

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: Tuesday, May 11, 1976 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present this petition with 1,000 signatures. Thousands of Albertans are concerned about the dismissal of Dr. George Abouna. They want to know the answers to questions that no court of law can answer, for they are questions of public policy. They want to know.

The Foothills Hospital in dismissing Dr. George Abouna without charging him with incompetence has denied the transplant patients the surgeon of their choice. We request that the Alberta government [institute] Dr. Abouna immediately in the Foothills Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that we can have a discussion, and I can ask a question. Why has the Foothills Hospital board of management denied the transplant patients the surgeon of their choice for over 11 months now? Question two . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Possibly the hon. member could just present the petition now. If he wishes to take any further steps with regard to the petition, perhaps he could consult the Acting Clerk of the Legislature.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 217****An Act to Amend****The Individual's Rights Protection Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 217, An Act to Amend The Individual's Rights Protection Act. Mr. Speaker, the two basic principles contained in this bill are: number one, that marital status shall not be a basis for discrimination; and secondly, that the equal pay for equal work provisions of The Individual's Rights Protection Act be given better substance by the substitution of "equivalent or substantially equivalent" for the words "similar or substantially similar".

[Leave granted; Bill 217 introduced and read a first time]

Bill 54**The Motor Vehicle****Administration Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill. The Motor Vehicle Administration Amendment

Act, 1976. The purpose of the bill is to restore one or two sections that were inadvertently dropped in the division of the old Highway Traffic Act between the motor vehicle administration act and The Highway Traffic Act, and to correct some wording in accordance with legal advice.

[Leave granted; Bill 54 introduced and read a first time]

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, today I wish to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, some 50 Grade 5 students from the Rundle School, accompanied by two of their teachers, Miss Meiyer and Mr. Rust. I'd ask the students and teachers to rise and the members of the Assembly to give them the usual welcome.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 40 Grade 9 students from Ernest Morrow Junior High School, situated in the Calgary McCall constituency. They are accompanied by their assistant principal, Mr. John Dyer, and teacher, Mr. Ray Freiday. They are seated in the public gallery. May they now rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you some 23 students from the Dapp School in the Athabasca constituency. They are in Grade 8 and 9. With them this afternoon are their teachers, Maureen Hantiuk and Maureen Wylie; one of the parents, Doreen McCallum; and their bus driver, Don Tomlinson. They are in the public gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I'd ask them to rise and be recognized by the House.

MR. SPEAKER: May I draw the attention of the Assembly to the presence in the Speaker's gallery of the distinguished Consul of the Federal Republic of Germany, who has had a very successful career in Edmonton as Consul of the Federal Republic and who has recently accepted a transfer to Malmö, Sweden. I would ask the Assembly to join me in wishing Consul Stegerwald further success in his career in the diplomatic service.

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to Motion for a Return 122.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the response to Question 192.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answer to Motion for a Return 119.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, as ordered by the Assembly, I'd like to table the responses to motions for returns 183, 185, and 186.

head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**Culture**

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, the Government of Alberta is concerned about the announcement by the federal government to extend the Olympic Lottery to 1979.

The financial support of the Olympic Games by the people of Alberta through the Olympic Lottery has been most successful. The sale of Olympic Lottery tickets was authorized by the Alberta government through an order in council only until August 31, 1976. Assurance had been received from the Olympic Lottery Corporation that it would give every support for a national lottery in aid of the Commonwealth Games after the Olympic Games.

While Alberta would have no objection to one more Olympic Lottery draw after August 31, 1976, to help cover the deficit of the Montreal Olympics, we have no alternative but to be opposed to the plans for extending the Olympic Lottery to 1979, as unilaterally announced by the federal government. Their unilateral decision, without consultation with the provinces, does not take into account repeated requests by many provincial governments to have the profits of a national lottery, after the Olympic Games, accrue to the provinces directly for amateur sport or cultural development, in proportion to the number of tickets sold in a province.

The Government of Alberta is opposed to Loto Canada in its proposed form. We are, however, strongly in favor of at least two national lottery draws in favor of the 1978 Commonwealth Games, as discussed with the Olympic Lottery Corporation.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Energy Policy**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Energy. Is he now in a position to give an indication of the Alberta government's position on the national energy strategy that Mr. Gillespie announced last week?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as I said when the matter was raised earlier in the House, it appeared to the Alberta government that many of the arguments we have been making over the period of 18 months to two years have been incorporated in the document.

However, it is a very extensive document. I have referred it to the Department of Energy and Natural Resources and to the Energy Resources Conservation Board and have asked them to provide me with a more detailed analysis. I do not yet have that in hand. Perhaps at some future time I could respond to questions on the document, or in some other way that would satisfy the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Would the minister be in a position to table a statement or make a statement in the House prior to adjournment for the summer recess — thinking that may be in the next week or 10 days? Is it possible for the minister to give a response to the Assembly in that time?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased, first of all, with the optimism with regard to the timing of the summer recess. I'm not sure that it would be helpful to table a document in response to the type of document the federal government have put out. It is after all, using their terms, a series of scenarios, alternatives, targets, et cetera. On my initial reading of it, I don't believe that it would be helpful for the province of Alberta in developing its energy policies to put out a corresponding reaction document.

Oil Pricing

MR. CLARK: Then, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the comments made by the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the comments in the federal document — I refer specifically to: to move towards domestic oil prices, towards international markets within the next two to four years, and comments attributed to the minister.

The question to the Alberta minister is: is it still the position of the Government of Alberta that within two to four years Alberta crude will be at a world price?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, in the document they talk about moving towards a world price — unable to cause them to say definitely that it would go to the world price.

I could see a scenario, as they put it, when the Canadian price may even be higher than a world price. I think the Alberta crude oil price should sell at a fair commodity value. I think it should meet the tests the Government of Alberta has proposed, the Canadian self-sufficiency price tests. I think that price is substantially above the going price for domestic oil. What the world price will be in two to four years is difficult for me to judge. But it certainly is a very important factor in establishing what the Alberta crude oil price should be.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps to rephrase the question to the minister. I relate to the evening a year ago when Alberta was rather jubilant at the announcement in the federal budget that we were moving to the world price.

Is a target of the world price within four years still the position of the Government of Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as I said previously, the hon. Leader of the Opposition should be careful about the wording the federal government has continued to use; that is, that Canada should move towards world prices over a period of two to four years. It was three to five last year, it's two to four now. One year has gone by. No commitment has been made as to being at the world price.

As I pointed out, it may well be that Canadians will find there will be a time in the future when they will want to be higher than the world price, if self-sufficiency is a target. When everything we buy from other parts of Canada is at world price and higher, I guess it's fair to say that crude oil should certainly be considered in the same context.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the wording problems of the federal government. But my problem is right now with the provincial government.

My question once again to the minister is: is it still the position of the Government of Alberta, as announced a year ago in this Assembly, that Alberta's target within four years is the world price?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I filed in the House — and the Premier made a presentation on national television, I believe it was, at an energy ministers' meeting some time ago — the Alberta government's target of a Canadian self-sufficiency price. That price would have to meet six tests. Everybody might want to argue about how each of those tests might alter what the price for Alberta's crude oil should be.

As I've said before, I think the world price is one of the very, very important factors in determining Alberta's sale price for its crude oil. But the total Canadian self-sufficiency price principles would be a better series of principles that the hon. Leader of the Opposition should use in trying to establish what Alberta's crude oil should sell for.

I suppose I should point out Mr. Speaker, that when he's talking about moving to higher prices, the government has certainly been part of policies that have moved oil from the \$2.75 when we inherited it to the present \$8 price, and natural gas from 16 cents to some 97 cents in the same period of time.

DR. BUCK: What was the world price at that time?

MR. LOUGHEED: At the rate you were going, it would have been \$1.40.

DR. BUCK: Oh sure, you started the war too.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. After the war is finished here, I'll proceed with my supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. minister. The minister has suggested in his answer to the Leader of the Opposition that a price above the world price might be a possibility.

My question is: has the Government of Alberta any projections as to substantial cost escalations in either oil sands oil or domestic petroleum which would indicate that a self-sufficiency price might have to be substantially higher than international world prices? Or was that answer based on the possibility that world prices may fall?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, we would certainly be considering both of those possible factors in the future. I guess it was only six years ago that Alberta's oil was selling at higher than the world price, although very little.

DR. BUCK: How about that?

MR. GETTY: It should also be pointed out that many external factors will have an influence on what Alberta will want to seek as a fair commodity value for its oil.

I tabled in the House the Alberta proposal for a Canadian self-sufficiency price. Because of the interest hon. members are expressing today, I think it's probably fair for me to remind them of these principles.

A Canadian Self-Sufficiency Price must meet six basic tests:

The price must encourage explorers to find the remaining conventional reserves in Alberta and the rest of Canada.

The price must encourage the development and application of new technology for improved recovery of our known deposits of conventional oil.

The price must fairly compensate the citizens for the sale of a depleting resource that cannot be replaced.

The price must be sufficient to bring frontier and synthetic supplies to market.

The price must be of a level to discourage the misuse or wasteful consumption of a depleting resource.

The price must recognize the need for the Canadian industry to be competitive in world markets.

Hospital Operations

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care and ask if he is in a position to confirm the statements made by a member of the Calgary hospital board of directors that the Calgary General Hospital is on a red alert situation at all times. It's my understanding this red alert situation really means there are no available beds.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the reference the hon. leader is making is to one board member of the Calgary General Hospital. As I've indicated to the House before, I met with the entire board, including the chairman. Their indication to me was that the Calgary General Hospital situation was manageable. As far as I am concerned, the chairman of the board, through resolution of the board and meeting with me — is the information that I have to base my decisions on.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to rephrase the question to the minister. If he doesn't care to confirm or deny that that's the situation at the General Hospital in Calgary, in light of the interest expressed, would the minister cause the officials of his department to check with the General Hospital in Calgary to see if a red alert situation is in place and then report to the Assembly?

MR. MINIELY: The hon. leader obviously misunderstands, because I am saying that in meeting with the chairman and the full board, the facts they gave me were different.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, regardless of what the minister may feel or what I may feel, the fact is that the patients in Calgary . . . So I'm asking the minister, will he have the officials of his department check with the General Hospital in Calgary to see that that is not the situation and report to the Assembly?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I have met with every hospital board in the city of Calgary and every hospital board in the city of Edmonton. They have given me their official views through the chairman and the entire board of the situation in the city of Calgary. If anyone provides me with evidence that

might be indicated through other than what I would consider proper channels — certainly I've made an effort to meet with the entire board. They have indicated in meeting with me that no patient who requires imminent care will suffer. They've indicated certainly, as boards have, they will have certain adjustments to make. Basically, I have to repeat again that the entire board and the chairman in meeting with me indicated there was no lack of capacity to meet imminent needs of patients. If I receive indication through proper channels that in fact that is otherwise, I'm sure the chairman of the board would contact me, because I've indicated that my office is available 24 hours to chairmen of boards of all hospitals in Alberta if they feel a situation is such that they should get hold of me. But on the basis of the comments of one member of a board, I don't feel that's an appropriate way to manage the hospital system in Alberta.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the minister saying that he'll only investigate the situation at the General Hospital in Calgary if he receives complaints through the proper channels, might I ask the minister then: who does he consider to be the proper channels — the hospital board and no one else?

MR. MINIELY: No, certainly . . . [interjections] every citizen in Alberta [can] write to me, and if a citizen writes, I'll respond. What I'm referring to is the fact that I've made efforts to meet with the entire board. The entire board has given me their position. They have not indicated to me that that is any different. The hon. leader is referring to the comments of one member of the board, not to what the entire board has indicated to me.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Then will the minister act upon complaints from citizens and members of the medical profession? Or does he have to receive concerns expressed through the board of management of the General Hospital in Calgary?

MR. MINIELY: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps one more thing. I have received nothing at all from the board member the hon. leader refers to. Basically, as with any communications in my office, if a citizen writes, I will certainly examine the situation and report in writing to the citizen the observations that we have. But in the matter which the hon. leader refers to, I have not received anything in writing from the individual board member involved.

Foreign Students

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, may I address my question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower? The minister recently indicated that consideration is being given to increased tuition fees for out-of-province and out-of-country students who are attending postsecondary institutions of education in Alberta.

Would the minister be prepared to advise this Legislature of the status of landed immigrant students in the case of a new fee schedule?

DR. HOHOL: I would be pleased to do that, Mr. Speaker. In the course of discussions over a period of weeks, in particular during the question period, I used

the terms "foreign student" and "out-of-province student". In context, this did not include the term "landed immigrants". During the estimates discussion, in questions from the hon. Member for Drumheller, there may have been some feeling in a hypothetical, speculative way about the position of landed immigrants.

Lotteries

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Culture. I'd like to ask the minister if there was any consultation with the federal people in relation to the minister's department and Loto Canada. Was there any consultation between the federal minister responsible and the provincial minister?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in the ministerial statement, because of the unilateral decision of the federal government in making the announcement, the Alberta government is presently opposed to Loto Canada in its present form.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. In light of the fact that this is the stand the province of Ontario has also taken, has the minister or any of his colleagues in the west considered any other type of lottery after the Olympic Lottery expires in August?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, as again was mentioned in the ministerial statement, the province of Alberta would be quite prepared to have one additional lottery draw after the last one in August — in other words, another one maybe in December — to cover the deficit of the Olympic Games. Considerations have, of course, been given to have a national lottery from which the benefits would go to the Commonwealth Games in 1978. So this question could only be answered by saying yes, consideration had been given to national lotteries or lottery draws in addition to the Olympic lottery.

DR. BUCK: A further supplementary to the minister. Is the province of Alberta considering having a provincial lottery the same as the Ontario one, Wintario or whatever they call it, in place of the Olympic Lottery?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I don't assume that the present Wintario lottery is really in place of a national lottery as the Olympic Lottery presently is. However, probably the Western Canada Lottery could be called similar. As I have said before, it is being operated by the Commonwealth Games Foundation, the Calgary Exhibition & Stampede board, and the Edmonton Exhibition board.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask a further supplementary question of the minister. Mr. Minister, have there been discussions between the provinces with regard to a national lottery after the Olympic Lottery is over, and have most of the provinces agreed to this kind of approach?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions between the different provinces, the Atlantic

provinces, Ontario, in fact Quebec and western Canada, regarding the continuation of a national lottery after the Olympic Games. These have been discussions only. No actual decisions have been made since of course all these discussions would have required a decision by the respective cabinets.

MR. CLARK: Could the minister indicate the position of the Government of Alberta in co-operating in that kind of national lottery?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, since no decision has been reached regarding this kind of national lottery, I'm not in a position at present to make a statement on that.

Park User Fees

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. I understand that a Golden Age [Pass] is available in the United States to senior citizens of both the U.S. and Canada for the use of the parks in the United States at no charge. I was wondering if the minister would consider such a program for Albertans.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in response to that question, I think the Golden Age Pass, as I understand it, relates to day-use facilities in the national park system of the United States. In Alberta we do not have a day-use fee, so in essence we have basically the same kind of concept.

I also understand that that pass in the U.S. does not relate to the state or municipal parks, but is really for day use by that person of the facilities in the park system of the U.S. As I said, we do not have a day-use fee in Alberta.

Lotteries (continued)

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Government Services also responsible for Culture. Are any funds from either the Olympic national lottery or the western lottery made available to Sport Canada and/or Sport Alberta?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer this question to the hon. Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife.

MR. ADAIR: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I could have the question repeated, please.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes. My question is: are any funds from either the Olympic Lottery or the Western Canada Lottery made available to Sport Canada and/or Sport Alberta?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I can speak only for Alberta at this point. Five per cent of the ticket sales comes to the province of Alberta. We do have that, in fact, in our Olympic Lottery fund. Now that specifically is used for the training of athletes for the Commonwealth Games or the Olympics, either as individual athletes or as team athletes.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary. Is a portion of that made available to Sport Alberta?

MR. ADAIR: Not specifically, Mr. Speaker.

Wage and Price Controls

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. It concerns the first ministers' conference last week.

Was the federal anti-inflation program discussed during the course of the meeting?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier. In light of current speculation about possible changes in the federal anti-inflation program, did the discussions deal with possible changes, including the policing of professional incomes and corporate profits?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no. The discussion related to the impact of increases in energy prices upon the anti-inflation program of the federal government, which is being co-operated with by the various provinces.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Labour dealing with the anti-inflation program. Is the hon. minister in a position to advise the Assembly about the walk-off of some 425 employees of Luscar coal protesting the decision of the Anti-Inflation Board on their contract?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I heard of the decision of the federal board to roll back the wage increase that had been agreed upon between the employer and employee in that particular instance, but I have no information on any action that may have been taken since that time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Does the Department of Labour or any department of the Alberta government monitor the appeal decisions of the AIB as they relate to contracts agreed upon between employees and employers in the province of Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of ways information of this type can come forward. There's a requirement that the agreements on which the federal guidelines apply be filed with the federal agency, and we are at their mercy along with the rest of the citizens of the country as to how much information that comes to them is published and when. The complaint heard from time to time is that the federal agency doesn't publish information soon enough or fully enough in regard to their decisions. I think that's a legitimate complaint.

There is, of course, a continuing sort of monitoring done through the Department of Labour in the sense that where there's a collective agreement, in due course under our Labour Act that should be filed with the department. But frequently the parties wait some time before filing those as a matter of course with the Board of Industrial Relations.

MR. NOTLEY: One final supplementary. To put this question a word of explanation is necessary. Frequently there have been appeals to the AIB, not only by employees but in fact joint appeals by employees and employer. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Labour relates to the agreement between Local 10007 of the IBEW and AGT for a 13.6 per cent increase which was rolled back to 10 per cent.

Can the minister advise why the Alberta government did not choose to make a joint appeal to the AIB on this particular decision after the agreement was concluded?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as far as the actual circumstances of the rollback were concerned, I would have to say that as of now I'm not aware what parties, if any, were before the board. It may well be that in the sort of variable practice that's followed before the federal agency, the contract itself was under review. It's implied at that point that because both employer and employee have agreed to the terms of a collective agreement, both would be pleased if the federal agency would concur.

Whether or not the Alberta Government Telephones Commission has taken a further decision in regard to a potential appeal beyond the Anti-Inflation Board, perhaps my colleague the Minister of Utilities and Telephones could add something.

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, yes, I can. As a matter of fact, this matter was posed to me two or three weeks ago by the Leader of the Opposition. The matter was posed to the Anti-Inflation Board because of uncertainty about one aspect having to do with the number of hours per day, and the question of the calculation regarding Easter Monday. The difference amounts to the difference between the AIB judgment and the judgment put forward by the union at the time of the review; whether the difference should be calculated on a full-year basis or the partial-year basis. That accounts solely for the difference. That explains the technical difference involved.

It's not really a matter of representation, but a question of uniform interpretation across Canada by the Anti-Inflation Board. As I understand it, that AIB decision is presently being appealed by the union.

Extra Billing by Doctors

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It's with regard to a motion for a return that was tabled in the last day or two concerning the fact that doctors are only reporting 21 to 35 per cent of their extra billing to the Health Care Commission.

I was wondering if the minister has had discussions with the AMA or the College of Physicians and Surgeons with regard to this matter.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, yes, I believe I have had about three meetings with the Alberta Medical Association over the past months since I've been in the portfolio. I've met with them, and at each meeting indicated our concern that a good monitoring and reporting procedure be set up which could be worked on between the Alberta Medical Association and the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Is the minister considering a similar survey later in 1976 to compare what is happening with regard to extra billing?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I can't be sure. Right now, the Health Care Insurance Commission and the Alberta Medical Association are attempting to arrive at the criteria that would result in more successful monitoring of extra billing by physicians throughout Alberta.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. As a matter of clarification of policy, is the government clearly against or in favor of extra billing at the present, or have you an in-between position?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Member for Little Bow knows, since medicare began in 1969 the right to extra-bill has been allowed members of the medical profession in Alberta. That situation has existed for seven years now. My expression to the Alberta Medical Association has been that I feel it is something in the health care field that must be exercised responsibly. I put onus and responsibility on the Alberta Medical Association in dealing with individual members of the medical profession to attempt to ensure that that is the case.

I think we must also realize that we have federal anti-inflation legislation in Canada, and that professional incomes, as expressed by the federal government, are to be covered by anti-inflation. The abuse of the extra-billing privilege during this particular climate in Canada may very well run individual members of the medical profession into a collision course with the Anti-Inflation Board.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. The minister indicated "responsible" extra billing.

Is there a set of criteria that define that word "responsible", or is that the judgment of the Health Care Commission or the minister?

MR. MINIELY: Basically, Mr. Speaker, I've indicated to the Alberta Medical Association that I think the medical profession practising in Alberta should not extra-bill low-income citizens and senior citizens in the province. In applying the right to extra-bill which has existed since 1969, I would expect the Alberta Medical Association, in dealing with our citizens, to exercise that kind of general parameter in a responsible way that reflects their ability to pay.

Extra Billing by Chiropractors

DR. WALKER: A supplementary to the minister. Does the departmental monitoring extend to chiropractic extra-billing in the province?

MR. MINIELY: Not so far, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Pay them more in medicare and they wouldn't have to extra-bill.

Earthquake — Italy

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Government Services. In view of the fact that considerable fund raising is under way in Alberta for the benefit of victims of last week's earthquake in northern Italy, would the minister consider recommending to cabinet that such funds as are raised in Alberta for the earthquake victims be matched by the province under our international aid program?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that any amounts that concerned citizens of Alberta wish to raise for the victims of the earthquake in Italy would receive strong consideration for matching by the government of the province of Alberta for the people of Alberta.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In view of the particular nature of the emergency, I wonder if the minister, when making his recommendation to cabinet, would consider that such matching for entitled organizations be made retroactive to the date of the earthquake in northern Italy.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, as has been our usual way of doing it in the past, as happened in Guatemala, we'd be very happy to consider these donations retroactive to the time these funds were being raised.

Lethbridge Community College

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It concerns the president of the Lethbridge Community College who was dismissed last fall. A statement of claim for \$180,000 filed by the dismissed president was settled out of court for \$125,000 by the college board.

My question to the minister is: did this settlement of \$125,000 come out of the operating revenue of the college?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, it came out of the operating budget of the college. If I understand the full import of the question, the hon. member is asking if it came from the operating budget or operating surplus. It did not come from operating surplus. That fund was approved by me for student housing at Lethbridge College.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the boards of public colleges in Alberta are appointed, as opposed to being elected, are all decisions of this nature reviewed by the minister?

DR. HOHOL: No, they are not, Mr. Speaker. As I recall a question in the House on this very matter some weeks ago, The Colleges Act and The Universities Act are very specific in their present intent. That is to have the board of governors appoint and maintain the tenure of its chief executive. That simply means that it shall appoint him and maintain him at its pleasure or displeasure as the case may be.

But it's certainly the responsibility of the board of governors.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, was any consideration given to the out-of-court settlement at the time funds for operating purposes were allotted this year to the college?

DR. HOHOL: Certainly not, Mr. Speaker. No question about that.

German Reclamation Experts

MR. DONNELLY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. Considering the successful visit to Alberta last week by the German land reclamation group, would the minister give consideration to an exchange visit by a group of Alberta farmers and mining people to see the end result accomplished by the German industry and people in this field?

MR. RUSSELL: I think that's an excellent suggestion, Mr. Speaker, and one which we could undertake to review. As a matter of fact, the head of the German delegation, Dr. Gartner, did extend a very warm invitation to us to return the visit. I'm sure if representatives from the Camrose area might be interested in going, we could undertake to carry out such an idea.

ALCB Regulations

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Solicitor General. Could the hon. Solicitor General indicate whether small fairs and rodeos will be able to hold beer gardens this year?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, you'll appreciate that I'm normally a man of few words. I wonder if I could have the indulgence of the House to answer this question at greater length than I usually . . .

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. WARRACK: I never promised you a beer garden.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, it must be clearly understood why the ALCB exists, and why it is a quasi-autonomous board. It has licensing and regulating powers set out by the statutes. As its name suggests, it is there to control the abuse of a drug which is at the bottom of much of the anti-social behavior we have today. Albertans rejected prohibition back in the '20s. They opted for control. The board isn't there to promote the sale of alcohol or to act as a tax collector for the government.

My function is concerned with policy and with the statutes under which the board operates. It would be highly improper of me to interfere with the day to day functions of the board.

I suppose the present background is that everyone's highly alarmed at the rapid escalation of the consumption of hard liquor, at the excessive number of alcoholics, and at the rise in the number of alcohol-related criminal offences.

DR. BUCK: The question's about beer gardens, Roy.

MR. FARRAN: I know. I'm just coming around to the point.

For the reasons I've mentioned, I can only give you the regulations and not the policy of the board. It's a special events licence which may be issued to an organization such as a fair, a rodeo, or a city, town, or village where an organization sponsors or conducts an annual event. Under the regulations, it must be of an annual nature. It's only issued once a year to a club. Special events licences are not issued to organizations just for the purpose of *ad hoc* fund raising. This is under the present regulations.

This is very different from the licences issued to a private club or a group of persons who want to conduct a private party. Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. member is talking about a beer garden type of operation in conjunction with holding an annual fair or exhibition.

These would be allowed on the same basis they've always been allowed under the regulations. There is no self-serve; there must be waiters. There has to be a number of security personnel, just as there are for licensed premises, to make certain that anti-social behavior is controlled.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will a permanent building be required in order to hold a beer garden?

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker. Although a permanent structure such as an arena is desirable, the board has been, in the case of country fairs, allowing the use of temporary structures such as large tents. This is only to be allowed in the case of smaller rural communities which haven't got the bigger facilities that are available in urban areas.

Licence Plates

DR. BUCK: Gee, I'm afraid to ask the minister a question. Mine's a very short question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Solicitor General.

Is it part of the government's restraint program that we're having just one identification tag on the licence plates this year?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, that practice has two advantages: one in that it saves public money, and secondly, that it reduces the . . . [interjections] Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants me to answer, maybe he should put his question after I finish giving him the answer. His supplementary can come later.

First of all, having only one validating tab on the licence plate reduces expenses. The second thing it does in terms of abuse is it increases control. There have been many instances of people using a pair of licence plates on two vehicles instead of one as intended. Now whereas the licence plate on both ends identifies the vehicle readily to the police, the one validating tab on the back gives us at least greater control of the licensing for the two years that validating tabs are expected to be issued.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary to the minister. Several years ago one of the ministers made the statement that personalized licence plates would be available.

Can the minister indicate if that will be this year or not?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, not, although we're still working on the proposition. I'm aware that in some jurisdictions personalized licence plates are sold for sums in the neighborhood of \$60 or \$75. We will consider that for the next go-around of the metal licence plates themselves.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move that question 193 stand and retain its place on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following motions for returns stand and retain their places on the Order Paper: 190, 191, and 194.

[Motion carried]

175. Dr. Buck proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

Copies of all documents and correspondence now held by the Government of Alberta which were dated from February 5, 1975, to April 15, 1976, with respect to the conditional approval for development of proposed subdivision, Lots 1 and 2, Twp. 66-24-4, and Lot 18, Twp. 67-24-4, Whispering Hills, County of Athabasca, Baptiste Lake.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move an amendment to Motion for a Return 175. As the hon. member knows, Mr. Speaker, the question of correspondence must of course receive prior approval of those people to whom the letters are addressed. Therefore I move that following the word "correspondence" the following be inserted: "subject to the approval of the correspondents". Copies of that amendment are available.

Mr. Speaker, while talking on the amendment I would further add that it should be clearly understood that the government policy is that copies of interdepartmental and intradepartmental correspondence cannot be included, which has generally been agreed to before. I merely draw that to the mover's attention.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair]

head: GOVERNMENT DESIGNATED BUSINESS **head: (Committee of Supply)**

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will come to order.

Culture

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions to the hon. minister?

Agreed to:

Ref. No. 1.0.1	\$90,075
Ref. No. 1.0.2	\$167,465
Ref. No. 1.0.3	\$50,593
Ref. No. 1.0.4	\$88,655
Ref. No. 1.0.5	\$98,686
Ref. No. 1.0.6	\$133,920
Ref. No. 1.0.7	\$45,841
Ref. No. 1.0.8	\$19,468
Ref. No. 1.0.9	\$23,150
Ref. No. 1.0.10	\$100,150
Ref. No. 1.0.11	\$16,933
Ref. No. 1.0.12	\$47,614
Vote 1 Total Program	\$882,550

Vote 2

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, under Cultural Development, I wonder if the minister would be in a position to bring us up to date on where things stand on the program on Alberta publishers, announced a year or two back, if my memory serves me right.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member referring to the loan guarantee program?

Mr. Chairman, through, of course, the Deputy Minister of the Department of Business Development and Tourism, we have been negotiating to have the Alberta Opportunity Company handle the administration and the, one can say maybe, negotiations regarding those loan guarantees, with the advice of the department of culture.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, to follow that up. The minister says negotiations have taken place. My question would be: have they been finalized? Are loan guarantees now being made to Alberta publishers by the Alberta Opportunity Company? If so, what are the ground rules for those loan guarantees?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, the negotiations in fact were finalized only last week, and an announcement will be made very shortly [by] the Minister of Business Development and Tourism and myself regarding applications to the Alberta Opportunity Company under the loan guarantee for publishers.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, is it the intention of the minister to make the announcement during this session? While we're in discussion of the estimates, has there been an agreement as to the amount that will be guaranteed to Alberta publishers, any clear definition at this stage of the parameters of the loan program?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, of course it would be within the definition of the Alberta Opportunity Company where a loan guarantee should be granted. As far as the general parameters for publishers are

concerned now, most likely I expect to have the announcement made before the Legislature adjourns. In fact, it's now a matter of preparation of the announcement. That's all that's still outstanding.

MR. NOTLEY: I take it that since these are guarantees, individual publishers would borrow from chartered banks or treasury branches, pay conventional interest rates, and the loans would be guaranteed through the Alberta Opportunity Company. Or how is it going to work?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is very close to the interpretation of what's happening. In fact, the hon. member may recall a \$2.5 million fund will be available under the program to guarantee loans for publishers to the banks by the province of Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Will that be based on conventional interest rates plus 1 per cent, or have you worked out the details yet on the interest rates?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the interest rate on loans guaranteed by the government is somewhat better than conventional interest rates because, after all, the Government of Alberta guarantees the loan. Therefore it should not be conventional plus. Rather, it may be prime rate plus 1 per cent. I would think so, anyway.

Ref. No. 2.1	\$283,230
Ref. No. 2.2	\$641,660
Ref. No. 2.3	\$2,075,360

Ref. No. 2.4

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the minister: do you have anyone acting as a consultant to you or your department in this area of films and literary arts? I emphasize the film area especially, because the possibility has been brought to my attention that you or your department have a consultant on staff who's doing some monitoring or an overview of the various aspects of the film industry in the province. I thought it would be interesting, first of all, to know if that's right; secondly, who it is; and thirdly, what he's doing.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, as the Government of Alberta, we have been trying to establish a film policy. To establish this film policy, as the hon. member may remember since he was minister himself at one time, one consults the civil servants in the department — in this case not only the department of culture, but also Business Development and Tourism. Commercial filming really comes under the jurisdiction of Business Development and Tourism. Mr. Charles Ross happens to be the person in that department responsible for film development. Our Mr. John Patrick Gillese and Mr. Charles Ross and their respective officials have met on several occasions.

To get an outside opinion, we have found that we should also consult people outside government. For instance, one of the people who was consulted by the department regarding our film policy is the person

who is presently, I think, the first Alberta producer of a major film, Mr. Fil Fraser. Not only he but others have likewise been questioned about their input regarding the film policy of Alberta. As soon as possible, and that may take some time, the Government of Alberta will hopefully announce a policy regarding the support of major films or feature films in the province.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister: how long is the contract for Mr. Fraser? Is it a yearly contract, a short-term contract, or a long-term contract? Could the minister indicate the terms of his contract?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, it's not actually a matter of a contract. It's a matter of Mr. Fraser being asked to submit to us his proposal for the way he, as a commercial film-maker, would see the film policy of Alberta. He was not retained on a signed, sealed, and delivered contract, but rather was asked to submit his opinion on a film policy.

DR. BUCK: Is it a paid position or just an honorary position?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I think that once a direct request for a certain proposal would be made of Mr. Fraser, we would probably then pay him on a fee-for-service basis. But at present Mr. Fraser has not been paid for that kind of work.

MR. NOTLEY: Supplementary question to the minister. First of all, what future does the minister see for a viable film industry in the province of Alberta? Obviously, some assessment has already taken place. I think it would be useful to have that information. I understand Mr. Fraser is already in the process of producing a film, is he not?

In terms of the financing, is it the government's intention to use the \$2.5 million guaranteed loan fund that is now available for publishers as a possible vehicle for promoting the film industry in the province, or will there be some other mechanism? I think I would be interested in being advised where things stand today in terms of how practical and feasible a film industry is in the province. Clearly, as we promote the arts in Alberta, in my judgment it would become much more realistic; the more the arts are promoted, the more likely it is that we can develop a film industry. The question I'm interested in is, to what extent can it be practical?

Canada as a whole has had some real problems in that area. As a matter of fact, I think in many respects we were further ahead 50 years ago, when a number of feature films were produced in Canada. In subsequent years, we just haven't been able to compete commercially. Some very excellent work has been done by the National Film Board and certain provincial governments, but in terms of a . . .

MR. SCHMID: Saskatchewan.

MR. NOTLEY: Excellent films from Saskatchewan, yes, even the odd one from Alberta.

But the point really is not making Barrhead or Westlock or Edmonton or Calgary the second Hollywood of the world, but to what extent does the

minister see a potential for that kind of investment and industry in Alberta?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate the rather well-expressed concerns and observations regarding film industry development in the province of Alberta. In this case, speaking as the Minister of Culture — especially speaking as such — one can really imagine that a film production requires a scriptwriter, actresses, costume fitters, designers, and so many other things which really have to do with cultural development in general.

Therefore, within the department of culture we have already encouraged the writing of film scripts. Maybe I'll just mention one project, the book *Half-breed* by Maria Campbell. We have encouraged Maria Campbell to write a script of her book, and are supporting her in her endeavor. I understand she is working on that now. Whether this will come to fruition is another thing. I understand the production of *Don't Shoot the Teacher* is taking an enormous amount of money. However, a start has been made on *Don't Shoot the Teacher* down in Hanna. I understand the number of people who came in from outside Alberta to take part in that film is rather negligible compared to the number of people who were taken directly from Hanna to participate in that production. It was a terrific boost to Hanna not only as far as additional income is concerned, but also as far as participation by the people is concerned. I understand the entire film crew there really appreciates the enthusiasm of Hanna to take part in that venture. I think it's a very fine example of what can happen in Alberta in the future.

Speaking as Minister of Culture, of course, I would express my thoughts in the following manner. Surely, if 10 oil wells or gas wells are drilled and only two turn out to be productive, that doesn't mean we'll abandon oil and gas drilling in the province of Alberta. The reference has been made that maybe some films were not as successful as they should have been. Looking at the overall investment, where a film could really bring in money, if two out of 10 are going to be successful in Canada, that's the kind of view we really have to have once you go into film production in this province. It is additional income for our people; I think it's diversification of our industry. It's diversification and encouragement, I would think, to our artistic development.

I'm quite sure that the Minister of Business Development and Tourism would join me in the thought that the earlier we are able to get additional funds which we would require for our film development policy, the better it would be for the province of Alberta in overall decentralization of development as far as business opportunities and opportunities for our many artists are concerned.

Agreed to:

Ref. No. 2.4

\$301,520

Ref. No. 2.5

DR. BUCK: I'd like to ask the minister a question or two. First of all, when is the minister going to do something to help the libraries in this province? I am sure the minister appreciates, and the libraries would

have appreciated it much more, if some of that OSP money was used for libraries.

I think the former government — and I said this last night — and the present government more so now, has to take responsibility for the fact that our grants to libraries are some of the lowest in Canada. I would just like the minister to give us some indication of his plans for the future, because quite obviously nothing is going to be done this year. Then we'll go from there.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, first of all we very much realize the seriousness of library support in the province of Alberta as far as the overall per capita support is concerned, compared to the rest of Canada. However, may I also state that in order to satisfy the desires of the many librarians of the province of Alberta and the Library Trustees' Association, we really had to consider first where we should go as far as library development is concerned. We therefore commissioned a study into rural libraries in the province and we commissioned *The Right to Know*. Having received the recommendations of these two studies, we felt that certain amounts of moneys were needed to even so much as initiate a program in the direction those reports asked us to look.

Of course, due to the restraints and establishment of priorities within the restraints of government programming, one could say, maybe regretfully, I was not able to get the additional support needed for library development. In the overall budgeting of government it was felt, and rightfully so I am sure, that housing and law enforcement were of greater urgency than library development at this time.

However, as the hon. member may know, a first step was taken in at least removing the ceiling of library support by introducing Bill 9. It would allow us, at least if the possibility arises the following year, to increase help to libraries, possibly even to pick up one or two of the recommendations of the Downey report, or the study of rural libraries.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, may I just comment briefly on this question. As I indicated in the debate recently on second reading of The Libraries Amendment Act, I'm quite unhappy that there is a decline in the amount of moneys to be spent by the department on library services in this coming fiscal year. I would appreciate it if the minister could explain to the committee why, in fact, a decline of 2.6 per cent for library services is indicated here, as compared to the actual expenditures in the previous fiscal year.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, the decrease is really in the fact that due to serious deficits in both regional libraries, the Yellowhead Regional Library and the Parkland Regional Library, we paid two grants which are over and above the normal amounts which would have been allocated, and this amount of course was not included in this year's allocation. Also, some personnel shifting has happened due to the splitting of the library into Recreation, Parks and Wildlife and Alberta Culture. So the overall decrease is not an actual decrease in support of libraries, but rather not including the amounts which were paid to cover a deficit for the regional libraries, plus some personnel shifting.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, on this point may I say that while I wish to express my disappointment in the fact that the library services in the province did not receive a substantial increase, not even 11 per cent, I can assure the minister that he will have my support for being able to implement, hopefully, some increase in future years, particularly now that the ceilings will shortly be removed by the passage of the amendment sponsored by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

While I realize this is a year of restraint, I think it is appropriate for me to express my concern and my real disappointment that it was not possible to obtain additional funding in this budget.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, unaccustomed as I am to agreeing with the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff, I think he has put the concern — which I suspect is shared by the minister — very well.

When we look at this budget, Mr. Minister, no matter how you want to cut it, at the very, very best we're staying even, or maybe there is just a teeny-weeny increase. Even if we assume that Mr. Trudeau's anti-inflation program is going to be a great success, when you consider the rate of inflation, I don't think there is an economist in this country who would estimate less than a 10 per cent increase in the cost of things. So when we're standing still, that means that back in Fairview, or wherever it may be, the library board has less money to work with in real terms because the costs of everything are going up. I think that has to be underlined. We're standing still, but in actual fact that means that there will be a decline in service. Many library boards are going to be strapped for funds.

I would just hope that the members of your caucus would accept the strictures and the recommendations of the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff. During the discussions in the coming year, let's see if we can get a little more money than this. We're going to pass legislation that takes ceilings away. There's no point in taking ceilings away if we're stuck with this kind of budgeting. The next move, it seems to me, is to provide the money to follow up the bill presented by the Member for Wainwright.

DR. BUCK: I'd just also like to say, certainly let this section go through, as long as we get a commitment from the minister that he will make this one of his top priorities in the upcoming budget. That's all we ask of him.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, as hon. members may well know, I had the privilege of announcing increased aid, or equalized support for recreational facilities, for recreational programs, for amateur sport, and for so many other programs of the government that have now been accomplished. I can only say that I assure the hon. members I will do everything that can be done to put the libraries of Alberta on the kind of footing we would all like them to have.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister for his version of what happened on this question of the selection of the paintings that are going to go into Government House. I raise the question for two purposes. First of all, from what I've

seen to date, in talking both to some of the people involved on the panel and to people whose work had been selected and then later turned down by the government, that it's people in this minister's department who are between the artists, on one hand, who made their works available under, I think, good feelings. They were asked to submit their work. They did this. They understood a panel had been set up which was very highly regarded by the people in the art community, at least the people I've spoken to. Now, I'd like to know what happened after that.

I'd also point out to the minister that, from people who I've spoken to, it seems that it's the minister's officials who are caught in the gears here, who are having to be the bearers of bad tidings, if I might use that kind of phraseology; because it's these people that your department, Mr. Minister, has to deal with day in, day out in the course of the year.

Whether the commitment was made by the government or not, I certainly am left with the impression that there was a commitment to something like \$70,000. I'm sure the minister too, along with his colleague the Minister of Housing and Public Works, has had discussion with some of the artists involved. Some of them have written the government already, indicating that they were advised initially their art had been selected, and that they feel the government now has an obligation to follow its word. So I'd be very interested in hearing the minister's side of the argument.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the concern the hon. Leader of the Opposition expresses. May I say first of all that without any question never in the history of the province of Alberta have the artists had better appreciation of their contribution to the province than during the time of this government. As we well know, the Alberta Art Foundation is the only foundation of its type in the western hemisphere. We have had letters from England as well as from central Europe asking how this foundation works and what its objects are.

When this government came into this building, I don't think there were very many, if any, objects of art created by Alberta artists. There now is hardly an office in this building which doesn't have at least one or two, if not more, works of art by Alberta artists, be they paintings, ceramics, weavings, or whatever.

Also, of course, as I mentioned yesterday, the exhibitions of the Alberta Art Foundation, which have travelled not only to London, Brussels, and Paris but throughout the province of Alberta, have now been invited to go to Japan, as well as to New York for a Bicentennial celebration. I think this bears witness that the support of artists in the province of Alberta has been really most outstanding, as far as I and the government are concerned.

To come to specifics regarding the selection of paintings for Government House, Mr. Chairman, all I can really say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition is this. While certain statements have been made, while certain reference has been made to paintings being accepted or not accepted, to my knowledge — and I have asked my officials about that — no final decisions as such have been made regarding the paintings or the acquisition by government. So if an artist finds that his painting may or may not have been accepted, all I can say is this. First of all, I was

contacted by only one artist out of all the discussions that were held. And, as I have mentioned before, the final decision of acquiring paintings for Government House, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition himself probably knows better than many others, because he was a minister himself at one time, naturally rests with the minister who happens to have within his appropriation the funds to acquire these paintings. If this fund is within the Department of Housing and Public Works, that minister has the final deciding signature for that matter on a document which would appropriate or allocate or pay for whatever acquisition he cares to make.

As far as the selection of the paintings is concerned, Mr. Chairman, again, whatever panels were selected — while I was aware of the process of doing so, I can only again say I was not aware of what kind of paintings or anything else was selected. I only have to repeat that I don't think the final decision has been made on which paintings will be acquired by the government for whatever purpose.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciated the preliminaries to the answer, but to get back to the answer, might I have some clarification from the minister. Mr. Minister, are you now telling us that the government hasn't made any decisions on which paintings are going to be acquired and which aren't?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, all I have said is that certain decisions probably have been made on the paintings for Government House, but what the decisions are and which paintings they refer to I'm really not aware of; because, as I have said before, the appropriation for that is not really in my department. So I would not be able to state whether or not a final decision has been made as to which paintings will be acquired for Government House.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just one comment and one further question. The comment is this: I find it hard to understand how the panel would have been set up — a very capable panel, as I understand it — with the department, with the minister apparently not really being involved in what was taking place here, in light of the minister's expressed interest in this area.

My question really is this: Mr. Minister, were you involved, and have you had any discussions with the people involved on the panel? This is the panel of people selected initially to look at the paintings made available by artists in the province. Have you specifically had discussions with responsible people in your department and asked them what kind of impact this whole unfortunate incident is having on the relations between their offices and the Art Foundation and your department?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, again I have in the past always considered, once a board or a commission or a body is established to do certain things, that especially as a minister it's best not to interfere in the decisions, especially since I happen to lean towards one kind of painting, one kind of specific art, while other people prefer other kinds of art much more than my kind of liking. So I would be the last one, Mr. Chairman, to recommend or, for that matter, to tell a panel of any sort which cares to select works of art

which direction they should go or what they should do. I think it could be confirmed, for instance, by the chairman of the Alberta Art Foundation that I have yet to so much as mention what kind of direction the acquisition of paintings should go, because Alberta artists are — it has been said in journals of Europe — some of the finest not only in Canada but for that matter in the western hemisphere.

Mr. Chairman, in all sincerity, I have always tried, whether in other committees or boards of my past portfolio or of this one, to stay away as much as possible from decisions once I have asked a board or panel to recommend to government what they should do. It could be the historic sites board, the advisory board, or whatever they may be. In this case, all I can say is that naturally I have discussed with the officials in my department concerns regarding selection of the paintings. But I have to repeat in all fairness that, especially as far as government officials are concerned, they all are very much aware that the final decision once money is involved rests with the minister of the respective department. After all, he has to sign the approval form to get the money for the payment of goods or services acquired.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, one last question to the minister. Mr. Minister, in the course of those discussions with officials of your department, could you tell us what their understanding was of the arrangement as far as the selection panel is concerned? Was it their understanding that the decisions and recommendations of the panel would in fact be the final decisions?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, since I only had verbal discussions with my officials, I would not at present be prepared to say what their understanding was, because I have not in fact put that question directly to the panel. While I'm aware who the members of the panel were, I don't think I have talked to or discussed any of this matter with the panel since they were asked to select certain paintings.

MR. CLARK: Then let me put it to you this way, Mr. Minister. Have officials in your department who are responsible for this area indicated to you that it was their understanding that the panel of three people who were selected initially would in fact be the final panel? What I'm really trying to get at, pretty candidly, is that if you haven't raised it with them — and you indicate to us you can't recall doing that — then have the officials, the responsible people in your department, brought it to your attention that it was the understanding of people in your department that this panel was to make the final selection?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, regarding again the acquisition of these paintings, the thing I remember discussing with my officials is that, as far as they were concerned, the final selection regarding those paintings had not been made anyway. That is the last I understand from my officials.

MR. CLARK: Just so there is no misunderstanding then. In speaking to people outside who have expressed concerns to us, it's fair for me to say that no one from the minister's department has expressed the concern to the minister that they were of the

understanding that the panel of three people was going to make the final decision. The minister has never heard any concern expressed from anyone in his department about that? I take that from your answer. Now, is that a fair assessment?

MR. SCHMID: No, Mr. Chairman. I have said that as far as the officials of my department are concerned, in their opinion, the people who have submitted works of art have not been advised as to the finality of the decision regarding certain paintings.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, perhaps just one or two questions on this, then I'd like to also deal with the Alberta Art Foundation in another sense. Is the minister in a position to advise the committee whether some of these paintings which some of the painters felt were going to be accepted and were subsequently not accepted were actually physically delivered or received at any time by the Alberta government?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure. But I think that what actually happened was this: certain artists I suppose were asked to submit paintings to a panel, [which] then probably rejected out of the first selection a certain number of paintings which were then sent back to the artists. Then I suppose another group of paintings was retained for the final selection, [for] whether or not they would be fitting for Government House.

I assume that's the way the selection was being handled. I'm saying "I assume", because again, once a board or a panel or whatever else is asked to do certain work, I really do not follow it up until of course a final decision is made, when I sometimes then see certain works of art. Whether or not I agree with it, I think, well, I have to put myself in the shoes of the panel or board or judges, whatever they are, and think, I wonder why they selected this or that, which I wouldn't have done, or would have done for that matter.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just — again to clarify in my mind the minister's answer to the Leader of the Opposition. As I understood his answer, officials of the department were of the opinion that no final decision had been made. That was the discussions you had with officials of your department. They advised you that in their minds, no final decision had been made.

But I wonder if the minister would clarify whether any of the officials on the original board set up to do this complained — let me just use the word complained, that would be a better way of doing it — complained to you that they were being by-passed in the final selection process of paintings for Government House.

MR. SCHMID: No, Mr. Chairman, not at all. No statement was made to me that someone had been by-passed. But maybe I should again put the final decision into the right context. The people of my department are under the impression that the artists were advised that a final decision regarding the acquisition of paintings by government had not been made if they have not been so advised, and that's really where it stands.

MR. NOTLEY: I think that the minister would do well to follow the excellent example of Mackenzie King in confusing language, because I . . . The Leader of the Opposition suggests that he run that past us again.

MR. SCHMID: In French or German or Italian?

MR. NOTLEY: Well, it wouldn't make any difference. It would be equally understandable or intelligible, I'm afraid.

So I gather then that as far as the officials of the department were concerned, they did not come to you and say, look, Mr. Minister, we were asked to do a job. We did that job as competently as we could. We made decisions. On the basis of our decisions, artists had a certain understanding. Now we have a mess. We've got artists who are mad because their paintings were not in fact chosen when they were under the impression that they were.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, again I have to repeat that the officials of my department came to me and said that they couldn't understand why the artists were upset, because really a final decision regarding the particular paintings of the artists had not been related to the artists. That's the information I presently have the understanding of.

MR. CLARK: If I might just follow this one question further with the minister. Mr. Minister, you're telling us now that the feedback you're getting from the people in your own department is that they can't understand why the artists are mad. Is that the situation? That's just what you told us, isn't it?

MR. SCHMID: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have said that some of the officials of my department couldn't understand why the artists were upset, because they had been told that a final disposition of their art work was still pending. In other words, they had not been told emphatically, your painting will not be bought by the government or, your painting will be bought by the government probably as far as some of them are concerned. This is my understanding from my officials.

MR. CLARK: Then let's follow along. In light of the concerns that had been expressed to you, in light of the anxiety of some of the officials in your department, whether they told you or not, what kind of involvement is the minister going to have from here? Is the minister going to do a Pontius Pilate and wash his hands of the whole thing? Or is he going to become involved now and assure himself that proper procedure is followed until decisions are made by his colleague the Minister of Housing and Public Works?

I say to you that I think you should consider that route, because there are a number of artists in the province who I think have good reason to be concerned, and they look to you as their defender in this situation.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, maybe I could state this much: the Society of Alberta Artists, or for that matter the Canadian Artists' Representation, as one of the groups is called, at all times has had an open door to my office. They would have to confirm that to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. If they care to

meet with me to discuss what their concerns are, I gladly would meet with them. If there's any discussion or subsequent dialogue to be held with the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works, I gladly will do so too. After all, he is not only my colleague but has been a long-time friend long before I ever got into politics.

I had a call in fact from only one Alberta artist. At all times, CAR came to see me for all kinds of projects, with all kinds of problems, and I'm still very much amazed that they haven't contacted me so far. So I'm very much open, and they know too that they can reach me till midnight every day. I haven't been called by them, Mr. Chairman. I'm awaiting their phone call.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, that's very nice. I wonder whether the government is seriously entertaining or would entertain acquiring the paintings which have not been chosen for Government House to be hung in some other appropriate government building, such as the Legislature.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, again I should relate that among the acquisitions of government since we came into office we have consistently acquired works of art, not only for this building but for many other government buildings. We have a loan program where we loan Alberta art for different government buildings. When the public comes in and sees them, they can purchase them from the artist, if they are provided for under the loan program.

As I said a little while ago — and the hon. member should have listened carefully — the artists have not been advised of a final decision by government of the work of art. I didn't say for Government House.

MR. NOTLEY: No decision at this stage. Okay.

MR. CLARK: You learned sometime, didn't you?

MR. NOTLEY: Something. Not much, but something.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could pursue the question of the Alberta Art Foundation. The minister will remember that last October there was quite a successful Peace River arts festival — in Fairview, as a matter of fact. It was held in Fairview College. The college could be commended for making the facilities available.

During the course of the arts festival, paintings by various people in the Peace River country were on display. I might just say that the festival itself was surprisingly successful in view of the fact that it was during the harvest season. A large number of people attended from all over the Peace.

In any event, the Alberta Art Foundation had several representatives at the festival. They looked at the paintings and marked certain paintings that the Alberta Art Foundation wished to consider purchasing.

MR. SCHMID: I would just like to interrupt here. May I underline that you said "consider"?

MR. NOTLEY: Right.

MR. SCHMID: Thank you.

MR. NOTLEY: I raise this because I'm sure the minister has received a letter from Bob Guest, who is a prominent artist in the Peace River country. In any event, as I understand it, the paintings marked for the Alberta Art Foundation were removed. At some later date, the decision was made which ones the Foundation would purchase. I understand that several were purchased. I'm not sure of the exact number, but several were purchased. The others were returned to the artist.

The complaint I've received is: number one, why did the Alberta Art Foundation representatives not arrange the purchase at the time, so that other people who were at the festival would have been in a position to buy paintings they liked but which were marked and removed for consideration by the Alberta Art Foundation?

I put this because Mr. Guest is probably one of the most distinguished promoters of painting in the Peace country. He has a number of classes all over the Peace. As a matter of fact, on Sunday I attended an exhibition of paintings that were painted as a result of a winter class this artist had in Fairview. So the question I put to the minister is: what is the policy of the Alberta Art Foundation on this matter? Is he aware of the specific complaints Mr. Guest has raised on this issue?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, first of all I have to say: far be it from me to interfere in any kind of decision of the Alberta Art Foundation, because then the hon. member across may rise and say, political patronage, or whatever it might be. So as I've said before, I've not done so in the past. I have no intention of doing so in the future. That's one statement.

The next would be this. It is possible, for instance, that the Alberta Art Foundation marked certain exhibits at the festival and said, we would like to consider these paintings. It probably should be offered as a suggestion to the chairman of the Alberta Art Foundation that they should say, we would like to have first choice on that painting. Visitors to that exhibition may like to indicate that they would like to buy it if the Alberta Art Foundation doesn't buy it. That's a possibility, of course.

On the other hand, if the Alberta Art Foundation states they are interested in a painting and don't buy it, I think that artist has every right in the world to state, unless you buy it, there's no question in my mind that I'm going to sell it to whoever else wants to buy it. I think it's something like walking into any kind of display, whether it be for cars or for a house, and saying, I'd like to buy that car. Unless you make a down payment, somebody else comes in and offers the money. Well, tough luck for the Alberta Art Foundation.

I appreciate that if I'm an artist, I probably would prefer to sell to the Alberta Art Foundation rather than to some private person. Because of that, I think we probably should convey and will convey to the Alberta Art Foundation the sensitivity that could arise because of the prestigious body they are.

I appreciate the comments of the hon. member regarding that exhibit. I think that saying, that's what we're interested in, would be a better way of approaching future purchases, if they happen to be contained within an exhibit.

Agreed to:	
Ref. No. 2.5	\$571,680
Ref. No. 2.6	\$598,100
Ref. No. 2.7	\$434,340
Ref. No. 2.8	\$118,850
Ref. No. 2.9	
Vote 2 Total Program	\$5,024,740
Ref. No. 3.1	\$228,024
Ref. No. 3.2	\$258,907
Ref. No. 3.3	\$284,810
Ref. No. 3.4	\$646,206
Ref. No. 3.5	\$486,310
Ref. No. 3.6	\$1,463,669
Vote 3 Total Program	\$3,367,926
Vote 4 Total Program	\$2,453,000
Department Total	\$11,728,216

MR. MINIELY: I move the committee rise, report, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Dr. McCrimmon left the Chair]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. MCCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolution, begs to report same, and asks leave to sit again.

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977, amounts not exceeding the following sums be granted to Her Majesty for the Ministry of Culture: \$882,550 for Departmental Support Services; \$5,024,740 for Cultural Development; \$3,367,926 for Historical Resources Development; \$2,453,000 for International Assistance.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS** (Second Reading)

Bill 36 **The Department of Housing and** **Public Works Amendment Act, 1976**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 36, The Department of Housing and Public Works Amendment Act, 1976.

Primarily, Mr. Speaker, the bill transfers responsibility for accommodation services and the administration of realty held, used, or occupied for public works from the Department of Government Services to the Department of Housing and Public Works. Further, Mr. Speaker, ministerial powers now include leasing, as a matter of clarification.

[Motion carried; Bill 36 read a second time]

Bill 51
The Department of Government Services
Amendment Act, 1976

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 51, The Department of Government Services Amendment Act, 1976.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment will authorize the minister and make him responsible for the acquisition, disposition, and servicing of all property for every department of the Government of Alberta, and assigns this responsibility to the Minister of Government Services. It also takes certain sections of The Queen's Printer Act and incorporates them into The Department of Government Services Act, as well as the director of purchasing and the present act regarding purchases by the province of Alberta.

[Motion carried; Bill 51 read a second time]

Bill 56
The Recreation, Parks and Wildlife
Foundation Act

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 56, The Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation Act.

The principle of this bill is to create a foundation that will be an agent of the Crown outside the government to allow people in Alberta, the citizens of the province, to make donations, either private or corporate, that will be totally tax deductible. These donations will assist the programs of recreation, parks, or fish and wildlife in the province.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. minister would advise the Assembly if provision is being made for dispositions for specific purposes in wills. If John Doe passes away and leaves a will for that money to go into this foundation, but to be specifically used for, say, Boy Scouts, is provision being made that that will be honored for the life of that fund?

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in response to the question posed by the hon. Member for Drumheller, the intent of the foundation is that that possibility will exist, that a donation for a specific purpose by an individual or corporation, through a will or whatever it may be, will occur. In other words, should some person pass on to us, by way of a will or a donation, a piece of property that may on his behalf be termed a wildlife sanctuary, a donation toward the Boy Scouts, as you mentioned, or the Edmonton rugby union or whatever it may be, that will take place.

[Motion carried; Bill 56 read a second time]

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Young proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta urge the government to consider the establishment of an Alberta science and technology institute, composed of representatives from existing Alberta research organizations, government universities, and private industry, for the following purposes:

The development, with the greatest possibly efficiency, of new technologies that would assist in the furthering of current provincial economic and social goals and in the provision of new opportunities for the future; and having the following principal functions:

- (a) the maximum practicable planning and co-ordination of government, university, and private research, and
- (b) to advise the government as to the priorities and allocation of public funding of research.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the motion I have on the Order Paper this afternoon, dealing with research and the manner in which the government will exercise its responsibility in the area of research and technology, is a subject which I suspect many hon. members will not be overwhelmed with interest in, at least not at the outset. Hopefully, other speakers and I may be able to indicate why hon. members of the Assembly should have some concern in this area.

Mr. Speaker, the first reason for concern is that in the 17th or 18th Legislatures, we have not directed our attention to the matter of science and technology, in the sense of having any kind of comprehensive debate or consideration of the matter.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the growth of the province of Alberta has been quite dramatic, in the past six or seven years in particular. Although I don't propose to suggest any particular allocation of funding to research or technology — that is, any proportion of our gross domestic product — some hon. members may wish to consider whether we have directed sufficient of our resources in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that in 1973 our gross domestic product was approximately \$10 billion. As a 'guesstimate', it will be in the area of \$15 billion in 1975, a very substantial increase in a matter of two years. Mr. Speaker, that ought to give rise to questions in our minds, such as: what areas is that growth emanating from? Do we in fact have a balanced program of research and technological development? Or have we allowed ourselves to become unduly interested, by crises or very rapidly emerging developments, in one facet of our economy to the exclusion of other facets?

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, we have witnessed fairly rapid acceleration of research in certain areas, and I would identify the main area as energy. Additionally, we as a province, as a government, have a policy of diversification of the commerce and economy of the province to afford better opportunities in the centres outside Calgary and Edmonton. I think that policy alone would suggest we need to focus on certain types of technological development and needs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer to what I consider some specific responses which the govern-

ment has made to specific challenges, and I'd like to enumerate for hon. members a few of the developments that have occurred fairly recently; that is, within the last six years.

Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority was spawned in 1974. That Authority has a rather large budget, in the order of \$100 million or better.

In addition, The Alberta Agricultural Research Trust Act dates from 1970; The Alberta Environmental Research Trust Act dates from 1971; The Forest Development Research Trust Fund Act dates from 1974. We have OSERP dealing with the environmental research in the oil sands, which dates even more recently, to 1975 I believe, and has a budget of some \$40 million and over.

Mr. Speaker, we can go back to 1970 when the Environment Conservation Authority was established. In addition, we have such functioning bodies as the Energy Resources Conservation Board, which has an interest in the development of research.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think it should not go unnoted that the Alberta Research Council has been in operation since — would you believe it? — 1921. So far as my study of the matter indicates, it is the longest standing of all the provincial research councils and research facilities in Canada. I didn't trace how it came into being in 1921, but it's a matter of considerable interest, I should think, to the members that we have an institution which dates that far back. Again, I didn't spend much time trying to study this, but comparative statistics indicated to me that as recently as 1972 or so it was about the second largest funded research council of all the provinces, outranked only by the equivalent research council in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I've mentioned some of the recent developments. I haven't put dollar figures on them. I had a rather interesting experience, as a matter of fact, while trying to collect information for the speech today, in dealing with some of the departments. Some of the departments have a very paternalistic attitude toward their expenditures in this area, and we received some interesting observations along with some of the factual information that came our way. It would suggest that there are some individuals in certain departments who are very jealous — maybe not zealous but certainly jealous — to guard their little empires. That would suggest to me, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to the fact that we haven't looked at this area for some time, perhaps we should be looking at it now.

Mr. Speaker, I want to concentrate my comments and thoughts today on what I guess should be called the natural sciences and engineering; those, I might mention in passing, as opposed to medical research or social sciences. I would assume that the hon. Member for Little Bow may wish to divulge to us some of his experiences with the Human Resources Research Council, but I leave that for him to unfold before the House. The reason for the limitation is that we have a very broad topic, and there is some question in my mind whether one body as such is able to span both the natural and the social sciences.

Mr. Speaker, the objective that I see is for mission-oriented research, the type of research which in many ways is considered to be applied, that has some relatively close and identifiable purpose consistent

with the economic and commercial goals of the province. We might consider that we should be doing what is considered to be foundation — the National Research Council describes it as foundation research or basic research — and some of that is indeed being done. I think that's another facet of our operation, and we should have a balance between the basic and the applied research.

I also want to distinguish research from the compilation and analyses of data, studies, and reviews. If one looks at the appropriations for certain departments and the descriptions that go with them, it's necessary to distinguish the money allocated to pull together information which already exists and to try to assemble it in some manner for decision-making purposes, as opposed to the generation of new information. It's not my thought here that we should be dealing with the compilation in the sense that departments must do it fairly regularly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reflect for just a moment, since there are many alternatives open to us, on the federal experience as I see it and as I can relate it in a couple of minutes. The federal government has had its problems dealing with research science and technology. It has established a Ministry of State for Science and Technology, and going through some of the reports it would appear that the success of that ministry is open to some question. It appears to have been a frustrating exercise for some of the employees and possibly also for the minister, although I have no basis for any statement on that. But I looked at the departmental schema of how the department's organized, and I can only think that it must have been a bad dream for someone when they managed to draw up the boxes and put the names of officers in and identification of function that they had there. I won't go into it, but if you're really interested in departmental organization in the science and technology area, that schema is a beautiful one to look at. It's just amazing.

But let me explain that for the last 10 years there has existed a Science Council of Canada. This is basically an advisory body. It reports to the minister responsible for science and technology. There is the National Research Council, which had a budget in '73-74 of \$163 million. Two interesting observations about this council. It has facilities for in-house work. In other words, it has a considerable laboratory facility and spends, as nearly as I could analyse quickly, about half of its \$163 million on and in its own lab facilities. The balance of the funds is channelled out to students, to universities, mainly in the academic area for basic research.

Mr. Speaker, there was recently a report from England about the question of co-ordination and organization of research and science in that country. Their recommendation is based upon the situation as they found it and, of course, they have many different structures there. But basically they have opted for a council of research councils. They would give the council a considerable bite in the sense that they would give it a good portion of the budget for research. It would have the responsibility for allocating that research funding. I would suppose that as long as it holds the purse strings it can call several tunes fairly effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to direct my attention for a brief moment to the Alberta Research Council,

which I've already mentioned is the senior research body in the province of Alberta. The objectives of that research council are to conduct research in needed areas and to provide technical services and information to industry and government. To guide it, it has a body of appointed representatives from the government, the university, and private industry and commerce. As a member of that council for about a year I would make only one comment. I have found it a little bit confusing at times to know exactly what the council is supposed to be doing.

I think you would appreciate why that might be so from my earlier description of the spinoff of different bodies and agencies with their rather narrow responsibilities in some cases. It's not possible, in my view, for a body which I take to have the responsibility to fill in the gaps, if I can express it that way, to be able to do that effectively when it really doesn't know, and has not direct access to where the gaps are to be filled.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the objectives of the Alberta science and technology institute should first of all be a framework within which we could determine and define research programs needed to attain provincial goals; in other words, the planning of research on a broad basis. The institute should have some muscle; in other words it should have some funds. I'm not suggesting that it should have all the funds. I don't think that's desirable, practical, or feasible. The government should have some physical facilities, apart from the university, similar to the provision of facilities which we now have through the Alberta Research Council, in which some research and development of technology could take place. It should establish working links with departments of government, with agencies, with business.

Mr. Speaker, I think the criteria we have to look for in the success of such a body would be that it should be composed and operate in such a way that it would respect the needs of government departments. Government departments have very specific needs. At the present time, if you look at the budget of the Alberta Research Council, a goodly portion comes directly from various departments of government to do very specific functions for those departments. Some of it is voted here in the Assembly in a special appropriation. I would think that whatever body evolves from this debate, if any, it should respect the ability of the departments to get certain things achieved which they require. It should also have as a criterion some degree of independence and discretion on the part of university research facilities. I think that's necessary, desirable, and a must if universities are to fulfil their proper role. I think it must, as well, respect the desires of private industry and private economy and respond to them. In its co-ordinating function, it has to recognize there are a number of groups with common interests which need to get together.

I'm rather intrigued to learn of two developments in Alberta, one this year as a matter of fact. For the first time the Department of Energy and Natural Resources has established a research advisory group consisting of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, the Energy Resources Conservation Board, the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority, and the Research Council, to

plan for the funding and implementation of programs in the energy area. Now, that's a voluntary activity. It's one that I think is necessary.

I notice that there's an institute of pedology — I hope I've got the pronunciation right — and the farmers will all know what that is.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is that?

MR. YOUNG: What is that? The Alberta Institute of Pedology was established in 1968. It has representatives on it of the Alberta Research Council, the University of Alberta Department of Soil Science and . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: What does it do?

MR. YOUNG: What does it do? It studies soils.

Mr. Speaker, with that slight diversion from my main objective of trying to identify criteria, the other which I think should be quite paramount is that we should not have more than one agency or body responsible for the research facilities capability which exists apart from the university. In other words, one Crown agency or one Crown body is sufficient.

Mr. Speaker, in that respect, I flag to the attention of members that we not only have a very substantial complex in the Alberta Research Council, but we also have under construction the environmental lab at Vegreville, which is not under the aegis of the Alberta Research Council. I just note in passing that that does exist, or will exist. It will be even more difficult to co-ordinate if we don't start shortly to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to indicate that in relation to government the body of which I speak, the institute, should relate and be responsible to one minister, not a committee of ministers. On it could be several ministers from those departments which are key in terms of the needs for research and technology. It would be a quasi-independent body — quasi in the sense that it would depend for representation on the appointment of members by the cabinet. In that respect, I would foresee that, much like the Alberta Research Council, it would have a good cross section of persons from government, from university, from industry, and some of the major agencies of government represented on it.

Mr. Speaker, I would see it conducting its work in terms of recognizing some in-house work through what we now know as the Alberta Research Council facilities. It would also contract out some work. It would be able to provide grants. In that respect, I think the initiative taken by the Oil Sands Technology Authority is very desirable, and one which could be emulated to a much greater extent in other areas. That is not an avenue which the Alberta Research Council has explored to the present time, so far as I know — at least not in any significant way.

In short, Mr. Speaker, what I have suggested would lead to a change in the Alberta Research Council, in that many of the functions of the council *per se* would become the responsibility of the institute of which I speak. The day to day operation of the lab facilities and the complex of technological capability might be carried over as a responsibility of the institute, or it might operate directly without a body of the general broad nature of the institute, but would relate to the institute by way of receiving part of its

funds from the institute.

Mr. Speaker, I would think the institute that I suggest would mean some substantial alterations would have to take place in the AOSTRA concept as we have it now, and that we would need to be rethinking some of our approach to environmental research.

I have indicated that I favor a continuation of a body somewhat along the lines of the Research Council, with a little more independence and with muscle enough to co-ordinate some of the separate entities which have sprung up recently in areas of environment, agriculture, and oil sands and energy research.

Mr. Speaker, I haven't tried to consider the balance which might exist between research and agriculture, forestry, energy, environment, et cetera. I leave that to other speakers.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have the opportunity to participate briefly in this debate, in that I believe a strong, co-ordinated, ongoing research program should be a major factor in Alberta's future. I'll confine my remarks to engineering research, in that I guess I really don't know enough to talk about the other aspects. I think, though, there should be a degree of cross-representation between various aspects: in other words, medical research, engineering research, and social research. But I find it difficult to see how one such engineering research institute or organization could effectively control three such diverse aspects of science.

As members know, research is done in Alberta by private industry, universities, governments, and the Research Council. I suspect that's true more or less across the country and in other industrialized nations of the world. I know there's often the problem of recognizing who is doing what. An immense amount of research is being carried out and has been carried out. If we don't know what somebody's doing in some other area, we could be in the position of reinventing the wheel.

I think everyone is aware of the worldwide paper explosion that has occurred over the last several years. I heard it said not too long ago — I don't know if it's correct — that all the knowledge ever developed by mankind has been equalled in the last two decades. We have an exponential increase in knowledge.

Also, of course, research is done in many different languages. There's quite a problem not only in cataloguing it but in translating many of the papers. I'm sure there's excellent work being done in various countries — Germany, Russia — that may parallel work we're doing here, and that we're not aware of. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I believe this resolution is particularly timely. I think it's imperative, especially in Alberta, that we get on with the job of establishing a strong, centralized research co-ordinating organization. Whether it be called, as noted in this resolution, an institute or a research authority, I don't know if that matters. Nevertheless, I do think that a strong co-ordinating body should be established as quickly as possible.

Research can be either of the free-wheeling variety or very tightly controlled and directed. I recall reading in a book quite a number of years back — I'm not exactly sure which one it was — the author was discussing the merits of the two different approaches

to research. He quoted two specific industry examples. Without naming the companies — they're both well-known laboratories in the U.S. — in one, the lab hired scientists, primarily Ph.D.s, and gave them a desk and whatever facility they required and told them to free-think, in other words have at it, and research whatever they felt like at the moment. This particular company was in the communications and electronics field. Of course the company hoped the scientists would produce creative research in that field. Nevertheless they didn't restrict the area of activity. On the other hand, the oil company lab was rather tightly controlled. Every year a budget was drafted, projects were planned and proposed, and there was accountability at the end of the year as to what was accomplished.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

The author of the book, from his evaluation, mentioned that the free laboratory had been perhaps more effective in an innovative sense, but then again it takes a long time to evaluate the true effectiveness of research. I have some personal doubts as to whether the free-wheeling approach or the tightly controlled approach is better from an economic standpoint. I know the oil company lab which was rather tightly controlled was highly productive. They pioneered many innovative changes in the oil business over the years.

Anyway, there are two schools of thought as to how closely scientists should be controlled. I would suspect that the more theoretical the scientist, the better he would fit the free-wheeling type of laboratory. However, there are obviously many capable applied scientists who would prefer to work in a more guided environment, to have set goals, and to work toward achieving goals in that field.

Again I would emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that I think the value of research, especially here in Alberta, just can't be overestimated. In my view, the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority is a tremendous concept. Although it's a very large fund, I personally think the \$100 million fund will prove, in the future, to be one of the best investments this province has ever made. As we're all aware, the organization has been sifting many proposals for oil sand pilot plant work. I understand they expect to announce their choice in the not too distant future. I think successful exploitation of deep-seated oil sands deposits is a virtual must, not only for the people of Alberta, because after all we are self-sufficient in oil — but we're all good Canadians; I think we want to see Canada once again self-sufficient in oil.

When you look at the quantity of oil contained in those deep-seated deposits, which are not minable, and when you look at what's considered proven, I think there is 80 billion barrels of synthetic oil, not bitumen but synthetic oil, considered to be contained in the Athabasca deposit; 8 billion barrels in Wabasca; 23 billion in Cold Lake; 11 billion in Peace River; and that adds up, if I'm correct, to 122 billion barrels of synthetic oil. Then, if you take the 26.5 billion barrels considered to be surface minable, we're talking about 148.5 billion barrels of proven or probable synthetic oil. That's comparable to Middle East countries.

It's obvious today, I think more so than ever before,

that technological breakthroughs are needed. Even in the surface mining deposits, while I'm convinced that the Syncrude project will be an economic success, it's still roughly a \$2 billion investment, whereas I understand that the Shell project, a project of like size, now is considered to be in the \$3 billion range. I suspect that in order to make future mining plants economic there are going to have to be some technological breakthroughs, whether in the area of coking or in handling of tailings and so forth. For the *in situ* deposits, I know that oil has been produced successfully from a technical standpoint, from at least a couple of those deposits I mentioned, from the 2,000-foot depth roughly. But I doubt that there has been any economic production.

I'm personally very hopeful that the pilot projects that AOSTRA will fund will provide the answers to the economic production of large quantities of oil from these deposits and again make Canada self-sufficient in oil. Even though Alberta itself doesn't need the oil, the advantages for the country are tremendous. Of course, there will be immense economic benefits to Alberta through the jobs and the spinoff created. There's a great deal of potential for research when we think of the spinoffs from *in situ* development. That's a role I think the new Alberta Science and Technology Research Authority could play a major part in.

When we think about how we're going to produce that *in situ* oil and the many thousands of wells that would be required, you can visualize the use of thousands of conventional beam-type pumping units, just to mention one item. In recent years these have been made, to my knowledge, only by two American companies. Yet I think the market for pumping units in our *in situ* deposits will exceed any other world markets, past or present. Furthermore, the application to our particular deposits is unique, because we're talking about a very heavy high-gravity oil. It's extremely viscous. We're talking about producing high volumes from relatively shallow depths. The type of conventional pumping unit that has been produced in the States isn't necessarily completely applicable to our operations. I think there's just a wonderful opportunity here for research in Alberta and the establishment of a large Canadian pumping unit industry right here, possibly the biggest in the world.

As a matter of fact, I'm aware of a field not too far from Lloydminster where in the past year a company has had a fairly good discovery and required in the order of 200 to 300 pumping units. Again, this is fairly shallow production. We're talking about producing fairly substantial volumes considering that depth, again of fairly heavy oil. Apparently, from what I understand, the American companies didn't appear too excited about providing that market. The producer in question went out and talked to Alberta companies. There are actually three companies assembling these units in Alberta. The gears are obtained from Ontario and British Columbia, but in all three cases, I believe, the units were actually being assembled in large part right here.

I just mentioned one specific example, but I think that the development of our *in situ* oil deposits will offer a tremendous opportunity to Alberta industries to establish these so-called spinoff industries. It's an area where research could be extremely helpful.

There are actually quite a few examples in Alberta. The Foremost track vehicles that are being produced in Calgary were researched and developed by private industry here in Alberta. As a result of that research, a successful industry that employs quite a number of people was developed. The product has been sold worldwide. I think the Russians bought quite a number of them.

The same is true of portable housing. Alberta companies certainly pioneered this field and have established a worldwide market. Another case I'm aware of is a hovercraft type of barge that's been researched and developed, at least in part, in Alberta. This type of barge is relatively inexpensive, compared with the self-propelled type. It can be pulled by a tractor or some other vehicle. There is a considerable interest in them for use as ferries to replace the existing type because, especially during the spring and fall when there's ice on rivers, these vehicles are apparently relatively unencumbered by the ice. In other words, they have the ability to rise and adapt to it. They've also tried these vehicles as ice-breakers in the Great Lakes, I think in the Thunder Bay area. At least tentatively, it appears that there might be some real prospects for a breakthrough in this area. Again, we're talking about the benefits of research done in Alberta. In this case, it was again done by private industry.

I really think, Mr. Speaker, that the need for research is probably more important in a province like Alberta than in almost any other province in the country. Because of our depleting natural resources and our landlocked position, it's obvious that we must diversify as the years go by. With our transportation problems, we've got to be selective as to the type of industry that we can best accommodate. We all ought to keep Alberta clean. We want to have high technology, clean industries — the relatively non-polluting type. These, of course, also create the good clean jobs that are among the best paid and will ensure a successful future for our children.

With regard to the type of research institute proposed, personally I would like to see it stronger rather than weaker. I tend to think that it ought to have relatively broad structural and fiscal capability. I would think, for example, that such an authority should have the power to buy and sell patents, to invest in joint ventures, and to engage in a broad range of activities to the benefit of Albertans. I think that such an authority should have control over not all, but a substantial part of the funds made available by government for research.

I would even suggest that this authority should probably take over the Alberta Research Council — rather than have a separate organization, incorporate it — and therefore have their laboratory facilities, as well as even the environmental laboratory being constructed at Vegreville. However, I would think that the board members responsible for such a proposed authority should definitely represent the three major sectors concerned with research policy; that is, the government, the universities, and private industry. Again, I would visualize that this would be a very strong institute or authority. I look at the success and the value of the ERCB over the years. I recognize how much of that value contributes to the relative autonomy and strength that that board has. I would think such an authority might be like AOSTRA.

Possibly it could even incorporate AOSTRA down the road. Certainly it would be a strong organization.

I think its role should be primarily planning, funding, co-ordination of research, and using the capabilities of existing Alberta research organizations whenever possible. Also, I wouldn't want the proposed authority to prevent the funding of university research projects through normal research grant channels. Nevertheless, I would think the authority should maintain an inventory of research done by universities.

Although government funding would obviously provide the major source of revenue for the proposed authority over the early years, I would hope that successful patents and licensing of technology would eventually go a long way toward putting the authority on a self-sufficient basis. As in the case of AOSTRA, I really like the idea of doing pilot plant and field work on a joint basis with private industry, wherever that is possible.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would again like to compliment the Member for Edmonton Jasper Place for bringing forth this motion, and indicate that I intend to support it fully. I think the establishment of a strong, well-funded Alberta science and technology institute or authority should be expedited, and given very high priority.

MR. KIDD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to make a few remarks concerning the motion introduced by the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place, although it seems at this point that most of what I say will be superfluous, since it's been covered so well by the two preceding speakers. I do believe this motion to be timely and of major importance. It certainly deserves careful consideration.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps to avoid any confusion as to semantics, let's define what research is. *Webster's Dictionary* defines research as: (1) careful or diligent search; (2) studious inquiry or examination, especially investigation or experimentation aimed at the discovery and interpretation of facts, revision of accepted theories or laws in the light of new facts, or practical application of such new or revised theories or laws.

I like the "especially" part of the definition. I think of research in two principal areas; first, the Einstein-Fermi-Rutherford-Best-Franklin type, or basic research. Just in passing, the great simplicity of old Benjamin Franklin, which is a feature of so many of these people with excellent minds, is exemplified by how he demonstrated that black absorbs light and white reflects it. On a nice, bright, sunny day, he took a piece of black cardboard and threw it out in the snow. In about an hour, it had sunk down. What a simple way of showing how things happen.

The second part of research: of the two, there's basic research, and in my view, when research is used for practical purposes, it's applied research. The word research has a certain amount of status. I know in my former occupation, it was a heck of a lot easier to get money if you called it research — in geology, for instance — rather than just plain old geology. It's a lovely status word. The public tends to believe that research is good. However, we tend to glorify mundane fact-gathering and those performing these tasks as researchers. But don't get me wrong in this context. The proliferation of information in this continent — and indeed, the world — in the last 20

years has been exponential. That was so well described by the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder. Therefore, in my view, a very important aspect of all research, both basic and applied, is to have full knowledge of all the work being done by others. In basic research, nearly all fields of scientific investigation have common elements.

Getting back to the hon. member's motion, it seems to me that prior to the establishment of any institution, co-ordinating body, or authority, it is absolutely essential that there be a clear enunciation of the research and science policy of this province. This policy, in my view, should state the following.

First, the level of continuing financial support the government will make toward research. I guess that decision must be very arbitrary. What percentage of our budget should that be? Five, 10, 20? That decision must be made. Secondly, the areas of research on which emphasis will be placed, such as energy, the environment, medicine, and so on. That necessitates a reiteration of the social and economic goals of this province. Thirdly, the balance between applied and basic research. Fourth, the methods by which research should be carried out. For instance, should most basic research be carried out in universities? Should most applied research be performed in partnership with private enterprise? Fifth, a statement of objectives and methods whereby favorable atmospheres or climates concerning research will be created so that the capabilities of the available talent in Alberta will be enhanced and the best brains in the world will be attracted to Alberta.

I believe these are a few of the elements required in a science policy statement.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, let no one interpret this as being critical of the research now being performed in the province by this government. That aspect was very well covered by the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place. I might again mention, as he mentioned, that the Research Council is second to none, except perhaps Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I must mention again AOSTRA, although it was well covered by the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder. One hundred million dollars is allotted to AOSTRA, with which I am very familiar; \$100 million is being invested, not only for the good of the people of Alberta, but for the good of all Canadians, to recover our vast *in situ* tar sands. You know, Mr. Speaker, being on the board, I'm confident we're going to do it.

Mr. Speaker, with humility, since I'm a member of the board, the manner in which that authority has operated has an important bearing on the hon. member's motion. Within the allotted funds and within the general guidelines in the act setting up the authority, the *modus operandi* has been as follows. Projects and ideas related primarily to the *in situ* recovery of tar sands oil were elicited from oil companies, universities, and any individual and group within the citizenry at large. Each of these projects and ideas was evaluated by established panels of experts or by the board where the board was in the position, knowledge-wise, to do so. In the areas of basic research, many of the programs were fully funded. In the areas of projects related to applied

research, a dollar-for-dollar sharing program was initiated.

I believe, again in agreement with preceding speakers, that the dollar-for-dollar sharing with private industry is a very important principle. When people spend their own money, their interest and efficiency is maximized.

Mr. Speaker, this exercise involved follow-up reviews with applicants, the fullest efforts to assure that each applicant had full and complete hearings, and that no one felt they were being by-passed, no matter how impractical their submissions initially appeared.

Mr. Speaker, an essential concept of AOSTRA is that we in Alberta own all the technology developed. That means, in many cases, obtaining access to knowledge from worldwide sources. I think that's extremely important to this province. There is little room for parochialism in research. I might say this about AOSTRA, I'm blowing the horn a little bit, but the staff is being kept to a minimum and consultants used in place of adding staff. Mr. Speaker, the time and work involved in AOSTRA has been of large volume. Frankly, the \$100 per month I receive is not excessive. In February I worked it out to 30 cents an hour. The seven members on the board have had a full slate, but have been sustained by the vital nature of the work involved. I believe this has been a most efficient way of initiating research.

Mr. Speaker, I would be a bit apprehensive of superimposing another directory body on such a group as AOSTRA. However, I do agree, that a body such as suggested, whatever it is named — and I don't like institute — can perform a necessary and essential service as a co-ordinating and advisory group avoiding overlaps, recommending fund allocations and establishing priorities. But, Mr. Speaker, I am apprehensive about such a body being too authoritative and too strongly directed. Those capable of doing research are a sensitive group. A great deal of discretion and latitude is required to establish the proper atmosphere so their efforts will achieve desired results.

I am concerned about such terms as "maximum Practicable planning" as described in the member's motion. If the word "practicable" is interpreted properly, however, it should be okay. Research on tough problems progresses very slowly. There is much to say for the free enterprise competitive system, where many people are working on the same problem. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that in research where top-level brain power is at a premium, our attitude and the climate created must be one that openly welcomes top people from anywhere in the world, hand in hand with fostering the development of our own Alberta researchers.

Mr. Speaker, with these comments, admonishments if you like, I generally agree with the motion. However, perhaps I should summarize my position. I agree that a co-ordinating body for research is required to be involved in advising the government in allocation of funds and on priorities, and assuring there is no overlap in such things as information services or facilities. The matter of facilities was well expressed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place. However, I believe the work involved in each priority area such as oil sands research or medical research needs the direction and time of individual

boards. I see a loss in efficiency if the institute becomes another directing body interposed between the cabinet, or the designated cabinet member, and such groups. With that statement, Mr. Speaker, I believe that our very lives and livelihood in the future depend on effective research being started now and continued.

Mr. Speaker, I'm tempted to continue but perhaps the action of the old lady who never voted should be recalled. When asked why she said, oh, it would only encourage them.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, by way of House business tonight, it would be our intention to proceed in Committee of Supply to deal with the estimates of the Department of Social Services and Community Health.

MR. SPEAKER: It being reasonably close to 5:30, would hon. members agree that when they convene at 8 o'clock this evening they will be in Committee of Supply?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

[The House adjourned at 5:25 p.m.]

[The Committee of Supply met at 8 p.m.]

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

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will come to order.

Department of Social Services and Community Health

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. minister have any opening remarks with respect to the department?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes I have, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a few brief remarks to the committee members this evening. I would like to open by speaking a little about some personnel changes that have occurred in the department since the last time my estimates were studied by this committee.

I would like to speak about a chap, Bruce Rawson, whom many of you will know. He was the chief deputy minister at that time. Bruce left and went to Ottawa where he is Deputy Minister of Welfare. He is seeking new challenges down there, but he served the province faithfully and well. I know all members

would like to wish Bruce well, as I do.

Our new Chief Deputy Minister is Mr. Stan Mansbridge, who comes to us from the Department of National Health and Welfare in Ottawa. I'm not merely playing tit for tat, but we were happy to be able to recruit Mr. Mansbridge and encourage him to join the Alberta team. We also wish him well and hope he will enjoy his new challenges in this province. He's in the gallery tonight to give me some semaphore signals and so on, to assist in getting through the estimates to the satisfaction of the committee members.

Also, Dr. Jean Nelson was acting Deputy Minister of Health, and her position as Deputy Minister was confirmed in July, 1975. Of course I'm delighted to have her as part of the team.

For the first time, then, we have three officials, the chief deputy minister and two deputy ministers, in the department. I hope that will remain static for a few years during the interesting times we have ahead.

I would like to speak also about the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission. I'm grouping it with the discussion on the estimates because it's Vote 8, I believe, and since the estimates were last done there has been a change. Mr. Richard Anthony resigned as chairman and sought new endeavors in British Columbia. Our new chairman is Wilf Totten, who took office effective October 1. He brings a good deal of valuable experience to this very important position.

Hon. members will know that many programs in this department grew very rapidly over the past few years. During our Budget Address [debate] I talked about challenges we face in attempting to hold the line and establish a policy of encouragement, yet work in a period of restraint. That's an interesting challenge indeed.

I've said on several occasions that we must improve the delivery of service by eliminating duplication and fragmentation. We require co-operation of groups, agencies, organizations, and individuals in order to make this happen. To this end we have done a considerable amount of planning and co-ordination in the department. But there is more to do. Indeed, as Bruce Rawson put it so well when he left the department to go to Ottawa, the department has soul. I believe it has. It should be considered as a living entity. We must change and develop, not just for the sake of change, but to keep up with the times, and our planning must be ongoing.

Before we go into the details of the estimates, I would like to mention a few of the good-news items which may not be noticed. They might just get lost in the large votes that are part of the program budgeting. It's rather nice sometimes to think about some of the smaller programs that have had a very real effect on the lives of many people in a meaningful way.

I'd like to tell hon. members about one of the programs, not widely known or talked about, that I think is important. In 1973 we started considering the problems of individuals with cleft palate/harelip syndrome. By checking the records for 10 years, we found that nearly 80 babies were born annually with this condition. But the concern I had, more than that, was not with the newborn infants, but with the older people who had never had adequate repair done; consequently there was poor dentition and often speech difficulties. I consider it a multiple handicap.

In 1974 the Department of Health and Social

Development inaugurated a comprehensive treatment program for the management of congenital cleft palate/harelip syndrome which would ensure the removal of expense as a deterrent to carrying out long-term, costly procedures. So we have initiated the program in co-operation with the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission. It's proven to be a very satisfying program, not only to the people in the department who deliver it, but very gratifying and well appreciated by those who receive it.

Many babies are registered within a few days of birth and, if necessary, a plate is fitted to prevent feeding problems. Older infants and preschool children are referred following surgical repair of the cleft lip or palate, and dental and orthodontic treatment may go on for many years. Of course we all know what an expense this has been in the past. That's why many older people have not taken advantage of it. They've been just delighted to receive treatment that has greatly improved their appearance, dentition, speech, and consequently their self-esteem and acceptance by their peers in society. I wanted to tell hon. members about this very small program in the scheme of things, one that is, I think, so helpful to individuals who've received it.

Another thing we're very proud of in the department that's working very well is the Alberta parent counsellors, a foster care demonstration project. That's an attempt to provide better and more appropriate care for adolescents by better use of manpower from the citizens of Alberta. It goes back to citizen involvement and caring for one another. We're attempting to harness those very fine qualities in our citizens, and it's working very effectively.

I mentioned at one time we had a project with the Voice of Alberta Native Women's Society. That is a foster care recruitment project, an attempt to involve native families in becoming foster parents by employing native women throughout the province to inform and recruit native families. Probably through the years we'll have more to say about that. I'm very encouraged.

The Alberta Foster Parents Association involves foster parents in planning and developing foster homes for children requiring protection. This involves educational programs, conferences, workshops, and so on. It's a very effective association, and I would like to have it on record as being considered as such by this department.

In special cases we pay special rates to foster parents over and above regular board rates. This enables us to keep children in the community and with individual families rather than in institutions. It does two things, then: provides a home atmosphere with the kind of care and attention that troubled children require, rather than requiring space for them in institutions.

The department has been funding the Calgary Boys' and Girls' Club to provide a non-institutional wilderness education experience for 16 seriously delinquent boys who would otherwise be required to spend time in the Youth Development Centre in Edmonton. We're funding the community services program at the William Roper Hull Home in Calgary, and at Mapleridge and Marydale in Edmonton. We operate such programs at Westfield and the Youth Development Centre in Edmonton.

We know the problem comes from the home and

the community. We know these children will eventually return there; at least that's our goal. It's important that people know, understand, and also be encouraged so they can accept children back into the residences and into the community.

During 1975 we opened two 10-bed youth assessment centres, one in Lethbridge and one in Red Deer. These centres provide short-term detention for young persons charged and before the courts, and young persons who present a danger to themselves. We're planning further 10-bed units in Medicine Hat and Lac La Biche, and 20-bed units for Fort McMurray and High Prairie.

We're funding an 18-month project undertaken by the Alberta Association of Child Care Centres. This will focus on the development of recommended standards of care for residential centres. We think we need to know this. What is the standard of care that we should have in our child care centres? Who better to tell us than the Alberta association? We undertook to provide them with funds so they might assess it and give us the benefit of their experience and information.

I could go on to talk about the same success we've had in encouraging people to take employment and move off social allowance, but that would take too long. We have some success stories. We also have some stories that aren't so successful. But I think it's important that we not lose track of the good things that are accomplished by people in the department, people in the community, or by individuals who make the effort to get themselves back into the mainstream of society. We like to encourage them to do that.

While I'm commenting on the involvement of our department and the involvement of parents and so on, perhaps I could read an extract from a letter which came to my desk only recently. My reason for doing this, Mr. Chairman, is to put on record the fact that some people do take time to say thank you; not to me, but to the hard working people in the Department of Social Services and Community Health. I know this doesn't happen very often. I would like to think that people feel appreciation. I'm sure they do. But it isn't often they take the time to say so.

Because of the nature of this letter, I would like to read it to hon. members. I will leave out part of it, because it contains names which I feel I would rather keep in confidence.

May I, on behalf of both my wife, Joan, and myself, express our appreciation for the helpful and most considerate assistance given to us on behalf of Gordie by all members of the Department of Social Services and Community Health.

Too often we complain about government activity, without coming in touch with the activities and dedication of individuals involved in public service.

Through Gordie, Joan and I were able to see the dedication and compassion which your department obviously has.

In times when we often don't seem to be doing anything right, Mr. Chairman, it is nice to get such a letter addressed to the social worker in the department. I know that kind of gratitude is probably felt often, but it doesn't always come to the attention of the minister and certainly doesn't always come to the attention of hon. members of the Assembly. I want to take this opportunity to pass on to those hard

working people in the public service the fact that I am cognizant of the contribution they're making. I want to have it recorded before this committee.

I hope that hon. members are interested and like the format of the program budgeting. I think it's a very useful way to look at the estimates and to look at the programs and their specific content. Rather than dwell at length on the details, I believe it would be advantageous if I responded to each element as it's raised. I think perhaps if hon. members would like to proceed that way in reviewing my estimates, I would like to recommend that to them. But of course it's whichever way they'd like to handle it.

As we go through the estimates, though, I would like to draw hon. members' attention to the amount of funds actually transferred through the department to groups, agencies, and individuals. There are a couple of very large votes, Vote 2 and Vote 3, social assistance and the assistance to senior citizens. They are extremely large amounts of money, and we're merely recycling dollars, I guess you'd call it.

I now conclude my opening remarks. I look forward to the contribution of hon. members over the days that lie ahead as we review my estimates. I trust that I'll be able to answer to their satisfaction the numerous questions I hope they will have. I look forward to the debate, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not entirely sure whether the hon. minister had a slip of the tongue when she said, in the days ahead as we review her estimates. It wasn't quite my thinking, Ms. Minister, that we would be taking days to do it.

MISS HUNLEY: It's all right with me.

MR. NOTLEY: If that's the situation, so be it.

I'd like to begin by saying I share the point, well made by the minister, that there are a large number of very dedicated employees of the Department of Social Services and Community Health. Too often we tend to hear nothing but criticism of the department, particularly the social allowance section. Frequently we fail to realize that there are a large number of success stories and many, many dedicated people who not only do the job they're required to do, but indeed do somewhat more.

As an MLA dealing with officials of the department, I have always encountered co-operation. At least in terms of officials in the Peace River district, [when] I have brought matters to their attention, I've found that they have looked into those questions and co-operated in every way. So while many of the things I'm going to raise in my initial remarks are not going to be so complimentary, I do agree there are a large number of very dedicated people in the department.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with four separate issues. The first is the VS Services controversy at ASH/Deerhome; the second is the question of the handicapped in Alberta and bringing the handicapped under assured income; the third, mental health estimates for 1976-77; and the final one is perhaps to ask the minister if she could bring us up to date on where things now stand on cost sharing with the federal government in many of the facets of programs in her department.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by turning to the VS

controversy. I realize that this is a controversy and that feelings are strong on either side. I'm under no illusions that I'm going to be able to convince the minister, but the fact of the matter is that I think it's important that people frankly state their views on this matter. Then the government, of course, will have to be accountable for the decisions they make.

Might I say that I have some doubts in the first place about the advisability of contracting out the services at the centre. I think this is an area where by and large we are probably better served by the public service. But if the government decides that flexibility requires looking at other options, I would say that at the very least there should have been open tenders as opposed to requests for proposals. It seems to me the RFP approach is far too restrictive. If we are going to move to a form of partnership, if you like, with the private sector, that should only come as a result of open tenders. I say that after first of all making it clear that I really don't feel this is an area for the private sector. But the minister and I have different political philosophies. I'm holding to mine and she's probably holding to hers.

Let me move from that particular position to review the issues that in my judgment are now relevant regarding VS Services and ASH/Deerhome. The department had set up a committee which was given the obligation of scoring the proposals. As I read over the findings of that committee, it seems to me the evidence is pretty strong. That evidence is that in most regards the VS proposal was inferior to the CSA proposal. Housekeeping: the rating for the CSA proposal was 149; the rating for VS Services, 131. Laundry and linen: the CSA proposal, 161; the rating for VS, 127. Food services: [the CSA proposal], 156; the rating for VS Services, 130. The combined totals: 466 compared to 388, or a difference of approximately 31 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, the point is made that the government anticipates saving \$1 million this year, and I believe — if I am correct in the assessment of the motion for a return that was tabled today — somewhere in the neighborhood of \$900,000 next year. Well, Mr. Chairman, I really find that a little difficult to understand. Looking over the scoring committee's assessment, I don't see where we're going to have a million-dollar saving during 1976-77. But if the minister can provide us with some statistics that would bear that out, I would be very interested.

There is also, I think, the memo from Dr. Koegler to Mr. Arcand. Now I think it's also fair to say that Dr. Koegler apparently has indicated that this is the feeling of the committee and not his own personal feeling. But he did say on January 29, talking about the VS contract:

At first glance it appears that considerable savings could be realized in some instances if we switched to a contracted service. We feel, however, that these projected figures are unrealistically low and could be realized only at drastic reductions of staff or greatly decreased quality of service.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the government's position, the last thing they would even want to consider is either reduction of staff or decreasing the quality of service. We are obviously going to have a shifting of staff from the public service to VS Services, but it is certainly not my understanding that the

government is contemplating drastic reductions of staff or greatly decreased quality of service. So it seems to me that the review committee which scored the proposals puts into very definite question the advisability of the government proceeding with the VS contract.

I'd just like to review the contract as I understand it. It is essentially a cost-plus contract. The government pays for utilities, laundry equipment, food equipment, cleaning equipment, vehicles, and operating costs; and then there is a management fee of \$4,072 a month plus a cost-plus of 3.5 per cent based on operating costs and salaries. Now, Mr. Chairman, the question I would put to the minister, and I think other people would be interested as well, is that I find it a little difficult to understand how we're going to monitor and control a cost-plus contract.

When this matter was raised in the Legislature the other day, the minister essentially said there are two ways of doing it. The first is that we are looking at a two-year contract rather than something that goes on indefinitely. Well that's obvious, and we know that. The other is that we have many dedicated public servants. I don't dispute that. Many people who have worked in the institution would carefully report to the minister any decrease or decline in the quality of service, and I don't doubt that.

But I do not believe that either of those two reasons is in fact an effective or sophisticated method of monitoring. I think it would be useful, Mr. Chairman, during the discussion in the committee if the minister would bring us up to date on just what special steps she sees as necessary to monitor the VS Services contract.

Surely we are not going to play with the quality of service because we have a two-year contract. If, after six, eight, or 12 months, we find that the quality of service is seriously reduced, there must be some way of monitoring that. There must also be some way of acting swiftly before the termination of the contract if, in fact, that situation arises. I hope it doesn't, Mr. Chairman, but I say that it seems to me we have to be ready to deal with it, if in fact that unfortunate eventuality occurs.

Mr. Chairman, I gather some of the employee questions raised earlier in the question period are going to be resolved with the new act dealing with the CSA, amending it, and essentially allowing the CSA an opportunity to seek to represent the VS employees. So I don't think those questions are necessarily that relevant at this stage.

I don't intend to launch into a long tirade about VS Services, Mr. Chairman, except to say we are not dealing with a company based in Alberta. Most of the directors are from outside. As a matter of fact they're all from outside the province as I understand it. This will be the largest contract VS Services has within the country, yet their head office is in eastern Canada and they are controlled by Automatic Retailers of Philadelphia.

As far as I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, the government has yet to explain in a convincing manner why the choice was made to go the VS route when we had a pretty well-documented proposal from the CSA, and one which was scored highest by the committee set up to evaluate the proposals. At a time of restraint I know we can talk about saving money. But if we're going to talk about saving

money, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we have to have pretty clearly documented facts and figures as to how we're going to save money. As I look over the contract and the information tabled to date, I just don't see that information. Mr. Chairman, that concludes the comments I would make on VS Services.

I'd like to move on to the issue of the handicapped in Alberta, and refer the minister to a motion passed by the Legislature on June 17, 1975:

... the Legislative Assembly urge the government of the province to consider making representations to the Government of Canada to amend the Old Age Security Act ... in such a way that a person who is handicapped to a degree which prevents earning a living shall receive a benefit equal to that payable to a person of age 65.

Mr. Chairman, my first question to the minister is: has the government ever made representation as a result of this resolution? If so, when was the representation made? Has there been any follow-up? What was the federal government's response?

It seems to me that one of the areas a wealthy province such as Alberta should consider as a priority is providing a decent basis of income for the handicapped people of our society. When you talk to people in the various organizations representing the handicapped and they make the point about the indignity they feel — perhaps unfairly felt, but the sense of indignity that they feel, often by having to go on social allowance — it seems to me there is a pretty strong argument for a form of assured income similar to the senior citizens in this province.

Those questions are fairly straightforward. Barring federal action, however, Mme. Minister, I would ask you to advise us whether it's the intention of the province at some stage — obviously it's not within the present budget — to introduce such a program in this province.

The third area I'd like to raise concerns the mental health budget. I am not used to congratulating the Premier of the province very often. But I have to admit that during his days in opposition, and after the tabling of the Blair report, I believe in 1968 or '69, no one pioneered the cause of mental health more forcefully in the province than the man who is currently the Premier of Alberta. In fairness, I would also say that in the first several years of this government there were some important innovations both in programs as well as programs backed up by additional funds for mental health. The members will recall the excellent discussion we had in the fall of 1973 about the new Mental Health Act.

My question to the minister is: in light of the 7.3 per cent increase in mental health expenditures, Treatment of Mental Illness, Vote 6 in the budget this year, what new initiatives does the government foresee? Or in fact is mental health treatment in Alberta in — if I can use a term that one Mr. Mathew used in Public Accounts — a holding pattern for the present time? I hope it's not in a holding pattern, not that kind of holding pattern anyway. But a 7.3 per cent increase is not really large enough, in my view, to keep pace with the rising costs which will occur.

The final point I would make and request the minister to answer is: where do we stand now on the myriad of cost-sharing plans in this whole area? This

is really an opportunity for the minister to bring us up to date on just where we stand on this matter. I assume that as far as cost sharing in programs under her department, the general philosophy would be the same as announced by the Minister of Health; namely, the government would prefer equalized percentage points, taxation points, in preference to any kind of cost-shared programs.

However, there were a number of meetings with federal and provincial officials last February and then several weeks ago. I think it would be useful for the members of the committee, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. minister could bring us up to date on just where we stand on discussions with Ottawa on this important matter.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few general remarks to the minister and also cover four areas. Two of them have been covered by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview with regard to federal-provincial agreements on mental health. Just to touch on those federal-provincial agreements, I'd appreciate an up-to-date report on that. Possibly we can question further.

Mental health — I had the same feeling as the hon. member that really the Blair report had been shelved, and we really aren't seeing any kind of thrust or direction at the present time. I'd certainly like the minister to comment on just what is happening. Are the recommendations from the Blair report being used as guideposts? Are the concepts that Blair set before us — such as community involvement, pushing the service back to the local community, involving professional people in different matters, those types of things — still in the mind of the minister? Is that the thrust of the mental health program?

I'd like to touch on two other areas: first of all, the sorts of social problems which face the minister generally, but I think maybe face all of us in a more specific manner. If we examine the statistics at the present time, we recognize that public assistance rolls and the cost of public assistance to government are up. We recognize that single families in the province are up. It's not just the social service problem. It's also a problem in the school systems; it causes a different type of environment and a different relationship in the management of our schools.

The other area is marriages. If we look at the statistics we find that — I haven't got the 1975 ones — in 1974 we have a divorce rate in Alberta, one of the highest in Canada, around 263 per 100,000 marriages. I understand there are no firm statistics on this matter of separations. But from offhand comments and observations that are made, for every divorce that occurs, usually about three separations are occurring at the same time. Maybe the minister could comment on that.

As government and as legislators, we continue to pump dollars into these areas. The social problems are increasing faster than we are pumping the dollars in. I think maybe it's time to examine the objectives of government and the objective of the minister. Is the minister's type of procedure or objective to get more government dollars into the communities to try to come to grips with the social problems? Or is another approach being examined at the present time where maybe we place these social problems at the family, community, or individual level? Maybe it's

time we say the race is over and finished, and quit this government feeling that we have all the answers. We're in a time of restraint.

Maybe we have to say that to the people of Alberta, because over the last 10 to 15 years we have conditioned the people — this is my observation as a person in politics for 13 years — to the fact that when a social problem occurs you go to government or some government agency. The responsibility within the churches has been eliminated. They are lost in the field out there. They don't know how to come to grips with social problems anymore. Maybe government should start saying, it's time we go back into the community, hand it back to the people. Maybe some of the problems will be solved, because we're not doing it as government. We're certainly spending the money. I'd like the minister to comment on that particular objective and how she examines that point of view at the present time.

The second area is with regard to public assistance. My observation in the last two or three years — and I really haven't questioned this area or raised it. I remember prior to 1971 that this was one of the areas of yearly examination from the opposition side of the House: why are more people on public assistance? The rolls are continuing to grow. What are you doing about it? I always felt a little ill at ease answering that particular question because I understand, and I know it's a very difficult thing.

In the minister's examination of that question, what is the present attitude of the government? Is it that anybody who wants social assistance has a right to it, and you hand it out and give it to them? Or are you placing a greater emphasis on employment? You mentioned that a little while ago. Are we hiring more social workers and saying they're going to solve the problems? Really, maybe they are agents to hand out financial assistance but they're really doing nothing in social assistance. I don't think they've got time to do very much. What is happening in that particular area?

Those are the general comments. I'll ask specific questions later.

MISS HUNLEY: I've attempted to make notes of the various questions the two hon. members have raised, and I'll try not to omit any of the items.

First of all, I'd like to deal with VS Services and some of the comments made by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. He's quite right. He and I are poles apart in our philosophy, but I hope we're not poles apart in how we feel and care about people. I happen to feel there are ways you can serve people adequately and make use of the private sector. I think perhaps the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview rather favors state control. I never will meet on that philosophy, but I hope that on the philosophy of caring and concern about people we are not at all apart.

The hon. member chooses to use a committee report which came into his hands. But in assessing contracts of this size, usually more than one assessment is done. I've based my opinion on the best judgment that was given after a number of assessments were done. I believe we made a wise choice. Of course only time will tell. I would not have undertaken this route or suggested to my officials that it was in order had I not felt it could indeed be

done. And I believe it can be done.

In the department we have capabilities of monitoring costs. How else can we budget? I believe the assistant deputy minister of finance and administration has always been a very effective manager of funds in this department. I notice that through the years, difficult budget matters such as social assistance — how do we measure how great the budget for social assistance will be, for example, if there's a sudden influx or growth in the unemployment rate and we have to pick it up there? That's a difficult way to budget. But I have that type of confidence in the officials in my department. I also believe they do have the statistics as to growth. They know how to budget. They know the estimated costs. They know what the proposal is. It was indicated to us that we could save some money. I have no objection to saving the people's money as long as we can deliver an adequate service that's as good as or better than we were doing before, and I believe we can.

The hon. member referred to the return that was tabled. I hope he was not quite accurate. I hope it said we estimated approximately \$1 million per year, and that the '76-77 fiscal year of course would be adjusted on eleven-twelfths because it didn't come into effect until May 1. I'll take another look at that return to be sure I said what I thought I said.

I think we've talked at some length about whether or not it can be done. I say we will look, and hon. members will be able to look. About a year from now, and in between of course, without a doubt we will be able to produce for them figures to show if indeed we're reaching our objective. I believe we will. I do not believe there will be a decrease in the quality of service.

I know the executive director was involved in the final assessment and was anxious for us to proceed. I don't think the executive director would like to borrow trouble. I think he's a very concerned and dedicated man who wants to run a good institution, and I'm sure he will. I know I personally feel the challenge of being sure it will work, as well as my human concern that I very much want it to be a great success. We have done a lot in ASH/Deerhome and we are certainly not, by default, going to defeat all the good things we've accomplished during the past few years.

The hon. member asked about a guaranteed income for the handicapped. Desirable as that may be, I do not see that looming on the horizon for some time. I think it's quite difficult for us to measure who the handicapped are. True, we know who some of them are. True, we know some are so profoundly handicapped that there would be no way we should give them an income. We must care for them as best we can, and we do it well. But surely we don't have a guaranteed income supplement. I think the hon. member was perhaps referring more to physically handicapped, physically disabled, than to handicapped as we think of the whole perspective of people who are handicapped.

We have talked with the federal government about income supplementation, but that is still one of the agreements subject to negotiation. It is subject to negotiation, because we are one of the provinces that want to take a really good look at what they're talking about. It's almost like a guaranteed income supplement. I'm not sure that's the route we want to go in

this province.

Some of the provinces are very interested in it. They say it looks pretty good, but if it costs us even \$1, we don't want it. But it is the subject of ongoing negotiation, and I'll probably be going to Ottawa to discuss it again. That's all part of the whole area of cost sharing that's under negotiation at the present time.

The social services act is a new act proposed by the federal government, through which they would expand the amount of social services in which they share costs. Perhaps while we're discussing that, I can include some of the comments by the hon. Member for Little Bow, because that's all part of the cost-sharing formula at the present time.

When the Canada Assistance Plan came into being, I think one of the key phrases in it was "those who are in need or appear to be in need". That's a pretty elastic term. I'm not sure how that was interpreted in the past. The hon. Member for Little Bow perhaps will know better than I. I know what our philosophy has been. We believe that people who wish to work and are able to work should be encouraged to do so.

I feel very strongly that single parents should not be forced to go to work. The hon. member talks about family breakdown. I am concerned that if the state should force an individual to go to work who might better be home with the children, that might indeed increase family breakdown; not necessarily, because many people who wish to work need to work, not necessarily for the money, but for the personal fulfilment they get out of it. So it has to be treated almost on an individual basis.

I too share the concern of the hon. Member for Little Bow, as I'm sure all hon. members are concerned. I don't know where the state fits in to keep families together. If I look back on my parents, and maybe the parents of most of us here, I think they stuck together because one of them would probably bloody well have starved if they hadn't stayed together in the hungry '30s. I really believe that often families stayed together because there was no choice.

The kind of atmosphere that has been set in this country and in many of the western countries does make family breakdown possible, and then the state pays the bill. It is not so bad that they pay the bill in dollars — that's bad enough. But in many cases they pay the bill in broken homes and ruined lives. That is the sad part.

I don't have the answer for that, nor does anybody else. I think it's a worldwide phenomenon. That doesn't mean we shouldn't look for it. I agree that back in the community and back in the family is where hopefully the salvation lies. I've commented on it before, and I will comment on it again as long as I have the opportunity. Whether I'm in this House or outside, I will encourage families to assume their responsibilities and attempt to keep their lives together.

When we can help in some way — I think there's a little too much stress on counselling; everybody should be counselled. Sometimes counselling works, and sometimes it doesn't. I have to use this term, Mr. Chairman, because to me it's indicative of what counselling really is. It occurred in my constituency. At one of the schools they have a native and white population, and children from the Mackinaw Band go

to a white school. As an assistant to the teacher, they have an older Indian man. That man takes care of all the problem children.

His method of counselling is to say: if you don't do what I say, I'll boot you in the rear end with my cowboy boot. The teacher says the kids respond to that kind of counselling and it works just great. So there are various ways of counselling. When one works, it's good. When it doesn't work, of course, it's like a lot of other things; it's not so good.

As for encouraging people to get off public assistance, we do. I'm sure the hon. member knows, and we're quite proud of, the Opportunity Corps particularly, which has proven very popular. It's teaching people to work. It can be called "work for welfare". I don't care for that term. But it gets them into the work habit. It has proven to be very effective in the northern communities where we're using it the most. In fact it's one of the programs that has been very popular and has been requested by many communities to see if it could work in their areas. They feel there is a real need. The communities involved believe in it. I believe in it. I'd like to see it expanded. I think it has to grow and be well managed. Because if persons have grown up to be older teenagers, in their young 20s or older, and have never established good work habits, have never learned to get out of bed and get at it in the morning — I think it takes some time and training. That's what the Opportunity Corps is all about. They do community work in most cases, but not entirely.

Employment opportunity is a special branch within the social assistance area where they work exclusively on what we call unemployed employables. The sole effort there is to encourage that individual to get back to work. One of the articles I had related to the number of people we got off social assistance who were now earning their own living, even with a large family in one case. He had taken additional training through Advanced Education and Manpower and was now independent. That's our ultimate goal. I'm sure it will continue to be as long as I'm the minister and as long as this particular government is in office. I expect that will be quite a while.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. She said that community-level programs were very important and that's certainly where the responsibilities lie. But a couple of actions I observed: one, the programs you outlined with regard to public assistance seem like they've been ongoing, and they're still government thrusts as such, with money behind them. The other observation I make is that local municipalities have now turned their public assistance responsibilities over to the provincial government with the exception of, I guess, one municipality. Well, that seems like more of a centralization of policy making, social public assistance determination, and provincial government leadership in this whole public assistance area. I don't see this community-level thrust that the minister seems to be implying. That's one thing.

The other thing I raise is with regard to marriages. Has the minister had the opportunity of reviewing a plan called the matrimonial support insurance plan? I understand this is a plan circulating around government at the present time that's somewhat similar to what is called the unemployment insurance program,

whereby married women are requested to pay X number of dollars into a fund. If separation or divorce occurs, they have the right to draw from the fund until they get married again.

I just happened to be given a brief that has been given to one of the departments of government. I wasn't sure whether it came to you as minister. If it has, I'd certainly be interested in your comments as to that type of thrust. There's no way I'm supporting that kind of program. We have enough socialistic things with unemployment insurance and other things the minister advocates.

DR. BUCK: That would fit right into this government's philosophy.

MISS HUNLEY: No, Mr. Chairman, I haven't been exposed to that little goody yet. Having once been in the insurance business, I think I'd consider a lot of people very poor risks.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, is the minister in a position to bring us up to date on the mental health question?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, I'm pleased to be able to talk about developments in mental health, and I appreciate the hon. member's remarks. Of course I'm well aware the growth has only been 7.3 per cent according to my estimates. I think we've made a good deal of progress during the past year, and I'm very encouraged. I would like to encourage hon. members to feel that we have not slackened somewhat in our onward thrust, but you have to admit we were going at a rather fast pace. I think it's time to pause, take a look, see where we are, smooth out our administration, and be sure it's operating effectively.

We've accomplished things during the past year. We've appointed a new regional director for the Red Deer district and a new director of clinical services for the Alberta Hospital, Edmonton. There are positions at Fort McMurray. We've set up front-end psychiatric services as an assistance to the courts in the forensic system. We've granted money to the Calgary General Hospital to develop an interim forensic unit which is ready to operate. That was causing us some real concern in southern Alberta, because there was a terrific demand on Alberta Hospital, Edmonton. We've been able to get that accomplished in Calgary by working through the Calgary General Hospital.

We've reconfirmed accreditation received for the Alberta Hospital at Edmonton and have finally received full accreditation for the Alberta Hospital at Ponoka. I'm sure the staff at the Ponoka hospital were very pleased to become an accredited hospital. We've commenced structuring of the accreditation process for all outpatient units of the division.

There was marked improvement in staff recruitment, particularly in the profession of psychiatry. We were able to fill some positions we'd been unable to fill in the past.

The forensic unit at Alberta Hospital, Edmonton has caused us some concern. We've made a number of changes, but are looking forward to the construction of a new forensic unit that's in the planning stages. We'll be making presentations later this year to Executive Council about our plans for the forensic unit. It's been a long time in the planning, but now

we can see that we have what we think will be a good functional unit to serve the province well.

The \$250,000 research grant was completely committed. We've worked with the Provincial Mental Health Advisory Council, a very useful group as far as I'm concerned. I haven't had the opportunity to meet with them too often, but each time I have been very reassured and encouraged by their great dedication, their suggestions, and by the things they've accomplished. It's through them the mental health grants have gone out. Of course in the budget again this year there is an additional \$250,000 for research. Once again, that will be scrutinized by the Provincial Mental Health Advisory Council.

The regional mental health councils are now under way. I had the pleasure of meeting with them during the course of the summer. They're kind of feeling their way — so they indicated to me at the mental health breakfast — but they're feeling encouraged. I think it takes a while for them to get up a really full head of steam, but I feel sure they will, and give us the feedback they were set up and established to do.

As far as working with groups and agencies within the community, I was delighted to meet with the Calgary group at the mental health breakfast and be able to discuss with them some of our ongoing problems and concerns about community involvement there. I'm not sure whether they've met the officials in my department, but if they have not I expect them soon, because I think our greatest strength can come from the community. If indeed we want to return people to the community, they must have somewhere to go and they must have the back-up support to regain their places in society and make a complete recovery if possible, which is our ultimate goal.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, being a member of the Hospital Visitors Committee and having had the opportunity of making a thorough tour of ASH/Deerhome in Red Deer, I was really impressed with the service and attention the patients were given.

I would like to ask the minister if the savings from the contract with VS Services, whether it be a million dollars or anything, will go to the Treasury of the province. Or could the savings go to improve some other services in ASH/Deerhome?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would be most reluctant to part with any of that hard-earned money. I've said in this House that I wish to see it redirected to treatment and nursing areas in the ASH/Deerhome complex. I have not yet received from the director the request to fill positions. I think he has some work to do there. I would not be so rash as to say we're just going with wild abandon to fling a million dollars in there if it doesn't need it. And I don't think it is needed.

But I do think we need some attention in those areas, and that is what I would like to see some of that money used for. I think it's important. I think we can make a very good use of the saving there, but I would then prefer to use the rest of the money in some other very worth-while areas.

Ref. No. 1.0.2

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister a question on social services, if this is where we deal with social allowances. The matter has been raised, and I think the department is doing an admirable job in terms of support for those unfortunate people who need it. However,

However, even with the increased allowances announced a couple of months ago, there is still no provision for what I would think is a very essential item for people on assistance, and that's the use of a telephone. Apparently that's not included in the scale of services offered to people on assistance. Yet in a survey just done of 120 people on assistance in the Lethbridge area, not one of them was without a telephone. So it would appear to be a very essential item, and I wonder if the minister would comment on that.

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'll be pleased to. I'd direct the hon. member's attention to Vote 2, where this is covered. But I'll be pleased to comment on that. We might as well do it now as when we get to Vote 2.

Telephones are supplied when it's necessary, in the event of medical treatment that might be required in an emergency, or for a person who is seeking employment. I believe there is a limit to how much the state can provide, and perhaps a telephone isn't as essential as some of the other things we might wish to do.

MR. GOGO: Just a supplementary, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member like to wait until we come to Vote 2, where the subject is properly situated.

Agreed to:

Ref. No. 1.0.2	\$741,970
Ref. No. 1.0.3	\$4,895,600
Ref. No. 1.0.4	\$938,060
Ref. No. 1.0.5	\$1,658,830
Ref. No. 1.0.6	\$329,000
Ref. No. 1.0.7	\$204,340
Vote 1 Total Program	\$8,890,630
Ref. No. 2.1	\$1,356,970

Ref. No. 2.2

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, one area in this Public Assistance for Aged is widow's pensions. Not too many years ago the federal government eliminated a pension for widows across Canada, and now they've come up with a spouse's allowance. However, there are many widows who are not 65. They've lost their partners, and no assistance is available for them. They don't like to go on welfare, and there's no assistance through the federal government as far as widows are concerned.

Many widows have been in touch with me who were under 65 and couldn't qualify for the \$1,000 for senior citizens. I certainly didn't think it was right that they couldn't qualify. If their husbands were living and over 65 and on a supplementary pension,

they could have got the \$1,000 to renovate their houses. However, they lost their partners and weren't able to get this. I was just wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the minister has made any representation to Ottawa in this area, as far as getting some assistance for widows under 65 years of age.

MISS HUNLEY: No, Mr. Chairman, I haven't specifically in this regard. But I share the hon. member's concern, and we were aware of that when the federal government passed the legislation. I think it has a great flaw in it because, as he has just said, if a senior citizen is over 65, getting the old age security and maybe the guaranteed income supplement, and the spouse at over age 60 qualifies for the spouse's allowance, things are fine. But if suddenly the person over 65 dies, then all income is cut off.

You know, to me that was a very short-sighted piece of legislation, and that creates a lot of problems for people. God bless them, they are proud enough that they don't wish to accept what they still call welfare. As an MLA, I personally have those submissions crossing my desk with more frequency than I really like, because it shows the concern is there, and it's unfortunate.

I try the best I can to say that there's no stigma attached, that it's really the wish of people to help people who are unable to help themselves. Of course then we pick it up through social assistance. But I agree it's not the most desirable way, particularly when people are proud and independent, as so many of our old folks are. It's there, it's a fact of life, and we try to live with it as best we can.

I doubt very much whether we can get those changes made in the Old Age Security Act during the course of deliberations and discussions with the federal government, because I believe that they too are having a little problem with their areas of restraint. I notice there has been quite a shift in the viewpoint of the minister for Canada in some of our negotiations at the present time in social services, income supplementation, and so on.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I'm glad the Premier and the Deputy Premier are here, because there is an area in which we can do something for these people. That's the area of extended benefits. When the spouse over 65 dies and leaves the widow, her benefits are removed as far as the extended benefits program goes. It has been brought to my attention, as a professional person and as an MLA, that they lose their benefits when their spouses die. This is an area that we, as a provincial government, could look into. There aren't that many people involved. The cost to the taxpayer would be relatively small.

But as the hon. Member for Bow Valley says, it does affect certain people and puts them in a difficult position. A woman is 60 or 61 and all of a sudden — I won't put it the way the hon. Member for Drumheller did, she's cut off — but it does happen. I'm sure there wouldn't be many dollars involved, but I'd certainly like the minister to look into this area.

MISS HUNLEY: There's merit in the hon. member's suggestion. I certainly don't mind having it assessed in the department to see how we can help in these

particularly difficult cases. I'm not too sure we actually know, but I imagine we can probably find out.

Agreed to:

Ref. No. 2.2	\$15,516,000
Ref. No. 2.3	\$57,520,000
Ref. No. 2.4	\$20,059,000
Ref. No. 2.5	\$6,670,000

Ref. No. 2.6

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could possibly tell us how many of these employables are considered chronic, how many years a person has to be on this roll to be considered chronic, and how many come off as chronic welfare cases.

MISS HUNLEY: I don't know that I have the exact statistics on that, though I'll be glad to check and take a look at it. Usually we have a way of assessing whether a person is employable. If they're handicapped or aged, we obviously would want to give them special assistance in becoming employable and independent. But we often know almost immediately — once again, if a person who has never worked is widowed at 60 years of age, we would consider her unemployable unless she wished to take some training. Some of them do, and some of them wish to retain their independence.

But for those who are considered employables, I think perhaps this vote will concern hon. members. I hope it would, because there's a dramatic growth in it. But the thing is that this takes into effect the transfer from the municipalities. The municipalities used to take care of all the short-term cases, and many of those are the employables. Many employables are coming to Alberta because they're looking for work here. Fortunately they're finding work. From the information we were able to assess, when the city of Edmonton entered into the agreement with the provincial government to turn over the entire public assistance area to the province, we found they were in and out of the system in 90 days.

So they do come, and under the Canada Assistance Plan we take care of those who are transients and come here from other provinces. That saves trying to have it charged back to Manitoba or Newfoundland or wherever. That's part of our requirement under the Canada Assistance Plan. But as they come into our system, they are also out again in a short time.

We have some chronic people for whom we will never find employment. I know that because I'm realistic. I would like to find them employment, but first I must find an employer who would hire them. I know most employers want a good day's work for a good day's pay. Some of those who are on our rolls are not employable in the strictest sense of the word, because we can't find an employer. But we do work away diligently at it. The regional directors have authorization not to allow them welfare or to cut it off if they — there's that term again hon. Member for Clover Bar. But they do have that and I expect them to do it.

I know of one instance — I don't know how current it is, but it's not a fact I find too difficult to accept — where one of the welfare workers was referred to by his colleagues. They said nobody likes to have him

for their caseworker because he goes out and finds work for them. I said, good. That's the philosophy I'd like to have prevail throughout the various regional offices.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I'm really concerned about the growth of the vote for unemployed employables. It's the largest increase in this whole group and probably the least worthy of increase. With the latest statistics, unemployment has increased in Alberta. It seems to me people able to work should have some pressure put on them to get out and work. Some of them are simply lazy lumps quite prepared to live off other people's work. Others may have illness periodically, or something like that, where they need temporary help. But this group of unemployed employables, who simply live off welfare — and I don't apologize for using the word, because that's exactly what it is in their case — from month to month aren't any asset to this country, and I think we're catering to them.

I remember going to Drumheller — this was about four or five years ago, but the case illustrates what I'm trying to get at — for one of my regular sessions for those having difficulties or troubles. This chap came down and wanted his welfare increased. I didn't know the man at all, so I asked him a few questions. Apparently he had a wife and five youngsters and was having a difficult time and so on. I told him I'd check with the welfare officer, which I did immediately afterward. The welfare officer gave me an amazing story. He said, the man's been in here for five or six months. He doesn't even show up at the unemployment office for work. The doctors say absolutely nothing is wrong with him. I went up to see him and dropped in at a neighbor's prior to going to his home out on Plug Street. The neighbor said, that fellow's so lazy he won't even go after his own beer. He makes his wife take the bicycle or tramp down to the liquor store one and a half miles away to bring home his beer.

When I visited the home I had great respect for the wife. The house was spotless and the kids were clean. But she looked to me like a worn-out young woman. No wonder. She even had to get his beer. I don't know what else she had to do for him.

I told the man, in front of his wife, that I was going down to the welfare office and recommend he be cut off welfare at the end of the next week, so he'd better get out and get a job. He said, you wouldn't do that. I said, don't you think I wouldn't. I'm going there right now and you can come with me if you like, because I'm going to recommend you get out and get a job, and that they look after your wife and children for a reasonable time. I went down and did this, and the welfare officer was quite pleased to do it. The man was told his welfare would end at the end of the next week. There was work around, if he wanted to look for it.

When I went to Drumheller two weeks later, he was gone. I thought, well, he's probably gone out and gotten a job. About three months later I find he's in Lethbridge on welfare. I suppose she's still hauling the beer for him at public expense.

I have no sympathy for that type at all. I have every sympathy for other people having a tough time, trying to do something for their country, not taking everything they can get. But for that type I've no use at all.

I really think the method used in Saskatchewan — I don't know if the member to my left would like me talking about Saskatchewan, but in this case it's good. When Mr. Thatcher was Premier, he gave all these unemployed employables 30 days to find work — and this was in the month of May — or else. I understand the welfare costs that summer were cut to about one-quarter because they did get out to work when they found they had to.

If absolutely no work is available, that's different. But with an increase in our employment rate, with opportunities for work, certainly these people should have some pressure put upon them. Let's take the money, this big increase we're giving them — \$22 million — and give it to some of these more worthy cases who are trying to do their bit and trying to help themselves.

One other point that I'd like to mention while I'm on my feet — I say this without having done any research on it. I'm always amazed when I drive in front of the single men's hostels and see sometimes seven or eight, sometimes 10 or 12 relatively young men in their 20s or early 30s sitting around in the middle of the afternoon. What they're doing there, I will never know. They should be out working, not living on public welfare. I think we should check these single men's hostels periodically, find out how long we are keeping these young fellows there.

I picked up one chap from Calgary who told me he was coming to Edmonton to live at the single men's hostel. I said, how come? He said, well, I stayed in Calgary till they kicked me out. Now I'm going to Edmonton. He probably stayed there till they kicked him out. He had a pretty good story; he was quite a talker. I suppose after he finished there he headed for Saskatoon or some place else — simply a parasite. I don't think we should encourage that type of chap any more than we absolutely have to. If they feel the pang of hunger, maybe they'll get out and work like the rest of us.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. At the present time what are the actual statistics on the employables? At the end of the vote I was going to ask if the minister had statistics on all these categories — the number of people. If she has, maybe to just table it would be fair enough.

The other thing is — I don't think it comes under this vote, but the hon. member mentioned the single men's hostels. What have been the statistics on those this winter? Have they been very high? Have they been 300, 400, 600, 800 for Calgary and Edmonton? Just what have been the statistics on that?

MISS HUNLEY: Do you want me to answer that now, Mr. Chairman, or when we come to the vote on the hostels?

MR. R. SPEAKER: It doesn't matter. Whenever you want.

MISS HUNLEY: I do have the information on social assistance and the categories for them. I can either table it or read it to the hon. member, whichever he'd rather.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Table it.

MISS HUNLEY: I can circulate it if hon. members would like.

Agreed to:

Ref. No. 2.6	\$22,162,000
--------------	--------------

Ref. No. 2.7	\$3,488,200
--------------	-------------

Ref. No. 2.8

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the minister a question. I see your budget is up 25.3 per cent, yet I got word over the weekend that in some of the homes for children who are picked up at night and transferred from one place to another, some of the beds were being cut down. What's happening there?

MISS HUNLEY: I'd have to ask the hon. member to be specific, because I'm not aware of any beds being cut back. I know that last year we did have some problem. We put in additional funding for the agencies providing the service. If it hasn't been adequate, that hasn't come to my attention this year. We are requiring them to budget quite stringently as well. It has not come to my attention that any beds have been closed down. I'd have to ask the hon. member to give me the example before I can have it investigated.

MR. LITTLE: I'd like to ask the minister a question. At one time I understand it was the practice of the welfare department to require a deserted wife to swear out an information for non-support. Is this practice still followed?

MISS HUNLEY: I can't answer specifically whether or not she's required to. I believe she is, under the maintenance and recovery section of our department.

We were successful in recovering about \$3 million over the last fiscal year, I believe. We've just done an analysis of it. That's an area we feel very strongly about: that we should have participation from the person who should be responsible for their support. We have a policy and a section in the department that concern rates on that. We were able to recover that much money over the last fiscal year.

MR. LITTLE: A supplementary. This requirement was before the woman was granted welfare. She had to swear to the information before being granted the welfare.

MISS HUNLEY: I'd have to inquire what the actual procedure is and advise the hon. member. I'll check it in *Hansard* and give you the answer.

Agreed to:

Ref. No. 2.8	\$24,032,850
--------------	--------------

Ref. No. 2.9	\$6,013,190
--------------	-------------

Ref. No. 2.10	\$16,573,100
---------------	--------------

Vote 2 Total Program	\$173,391,310
----------------------	---------------

Ref. No. 3.1	\$41,332,000
--------------	--------------

Ref. No. 3.2	\$308,660
--------------	-----------

Vote 3 Total Program	\$41,640,660
----------------------	--------------

Ref. No. 4.1

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask earlier about the transfer of staff from the local municipalities to the provincial civil service. Are the municipalities transferring the staff in total — the local social workers, the local staff, and so on? Or are some being transferred into this area of preventive social services and remaining at the local level? At the same time, are you having to hire another fleet of civil servants to replace those who stayed at the local level?

MISS HUNLEY: The arrangement we made and offered to the municipalities was that we would absorb their staff. We usually have unfilled positions. As well, if we're absorbing their workload we could use the staff.

I don't know whether everyone has moved into the public service of Alberta right now. I think Calgary is just in the organization stage, and I don't have the specifics on the number of people. But the intent was that they could move into the public service of Alberta. The vacancies were there, and we would take care of and protect the positions.

They would not likely move into PSS unless there was a vacancy there, because the PSS budgets are also very tight this year as far as the municipalities go — so they give me to understand. They would be unlikely to move there unless there happened to be a vacancy. What we were attempting to do was shield the jobs and the employment opportunities for the staff. I think we were able to do that successfully.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure all members got a circular from the Birth Control & Information Centre in Lethbridge. On the letterhead there is a picture of some building with a rope and a bell. I was just wondering whether the minister could advise whether this organization is in the opposition or in the affirmative.

MISS HUNLEY: I got one of those letters myself, and I had a little trouble trying to figure out what it was about, Mr. Chairman. They are questioning whether we have done an adequate assessment of family planning in Alberta. I believe we have. Probably any one of these programs is never adequately funded, researched, staffed, or anything else in the view of some person in Alberta, and I've learned to live with that.

I'm not too sure what the specific concern was in Lethbridge. We do have a family planning advisory group that is very active and doing an excellent job for us. We picked up the program that had been instituted by the federal government. We had an agreement with them that when they terminated theirs, we would continue ours. We were able to do that in this year's budget. We're working through the local health units and through some local groups. I cannot explain to the hon. member the exact reason for the widely circulated letter.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, a question to the hon. minister.

But just before the question, on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I had my first guided tour through the Legislature about a week or 10 days ago, and I found

out some of the traditions in the Legislature. One of the traditions that was brought to my attention was the fact that those flowers that sit exactly between the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health and myself are supposed to be between the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. So I don't think it's really just that I have to stand up every time I want to look the hon. minister in the eye.

The question is, Mr. Chairman: what effect has the Alberta PSS program had as far as social services are concerned? What overall effect has it had since we've had it in operation? Another area that was creating problems, when the program first started where you had several municipalities involved, was getting someone to head up the PSS program in the area, getting together, say, a town council, a county council, and a municipality to set up a preventive social service program. Is this still a problem?

MISS HUNLEY: If I remember correctly, Mr. Chairman, I believe about 90 per cent of Albertans now come into some area which has a PSS program. There are still some who are not included, either from choice, who have decided they don't want any part of it, or some who were late making their application and deciding that they wanted PSS programs. They happened to hit the budget restrictions last year, and I have not been able to accommodate them even this year.

I guess it's hard to describe the public acceptance of PSS. I believe in it. I think it has great prospect for delivering services where the communities decide what they want, and they're willing to put up 20 per cent of the dollars in order to achieve that. The volunteer component is extremely valuable and really contributes a great deal to PSS.

The concern I have is that when we meet with the executive of the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, for example, it is not high on their priority list, because it has been restricted in growth. So I guess it's a question of judgment. I'm impressed with most of the work the PSS groups are doing.

I believe this restraint is a very valuable thing because it will give people an opportunity to assess their priorities. Some of them have done an extremely good job of that and reshuffled their priorities, which is one of the things I asked them to do when I met with them last fall. I think it's very valuable, because it's pretty difficult to kill a program. If you don't like it, if it has been there and somebody has a vested interest in it, it's pretty difficult at a municipal level, or even a provincial or federal level, to kill a program. But it's much more difficult when it's your next-door neighbor's pride and joy, and you don't happen to share the enthusiasm for it.

But I think this will have a very useful role. Then I hope we can let out the string again after they've had time to assess it — certainly let in some of the new areas that have programs waiting in the wings. I would very much like to be able to do that. I don't know that I'll be able to next year, but I would like to, because I believe it can serve a very useful role to people at the local level.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, under PSS, I'd like to ask the minister about the government's reaction to the success of day care centres in the province. The minister has already indicated that PSS is a system

whereby municipalities make and determine priorities. I would say that the fact the municipalities fund 20 per cent, or one-fifth of the cost is an indication that the municipalities themselves must recognize the need.

A comment about the Birth Control & Information Centre circular that went around. There are three or four in Alberta, one here in the capital. I've talked to the people at the Lethbridge birth control centre. Last year 4,200 people came for advice, and really their role is to supply advice. If one looks at the cost of VD in this province, one recognizes that indeed it plays a very meaningful role.

An interesting fact in its success is that young people are very reluctant to go to family doctors — because we're talking now about the 15- and 16-year olds who don't have confidence in their family doctors, for fear they will tell their parents. I think this is really the reason the birth control centre has been successful. This year's budget is about \$27,000, of which 20 per cent comes from the municipal level, and I think the dollars are well spent. They anticipate 8,000 people going through this year.

They do have some concerns. I think that's why the circular about the new family planning division in Social Services and Community Health came around. I think it's really their concern whether there will be co-ordination in family planning, VD prevention, and birth control information among all the agencies that somehow have a finger in the pie. I think they've done a tremendous job, as evidenced by the fact that the cities of Calgary, Edmonton, and Lethbridge obviously rate it as a priority in order to fund the 20 per cent in the first place.

So really two questions, Mr. Chairman: one is the role of the new family planning division, specifically if possible; and the other is the success of the day care centres in Alberta, because a lot of dollars are going into them.

MISS HUNLEY: I don't know that I'd call family planning a specific division. There are some permanent positions though in order to establish continuity, because I think it's an extremely valuable preventive program. Certainly I would expect them to work with the local agencies, but you occasionally get into the scramble at local agencies where they fight with one another. We all know of experiences such as that.

Day care centres are fulfilling a very useful role. They have been allowed to grow, but only a limited amount. If you study the summary by element, it's 8 per cent rather than the 11 per cent in order to accommodate the money in the PSS budget and stretch it in as many ways as we possibly could.

I think day care centres — and I hope you heard me respond to the hon. member who raised the issue last night in the estimates — are partly the responsibility of an employer, and would assist greatly in securing people to work, not only women, but perhaps men. There are men too who have children and no mother in the home. So I don't think we should only talk about women who need day care centres.

I think sometimes families need day care centres. Quite often they do, and for two reasons: one, maybe the wife needs to work to supplement the family income. Sometimes the wife needs to work because

of her motivation, and she wishes to do so. Far better to have her working and the child in a day care centre than perhaps to have a battered child.

I think day care centres have a role to play. I think they are like everything else: we have to trim our sails on some of these things. We can't be all things to all people.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, just a quick question about day care. What has the minister done to enhance the private day care systems in the province? I recall quite a controversy between the private groups in Calgary and the public day care systems that were established through preventive social services.

MISS HUNLEY: I personally haven't had the opportunity to meet with the day care operators myself. Prior to my assuming this portfolio, though, the previous minister had a seminar for day care operators, and a good deal of useful information was gathered there. I think there's a role for both of them. Personally, I think the private day care centres — we're in the process of working with them to establish regulations so we have a certain standard throughout the province. We would like to develop that in co-operation and consultation with them. The people responsible in the department are in the process of doing that at the present time.

Agreed to:

Ref. No. 4.1	\$11,034,740
Ref. No. 4.2	\$1,867,340
Ref. No. 4.3	\$1,868,210
Ref. No. 4.4	\$823,860
Ref. No. 4.5	\$10,011,520
Vote 4 Total Program	\$25,605,670
Ref. No. 5.1	\$281,800
Ref. No. 5.2	\$866,680
Ref. No. 5.3	\$7,257,470

Ref. No. 5.4

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, just before the total program, I want to make a comment to the minister that I appreciate the program whereby she helped a number of persons who had polio and handicaps, and enabled them to stay in homes and so on. I have seen the results of that particular program. Not only did it help the individuals, sort of to rehabilitate them and make them feel more acceptable in their community and financially more secure, but I think we both can recognize the saving that was made from institutional care. I want to say I appreciate that.

Agreed to:

Ref. No. 5.4	\$28,213,360
Vote 5 Total Program	\$36,619,310
Ref. No. 6.1	\$386,940
Ref. No. 6.2	\$5,426,720
Ref. No. 6.3	\$1,812,000
Ref. No. 6.4	\$22,110,670
Vote 6 Total Program	\$29,736,330
Ref. No. 7.1	\$364,590
Ref. No. 7.2	\$1,589,090
Ref. No. 7.3	\$225,850

Ref. No. 7.4

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if this is the proper vote to bring this up under, but could the minister indicate the reasons for and advantages of incorporating the allied health services into our hospitals? I'm thinking of the new hospitals being built. Is it now general policy when they're building a new hospital to incorporate the allied health services into the hospital?

MISS HUNLEY: I appreciate the question, Mr. Chairman, because it's a matter that as yet we haven't made a firm policy decision on. There was a trend, should I say, to feel this was an ideal situation, and perhaps it is. But if you think of the expensive space that hospitals occupy, compared to, say, commercial or other space, and the cost of rent these days, I personally would rather have a few more people delivering the service than pay for expensive space for them to occupy. I do have an open mind on that though, Mr. Chairman. I think I'd like to be a little more confident of the cost benefit of having them right on one site.

Another disadvantage [is that] all hospitals aren't good sites, for example, for health units. I would rather have them more readily available to women with small children. If a hospital is on the outskirts of a fairly large town, it might be better if we could possibly have them closer to the downtown core. All these things need to be weighed. We don't have a firm decision on that.

I'm concerned about the expensive space we would be occupying, because hospitals cost more to build than ordinary space. Of the two, I think if I had my 'druthers', I'd 'druther' see them in provincial buildings. But as long as health units are considered not a part of the department but rather an isolated entity unto themselves, that's another policy decision we must make.

It's one of the things I'd like to get a decision on before too long so that we can make some determination about a couple of hospitals that are waiting for an answer, also about where we ultimately see the resting place of all the people who are delivering services to the community. I think it's an extremely important decision and one that must be made before too long.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, two very quick questions to the minister under Ref. No. 7.4. Does the government have a policy in terms of fluoridation of water in the province and, if they have, is it left to the municipality?

The other question: fluoride tablets or fluoride treatments used to be available at the public health units. I understand they've been discontinued. Is that true?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, we do have a policy about fluoridation. The policy is that the local municipality makes the decision. I think it would be very helpful if many of them took it seriously, because it's a very good preventive measure. But I believe they should make that decision themselves.

Grants for fluoridation are available through the Department of the Environment. You can obtain that from the Department of the Environment, because I

don't know the details. I believe in most health units we still have a program of painting children's teeth with fluorine. I am not sure about the tablets. I'd have to check. I'll do that and advise the hon. member.

Agreed to:

Ref. No. 7.4	\$20,210,040
Ref. No. 7.5	\$3,608,000
Ref. No. 7.6	\$442,620
Ref. No. 7.7	\$1,848,300
Ref. No. 7.8	\$714,730
Vote 7 Total Program	\$29,003,220

Ref. No. 8.1

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. With the new director taking over the program, is any different attitude or philosophy coming into Alcoholism and Drug Abuse? Is a new skill or a new thrust being brought in? Will a new approach to this type of treatment and education be coming up? Would the minister comment?

MISS HUNLEY: From observing the progress of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission over the past few years, and then of course the progress we've made in the last year, I feel we've made greater progress in working well with the local groups and agencies that are delivering the service, and that we can spread ourselves so much thinner that way. I think it's extremely important.

One of the concerns we have in the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, and indeed in the department and the government, is what would be a good preventive measure. I've commented before in this House about how many dollars have gone to treatment, and we've just been through all that. Treatment in all the areas is after the fact. If we could have more preventive measures, what would they be? Many people are grappling with that everywhere in the western world — probably all over the world and certainly everywhere in Canada.

The new executive director and chairman of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission has talked to me on numerous occasions, and I know the board is directing its attention to it. But once again, they don't have the answers. We'd like to seek the answers. Researching has gone on *ad infinitum*, and we can turn to a lot of research that's been done at the federal level. I don't see an additional need for that. But I do see some kind of — once again it's back to the individual and responsibility.

Perhaps I could inject another little commercial here, Mr. Chairman, because I think we have a program that has caught on with some young people. That's the impaired driving program. It's in my riding. I wish I could take credit for it, but I can't because the kids did it on their own. At their initiative, students in the high schools asked the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission to come out and put on courses. It's proven very effective, and it initiates — they will not go unless it's asked for by the students. It's no good for the teachers to try to thrust it on them. It has to be voluntary, and attendance also has to be voluntary. It has proven very effective.

I've had a chance to be a bit close to it. As I said,

I'd like to take credit for promoting the idea, but I can't. The kids thought it up, and I'm very excited and pleased about it. If we can get more of that from the young people, I think that's the best route we could follow. We'll be encouraging them in every way.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, a supplementary to the minister. I raised this question the other day, and I'm sure I'll again get a response from the Minister of Transportation. It is with regard to the age of drinking. Has the commission considered the age of 19? Would you be asking them to consider that particular aspect? As we both recognize, other provinces are considering that at the present time.

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, I believe the commission will be discussing that and giving me a report on it. I've discussed it only very briefly with the chairman, and he has indicated to me that they are interested in it.

My first impressions are that they really don't feel that is going to be the total solution. I think they're more enthusiastic about young people themselves taking some initiative, such as with the impaired driving program. But the jury's still out on that. I guess I should wait until I get the report assembled from the total commission.

We discussed it at the ministers' conference in Ottawa, and some of the ministers there indicated that their governments were going to advance the drinking age. But there wasn't a widespread philosophy from all the ministers even feeling that really was the solution. I think the ultimate solution has to be back to the responsibility I hope our young people will take. We have to try to encourage them to take that as much as possible.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Has the minister considered talking to these young people who are 17, 18, 19, and 20, or going into the schools to discuss the issue — maybe on some type of planned tour of the province, taking a week and going to five or six of the major areas, or asking, say, a group of MLAs to sit in and discuss the matter in the school systems to try to get some feedback from that particular level? Maybe they have an attitude.

The first reaction I get from many people is that the young people like it the way it is. They don't want it changed. Maybe we're wrong. Has the minister inspected it on that level?

MISS HUNLEY: Valuable as it is, I don't see myself with the kind of time, although I certainly think there is some merit in it. I would enjoy doing it. I've not yet had the opportunity to visit all the various agencies and institutions connected with the department. I'd like to do that first. I'd like the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, if anyone, to handle that specific thing.

One of the areas we are considering as well, as ministers of health, is talking to — and I think there's merit in rapping with the young people and getting their concerns, because some of them really are concerned. They're very responsible people. They worry about their peers the same as we do. I worry also not only about the children, but about everyone and the rate of consumption in Canada and in this

province.

Once again, I think it's a matter of moderation. I don't know how you turn people around and encourage them to do that, and moralize. If I could answer that, maybe I wouldn't be here. I'd be performing a more useful role somewhere else.

Agreed to:

Ref. No. 8.1	\$1,139,432
Ref. No. 8.2	\$3,818,800
Ref. No. 8.3	\$406,118
Ref. No. 8.4	\$1,482,500
Vote 8 Total Program	\$6,846,850
Department Total	\$351,733,980

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Dr. McCrimmon left the Chair]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolutions, begs to report same, and asks leave to sit again.

Resolved for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977, amounts not exceeding the following sums be granted to Her Majesty for the Department of Social Services and Community Health: \$8,890,630 for Departmental Support Services; \$173,391,310 for Social Allowance and Child Welfare; \$41,640,660 for Senior Citizens' Supplementary Benefits; \$25,605,670 for Preventive and Specialized Social Services; \$36,619,310 for Services for the Handicapped; \$29,736,330 for Treatment of Mental Illness; \$29,003,220 for Preventive and Community Health Services.

Resolved for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977, a sum not exceeding \$6,846,850 be granted to Her Majesty for the Treatment and Education program of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, we'll be dealing primarily with bills in committee tomorrow, and then additional estimates on Thursday evening. I beg leave to move the House do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at half past 2.

[The House rose at 10:02 p.m.]