advocate was established to assist individual farmers with individual problems. He's been doing an excellent job in that regard. We don't, however, expect him, nor does he have the resources, to get involved in areas of general, broad government policy, you might say. With respect to that, decisions simply have to be made through the normal course of the Energy Resources Conservation Board, the cabinet, and so on.

But certainly, he has and would continue to advise individuals in that area as to what he sees as their rights as individual landowners, always with the caveat that the Farmers' Advocate is not a law specialist, nor was he intended to be. He is knowledgeable about a variety of things like surface rights and certainly can be of great assistance to people, as long as they don't pin him to every statement he makes with regard to what the rights are. But he can show them where to go and what to do when they have a particularly difficult problem.

Agreed to:

Appropriation 1.2.3 \$109,722

Appropriation 1.2.4

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, \$134,914 is budgeted for the Land Use Forum this year. What is going to be the function of the land-use committee from this day?

MR. MOORE: The major portion of the expenditures budgeted for this year are for printing additional copies of the Land Use Forum report.

In addition to that, the chairman of the Land Use Forum, Dr. Wood, who is an employee of the Department of Agriculture — as it is summarized in the estimates — will be retiring from the government service in September 1976, I believe. We've asked him to stay on as an employee until his retirement date. He will be doing some special projects — research and so on — in relation to land use for the Minister of the Environment, for me, and for others during the course of the next few months until his official retirement.

I believe we have one other staff member still being paid under that vote. That's Mr. Gylander, who was in another position in the Department of Agriculture. It would be our hope that in due course he would come back into the Department of Agriculture in a permanent position.

The major portion of that fund is for printing additional copies of the Land Use Forum report.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, have the other two members of the forum now completed their work? Are they no longer employed?

MR. MOORE: Yes. I guess I was wrong in talking about Mr. Gylander as a member of the forum. He worked for the forum full-time.

The other members of the forum are lay people and have their own occupations. Insofar as I know, subject perhaps to correction by the Minister of the Environment, to whom they have been reporting in the last year, they've completed their work and are no longer on the payroll, or involved in anything of that nature.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I understand to this point the gross expenditure for the report is around \$600,000. That's my first question. Is that correct?

Secondly, there's an indication here of \$135,000. We're going to do two things, as I listened to the minister: print more of these reports and keep Dr. Wood on until the fall. For \$134,000, that's not very much, unless we're going to print an awful lot of these reports. I have some comments about the report, too, along the line here.

I'd like to have the minister comment on those three things. One, what has the gross expenditure been? Two, what is the exact amount of money it will cost for Dr. Wood? And how many reports do we intend to publish in this coming year?

MR. MOORE: I can't give you an exact figure on the number of reports we intend to print, but indeed, in addition to the global mailing that was done to various committees on municipal councils, ag. development committees, agricultural service boards, chambers of commerce, towns, and cities, my office alone has mailed more than 100 copies of the report in the last couple of months. Requests for copies of the report are coming in continually from individuals.

We felt that the report is of such a nature that many of the media articles that reported on the contents of the report did not give the entire picture. It's pretty deep reading. There are some 180 recommendations. For example, I don't think many people who have commented on the suggestion in the report that an individual would have the right to trespass on land without permission have really read that section of the report and the comments of the Land Use Forum committee. Indeed, they said, we recognize it would be difficult if not impossible to legislate this, but it should be an educational process. There are other factors that are complicated by the fact that we presently have a problem with trespass laws. Farmers believe — and they may be correct — that when they allow someone to trespass on their land, they're liable for any accidents he or she might incur, and can be subject to all kinds of lawsuits and



so on in that regard. That just points out that the report itself can't just be read and then commented upon. It has to be read, reread, and then studied.

I felt that really we should make a copy of that report available to every single Albertan who wrote in and asked for one. If he is interested enough to write a letter to any MLA or to my office asking for a copy of the report, he would have it. As to what the reports individually cost to print, I don't know. I can find that out. As to the cost to date of the Land Use Forum, all one has to do is [look] in the book and add up the '74-75 actual and the '75-76 forecast, and it comes to \$603,000.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate that, but in my own mind there certainly isn't some \$600,000 of information in this report. With the attitude that has prevailed, the relationship between this report and local input — we certainly haven't got \$600,000 worth of output. But that can be discussed by resolution.

The thing is, I'm just not satisfied that we should approve a vote of \$134,000 when we haven't any assurance that, one, the report committee as such has finished touring around the province holding hearings, doing things. Because this is the final report; it says that within the first few pages. That's number one. We've got to be assured of that.

Number two, I'm not sure what Dr. Wood's function is. If we're just keeping him on to preserve an income for Dr. Wood, I think that's wrong in principle. His pension at this point will bring him an equivalent income. We really don't need him around for that purpose. I don't think it's at all fair at this point to approve a \$135,000 expenditure without knowing the details of what is really going to happen, because I know other areas of government that could use \$100,000.

MR. CLARK: Whitecourt Hospital.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Whitecourt Hospital, nurses — and right across the province that problem prevails. The Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care needs the money. Maybe we could chop out \$100,000 here, and I can think of about five other places in this budget where we could do just that, plus a few more, that are of higher priority than keeping the staff and sending out a lot of these books. Maybe there's enough in the province at the present time. I hope the minister can break that \$135,000 down so we know what we're talking about.

MR. MOORE: First of all, Mr. Chairman, it's well recorded in *Hansard* that the hon. member disagrees that we should be printing copies of that report and sending them to Albertans who ask for them. I happen to think we should, and that's why the vote is there. There's a difference of opinion there.

Secondly, with respect to Dr. Wood, surely the hon. member is not suggesting that a dedicated public servant, who has served this province as long as Dr. Wood has, would sit around on salary doing nothing from now till September. He's going to be working and working . . .

MR. CLARK: Just tell us.

MR. MOORE: . . . very hard doing some special projects that relate to questions we have with respect to the Land Use Forum.

MR. CLARK: What are they?

MR. MOORE: He's going to be working under the direction of the Minister of the Environment and me in that regard. To say what they are: some research, for example, into the whole question of trespass, which should have been done a long time ago as a concern of farmers throughout Alberta.

I just conclude by saying that I know the individual, and I know he's not the kind of individual, as the hon. member might suggest, who is going to sit around and draw salary. Indeed, he's done an excellent job of getting the views of Albertans during the course of the Land Use Forum study, and he'll be doing some excellent work during the course of the next few months, I'm sure.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I have nothing against sending out the report to different people, but I'd like to know, one, what the report really costs. Really, I don't think that's the big cost in the \$135,000 anyway. The big cost must be for staff and people and travels. That's just not clear. If Dr. Wood is going to do work on trespass legislation, I can only repeat what I said a few minutes ago. We have spent \$600,000 on time, people, just these people who wrote the report. On top of that, hundreds of Albertans made submissions to this report at their own cost. I'm not sure how many dollars that would amount to: many, many dollars, many more than \$600,000.

Here we are at this point, in the next five or six months, continuing a staff to do research on trespass. I look at the back, the section of this report that talks about foreign travel or something — I forget what the title is, but I think that's what it was. They toured all over the world to look at different programs, different ideas. Well if they don't know by this time, by spending \$600,000 and having some valid recommendations, maybe it's time we examined why we're spending more money at this time. I can't see it. We've got to know, as opposition and people in this Legislature, what the dollars are for.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, aside from the fact of what each individual report costs, in dollars — and I don't know — I told you that the additional funds are for two employees, one of whom is a permanent employee of the Department of Agriculture and is still included in that vote. The other is for the salary until September of Dr. Wood, the chairman of the Land Use Forum. The balance is for printing additional copies of the report as they are required. I'll undertake to find out what each individual copy of the report costs. Beyond that, I don't think I can add anything.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I might just follow on with the point being made here. If we look at the code of expenditures and look under agriculture departmental support services and agricultural assistance, we'll find that for policy [and] liaison, agricultural [societies and] research, Farmers' Advocate, Land Use Forum, and surface rights, the total

material and supply is \$62,000. Now if every last cent of that were going to be spent in more copies of the Land Use Forum [report], that would mean there would be no materials and supplies for the other programs in this vote. So it's pretty obvious that \$62,000 isn't going to be spent on reprinting the Land Use Forum [report].

Now what my colleague is really saying is, what are we going to do with this \$134,000? The minister has said that Dr. Wood is going to carry on from now until September, I believe. That's April, May, June, July, August, September — six months. That isn't going to make very much of a dent in \$134,000. Secondly, the minister says he's going to be involved in research, and the only research that we've heard about is to look at this question of trespass. Really, what we're saying is that there has to be more justification than that for \$134,000, especially when we look at the code of expenditures. If all the materials and supplies are going to be pumped into sending out the Land Use Forum [report], that's \$62,000. That still leaves about \$72,000 or \$73,000 for something else.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I'll undertake to get a breakdown of what all those funds are for. We can leave the vote. The hon. member missed my comments on two occasions about the fact that there's another full-time employee in there, Mr. Gylander. I don't know. What do we pay people like that?

The other thing I'd like to know — and I indicated an example of the kind of thing Dr. Wood is going to be doing. But if the hon. Leader of the Opposition thinks his employment should be terminated now, I wish he'd say so.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, if I thought Dr. Wood's services should be terminated, I would have told the minister during the debate. The minister wants to put words in my mouth. If he wants to try that kind of thing, all well and good. The minister knows bloody well that wasn't what I said or what the hon. Member for Little Bow said.

We can spend a great deal of time here and try to draw a red herring across the thing and say that the question is Dr. Wood's employment. That's utter baloney. The minister knows it. The situation here is, the minister can't explain what he's going to do with \$134,000. He'd like to try to imply that members of the opposition think Dr. Wood should be cut off salary. That's a bloody poor illustration of what he knows about what's going on.

MR. DOAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister if he anticipates any legislation on the Land Use Forum coming out of this session, or if the government is likely to make a stand on foreign ownership?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, we don't expect any legislation with regard to land ownership or foreign ownership at the current session of the Legislature. Some areas within the 180-odd recommendations might be included in legislation this fall. I'm not aware that there are any substantial ones.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, the minister said he's going to give us a breakdown of the \$134,000. I think possibly we should hold the balance of the debate

until then.

But I would like to say that I believe every Albertan who wants a copy of this report should be able to get it. I don't want to have to say to people in my constituency, I'm sorry, we can't give you one. I've sent out a lot of these personally. I expect there are going to be a lot more requests for them. This is paid for by the people's money. This deals with items of far-reaching importance to everyone, rural and urban. In my view, they are entitled to have a copy of this. I certainly wouldn't be in favor of cutting off the thing now and saying, we've run out, and the people who didn't get one can't have one.

I think we should make provision to make sure that every Albertan who wants a copy, for the next four or five months at least, should be able to secure one.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I don't think anybody argues with that. I think some of the discussion was misinterpreted with regard to that matter.

There is a recommendation with regard to the planning act and so on in the report. Is it the intention of the government to bring in an act this session, or is that planned for the fall session? I understand the Minister of Municipal Affairs has been doing some work in that area.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I'd refer the question with regard to when the new planning act is coming before the Legislature to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, we will be tabling the new planning act in the Legislature in the spring session.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I'm sorry. Did you say the spring session?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, sir.

DR. BUCK: This year?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Good. To the Minister of Municipal Affairs then: has the act been prepared by civil servants within your department and under your guidance? Have any outside consultants been utilized?

MR. JOHNSTON: No. I spent the last five months myself working with our department trying to arrive at a balanced land-use policy to reflect the planning concerns we have. It will be a point and counterpoint, in some respects, with respect to the Land Use Forum, but I'm sure some of the contentions there will be reflected.

MR. R. SPEAKER: To the Minister of Agriculture then: there will be no money from the \$135,000 that goes toward writing and preparing this new planning act. Is that correctly interpreted now?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I have indicated I'd like to leave that vote and get a complete breakdown of it. Then we'd know.

Agreed to:  
Appropriation 1.2.5 \$493,083

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will hold total agricultural assistance and total departmental support services until we've cleared 1.2.4.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to pose four or five questions to the minister. If he has the information, all well and good. If he hasn't, he could give it to us when we come back to the Land Use Vote 1.2.4.

With regard to code 130, the personal service contracts, \$22,000; could the minister give us some indication what that is?

Also, with regard to a breakdown of code 200, \$63,850 for travel and relocation; Vote 430, \$118,500 for professional, technical, and labor services; and the hospitality vote which, I think, is 510: could the minister give us an explanation with regard to the grants, \$2,715,000? Where do they end up?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member reading from the computer run-out that was provided by Treasury? From what . . .

MR. CLARK: Yes, I am. Right. With regard to agricultural assistance, and codes 130, 200, 430, 510 . . .

MR. MOORE: What page are they on?

MR. CLARK: They're just numbered 1 and 2, agricultural assistance.

MR. MOORE: Okay, we'll find them.

Agreed to:  
Appropriation 2.1 \$536,391

Appropriation 2.2

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the minister if he, his department, or the Department of the Environment has any money in the votes for the development of our basins, or for a study of the development of water resources on our river basins. I'm thinking of a study such as the one on the Oldman River basin that they're just about to complete. We have the Bow River basin. The federal government is thinking of doing some repair work on the Bassano dam at this time. I think it would be very advisable and feasible if we had a good, comprehensive study on the Bow River basin.

At the present time, there are several areas where they could store water on the basin. In the Bow River basin, there's a dam at Cheadle that could back the water up into two basins. There's another area on the Crowfoot Creek that could store one million acre-feet of water. We could also pump water out of the Red Deer River into that particular basin. One area where they could store 300,000 acre-feet of water is the Eyremore Dam. I know that eastern irrigation districts have been in contact with the Minister of the Environment and the minister of irrigation in regard to this particular dam.

I would certainly like to see a study made on this basin before the federal government goes ahead and

spends an enormous amount of money in the renovation of the Bassano dam at the present time, or else putting in a dam downstream, which will strictly be a diversion dam.

I was wondering if there is any money in the minister's vote in irrigation here — it's not broken down as to grants — for studies on any of the river basins.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, the situation with regard to irrigation is that a split was made between the responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Environment. Generally speaking, Agriculture will be assisting with expertise, funds, and so on from that point we refer to as the head gates, or the start of the irrigation districts themselves.

The Department of the Environment will maintain responsibility for the delivery of water to those systems, which I think includes all the things the hon. member made reference to, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I could say that the individual districts are working with the irrigation division and the irrigation council in looking at additional water storage within irrigation districts.

All the other points you mentioned are under the jurisdiction of the Minister of the Environment. If you could raise it during his estimates, you could get some answers on it. I would alert him to the fact that you're concerned about it.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One further question, Mr. Chairman. There's \$4,239,000 to be spent on irrigation. The element here has, secretariat, \$2,069,000. Is that what the grants that will be available to irrigation districts will be coming out of, the \$2,069,000?

MR. MOORE: I didn't quite follow you. Could you repeat that?

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, there are going to be grants available to irrigation districts under the vote here. In summary by element, it has indicated the secretariat is going to get \$2,069,000. It's broken down to conservation and development, \$1,114,000; technical resources, \$504,000; project planning, \$551,000. I was just wondering what portion of this is going to be for grants for irrigation districts.

MR. MOORE: Within this budget there is \$2 million of direct grants to the 12 irrigation districts. They are provided to them on a water-charge acreage formula, a 70-30 formula we call it. It relates to the charge for water, as well as the number of acres each district has under water. I presume that breakdown relates to what those irrigation districts are going to do with those funds — what area the districts will be putting it into. But they will be spending all of that, and there's \$2 million.

I indicated on Monday as well that any additional funds with respect to our commitment from the Alberta heritage savings trust fund would be by way of the irrigation districts themselves obtaining financing from chartered banks and other lending institutions until the end of this year when we intend to present to the Legislature an appropriation bill that

would provide \$5 million to pay for the amount spent this summer by the districts.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might just ask the minister to elaborate a bit on the procedure we are going to use to get the available money. I recall, last year, the minister talked about the loaning venture. Did the minister say that this fall an appropriation bill would come in? Could you elaborate on that just a bit, please.

MR. MOORE: I'm not sure. But just going by the draft act that came into the Legislature on the heritage savings trust fund, it says in effect that the 20 per cent of that fund which will be spent on things like irrigation and do not bring a direct dollar benefit to the fund itself, would not be spent without an act of the Legislature. So all I'm saying is that we expect that situation with respect to those dollars to remain somewhat the same in a new bill that might be presented, which would leave the requirement of introduction of a bill of some type in the fall of this year, after the heritage savings trust fund act has been assented to. That would allow us to extract \$5 million for irrigation development and repay the districts which have done work in 1976.

The only other alternative was to say to the districts, you cannot start on this new project until 1977. I felt they were sufficiently geared up, in terms of their planning and engineering and the availability of contractors and supplies, to spend an additional \$5 million over and above the \$2 million in here during this construction year. So we've asked them to go ahead on that basis.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a point of some concern. I want to make it very clear, so the minister and I don't get involved in a point of misunderstanding. I'm not in any way being critical of the amount of \$5 million being made available for irrigation, for work to be done this summer. I commend the government for that. My colleagues, the member from Brooks and the Member for Little Bow, have in fact urged that be done. We're in support of that venture.

But I'd say to the minister and the members of the committee, Mr. Chairman, this is one of the real problems this Assembly is having with regard to being master of its own spending. Surely to goodness, with all the lawyers on the government front bench and some on the back bench and some on the third bench, there is some mechanism we can use, even if we have to wait until after the heritage fund legislation is introduced and approved. I hope there are changes in it before it gets here, and some changes once it gets here. Surely, after that's done, we can bring in a bill somehow to deal with the question of the expenditure of that \$5 million right now, during this session.

Really, what we are doing by following the minister's approach — and I'm not arguing about what he's doing, but I'm arguing about the approach from the standpoint it puts the Assembly in once again — we are going to be going back and approving the expenditure of that money after it has really been spent. The minister has really stuck his neck out to the irrigation council — and I herald him for doing it — to say there will be \$5 million in the fall. If things should change

dramatically in the province, the irrigation councils could find themselves completely out to lunch. The only thing they have to base it on is the minister's word. I'm not suggesting, in this case, the minister's word isn't good. What I am suggesting is that we're putting ourselves in a situation of the minister telling the boards to spend the \$5 million, and in the fall the Legislature will approve it.

My proposition to the minister is: if we are really concerned [about] the Legislature controlling the expenditure — and I think we should be, very seriously, we should be — then the government should be bringing in a piece of legislation for consideration of the Assembly this spring to discuss the question of \$5 million for irrigation. I gather the feeling from members on both sides of the House [is] that that would have strong support.

I raise the matter at this time for two reasons. One is: if we are going to establish the principle of this kind of situation of a minister going out and making a commitment of this size, and we come back in the fall and rubber-stamp it — there's no question the government has got the muscle, or the manpower, or the 'ladypower', or the power in the House, to do that. But I say to members on both sides of the House, it's indeed a very dangerous precedent for us to establish. So I say to the minister, with all the legal beagles on the government side, surely to goodness there is a mechanism we can use during this session to put that money into the heritage fund, on the assumption that legislation is passed, so the irrigation councils and the minister are not on the line, but in fact the Legislature has made that decision during this spring session.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, first of all the question is one of the irrigation districts having to know early in March 1976 what kind of funds they might have. It was not possible to wait until the latter part of this session and pass an act to allow them to do any planning or know which direction they were going with regard to this year's expenditure.

I should also point out — I think my statement was that I would present to the Legislature in some form or another, and it would certainly be a bill, a request for that amount of money, \$5 million, in the fall of this year to repay what was spent. I would hope that I would have the support of the Legislature in approving that. If in fact that didn't happen, of course, there are a number of other ways. It could perhaps have been in this year's budget, but it could be funded in the fall of the year via special warrant, or it could be included in next year's Department of Agriculture budget if the Legislature said no. But I stuck my neck out quite a way indeed with the full intention it would receive the full support of the Legislature in terms of the spending in irrigation areas, because I know how important it is to a lot of members.

MR. CLARK: Just to follow the minister's comments, Mr. Chairman. No one disagrees with the minister about the importance of the expenditure. The real matter of disagreement is: does the Legislature become involved in that discussion during the early time of that expenditure, or does it become involved after the expenditure is finished? My submission to the House is that the council could have the informa-

tion when the minister gave it to them. But we could then approve the expenditure of that money late this session by whatever means the government chooses. For example, if they wanted to bring in supplementary estimates after the heritage fund legislation is approved, it could be done by that means.

The whole proposition is that we're setting a precedent for how the heritage fund money is going to be spent. I don't think we're setting that precedent on a very sound basis. Hopefully, what we're arguing here is not the particular expenditure — I think we all agree it's good — but the mechanism the government is choosing to use. That mechanism is that the Assembly isn't going to have the opportunity to voice its views on it until after the money is spent. I think that's a very dangerous precedent for us to establish.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, the only other thing I have to say is that I thought about that as well. It would have been quite easy for me, on Monday last, to avoid telling the Legislature that we intended the irrigation district to spend \$5 million in 1976. In fact, I said we intended to do that, and I said how we intended to do it.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the field is now open for debate on whether that \$5 million will be spent properly, and whether it's spent right. It will be open for debate again next fall, Mr. Chairman, although admittedly after the money has been spent. But I really think the advance notice I gave — which I suppose I really wasn't required to give, but I thought the members of the Legislature should be told that's what we intended to do — does give us an opportunity to discuss it.

Agreed to:  
Appropriation 2.2 \$4,239,914

Appropriation 2.3

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would give us some indication what has happened with the rather extensive study that was done on artificial insemination. It's my understanding that the department had someone on staff for a year, or a year and a half. That person made a number of recommendations to the department. What action is the department taking with regard to those recommendations?

MR. MOORE: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I simply can't advise what total action has been taken, or what in fact was done as a result of any reports that might have been submitted. I'd have to check on that and find out.

Appropriation 2.4

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, on animal health, is this the pilot project the department set up where they are inspecting livestock yards for warble flies? Does this come under animal health? Have any results been fed back to the department on these inspections? The program started early in the winter, and it ends May 31.

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This vote does include veterinary field services, which would include inspection services there, as well as veterinary lab services, analytical services, and meat inspection which, incidentally, accounts for the major share of the increase in this particular vote.

Insofar as the warble control inspection program is concerned, I don't yet have, and don't expect for some short time, a complete report on that work through the course of the winter. The hon. member is well aware, of course, of some of the problems with respect to warble control in the three areas that opted out. We're still working, with some hope, to have those three included in the program so the entire province will be part of it.

Agreed to:  
Appropriation 2.4 \$2,625,031  
Appropriation 2.5 \$12,569,970

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the minister the same questions on Vote 2 as we did on Vote 1, going back to the code of expenditures once again. What's involved in the personal service contracts, code 130? What's involved in travel and relocation, \$1,251,000, code 200? What's involved in code 430, \$795,000 in professional, technical, and labor services? What's involved in the \$20,000 for hospitality?

Referring to page 27 of the Estimates, I wonder if I might also ask the minister if he could explain to us what the term "financial transactions" means down there. I see we have grants and the usual items there, but could the minister break down financial transactions? Just what, in fact, is that \$1.8 million all about?

MR. MOORE: First of all, the total sum in financial transactions involves the interest rebate on the cow-calf program for this year, wherein we will be paying the interest costs over and above 7 per cent.

MR. CLARK: Will the minister get the rest of the information for us?

MR. MOORE: Yes, I have a complete breakdown of all the personal service contracts, for which I gave you some total figures the other day with regard to what was formerly fees and commissions. What were the other items you wanted?

MR. CLARK: What we'd like is the breakdown of the question of personal service contracts in this particular vote; it's 130. We'd like the breakdown as far as travel and relocation, 200; 430; 510. The minister answered the question of 930, financial transactions. Basically, those are the ones we're going to ask for each of the votes.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, my difficulty is I'm trying to go by the blue book in terms of the code numbers and so on. I presume you're utilizing the document which was forwarded by Treasury. Is that right?

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, if I might say to the minister, the reason we're doing this is that this is

the only way we can find out what's happening as far as wages, contracts, travel and relocation expenses, hospitality, and those areas. I indicated earlier to the Acting Treasurer that we think those are the areas where the government has been very lax this year. The only way we can get to it is to get the information for each program, so we can then make a value judgment when the estimates are finished.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is really asking for those things he mentioned that are included in Vote 2, production assistance. Is that right?

MR. CLARK: Yes, but I asked you the same things in Vote 1. I'm going to ask you the same ones in 3 and 4.

MR. MOORE: Well, all I'm trying to get at is, I would like to have them identified as to the estimates as we're going through them. Now what do you want in Vote 2?

MR. CLARK: Well, I'd like broken down out of Vote 2 what is meant by personal service contracts. What contracts have we entered into as far as Vote 2 is concerned for personal service? Who is it to? Who's the person? I'd like a breakdown of the \$1,251,000 for travel and relocation expenses. What's involved as far as travel and relocation expenses? I'd like a breakdown of professional, technical, and labor services, \$795,000. What's involved in that? I'd like a breakdown of the \$20,000 for hospitality. So that those are basically . . . I'm sorry, I should add one more: 540, other purchased services. We'd like a breakdown as to how the money is going to be spent in those areas.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I think I could probably supply a complete list of those as it applies to the entire department. Insofar as personal service contracts and supplying names of individuals and amounts, I'm sure that would not be entirely possible, because many of the dollars put in there are with respect to work that we know has to be done that hasn't been awarded yet. You know, we do our best in that regard. The same with travel. You know, that's a figure based on last year's costs, and to identify who, in fact might be receiving it . . .

MR. CLARK: With regard to the personal contracts, I recognize the minister can't give us the names in all cases, but he can give us the projects we're going to spend this money on. With regard to travel and relocation, can you give us a breakdown between travel and relocation?

AN HON. MEMBER: [Inaudible] doesn't go that far.

MR. CLARK: Well, the public accounts go that far now. You can get a breakdown. Surely, you have to work from what we had last year to this year. So you can give us some indication of the breakdown.

MR. MOORE: I'll see what we can provide, Mr. Chairman. That's all I can do. I'm not sure . . .

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, just one question on Vote 2, before we move on to Vote 3. There's a large reduction in the grants. Are there grants that are eliminated, or is it just fewer applications for grants?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, that comes under plant products and it has to do with the \$15 million, which I mentioned earlier, that will be funded in a different way for the federal government's share of Alberta hail and crop insurance premiums. So, if you look at the grants area there, you'll see that that accounts for almost the entire sum of the decrease in grants. The \$15 million that the federal government paid previously was funded by the department and was called a grant.

Agreed to:

Appropriation 3.1

\$531,675

Appropriation 3.2

\$3,502,596

Appropriation 3.3

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, could the minister just briefly outline what work they are providing in the market intelligence department in relation to livestock?

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Chairman, that covers our market analysis branch, field services, statistics people, resource economics people, and production economics people. That's largely for the costs of operation, personnel, and so on in the five areas I mentioned. For example, to mention someone the member would be familiar with, Jim Dawson is doing market analysis in the livestock area to try to forecast trends. And the statistics people compile all of that and periodically release information with regard to market prices, market trends, not only here in Alberta, but around the world with respect to livestock, feed grains, and that kind of thing. Resource and production economics people, of course, are a back-up to those in a general way.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just following along the question by my colleague from Brooks, I wonder if the minister would explain to us the \$1.193 million in grants in this area. Secondly, I wonder if the minister would be prepared to give us some indication as to this market development and market intelligence.

I've raised in the House on more than one occasion what I consider to be the overlapping situation among the minister's department, Business Development and Tourism, and the Export Agency itself. A more proper place to raise the whole question, of course, would be with the minister who was going to get this matter straightened out a year ago but apparently hasn't yet. But I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture would spend some time outlining exactly what his people are doing as far as market intelligence and market development are concerned. Because from where I sit — and I've changed my view on this somewhat — I think the former minister, when he set up the Export Agency, has likely been further wrong in some other areas. That may come as a bit of a surprise to the former minister.

But what really seems to strike a very odd chord is

the kind of market development and competition that's going on within the Department of Agriculture with the Export Agency, and the same thing in Business Development and Tourism. Last year, when we went through the estimates, the Minister of Business Development and Tourism was going to have this matter all dealt with. Now the best information I can get is that it's still waiting to get to the cabinet somehow. It's been a year. Once again this hits an area where we want to see some indication the government has really tried to come to grips.

It isn't a matter of cutting back on what's being done, but of not going over the same areas by three groups of people. I'm not suggesting that's happening on every occasion, but certainly on some occasions it is. You have competition among the Export Agency, people in Agriculture, and certainly over in the department. I see this kind of thing developing, in fact getting worse, until there's some resolution of this question of who is really going to be calling the shots, if I might use that term, in this whole question of looking for markets, be it in Agriculture or in Business Development. Is the Export Agency the organization responsible? Is it the Deputy Minister of Agriculture? Is it some of the people in Business Development and Tourism?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I just briefly discussed the market intelligence area. That doesn't really have anything to do with market development as you just described it. That involves our people in statistics, resource economics, production economics, and market analysis, like Mr. Dawson, and some others who put out weekly and monthly reports on market intelligence. Market development, of course, is a different question and does relate very definitely to the area the member was talking about.

First of all, perhaps I could go into the grant section of \$1.193 million. Included in that grant section is the nutrition and food branch, which provides grants of up to \$40,000 a year to Agri-Prom, which is a joint effort of some agricultural processing firms in Alberta and the Department of Agriculture in promoting Alberta agricultural products on the domestic market — nothing to do with export. They've had a number of programs involving the Edmonton Exhibition Association in both the spring and the fall, and I think some in Calgary as well, in promoting Alberta agriculture.

AN HON. MEMBER: What cost sharing [inaudible]?

MR. MOORE: Oh, I'm not exactly sure of the cost sharing, but it is about 50-50. We in the Department of Agriculture really started in an area by ourselves in promoting Alberta food products and then moved into an area where Agri-Prom was formed. Industry is now contributing fairly substantially to the costs of that advertisement, because of course they benefit as well. A number of our marketing boards, too, like the egg marketing board, the honey, the Sheep and Wool Commission, and so on are involved in promoting their products at that show. It usually occurs where there's the largest concentration of people and you can make the best use of a marketing dollar.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much did you say was involved there?

MR. MOORE: Up to \$40,000.

In addition to that, we have some \$12,000 for grants to provide incentives to individuals, firms, associations, commissions, marketing boards, et cetera for the expansion and penetration of existing and new markets or for market studies.

There's a \$21,000 grant to the Alberta Cattle Commission. There is \$500,000 in that vote for developmental and promotional grants to livestock organizations and semen producers and firms. For example, we provide up to \$20,000 in matching dollars to every breed organization in Alberta. In addition, we funded pretty extensively last year — I'm not sure of the figures — the All Breeds Association from this vote under grants to livestock groups for livestock promotion. That, Mr. Chairman, is an area that from time to time would involve people in the Export Agency.

Maybe I could stop there and say we have, in my view, a very good working relationship with the Export Agency in the marketing division of Alberta Agriculture. Indeed, the Export Agency, in its export market development, utilizes staff from the Department of Agriculture from time to time. In at least every major kind of promotion in terms of market development that either the agency or the marketing division is involved in, one always has full awareness of what the other is doing. As a matter of fact, I personally have a good number of meetings with individuals in the Export Agency in assisting co-ordination between the agency and the marketing division of the department.

Aside from the odd isolated case, I really don't think there's a problem there. It largely comes about from the fact that the agency was a part of the department from its existence until last April. The individuals there, quite naturally, have been able to work very closely with Department of Agriculture officials. So I'm pretty confident, at least, that the duplication of effort the hon. member talks about simply does not occur in the Department of Agriculture marketing division and the Alberta Export Agency.

In terms of grants, the vote also contains grants to farmers' markets in the amount of \$200,000, and grants in the amount of \$415,000 to individuals, firms, associations, commissions, marketing boards, et cetera, for the expansion and penetration of existing and new markets or for market studies. That is the amount to be used generally for assistance in promoting markets in an export area offshore.

It may be used as well in promoting exports in other parts of Canada. But generally, it will be allocated on a formula basis — not necessarily 50-50, most often it's much less than that — as assistance to help an individual, a company, an association, a commission, or a marketing board get into a new area of marketing; for example, a program involving the Alberta Cattle Commission and a market penetration into the Pacific rim in terms of supplying 25 head of fat cattle grown to that market. It can readily be seen that in developing that market there's always a shortfall in terms of freight and so on, and you can't charge the uppermost.

So we could be involved in supplying, say, to the Alberta Cattle Commission — this is just an example — \$20,000 from that vote to assist in a project like that, which we feel might bring better returns down the road for beef producers.

That's pretty well the extent of the grants in that area, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would elaborate just a bit on the kind of assistance to, I think he used the term, semen firms. I raise the question in light of the outfit just west of Edmonton that went into bankruptcy not long ago and left a number of debts in Alberta — well, literally across the world — fortunately not in huge amounts, at least from the list I've seen from the bankruptcy proceedings. But certainly a number of people in the business itself stand to lose no small amount of money in a number of cases.

So I'd like to have the minister pursue for us, in some detail, this question of assistance that semen firms get out of this vote — or, frankly, any other vote — with regard to semen to be used in Alberta, in Canada, and then outside Canada.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, two or three years ago, I think, we set up a program of assistance to people who were involved in marketing semen outside Alberta. Generally speaking, we assist them on a 50-50 cost-sharing basis in their promotional activities, where they can show us they're bringing new business to semen producers in this province. We don't assist them, for example, in their costs of setting up distribution stations and freight costs of actually handling, distributing, and selling semen. But we assist them with advertising costs, mainly advertising costs in a new area.

For example, if one of our semen distributors wanted to penetrate a United States market where he had not previously been, and that market was serviced by other than an Alberta firm, we would assist with a market development program there that might initially involve some advertising — which can be quite extensive — brochures, bulletins, or direct calls to people who are large purchasers of semen.

I, myself, perhaps wasn't aware until the last year or so of the importance to Alberta cattle producers of the semen business. Indeed, the potential for income is very great for breed organizations, individuals, and associations in this province, in terms of the sale of semen around the world.

As the hon. member probably knows better than I, we have some of the finest breeding stock in Canada. It was our intention, via this program, not to give them any benefits over and beyond what anyone else might receive, but only to help them when they were involved in penetrating a new market. That doesn't just apply to the United States. You can apply it to many other countries as well.

Incidentally, this vote has nothing in it in terms of loans, which you spoke about. Any semen organization that wants to develop a program and requires funds has to go to normal lending sources, which of course would include, depending on what they're doing, possibly the Alberta Opportunity Company or the Ag. Development Corporation.

MR. CLARK: Just two follow-up questions to that, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I'd like to ask the minister what instructions have gone to employees of the Department of Agriculture with regard to being involved with making semen available from their own livestock for this kind of effort? It would seem to me

that obviously directions should have gone to employees of the department saying, look, if you're an employee of the department, you'd better stay out of these things. I don't think I need to elaborate on why that should be the case.

The second question I'd like to ask the minister, pretty candidly, is this. With regard to Dr. Day's establishment west of Edmonton that filed voluntary bankruptcy, a number of Alberta breeders lost a sizable amount of money in that venture. Also, a number of people who had done business with that particular firm lost money in other parts of Canada, and other parts of the world.

In light of that kind of business operation, does the minister consider that some of Dr. Day's other firms — one in particular sent a letter out to Alberta breeders during the time the bankruptcy proceedings were on which said, we're carrying on business as usual. Surely to goodness, we're not making assistance available to that organization in light of the experience we just finished.

MR. MOORE: I really am unsure, Mr. Chairman, to what extent we should get involved with individual persons in this session. But I will say that in this particular case a request for a grant from that new organization was turned down. It was turned down simply because of its record of performance on the other situation you referred to.

As to any instructions from me, or the department, to individuals who work for us, Mr. Chairman, I think it's quite clear to them without instructions what their manner of conduct should be with regard to getting involved in anything like that.

MR. CLARK: I'd just like to say to the minister that perhaps it's quite clear to people in the department now without instructions, but frankly I thought it was very clear before that they shouldn't be dealing in this kind of area. So I'm really asking the minister if he will send out a directive, or some sort of statement to employees of the department, saying exactly what they can and cannot do, so that we don't have another situation like the affair we had the judicial inquiry over.

It may well be that a number of civil servants in the department will remember that kind of situation for a long time. But the Department of Agriculture has grown over the last three years; new people are coming in all the time. The changeover in staff is great. I really think it's vital that the minister get some sort of directive out to people in the department, covering not just the semen situation, but their involvement in a variety of programs in the department. I simply don't think it's good enough to say people should know what the situation is. That's what a former minister of agriculture said, and we know what happened there.

Mr. Chairman, will the minister move in that direction or not?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I have said I think it's quite clear to everyone who works in the department. It's not just this area. There are a variety of things civil servants have to concern themselves with in terms of the kinds of personal dealings they get involved in.

I would have to check exactly whether any instruc-



tions have gone from the deputy minister's office or elsewhere. But I recall some extensive statements and discussions in this Legislature, a number of them by the Premier, with regard to the conduct of senior civil servants. Certainly the hon. Leader of the Opposition makes a point when he says it's important that they know that. I'll check to make sure that we're convinced they are fully aware of not being involved in any such thing as he mentioned.

Agreed to:

Appropriation 3.3 \$1,073,714

Total Program

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, the same question to the minister once again. Can we get a breakdown by program; also, a breakdown with regard to the elements of market development and market intelligence in, I suppose, what the minister might refer to as my five pet areas. Those once again are: personal service contracts; travel and relocation; professional, technical, labor services; and hospitality. I guess those are the ones for this area.

Agreed to:

Total Program \$5,107,985

Appropriation 4.1 \$804,895

Appropriation 4.2

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, before we agree too rapidly here, might I ask the minister, perhaps now or at the end of this particular program, to give us a fairly detailed breakdown of the \$11.5 million as grants.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute which we fund jointly with the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, referred to as PAMI, \$775,000; the ARDA III water grants, which are grants to individuals for development of water supplies, \$1,770,000; the agricultural input monitoring system, which was a contract with Unifarm, \$30,000; other grants, in total \$215,000, which include a variety of things such as our grants to a ploughing match.

The major expenditure here, Mr. Chairman, is the Canada-Alberta nutritive processing agreement. It will be funded by \$6.1 million this year. That's the agreement between Alberta and Canada signed last March for grants of up to 35 per cent of eligible projects in nutritive processing, or agricultural processing if you like. That's been a difficult figure to arrive at. The commitment from the federal government was to cost-share an expenditure of \$17 million over three years. In the fiscal year just ending, we will have spent in the two levels of government — we fund it all and then apply for refund — about \$1 million. We've budgeted for \$6.1 million next year. That would be a total of a little over \$7 million. We would still have \$10 million of expenditures in the following year.

I've been somewhat disappointed in the progress made in terms of approvals in this area. We've had talks with the federal minister responsible for DREE, Mr. Lessard. I'm now fairly confident that we're

moving along reasonably fast on getting approvals.

In addition to that, there's \$50,000 for the seasonal housing grants for sugar beet workers; \$113,000 for training on the job, which refers to the green certificate program; \$20,000 for training allowances to green certificate trainers, the farmers who take on employees under the green certificate program; and \$50,000 to develop training courses, which pertain to the green certificate program, in co-operation with the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower.

The final large sum is \$2.4 million of grants to municipal governments for agricultural service boards. It involves the whole area of agricultural service board work: the agricultural fieldmen's salaries of \$421,000; training sessions, tours, and conferences, \$99,000; agricultural advisory committee operation, \$15,000; and so on. They're all the work of the agricultural service boards in each municipality. I'm sure most members are familiar with what they do: weed control programs, soil conservation programs, pest control programs, and that type of thing. That totals \$2,000,374, to be exact. That's the sum total of the grants, Mr. Chairman, in Vote No. 4.

While I'm on my feet, I'd perhaps explain that in Family Farm Services, the decrease of 15.5 per cent results from the different method of funding part of the costs of the operation of the Ag. Development Corporation, where some previously budgeted items are now paid for from the revolving fund. That is the reason for the decrease in that vote of some 15.5 per cent. That doesn't mean there will be a decrease in services, because it's funded directly by ADC from the revolving fund, rather than from the department budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's past 5:30. Perhaps we could hold 4.2 over until the next session.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Dr. McCrimmon left the Chair]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. MCCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, begs to report progress, and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. HORNER: I move the House do now adjourn till tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Deputy Premier, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at half past two.

[The House rose at 5:32 p.m.]