

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Wednesday, April 6, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 36
The Highway Traffic
Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. FLUKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 36, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1977. The main points of this bill are: one, as a companion bill to The Motor Vehicle Administration Amendment Act, 1977, regarding mopeds; two, the use of flashing lights on safety vehicles to be set by regulation; and three, the inclusion of Bill 206 introduced by the hon. Member for Drumheller in the last session.

[Leave granted; Bill 36 read a first time]

**Bill 35
The Workers' Compensation
Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 35, The Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1977. This being a money bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor has been informed of the contents of the bill and recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is based on recommendations that have come to the government in regard to the financial benefits payable pursuant to The Workers' Compensation Act and updates for the year 1977, effective July 1, 1977, the financial benefits payable. I think I may be able to add that the overall recommendations based on the select committee report that have been before the House have not been addressed by this bill. Therefore the principle, I want to indicate to members of the House, is to deal only with the financial aspects at this time, effective July 1, and to deal with other matters on a subsequent occasion.

[Leave granted; Bill 35 read a first time]

**Bill 30
The Attorney General
Statutes Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 30, The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1977, on behalf of the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, who is not able to be present in the House today. This is the usual omnibus legislation, which I normally introduce once or twice a year, concerning minor matters in a series of statutes of this province.

The first affects The Clerks of the Court Act, a minor amendment concerning the appointment of staff in the courts.

The second is amendments to The Commissioners for Oaths Act, which affect the appointments of commissioners.

The next is an amendment to The Expropriation Act, which is designed to speed up the process for citizens and thereby reduce the cost to all parties, at the same time preserving the major principles of that act.

The next is an amendment to The Garagemen's Lien Act which simply clarifies one of the forms in the act. When this act was amended earlier in this House, for some reason we overlooked the amendment of one of the forms. This amendment is just to bring it into line with the legislation as it now stands.

The next amendment is to The Gas Utilities Act, and a companion amendment to The Public Utilities Board Act which affects the procedure of the Public Utilities Board and should assist the board and the parties before it. I'll be happy to go into more detail of course on second reading.

The next is The Notaries Public Act, Mr. Speaker. This affects the appointment procedure of notaries public.

[Leave granted; Bill 30 read a first time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following bills be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders: Bill No. 36, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1977, and Bill No. 30, The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1977.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 233
An Act to Amend
The Fire Prevention Act**

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, an Act to Amend The Fire Prevention Act. This bill would make available to the minister and to the government an inventory of fire-fighting apparatus now available in the province. It would set up governing of the minimum fire-fighting standards, apparatus, and equipment. It would also look at the training of men, and would provide grants or loans to municipalities so some of our municipalities in rural Alberta that now lack fire prevention equipment may be able to acquire this type of equipment.

[Leave granted; Bill 233 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table two copies of the sixteenth annual report of the Local Authorities Board for the year ended December 31, 1976.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file two reports today. The first is an earth sciences study dealing with the proposed Camrose-Ryley coal development. The other is a consultant's report on Materials Handling Methods for Plains Strip Mines, also commis-

sioned with respect to the proposed Camrose-Ryley project.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, may I introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, some 65 young men and women from Queen Elizabeth High School in Calgary, which of course is the finest city in Alberta. At 1 o'clock they met with three members, the Member for Edmonton Jasper Place, the Member for Calgary McKnight, and me. They fired some good questions at us.

They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Bill Mokoski and counsellors Don Norman, Betty Galatiuk, and a student teacher Miriam Venegas. They are seated in the public gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce through you to the House 38 grade 9 social studies students from Georges Vanier Junior High School in Calgary's North Hill. They are accompanied by their teachers John Dyer and Dave Gunderson. Could I ask them now to rise and be recognized by the House.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

Department of Housing and Public Works

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Business Development and Tourism and I are pleased to place before the Legislature the details of the industrial land program to be administered by the Alberta Housing Corporation.

The new program will assist municipalities to purchase and develop industrial land. It will contribute to balanced regional development of the province. The objectives of the program are:

- (1) Improvement in the supply of serviced land for industry, consistent with need.
- (2) Reduction in the rate of increase in the cost of serviced industrial land.
- (3) Assistance to municipalities to attract suitable industries. Communities that are interested in diversifying and strengthening their economic base can take their first visible step toward this goal through land assembly and land development for that industry.

Five million dollars have been allocated for the industrial land program through the Alberta Housing Corporation's budget for the 1977-78 fiscal year.

Inquiries from municipalities will be responded to by Business Development and Tourism offices in Calgary, Edmonton, Camrose, Edson, Grande Prairie, Lacombe, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Peace River, and St. Paul. An interdepartmental planning committee will review all applications and make recommendations. The Alberta Housing Corporation will be responsible for all land purchases and development projects.

The industrial land program essentially offers two options to the municipalities. First, the Alberta Hous-

ing Corporation can assemble an industrial land bank for the municipality and sell the land directly to the municipality as required over a period of 15 years; or, secondly, the Alberta Housing Corporation can purchase land and develop a fully serviced industrial land bank for the municipality. All serviced land sales from the land bank will be to the municipality only. The municipality would have the responsibility for the sale, lease, or lease/sale of serviced land to the private or public sectors.

Mr. Speaker, we are certain that the industrial land program will be enthusiastically received by Alberta municipalities, and we are confident that the program will make a significant contribution to the diversified economic growth of the province.

With the ministerial statement, Mr. Speaker, I attach the brochure on the program.

Thank you.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, responding to the ministerial announcement on this occasion may I say to the minister that we welcome this announcement. In the course of a number of visits we had with municipalities across Alberta last year, one of the complaints heard most often was the problem of basically the chicken or the egg: how do we get industry to a rural community unless we have serviced land available? I think the government is to be commended in that portion of the announcement.

The portion of the announcement which does concern me very much is that the complaint expressed to us so often by municipalities in Alberta of the difficulty in getting decisions from the Alberta Housing Corporation. If this is going to be handled in the same way many of the land assembly programs in the Alberta Housing Corporation are handled, many municipalities and local councils will be sadly disappointed. So I caution the government to see that this program doesn't get caught up in the bureaucratic bungling in the Alberta Housing Corporation that many of the land assembly programs are so caught up in.

Department of the Environment

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement that I hope will make the Leader of the Opposition a little happier than the last one. It concerns existing sour gas facilities at Crossfield, Alberta.

As a result of discussions between the government of Alberta and the owners of the east Crossfield D-1 natural gas processing unit, a program has been agreed upon which will reduce the risk of accidental sour gas release from the wells in the pipeline system. The facilities are located about 18 miles north of Calgary. The program will also permit the village of Crossfield to proceed with development of new areas which have currently been suspended by the Calgary Regional Planning Commission.

The program will be completed by this fall. The core of the program is a supervisory control system which will permit centralized monitoring and control of the wells and the gas gathering system, and the installation of automatic block valves in conjunction with a flare system on the existing gas line which runs east of the village. This will improve the already sophisticated system for protection of area residents

in case of an accidental release of sour gas. In addition, the gas line now located west of Crossfield will be relocated to a route running east of Highway 2.

Amoco Canada operations have successfully co-existed with the Crossfield region community in a safe and secure manner for the past nine years. In an expanding economy, however, all involved parties have agreed that urban settlements such as Crossfield should be protected now and for future growth. The program announced today safeguards the interests of the community, the company, and many Albertans.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in responding to the ministerial announcement, I should caution members that this situation affects my constituency directly. I may perhaps be permitted a certain amount of congratulating the minister on this particular occasion. I'll perhaps save any other comments for the minister until we get to his estimates.

But seriously, I commend the minister on the action taken here. I think it's an example of the minister, the village of Crossfield, and Amoco having worked out an extremely difficult situation in the best interests of the people in the Crossfield area. I commend the minister for his action.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Energy Ministers' Meeting

MR. CLARK: Now, Mr. Speaker, to get back to a more familiar tone, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. In light of the energy ministers' conference in Ottawa and Alberta having stated its position prior to the commencement of that meeting, I'd like to ask the minister to outline Alberta's position at that energy minister's meeting to the Assembly.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be immature to do that at this time, insofar as the meeting is going on. I think the position of the government has been set forth in general terms on previous occasions. Undoubtedly the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources will wish to report to the Assembly and answer questions upon his return.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the minister's comment about it being immature for Alberta to talk about its position . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Premature.

MR. CLARK: . . . premature then, both are likely right — prior to and during the discussions, and in light of the fact that the minister last evening indicated to the Alberta government's special correspondent in Ottawa, Paul Jackson, that Alberta would accept a minimum \$2 per barrel increase, I'd like the minister to indicate to the Assembly, if he would, why the government refused to give an answer in the Assembly but chose to indicate the \$2 minimum on the evening before the meeting in Ottawa to a member of the Ottawa press gallery, when the government has been

asked what target it was looking at on numerous occasions in this Assembly.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I've glanced at that report. I would have to caution the hon. Leader of the Opposition to take as fact what he reads in a report. For example as I recall, the statement in no way suggested that that was a statement definitively made by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, but rather that it was something which the reporter who wrote the article drew from it. I would think that if the honorable gentleman has facts directly from the minister as to statements he made, then he can properly bring them forward. But I think our position as a government has been stated a number of times. We're seeking a substantial increase toward world prices. That remains the position at this time.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate the position of the Alberta government vis-a-vis the announcement made by the federal Minister of Energy that their policy is that the Canadian oil price should not exceed the United States price or the Chicago price; that Canada should not go to the world price but should tie closer to the Chicago price? What's the position of the Alberta government on that situation?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well I haven't heard that made in a definitive way by that minister, Mr. Speaker. However, again we seek to move Alberta prices in a substantial way by means of a substantial increase toward world oil prices. I gather the federal government has been convinced by representations of this government over the last two or three years that that is necessary. I would think that the statement of Mr. Gillespie is moving in the right direction, but I doubt if it's fast enough in terms of what Alberta feels is appropriate for the citizens of this province.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to confirm that Alberta has taken the position today at the conference that a \$2 per barrel increase is the absolute minimum that Alberta will settle for?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that will be known when Alberta's position is taken today at the conference.

Brucellosis

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask if he can indicate to the Assembly the seriousness of the brucellosis outbreak in the Lethbridge region.

MR. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker. The recent reports from the federal health of animals branch indicate that the situation across Canada, and indeed in Alberta, has improved from what it was two or three years ago. I would have to say our reading of what's happening in Alberta is not along those lines. We think indeed that there has been some increase in the incidence of the disease, in spite of the fact that a stepped-up testing program may have resulted in us

finding more than what might have been the case earlier. Insofar as the Lethbridge area is concerned, I'm not aware there's a serious outbreak that pertains particularly to that part of the province.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister had discussions with his federal colleague the Minister of Agriculture on the difference of opinion between the view of veterinarians in the federal government that in fact there should be, I think the term is, a de-population program, which really is a slaughter program, as opposed to the idea of a vaccination program which, I think it's fair to say, many veterinarians in this province favor in light of the present circumstance?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, we've had a good number of discussions not only in that regard but with regard to the level of compensation being provided by the federal government for the test and slaughter program. Quite frankly the views of experts in the field of brucellosis control are not all the same with respect to whether we should go back to a vaccination program, which was the position across Canada before about 1964, or whether we should continue across the country with a test and slaughter program.

As hon. members would know, the vaccination program is of such a nature that you can never absolutely eradicate the disease. On the other hand it is possible, and it has been done in other countries, to eradicate the disease by the test and slaughter program. It was on that basis that the federal government decided some years ago to go to the test and slaughter program.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it's my view that one of the problems with the lack of success of the slaughter program has been the poor compensation payments. Individuals who own herds that get infected are not anxious to report and to have the entire herd slaughtered when the compensation they receive, particularly in the dairy industry, is oftentimes considerably less than what it costs them to replace the herd, bearing in mind as well that they have a loss of production problem oftentimes for two or three months.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the minister's comment with regard to the poor compensation from the federal government — and I agree with the minister's assessment — has the Alberta government given any consideration to a provincial assistance or beefing-up of that compensation, in light of the very serious detrimental affects that a major brucellosis outbreak could have in Alberta?

MR. MOORE: Just in one area. Certainly we've given consideration to the possibility of doing that. But if we're going to eradicate the disease in Canada, quite frankly the matter has to be approached on a national basis. The only way we could have any success within this province with our own programming would be virtually to close the borders, or at least inspect and test on cattle movements from one province to another. We have enough problems, I suppose, with movements of cattle between the United States and ourselves without having provincial boundaries.

We do, however, have within the Agricultural Development Corporation a program that provides some assistance to individuals. Prior to 1977 the disaster loan program of ADC did not cover diseases for which there was a known cure, or diseases which could be identified. Since that time, in fact in December 1976, we changed the disaster loan program so it can apply to individuals who have suffered loss because of brucellosis. That program, Mr. Speaker, involves interest-free loans for a period of time. That can be of some assistance to an individual, for example in the dairy business, who has had to disperse a complete herd of 100 cows, or something, and has to replace them.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister's department giving any consideration to some additional assistance to dairy farmers in both the Lethbridge and Wetaskiwin areas — in the Wetaskiwin area a herd has been completely wiped out, and the same thing may very well happen in the Lethbridge area — some sort of special assistance to these farmers?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of both situations. In fact I've had direct discussions with the individual involved in the Wetaskiwin area. Initially, the situation appeared more serious than it is today. My recent information is that the level of compensation — which is \$500 maximum on grade cows and, I believe, \$700 for purebreds — will meet most of the costs those individuals are incurring in terms of removing their existing herds and bringing in new animals. Certainly there will be some loss to them. The only thing I have indicated to them is that in the event that they require new funds in order to purchase animals, the disaster loan program would be available. Certainly they are free to make application for that program, and I would expect they would be successful. Aside from that, we've given no consideration to supplementing the federal government's compensation.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister prepared to make the strongest possible representation to the federal minister to do really two things: speed up the approval from the federal health of animals people to approve slaughter once a herd has been deemed to be infected; also, to try to get the federal government to get more federal vets available in Alberta?

I raise that question, Mr. Speaker, because the federal Treasury Board has made the decision that federal vets have to test virtually every animal. We have situations the minister knows of where it is two and three and four weeks from the time a herd has been deemed to be infected until the slaughter, which is a great danger to other cattle in the particular area. Is the minister prepared to make representation to the federal minister immediately on both those counts?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, we have made continuous representations on the matter of testing and federal vets. But they have not been in the form of additional federal vets. What we have tried to impress upon the federal government is that there should be more frequent testing and it should be done much more quickly in the event we know we have problems, but that it should be done by our existing private practis-

ing veterinarians rather than by federal veterinarians who are brought in. As hon. members would know, a great number of them throughout this province have had some difficult times in the last two or three years because of cattle prices.

My understanding is that indeed some of our private practitioners have been working more extensively in recent months for the federal government in that regard. Mr. Speaker, we will keep pushing to ensure that they move in that direction and provide our private practitioners with more work in the field of testing for brucellosis.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, could I just ask the minister to respond to the second portion of the question; that is, the lag time once a herd is deemed to be infected until the slaughter is approved, which I understand is three and four weeks on some occasions. The approval doesn't come until either federal officials or in fact the federal Treasury Board are prepared to approve it.

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, personally I have not made any representations to the federal Minister of Agriculture in that regard. But I know that staff in my department who work almost daily with the federal health of animals branch have. I will look into the matter and see if there might be some way that direct representations from me would be helpful.

Pornographic Magazines

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Attorney General. In the government's fight to keep pornographic literature out of the hands and sight of children, is the office of the Attorney General keeping in close touch with the distributors in the province?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I recently wrote to the major distributors in the province to thank them for their assistance and co-operation in this program in the past. I specifically invited them to give me a further report in about six months. Since their people visit each retailer in the province, some 2,500, they have an intelligence gathering capacity that exceeds anything I know. They have agreed to respond and give me their advice, in five months now. I'll have some indication then as to whether the retailers are continuing the level of co-operation that I think is there.

I might add that I have personally observed some relaxation on the part of some retailers, particularly in my own constituency.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary to the hon. minister. Does the minister's office make suggestions to the distributors as to magazines that should be kept out of the sight of children?

MR. FOSTER: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the distributors themselves have thus far been very co-operative in recommending magazines they would prefer not to carry. Frankly, I assume they are concerned about their own criminal liability, which rests with them and with the retailer if it gets to that level. So they've been concerned about this. It's not unknown for them to voluntarily turn back publications.

Now when it comes to retailers, not all are as responsible as others. Sometimes retailers are inclined to say, well, I really have no choice because the distributor gives it to me, therefore I must take it. That's not true. The distributors have indicated a willingness to turn materials back. I invite retailers as well to consider returning or not accepting materials, in addition to exercising a little more discretion in their display tactics.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary. I wonder if the minister would know if a magazine called *Nude Moppet* has been turned back. I mention this because the mayor of Vancouver has termed this magazine an exploitation of children. I have not seen it on the bookshelves in the few Alberta bookstores I've looked in. I thought possibly the minister's campaign might have led the distributors of Alberta to turn back that magazine, as rightly they should have.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I don't spend very much time reviewing this material — because I haven't got the time. [laughter] But the name the hon. member has given to me is not one I can recall ever having seen or heard before. No doubt there will be many names. Some of these publications change their name monthly — regularly. That's not all they change monthly, I'm told.

MR. TAYLOR: One final supplementary to the hon. minister. In connection with the magazine *Nude Moppet* and the campaign in British Columbia, one of the customs and excise managers said they have a banned list. Actually they destroy about 40 tons of this stuff every year and turn back another 40 tons. But he said this particular magazine was not on that banned list, possibly for the reason you just mentioned. My question is: have the attorneys general of Canada been in consultation with the federal government in preparing that banned list?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, when this matter was first discussed in this Assembly, I think in question period, I indicated to the House that all provinces had agreed to take the kind of initiative we described earlier in this province. I discovered in my most recent meeting in Toronto with my colleagues that not all provinces had done so. Some of them have. Some of them have provided the federal Solicitor General, the federal Attorney General, and the federal Minister of National Revenue with advice such as we did concerning publications which the distributors themselves find objectionable. My advice from my federal colleague is that that material has been forwarded to National Revenue and to the customs people and that Canada Customs is in fact turning back a good deal of material at the border.

As I mentioned a moment ago, however, there's no doubt some of these publications change their names regularly. If they're not on the list or they don't happen to catch the customs' eye, they may pass through. It's a fine point, Mr. Speaker, which ought not to be discussed here but I'll raise the concern, whether customs people at the border should be exercising this kind of discretion about literature coming into Canada. They do have the jurisdiction to do so. But there is some concern in this country. I think the concern is valid to put on the table unexpressed,

and one has to be very cautious about denying publications to adults. That's principally why the focus of our initiative has been to invite the distributors, but more particularly the retailers, to sharpen up their practice with respect to the display and sale of this material to young people.

Aboriginal Rights

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Attorney General too. It's a follow-up to a question I put to the minister on Monday concerning Bill 29. In light of the proposals in Bill 29 which have been drafted and filed with the court in response to the initiative of the native people filing a caveat on Crown land, has the government given consideration to the concern of at least two native groups — I believe the Indian Association of Alberta and the Metis Association of Alberta — that these amendments contained in Bill 29 may be counter to the provisions of The Individual's Rights Protection Act? My question is not of legal opinion but whether any consideration has been given to the concerns of these two organizations or to meetings with them.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I think whenever this government, or any other government for that matter, but particularly the government of Alberta proposes legislation to this Assembly, we must always have in mind the Bill of Rights and The Individual's Rights Protection Act because that is after all, in the judgment of this government at least, one of the cornerstones of this administration. Clearly that is not an issue that was a major concern to government when this legislation was brought forward. But because we were aware that some people may feel it has an effect on those two acts, some consideration was given to it. It would not be before this Assembly if we felt there was a conflict between Bill 29 and The Individual's Rights Protection Act or the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet on this subject, I might say I do not detect the continuing concern of either the Indian Association or the Metis Association that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has referred to. I think there was some early concern with the legislation. I think this concern has now passed, however. But of course that's up to the leaders of those two organizations to respond to.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. In light of the legislation which is before the House and would in fact eliminate the placing of a caveat in order to establish temporary claim of interest pending a resolution of native land claims, is the Attorney General in a position to advise the Assembly whether the government is reconsidering a position on land claims stated in the House several years ago by the hon. Premier, which as I recall suggested there would be no negotiation of land claims but in fact land claims would be settled in court before any decision would be made respecting public lands?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, we're getting very close to debate. But if the native people of this province feel there are some concerns they wish to raise with their provincial government, clearly those concerns can and should be discussed with the government.

If the focus of those concerns is the claim to a legal right which they contend exists, and that claim is to be advanced on the basis of supposed legal rights and there is some doubt in the mind of the government as to the existence of those rights, then the only way of resolving whether those rights exist is to carry that question forward to the only forum I know, which is the courts.

I have said earlier in this House, and I say again, that the issue as to whether or not those rights exist — i.e. aboriginal rights — is not before any court in this province. I have invited the Indian Association or whoever wishes to advance that claim — if they wish to bring it and make a claim to government on the basis of rights — to proceed in that way. I have some indication that is not their wish. If it is the wish of the Indian people or the Metis people to sit down with the leaders of government to discuss their various concerns, of course, as I've said before, they're always free to do so. But the government cannot be seen to be negotiating settlements to alleged legal rights when there is doubt as to the existence of those rights.

So what I'm saying is: if action is commenced in the courts on the matter of aboriginal rights, there ought not to be negotiation with the government on that point. To put it probably too frankly, I think we have to select one course or the other: to either proceed through the courts to determine whether those rights exist, or abandon that procedure for the moment and sit down with the government and discuss the concerns. As I say, I have to conclude from recent discussions and recent activity, or the lack thereof, that there is some interest in the latter course.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. I'm sure one reason may be the fact that the courts may take six or seven years. But my question to the hon. Attorney General is in light of his answer that in fact native organizations may be looking at the latter alternative of sitting down with the government instead of taking the legal route through the courts. Will there may be specific mechanism, or does the government have any specific plans at this point in time, to facilitate that kind of negotiation and at the same time not qualify or compromise the stated aboriginal interest of native people in said lands?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, this discussion is somewhat hypothetical. But for the purposes of the question period and the question now put, perhaps I should say that if there are individuals — native, Metis, or otherwise — who feel they want to pursue certain interests with the government, of course they're entitled to make contact with the government and the government will then set in place appropriate procedures and mechanisms to accommodate those discussions.

I'm not in a position today to make any specific comment on this point with respect to the native association or the Metis Association. However, let me say this. The government of this province, through its cabinet and a cabinet committee chaired by my colleague the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, has a cabinet committee structure. One of those cabinet committees chaired by my col-

league is responsible for the co-ordination of government concerns with respect to land claims and the like.

One of the appropriate points of contact, were that interest there, would be to express to either my colleague or me the interest in such discussions. I'm sure my colleague the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, in discussions with the Premier, would sort out appropriate mechanisms and procedures.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the door is always open. Procedures, mechanisms, and the like can always be found to allow people to communicate and discuss their concerns, hopefully leading to a solution acceptable to all sides.

Warble Control

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate whether the warble inspection program initiated last spring at auction marts is going to be continued this year?

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, either in the form introduced last year or in some modified version.

Mr. Speaker, we're concerned about the warble control and treatment program. Quite frankly, I've had under consideration the problem of three municipal authorities in Alberta which are not involved in the compulsory program. We will need to make a decision very soon whether or not we make the entire province a warble-free area and involve those three municipal districts as well.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister have any information on the results of the inspection program last year?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that from memory. I would be pleased to get it and supply it to the hon. member.

Driver Training

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Solicitor General. I would like to know if the minister has had any communication with the Alberta Professional Driver Educators Association in regard to standardization of the driver training program as it applies to public school driver training and commercial driver training schools.

MR. FARRAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister going to be taking any steps to get standardization of driver training in schools and the professional driver training schools?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, the main jurisdiction of this area comes under my colleague the Minister of Transportation. However, my department has an interest inasmuch as we recognize certain driving school diplomas in lieu of a driving test. So we have a standard for recognizing their passing out examinations, so to speak.

The question of a standard curriculum for driving

schools right across the province will be one for the Minister of Transportation. I would like to refer the question to him.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Deputy Premier, the Minister of Transportation. Can the minister indicate if his department is looking at standardization of driver training?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, what we are looking at and have already put in place is a higher standard for driver instructors. That is an ongoing thing, as I'm sure the hon. member will understand. We are toughening it up. It's going to be more difficult to become a driver instructor unless you have the necessary ability and knowledge relative to that area.

So the answer is yes. Standards are being set and increased. We hope that can spread right across the province.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Is the minister aware that some students who have been allowed to make 21 mistakes have been passing, which seems rather high?

AN HON. MEMBER: Order.

DR. BUCK: But my question, Mr. Speaker, is: is the minister looking at making the tests for both driver trainers and students more difficult, as he stated?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I think one follows the other.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the Minister of Education. Can the minister indicate if there's any possibility of tying in two programs, the school programs and the commercial driving program, so there may be credit for both of them?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the driver training course is provided in some schools throughout the province. I believe three credits are awarded. It's not a compulsory subject, although I recall debates in this Assembly — and I'm sure those who served in this Assembly before me recall debates which ranged on both sides of the issue — as to whether driver training should be a compulsory portion of the high school matriculation program.

MR. GOGO: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Transportation. Did the minister receive the same form letter the Member for Clover Bar is referring to?

AN HON. MEMBER: I guess.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, at least I am doing something about it. What's the member from Lethbridge doing? You might as well go home to Lethbridge, Gogol.

Smoking in Public Places

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to try again this afternoon. I wish to direct my question to the hon. Government House Leader. Does the govern-

ment have any intention of bringing any legislation on smoking in public places in this session?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I gather there have been a number of private members' public bills on that subject. Also, I gather the city of Calgary is moving by way of by-law on that matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Ask the Minister from Calgary.

MR. KUSHNER: A supplementary question to the minister then. If the government does not bring any legislation, I understand, Mr. Minister, that . . .

DR. BUCK: "If is hypothetical, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KUSHNER: Maybe it is. [laughter] But I understand that by-law would not hold water, or would be illegal. Am I correct?

AN HON. MEMBER: It won't hold smoke, John.

Vehicle Insurance

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, my question is with respect to the motor vehicle accident claims fund. I think it should go to the Attorney General. It's my understanding that police don't generally respond to accident calls involving property damage under \$300 and that only damage in excess of \$100 can be claimed from the accident claims fund. Since no police report is necessary for verification of accidents which result in payments between \$100 and \$300 from the claims fund, is the minister giving consideration to increasing the \$100 minimum for the accident claims fund to \$300?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, there was a good deal of detail in that question, and I'm not sure that I . . .

MR. CLARK: Know the answer.

MR. FOSTER: . . . know the answer. I'm not sure the \$100 figure is accurate. But you have given me notice of a subject that will obviously be discussed during my estimates, so I'll prepare myself and discuss it at length then.

DR. WEBBER: Supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Since I understand the majority of car insurance cancellations are due to non-payment of premiums — for example taking out insurance for six months and simply not renewing that insurance — is the minister urging insurance companies or has he made representation to insurance companies to go from six-month coverage periods to payment once a year?

MR. HARLE: No, Mr. Speaker. I have to say that many companies went to the six-month policy because of financial problems which relate to the reserves they must maintain. In order to provide an availability in the market place, many companies in fact had to go to the six-month policy.

DR. WEBBER: Last supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. Is the minister giving consid-

eration to recommending that fines for driving without car insurance be raised beyond the present \$400?

MR. FOSTER: No, Mr. Speaker. I'm not, but my colleague the Solicitor General may have some comment on that subject.

I might make this observation, however. If the public feels that a fine imposed by a court is too low, and indeed if the Crown feels that, our obligation is to appeal that sentence to a higher court. One of the problems we encounter with minimum fines in legislation is that, recognizing that judges are human beings, where a judge may discover a technical breach of the act he may conclude that the minimum penalty is too severe in view of the rather minor infraction. Rather than find the individual guilty and fine the minimum, \$400 or whatever it is, the judge may be inclined to find that person not guilty. It sounds rather strange, but I believe that to be the case. There are one or two recent examples of that in this province.

Therefore the difficulty with increasing minimum fines in legislation is that sometimes people either aren't charged or are not convicted when they should be. I opt, Mr. Speaker, for the maximum discretion possible in the court, the minimum number of fines in legislation and giving the court the discretion. If the court sentences are too low, the Crown always has the capacity to appeal and move that sentence up.

It's very difficult to draw general rules that will satisfy every situation. I understand that on some occasions minimum fines in legislation are indeed appropriate, and I would not want my remarks to be focussed only on the matter of driving while uninsured.

Rapid Transit

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Deputy Premier and Minister of Transportation. Some members of the Calgary city council are visiting Europe prior to ordering LRT equipment for a rapid transit system. I wonder if the minister could advise if the province will be sending any official along with this fact-finding mission.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we will be asked to pay a substantial portion of the cost of these particular cars, one senior member from my department will be accompanying that particular delegation.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I understand from the city of Calgary officials that they want to have two parts of their system operating within 18 months of each other. I wonder if the government is considering granting them extra funds under the urban transportation policy so both parts of their system can be operating fairly closely together.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I think I should put to rest the fact that we're thinking of expanding our present level of help to the two major cities relative to rapid transit. That policy was announced, is in effect until 1980, and includes the \$7.5 million contribution to each of the two major cities over that period of time. During the next two years as we see the first one operational and can learn from it we will be assessing

our position, and future policy will then have to be made.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister advise if the city of Edmonton was given any extra capital funds to get the first leg of their system started?

DR. HORNER: No, Mr. Speaker, identical funds were allocated to both Calgary and Edmonton. Any statement different from that just isn't in accordance with the facts.

MR. KING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister give an undertaking that the cities of Edmonton and Calgary will not have to worry about the provincial government reneging on its commitment for transportation assistance as the federal government has indicated it is going to do?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, our policy has been in effect. The cities have been receiving the money. Indeed they've been collecting interest on some of it, particularly the city of Calgary.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would clarify to the House whether the funds designated to the city of Edmonton were designated specifically for rapid transit or for transportation in general.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I would refer my honorable colleague to the urban transportation policy document, which set out in detail the various funds available not only to Calgary and Edmonton but to the other cities in the province. They include substantial portions for rapid transit, substantial amounts for mass transit deficit funding, then the arterial and continuous corridor road programs.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary to the hon. minister. In light of the fact we may have a brother act looking after transportation in this country, would the minister be in a position to indicate if they would consider negotiating with the federal government so the federal funds would be available to the city of Edmonton?

MR. NOTLEY: At a family reunion.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a hypothetical assumption, at least in the first part.

Water Line — Crossfield Area

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of the Environment. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly today when he expects the water line from the Red Deer River to Crossfield, serving the communities between, to be operational?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, we hope to have it open and in operation sometime during August. The construction is essentially complete at this time. The testing, lining, adjustments, connections, and those kinds of things that have to occur are now under way, and we're looking at August.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the House whether his department has expressed some very real concern about the number of breaks in the line during the period of testing? I raise the question because a number of people in the area had anticipated the line would be in operation much sooner. I'm advised that the major problem is a tremendous number of leaks which have developed in the line.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I must admit I hadn't had that concern brought to my attention. I know that during the winter construction months the general contractor was experiencing some difficulty meeting the specifications with respect to lining. In brief, the contractor had invented his own apparatus for installing the lining according to our specifications. I know he had some problems in the initial miles. He kept at it and those problems have been overcome. But I wouldn't be surprised if a number of leaks were in the lining installed in the early portions of the line.

MR. SPEAKER: We have time for a short question and a short answer, which may of course be a slight departure for this particular question period. [laughter]

AN HON. MEMBER: There's a challenge, Grant.

Regional Bank

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this short question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer and ask whether the government of Alberta is giving any consideration at this point in time to participating with the governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan and the prairie credit union movement, in the Northland Bank?

MR. LEITCH: No. [laughter]

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but the time has elapsed.

MR. NOTLEY: I'll bring it back next Wednesday.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

3. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:

Be it resolved that the Assembly do stand adjourned from Wednesday, April 6, at 5:30 p.m., until Wednesday, April 13, at 2:30 p.m., Standing Order 3.(1) notwithstanding.

[Motion carried]

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

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

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

Department of Social Services
 and Community Health

MR. CHAIRMAN: As this department has been to subcommittee, perhaps we could have a report from the chairman of Subcommittee A.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, pursuant to instructions contained in the Committee of Supply resolution of Monday, March 21, 1977, Subcommittee A of the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the estimates of expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1978, for the Department of Social Services and Community Health. Subcommittee A recommends to the Committee of Supply the estimates of \$406,501,306.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee prepared to agree to receive the report of Subcommittee A?

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister was going to bring a considerable amount of information back to the House. Perhaps we should hold our agreement until we've got the information, and go a bit further from there.

DR. HOHOL: . . . just receiving the report.

MR. CLARK: Just as long as we receive the report. I just didn't want it to slip through so quickly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have to receive the report from Subcommittee A before we can proceed to the regular estimates in full committee. Are you agreed to receive the report of the chairman of Subcommittee A?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. minister have any report to make before we go into the votes?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Chairman, as a result of two very useful evenings of study, I have the information which was requested. Some I can answer orally because they are very simple explanations. Some has been requested in written form. I have that and I'm prepared to hand it out. At the same time, I will go through the oral questions and relate to them.

The first question on which I was asked for a written response was from the hon. Leader of the Opposition, a list of community residences. I have it here.

The second question related to the location of the eight absolute discharges from the Alberta Hospital, Edmonton, and the number who committed further offences. Because of the general interest in that, I have a copy for all members of the Legislature.

Yesterday afternoon I received a request for information from the hon. Member for Little Bow. He

indicated that the Leader of the Opposition would receive it. I have that information. During the course of the review in subcommittee, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Little Bow asked for some other information. I'm providing it also. Dr. Paproski requested some statistics on the incidence of venereal disease, and I have this.

Oral answers. The hon. Leader of the Opposition requested information regarding the number of mentally retarded persons readmitted to Michener Centre following their admission to the community. The institution's records indicate that since April 1, 1972, a total of 489 persons have been discharged, of which 34 were readmitted to the institution. The majority of these were adults.

Mr. Chairman, I believe those are all the questions I felt required to answer. Some of the other members have received their information separately and have indicated they are satisfied with the report.

Sorry, I almost missed one of the most important announcements in which I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition was interested: whether or not the position of Dr. Watt had been filled. I'm pleased to advise members of the committee that that position has been filled by Dr. Marian Webb, commonly called "Bud" Webb. He has an M.D., Doctor of Public Health, M.P.A. and F.R.S.H. We feel he is highly qualified, and we are delighted to have him join the staff of Social Services and Community Health.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In light of the fact that these votes have been through subcommittee, is it agreeable to the Committee of Supply that we go by total vote rather than by number?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Agreed to:

Vote 1 Total Program	\$9,435,460
----------------------	-------------

Vote 2

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like the minister to spend a few minutes on 2.3, which is public assistance for single-parent families.

I wasn't in the committee at the time, but my colleague from Little Bow indicates that with the kind of increase we're looking at in this particular area . . . I'd like to know if the minister is in a position to indicate what percentage of the people coming onto social assistance are people from outside the province who are really coming as part of a move to Alberta. In a lot of cases [they are] unskilled from the standpoint of training, and end up at least for a period of time on our social assistance rolls here in the province. I have a number of other questions in this area, but perhaps we can just start there.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Chairman, could I ask: are you particularly interested in the unemployed employables or the single-parent families?

MR. CLARK: Really both.

MISS HUNLEY: We dealt with that at some length the other evening, so I hope I'm in practice, Mr.

Chairman.

We don't have, nor do we collect, information regarding whether or not they are transient. We did one study in June last year in order to get some indication of the flow. That was done only in the Calgary office. We chose the Calgary office because it's sort of on the main line, and we might anticipate that would be a gathering place for transient people.

Part of the problem with people coming into Alberta is that we don't really know. They may present themselves some morning in an old beat-up car, and we know they've arrived from somewhere. On the other hand, they may come preparing to make their home in Alberta and find that the job they were seeking or the opportunity they were looking for is not available. Maybe they have been here for several months and then show up on our welfare rolls.

So it's very difficult. We do not have the information gathering system that tells us how many people are coming into Alberta from outside the province.

In regard to the unemployed employables, the same thing applies if they are transients, for the simple reason that we don't keep track of them. Because we have the reciprocal arrangements with the other provinces through the Canada Assistance Plan, it has not been necessary. That doesn't mean it isn't necessary now, or that we may not decide that we wish to monitor it a little more carefully. But as long as that plan is in place, we have that obligation and that agreement.

In one study we did on the employables — now I'm going by memory — 78 per cent were in and out within a three-month period. We felt this was quite satisfactory. They were employable, looking for employment, and then they disappeared from our rolls because they either found work or moved on or, in some instances, had been considered no longer employable because of health matters. That is rather the situation, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, to the minister just for clarification. Of the 2,200 or 2,300 unemployed employables, I understand some of those are in fact people who are employed but just aren't earning enough money and getting assistance. So some of them are really partly employed. They are not unemployable employables, are they?

MISS HUNLEY: We do have that on a very limited scale: a supplementation for those working part time who are low earners and do require some additional assistance in the system. Yes, that's quite true. We feel it's an encouraging sign when people wish to be independent, and we like to encourage them as much as possible.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just before we get ready to agree, I refer again to 2.3. If you look at the estimates last year and the estimates this year, there's a 45.1 per cent increase in public assistance for single-parent families. I suppose when I look at this portion of the minister's estimates, it has to be the most disturbing portion. I think it's one thing to talk in terms of a 45 per cent increase from the estimates the Assembly approved a year ago to what we're being asked to approve now. But at the same time I think we have to ask ourselves: what kinds of things are we doing from a preventive point of view?

MISS HUNLEY: Well of course several things are always going on in the community in an attempt to prevent the necessity of a single parent coming on social assistance. Because the hon. member missed it, I would like to give some information on who the people are, because I think it is a very revealing bit of information. If the committee will bear with me while I quickly turn to it, it would be useful.

Most of them are female. This was as of January 1977. There were 14,021. If we wish to know their ages, 7.4 per cent were under 20, 20.7 were 20 to 24, 35.5 were 25 to 34, 21.5 were 35 to 44, and 14.9 were over 45. Their marital status, and I think this is one of the most critical areas that causes so much concern: separated were 58.7 per cent, never married were 19.2 per cent, widowed were 6.3 per cent, and divorced were 15.6 per cent.

In an attempt to kind of grapple with this problem, I think their education is extremely interesting too: 44.6 per cent had less than grade 9, 50.5 per cent were grades 10 to 12, and 4.9 per cent were postsecondary. So from those statistics you can almost readily gather where some of the problems are.

One of the things we've already indicated in the Speech from the Throne, and again in the Budget Address, is our attempt for maintenance and recovery. But it isn't always as simple as it sounds, although we're determined to make a very good try. When people are separated, often they have drifted off and maybe started another family somewhere. Then you have your choice over which family you're going to have on social assistance. Is it the new one if you take too much from the wage earner, or is it the one you already have? These are just some of the problems we're faced with in attempting to deal with this problem.

Unmarried mothers: there's a fair number, 19.2 per cent. That causes me some grave concern, Mr. Chairman, particularly when they're very young and they like to keep their children. They have not been discouraged from doing that. They have been allowed to when they wish. But 19.2 per cent, particularly if many of them are very young — and I don't have that particular breakdown in my statistics — is a matter that causes me some very real concern, because I can see they will need additional support and encouragement through the years ahead. We try to provide that as best we can.

MR. CLARK: To the minister. Did I get the figure 7.4 per cent for the number under 20? Was that the figure you gave us? You said 20.7 per cent between 20 to 24 and 35 per cent from 25 to 34 years. Was it 7.4 per cent for under 20?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, two questions to the minister. As a result of this move in the area of maintenance recovery, what kinds of figures are we looking at there — any kinds of projections?

Secondly, in light of the information we have here, how successful are we in co-ordinating between the minister's department and the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower in the area of programs of the AVCs? I raise this question because one of the most common complaints I get — these people in my own constituency are young people who have

gone to Calgary or Edmonton and in some cases fit into this single-parent family question — is a real runaround at the AVC centres in Edmonton and Calgary. It seems to me this whole question of co-ordination between the minister's department and the AVC people — because if the minister looks at the figures here, it may well be that a lot of our problem lies in the number of people we can get into some form of postsecondary education or at least further education, equipping them for job opportunities down the road.

So my question to the minister is: what kind of co-ordination or liaison is there between the departments, and also with the student assistance board? I've had some real concerns expressed to me as far as the student assistance board and its willingness to co-operate with the minister's department and with some of the single parents who have a desire to go to perhaps one of our colleges once they get a basic education at AVC.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe we have a very good working relationship. We've been working on it quite closely with the student loan board, because we don't feel it's fair to others who borrow money or work to put themselves through school that you should be able to get loans or welfare in order to completely educate yourself. That's just not fair in my view.

So we've attempted to take the training and retraining to make a person employable, if they can, within a two-year term. I would be surprised to find out if very many people who really wished to do that couldn't do it. Because we agree that if they can become employable and self-supporting after two years training and retraining, that's a very desirable thing. However, we have stopped encouraging university. Those who were in university prior to making the change are allowed to finish their courses, but we stopped making that one of the options available. We feel the two-year training program should be the one available.

Another thing that caused us some concern was when we found that a few people were quitting their jobs, going on welfare, and getting put through university. That's not fair.

MR. NOTLEY: Just before we move away from Vote 2, I'd like to raise a question I first brought up in question period, and we did discuss it for a few minutes during the subcommittee on estimates. It really relates to changes in our social allowance payments, as a result of the new unemployment insurance provisions.

I know it's difficult to be completely accurate in the projections, but at least some of the figures bandied about in Ottawa would indicate there will be a shift in part from the federal to the provincial. Of course that'll be a far more serious problem in the Atlantic provinces, where you have unemployment rates as high as 25 per cent on Cape Breton Island. It's a less serious problem in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, where we have relatively low unemployment rates. Nevertheless there will be a shift of some amount of money — \$6, \$7, or \$8 million. When we consider the estimates for the department, I suggest this is something — while we're not able in this particular set of estimates to do anything about

changing the federal Unemployment Insurance Act, the fact of the matter is that we should be mindful that changes there have a direct bearing on our provincial budget.

Some of the concerns that have been expressed — and I've had this brought to my attention rather forcibly by constituents in Spirit River-Fairview, who feel the rules now for unemployment insurance (a) make it very difficult for women, particularly in rural areas, to ever obtain unemployment insurance because of the number of miles you have to be ready to drive and virtually give up your home in order to qualify, and (b) the impact the changes will have on the availability of unemployment insurance for people who are laid off during the winter season. Mr. Chairman, I suspect the problem will be rather more serious in those pockets of unemployment we've talked about before in the Legislature; for example, along Lesser Slave Lake and other places in the province where we do have rather serious unemployment from time to time.

I raise it because I think it is a matter of some concern. I'm not really sure that much can be done about it, because that's federal jurisdiction and we have to live with the consequences. But it does seem to me that when the federal government begins to tighten the regulations to save payments from unemployment insurance, and it is that unemployment insurance, the fact of the matter is that often the costs of picking up the pieces have to borne by the provincial governments through social service programs of one kind or another, most particularly programs that are directed to unemployed employables.

MISS HUNLEY: I'm not sure whether he was asking me a question or telling me something. Whatever it is, he's quite right. If there is a serious unemployment situation in Alberta, it could reflect in my estimates. Though feeling somewhat encouraged, we are thinking it may be the second earner or a student who we may be able to pick up on another program, rather than the main wage earner in the family.

Agreed to:

Vote 2 Total Program

\$215,527,390

Vote 3 Total Program

\$41,084,310

Vote 4

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before we pass over this vote — I didn't have an opportunity to raise this during the subcommittee on estimates, but I'd like to raise it now. It concerns the request for funding of the Rape Crisis Centre in Edmonton. Perhaps, Mme. Minister, you could bring us up to date on the position of the government generally on requests for assistance from organizations such as the Rape Crisis Centre.

MISS HUNLEY: Well I'm at least consistent, Mr. Chairman. When they happen to be new programs, and they don't fit anything else that can be broadened to include them, I have been declining them all. The Rape Crisis Centre happens to be one of them, worth while as it may be.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not quite sure I followed the reason for that. Was the reason budgetary at this at this point in time, or was there some other reason for not accommodating the request?

MISS HUNLEY: The principal reason was budgetary, Mr. Chairman, the funds. Under the restraint program, broadening of any programs was not my prerogative.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, to the minister: will the request of the Rape Crisis Centre be considered? Let me put it this way: will it in effect be put in a holding pattern? No doubt you'll be receiving requests for some kind of funding from various groups. Is it the government's intention to look at that, along with others, and give it a high priority when the restraint program is lifted? Or in fact has the government made rather a more deliberate judgment, at this point in time, that there won't be any funding of the Rape Crisis Centre? I suppose it's really a case of whether the minister considers this sort of thing really valuable and useful to fund at some point, or whether you just would not see that as a useful move to take.

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, I consider it valuable and useful. I feel better use could be made of existing facilities. I've said that to the groups. They don't necessarily agree with me. I think more work needs to be done with your first encounter with police, if you wish to report it. I think we need to work in that area. I've encouraged them to do so. We have social workers, and the city has social workers, who are helpful. They have indicated to me that that still doesn't quite fill their need.

But my mail and my telephone and personal encounters are filled with requests for causes, most of them worthy. [With] many of them I suggest there might be another way. If it's that good a cause, perhaps the community or some specific organization might undertake it. I have no particular bias against the Rape Crisis Centre, any more than I have against many of the others that come to my door requesting financial support. When you look at my budget, if I didn't have to spend so much on social assistance I might have more to spread around in other areas. We'll try to redeploy our funds when we can.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just following that up for a moment. It seems to me that one of the reasons we should take some time on this particular vote is that we are now dealing with the preventive aspects of social service policy. I agree with the minister: if we can shift by developing better programs, by making it possible for people now receiving assistance to get into the labor force, we are all far better. The people who gain most are the recipients, who are able to earn a living and feel that sense of contribution which I think is necessary, at least for the vast majority of individuals.

Just one point though. I realize the minister is going to get all sorts of requests from every conceivable group for funding. I would argue, Mme. Minister, that in this particular case there really are some strong arguments for assistance. One of the sad facts of our society is that there are more rapes. This is a brutal but yet a traumatic experience for women. I think as we in Alberta and elsewhere in Canada

move forward in promoting women's rights, as we are, we have to keep in mind that this sort of thing may have to receive a higher priority from you and your cabinet colleagues in the years ahead. So I make a pitch for it here. I think it's a worthy cause. You've acknowledged it's a worthy cause. I would suggest that perhaps it should be given higher priority than it has to date.

May I move from that point, Mr. Chairman, to the issue of day care itself. One of the strongest arguments I have heard for day care came from Mr. Day, the director of day care in the city of Edmonton, who compiled statistics that indicated an investment in day care is an excellent way of making it possible for women who would otherwise be at home to get into the labor force and that more than the money spent on day care is actually saved in public assistance payments.

So I think moving more quickly on day care, and perhaps even lifting the restraint policy as far as day care is concerned, is the sort of investment in people that may very well save us some of that — not all of it or anything like all of it, or even a large part of it, but a significant amount compared to day care expenditures.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions. Perhaps I might start by saying that, unaccustomed as I am to agreeing with the Member for Spirit River-Fairview on at least some basic issues, we are now in a situation on this question of preventive social services — I say not only to the minister but to the members of the Assembly — that we've had preventive social services in one form or another in this province for I would suspect eight or 10 years now.

MISS HUNLEY: Ten or 11.

MR. CLARK: Ten or 11 years. It is not a very good record for either the former or the present administration, to see the kind of thing that is happening — not only in the single-parent family area — when we look back and remember what was at least initially thought of as far as preventive social services was concerned. I recall some of the same arguments being made by the minister's predecessor, my colleague who sits on my left, Mr. Ray Speaker, when he was minister.

It's very difficult to assess successes in preventive social services. But if there is one thing that should catch all our attention this year, it should be those figures the minister gave us earlier this afternoon: when we look at single-parent families, the numbers, ages, and educational achievements of many people who fit into that category of single parent families and have to receive some form of public assistance today.

I'm really saying to the minister and to all members of the Assembly that we've had preventive social services in effect for 11 years in Alberta. If you look back at Vote 2, that's not a great recommendation for the strides we've made over those 10 years under both governments. I say this not just to the minister, but to all members. It seems to me the government in this Legislative Assembly would be very wise to place a very high priority on this area in the future.

I go back to the point I raised in committee: with the

rapid industrial growth in the province, new people coming to Alberta, and so on, we perhaps have to deal with casualties in those areas. But if we can redirect the preventive social services program in the area of not only day care but beefing up some of the educational programs we have, homemaker service, and a variety of areas, our money is in my judgment much better spent in the area of younger people. Once again I refer to the statistics the minister presented to us today.

I don't expect the minister to respond, other than to say I think it's fair to say we can look at the estimates next year, when I anticipate restraint may be off somewhat. It would seem to me this is one of the areas in the minister's department that should receive a very, very high priority.

Now I know it's politically difficult to come out with figures and say, we've kept this many youngsters out of problems here, we've kept this many families together. That's impossible. That's the hard part of the program. But in the long run, when we look at a 45 per cent increase in the assistance to single-parent families — and other increases in the area, but that's the worst one — no member of this Assembly regardless of where he may sit can be very proud of that kind of thing.

Mr. Chairman, this leads me into an area where I would like to ask the first of a series of questions. It deals with this area of preventive social assistance, preventive welfare. What nutrition programs does the minister or her department now have in place for children in the inner areas of the cities of Edmonton and Calgary? Has the minister done a survey to determine the number of students who come to school without breakfast in the morning? Is some sort of survey done in Edmonton and Calgary by the minister's department? I ask the question because it is my understanding that the department has been somewhat involved in funding a school lunch program in the city of Edmonton, on a very limited basis.

Also does the department have statistics on the number of children who end up in the Royal Alex hospital because of lack of proper food? Has the government considered some type of program where food, a school lunch or school breakfast, is available to young people specifically in the downtown core areas? I recognize the minister won't have all these figures with her today — but some kind of overview as to what's happening in that particular area both in Edmonton and Calgary.

MISS HUNLEY: To my knowledge we have not done a nutritional needs study. I believe the Department of Agriculture undertook that and does have an interesting program in an attempt for nutritional education only. Our main nutritional program has been focused on the Metis and isolated community areas. We are quite enthusiastic about that, although . . . Our initial information is encouraging, we think socially as well as just getting the kids to school. We don't yet have a measure as to the nutritional value of what we've accomplished, but we feel we've accomplished something. You will notice there is a considerable increase in my budget to expand the program this year, but that's in the isolated areas. I think we would be talking about millions and millions of dollars if we were to get into a school lunch program. I don't have those statistics. I will be pleased to check with

the department.

Nutrition is of course something we're extremely interested in, because we think it's a very important preventive measure. But I'm not sure it would be one of my priorities to throw that many millions of dollars into that particular area of prevention. I would have to think about that, inasmuch as it's important.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just another question, and prior to that a comment to the minister. When we talk in terms of millions and millions of dollars in this area, I think we should be careful to remember that we are basically talking about the downtown core areas in Edmonton and Calgary. I know very often people say such a program would cost a tremendous amount of money. I suspect, though, that if something were worked out with the public and separate school boards in Edmonton and Calgary, considerable strides could be made in this area.

I notice the Deputy Premier frantically writing. I know there was a successful program carried on in the Crowsnest Pass, it seems to me two or three years ago in this particular area.

DR. HORNER: And in the cities.

MR. CLARK: In the cities also. My question then to either of the ministers: is the program carrying on in Edmonton and Calgary?

DR. HORNER: Through the home economists in the Department of Agriculture, in co-operation with the school boards and the cities.

MR. CLARK: The question is: is the program operational in the downtown areas of Edmonton and Calgary? My information is that it was started in Edmonton on an experimental basis, I believe, but has not been carried through.

DR. HORNER: I don't know the circumstance.

MISS HUNLEY: I believe it's continuing, but it's not under the auspices of my portfolio unless it's in the PSS area. I doubt that very much, because I think we'd have to expand the rules to consider that preventive for the interpretation of the federal act.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, a second area I'd like to deal with is this question of unskilled workers coming to the province of Alberta. We've explored this in question period on more than one occasion.

Knowing that the minister's department doesn't have the kind of statistics as to where people come from, I raise this once again from the point of view of the housing problems in the inner city area. A sizable number of the housing accommodations in downtown Edmonton and Calgary that these people are using are being torn down now. At least my information is that this is increasingly becoming a problem in the downtown area. As one of the ministers mentioned in the estimates last night, as far as rental accommodations over \$400 are concerned, there's a bit of flexibility there. But when you get to these low rental areas — once again in the city centres — the situation seems to be becoming increasingly difficult.

My question to the minister then: is the government giving any thought to using some of the older

buildings in the inner city areas of both Edmonton and Calgary, even on a rental basis, to acquire these facilities perhaps on a shorter term to meet this very real problem of unskilled people who find themselves in the downtown core area with virtually no place to get accommodations, many times for a week, two weeks, or a month? What kind of action is . . .

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Chairman, we usually leave housing to the Minister of Housing and Public Works, although we have that very real concern. It affects our budget. But our philosophy has been to encourage people to find their own accommodation. Surely if we had to find accommodation for everyone, on top of all the other things we try to do, we would find we didn't have time for anything else. Either that, or we'd have to add greatly to our staff.

I think it would be extremely expensive to take over housing in the downtown area. We haven't done an analysis of that, but we're watching very closely what's happening in rents and how that affects our budget. We may need to take some drastic steps in that area if we find people moving into high-rent accommodation. Perhaps they may have to move into something not so expensive. But it's an area we're constantly involved in, through officials in my department and in the Department of Housing and Public Works. We're working together on that very problem: what do we do not only for those on social assistance but for any low-income earner? It's a problem we don't have a ready solution for, but we will attempt to work at it as best we can.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, one other area is this whole question of agencies that work in the downtown core areas in both Edmonton and Calgary, whether it's AADAC, native counselling, Salvation Army, the department itself, the mental health people. We discussed this briefly in the subcommittee on the minister's estimates. What kind of co-ordinating role does the minister see her department playing in the central core areas of Edmonton and Calgary?

MISS HUNLEY: I see us being involved extensively, providing some service that isn't provided by others. To the best of my knowledge, I think we have a fairly good working relationship. We are knowledgeable as to what's going on in both major cities. When I've had reports from and met with some of the groups myself, I know they're involved and committed. We want to be sure there isn't duplication of service, that one picks up where the other leaves off.

We do the best we can in that area. I know there's always someone who will fall between the cracks, who just doesn't fit any service or doesn't want to be helped for that matter. But it's a matter of concern. We have a good many dedicated workers in my department, and in the commission as well, who believe in community involvement, working with the community. We have to work together or none of us will succeed.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just one supplementary question to the minister. Would it be fair for me to ask the minister if she sees her department playing the role of a catalyst in the downtown areas of Edmonton and Calgary? Would that be a fair assess-

ment of the role the minister sees her department playing?

MISS HUNLEY: Well I think we've heard a great deal about local autonomy. Some of them jealously guard their rights and prerogatives. As you well know, the PSS programs initiate with the municipality. Some of the others are special programs that relate to the cities of Calgary or Edmonton, or any other city for that matter. I see us being very anxious to work with them. I see us trying to encourage it, and I hope we are.

But I think we have to be very careful that we don't give the impression we're attempting to take over or intrude in areas where we're not welcome. Perhaps we are welcome, but I think we should respect what the cities have undertaken through their own social service areas, work with them, supplement that, and encourage them in any way we can.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Who does the minister see playing the role of trying to get this multitude of services together: the voluntary agencies, the city, and the variety of government departments? It seems to me it would be a deuce of a job to get all the government departments co-ordinated in those kinds of areas, in addition to trying to work with the city of Edmonton. Who really has a handle on this thing as far as the province is concerned, then, if the minister doesn't see her department as the catalyst?

MISS HUNLEY: I think we could use one example. I know it isn't in the downtown core area, but — West 10 happened before I became the minister responsible. I did have the opportunity to visit them and listen to their enthusiasm. That's where the city as well as the government services are all located. To me that is a great step forward. I can't honestly say where it originated. I think it originates by dedicated people talking to one another, and from somewhere the idea springs.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I could pursue that. I was interested when the minister mentioned West 10. Do you see that, then, as the model for co-ordination elsewhere? Is there any role that should be taken by the provincial government in attempting to develop counterparts of West 10, particularly in the downtown cores of the two major cities? It would seem to me there are problems there.

In West 10 you've got a lot of extremely able people who are committed to the community. Let me put it this way: it seems to me it would be more difficult to develop the core of local leadership in the downtown cores of both our major cities, because there tends to be a more transient population.

MISS HUNLEY: I don't often agree with the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview either, but I agree in that case. That's quite a different area, of course. But that doesn't mean we shouldn't try and that we aren't trying. We haven't made any great startling developments to date. But the challenge is there, and we'll have to accept it.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, because I was involved in another subcommittee, I didn't have the benefit of

attending the minister's subcommittee estimates.

I have a comment on the PSS, but first of all I'd like to commend the minister's department. I have found the regional office in Lethbridge extremely helpful to people in that area who have difficulties. Just recently a new regional director moved in there. I just find the regional office so very helpful to constituents' problems. I don't know how else I would get that message there without telling the minister, and I hope you would relay it to that staff in the south. There are 1,977 single parents handled out of that office, which is something that didn't exist 10 years ago. I think it's a whole new world for the department, and they should be commended.

Under the PSS, I'm very interested in the point of the Leader of the Opposition that it would be interesting to look down the road and see what happens. If the PSS programs are working, why do we have that preponderance of assistance in Vote 2? I wonder what would happen if we didn't have PSS. I think the former government should be commended for starting it.

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the secret of PSS is local authority, local autonomy, and local priority setting. I would hate to be a member of a government that would take that away. Surely the people in a given region know what's in their best interests, and I agree that the terms of PSS, of local priority, is very, very important.

The day care breakdown of 35 per cent federal, 35 provincial, 17 for the municipality, and 13 user pay is a good concept. My question to the minister is: should the Canada Assistance Plan terminate next year, would that change, would that disappear, and if so would we have something to fill that void?

The other point — I know the minister appointed a task force on day care that's going to report by the end of the month, and I understand the terms of reference have perhaps been expanded to include not only the standards but perhaps financing, public versus private. I'd like to hear a comment on that.

The last one is the minister's reaction to the direction Albertans are taking with regard to the volunteer sector. Because it seems to me that the philosophy of the government in this area, to help those who can't help themselves, depends to a great extent on the volunteer role. I think we in Alberta have been very fortunate to have volunteer organizations to help the government implement its plans. Does the minister detect an increase or a decrease in the volunteer role in Alberta?

MISS HUNLEY: Maybe I should start at the last one and work my way back. Speaking about the volunteer role, of course I think it is extremely important. I attempt to say so at every opportunity. Truly the role of the volunteer is changing. One of the concerns I have — and I don't mind telling them that when I meet with them — is that some of them masquerade as volunteers, because they only volunteer to form a group to try to get money from the government, whether it's municipal or provincial, and everybody's paid. That isn't my idea of a volunteer. All they want to do is take the money and tell me to mind my own business. That's not my idea of volunteerism. Volunteerism is perhaps partially paid, but by and large it's still the old-fashioned volunteerism. It's still around, thank goodness, and I hope it will never go away. But

the more we intrude, the more it's liable to disappear.

There are lots of challenges for volunteer agencies today. They may not be the same as they were 10 or 20 years ago when they were building residences for senior citizens, homes for the handicapped, and so on. Perhaps that role has changed. But there are still a lot of things that can best be done by volunteers, and it would be a sad society indeed if we took that opportunity away from them.

Going back to day care, I had the opportunity to meet briefly with the chairman, who gave me an update on their progress. He's feeling very enthusiastic and encouraged by the work the task force has undertaken so far. I have arranged for a meeting with them toward the end of April to thank them, because most of them I do not know, for the work they're doing; and I hope we'll make their findings public as soon as possible. He has indicated to me that it has been an interesting challenge, because they were able to bring, as I was sure they would, the very hard-line, expensive high standard from the very sub-standard, which was worrying us in the beginning. As he says, they finally began to see one another's points of view, which was what I was hoping for in the first place. So I'm looking forward to hearing from their report, and I'm sure hon. members are also.

Agreed to:

Vote 4 Total Program

\$27,832,660

Vote 5

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister to explain where we find the \$1 million saving as far as VS Services is concerned. I believe it's in Vote 5 that we'd find Michener Centre in Red Deer or ASH/Deerhome. I'd be interested, even if the minister had to take a few minutes to explain, just where in the estimates here we'd find the \$1 million saving.

MISS HUNLEY: That's an interesting challenge, Mr. Chairman. I have submitted to the members of the Assembly the breakdown for the figures we have as to the end of December. Now what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is overlooking is the fact that costs are not rising as high as they would otherwise be. That's where the saving comes. I can't look at last year's estimates, for example, and say I'll take a million dollars off last year's estimates, because we know that costs are rising. They're just not rising as rapidly.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, that's a nifty bit of footwork, if I might use that expression. But I look under . . .

MISS HUNLEY: But it's so simple.

MR. CLARK: Yes it's so simple, but it doesn't wash. Because if we look at the estimates last year and the estimates this year for supplies and services, we see a 44.6 per cent increase in this particular area. Perhaps we can just start right there. If we look at manpower costs, we see about a 2 to 3 per cent increase.

MISS HUNLEY: What vote are you on?

MR. CLARK: I'm looking at the estimates for Vote 5.

MISS HUNLEY: 5.3?

MR. CLARK: On page 279. If you look at the estimates last year and the estimates this year for supplies and services, there's a 44.6 per cent increase.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Chairman, there is an increase in the overall operation of Michener Centre. The group homes are operating and functional. I have not said at any time that I would reduce the amount of money spent there. In fact I've said that I would reinvest that money in other services to provide other staff, and that is included in my budget for the coming year.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, following that along. Earlier in this session the minister indicated they'd taken on several additional staff at Red Deer. But I think if the minister checks — I'm sure she'll agree with me — upon checking with Michener Centre, the staff complement at Michener Centre or ASH/Deerhome was down considerably. The positions weren't filled last year. I think just recently between 30 and 50 additional staff were taken on at Michener Centre, with a high percentage of them in the lower functioning portion of the institution. But those positions were available last year. The minister shakes her head, but I think if the minister checks we'll find that a sizable number of positions allocated to Michener Centre last year were not filled. It is true that some are being filled now, but basically those were positions which were available last year and were not filled last year.

I just think it would be extremely regrettable if in the course of this \$1 million saving we tried to consider those areas. Because my reading of the situation is that basically the service provided by VS Services is, I think one could say, reasonable at Michener Centre now, but any allusion to a \$1 million saving is simply not visible. A number of positions at ASH/Deerhome that were not filled last year are now being filled, but earlier during this session and last year also the minister indicated additional people would be working with a number of the handicapped people there. My information as far as positions are concerned is that the positions last year weren't filled. When we talk about the positions for this year, we'd better fill the ones for last year first.

MISS HUNLEY: Last year we did get authority for additional positions for the group homes. There are 52 additional positions allocated this year, and recruiting will be . . . I imagine it's under way now, because it's to become effective April 1, 1977.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, is the minister in a position to indicate to the committee if a number of positions at ASH/Deerhome were not filled last year? Or if the minister hasn't got the information now, can she get it for us following the study for estimates?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, I'd be pleased to provide that. We are always filling positions in nearly all sections of the department, but I can't tell you specifically

where those are in any one institution or any particular area. But I'd be pleased to do that.

MR. CLARK: May I conclude this area, Mr. Chairman, by saying to the minister that if the information I have received is accurate — and I believe it to be — we had a substantive number of positions not filled in the day care area at ASH/Deerhome last year. We're now coming along and saying we're adding a number of people to the staff at ASH/Deerhome. The minister says we're adding 52 positions. The point I want to make is: before we start bragging about those 52 additional positions, we'd better fill the positions that should have been filled last year.

MISS HUNLEY: We are recruiting, Mr. Chairman. We've had some difficulty in recruiting, but we are recruiting almost constantly. But there are 52 additional positions for this year in this year's budget.

Agreed to:

Vote 5 Total Program

\$40,592,650

Vote 6

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister a couple of questions. What is the position with regard to Dr. Blair's involvement with the department? It seems to me I read recently that Dr. Blair had ceased to be involved as a consultant to the government. I'm referring to Dr. Buck Blair, the author of the Blair report on mental health.

MISS HUNLEY: Dr. Blair was chairman of the mental health advisory committee until December 31, 1976. He extended it one year, for which I was most grateful. Then he felt he really must resign. I accepted his resignation with regret. I still find him a very useful source of information.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, can the minister indicate what progress is being made on the study with regard to this whole process of releasing patients held under a governor's warrant? I believe the study was to be finished by the end of April. Is that right? What progress is being made with the study?

Also, how are the minister's department and the Attorney General's Department coming along with the joint venture? What does the minister see now as the target date, and when will it be public?

MISS HUNLEY: I can only speak for myself, Mr. Chairman. I presume the Attorney General will deal with that in the course of his estimates. Our agreement with Dr. Earp has been signed and tabled for information in the Legislature. I presume he's undertaking his work because we have a commitment that it's the end of May. If I remember correctly it was the end of May or the first of June. We were talking about a three-month period.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, the minister didn't answer the question about making the report public. I assume the report will be made public shortly after Dr. Earp makes it available to the government. Is that the government's position?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, I would expect it to be so, Mr. Chairman.

Agreed to:

Vote 6 Total Program

\$32,958,140

Vote 7

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, just a brief comment on this, if I may. I'd like to thank the minister for providing the additional information regarding venereal disease control. Certainly I want to go on record as complimenting her for managing this department so extremely well.

I would want to make only one comment. I know she's addressing her mind to the problem of day care centres. I'm pleased with respect to that task force.

The question I'm going to ask, Mr. Chairman, is regarding venereal disease control. I note in the statistics provided to us today that in fact the incidence of gonorrhea in Alberta is about two times the Canadian average — some 480 per 100,000, versus about half that amount in Canada. Noting also the estimate regarding that entity is not a substantive amount, I wonder if the minister would reconsider in her estimates, in view of the high incidence of this disease and the public health problem it is and the problems it creates, if she can't correct this this year then I would hope she would pay very special attention to it next year, because the rates seem to be persistent over the past few years. In the past 10 years, especially with reference to gonorrhea, it's about two times higher than the Canadian incidence. I hope public relations and other methods of control would indeed increase in intensity.

MISS HUNLEY: We discussed this earlier, Mr. Chairman. We did undertake an advertising campaign. But we feel there's a certain point when you stop advertising, or people will stop looking at it. We'll take another look at it, because it does cause us concern.

As far as statistics go, sometimes our statistics are very high because of our good reporting system. Maybe our system is better and more accurate. So that's something.

Regardless, it is a serious social problem to which we should address ourselves. And we're doing that as best we can through the department. You'll see continued activity in that area and some continued advertising, but not quite as heavy as attempted before unless that really appears to have a pay-off. We did note that we didn't turn up very much more incidence, but we did have more people checking in to find out if perhaps they should be tested. But that didn't necessarily indicate we found more cases of venereal disease.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I had a chance to look very quickly at the information the minister supplied to us with regard to local health services. I note something like a 52.4 per cent turnover in the staff of local health units — I guess in the central office, the health unit service. My question to the minister, and we discussed this briefly in the estimates without benefit of the figures: now that a full-time medical

officer has been appointed to take Dr. Watt's place, what does the minister see happening as far as this very high percentage of turnover within the area of local health units is concerned?

MISS HUNLEY: I'm frantically looking through paper; because I have a sheaf of it here. I don't know whether it's health units or central office. Could I ask the Leader of the Opposition to indicate?

MR. CLARK: I wouldn't want to mislead the minister, but I assume it's central office.

MISS HUNLEY: Okay. Because if it's health units, that's a different matter.

Mr. Chairman, because I don't know who has resigned and so on, I would estimate that when you have a very small staff it doesn't take too many people resigning or moving on to other opportunities to make a high percentage. I feel sure Dr. Webb will make a real contribution to the department as well as to the province. I'll study the information. It came to me rather quickly, and I quickly forwarded it.

MR. CLARK: According to positions.

Agreed to:

Vote 7 Total Program

\$31,976,680

Vote 8 Total Program

\$7,094,016

Capital Estimates

\$1,451,165

Department Total

\$406,501,306

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Chairman, I move the resolution be reported.

[Motion carried]

Department of Transportation

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. chairman of Subcommittee B, do you have a report to present to the committee?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, pursuant to instructions contained in the Committee of Supply resolution of Monday, March 21, 1977, Subcommittee B of the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the estimates of expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1978, for the Department of Transportation. The subcommittee recommends to the Committee of Supply the estimates of expenditure of \$271,666,210.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've heard the report of the chairman of Subcommittee B. Is the committee prepared to accept the report of the subcommittee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it's agreeable to the committee, we will go through the same procedure as in the previous set of estimates, going through by votes rather than by individual numbers.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Agreed to:

Vote 1 Total Program

83,351,119

Vote 2

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, just a few remarks on Vote 2. In budget debate I made some remarks pertaining to the item I'm going to discuss here. However, I think it's justifiable that I make them again, as I got some phone calls from Brooks since then. It is in regard to the contract on 20 miles of Highway 1 at Tilley, let to Everall Construction. They retendered the trucking to a firm from Edmonton. I don't know what the rates were. The part that annoys me and bothers me is the fact that the trucking firm that got the job down there wouldn't take on one local trucker.

Mr. Chairman, I asked the minister what the policy of the government was. He indicated that if possible they do like contractors to hire local truckers. However, I went out and met with the contractor who took on the subcontract for hauling the gravel. I met with them and they said they weren't going to let one local trucker work out there. That was around February 20. They are still hauling out there, and not one local trucker has been able to get on this particular job.

I realize that under the tendering policy it's an area where the minister can't get involved. But if there is anything he can do to keep contentment amongst local truckers and local areas — not only the one I am discussing, but as far as other areas of the province are concerned — I would certainly appreciate it very much.

Mr. Chairman, I was a little disappointed when I saw that the budget was cut from \$294 million to \$271 million, a cut of \$23 million. I don't know that we can spend money in a better area than on a network of highways for this province. I hope the minister is not losing his vigor in getting the amount of money he should have in the Department of Transportation.

I realize and appreciate the fact that governments are under strict restraints, and I agree with it in many of the departments. However, I certainly don't think we should be cutting back in the highways. I would think this is an area that would add to the heritage of this province.

A question I was going to ask, Mr. Chairman: is there any money in the budget for twinning Highway 1? Are they going to continue the twinning of Highway 1 from west of Strathmore to the Medicine Hat border?

DR. HORNER: Relative to the first area, we do encourage, where we possibly can, the use of local truckers. On the other hand, when you're using the tendering system you can't have it both ways. I'm sure my hon. friend appreciates that.

Relative to the so-called reduction, I think I explained in subcommittee that in fact there isn't a reduction but that because of the oil tax fund, or whatever you call it, we will be getting in Vote 2 additional moneys that are not there at the moment and that will almost equate to what we had last year.

The Leader of the Opposition may recall the \$15 million special warrant related to the special funds

relative to the oil tax fund. That's what causes the discrepancy. In fact there will be a similar amount. It's not in here primarily because each of these projects has to be identified and agreement with the federal government received. As we get that agreement, we will be bringing that oil tax fund money in as well.

The other reductions — if I could, while I'm on my feet. In Vote 3 there is a 19 per cent reduction related to the decrease in interest costs on the ARR — a slight increase in revenues, but primarily a decrease in interest costs in the ARR. The total decrease in Vote 4, of course, is related to the fact that the Wardair hangar has now been built. So in fact the department, I think, has done very well in having a substantial budget, and it's substantially within some dollars of last year.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Just the question, Mr. Chairman, on the twinning of Highway 1.

DR. HORNER: Well, that's of course an ongoing project. I think we've emphasized that the priority on No. 1 was to get the overlay done — which we're in progress of doing — and doing some additional strengthening on what we have. That has to be the priority on No. 1: getting it up to the 110,000-pound load limit and getting some of the surface redone. But we will be twinning No. 1 east to the Saskatchewan border, as we can, as quickly as funds are available over the period of time. But I can't say other than that the priority is to maintain what we have.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One supplementary question, Mr. Chairman. Will there be any work on the overpass being surveyed for the Brooks intersection, the access road going into Brooks? When will construction on this project start?

DR. HORNER: It won't start this year, but I'm hoping to get some stoplights up.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just three comments. Hopefully involved in those three comments will be a couple of questions. I didn't have a chance to sit in on the minister's estimates. First, with regard to Vote 2, we look at the comparable estimate for last year, \$155 million. Add \$15 million to that, and by my math that comes to \$170 million. My question is: where does the other \$7 million come from? Is it the intention of the government to deal with a special warrant to pick up that additional \$7 million once the session is over? Where does that \$7 million come from?

DR. HORNER: Part of that is a transfer within maintenance and capital.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister could be a bit more specific with regard to the vote. Looking at maintenance and capital, I don't see the \$7 million the minister would move from last year's estimates to this year's forecast.

DR. HORNER: Well I can get that information for the leader very quickly.

MR. CLARK: If you will.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, to the minister. With regard to the minister's comment to my colleague the Member for Bow Valley on the question hiring local truckers — the minister says you can't have it both ways. Indeed that is so. On the other hand, Mr. Minister, what kind of consideration are you giving to putting into the terms of the tender that a certain percentage of the truckers be hired locally? It would seem to me that the minister would have much more leverage going that route than calling in the people after the contract has been let and saying, now look, we want you to hire local people. I can just think of all the reasons the contractors say that they can't do that. There may be some hazards in doing that, and it would likely cost us more in some situations. But at the same time it's pretty difficult to explain to local truckers, be they in my colleague's riding or some other riding, why they're not at least getting a substantive portion of the local trucking. Has that been considered?

DR. HORNER: It has been considered and, for the obvious reason, it hasn't been done yet. We're willing to have a look at whether you can include that in the tender documents.

If I could be very candid though, in '74-75 when we had a very rapid acceleration in per unit costs in a variety of areas, we were looking at every possible avenue to increase the competitive bidding process so we could get better prices, get more roads for our dollar. While I'm quite willing to have a look at it — and perhaps we could do that, particularly in certain kinds of tenders — most of the contractors in fact use a lot of local truckers. The one my honorable friend refers to doesn't, but most of them do.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, just following along. Is the minister in a position to give us a bit of a gaze into his crystal ball — I know he's prepared to do that — as to what's going to happen in the unit cost situation this year? What does the tender situation look like?

Perhaps I might ask the minister at the same time, Mr. Chairman, if he can give us some sort of breakdown as to where we stand on construction of that road from Fort McMurray to Syncrude. Where do we find the money in the budget for that? How many dollars? Is this the last year for that kind of thing? Could he also give us a total of what we've spent over the last couple of years, plus the amount for this year? What's the total amount we'll be having for that Syncrude roadway?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could do the latter first. Yes, we hope this is the last year of major expenditure in the Fort McMurray area. The last big contract, relative to twinning in the town, was let just a few days ago. We also have a contract going on there right now, the first ever tunnelling project in tar sands — which is an interesting one from the engineering point of view, because they react differently — to try to divert Saline Creek so we can get some stability on the hill. We were worried about twinning that road on the hill. We had to do the tunnel first, otherwise we were afraid the hill would slide on us. That last big contract has been let.

The road to the Syncrude plant is now under con-

tract and should be completed this year. Those two major [ones] are the last in the Syncrude area.

Relative to unit costs, I think everybody's aware — and indeed we'll shortly be announcing to the industry, if we haven't already — that the gravel haul rates will be going up about 7.5 per cent. That's an average because it varies for the type of unit, and so on. Aside from that, we've been pleased with the tenders we've received so far. The unit costs appear to be remaining relatively stable compared to last year.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister would give us figures with regard to the Syncrude venture.

DR. HORNER: I hope the leader will accept ballpark figures. The total amount spent in the Fort McMurray-Syncrude area in the last three or four years — including Highway 63, which is the highway going up — is in the neighborhood of \$60 million.

Agreed to:

Vote 2 Total Program

\$156,526,490

Vote 3

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, this may be as good a place as any to pursue this area of the Snavelly report and what's happening here. I think it would be helpful, at least for the readers of *Hansard* and for the members too, to get somewhat of an overview from the minister with regard to the Hall commission, Snavelly and the work he's done, and the other groups presently involved in this federal field.

I'm not asking for an assessment of what each has done, but how and when does the minister see these coming together? In getting across the province and talking to people, my experience is that there's just a tremendous amount of anxiety by rural people as to which report means what, which report is dealing in each area. People are beginning to say, all these bloody reports and where do we go?

DR. HORNER: And I agree with them.

The hon. leader may recall I made a major speech in the throne [speech] debate relative to where I felt we would be going. But just to encapsulate it briefly and bring the Legislature up to date, the Snavelly report has to do with the actual cost of moving grain by rail. He has said that the cost to the railways is deficient by a factor of 2.6, based on 1974 costs. The interesting observation there is that the provinces — Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba jointly — put together a submission. He was closer to our submission relative to the cost of moving grain than he was to the railway's. So we made some progress.

The next thing of course is the great deal of work we did presenting our position to the Hall commission. It is my understanding that the Hall commission [report] has been written. It's in the final printing and translation stages. We hope to get it some time this month.

Along with that, we expect what is called Snavelly No. 2, in which Mr. Snavelly has been retained by the federal government to relate his costs of moving grain

relative to branch line abandonment. When we get those two reports we would hope — indeed we've been assured by the federal minister — we will then have some very intensive and meaningful consultation. We have put together a task force consisting of my own department, the Department of Agriculture, and Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs relative to how our response should be made.

We have done a great deal of work in that area. As I'm sure the leader is aware, there is a variety of alternatives. It starts with who picks up the gap, how you narrow the gap and, if you're going to pick up the gap, who you pay it to? These are all alternatives the federal ministry have been looking at and to which they want our input. I think I've said very broadly that our position so far is: having regard to all the federal subsidy money and the various modes of transportation in this country, it may be more reasonable than ever to have a hard look at taking that half a billion dollars and taking over the roadbeds, at which time, according to Mr. Snively, the Crow rate becomes compensatory. Otherwise all I see is a band-aid approach, and I don't like that because we've been dealing with that for a hundred years.

As much as I would like to be more definitive, I think we have to await the Hall report and Snively No. 2. We are continuing our work at the moment and have indeed taken on some consultants to help us put all these things together again. One is Dr. Platt, a member of the former royal commission, who is certainly knowledgeable in the area.

My department is working hard and long hours on all these very complex matters. I would hope that before the end of the session I could make a further progress report, if you like, relative to where the negotiations are and what the situation is in regard to freight rates.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. When do we expect Snively No. 2?

DR. HORNER: Ideally, at the same time as the Hall report. He's working closely with Mr. Justice Hall at the moment.

Agreed to:

Vote 3 Total Program

\$6,625,460

Vote 4

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, on this particular estimate. Now that the Wardair hangar is completed, I'm sure the minister is aware of rather persistent stories making the rounds that it wouldn't be too difficult to change the Wardair facilities at the International Airport to maintenance facilities for PWA. I have no hesitation in saying I supported the government in bringing the head office to Calgary. I think in time, if Albertans own PWA, maintenance should be in Alberta also. This would be a great time for the minister to indicate just what he has in mind in that particular area.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, I think I'd like to put the rumors to rest that the hangar is going to be used for anything but what we said it was going to be used for

in the first place. The hangar will be used by Wardair. It is public, because the president of Wardair announced his intentions. If they're carried through they're frankly very exciting for Alberta. They will double the number of skilled jobs available in that hangar and will open up an entirely new area in engine overhaul that is not now being done in Canada. I think the hangar has in fact been an useful investment for us. It's paying a return of approximately 9 per cent, and has assured us of an aircraft maintenance industry of a substantial nature in this province. I agree that as we go down the road with Pacific Western, the expansion of maintenance — and if the northern development takes place, there will be an expansion — should take place in Edmonton at the International. Additional land is under lease by the province relative to that particular area.

MR. CLARK: The minister talks about additional maintenance facilities. Looking into his crystal ball, when might we expect PWA to start to do some of their maintenance work in Alberta? They're doing some now, but they do the bulk in Vancouver. If I understood the minister correctly, he's really saying that rather than any more expansion in Vancouver, more and more of that work will be done in Alberta. If I understand PWA's operation in Alberta properly, if they're going to do much more maintenance here they've got to start to think in terms of facilities here. If my memory is accurate they're in rented facilities now, although I could be incorrect there. When do we expect to see some move toward PWA doing an expanded part of its maintenance work in Alberta? Is Edmonton the likely site?

DR. HORNER: I didn't get the latter.

MR. CLARK: Is the likely site Edmonton?

DR. HORNER: Yes, the site will be Edmonton. Once we see some decisions relative to northern development, I think the PWA management and board of directors will have to make some decisions relative to expanding their facilities in Alberta for increased maintenance.

MR. CLARK: When the minister says, some decisions as far as northern development, I assume he's primarily alluding to federal regulations as far as oil and gas development are concerned but primarily the pipeline question.

Would the minister care to report just briefly on his trip to Alaska last summer?

DR. HORNER: Yes I could, Mr. Chairman. It was interesting and informative, and we had a good exchange of views with both the state government people and business interests in Alaska. They were of course very interested in our heritage savings trust fund, because they passed a similar thing in their recent election. They did it by constitutional change to their state law. They were very interested in how we were handling ours and how they could gain from us.

A direct result was a trip to Edmonton by six of their senior people, including the chairman of their legislative finance committee, I think he's called, to meet with our Treasury people. They spent two or

three days here going over that area in detail.

I think closer contact between Alberta, the north, and Alaska is the other important area. I think we opened some interesting discussions with some of the business people there, including the air line people who fly from Fairbanks into Whitehorse and have the route from Fairbanks into Inuvik. Alaskans are very interested in the question of a rail link with the "lower 48", as they call the rest of the United States. I think we could have some input into that rail link if it were ever to come about.

Certainly if you look at the terrain, the route from Fort Simpson west to Whitehorse and Fairbanks along the Yukon River might be a least-cost option relative to that.

We also had some interesting discussions with the Alaskan railroad, which was originally built by the United States government and has continued to be operated by the government. It is the only railway of its kind in the United States. Interesting figures relative to what they've been able to do in a passenger sense, in the summertime in tourist excursions, and some ideas there that hopefully we might apply to the ARR down the road.

Of course we discussed matters of mutual concern relative to getting our products into Alaska and were talking to them particularly about their fish industry — getting their product into Alberta. I think there can be mutual benefit there.

That is a brief report on the very interesting three days we visited primarily in Juneau and Anchorage. We also stopped in Whitehorse and had interesting and informative discussions with both the chamber of commerce and the members of the Yukon legislative assembly.

Just as a minor thing: one of the problems they had been having, because of regulation on the Alcan Highway: they weren't able to buy 14-foot, 6-inch wide mobile homes from Alberta industry. We were able to get that resolved so they now can buy them. That's just one of those interesting little sidelines from these trips. I think my colleague the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and I intend to devote more time to upgrading and improving those contacts with the territorial government in Yellowknife, the territorial government in Yukon, and the government of Alaska.

Agreed to:

Vote 4 Total Program \$7,880,409

Vote 5

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, on this particular vote. I imagine this is where the ferries come in. I wonder if the minister could report on the five-year program the department has of replacing ferries with bridges. Is there more money in this vote for updating this program, or bringing it up to the five-year program?

DR. HORNER: As a matter of fact we have — I could be wrong — eight or nine ferries left in the province. As we go along we'll of course be building additional bridges in an attempt to have year-round transportation across these rivers.

One of the interesting developments, which should be available by midsummer, is the hoverlift ferry. It's a very exciting development using the movement of air. That engineering is rather new. It's being developed by a group in Calgary who are probably the most knowledgeable in North America on the hoverlift systems.

The other exciting part of that is if it works out — and they have done some substantial testing — the hoverlift principle will be major boon to ice breaking and could in fact be a very substantial aid in keeping for example the port of Churchill and the seaway open for longer periods of the year. Using a bell-shaped hoverlift in front of an icebreaker can increase its capacity by 10 times. So it has some interesting possibilities.

We hope to have our experimental ferry in operation in La Crete this summer to replace a conventional ferry. We see it operating year-round, because it has the capacity to break up to 30 inches of ice. If it were operating every day, no ice would form across its path. I imagine there would be some problem for maybe two or three days in spring when there is a pile-up of ice or something like that, but it's going to be very interesting engineering.

The fact of the matter is that the firm doing the research and development with us and the National Research Council has now had inquiries from Saskatchewan, British Columbia, and Quebec relative to how it operates. They are hopeful we can get this one operating by midsummer so we can develop it.

I can give the hon. member a breakdown relative to bridges. There is a substantial amount in Vote 2. But it's an ongoing program — I think something like 500 bridges to replace. One reason for the increase in the vote we are now talking about, operation and maintenance, is an increase in maintenance in two ways. We've taken over the forestry roads of course, and that requires some additional maintenance. We've also taken over a number of miles of 900 series roads, particularly in the IDs as well as in some of the counties, and we will be maintaining them out of our own budget. The problem is one that has been with us: they know we are eventually going to take over the 900 series roads anyway, so the maintenance on them sometimes leaves something to be desired. So that's the general area there.

Agreed to:

Vote 5 Total Program	\$40,376,293
Vote 6 Total Program	\$2,574,198
Vote 7 Total Program	\$50,601,680

Vote 8

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, on surveys and mapping. They take care of all the surveys as far as highways are concerned, and they are bogged down with subdivision surveys. I wonder if any consideration has been given to separating subdivision surveys, that have to go to the Land Titles Office, from highways surveys to solve a lot of problems we have in that area.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, I think the problem can be solved, and we are now working on trying to speed

up the process in our department. I would hate to see a duplication of the facilities required, though, and I don't think that's necessary. We do understand the problems and delays relative to subdivisions. We are trying to speed that up and expect to have some improvements there.

While I'm on my feet, I would like to answer a couple of things from the Leader of the Opposition. I have a note that rumors from Ottawa are that the Hall commission report may be tabled May 9. I'm not very sure of the rumors that emanate from that particular hothouse.

The explanation relative to the \$177 million is that the figure is wrong by \$6,098,000. This arose as we were able to reduce our request for salary contingency funds by transferring in surplus figures from other votes; however, this took place after the book went to print. That's the explanation.

MR. CLARK: That sounded awfully quick and very simple.

DR. HORNER: Well in fact the \$6 million is in the salary contingency funds that weren't really required. But let me read it the way I've got it.

The figure of \$177 million is wrong by \$6,098,000. This arose as we were able to reduce our request for salary contingency funds by transferring in surplus figures from other votes. However, this took place after the book went to print.

MR. DIACHUK: You know how that happens, Bob?

MR. CLARK: No, I don't know how that happens.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of getting the department's estimates through, I wonder if the minister might agree to perhaps having someone in the department set that out, with reference to which votes. That might speed the passage of the . . .

DR. HORNER: I'll provide the information to the hon. leader.

MR. CLARK: Very good.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Just one further question on property acquisition. I see there's about \$1,300,000 on property acquisition. Could the minister indicate if most of this would be for acquiring right of way for primary highways? When they're acquiring the right of way, are the appraisers who set the value on this government appraisers, or are they in some cases independent appraisers?

DR. HORNER: They're usually both. While we use government appraisers and outside appraisers from our point of view, certainly people selling land to us hire their own appraisers as well. So the answer is both.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, my other question was: is the majority of this \$1,353,732 for acquiring right of way for primary highways?

DR. HORNER: That, and 900 series.

Agreed to:	
Vote 8 Total Program	83,730,561
Capital Estimates	
Vote 1	\$113,800
Vote 2	\$147,944,715
Vote 3	—
Vote 4	\$7,498,000
Vote 5	\$400,735
Vote 6	\$28,834
Vote 7	\$50,601,680
Vote 8	\$206,635,744
Department Total	\$271,666,210

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, I move the resolution be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1978, amounts not exceeding the following sums be granted to Her Majesty for the Department of Social Services and Community Health: \$9,435,460 for departmental support services, \$215,527,390 for social allowance and child welfare, \$41,084,310 for senior citizens' supplementary benefits, \$27,832,660 for preventive and specialized social services, \$40,592,650 for services for the handicapped, \$32,958,140 for treatment of mental illness, \$31,976,680 for preventive and community health services, \$7,094,016 for alcoholism and drug abuse treatment and education.

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1978, amounts not exceeding the following sums be granted to Her Majesty for the Department of Transportation: \$3,351,119 for departmental support services, \$156,526,490 for construction and improvement of highway systems, \$6,625,460 for construction and improvement of rail systems, \$7,880,409 for construction and improvement of airport facilities, \$40,376,293 for operation and maintenance of transportation systems, \$2,574,198 for transportation policy development, \$50,601,680 for urban transportation assistance, \$3,730,561 for surveys and property acquisition.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, to outline the probable course of government business which will be proposed when the Assembly returns next Wednesday, The government days will of course be Wednesday, April 13, in the afternoon; Thursday, April 14, in the evening; and Friday, April 15.

What we propose to do would be to study in

Committee of Supply estimates from subcommittees of the following departments: Recreation, Parks and Wildlife; Energy and Natural Resources; Hospitals and Medical Care; Municipal Affairs; Housing and Public Works; and, assuming there is time on one of those three occasions, the Department of the Attorney General, followed by the Department of Business Development and Tourism.

I would now move, Mr. Speaker, that the Assembly do now adjourn until Wednesday, April 13, 1977, at 2:30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to wish all hon. members a happy Easter.

The Assembly stands adjourned until next Wednesday at half past 2 in the afternoon.

[The House adjourned at 5:27 p.m.]