

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Tuesday, April 18, 1978 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 35**
The Pension Statutes
Amendment Act, 1978

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a bill, being The Pension Statutes Amendment Act, 1978. The principal purpose of this bill is to remedy a result of legislation recently introduced with respect to the treatment of spouses in connection with pension benefits. An additional purpose of the bill is to make some amendments to the current provisions relating to the payment of interest on deposits in respect of pensions.

[Leave granted; Bill 35 read a first time]

Bill 37
The Corrections Amendment Act, 1978

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a bill, being The Corrections Amendment Act, 1978. The principal purpose of this bill is to improve the procedures in regard to internal disciplinary inquiries in correctional institutions.

[Leave granted; Bill 37 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a response to Motion for a Return No. 102.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report of the Alberta Hospital Services Commission for the year ended March 31, 1977.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, a number of young ladies from the Terra school in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Ashmore, Mrs. Robinson, and Mrs. Sehested; and by staff members Mrs. Stretch, Mrs. Geary, and Miss Jeske. They are in the members gallery, and I would like them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the

Assembly, some 50 students from Caroline in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Ken Maki, and by Mrs. Nissen and the bus driver Mr. Ed Keim. They are in the public gallery, and I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I am very honored and privileged to introduce to you and through you a group of 28 students from my constituency and my community, where my wife was born. We still live there. With them came their teacher Mr. Grey and Miss K. Costello. They came here twofold. For some of them it was their first time on the train from Calgary to Edmonton. Also it's their first visit to the Legislative Assembly to see the Assembly in action.

At this time I would like them to rise and receive a welcome from this Alberta Legislative Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Hospital Budgets**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the only question I have today to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Perhaps it's an appropriate day to do it, because the minister tabled in the Assembly today the last report of the Alberta Hospital Services Commission. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly the anticipated effect on hospital waiting lists that the budgets which have been sent to hospitals will have?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, the judgment of the department in applying budgetary policy to the hospital system in Alberta is as it was in the early years of restraint in 1975-76 and 1976-77. The issue of waiting lists has been dramatized much more because of the fact that we have been applying restraint. But in fact waiting lists have not been relatively higher than in years prior to restraints being applied.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate whether he's had representation from hospital boards, especially the urban hospital boards, Edmonton and Calgary, with regard to the effects that the budgets which hospital boards have received from the department are going to have on their waiting lists and on the operation of various wards in the hospital, as to whether or not those wards will be able to continue to operate?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, not to this point. I understand from the Deputy Minister of Hospitals that some hospitals made some informal remarks. But I think what we must bear in mind is that the individual hospital budgets that have been granted throughout the province have been granted on the basis — first of all, with prior consultation with the Alberta Hospital Association — that the existing level and quality of service in the hospital system throughout Alberta should be able to be maintained. Now, if an individual hospital finds they are unable to do so in applying their particular budget, they have a process of being able to come back to the department and demonstrate why, in the case of their particular institution, they are not able to maintain services and

programs at the existing level and quality. If they are able to make their case with the department, certainly the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care would make an adjustment in the case of that individual institution.

But clearly the policy is to maintain the existing level and quality of service in the hospital system. Sometimes there can be mathematical errors in calculations that might require correction for an individual institution.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In the course of maintaining the present standard of hospital care in this province, has the minister's department taken into consideration the need to open wards in various hospitals, i.e. the Foothills Hospital in Calgary where they had to close wards last year?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, when restraints were first applied, individual hospitals made their decision as to what their priorities would be. I indicated in answer to a question in the House, which I believe came from the government side, with respect to the Calgary bed situations — the hon. leader mentions the Foothills Hospital — that in fact we were examining the possibility of phasing in beds which, by the choice of hospitals, had been closed down within the first two years . . .

MR. CLARK: Oh, choice of hospitals, baloney.

MR. MINIELY: . . . which had, within the priorities of the hospitals — they had chosen to close them down, Mr. Speaker. That's accurate.

MR. CLARK: They haven't got any money. They can't operate them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you want to hear him or not?

MR. MINIELY: As the beds are needed, we will look to phase in those beds which had been closed down in past years. But clearly within the parameter, Mr. Speaker, the cities of Calgary and Edmonton — if we're taking those cities as an example, or outside Edmonton and Calgary for that matter — continue to have the highest number of hospital beds per 1,000 population of any province in Canada other than Saskatchewan.

DR. BUCK: The highest closed, too, Miniely.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister: is there a factor in the budgets that have gone to hospital boards, especially in Edmonton and Calgary, which takes into consideration the fact that there are 1,500 additional people coming to each of those centres each month?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, that clearly is in our long-term bed plan population growth as determined from the city of Calgary, and is included in all the assessments we have made. It will be included in the assessment of whether we should open up any additional capacity.

Since the hon. leader is on this topic, I might note that more beds are closed down in the city of Calgary

because of construction which has nothing to do with financial or budgetary reasons than for budgetary reasons. Nevertheless, we have provision for opening up beds as they're needed, both in the short-term and in the longer term, to meet population growth requirements in Calgary.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to bring this to a conclusion, can the minister give the Assembly his assurance that all the beds in Alberta which were closed down last year because of budgetary restraints imposed by the minister will be able to be opened this year?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader leaves by implication in the question that a lot of beds were closed down in Alberta. First, the only beds closed were in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary.

MR. CLARK: Those are the ones we're asking about.

MR. MINIELY: The reason hospitals chose to do that in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, if the hon. leader would like to know the facts, is that there's much more flexibility when the concentration of beds with many hospitals exists in our two major metropolitan centres. Nevertheless, I answered earlier that as those beds are required, and it's demonstrated by need that they are required, yes, we will open up the beds.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can the minister give us his assurance that all the beds available for usage at the Calgary Foothills Hospital will be able to be used in 1978, and that they won't be closed for budgetary reasons?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader seems not to understand that I've just answered that question. First, with respect to a hospital like the Foothills Hospital as an example: that particular institution is running on a global budget of \$30 million. That's a substantial budget. I believe the budget that's been granted to that hospital is \$2 million higher than it was in the previous year. Because we believe there should be effective management of the hospital institution, we first ask hospitals to assess their priorities and apply the \$30 million in as effective a way as possible to meet the needs of the citizens of Calgary and southern Alberta they're intended to serve. If they're able to demonstrate to us that within that \$30 million their only choice is to close beds or wards, or they are not able to open beds or wards, then certainly when that's been demonstrated, Mr. Speaker, we would make a budgetary adjustment.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister, just one last supplementary question. Thanks for the assurance.

But is the minister aware, Mr. Speaker, of the memorandum that's gone from the executive director of the Calgary Foothills Hospital to department heads, section heads, and medical directors, indicating that the funds that are to be made available for that hospital this year "are not sufficient to operate the hospital at the 1977 level much less provide for any improvement in the quality or quantity of services provided." That's the memo from the executive direc-

tor of the Calgary Foothills Hospital to his senior staff people.

My question to the minister is: what steps is the minister going to take, at least to guarantee that the Foothills Hospital in Calgary will be able to operate at the 1977 level, plus open all the beds that were closed last year, plus be able to reduce the long waiting list at that hospital?

MR. MINIELY: It's clear to me that the hon. leader simply reacts to what he reads. There are several responses to that.

MR. CLARK: Talk to the people on the waiting list, then.

MR. MINIELY: The first is that I have not seen the letter the hon. leader is referring to. The second is that the Foothills Hospital has the provision to appeal their budget in the same manner that I indicated in my earlier responses, if those facts can be demonstrated to the department and a budgetary adjustment should be made. The third thing is that I am extremely surprised that an executive director of any hospital in this province would give out such instructions internally before he has gone through the budgetary appeal process with the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care. Mr. Speaker, that doesn't make sense to me.

MR. CLARK: Well, they know how you cut them off last year.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, for clarification I would like to put a supplementary to the hon. minister. The hon. minister has given us some figures with respect to the global budget provided to the Foothills Hospital. Does the minister have a breakdown of the information at hand, as to what this budgetary provision is on a per patient basis?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I don't. But I indicated in my earlier answers that the department will be meeting with the Foothills Hospital. They've received their initial budget figures. Per patient day costs will certainly be one of the factors that will be examined in determining whether the apparent case, referred to by the hon. leader as a letter from the executive director, is in fact true.

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister that in all fairness I have to ask as well. I have received several calls from the Foothills Hospital saying that certain units will be closed because of the restraint of the budget. I think they are quite concerned, especially the staff. I wonder if the minister could assure that no instruction came from his department to try to restrain or cut down services.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, clearly not. Hospitals are institutions intended to assess the priorities within the budget that's been granted to them and then operate within that.

PWA Labor Dispute

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My

question is to the Minister of Transportation. Has the strike at PWA officially ended?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding from the chairman of the board that a tentative agreement has been reached. The employees now have to ratify that agreement.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. If this is so, would the minister convey to the staff who kept it going the sincere thanks of those of us who use PWA quite regularly.

Industrial Heat Usage

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. A very short explanation is required first. For a long time the 80,000 horsepower compressors that pump the oil in our pipelines has simply been dissipated. A recent experiment by Alberta Gas Trunk on or near the Saskatchewan border is using this heat for greenhouse purposes to grow tomatoes, cucumbers, et cetera. In the Alaska pipeline, are there any plans to make use of this heat and not waste it? Is this a fact that could possibly be discussed with the Canadian government?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had an opportunity to discuss it in relation to the Alaska pipeline. However, I have had a discussion with the chairman of the board of Foothills, and Mr. Blair, president of The Alberta Gas Trunk Line Company, and they are quite encouraged by the results of their experiment with gathering the heat that was otherwise lost and being able to grow hothouse vegetables. If the success of the experiment continues to be encouraging, there may well be an ability to come up with a completely new feature in managing the energy lost from these compressors.

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary. I think most of us were unaware of the tremendous heat wasted. Would the research board in the hon. minister's department possibly give some consideration to making other uses of this tremendous amount of heat that's generated and so far simply dissipated?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'd certainly make sure they take a look at that.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the Deputy Premier and Minister of Transportation. When the minister was the Minister of Agriculture, I believe a pilot project was carried on in the Wabamun area using excess heat from steam generation of electricity. Can the minister, or the Minister of Agriculture, indicate if that pilot project is still being carried on?

MR. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker. That project has been completed. A report on it was issued. I'd be happy to provide the hon. member with a copy of the report.

Northern Development

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism in his capacity as chairman of the

Northern Alberta Development Council. I'll try to bypass the comments made by the former mayor of Calgary. I'd like to ask the minister about the rather important meeting, held on Friday and Saturday last week, of reeves, mayors, and representatives of municipalities throughout the Peace River country. What specific steps does the government propose to take to follow up the proposals made at this conference?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm awfully sorry. I missed the first part of the question. I got the latter part.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. The question relates to the conference, held on Friday and Saturday last week, of mayors, reeves, and municipal representatives throughout the Peace River country, who expressed a number of concerns as well as their recommendations. My question to the minister is: where do these concerns and recommendations stand at this stage as far as the government is concerned?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I apologize to the hon. member.

We are now in the process of examining the details of what transpired at that meeting. As the hon. member knows, I was away during the last three days of last week. We are not in a position to make any judgment at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Given the statistics compiled by the mayors and reeves that through bonus sales, oil and gas royalties, as well as other taxes, the Peace River country generates approximately \$1 billion worth of revenue for the province, has the Northern Alberta Development Council compiled any figures on the amount of provincial dollars ploughed back into the region?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, not specifically. But I suppose the same argument — if it's an argument the hon. member is putting forward — could be made for any area of the province that is resource-based with a small population. We're very much aware of the contribution made by northern Alberta to the overall economy of Alberta; but we're likewise very much aware of the contribution made to our economy by any part of the province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the government given any consideration to modifications in the Alberta North Agreement to tailor the '77-82 agreement not only to the remoter areas of the north, but specifically to the broader Peace River region?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what the Alberta North Agreement does. It gives a broader application for the moneys that have been allotted to us. We will be dealing from time to time with various proposals for utilization of that money in conjunction with the provincial funds.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Transportation. Is the minister

in a position to advise the Assembly where things stand on the Hall recommendations with respect to the northwestern region of the province; specifically the recommendation that the CN should acquire the ARR and the other rail lines in the area?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I can answer it this way. That matter was raised at the recent meeting in Yorkton relative to bringing the other western premiers up to date. The province of British Columbia is now showing a great deal more interest in the proposition.

Unfortunately, the best response I've had from Ottawa on that particular recommendation of Mr. Justice Hall is that they would appoint another task force. In an attempt to skirt such a delaying activity, I've approached the president of Canadian National directly and asked him to acquire Canadian Pacific's interest in the NAR and to work out a lease arrangement with us, and perhaps with the BCR, to have one operating authority in northwest Canada.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Given the reluctance, I suspect, of the CN to purchase the ARR, is the government of Alberta of the view, at this stage, that we should push for the Hall report recommendations of the CN actually purchasing the NAR? Or is it the government's view that we should go back to the initial position advanced before the Hall commission hearings; that is, that there would be not necessarily a purchase of other railroads by the CN but an overall operating authority?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I think the primary thing is to reach the objective that we set out to do in the first place. That was to get a simplified, effective, and efficient operation of the railways in northern Alberta. Sometimes one has to take several routes to get at that particular problem.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Transportation. Is the minister in a position to outline to the Assembly whether any progress has been made, or whether he's had any discussions with the officials of the NAR or the CNR, with respect to the proposals in the Hall report for extension of rail lines, and the Manning-Fort St. John proposal?

DR. HORNER: Relative to the Manning-Fort St. John proposal, Mr. Speaker, I've had some brief discussions with the NAR but more particularly with Canadian National. They have done an aerial survey of the routing, but that is all at the moment. They're more particularly conscious, I think, of rail extensions north of Fort McMurray if additional tar sands plants are going to be constructed there. That will be the subject of an economic feasibility study. But to date the engineering side of the routing has been accomplished.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has any time frame been considered by the Alberta government with respect to the major proposals dealing with northwestern Alberta, as to the CN acquiring or working out an operating agreement, plus the extensions? Has any ballpark time

frame been assessed by the government at this stage?

DR. HORNER: Very difficult, Mr. Speaker, because the government isn't in control. We have to continue the pressure, and cajole and use what leverage we have to try to accomplish that particular objective.

MR. SHABEN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture on the topic raised by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. At that excellent meeting on Friday in Grande Prairie, did the minister give any commitment by the government on those very good papers presented by a number of delegates?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, first of all the mayors and reeves of the Peace River country, in organizing this meeting, indicated that the purpose was to provide a number of briefs and to have some discussion with respect to various concerns throughout the Peace River district. The chairman of the meeting indicated it was not his intention to ask for immediate response from government, but to allow us an opportunity over the course of the next few months to assess the matters which had been brought forward. It would be my intention, along with the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, to ensure that where concerns were raised, the various ministers would get copies of those briefs.

I can say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, although it was a very good meeting with I think about 28 of 38 mayors or reeves in attendance, some of the main speakers did leave me with a little feeling that we kicked off the federal Liberal election campaign.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, we'd never want the minister to have that feeling.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the Deputy Premier with regard to northern development. It also flows from the meeting in Yorkton on the weekend. At what stage are negotiations between Alberta and the province of British Columbia, along with the grain handling companies, regarding the possibility of a terminal at Prince Rupert?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, a progress report was given to all the premiers relative to that particular project, and in separate consultations with the province of British Columbia we outlined our objectives. I'm happy to report that British Columbia is in agreement with those objectives. At this time I can't say more than that negotiations are proceeding.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct one further question to the Deputy Premier on the same question. Can the Deputy Premier give an assurance to the Assembly that it's the intention of the government of Alberta, if Alberta puts any funds into the project, that in fact a terminal there would be operated by one or perhaps a combination of the grain handling companies? The reason I ask the question is that I think it's important to get on the record that in fact the government of Alberta doesn't plan to get involved in the grain handling business itself.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I think it may be important to get on the record that we certainly don't intend to get into the grain handling business ourselves.

Coyote Hunting

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. It pertains to the illegal hunting of wildlife with mechanized vehicles. In light of the fact that the estimated total kill of coyotes in Alberta this winter has risen dramatically, could the minister indicate what measures are undertaken by his department to systematically monitor the hunting of wildlife with mechanized vehicles such as snowmobiles and four-wheel drives?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I think some of the points raised by the hon. member are somewhat hypothetical, although certainly many, many cases of using snowmobiles, four-wheel drive vehicles, or the like, particularly for coyote killing, are brought to our attention some time after they happen. We have some concerns within the department that in some local areas there appears to be a much larger kill than we had anticipated.

We have a very diligent staff in the enforcement area of fish and wildlife, and I have them looking into just what numbers possibly may be killed; in other words, we're doing some checking as to the number of pelts sold. Certainly from that standpoint we've also been working with the problem wildlife committee, a joint committee between the Department of Agriculture and members of the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, to see if we can put together some regulations that would in fact cover the problems stated relative to illegal use.

I must say that one of the problems we in the department face, and I think the members of any enforcement unit face, is the fact that the number of people we have on field staff, be they fish and wildlife officers or members of the RCMP, can't be at any specific spot just when that particular infraction occurs. We have to rely a great deal on the co-operation of the public at large in getting the information to us as quickly as they can so that we can pursue the matter.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister given any consideration to protecting coyotes by establishing a season on them?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, that is one aspect that's under consideration right now by the committee I referred to earlier.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has there been any consideration of stopping the hunting of coyotes with hounds?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, a year ago we included in The Wildlife Act the ability to place some regulations for controlling the use of hounds. If you recall, we talked about that in the particular bill and the fact that we had no mechanism to cover any infractions. That mechanism is there, and at the present time we're looking at what regulations we can put in place to have some control, not necessarily total control, over the use of hounds.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to send some coyotes down to Brooks.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Does the minister's department take an annual inventory of our coyotes?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not just sure how to take that particular one. We don't have them line up to count, and I don't mean that facetiously. But we do have the mechanism in place at least to determine to the best of our knowledge the pelts that are sold, and from that to get some spot counts so we can determine by computer approximately what the coyote population is.

Sugar Beet Industry

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. I would like to ask the minister whether he or any of his officials have met with the Alberta sugar beet growers in the last few days with regard to the '78 contract.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, it could well be that members of the staff of the Department of Agriculture located in the Lethbridge region have met with the sugar beet growers. But I can say that the sugar beet growers had arranged for a meeting in conjunction with their MLA Dr. Walker, the Deputy Premier, me, and some others, for Monday this week at 12:30. That meeting was cancelled by them, I understand due to their inability to get here because of flying conditions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether the meeting has been rescheduled, but I expect it will be shortly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Deputy Premier. Has he information with regard to the rescheduling of the meeting? Will there be discussion at that meeting with regard to additional transportation facilities, such as the bridge, the highway, et cetera?

DR. HORNER: Well, that primarily is my involvement at the moment in meeting with the growers, Mr. Speaker. My colleague has outlined the situation. We were going to meet them on Monday. We'll try to restructure that meeting when it's convenient to them and to those of us involved.

Amateur Sports

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife and deals with the funding of interprovincial teams. Can the minister indicate what the guidelines are for the assistance of teams travelling to national championships?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, basically any team winning an Alberta championship — now we're speaking of teams, and I assume also within that individuals who may be provincial winners in individual sporting events — has the right, through the provincial sport governing body, to apply for assistance to go to a western Canadian, Canadian, or international event. At the present time, the assistance they may receive from the province is 25 per cent of their travel costs on that particular application.

Now I should also indicate that we have the ability to assist with some of their training costs through the

program that was announced, I believe two years ago, in which we were providing assistance to Alberta athletes training for the Olympics, for the Olympiad for the disabled, for the Commonwealth Games, or international events like that. On the application by the provincial sport governing body for that particular individual or team, they would receive assistance for some of the training costs. They are paid through the association to that individual or team, and they range in amounts from roughly \$18,000 to maybe \$200 or \$300, depending on what it may be. That is also a payment by the province of Alberta on top of what is called "game plan", the federal program that again provides some assistance.

Now if we're getting closer to home and the coming Commonwealth Games, the 10 sports specifically the responsibility of the Commonwealth Games, there is also a plan in place to assist any athletes. Again the application must come through the provincial governing body that represents the sport in which that athlete or team participates.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister, specifically on the University of Alberta junior girls' volleyball team, who are travelling to Montreal for the national championship. Can the minister indicate if his department would be involved in supporting that team to go to the national championship?

MR. ADAIR: I'm not aware, Mr. Speaker. I would have to take some time to check. That was the Alberta junior girls' volleyball team?

I would assume that if their provincial sport governing body applied on their behalf, they would be eligible for the 25 per cent I spoke of earlier. I'm not sure they have applied. I would have to check that.

DR. BUCK: A further supplementary to the minister. In light of the fact that Alberta is ninth in per capita support of its amateur sports, is the minister considering increasing the funding of support of amateur athletes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take the time of the House this afternoon to debate the question that I read too, and am about to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: In view of the way the question was asked, the minister certainly should not be unduly limited in his answer. [interjections]

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, if I've got all afternoon, we'll have some fun.

In this year's estimates, in fact — and I assume I'll be going into that very shortly — we have provided probably some of the best program funding and assistance to athletes in all of Canada and we lead in total, number one.

DR. BUCK: Those are your figures.

AN HON. MEMBER: You're talking about your own contributions, which were forty dollars.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, they may be my figures, and I'm not an accountant so they can't be fouled up. But I think it should be pointed out very clearly that certainly Alberta does lead in a number of areas. We also were the first to put in place the . . .

DR. BUCK: Per capita, Adair.

MR. ADAIR: Your turn or my turn? Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if he's having a little trouble hearing what I'm saying. I can speak a little louder.

We were the first to put in place the program for the Olympics, the Commonwealth Games, and the Olympiad for the Disabled. That was a follow-through as a result of adding funds to the game plan that was a participating program for all the provinces. We weren't happy with it. We moved quickly enough to ensure that we had more funds in place for those particular athletes, and in general all of them I have talked to have appreciated the support we have provided.

Now, I can say quite unequivocally it doesn't matter how much we provide; it isn't the total amount they would like to have. We recognize that, and on their behalf I'll pursue additional sums as I can throughout the budgetary process.

MR. JAMISON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. I'm sure the people of Alberta are very pleased with the department in its funding and help in the Alberta Summer Games and the Alberta Winter Games. I wonder if the minister is in a position to announce the location of the Alberta Summer Games, 1979; or, if not, when he will be able to make that announcement.

DR. BUCK: Bypass the constituency of St. Albert.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, at this particular time I can't give you the selection of the summer games of '79 or the winter games of 1980. It is my understanding that the committee, the Alberta Games Council, is reviewing on site those particular sites that applied, and that that information should be coming to me by recommendation possibly by the end of this week.

Coal Policy

MR. KIDD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. I anticipate that his answer won't take all afternoon.

To the hon. minister: in view of the present rather adequate supply of natural gas in Alberta, is the government's policy of using coal as an energy source where practical still being consistently monitored and vigorously pursued?

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Grande Prairie Project

DR. BACKUS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation. Is the federal government trying to reduce the size of the proposed air terminal at Grande Prairie?

DR. HORNER: Not that I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker. We have worked well with the western regional officials of the federal Ministry of Transport and, as a matter of fact, have agreement relative to the size of the terminal at Grande Prairie. It should be able to go to tender very shortly.

Medical Examiners

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney General. It follows the questions I asked earlier last week with regard to the resignation of the assistant chief medical examiner. Has the Attorney General had an opportunity to check to see if other members of the staff of the chief medical examiner's office have in fact resigned, in addition to Dr. Markesteyn?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I haven't checked, but it runs in my mind that we did lose one or two employees in the medical examiner field some time in the last several months. But I can't recall that information.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would check. It's my information that four people have left the chief medical examiner's office.

I'd like to ask the Attorney General if he has had an opportunity to check with the chief law enforcement officers in the province, the RCMP and the police commissions in Edmonton and Calgary, with regard to the replacement of Dr. Markesteyn. I ask the question because of the Attorney General's comments earlier when he indicated a forensic pathologist wasn't needed as the assistant. Has the Attorney General checked with the major law enforcement officers in the province to get their view as to the desirability, in fact the necessity, of having a second forensic pathologist on staff in the chief medical examiner's office?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to be smart alec or anything, but according to law I am a chief law enforcement officer in the province. So if you want me to check with myself, I'll give you my opinion. [interjections] I don't know who you intended. Maybe you're talking about my colleague the Solicitor General or indeed the RCMP. But in my judgment — and I'm very confident of the judgment of the police community — it is not essential, it is not necessary but perhaps desirable to have a forensic pathologist.

The point I was making in the House a while ago is that to my knowledge there were only four, and perhaps now three, forensic pathologists in the entire nation of Canada. We happen to be fortunate enough to have two of them in the province of Alberta in the employ of the Crown. As it turns out, we have a forensic pathologist in Dr. John Butt, who is the chief medical examiner. Indeed one might argue, Mr. Speaker — and this is not a debate — that a forensic pathologist is not necessary as the chief medical examiner, but we happen to be fortunate enough to have a highly qualified person, Dr. John Butt, in that position. I do know that Dr. Butt is seeking a replacement for Dr. Markesteyn as deputy chief and that he is talking with a pathologist, but not a forensic pathologist.

I want to assure the Leader of the Opposition, Mr.

Speaker, that the quality of service, indeed the protection the public is entitled to receive from the medical examiner's office, will not be prejudiced whatsoever by the inclusion of a pathologist as deputy chief as opposed to a forensic pathologist.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, let me rephrase the question and ask the Attorney General if he has had consultations with senior RCMP officials in the province or senior officials of the police forces in Edmonton and Calgary with regard to the desirability of having a second forensic pathologist on staff in the chief medical examiner's office.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I have not had such discussions, and even if I had, and the police officers had said it was desirable, I would like the Leader of the Opposition to indicate to me where we would find another forensic pathologist in Canada. The simple fact is that I don't think it's necessary. And whether it's appropriate or not, it's virtually impossible for us to be in the position we were before, when we had two forensic pathologists.

I'm curious, Mr. Speaker — again, unfortunately this is not a debate — why there is such emphasis on replacing the deputy chief with a forensic pathologist. I don't see the need for it at all.

Taxi Robberies

MR. JAMISON: I'd like to direct a question to the Solicitor General. I wonder if the Solicitor General has any advice to give to cab companies or cab drivers who have been subject to armed robberies in recent weeks.

MR. SPEAKER: By "advice", if the hon. member meant information and he would like to be somewhat specific about it, that would be all right. But most advice is in the nature of opinions. Perhaps the hon. member would like to put the question in another way. As the hon. member knows, there are many questions which appear to be out of order, and if put another way are not out of order. Therefore I hesitate to intervene when the substance of the question is in order.

MR. JAMISON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Solicitor General have any information to give to the cab companies or their drivers who have been subject to armed robberies in recent weeks?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly wouldn't advise any cab driver to arm himself with a weapon that's prohibited in law, as I understand they've been talking about it. In many major cities, particularly in the United States, and in London, England, the cabs have shatter-proof glass dividers. If they put such a thing in cabs in Edmonton, of course that would mean the by-law would have to be changed to prohibit passengers riding in the front seat. I understand the cost of putting in a glass divider, depending on the type, would be between \$180 and \$350.

Another possibility is: the RCMP have a swing panel which can be put in position or slid down the back seat at will. These are quite effective, comparatively cheap, and can be moved from one car to another. I believe they cost in the neighborhood of

\$135, plus \$10 or so for installation. They can be installed in about three hours. Of course the RCMP price, which is the price to us, is a bulk price, and they're buying right across Canada. So they may be a little more for a small order for a cab company.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following motions for returns stand and retain their place on the Order Paper: 128, 129, and 130.

[Motion carried]

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, might I revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (*reversion*)

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, it's a very great pleasure for me to welcome here today, and to introduce to you and through you, some very distinguished visitors from a very beautiful part of my constituency, the town of Picture Butte. They are the mayor, Ted Crapnell; councillors Mrs. Thelma O'Donnell and Mr. Ric Casson; and the secretary-treasurer, Mr. Pius Ries. They are here to discuss the social, industrial, and economic future of their community. I would ask them to stand and receive a welcome.

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (*continued*)

131. Mr. Clark moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing the location and cost of all rural hospital construction carried out during the fiscal years 1976-77 and 1977-78 under the \$50 million per annum capital program announced in the 1976 Budget Address.

[Motion carried]

132. Mr. Taylor moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) the names of hospitals in Alberta where abortions were performed;
- (2) the number of abortions in Alberta paid for by the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission during the period (a) April 1, 1976, to March 31, 1977, (b) April 1, 1977, to March 31, 1978;
- (3) during the periods in No. (2), the number of women who were (a) married, (b) single, and
 - under 16 years of age,
 - over 16 and under 18,
 - over 18 and under 25,
 - over 25 and under 35,
 - over 35;
- (4) the number of women in No. (3) who had received abortions (a) once before, (b) twice

- before, (c) three or four times before;
- (5) the total amount paid by the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission for abortions during each period in No. (2).

[Motion carried]

133. Mr. Taylor moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing for the period (a) April 1, 1976, to March 31, 1977, and (b) April 1, 1977, to March 31, 1978, the amount of money paid to the provincial government by the federal government for the custody of federal prisoners in provincial prisons while awaiting trial on federal charges.

[Motion carried]

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

202. Moved by Mr. Stromberg:
Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, in this Year of the Child, urge the government to reaffirm its respect for human rights and its commitment to strive for equality of opportunity for all people by supporting the principle that no child is ineducable. Be it further resolved that this Assembly urge the establishment of a committee, whose membership shall include Members of the Legislative Assembly, professionals in the education field, representatives of volunteer organizations, and members of the public, which shall receive the mandate of this Assembly to recommend just and practical means through which to provide quality education to all Alberta's children. To which the following amendment was moved by Mr. Taylor:
That the period at the end of the last paragraph be deleted and the following words added: and initiate an inquiry into the rights of children and recommend any legislative changes it deems advisable by 1979, which is the United Nations International Year of the Child.

[Adjourned debate March 14: Dr. Webber]

DR. WEBBER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make some brief remarks on the amendment by the hon. Member for Drumheller to the motion made by the hon. Member for Camrose.

Mr. Speaker, without the amendment by the hon. Member for Drumheller, the motion has two parts; the first part dealing with the principle that no child is ineducable, and the second part dealing with establishing a committee to look into the provision of quality education to all Alberta's children. The amendment asks the Legislature to

initiate an inquiry into the rights of children and recommend any legislative changes it deems advisable by 1979, which is the United Nations International Year of the Child.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for this amendment, as I have a great deal of respect for the hon. Member for Drumheller and his ideas. Not too long ago I learned that the hon. Member for Drumheller has been in political office about two months longer than another great politician in this country, Mr. Diefenbaker, which I think is quite an achievement.

Not only has the hon. Member for Drumheller had a great political career — I don't want to put it in the past tense, because I understand he's pursuing this career at the federal level — but in addition to his political career he has a great reputation throughout Alberta for his fine work with young people. I think his concern for the young people of Alberta is reflected in the amendment to this motion. The amendment is a worthy topic of discussion and one which deserves to have a lot more time allocated to it. However, I don't think it should be part of this particular motion.

Children's rights have received considerable attention in the past few years, Mr. Speaker. The Newfoundland Conservative, James McGrath, introduced a private member's bill in the House of Commons to set up a joint federal/provincial work force to establish human rights for children. The B.C. Family and Children's Law Commission has concentrated on legal rights for children. They've outlined 12 recommendations to be adopted as an integral part of new legislation there. Children's rights advocates say we don't have a child-centred culture as is sometimes claimed, and that the Charles Dickens era of disdain for children is still not far enough behind us.

I think that awareness of child neglect, beatings, kidnapping, and custody disputes, is growing stronger. In fact in March 1974, the federal government commissioned a major study on children. That study is due for release this spring. It's from the Canadian Council on Children and Youth.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the question of children's rights is certainly worthy of debate and should have considerable attention. However, it is my view that the amendment really broadens the scope of this motion, which, if I can say so, is extremely broad anyway. I'd be happy to take part in a debate related to the rights of children, if the hon. Member for Drumheller would put such a motion on the Order Paper. However, it's my view that we should debate Motion No. 202 without the amendment.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few observations in connection with the motion before us, particularly as the amendment relates specifically to it, and the changes which I think the amendment would convey.

First of all I'd like to compliment the mover of the amendment, the hon. Member for Drumheller, who is supporting a motion which I also applaud, put on the Order Paper by the hon. Member for Camrose. I think both motions show the concern and empathy those hon. members have for youth and children. Both motions point in the direction of concerns which all of us in public office share.

Mr. Speaker, I should wish to express my reservations with respect to the amendment this way: first of all, with respect to the hon. Member for Drumheller, could I point out to him that I have great concern about the use of the expression "inquiry". It sent shivers down my spine. I know it was not his intention that the inquiry proposed here would be of that nature. But it does suggest, and indeed would be, a very major undertaking.

The original motion as I read it was concerned primarily with education, the prerogatives or rights of youth and children in the area of education. It seems to me this amendment broadens the scope very great-

ly. Just to give an indication of my concern with respect to the broadening nature of the amendment, it seems to me it would get us involved in such questions as the age of adulthood. We could translate that another way and say the whole area of juvenile delinquency and who is a juvenile delinquent. We've already had some debate about that on a motion which I put on the Order Paper earlier.

It also gets us into the question of curfew, which has been raised in this House by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that gets us involved in the whole issue of parental responsibility: the rights of the parent as opposed to the gradual and growing independence of the child and the breaking away of the child from the family unit. At what stage should that occur? Who has the responsibility as that happens? I think a whole series of social issues are opened up by this.

The hon. Member for Macleod has had on the Order Paper a resolution dealing with the opportunity for medical services to children. It seemed to me that resolution engendered a great deal of debate, pro and con. It certainly engendered some mail. I know that some was initiated, because I've been on the receiving end of correspondence stimulated by that particular resolution and the points of view expressed in connection with it.

Mr. Speaker, I think I'd just like to say that those two items alone, curfew and the opportunity for medical services without parental consent, indicate to us how comprehensive, difficult, and far-reaching this amendment might be. I can think of this amendment taking us into the area not only of education, which is the substance of the original motion, but of health, child abuse, medical treatment, the level of fiscal support which should be available to children as a right through the Department of Social Services and Community Health. Hon. minister, it could very well take us in that kind of direction.

I have a constituent who, given the opportunity, would be more than pleased to make a submission on the opportunity and the right to employment which should be available to whom we consider as children, if they so desire. On behalf of persons who have underage kids — if I can use that expression — he has made a representation to me that these people would be much better off being permitted employment than prohibited from being employed because they're underage and forced thereby to try to raise their spending money in less legal and less responsible ways and, instead of concentrating their efforts on something positive, being forced to entertain themselves. And their entertainment and self-amusement leads, I think, to what we refer to as vandalism. Certainly in his opinion, it does.

I think it would raise a number of questions with respect to some of the protective labor regulations and legislation we have introduced, or which was here before most of us in the present Assembly came to the Assembly. It will get us into a very complex field. Maybe it needs inquiry, but my point in rising at the present time is to indicate the breadth, complexity, and magnitude of the task this amendment would suppose.

Mr. Speaker, I might make the additional point that not only does the amendment presume that by 1979 this task could be accomplished in terms of identifying what we desire in principle as a society, it further

presumes we could analyse what we already have in relation to what we desire. I say "already have", in terms of the legislative framework. I call to the attention of hon. members the duration most of the examinations by our legal friends require. With all respect to lawyers, I think there is no way the law commission, given a mandate to inquire into this, could possibly review all the legislation which bears on children within this time frame.

Mr. Speaker, I say again that I think both the amendment and the original motion reflect a concern and empathy for children. I would point out, however, that I think the mandate and the time frame would be just too large. It would become an unmanageable task. I cannot support the motion on the amendment for that reason.

While I am on my feet on the matter, although it seems to accept the presumption contained in the first part of the hon. member's motion, the amendment does not make the presumption, the principle, that no child is ineducable. I'm not sure what that means, and I would have grave difficulty trying to sort out in my own mind what it means when we come to the ultimate decision which has to be taken. This amendment does not affect that, so I'm still left on the horns of that dilemma regardless of the outcome on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have advanced, I find that while I am in sympathy with and supportive of the intent of the hon. member in proposing this amendment, I think it is not a task which can be realistically accepted without a very, very major undertaking over a long frame of time. Therefore I cannot support it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, very briefly I would like to make several observations on the amendment. First of all, I support both the resolution put forward by the hon. member for Camrose, and one can't really oppose in principle the amendment moved by the hon. Member for Drumheller. The only problem is: should we be dealing with this particular amendment to the motion of the hon. Member for Camrose, or should we in fact be looking at two separate motions?

Mr. Speaker, my view is that the proposal made by the hon. Member for Drumheller is sufficiently important that it might well be worth while for this Legislature to establish a committee to look at the rights of children in the broadest sense and separate that question. If we're getting into child neglect, child beating, age of majority, the whole question of medical rights, it seems to me that is something which should be looked at when one views the amendment.

But the proposal made by the hon. Member for Camrose deals with the right to education and, more specifically, with the rights of those people who have not normally been educated to the full extent, I think, of society's obligation to provide educational opportunities for Alberta children. Because we're talking, to a large extent, about education for the handicapped, I think we would be making a mistake by passing an amendment which would draw such a broad assignment for the committee that we lose sight of the original proposal of the hon. Member for Camrose, which in my judgment is a worth-while proposal and one I fully support.

So while all members of the House would have sympathy for the amendment, I submit it would be

unwise at this point in time to pass the amendment because we would be broadening the scope of the responsibilities and detracting from the objective of the original motion. That being the case, while I have a great deal of sympathy for the proposal made by the hon. Member for Drumheller, I would recommend that the appropriate course for the government to follow, particularly because of 1979 being the United Nations International Year of the Child, would be perhaps to look very seriously at some appropriate response, separate from the amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

I would fully support their moving in that direction. But as part of the motion before us, I think it would broaden a motion which at least is aimed at the right to education, essentially of our handicapped children in Alberta. I think that's where the emphasis should be if this motion is to have any meaning.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

[Motion lost]

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the main motion I would like to make amendments, and have copies for you and other members of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the remarks made by the hon. Member for Camrose when he introduced this resolution on March 14, were among the most carefully considered and important to be addressed to this Assembly in a long time. I think it would be worth all members' time to keep in mind the remarks of the hon. Member for Camrose on that occasion.

I would like to begin by saying I share with him the conviction that no child is ineducable. My wife worked for a few years at the Jean Vanier School in Sherwood Park. I suppose because of the namesake, the students and teachers in that school took a good deal of interest in Jean Vanier's work in France and in the Jean Vanier centres subsequently established around the world. As a result of what I learned through that experience, and what I observed in other experiences, I believe unequivocally that no child is ineducable.

I also believe the practice of the Department of Education affirms this belief. It seems to me that in the deliberate way of the public service everywhere, the programs they are experimenting with and that they transfer from the experimental stage to the ongoing stage demonstrate their belief that, with imagination and resources, you can provide some level of education to any child born into this world. Now, in some cases it may be we're talking about such a rudimentary level of education it is more properly called training than education. Nevertheless, I believe every child is susceptible to some kind of approach that will improve his ability to relate to the world around him.

The study going on at Mayfield School in Edmonton with respect to children suffering from Down's syndrome is perhaps a good current example. The willingness of the Department of Education at least to consider an ongoing shared responsibility for that program with the Edmonton Public School Board supports my belief that they too believe education can be applied to any and every child over time.

Nevertheless, following the comments made by my

colleague from Edmonton Jasper Place, I do not believe the first operative clause can pass the scrutiny of this Assembly at this time, because of honestly held differences of judgment, first, as to what constitutes education and, second, as to whether or not every child is educable. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the first and second parts of the amendment I have submitted to you first of all make consistent the reference to the Year of the Child, which is 1979, not 1978; secondly, delete the words "that no child is ineducable" and replaces them with the words "every child has the right to an education or training appropriate to his or her needs". So the first operative clause, if I may amend it, would read:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, in anticipation of the observance of 1979 as the United Nations International Year of the Child, urge the government to reaffirm its respect for human rights and its commitment to strive for equality of opportunity for all people, by supporting the principle that every child has the right to an education or training appropriate to his or her needs.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion an interpretation of the education or training appropriate to the needs of every child means some degree of education or training for every child. I make the amendment because I believe my conviction is not shared by all my colleagues in the Assembly.

The third part of the amendment, if I may make it, would be with respect to the second operative clause. I disagree with the second operative clause. I agree with the intent, but not the proposal. What is required is not more study, and not the presentation to this Assembly, or indeed to anyone else, of the just and practical means through which to provide quality education to all Alberta's children. The parents of the children in this position are the parents who have written to all of us as Members of the Legislative Assembly, and said: it is time to stop taking surveys; it is time to stop reviewing the literature; it is time to stop comparative studies of what is happening in other jurisdictions; and it is time to start implementing some of these programs in this province and, for better or for worse — hopefully for better — to learn from the experience of doing rather than from the experience of studying.

Not more study, but rather more action, is required. We need to do something which will create the opportunity to identify, by name and location, special students who live in our province. We need twice as many special education teachers as we have right now. We need 3,000, not 1,500. We need specially prepared teachers. We need four to five times as much curriculum material as is presently available. We need to have that curriculum material produced locally. What is required now is to continue the job that has been begun to provide next year more teachers and more locally produced curriculum material than we have this year.

Mr. Speaker, we need local governance in the delivery of these special education programs. We need to use the local school board as the vehicle of delivery. As much as possible, we need to minimize the active participation of the Department of Education in the delivery of these special education programs to the students wherever they live. And we need strong parental involvement in all these programs.

We need to pursue those activities now, Mr. Speaker, rather than another year or two of study, even presuming that as disparate a group as Members of the Legislative Assembly, professionals in the education field, representatives of volunteer organizations, and parents, could agree on the just and practical means through which to provide quality education. Nothing would be more likely to hang up the delivery of these programs to the students who need them than putting those four groups together and asking them to agree upon the means by which an end is going to be achieved.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend the second operative clause to delete all the words after "urge" and replace them with the words:

... the government to continue, with all deliberate speed, extending the provision of quality education to all the children of Alberta who can benefit therefrom.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, the clause which is particularly important is: "with all deliberate speed". What I offer to the hon. minister, if he would care to accept, and what I hope other members will offer him as well, is support in the budget deliberations this fall, this winter, and subsequently, so the work that has been done in doubling the number of teaching positions since 1972, in increasing the level of participation from 1 to 7 per cent of the affected population — that thrust and that momentum — can be continued for the next five years. If it is, hopefully we will be involving 13 to 14 per cent rather than 7 per cent of our school-age population in special education, and will have the teachers and curriculum material required.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, having mentioned curriculum material, I would like to make a special plea for those who are severely deaf and multiply handicapped. I noted in the ministerial statement on, I think, March 27 that a good deal of money was going to be spent in the development and preparation of material for the blind.

I had someone living in my constituency who last fall moved his family to North Dakota because of his personal conviction, whether we share it or not, that for his severely deaf, multiply handicapped child the opportunities for education would be better in the state of North Dakota — with a population of 855,000 — than they would be in the province of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, that represents the loss of the parent who was making a significant contribution to this province, and ultimately it represents the loss of a child who might otherwise have grown up in this province and made as significant a contribution as his father and mother. I think that's unfortunate. I would like to see us moving so that does not happen too many more times in the future.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the amendments I have submitted to you and the other hon. members.

Thank you.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, if I may enter the debate on the amendment and on the motion itself. First of all I'd like to congratulate the hon. Member for Camrose for introducing the subject by his resolution. The area we're dealing with is an emotional one. It shows the empathy, the sympathy the hon. Member for Camrose has for our students, in particular those

students who have handicaps. It's an emotion of the heart, Mr. Speaker.

We all recall the words, and their source: whatsoever you do for the least of my brethren, you do unto me. I recognize that type of concern in the thoughts of the Member for Camrose and of all who have spoken on this resolution, both in connection with the resolution and the amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Drumheller, although it was subsequently defeated.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the subject I would like to indicate some of the progress that has been made in ministering to the needs of the least of our brothers. Some of these highlights have already been raised during the course of this debate. In the last number of years, particularly since the 1970-71 and '71-72 school years, there has been a tremendous growth in special education facilities available in this province. One has only to look at the growth in special education teaching positions. With the 120 announced in the budget and enlarged upon in my ministerial statement this spring, the total provided in this budget will be 1,525 — one in 15 teachers in this province; 7 per cent of all teachers, as the Member for Edmonton Highlands pointed out, are providing direct special education services under this particular program. That's a growth, Mr. Speaker, a substantial growth. We're looking at a tripling of special education teaching positions in a period when the school population has in fact declined by almost 1 per cent. So that represents a substantial commitment to a very important area.

At the same time we've seen the funding for these positions increase dramatically. In 1972 the teaching position grant was \$5,000. Now we see that grant, at its lowest level of \$10,050, more than a doubling in the five or six year period, all the way up to \$19,875 for a special education teaching position which provides services for deaf children in a total communication package: a very substantial increase in support.

It's not only through the special education teaching positions that we provide services to the handicapped in this province. We help these students through the early childhood services in this province. We help them sooner than might have been the case were it not for such a program. Our early childhood services program is renowned in terms of its approach and its success. We have had reference made to it not only within this country, on this continent, but in Europe as well.

Last night we dealt fairly quickly with the estimates of ACCESS. Had I been asked, I would have raised with the members of the committee . . .

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. minister, and perhaps he can assist me in this regard, I'm having great difficulty relating his remarks specifically to the question as to whether or not this motion should be amended in the manner proposed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands. It seems to me that what we're getting is a speech of a general nature on the topic of education and the achievements of the Department of Education.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I don't have a copy of the hon. member's amendment before me. But as I recall, the words that were used by the hon. member in the third portion of the amendment asked

that the government be urged "to continue, with all deliberate speed, extending the provision of quality education to all the children of Alberta who can benefit therefrom." My remarks at this particular point are being directed to what is being done and what should be done in the future, which is directly on point with the hon. member's proposed amendment to the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister would be entitled to debate that point once it was included in the motion. It's not yet included in the motion, and the question is whether or not it should be.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the comments I now make are in support of including that in the motion. Were I not convinced of the direction we have taken to this date, and the direction we should continue to take, I could not support the amendment. I had hoped my remarks were going in the direction of indicating that support, perhaps moving a little slowly, but I think deliberately in any event.

As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, the support we provide to students with learning disabilities or handicaps is not limited to support in the special education teaching position area. We find that support in the early childhood services program. I was commenting on the success of our early childhood services program. The fact that the ACCESS-produced films relative to that program are made available and being sold in the United States is a tribute to the efforts of both ACCESS and the early childhood services program in this province.

The early childhood services program is a combination of the efforts of a number of departments, including the Department of Social Services and Community Health, the Department of Culture, and the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. The efforts of those groups are more than educational in terms of a child's needs. Through this process, we can find earlier those children who have handicaps and deal with those handicaps in a much more successful fashion. So the ECS program is a very useful tool in the overall development of special education programs for students in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. minister, and I really apologize for interrupting again, but it seems to me that what we're doing here very specifically is debating a part of the amendment as if it were already in the motion, and it's not in the motion. The merits of the motion as amended are not yet before the House, and they won't be until the amendment has been agreed upon. With great respect, it would seem to me that the hon. minister's remarks are somewhat previous, and that we should first of all settle whether the amendment should be included in the motion or added to the motion. Then we may debate the substance of the amendment on its own merits, as it affects the motion.

MR. KOZIAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll direct my remarks specifically to the question of the amendment, as suggested by the Chair. I hope the points I've made have not been missed by hon. members, and I trust I'll be able to use them again during the course of further debate on the amended motion.

MR. SPEAKER: That's precisely the problem.

MR. KOZIAK: I must commend the Speaker for his adeptness in being able to discern the purpose behind some of my remarks, and plead guilty.

I would urge all hon. members to support the amendments of the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands to the original motion.

The confusion that exists — for example, the Year of the Child, which appeared at one time relative to the motion and the earlier amendment which was defeated — sometimes appears in the area of special education. The suggestion that no child is ineducable, although we wish it were so, is not logical. No amount of wishing is going to make it so. Although we would like all children to be normal and able to learn at the same speed in a normal classroom setting, that is not in fact the case.

The change the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands recommends in his amendment is one I heartily support and would ask all hon. members to support.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, at some risk I would like to comment on the amendment before us. I'd like to say that I heartily endorse the amendment. I think it gets at the concern I mentioned previously and which was alluded to here.

I would like to be a little bit personal for just a moment in my support of this amendment. I have a nephew whose situation would be covered by the proposal here. I would just say this: the child did not have a very bright future at birth. In a normal situation, without very special care and a great deal of effort on the part of his parents, he would not have had a very long future, according to all the forecasts at that time. Through some special effort on the part of the parents in finding appropriate circumstances and an appropriate school, he was able to develop to a considerable degree. I don't call it education, but certainly a longer and happier life for the child and, in a certain respect, an easier life for the parents, were made possible. I am pleased to see the amendment to the first paragraph of the motion, because I think the amendment more adequately covers what I envisaged was happening with that individual.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the amendment to the second part, because again I feel the main progress which can be achieved is the progress which can come about through those things we're already aware of. It's a matter of putting them in place and relating them to the existing situation and systems we have; in other words, to seek out the nooks and crannies and gaps that may exist in our system for education of these particular individuals.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment and encourage all hon. members to do likewise.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I want to make some very brief comments on this amendment.

The original motion uses the term "ineducable". I have some concern about that particular term, as other members have already indicated. To state that no child is ineducable — though it's apparently an admissible statement to professionals in the special education field — causes me considerable concern. I think the important question to ask is: given the level of handicap, is a child receiving education or training appropriate to his or her individual needs? That ques-

tion could be qualified even further by asking the question: does equal opportunity exist in access to educational and training services?

Therefore I think I agree with the more appropriate wording that exists in the second part of this amendment. It would clarify the original motion in terms of the actual issue at hand. However, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the third part of that motion, I just want to indicate that the term "quality education" also causes me some concern. I think the phrase "quality education" is very subjective. It can be interpreted to include a variety of principles and objectives. I think it's essential that that term be defined before policy decisions are made with respect to the education of handicapped children. However, for the purpose of debate in the Legislature, I don't think my hang-up with the term "quality education" is sufficient to speak against the amendment. In fact I support the amendment.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to these amendments, I can agree on the first amendment, the words "the Year of the Child". But getting into the second amendment moved by the Member for Edmonton Highlands, I'm afraid these two amendments are going to water down my intent. I see you frowning, Mr. Speaker; perhaps I might ask you for a ruling. Can I speak on the amendments?

MR. SPEAKER: My understanding is that the hon. member will have the right to close the debate. If the amendments are made to the motion, he can comment on them at that time; if they are not made, he won't have to.

Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

[Motion carried]

MR. SPEAKER: In regard to speaking on the motion as amended, if hon. members who don't have copies of the amendment and wish to speak on the motion as amended would indicate, I'll see that they are presently provided with copies.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I won't begin my remarks ... [interjections] Dr. Buck is back, I see. You can read my earlier remarks in *Hansard*.

DR. BUCK: I've been here all the time, Julian.

MR. KOZIAK: I've already dealt with the special education teaching positions and the question of the early childhood services program. In connection with the early childhood services program, I should add that I mentioned it's a co-operative effort involving a number of departments. The process of providing at an earlier age these services involving other departments permits the discovery of particular handicaps in children, and the ability to provide whatever services are needed to ensure that that child benefits from an education to the best of his or her ability. In the area of the hearing impaired, that is provided at an even earlier age than it is with respect to other students.

I should also reflect for a second on the Mayfield project here in the city of Edmonton where, jointly with the Department of Social Services and Community Health and the good support of my colleague the

Hon. Helen Hunley, the Edmonton Public School Board is providing services for children between the ages of zero and two-and-one-half to three who have Down's syndrome, working toward improving their ability to cope to whatever extent they can in life, having regard for the handicap they are born with.

Services also are provided to students with handicaps of whatever form, by virtue of other programs in addition to those I've mentioned. For example, the compensatory section of the educational opportunity fund, the elementary opportunity fund, and the learning disabilities fund: all these assist in perhaps diagnosing and providing services for students who are found in this fashion.

No, Mr. Speaker, at this particular point in the provision of special education to students, I don't think we need another study. I'm pleased the motion has been amended, because a study was completed in the summer of 1977. That study indicated that almost 10 per cent of the elementary and junior high school students in this province are receiving some special attention, whether by virtue of the special education teaching positions or other programs I referred to earlier in my contribution to this debate.

The 120 additional special education teaching positions announced in the ministerial statement is, I hope, the direction we should continue to go until we have provided for all students who have been located. As a matter of fact I should point out here, in terms of those children who are severely handicapped, who are more than just mildly retarded: if those children are located, when they are located, a service is provided. If a school board that has within its jurisdiction students of that nature who fall within the Type A positions, identifies those students, and provides a teacher to deal with their needs, funding is automatically provided.

The growth in this particular area has been about 100 per cent in the last six years, but this is not the area where the greatest growth is taking place. The greatest growth takes place in areas where it's more difficult to find the handicapped child. With the blind, the deaf, and multiply handicapped, it's much easier to identify those children and provide services for them. But there are students within our schools who are having difficulties, whether by virtue of a learning disability or otherwise, who are not as easily identifiable as somebody you can pick out just by looking at them. As these students are identified over time, services are provided by these special education teaching positions that this year's budget will provide.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to support the resolution as amended, urging the government "to continue with all deliberate speed [to extend] the provision of quality education to all the children of Alberta who can benefit therefrom", in accordance with the motion.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I rise for the third time today, which I'm not used to doing, but we'll have a third shot at it now. The third occasion gives me an opportunity to finally congratulate the Member for Camrose for bringing the motion to the attention of the Assembly, even though it's been revised considerably from what he had. I think we do need to be reminded of the high priority necessary for quality education of all children. That includes the handicapped, and I include the gifted in the handicapped.

It's also important to understand the importance of maintaining the highest possible standards in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to do two things this afternoon: one, to provide a brief background on education of the handicapped and, secondly, to add to some of the comments from the minister with regard to our progress over the past several years. The term "handicapped" is one of common usage to identify a broad range of kinds and degrees of exceptionality among students. An educational definition of an exceptional child is: one who deviates from the average or normal child in mental, physical, or social characteristics to such an extent that he or she requires a modification of school practices or special educational services in order to develop to his or her maximum capacity.

Thus you can see the concept of exceptionality is highly relative. It could include those I've mentioned before, who are referred to as gifted. However, the term "handicapped" generally includes those categorized having, first of all, sensory disorders, such as those with hearing and visual problems. Secondly, it includes those having mental disorders, such as the educable mentally retarded, the trainable mentally retarded, and the custodial mentally retarded. The third category of handicapped are those with communication disorders; that is, those with basic psychological process problems in understanding or using spoken or written language. They're often referred to as the learning disabled. Further, Mr. Speaker, there are those who have neurological, orthopedic, or physical impairments and, finally, those having behavioral disorders, such as the emotionally disturbed.

Now these classifications do not reflect the growing number of subcategories of children with whom particular services may be developed, especially those with specific learning problems. Nor, Mr. Speaker, does it deal adequately with children who could logically be placed in more than one category, those who fall between categories, and those who are multiply handicapped.

In the past, and to some degree today, the learning experiences in the school, the curriculum, the organization, and the instruction, were directed toward the so-called average students. They were in the majority. Students who did not respond reasonably well often dropped out of school or completed their education outside the regular school system. These were the slow learners, for whom the teachers, by reason of the limitations of their teaching situation or of their professional capabilities, could provide only minimal individual attention. Those with learning disabilities that were more aggravated might not attend school more than a year or two, and a few might never enrol in school.

However, the gradual evolution of concern for and understanding of individual differences in children produced a variety of attempts to overcome learning disabilities and learning difficulties, or to modify school programs sufficiently to warrant continued attendance by these children. Mr. Speaker, these efforts resulted in the special education programs, opportunity classes, remedial classes, and resource centres that we see in our school system today.

The traditional view that provincial authorities should be responsible for the severely handicapped, and that other deviations in children fall somewhere

between the responsibility of the school and the home, has undergone considerable change in the last 20 years. In recent years the education of the handicapped has tended to become a shared responsibility of institutions and the regular school system. I believe there is still a great need for special schools such as the Alberta School for the Deaf, which is administered by provincial authorities. But the basic school system is gradually expanding its services for students whose handicaps are less severe and amenable to modified programs which can be given in the educational environment of a regular school.

A question often asked, Mr. Speaker, is: how many of our children are handicapped? The 1970 Commission on Emotional and Learning Disorders in Children, often referred to as the CELDIC report, indicates it is very difficult to answer statistical questions about the number of handicapped. However, the commission indicates that somewhere between 2 and 3 per cent of the school-age population of Canada are in full-time special educational placements, and a further 8 to 12 per cent of the children are considered to need additional help both in and outside the school.

I'd now like to turn for a few moments to some initiatives our government has taken in the last few years, which I think reflect the high priority we've given to the education of the handicapped. In researching this particular motion, Mr. Speaker, I found it difficult to ascertain precisely the total funds that have been made available, in that there are a number of programs, which the minister mentioned a few minutes ago, which yield part of their funding to the education of the handicapped, and other programs where the total funding goes into this area.

The learning disability fund was established in 1973 to provide school boards with funds for the assessment of children with learning disabilities and the development of programs to improve their performance at school. That fund has grown from \$10 per elementary school student to \$17.80 in 1978-79, up to a maximum of \$108,000 per school board.

The early childhood services program, which the minister referred to, was also established in 1973 for children four-and-a-half to five-and-a-half years of age, with special funding for the assessment and education of handicapped children, including three-and-a-half-year-olds. That fund, which started with \$4.7 million, has now reached the level of \$19,795,000 — almost \$20 million — a 14.3 per cent increase over 1977-78.

Again back in 1973, Mr. Speaker, two pilot projects became operational. One was a learning assistance centre in Grande Prairie and the other the learning assistance field service in Red Deer. Each program serves a large area by means of an assessment and program development mobile team. I understand that these two programs have now become permanent and are no longer simply pilot projects.

Grants for special education teaching positions, as the minister indicated, are \$10,050 for resource rooms and mildly handicapped and range from \$12,860 to over \$19,000 for positions which serve the severely handicapped. Again, that's for the '78-79 year. Compare that with the \$5,000 in 1972 the minister referred to earlier.

Also for the 1978-79 school year the Department of Education has proposed, as he indicated, 120 new special education teaching positions, I think a tre-

mendous increase. It brings the total up to over 1,500 teachers, nearly 7 per cent of the total teaching force in the province.

The increase in the number of students enrolled in special education programs in Alberta over the last few years has been indeed remarkable. In 1972 about 5,400 students were enrolled in special programs, which constituted something like 1.3 per cent of the total school enrolment. Because many children who benefit from special ed. programs are integrated into regular classrooms, their actual numbers are difficult to ascertain today. The conservative estimate is around 17,700 at this time, a tremendous increase in the last few years.

Another program established in 1973, Mr. Speaker, was the educational opportunity fund. That fund provides for the operation of quality improvement projects covering a wide range, including remedial reading, remedial mathematics, upgrading teaching skills, and the provision of additional materials and equipment. Again a remarkable increase, from \$4.5 million in 1973 to over \$8 million in 1978-79. That includes a 13.5 per cent increase over the previous year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I could go on with these statistics on the availability of programs for the handicapped in Alberta, but I think it's clear from the foregoing that our government has taken tremendous steps in the last few years to assist in the education of the handicapped in this province. By saying that, I certainly realize at the same time the need for continued emphasis and priority in this area in the future.

About a month ago, during debate when the motion came up the first time, I think reference was made to the possibility of using heritage savings trust fund money for research in the area of identification of disabilities among our children in the province, and I think that thought is worthy of consideration.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would again like to congratulate the Member for Camrose for bringing this most worth-while motion to the floor. I look forward to comments from other hon. members.

Thank you.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, may I express my thanks and appreciation to all who have taken part in the debate on this motion, both pro and con. Listening with considerable interest to this debate, I was surprised that none of the rural members followed up on some of my remarks where I voiced the concern of zone four of the Alberta school trustees: the lack of facilities out there in rural Alberta compared to Edmonton and Calgary for schools such as the Cairns type school, the Wagner type school, where the child can get a work experience.

AN HON. MEMBER: You said it all, Gordon.

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you.

I did appreciate the Member for Drumheller for his amendment on the need for a bill of rights. Nowhere in our legislation do we have stated and spelled out

clearly that it's the right of the child in this province to have the best education the state can afford. Believe me, there are children out there whose parents today, as I said earlier in my remarks, are subsidizing their children's education, especially in the retarded schools. They're subsidizing by driving their children over 100 miles to attend opportunity schools.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect I could agree with the first amendment — the Year of the Child; whether it's this year, next year — I wanted it this year, and I wanted this bill to pass consent here.

But the other two amendments: my concern is that I'm afraid they are watering it down. Are we going to see action? If we vote on this motion favorably, is the minister going to proceed with all haste? Are we going to see a lot of action coming out of that department, dust flying, and ministerial announcements right and left? I would hope so.

Mr. Speaker, the minister mentioned the progress especially in the field of special education. Yes, there has been tremendous progress since 1971. But I also might remind members that there has been tremendous progress in other provinces. There has been progress especially in the United States that I think is superior to the progress in this province, and especially progress in Europe. So I suppose we're just keeping up with what other countries and provinces have done in the area of special education and the education of our retarded children. What I'd like to see is this province becoming another leader. We're a leader in many areas. Perhaps we could be a leader throughout the world in this very important investment, the investment of the education of our children.

I'd like to remind the minister that when I look at this progress I can remember when retarded children in my constituency never had the opportunity to attend a school. They stayed at home. They were shut out. You bet we've come a long way. But I don't know why we still have retarded schools that are being built. They're being built across the track. They're being built over here. They seem to hide them in the town. Don't put them downtown where everybody can see them. Mr. Speaker, for the life of me, I cannot understand why, when a retarded school is built, there has to be that big sign up there — Burgess School for the Retarded. [inaudible] school for the retarded. Why couldn't they be called any type of school other than retarded? Why advertise the fact? [interjections] Was that the one you graduated from, Bill? Oh, I'm sorry. That was the Two Hills one.

I think we also have to recognize that the Lethbridge public school board has shown tremendous leadership . . . Mr. Speaker, with all due regard, I have nothing but praise for the Two Hills retarded school in graduating the Member for Edmonton Beverly. Look what it did for him. [interjections] Oh, he didn't graduate. I see.

But the Lethbridge public school board, Mr. Speaker, was the first in Canada to integrate its retarded school right into the core school. I'm very pleased and have had the opportunity . . .

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question.

MR. STROMBERG: Against my better judgment, yes.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. member is referring to schools for retarded students or retarded schools.

MR. STROMBERG: Both. The Wetaskiwin school last year — the buildings branch of the Department of Education agreed to the funding. They brought in a portable classroom, and it was put right onto the side of the core school. These retarded children now are integrated in many activities in that school — into the gymnasiums, sports — and they're no longer hidden. They're part of the community. For both Lethbridge and Wetaskiwin I think that is quite a step to be the first and second in Canada.

I would like to recommend to the minister, or to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, one area I did not touch on in my remarks a month ago: we seem to get the children who are eligible for a retarded school from there to a sheltered workshop, and after they've graduated we forget about them. They're dropped out of the scene. Now some associations of parents with retarded children have undertaken to find meaningful employment for their children. I think we really don't know the actual population of the retarded children and adults, especially in rural Alberta.

The minister mentioned some of the advancements we've made, and in his ministerial announcement [spoke] of 180 special school teachers. But I pointed out to him earlier that 12 per cent of the school population is deemed to be in need of special education. Taking that percentage, we need 1,200 special education teachers today in this province. The 180 that were funded fall quite a bit short of that figure of 1,200.

The minister mentioned the number of teachers he's funding for the retarded schools. Yes, it's great. We now have some extra funding for teachers at the retarded schools, extra funding for teachers in special education. But there's still a big gap out there. Has the minister thought of or recognized the fact that parents of children with learning difficulties are forming groups throughout Alberta? These parents are going into the school and are helping the special education teacher, the opportunity room teacher, to work with those children.

A special education teacher getting down to perhaps a class of 10 — but there's quite a difference taking a child out of a classroom, taking him for a walk down the road, and let's count the power poles. That's where the parents of children with learning difficulties are filling quite a role in our educational field. It's voluntary, and that's the way it should be. I suppose what I'm trying to impress on the minister is that there's still quite a gap there. I, along with I hope a great majority of Albertans, am of the opinion that dollars spent on the education of our children is the soundest investment this Assembly can pass.

Mr. Speaker, some members seem to have a little problem with the ineducable child. I have visited ASH/Deerhome. Why I made that statement: regardless of how severe that retardation is, you can teach that child many things. Maybe it's just bathroom habits; maybe it's tying his shoes; maybe it's learning to play with toys, and that's as far as you're going to teach him. But I think that's a tremendous step.

I agree whole-heartedly with the Member for Edmonton Highlands and the minister. We've had too

darned many studies, too much time has been spent on this, there have been too many reports. I know the minister is scared of this motion, because he thinks it will be another Worth report. But if he would read my motion, it says: whose membership shall include Members of the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, I told the minister that if he would make me chairman of the committee we would have an answer in two weeks, and it wouldn't cost him a dollar. But, Mr. Minister, Motion 202 must be a good motion. I say it must be a good motion because the Minister of Education doesn't think it is.

Thank you.

[Motion as amended carried]

203. Moved by Mr. Taylor:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta request the government of Alberta to give consideration to establishing industrial training schools to which juvenile delinquents may be committed under the Juvenile Delinquents Act of Canada.

[Adjourned debate March 14: Mr. Stewart]

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not repeat what I went over at my earlier opportunity, but rather conclude the few thoughts I had on this particular motion. I want to thank the Member for Drumheller who brought this motion before us. I think it's timely and worthy of debate. All Members of the Legislature will recognize that as we've been talking this afternoon about the younger members of our society and their various problems, this is another time and another subject that deals not with the same type of problem but a different one.

Juveniles who run afoul of our society's laws are probably the end result of some of the things that have taken place in society in the last few years. Not that we did not always have younger members breaching the law, but the problem has arisen due to pressures forced upon them. We have more running into trouble with the rules and regulations we're expected to live by.

The natural chain of events for a young person growing up is the guidance of a home. When this breaks down as it has in so many cases in our society today, and we have single-parent families, as a direct result we have more young people with insufficient parental guidance to give them the opportunity to grow up and take their places in society in the normal fashion. If they fall afoul of our rules and regulations, it becomes a responsibility of the state and of us as legislators to develop a system to rehabilitate these young people into the mainstream of life, and hopefully they can continue and become respected citizens of our society.

Before we pass judgment on how this should be done, I think we should recognize the root of the problem. I've been discussing some of the causes. I think it's only natural that as society becomes more complex, we should devote more of our thoughts to rectifying as many as possible of the problems that trip our young people, and get them off the path we would all like to see them follow. I'm quite well aware our educational system has been criticized, but I do not believe a standard educational system will necessarily take care of the problems. No doubt today

some of these young people become disenchanted with the schooling they are getting, take the easy course of trying to drift away and seek their own enjoyment, and consequently end up as delinquents in our society.

But I believe the proposal of a form of schooling that young people who have breached our rules can continue, an educational type of confinement or segregation from society, probably will [give them] the opportunity of getting a grasp on their thoughts and feelings, and feel the value of education or training. Because I think it's very easy for young people who have been led astray to have mixed thoughts about what life is all about. We have to have an understanding deep enough to reach these people and show them the value of education or training. This is a fundamental part of what rehabilitation is all about. If we can't gain young people's confidence and interest, we're going to fail in what we're trying to accomplish. I feel that as legislators we can only set down the pattern. Other people will have to carry out the programs. We have a lot of good people who are trained and sympathetic to the problem, who have given the opportunity to devote their time in working to make a meaningful change in the outlook of these young people's lives.

It's recognized that if a young offender is not properly coached, he will breach the law a second time. I think every time this happens it's possibly an admission on our part that our rehabilitation program is not successful. Simply locking these young people away from society for a period of time is a very poor excuse for rehabilitation. We have to devote our time. Capable and qualified people should be given an opportunity to develop a program to create the environment to bring these young people back into society.

I won't continue, Mr. Speaker. I've covered most of the thoughts I had on this subject. I look with interest to the views of the rest of my colleagues on this particular subject, because I feel we should all address our thoughts to it.

Thank you.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to make some comments on this resolution. As a father of five — and I'm not Roman Catholic — I have a vested interest in the matter. I hope to develop some small quarrel with the presumption we make about our young people in Alberta. I wouldn't presume for one minute to have anywhere near the knowledge on the subject that the Member for Drumheller has, even though he doesn't speak from first-hand experience as a parent, I would assume.

I have the deepest respect for the hon. member's motivation in bringing forward the resolution a second time. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it's only with a sense of frustration, brought about by his dealings with not only constituents but the judges of our courts, about what the Member for Calgary McCall would describe as the apparent futility, and if I could paraphrase: we in Canada have the greatest number incarcerated for the longest period of time in the western world — indeed hardly a record to be proud of. If there's one thing our correctional system proves to us, it's that in the 100-odd years since Confederation it hasn't worked, as evidenced by the fact that perhaps four out of seven go back for return visits.

The Member for Drumheller clearly mentions the term "juvenile delinquent" I think it's probably wise for us to understand the definition of a juvenile delinquent. That's an offender who is below the age of legal responsibility. So we're talking about a somewhat unique concept. Mr. Speaker, if we in this government could act with respect to bringing in a common age for the age of majority, I would suggest that would be a start in the direction of the resolution. Why do we insist upon having a different age of responsibility for males and females when we know that biologically it should be the opposite, if anything? Perhaps my experience tells me it should be the same. But when we consider that we're dealing with the term "juvenile delinquent", I think we would first of all have to rationalize whether those of us in the debate or considering entering the debate would like to restrict ourselves to that definition. Or would we indeed like to address ourselves perhaps to the cause of the problem?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that when the Member for Drumheller, the mover of the resolution, talks about his experience not only within Canada but in other jurisdictions, there is no question that the message comes out loud and clear. We're perhaps starting at the wrong end of the stick. According to statistics young people entering school today, at the age of 6, have been exposed to more of the learning process via television than they'll encounter in the next 12 years of formal schooling. Certainly those patterns are formed at that time. It's been said that you have until the age of 3 to change a person's characteristics and attitudes toward life — at such a tender age as 36 months. After that you can't change it; you can only destroy it.

Be that as it may, I'd like to comment on what I think would be the root of the problem, and hopefully some alternatives. For example, this year we see an increase of about \$70 million in the budget of the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. A large part of that is directed toward the factors that determine the problem we're dealing with in the resolution today.

I think in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, when we recognize, as the Member for Calgary McCall has said, that in one school in his constituency alone 500 of 575 children weren't there at the end of the term — in other words, the turnover had been that rapid — when we consider that, to quote the hon. Member for Calgary McCall, a third of the youngsters in that school are from single parents. In a school in the constituency of Lethbridge West, 65 per cent are from single parents. When we consider, Mr. Speaker, that on average every Canadian moves once every four years, surely that tells us something about the mobility of Canadians, our fellow citizens. Is it really unusual to expect the sorts of problems we have today with young people? I suggest it's not.

When we consider the life styles we see today — the phenomenon of two out of three women working, not only in Alberta but in other areas of Canada, and minimal parental influence on the youngster, if any — to have the temerity to stand in this House and say, it's the responsibility of the parent and really if we can only get it back where it was. I suggest if we could live in 1942 again, the world would be decidedly different. But that can't be done. I think we have to recognize things for what they are. If we can

understand why we have the problem, perhaps we can then take some positive steps toward resolving the problem.

The only area where I quarrel with the hon. Member for Drumheller is the presumption that juvenile delinquents — that is, those people under the age of legal responsibility who have come in conflict with the law — should be attending vocational or industrial schools. Perhaps "industrial or trade schools" is a better term. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, when we consider factors such as the non-influence of the parents, the affluence in our society today, the peer pressure on our young people, as was so clearly spelled out by the Member for Wainwright, and that in the area of marketing we have self-serve stores, which are no other encouragement except to steal . . . It's fine to say, they shouldn't steal, because if they had proper upbringing they wouldn't. That's great. But what about those tens of thousands of youngsters out there who are the products of marriages that have broken down or of single parents? I think we have about 15,000 single parents on assistance. Or if we consider in very real terms the drastic decline of the influence of the church over young people, I think in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, we should be concentrating on those people in our society who have the greatest influence on these children.

If you look at a typical day in the life of a child today — not a 16- or 17-year-old girl or a 15-and-a-half-year-old boy, but a 10-year-old — I think you'll see that the people who have the greatest exposure, and therefore the greatest influence, would be within our school system. Following the influence of the school teacher or the school system would be the child's peer or fellow student.

Mr. Speaker, when I talk to school authorities and school teachers, it seems to me they come up with the same story. They say, Mr. Gogo, we have so many cases whereby children come to school who have no interest in school; they're not interested in academics for whatever reason. But because The School Act spells out that they must attend school, and because the law spells out that the parent will be prosecuted or, in a recent amendment to an act, the director of child welfare can take some stronger measures than before, the youngster is going to come to school. Certainly the youngster is not going to learn, but indeed will cause a disturbance, or come in the front door and out the back.

I've asked people in the schools, what's the answer? Unequivocally the answer seems to come back: The School Act should be amended whereby grants are not tied to the school child being age 16. If we only had some method whereby we could find programs for these 11-, 12-, and 13-year-olds other than academic-oriented programs within the typical class system. If we had that freedom . . . But the school board says we can't. We must educate those who come through the doors. If they don't come through the doors, we must report them truant and, at the very worst, expel them.

Maybe many members here are considering only those youngsters who are expelled from the school system. They believe and have said to me, if we could only modify a program in such a manner whereby youngsters could take academics for a portion of the day and trade training the rest of the day. I think this ties in very clearly with the intent of the

Member for Drumheller. He's saying, in effect, that these youngsters need some alternative to academic training. That seems very simplistic on the surface.

It's not easy for our school boards, however, because they must comply with The School Act. So the answer to allowing these professionals in the school system to institute programs that would answer some of the problems raised by the members for Drumheller, Calgary McCall, and Wainwright perhaps lies here in the Legislature with making amendments to The School Act. I don't think the answer necessarily lies in money, Mr. Speaker.

I think the answer lies in properly recognizing the problem, properly understanding what the problem is. I think labor strife in Canada today is really the price you pay for democracy. I don't think that's unusual. Perhaps some people think it's gone overboard, but I think it's a fact of life, and a strong democratic government should learn to cope.

What I'm fearful of is: if we don't take some action, Mr. Speaker, we'll see that not only will we continue to have the record number of people in our correctional institutions for longer periods of time . . . When we look at statistics two years ago in Alberta, we find that of the 6,000 people incarcerated in that year 4,000 were repeaters, as the Member for Calgary McCall has pointed out so very clearly. The number of people who come back to our institutions indicates either our society is not able to cope with them or they want to come back. I suggest to you neither one is the case. I suggest to you it's a result of us defaulting on earlier programs that put them there in the first place. The most startling figure, though, out of the Solicitor General's annual report of corrections is that of the 4,000 going back 2,000 are under 21. I suggest that's very startling.

So whether members would find my suggestions helpful, I don't know, but I would like to repeat them. One is that we increase the funding of the Department of Education whereby we recognize in a very pragmatic way that the people who have the most influence on the children are within the school system. Again, I'm talking about those under 16, or under the age of majority in terms of the Criminal Code. That we make allowances in a substantive way whereby The School Act could be amended, whereby school boards could institute trade training programs within the school system in Alberta which would take these hyperactive kids or these youngsters who are just not, for whatever reason . . . Some have learning disabilities, as the Member for Drumheller pointed out, and some have found that the only way to attract attention is to be disruptive in class. I suggest there are many dedicated teachers in Alberta who would take the time to see that these programs were carried through if we instituted them.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have the knowledge of perhaps other members of the Assembly of what's done in other jurisdictions. But I would suggest that if we as legislators are truly concerned about the direction the youth of our country and young Albertans is taking, where the problems of society, particularly with marriages and the increasing single parents — if we could extrapolate a line based on the number of people in conflict with the law — continue in five or 10 years, it's going to be truly out of proportion. So perhaps now is the time to act.

In fairness, we haven't had the opportunity of

seeing the effect of the minister's ambitious day care program. Maybe that will solve part of the problem, because I suggest many of these problems are formulated at ages 4, 5, and 6.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying I'm very impressed with the arguments I've heard by the Member for Drumheller and the Member for Wainwright, and I think that we in this Assembly in all good conscience should respond in a meaningful way by backing the professionals who have the greatest influence on the children of Alberta, the school boards and the school teachers, in allowing them to reorganize curriculum and funding so that they may implement some form of trade training or vocational training within the education system.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I've been looking forward to my opportunity to make a few remarks in the Assembly, also to express appreciation to all members who have directed their attention and thoughts to what is one of the most complex, frustrating and, I guess, probably one of the most heartbreaking situations society finds itself faced with today.

I think all too often we quite casually talk about children, and because they upset us and are acting out the common tendency has been, that kid has to be locked up. How many times have I heard that said? How many times has that been reflected to me and to people in my department? So I'm rather gratified today to listen to the hon. Member for Lethbridge East and the hon. Member for Wainwright, who seem to have a somewhat different attitude and some appreciation for the complexities of society and, of course, for our young people who perhaps are victims of our society today.

I was somewhat concerned earlier when we started this debate. Last fall it seemed to take quite a strong trend toward corporal punishment — caning is good, and all this sort of thing — which seemed to imply this would change people around. I don't agree with that. I agreed with some of the things my hon. colleague said when he said: a nation isn't a law book, a constitution, or a colored diagram or map; it's an attitude, a frame of mind, a community of ideas, and a common loyalty to fundamental principles. I support that. Who doesn't? We believe that when young people become delinquent for any number of reasons, whatever causes it — and we don't always know, nor do they — they do not share in this common loyalty to fundamental principles.

At one time in the course of the debate I became very nervous, because I felt we were getting off the track of juveniles and starting to sweep up young offenders along with the terminology of juveniles. But the last speaker said it quite clearly in the proper context: we're talking about boys under 16 and girls under 18 years of age, who have been arrested for an offence under the authority of the Criminal Code. The police can arrest a person in that age category for an offence under the authority of the Criminal Code, but for any other offence a peace officer can only apprehend a child. It's important that we not lose track of those people and that age, and what their problems are in particular, what the attitudes are, and what indeed we can do, because it seems to me we're almost dealing with a moving target.

If you reflect on what was said in this House last

October, the focus of the debate indicated one attitude; and today I detect quite a strong swing to the other side. That's one of the points made to me just last week when I met with Mr. Edey and had the privilege of introducing him to members of this Assembly. He is a person who, under contract, takes juveniles to his ranch, called the Stampede Ranch, and carries out a system of treatment which is not unique in the world but rather unique in many areas, not because of the difference in that it's a work experience, a ranch experience, an outdoor experience, but the experience those boys encounter there is an experience of philosophy, of the very presence of the man called Mr. Edey, the things he stands for, and the impression he can make on the children assigned to his care.

In a private meeting in my office Mr. Edey said to me, I don't really agree with you and your Bill 37 and closed facilities, but I believe you had to do it; I believe it was necessary at this time. He used this expression: any time a man has to lock up his dog, he doesn't have much control over the dog. That was an interesting philosophy expressed to me by someone who is regarded by the officials in my department as having the most success with troubled children of any other project we have tried. You might well say to me, why don't you make it larger? We've talked to Mr. Edey about it and we believe we can, but not too much larger. Because the influence on the children at the Stampede Ranch comes from the presence of that individual. We would not like to dilute that in any particular way. I'm happy to be able to pay a tribute to the philosophy of Mr. Edey and the good work he's doing in very difficult circumstances.

In his report Justice Kirby tells us there are 100 to 150. To read in that report that there were so few was quite a shock to many people. When I've spoken to groups across the province and mentioned this, they often say, how come they all live in my town? How come they all live in my neighborhood? Because many people believe there are many, many more children who are delinquent than the actual statistics show. Another interesting phenomenon which is occurring, and we hope it continues, is that the police forces in Calgary, Edmonton, and some of the rural areas have told us the percentage of offences under the Juvenile Delinquents Act is declining, while the numbers of juveniles reaching a certain age has been rising, but of course we know that with our population trends that will drop off.

So it's a rather interesting phenomenon that we're engaged in at the present time as we examine our treatment patterns and as we consider what solution is best. We reach and struggle for solutions, and it's a frustrating experience for everyone. It's difficult for parents who don't know where to turn. They don't know where they've gone wrong. It's difficult for the personnel in my department, employees of the provincial government, good, dedicated public servants who have various theories. Some of them work and some of them don't work. Nobody knows why. Something will turn a child around. Something will also turn an adult offender around. No one knows in many instances what particular issue it was that made that impression.

People today have talked about children and children's rights. The debate on the previous motion almost spilled over into this particular motion,

because they all deal with children who have problems of some type or another.

Not too many years ago children were considered chattels of their parents. They were sold into slavery. They were forced to work at an early age. Then we brought in child labor laws. The hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place has made comments about child labor laws. Children were offered as human sacrifices and so on. It's only recently in the history of the world that children were considered to have rights of their own. Then we get into the conflict alluded to earlier this afternoon, the conflict of philosophy and the uneasiness that develops when we start to talk about the rights of children. Parents say, don't go too far; I don't know how much right my child should have. I don't think we should go too far either in talking about rights until we start to talk about responsibilities. Until we can get back to the responsibilities and to the acceptance of responsibility by everyone, the parents, the community, and the children, we are not going to solve this problem. So it's all very well for us, and I'm glad that we sit here and devote our time and our thoughts to this specific concern.

We might well say, why don't we just adopt the motion? What's the harm in saying, urge the government to give consideration? I don't have any quarrel with that, because we've been considering it. It is one of the alternatives we have examined and probably will continue to examine. But I get increasingly nervous with our clutching at straws because of our frustrations in trying to deal with this very, very critical and worrisome social problem.

It's only recently been announced that Ontario will phase out their training schools and move into the community. They've had them for some time, and we've been examining what they do in Ontario. But Ontario has not been happy with their training model for juvenile offenders, and now they're moving away into a more integrated type of children's service. They plan to leave approximately only 120 training school-type beds for children, in a province with a much larger population than Alberta. So this gives us cause to reflect and not be too hasty to move into one particular area because we hope it might solve our problem.

An interesting article also came to my attention in which a research study was done. It dealt with 305 youths aged 10 to 14 who had been in trouble with the law at least twice. They were divided into two groups. The first group received the best there is in professional therapy and support. The second was left to the usual vagaries of the Juvenile Delinquents Act. The results were reported in February to the senate subcommittee studying children and crime. They were very interesting. Enlightened treatment not only did not reform the kids; it hardly altered their pattern of behavior. So the researchers who were trying to examine this, and searching for answers — the same as all of us are — decided they really didn't know enough about juvenile delinquency. They were very nervous about the government committing itself to yet another program unless there was something a little more encouraging to make them believe that at least something works.

One of the thoughts that came from it was that no technique aimed at preventing antisocial behavior or treating existing antisocial behavior has been found

to be effective. That goes back to the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, who talks about the school and the attitude to the school, the difficulties in learning. But that isn't all that causes children to act out. As I review the files and have read extensively on this area, I find it isn't only those who have difficulty in school. Occasionally they're too bright for school, so I guess they do have difficulty in school. It's the philosophy of the easy dollar.

I had extensive correspondence with a lady who knows I will be using some of her comments at some time in this Legislature. She wrote to the department, to the police, and to a number of people about a year ago with a plea that her child needed help and so did she. The correspondence in itself is extremely moving and would make a very interesting story. This young man got away to a bad start and couldn't believe there was any sense at all in working for \$3.50 an hour when you could knock off a grocery store and get \$50 for one break-in. That was his attitude. He ran around with bad company. He'd been in trouble with the police. They tried to get him a work experience, so he did, and he and his friends worked out a little scheme where they were ripping off the people they were supposed to be helping in order to rehabilitate them. Eventually he ended up in the detention centre in Edmonton.

At this point the department and my office entered the picture as a result of a plea from this lady. As a result of the system working — and sometimes it does work — they made the decision as parents that they would not ask to take their child home. They didn't want their child released to their custody, whereas the other children who were picked up for the same incident were taken home by their parents. They thought the kid who was left in the detention centre was being badly treated. They felt pretty smart, and away they went.

But my particular lady and her husband decided there had to be a better way. So they started to talk with their son, they sought counselling themselves, they worked in a group atmosphere, and they eventually asked that the child be assigned to their custody. They took a new interest. The lines of communication — as she said in her letter, it was as though the dam broke and we suddenly started to communicate with one another. We checked with her recently, when I thought I might like to use this case history in the course of my remarks. She agreed that it was fine and said things were still working well. I hope they will continue to do so.

It isn't always that that type of success story takes place. I don't know whether it's because of the system or in spite of the system, or what particular thing turned their child around. But the parents felt and assumed their responsibility and were prepared to seek professional help, which they were able to obtain. The father obtained a part-time job for the boy. He then decided to stay away from his friends who had been leading him astray. Let's hope that this continues to be a success story. But that doesn't negate our attention to the hon. member's motion and what he hoped to achieve.

I too appreciated the comments of the hon. Member for Drumheller. I know his great interest in this area. I have to express my appreciation to him for the comments he has made in this Legislature, both in this debate and in other debates, about the people

who work for the Department of Social Services and Community Health. All too often they are considered as — what is it — woolly-headed liberals who don't care. I'd like to say to the hon. Member for Drumheller that his words of support for those many dedicated people out there are very much appreciated. It does help in very trying times, because I can assure you in this particular area the burnout is rather high.

So it is not unreasonable for us to consider establishing an industrial training school. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to members of this Assembly, that I hope we're not just clutching at straws and believing that is really going to solve all our problems, because I know it is not. To begin with, we're talking about very few juvenile delinquents. We are talking about 100 to 150 at most. And where are they? Primarily in the metropolitan areas. Many of them are sentenced for short terms. I believe I heard one hon. member say they should be sentenced for not less than two years, and I would hope that might be considered on the most extreme circumstances. So it's not quite as simple as one might think. True, they're not all interested in books and in learning to read and write. But we too are bound by The Department of Education Act and must offer an education to the children who come into our custody.

In Alberta in January 1977, I believe we had 10,000 children in our custody, not juvenile delinquents — some were. Some were in custody by agreement, some were wards of the government, and some were there for purposes of adoption. The mix varied. So let's not think we're talking about 10,000 juvenile delinquents. But we do have a large number of them in the system in some form or another. They may be in group homes or in institutions where there are handicapped children. I suppose we shouldn't cloud the issue by talking about such large numbers, but we are talking about large numbers of children who are in the care and custody of the Department of Social Services and Community Health.

I don't know that we should also confine our comments to the juvenile delinquents who would profit by training in an industrial training school. Sometimes it's a very thin line. It's been said to me it depends who first gets to the child who is acting out, whether he's charged by the police as a juvenile delinquent or picked up and apprehended as a child in need of care under Section 15 of The Child Welfare Act. Many of the things they do are similar. Many of the causes are similar.

A lot of causes have been alluded to here: family breakdown, the change in society's attitudes, the peer pressure that caused individuals to do a number of things those in our age group can't understand or find acceptable. But there is peer pressure on young people today, and it's not a simple matter. We cannot readily dismiss the matter. What will work for one will not work for others. We must have a mix. We've tried to do that in the department: everything from probation to assignment to the custody of their parents, group homes, youth assessment centres, closed units. Perhaps we'll get an opportunity to talk about that later on in the course of this session. But the majority of the institutions with whom we have contracts and agreements are for children who are there under The Child Welfare Act, not under the Juvenile Delinquents Act.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how much more time I

have on this matter. I would like to bring some of those statistics for the consideration of the members. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Do hon. members agree that when they reconvene at 8 o'clock they will be in Committee of Supply?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

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

head: **Government Motions** (Committee of Supply)

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

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

Department of **Housing and Public Works**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you have any opening remarks?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to make any opening remarks except to say that I spoke fairly extensively during the throne speech debate, in which I covered a number of matters, including housing. During the budget debate also I spoke fairly extensively on the extent of the construction industry in the province and the effect this particular budget would have on the construction industry.

Mr. Chairman, I think I'd like to leave my opening remarks at that and just answer questions that may be put to me.

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

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks. I did cover quite a few of the areas in my budget debate. Possibly this might be the last time I get to deal with the hon. minister as far as housing is concerned. I want to say I've enjoyed working with him. Mr. Chairman, we have . . . [interjections] Could be leaving any time. Could be a rose.

In all seriousness, the minister certainly has been one who has been on top of his department. I say it every time I get up on the estimates. He makes an honest effort. As I said before, I would like some of the other ministers to take note of that book on capital construction, because it's certainly very helpful for going through the capital construction or capital works. He covers pretty well all the departments on this.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I have had some run ins

with the hon. minister, but we've been able to keep them pretty well behind closed doors. We seem to be able to solve our problems and get them all ironed out. I certainly appreciated that.

Also, I appreciate very much the philosophy or method of decentralizing our senior citizens' accommodations. I think this is great. I have it in my own constituency, Mr. Chairman, where Bassano has been sending its senior citizens to lodges in Brooks, Medicine Hat, and Claresholm. I don't think this is really the right way to handle our senior citizens. I think if we're going to spend money, there's not much advantage in enlarging the centres we have. I appreciate very much the lodge that's going to be built in Bassano. It's certainly going to be appreciated by my constituents there. And the four self-contained suites approved for Duchess are very much appreciated in that area.

However, the problem we're facing in the housing and construction industry is affordability of houses. We certainly haven't got on top of this yet. In the real estate business ourselves we find so many times a young couple will come in and make an offer on a home or piece of property. They just don't qualify for the mortgages. By the time they put up \$10,000 on a \$70,000 home and get mortgage money on \$60,000, their income is just not high enough to qualify to buy a home. I appreciate the beginner home program. That's certainly advantageous to our people on low incomes. However, we find people on middle incomes have the problem of trying to buy these homes.

It's hard to come up with answers in this area. We can't blame it on the developers who are assembling land, on our contractors, or on the real estate people. I think it's a series of everyone having to take a good look at bringing houses down so more of our people in this province can afford to buy homes.

Looking at some reports, the highest priced houses we have in Canada are right here in Alberta. Taking a look at the American survey, it looks to me like land in Alberta is costing up to seven times as much as in the United States. Here I think we should be able to control the escalating cost of housing, and it has to be as far as the cost of our lands are concerned. Wherever we are in the housing industry, we all have to take a good look at bringing down the cost of housing to where the affordability is more realistic, so more of the people in this province can afford to buy homes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you want to answer each one, or do you want to gather them and wait until the end?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, I do believe I should make some comments on affordability at this time, particularly because the hon. member has just said that we should control the price of housing. I think the nation has just gone through a system of trying to impose price controls on commodities or products, and I would just like to suggest to him that it is very difficult to attempt to control the price of a commodity, particularly the price of a house which has so many elements to it.

One can start to control what? The labor costs for construction, the materials themselves, the profits of the builder, the raw land, the utility systems, or the

extravagance that people want in a community development? What is it that we should control? You can't control the total price structure of a house or a home and the lot unless you start to control components. What is important and what we have tried to do during the last several years, is to provide alternatives, to provide people with affordable alternatives, because in the free enterprise market we're in, there is only one thing that sets the price of a home; that is, what the market will bear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Minister. There is far too much noise in the committee. Could we tone things down.

MR. YURKO: I want to say that again. What controls the price of the lot is what the market will bear. What controls the price of the finished lot is what in fact the market will bear. If the price gets too high for a particular type of house in the free market we enjoy in Alberta, then the affordability or the number of families who can afford that type of commodity, that price of lot, that price of house, shrinks. It shrinks from 70 per cent of the total families to 50 per cent, then 30 per cent, then 20 per cent. The market for that commodity shrinks. We have been trying to provide, across the spectrum, alternatives of choice which are affordable.

The member spoke about the middle-income group. Indeed our own programs under the direct lending program relate directly to families making under \$23,500. Now that's the middle-income group. You get above \$23,500 and you're starting to get into the upper-income group. So our total programs, which are related to approximately the bottom one-third of the price structure of housing, make housing affordable for any family in Alberta. Any family in Alberta can afford to buy a house under the provincial government's programs. Indeed if you're only making \$8,000 a year, you get an interest rate subsidy and a direct monthly subsidy to make it affordable to you on the basis of a 35 per cent gross debt/service ratio.

So one can't say that housing isn't affordable. Choice is what's important. Some people want the house that's now \$75,000, and they want that to be made affordable to the family making \$15,000 a year. Of course that's not affordable. But there is a condominium, and another type, half a duplex, that's affordable to that couple.

Without attempting to interfere in a gross way in the housing market in this buoyant economy we have, where price structure is set by what the market will bear, we have attempted through government policies and programs and the judicious use of funding to establish alternatives, choices, for a family. Be it a single parent with a dependant, or a married couple, we have attempted to provide them with a choice. And we haven't only attempted to provide them a choice in home-ownership, but indeed in rental accommodation.

I've indicated we've been quite effective by virtue of the number of starts, allowing the free market to relate to what profit they wish to make in relationship to starts. That's why we've had 38,000-plus starts in the last couple of years. Can you imagine what would have happened to the starts in the province if we'd tried to control price? The starts wouldn't have been 38,000 at all; in fact they would have been

much less. Then you would have had a very tight rental market.

So we use the free market in order to create supply in a massive and major way. As I've said earlier, the number of starts in Alberta in the last year was equivalent to six provinces in Canada, using the free market without imposing too severe restrictions of any kind upon it, but at the same time dealing with the bottom third of the spectrum with respect to affordability. So we have what I consider to be the best of both: the free market causing supply, and indeed the government with its programs making housing affordable in the lower one-third of the spectrum.

At the same time of course we've dealt in a massive way with social housing, which is housing for fixed-income people who are senior citizens, community housing, rural and native housing, land banking, and so forth.

In terms of the high cost of land, again we've used the process of providing an alternative. If a community wanted to get into land banking with the provincial government, there was money there and alternative there. Indeed, as everybody in the House knows, the price of a lot, without relating to what the market will bear, is coming in at \$7,000, \$8,000, \$10,000, and \$12,000 in smaller communities where the community wished to land bank what was available from the province: money, expertise, and so forth.

So I say again without difficulty in this House, we have used the free market system to provide supply, and at the same time judiciously used money in such a way that we've made housing affordable to the lower income people in the province.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify my position on this. When I say controlling of prices, that probably wasn't the right term. I certainly agree with the minister. We have to keep it in the free market place, without controlling prices as such and with very little interference. I think some of the areas, for example in regulations when subdividing and assembling land — in so many cases you will talk to a developer, and it takes a long period of time to develop that land. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is shaking his head.

DR. BUCK: He's been hiding his head in the sand so long, that's why.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Being involved in the area, I certainly know that in many cases it does take a long time to get this land assembled, and they have a lot of money involved and have to have return on their investment. With the regulations and legislation we have, it certainly takes a long time to get this land developed. Down in Houston, when they develop land they have to provide education reserve and streets and that; other than that they can go ahead and develop. In a matter of two or three months they can get their land onstream and develop these houses.

One other area I think has really helped is the front-end services we're going to provide to some of the municipalities. I think this is an area where the minister is getting involved that will certainly help to control the escalating price of housing. What has happened in the past in so many areas is that

municipal governments have had land and have sold it out and haven't developed land that provided the services to land the free enterprise individual who has got land. They haven't provided services to it. Our municipalities in so many cases have sold all their land. They've sold it out and now have only one place to go to buy land: to where the land has really escalated. All I'm saying is keep the cost of housing down in any area we can, so more people can afford houses.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to make just three comments, as I agree very much with the comments made by the minister on the free market place.

First of all I'd like to mention supply and demand. Houses are like anything else. If there is a scarcity of houses, the price is going to go up; if there is ample supply, the price is going to go down. They are going to be competitive in the free market. I think we have that system working, and I think the policy of the government to get more and more houses available with a choice is accomplishing that particular purpose.

The second place where I think we can make an improvement in this province is the long delays that occur from some of our planning commissions. Some developers have told me they get so frustrated they just want to get into another business. When it takes two years to get a plan approved by a planning commission, the people who are trying to invest their money get pretty frustrated. I think we have to look at this pretty carefully. We can surely plan without causing these undue, long, and frustrating delays when people want to invest their money. One Calgarian told me he just got so fed up that he's not worrying about it. He said: I'm putting my money in the bank, and I'm going to collect my interest; I'd much rather go out building houses, but I'm just fed up with trying to get approvals through planning commissions. The delays and the frustration are out of this world, and he is completely fed up.

One or two developments, subdivisions, that I know of were also most frustrating: delay after delay, some of them almost deliberate delays to try to make it difficult for the man to invest his money. I think a lot of the things that the planning commissions are showing their noses into, if you will pardon the expression, are just none of their business. If a man wants to invest his money and loses it, or a planning commission thinks he might lose it — and planning commissions in most cases haven't had nearly the experience he has — so what? There is no guarantee in a free enterprise system that you don't lose. You win or you lose. That is one of the challenges of the free enterprise system. You don't always have to make a profit. Sometimes you make a loss, and sometimes you go out of business.

A former Lieutenant-Governor of this province, the late J. J. Bowlen, used to tell in this House that he had gone bankrupt three times in his life and seemed to be quite proud of it. He had made a lot of money, but he had lost money too. He didn't always make the right judgments. But when somebody else is looking over your shoulder and telling you you can't do that and you can't do this, I think it's causing a lot of finger-pointing at the government, and unfairly so. I think our planning commission should revise its

procedures and see what it can do about putting these, in my view, unnecessary delays and frustrations in front of people who simply want to invest their money. They want to take a chance, and it's their money they are investing, nobody else's.

The third point that I think could make an improvement in housing is productivity. A chap from Newfoundland, whom I met in the Calgary Inn about five or six months ago, told me he came out as a carpenter, a journeyman carpenter. But he said, I get fed up. Those were his exact words. He said, I wanted to do a day's work and my employer insisted I only do a certain amount; he cut me short. A bricklayer told me he's not permitted to lay more than a certain number of bricks in an eight-hour day. He could lay many more.

That kind of policy, whether it's labor unions or employers or whoever, is simply not good for the country. A man should be able to increase productivity, not cut it down. One of the things that killed coal mining, when it was competing against oil and gas, in the early stages, was the reduction in the tons of coal per man in the mine. It got to the point where the cost was just too high, and it couldn't compete against another product.

I don't know how you can deal with this matter except through our labor unions and employers. It's not always the labor unions. Many labor unions have full productivity, but this is apparently going on. To the extent it's going on, it's holding back and increasing the price of homes for everybody.

I think one other thing is very evident, and supply and demand works here. A man in this city told me that he bought a house in 1949 or '48 for \$14,000, and after living in it for over 30 years he sold it for \$50,000. Without any major improvements, he tripled the price. I said, isn't that highway robbery? And he said, well if I had sold it for what I considered was a proper price, \$25,000, making a reasonable profit, the next fellow would have sold it for \$50,000. He said, it was my product; I could do it. If a lot of houses had been available, I don't think anybody would have paid that much for a house that old.

Again I think the policy of the government to build more, get more and more houses so there isn't a scarcity is the best way of trying to bring the price down within the range of reason.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, I want to make some very brief comments, particularly on one very good point the Member for Drumheller made. I wish to sympathize with him in regard to the time taken by regulatory bodies in general. Indeed, I would like to say that if there ever was a way in which economic activity in the nation in total could be increased very quickly and the whole pulse beat of economic activity in the nation stirred and accelerated, it would simply be by issuing a decree that all regulatory bodies in the nation, including the province, should cut their processing time in half. I suggest that if the nation was strong enough and had enough guts, if you wish, to have its governments dictate to its regulatory bodies, regardless of what regulatory body it is, to decrease by half the time for making a decision, you would find that the pace of economic activity in the nation would be stimulated considerably.

I want to give the Minister of Municipal Affairs some credit, because he has been working behind the

scenes and with me to accelerate this process in a number of different ways. When you have 38,000 housing starts a year for two years in a row, that suggests somebody is making decisions.

It's easy to say you want to have a particular parcel of land approved quickly, and that particular fellow wants his land. He may be holding 10 years' supply, I don't know. Another person is holding a land bank of 15 years. Another person is holding one year. I sympathize with the person who is only holding one or two years' supply, in terms of getting a fast approval. But I'm not sure I sympathize with the fellow who is holding 15 years' supply and wants to get approval for a vast area, for example, which in fact might guarantee him the number of lots for five, six, or seven years. He has then a tremendous competitive advantage over the smaller fellow who only has one or two years' supply and is trying desperately to keep in a solvent position from year to year.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I really wanted to sympathize with the hon. Member for Drumheller, because I do want to suggest that there is a need in Canada today to accelerate economic activity. I can think of no faster way of doing it than to accelerate very dramatically the approval processes — cut the time in half, if necessary — by all the regulatory bodies in this nation, including this province.

I do want to suggest that I think the new planning regulations, to some degree, will have an effect in this regard. But that's not to suggest that we in the province of Alberta in the area of planning can't go considerably farther along that road than even we've done so far in terms of decreasing the length of time for approval. In a market in which inflation is very high, risks are high. Indeed, it's very hazardous to invest your money for a particular length of time because the risk is very high.

Risk and time of approval are very closely linked. If you have to wait for 15 years or five years to get approval of a major energy project, or two or three years for a housing development, with inflation at 9 and 10 per cent and not knowing where it's going risk and time are directly interrelated. If we cut the time in half, we'll cut the risk. Long-term investment will therefore be enhanced, and a lot more activity will take place.

I want to say something very quickly on productivity. I want to give credit to the working force in Alberta in the housing industry, because it's really not that bad. The joint task force of the province, the city of Edmonton, and the industry did an analysis of the situation in Edmonton. Whereas it recognized that land prices went up about 470 per cent and servicing went up considerably, the actual cost of labor input per house, I think, in the last five years only went up about 75 per cent. That's not much different from the inflationary rate. So for all practical purposes, you can say that the labor costs of building a house haven't changed very much in the last five years, when you account for inflation.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the minister one or two questions and make one or two comments.

First of all, I would like to know if the minister can indicate what the government policy is on how large the Alberta Housing Corporation is eventually going

to grow. I know we all start out with good intentions, that it's going to be just a co-ordinating and regulating body. Then all of a sudden we end up eventually with thousands of people working in a new Crown corporation. So I would like to know: are the private people in Alberta eventually going to be put right out of the building business? I just want to know the basic government philosophy about what will be the ultimate end of the Alberta Housing Corporation.

Secondly, I would like to say to the minister and to the Minister of Municipal Affairs — when I saw the Minister of Municipal Affairs shaking his head about, no, it didn't take too long to get land on the market, I am sure the minister was shaking his head to get the sand out of his eyes and ears. He's had his head in the sand all this time if he thinks you can get land on stream in a reasonable length of time, because you can't. As a simple example of how the planning process seems to get bogged down, a person I know in my constituency asked to have 179 acres of land subdivided into two 80-acre plots. The kicker was that the reason he had only 179 acres was that the Department of Highways had taken one acre for highway. So the act said . . .

MR. KOZIAK: One hundred and fifty-nine.

DR. BUCK: I beg your pardon, 159. Thank you Mr. Koziak; I appreciate that.

So they said, no, under the act you can't have two 80-acre plots; therefore, no way. Well, you know, how infantile can a decision like that be? Certainly we know you can appeal, and it will go through. But it just amazes me how we plan ourselves to death at times.

I would like to refer to the Mill Woods project, on which the former government went into a land banking plan. I have asked many developers what happened to that project. They said, what happened is that we planned it to death. We turned it over to the planning authorities and they planned it and planned it and planned it and planned it, until we really didn't have a land bank.

I really find it hard to understand the minister saying that if the large corporation had 15 years' supply of land on hand, and we gave them the authority to go ahead and develop that 15 years — isn't that really what we are trying to do, put sufficient land on the market so the price becomes competitive? We always seem to be in a catch-up situation where there never seems to be a surplus of developed land, tremendous surplus. [interjections] Well then why does the price of lots stay up to \$30,000 and \$40,000? That's what the market will bear.

Mr. Chairman, when we speak about affordable housing, I will give the minister his due when he says maybe our expectations are too high. I will grant the minister that that is part of the problem. In the town of Fort Saskatchewan it's a real estate bonanza, because young couples get into some of these \$65,000, \$75,000, and \$80,000 houses and find after six months they can't handle them. They have to go.

So, in fairness to the minister, maybe our expectations are too high. In many instances they are. Still we have not solved the problem of affordable housing, in spite of what the minister says. It's fine for the

minister and some members of the Legislature who are making a decent living to talk about affordable housing. But for that young couple starting out, either there aren't sufficient numbers of low-cost housing units, affordable housing, or there's something wrong, because in most instances these young couples cannot find affordable housing.

Mr. Chairman, with those few things, I'd like to know what eventually is going to be the size of the Alberta Housing Corporation, and is it going to leave any room for the private sector in this province? Secondly, I agree with the minister, and I hope that if he gets to Ottawa he can cut the red tape and try to speed up the planning process.

MR. YURKO: In regard to the last one, Mr. Chairman, I was speaking about all regulatory processes, rather than just the planning process. There are very, very many directly controlled by government and the nation today. That area has grown dramatically in the last 10 years.

I want to deal with the question asked by the Member for Clover Bar in regard to the role of the Alberta Housing Corporation — what it does, how many people it has, how fast it's expanded — and then touch on the Home Mortgage Corporation, and just slightly on the department and housing.

In the last three years, Mr. Chairman, we've reorganized housing into the Department of Housing, which is under a deputy minister within the department, the Alberta Housing Corporation, and the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, the Alberta Housing Corporation is involved primarily in the production of social housing; secondly, land banking; thirdly, the construction of areas like Fort McMurray. I should say approximately 230 people are working in the Alberta Housing Corporation. The Alberta Housing Corporation doesn't build anything. It relates entirely to the private sector.

As a matter of fact, I found the private sector extremely pleased with the manner in which the Alberta Housing Corporation and the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation conducted their business, because the Alberta Housing Corporation uses private sector architects and largely private sector legal help, when necessary. Indeed, they use private sector contractors. The architects design it. They tender everything and are therefore a catalyst in the supply of social housing for that spectrum of the population which is on fixed or low income, which indeed is being harmed by the accelerated pace of activity within the province, because of course the accelerated pace of activity does create and leave behind all those people on fixed income, the senior citizens. The senior citizens' group is growing. It's not decreasing. It's growing and growing quite rapidly.

Divorced women, if you wish, single parents with a child — in the Edmonton housing authority, the community housing or public housing in Edmonton, 60 per cent of the tenants are single parents with one, two, or three dependants. If these kids didn't get a chance to live in decent housing in a decent community with a proper type of community but had to live in a basement somewhere in the centre of the city, you would create an unacceptable individual in our society in the long run, with a great propensity for crime and so forth. It happened in New York, New

Jersey, and all the big cities in the United States.

So social housing does not look after parents. Social housing, in the area of community housing, in my estimation is directly related to children, children who need to have a decent home in a decent community with decent schools and decent playgrounds, who have only one parent who may only be making \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year. That's why the program is so necessary.

But we've gone further. We have said that that single parent with her child and children deserves to be a home-owner if she wants. She should have the ability to be a home-owner if she makes only \$8,000 a year. As an Albertan, we have given her that right and privilege to become a home-owner, to come under the starter home ownership program, buy herself a condominium under our maximum price structure, and make that house affordable to her, such that she not only lives in this type of house but in fact can own it.

On one side, it's being done through the Alberta Housing Corporation, which provides the social housing, the rental accommodation which takes them through a certain stage; then, if they want, to shift to home ownership through the Home Mortgage Corporation. What does it do? It has about 110 employees. It's a bank that uses heritage savings trust money in a unique way, a very unique and challenging way, Mr. Chairman. What do we have in the Home Mortgage Corporation? We provide money for the private sector to build, totally to design and buy the land and construct the housing for a certain spectrum of our population.

We do it this way: we average interest rates such that there really is no subsidy or burden on the taxpayer. In fact, the Home Mortgage Corporation will always come very close to breaking even on its portfolio. It has a high-level portfolio with interest rates — like at Syncrude Housing, where there is an ability to pay the going rate, some of the interest rates are 11.5, 11, and 10.5 per cent. At the low end of the spectrum the Home Mortgage Corporation provides interest rates effectively down to 5.6 per cent under the starter home ownership program. If you account for the \$130 a month subsidy, we go down effectively to 5.5 to 5.6 per cent. So the person with \$8,000 a year can end up owning their own home. It's done in such a way that the staff of both these corporations isn't exploding at all. They relate entirely in a very intimate way with the private sector, maintaining their strength in such a way that they provide a decent service.

One of the decisions we made recently in the Home Mortgage Corporation, without necessarily increasing staff to make the programs more available to people across the province, was to engage the treasury branches to handle the applications directly and receive applications under the starter home ownership program and the direct lending program. So that is the future of the Housing Corporation and the Home Mortgage Corporation.

Let me say this to you: in the Housing Corporation we found that the need for social housing, for example, started to go up fairly rapidly because of the economic activity, inflation, and skyrocketing rents. Rather interestingly, when we provide the alternative of home ownership, we're starting to experience vacancy rates in social or community housing. In

other words, we have approved 900 or 1,000 units of rental social housing a year, but at the same time we have provided the opportunity to purchase. We've done exactly what we wanted to do. Indeed we have started to decrease the requirement for rental social housing. Though I think we have 900 for approval in this budget, this coming year we will be looking seriously at the need for community housing related to the fact that they can now afford to own their own condominium or home. This program will be dovetailed into this other program and, I suggest, the need for rental community housing is going to drop.

The area of senior citizens is more difficult. Because of fixed incomes and the increasing number of people on fixed wages in this area, our projections are that there's not necessarily going to be a diminishing trend. In fact, it's going to rise. The senior citizens' self-contained apartment program, which is so attractive and desirable, really only started a few years ago. The actual stock is not that high. I can't remember the figure exactly, but we have across the province somewhere in the region of 6,000 units, and the demand is very high. They are being operated by non-profit organizations, church organizations, at a minimal cost to government. This is not a bad way to subsidize senior citizens, apart from raising their assured Alberta income plan. So I see growth in that area.

We are, of course, dropping in lodges. The number of lodges required has dropped considerably, so we're not building them. The senior citizens of Alberta still demand and want privacy, so the senior citizens' self-contained apartment program is going up. This is the third year in a row we've approved over 1,500 units, 1,548 this year. The lodge program is dropping, apartments are going up considerably, and a lot of senior citizens are in fact getting into homes. Where possible the 10 per cent of public or community housing is allocated to them.

But the other area that has to come up in a major way is not necessarily lodges, but nursing homes. The transition is from a self-contained apartment where you live in your own privacy as your own boss, if you wish, through the lodge into the nursing home. As a government we have to concentrate on the nursing home area, and we are going to, as the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has indicated. For example, we have for the first time budgeted \$10 million in the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation to begin the process of funding, through the private sector, senior citizens' nursing homes directly by using the heritage savings trust fund.

I hope I've answered your questions. We are constantly relating one program to the other. The reason we've separated the two corporations is so we can deal from a banking point of view, if you wish, on one side, do this averaging between the low-interest and the high-interest requirements, and provide social housing, land banking, and so forth.

Very briefly on Mill Woods, Mr. Chairman: I give credit to the previous government for buying the land in Mill Woods, but that land is being used very effectively. In fact, the lots are coming on the market at the rate of some 700 lots per year or more. [interjection] Good. Excellent. We had quite a discussion with the city as to what they were selling their lots at from a provincial government land bank. You will probably remember a rather heated discussion a year

and a half or so ago between me, the mayor of Edmonton, and the city council.

What has happened is that all lots — and the recipients of the lots build under our programs, the direct lending program and SHOP — are sold with the second forgivable second mortgage. The price of these lots in Mill Woods varies somewhere between \$13,000 and \$19,000, and is related to the production of an affordable house. Now there is a second mortgage at \$10,000 to \$12,000 on that lot, taken out by the city with the Home Mortgage Corporation's approval. Ten per cent of that mortgage is forgivable annually, so in 10 years the entire second mortgage is forgiven. So if a person doesn't want to speculate, but truly buys a lot and a home for use rather than speculation, that second mortgage between, let's say, \$18,000 and \$30,000, is forgiven.

This arrangement and contractual agreements we signed with the city of Edmonton in terms of administering the Mill Woods land bank. This is where we are using very effectively the co-operative housing program. If you want to see affordable housing, go to Mill Woods and see a 1,200 square foot house built for \$48,000, with a lot at \$15,000 that has a second mortgage, but the second mortgage doesn't come into the total price of the house. This person has joined a co-op, has gone to NAIT, I can't remember for how many weeks, but quite a few. It costs him \$80 or a little more to go on a course. They band together in a co-operative organization of a minimum of five to 25 people, go out there and use sweat equity, engage their own subcontractors and build their own houses.

Last year I think we had around 300. This year, I think I indicated in my budget debate, this program is expanding and going to Calgary, Wetaskiwin, Vegreville, and some of the other smaller centres. This again, Mr. Chairman, is an alternative. It is simply following the path we decided on some years ago to provide people with alternatives.

Those who wish to work very hard and build their own home with some sweat equity can indeed do so and get that single-family house on a 50-foot lot at a reasonable and affordable price. If they qualify for a reduced interest loan through the Home Mortgage Corporation, SHOP or the direct lending program, they can end up with a 7.75 per cent loan, a nice 1,200 square foot house with probably \$6,000 or \$7,000 of sweat equity. The whole family helps build the house, not just that young couple. The whole family is there on weekends, shingling and so forth. It is really very rewarding.

If there is a program I've been excited about to a large degree in the last couple of years — though I've been excited about all our programs — it's this one, where young couples have the guts and the tenacity to go out there and become their own managers, their own general contractors, and build their own homes. For example, I've had single parents, women with one or two children, act as their own contractors. In fact they have built homes for themselves at reasonable prices.

MRS. CHICHAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make just a few comments, and a few questions to the minister. He is covering the exciting program under the Department of Housing so well that he leaves very little for inquiry and discussion.

However, there are a few areas. I would like to ask the minister whether he has some update in reporting with regard to the federal/provincial ministers' conference held in Edmonton at the start of the year.

Before I go into that, I would simply like to commend the minister for, yes, the very many exciting programs developed under his guidance and jurisdiction. I know when you look at the development in senior citizen housing, many of my citizens have expressed real gratitude for the type of housing that has been made available to them. In fact they've been extremely excited. I go back and visit some of the senior citizens in their self-contained units. They may have been in the units for two or three years, but they continue to say: we're so excited, we don't think senior citizens anywhere are as fortunate as we are here in Alberta. They don't believe they would have been able to enjoy their senior years to the extent they can now because of the kind of homes provided for them, the innovations and the plans made available, and the degree to which we strive to meet their needs under all and any circumstances.

I know as well that many young couples have indicated their extreme fortune in recognizing that now, perhaps for the first time in their lives, they can dream about owning their own homes. In fact, many of them have succeeded in doing this, in purchasing.

But I would like to ask the minister whether he is in a position at this time to provide us with some update on where the negotiations or considerations stand with regard to the neighborhood improvement program. Has the federal government made any indication yet whether it intends to continue the program beyond the 1980 time line? And is the minister in a position to indicate if the federal government is considering some new directions with regard to the neighborhood improvement program, in the manner in which funding is provided, and the degree of flexibility that may be left to enable the provincial government and the municipal governments to determine the areas and needs, and how the overall funding might be appropriated to a greater extent?

I'd be interested in hearing whether the minister has given some consideration — he may have made the announcement, and I may have missed it — with regard to AHOP, the Alberta home ownership program. Is there some expansion of the program to be applicable to existing homes, both within and outside the areas of the neighborhood improvement program designations?

Could the hon. minister indicate whether a greater emphasis is designed on providing assistance for the purchase and/or rehabilitation of existing housing, particularly in areas that are NIP designated, but not exclusively so, rather than the funding being available for the construction of new units? I think the hon. minister will recall that I raised this point in some of my previous debates a year or two ago. I think it would be very helpful. I've had numerous approaches from young couples who want to establish themselves in the older neighborhoods rather than go to the outlying areas where the new residences are developed.

Has the minister made any progress in his discussions with his federal counterpart with regard to the ability to consider as a write-off or a tax exemption either mortgage interest in housing or some portion of the property tax, to make it easier, particularly for

those home-owners in the lower income brackets — to give them a little more leeway or working capital and the opportunity to enjoy to some extent some of the benefits of our social living that they might not otherwise have because of the budgetary constraints.

I'm pleased that the minister has, I think, extensively expanded the program or considered bringing in some real activity: the construction for senior citizen nursing homes, or just nursing homes that will accommodate not only senior citizens but perhaps younger citizens who require that type of facility.

Mr. Chairman, generally I'm extremely pleased with how the minister has developed the Department of Housing, the many exciting things that have happened in a very short period of time since 1975. I would be pleased to hear the minister's remarks with regard to the points I have raised.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, I may miss some of the points the Member for Edmonton Norwood has raised. However if I do, she can put them all on the table again, and I'll try to respond. But I would particularly like to respond to her queries with respect to the relationship between the provincial and federal governments, and the results of the conference that occurred in Edmonton, by provincial initiative, on the last day in January and the first day in February of this year. I'll deal with several of the points.

First of all, the provincial ministers met during the first day and reviewed a number of items. One was the deductibility of mortgage interest rates for income tax purposes. I want to suggest that the ministers did not agree with that proposal; that proposal was not recommended to the federal government by the provincial ministers.

The other matter discussed by the provincial ministers was the deductibility of property tax from the federal income tax. The consensus was that the federal government should study the feasibility of the tax credit approach, to implement this type of approach. So we agreed there on a study.

In regard to NIP, the first point I would like to place on the table, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that there is no doubt that existing NIP appropriations, which have been made for a series of years, are in place and will continue. It is new projects under the federal/provincial NIP program that are in question.

NIP is funded, as I remember — I can't remember the exact formula. I don't want to be incorrect, so I'm not going to mention the formula of actual funding. I think it's 50 per cent by the federal government, 25 per cent by the province, and 25 per cent by the municipality. But some adjustments are possible.

I would like to indicate to the Assembly what the provincial ministers recommended to the federal minister in regard to NIP. Consensus was reached on the following: that NIP should be extended indefinitely as an ongoing program; two, NIP and RRAP, the rural rehabilitation program, should be part of the global funding financing program when implemented; thirdly, it should be left up to each province to specify the program objectives and selection criteria in terms of that province's municipal priorities, and municipalities selected should be chosen by the province; four, more flexibility is required to provide RRAP outside NIP areas where there is a definite need to repair homes; five, all NIP improvements, including municipal services; should be eligible for the 50 per cent

federal funding, as the current system favors cultural/recreational projects; six, an increased funding commitment is required for this popular program, as many more municipalities have expressed a desire to participate, with priority given to the RRAP part of the program; and seven, that AHOP under the federal government — which is low-income housing — should be made applicable to existing NIP designated areas.

Now the federal minister's response was as follows: NIP could be part of the global funding program, because the provinces had put before the federal government a global funding proposal; two, the assisted home ownership program, the federal AHOP, may be applicable to existing homes within and outside NIP areas.

Now the Member for Edmonton Norwood has asked what the situation is today in connection with NIP, RRAP, and AHOP, which are federal programs primarily but tied into provincial assistance. The only thing I can say is that I know the federal minister has been trying very hard to get his programs before the federal cabinet before a certain event. My understanding is that there was a discussion in the federal cabinet last Friday in connection with the housing programs put forth by the provincial ministers to the federal minister and by the federal minister to the federal cabinet.

But the essence of what was accomplished at the provincial/federal housing meeting in Edmonton, which was taken by the federal minister to his colleagues, is primarily this: we had established a task force of provincial and federal officials to work out the implementation details of a global funding procedure whereby all federal/provincial housing programs would come under a global funding procedure, whereby funds were allocated over a three-year basis, and the priorities and approval process would primarily be left to the provinces. We would disengage ourselves from the terrible interlocking approval processes that now require so much time and waste so much money. The federal minister was favorably disposed to this proposal. The committee of officials have in fact worked out the mechanics and have proposed and put it before the federal minister and the provincial ministers.

The second part dealt with by this task force was a re-examination of the whole area of social housing, to permit a much larger supply of social housing, particularly community housing, across the nation and move toward the federal government not supplying the capital, but the private sector providing the capital with the federal government providing the subsidies. Therefore social or community housing could be produced throughout the nation more on a need basis. If the need was far greater in Newfoundland or Nova Scotia, they could then perform, using private capital, to a much greater degree in those provinces. If it wasn't so highly needed — as I indicated, our own ownership program is replacing this program to some degree — then there wouldn't be so many units subsidized or produced in Alberta.

The third area was to deal with a new approach to community services, using federal and provincial money to fund municipal or community services. These programs primarily involve the federal government's sewer and water program, the neighborhood improvement program, and the rural rehabilitation

program.

Also, the third program involved in this package of re-examination was the grants to municipalities. A \$1,000 grant goes through the provinces to the municipalities for every home a municipality builds below a certain price structure. I believe currently or in the last year, Alberta municipalities received just over \$4 million for having approved and constructed housing under this price limit structure in their municipalities.

The officials were discussing an integration of these community services into a single program, funded in an appropriate way, with a great deal more responsibility and approval, responsibility resting with the provinces and the municipalities rather than with the federal government; again with the express intent to disentangle the programs and not have duplicate approvals and time delays in approval of housing projects.

Mr. Chairman, I should say this: the provincial ministers have been trying to arrange an additional meeting with the federal minister in the last several days, in fact weeks, because the committee of officials completed its work several weeks ago. It has been rather difficult to arrange a meeting in these trying times in Ottawa.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the minister for covering all the points I raised. I would like to raise one more point with regard to the discussions at the ministers' conference, on rural and native housing insofar as some consideration for extending the eligibility for funding of rural, low-income people, part-time and seasonal workers. What is the minister's view in this regard, and what progress has been made in respect to that particular consideration?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, I think I can answer that question most appropriately by indicating to the Assembly what the provincial ministers unanimously agreed upon with respect to the rural and native housing program, and then indicate the federal government response.

1. We are locked into unrealistic standards which should be revised with adequate provincial consultation.
2. The income eligibility and other criteria of the program should be reviewed to ensure that all low income rural families are eligible; in particular, farmers, fishermen, loggers, seasonal and part-time workers should not be excluded from the Program.
3. It was agreed that the Rural and Native Housing Program should go into communities of up to 5,000 population but be limited to communities below this level, at the province's discretion.

We have been limited to communities of 2,500 and lower. Therefore we excluded some very vital communities in Alberta, but we have been successful in getting several approved. I believe Slave Lake was approved subsequent to the initiation of the program. I think Bonnyville was approved, but we had requested approval of additional towns.

However, I want to suggest that the provincial ministers dealt with this and said it was agreed that: the Rural and Native Housing Program should go

into communities of up to 5,000 population but be limited to communities below this level, at the province's discretion.

In other words, we're really strongly suggesting that this should be a provincial decision with the municipalities, rather than a federal government decision.

With regard to the federal response, the following was agreed to by the federal minister:

1. that current standards be reviewed by Federal and Provincial authorities.
2. that the income eligibility and other criteria of the program should be reviewed to ensure eligibility of all low-income . . . families. Farmers, fishermen, loggers, seasonal and part-time workers should not be excluded from the program.
3. that the maximum size criteria of eligibility of communities be reviewed, particularly with respect to Provincial proposals that it be increased to 5,000.

Mr. Chairman, you will recognize why the provincial ministers wish to meet again at the earliest opportunity with the federal minister.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, my question is related to one of the earlier comments of the minister with regard to the fact that if we could cut in half the time of approving applications, we would accelerate the economy and do a number of things. The minister approached that concept very philosophically. But I wonder if I could ask a more specific question relative to that concept with regard to land assembly and land banking. Could the minister indicate what he has done in the last year or year and a half to decentralize decision-making with regard to land banking or land assembly for municipalities, rural municipalities specifically?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to suggest that the program of land banking within municipalities is very successful and has been moving forward quite appropriately. I think we now have land banks with some 30-odd communities. I have the lists. I can dig them out and tell you exactly what communities have land banks and how big they are.

The difficulty with that particular program, of course, is that municipalities can be totally unreasonable when they think they have an unlimited bank. Instead of having an appropriate land bank of 50 acres for a municipality, which is enough to keep it growing for 25 years or longer, they want twice or three times as much. So municipalities have been quite unreasonable on some occasions.

The other very important aspect of this program that Alberta Housing Corporation has to watch is simply this: escalating land prices. There just isn't any doubt that if anybody thinks the government or the Alberta Housing Corporation is coming into the area to buy land, the prices start to skyrocket. The municipalities haven't behaved judiciously in this area. They go out and create anticipation and, to a large degree, stir everybody up in terms of what direction land is going to be bought and at what price. Then they come to the Alberta Housing Corporation and say, we want to buy this parcel of land. By then the price is almost out of sight, and we can't produce a lot on the market at a reasonable price.

Our agreements with the municipality, through the

Alberta Housing Corporation, very specifically specify the nature of the marketing: 50 per cent of the lots will be marketed to this lower one-third of the income spectrum, and they can market the other 50 per cent as they wish, to whomever they want. But in order to maintain a lot price and a house price in an affordable area for at least 50 per cent of the population, we have to be judicious in what we pay for land in the smaller communities. If there is any difficulty in this area, it's not because of intent or because of budget, but simply because of procedure. Many municipalities have acted wisely in this area, but some haven't. Indeed some didn't want to.

I know a community in the member's constituency that felt it shouldn't have to respond at all to the requirement that 50 per cent of the lots be sold under the price structure to provide housing for the lower third of the spectrum, or below the price structure to provide a home and a price structure under the starter home ownership program and the direct lending program. So we had a little difficulty. But the problem was resolved, and the low- and middle-income people are getting some lots. Again, there was some difficulty, which was settled without too much acrimony.

MR. R. SPEAKER: With regard to the minister's comment, the problem I want to get at is in the procedures that do occur. The fact of the matter is that the regional people in Calgary knew what the situation was in the local community, knew that the community agreed with 50 per cent middle- and low-income housing. But the problem was just down the hall here, in the minister's office. He didn't know, until one of his officials in Edmonton telephoned the guy in Calgary and was told. That's the problem in procedures I'm talking about.

When I talk about decentralization, I'm asking the minister: has he changed the decentralization policy so that regionally, or at the local municipal level, there are some guidelines under which the municipalities can make some decisions for themselves? Under the present ones, when I went through this little bit of — I'm not sure what to call it — activity, there was no regional responsibility. It all rested in the minister's office, and it cost us a lot of money at the municipal level. If the minister hasn't changed that, nothing's really improved. So I think the minister — you know, this government talks about decentralization. One minister, the Deputy Premier, understands it, but it hasn't really flooded down to the rest of you. I think the Minister of Housing is the worst abuser of the whole thing.

MR. YURKO: I'm amazed. One of the main things I've worked on for the last seven years is decentralization, with sewer programs, water programs, housing programs, and community development programs. And we've been quite successful.

DR. BUCK: Decentralization of power.

MR. YURKO: Let me suggest to you that land buying is a very difficult, very ticklish and responsible business which to a large degree has to be regulated very closely. I don't mind telling you or anybody else what the procedure is in the Alberta Housing Corporation. The board of directors of the Alberta Housing Corpo-

ration gave the responsibility for final approval in certain areas to the president and chairman of the board. In the area of land buying and land banking that procedure of final approval rests with the president of the corporation and the chairman of the board. It will continue to rest there, because few activities are subject to greater abuse in the field than the area of land buying and land transfers. That's why, from experience — I would think the member would have experienced this in Mill Woods in terms of what the former government caused in the Alberta Housing Corporation with respect to a subsequent inquiry; I would have thought he learned the lesson extremely well.

So that area has to be closely controlled, closely guarded, and in fact managed to the nth degree. It'll continue to be managed in that way in the Alberta Housing Corporation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the minister can talk about worrying about somebody abusing the funds or doing something. The fact is, the minister shows no trust in local municipalities, or even urban municipalities. But the problem we had didn't start with Edmonton. That isn't where the abuse took place. Unfortunately it happened to be in our own housing authority. But there is no trust at the local municipal level at all. There are no guidelines for them in land assembly.

If the minister could say to the local municipality, a town of 1,000 will have this many funds available to buy land, the local municipality could get it done faster and on a more secretive basis. But by the time they start looking for land, negotiating it, and find the minister's office, everybody knows about it because it's months later. That's why the prices are up so much higher.

So the minister says, well, we have to put trust in the president and the chairman. But who do they tippy-toe to every time they need a decision approved? The minister puts his little stamp on it before the approval is given. So I don't think that's any decentralization of authority.

You should take a lesson from the Deputy Premier who trusts his regional transport officers to use the funds with a little flexibility, to meet the needs of the local community. But in your ministry there is just no way that ever happens. The central power sits in your office. How can you stand there and say, well we don't trust local municipalities; those people elected at the local level don't know what they're doing; they are all going to be doing us in, doing government funds in. Nonsense. What you have to do is give them some terms of reference.

You say they want to expand and build a big city at Vegreville, Two Hills, or Bow City. They want to build a big city and assemble all kinds of land. Nonsense. If there were some terms of reference, some trust that this kind of fund was available to expand according to needs, some negotiation, they could do it at the appropriate time. But the way the minister has done it, they have to come tippy-toeing to Edmonton, then they can't find him.

One, there's no decentralization. Two, there's no trust to local municipalities. And three, you're asking them to come up here and put all the pressure they can on you to get all they can, because they don't know when they're going to get any more later on.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, all I would like to have is the record prove for itself how successful the land banking program is, and I'm prepared to table at any time the number of communities that have engaged in this program in the last couple of years. It's quite impressive.

All I wish to suggest is that when the hon. member was in government he had an opportunity to use his management processes in the whole area of decentralization, and that was some management: as predicted by his own government, 85 per cent of the population was going to reside in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary in just a few more years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

MR. YURKO: Indeed, if there ever was a successful policy and program by this government, with good management and some degree of courage, it is in this area of decentralization, in fact creating viable communities out of all these towns which were created by the pioneers. Here is this individual who had an opportunity to do this, and you know what he said in his study?

AN HON. MEMBER: What did he say?

MR. YURKO: Eighty-five per cent of the people of Alberta were going to live in Edmonton and Calgary.

AN HON. MEMBER: Terrible.

MR. YURKO: Now that's some policy.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The minister stands there attempting to take credit for things that were going to happen in Alberta whether we or the Conservatives were in power. [interjections] Nonsense he gives us. What increased the rural population? The farm income increased the rural population. That income wasn't related to the former Minister of Agriculture or the present one. World conditions predicted that.

DR. BUCK: I suppose they invented oil.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Yes. I mean, that is the next thing: he is going to stand up and say he invented the oil, and he is going to go to Ottawa to invent great things in Ottawa. Nonsense.

But, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that land assembly in this province may have taken place in various rural towns, villages, and cities, but the process took a long time. They all had to come cap in hand to the minister for approval. That's not decentralization; that's not trusting local municipalities. At this point in time it's not going to change, and what minister can change responsibility-giving? I just hope the next minister has the capability of giving a little trust and authority to local governments. I think if we trusted local people, land assembly that occurred may have occurred at a lot lower price, and the same thing would have been done.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, I can see there's another example of absolute lack of understanding of the management process. Indeed in the land buying process, an option is taken very early in the game. The

officers in the field with the Alberta Housing Corporation have the opportunity, the privilege to take an option on land very early in the game. [interjections] In some cases the municipality doesn't even ask. We anticipate growth in the area and go out and take the option, as the Housing Corporation does in a number of areas, for example Bruderheim. And indeed the options are taken very early.

But before that option is finally approved as to requirement, indeed as to extent and price, it has to go through the process and come to the proper signing authorities. That authority, on final approval — and generally a 30-day option is taken, a 6-month option is taken; I think we've had one case where we've taken a year's option. So we take the option on the land very early in the game. Our people involved in land buying and taking options of land are just as efficient and knowledgeable as any other organization in the province. [interjections]

So in fact the system is working extremely well under the management system established. All you have to do, Mr. Chairman, is examine the record. If you want the record, why don't you ask for it, not only as to how many places we've land banked but the prices and indeed the number of lots that come on the market annually. Indeed, we were asked to come into Fox Creek and bail out the town because it totally mismanaged the process of buying land, servicing it, and bringing reasonable lots on the market. So they came hat in hand and asked the Alberta Housing Corporation to bail them out.

So there is a great deal of expertise in the Alberta Housing Corporation. It's working under a very efficient and good management, and indeed it's accomplishing what it sets out to do. The record proves it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: My comment on that whole speech is one thing: the minister is saying, we know what is best for the communities in this province; the control must rest with us; we will do the best for the people.

MR. DIACHUK: Well, that's what your friend wanted.

MR. R. SPEAKER: You know, that's not good enough. That's millions of dollars spent here where there is just a lack of local participation; our land buyers know what is best. But if there were some kind of trust built into the program and the policy and the decentralization concept, something better could happen. It's just not good enough.

MR. KING: In view of the time, Mr. Chairman, the first question I'd like to ask is whether or not in NIP areas it is possible for the same couple or individual to apply for assistance under both CHIP and RRAP for the same residence.

AN HON. MEMBER: Good question.

MR. YURKO: I presume the member is referring to the federal government insulation program, which is CHIP [interjections] — they took a page out of our book — and the rehabilitation program, which are both federal programs.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, a point of order, just so the rest of the members understand. We had a bet with the Minister of Housing and Public Works that

he could not go 10 minutes without using initials. He went 12. He deserves his \$10. [laughter]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Well really, betting in the House is illegal. [laughter]

DR. BUCK: Does the House get 10 per cent?

AN HON. MEMBER: Foster gave us a permit.

DR. BUCK: Can we have a calcutta on this?

MR. KING: Really, I had the question written down even before the bet was made. It just became more urgent as time went on. But what I really wanted to know was whether or not, within a neighborhood improvement area, it is possible for a couple to apply for and receive assistance under the senior citizens' home improvement program as well as the residential rehabilitation assistance program, and I suppose I could add the home insulation program.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, I really don't see why a person can't qualify for two or even the three programs, provided he doesn't get paid for doing the same job two or three times. If it's properly approved, the work is done in accordance with the programs, and the work is in fact done, I don't really see why the programs don't apply to him. It has been suggested to me that there have been instances where a home-owner does a certain job, then tries to collect twice for the same job under two programs, and this is where the difficulty has arisen.

MR. KING: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I should have said that if I could, I'd like to ask three questions. The second one relates to the land surveys being done. We have discussed land assembly this evening, generally in terms of an already existing urban municipality. I wonder if the minister could comment on any work that is being done in the department, or on the current thinking of the department with respect to land assembly for the creation of instant or new towns outside presently existing urban municipalities.

MR. YURKO: I think, Mr. Chairman, I might indicate that the private sector is involved to some degree in terms of the creation of a new town like the Ardrossan project. I would also like to suggest that through the commissioner in Fort McMurray, with the Department of Municipal Affairs, the Alberta Housing Corporation is of course actively involved in the planning and the location of a new town north of Fort McMurray. This of course is conditional on a number of matters as to whether or not it will become a reality.

I should indicate that the Department of Housing and Public Works has looked at one particular possibility: the possible creation not of a new town but a natural growth, if a certain thing happened. For example, if a major water system were built on the North Saskatchewan River north of Fort Saskatchewan to service a number of communities, the question that cropped up and was debated within the department was whether or not a town would crop up at the point where the water plant was built. And this was considered a very definite possibility.

If there are facilities — highways, water facilities,

good non-agricultural land that's not very expensive — that's a natural condition for the growth of a new community. If conditions are right and jobs are available in the area, you can have pretty rapid growth of a new centre. But we haven't actively, as a department nor as a government I think, pursued or considered a new town except for the one north of Fort McMurray.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, could I just ask further to that whether or not any work has been done in this jurisdiction, or perhaps in other jurisdictions that the minister is aware of, respecting the short-term and long-term economics of the construction of new towns, removed from existing infrastructure.

MR. YURKO: I believe we certainly have the figures which were put together in considerable detail for a town north of Fort McMurray. I'm sure some of the figures are available for the Ardrossan situation, if we wanted to ask for them.

But I do want to suggest this: in the creation or evolution of a new town, the private sector attempts to pass on as many of the costs as they possibly can to the province, in such a way of course that they maximize their profit and have a viable entity, but unloading costs for transportation on the province, some of the infrastructure, indeed if there is need for a water supply, transferring to the province the costs of the water supply. The Red Deer water line was an example that made a number of towns quite viable, which are now growing.

The question always relates to how much of the real costs are transferred to the province from the person building the town. This means hospitals, recreational facilities, schools: all the amenities that have to come to the community. Generally the persons trying to build the new town, or building the houses, like to shove this on the province or on somebody else to look after, so they can just concentrate on housing.

But I have indicated to several of the bigger builders that if they want to come forth with a proposal that's indeed a complete module, a complete town that has everything in it, all the amenities besides just the housing, my department would certainly be prepared to look at such a module, if in fact some company is prepared to put one forth.

MR. GOGO: Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. As hon. members know, I'm never critical of the opposition. But I sit here tonight and listen to some of the things being said, and heaven knows, Bill Yurko is not perfect.

DR. BUCK: He thinks he is.

MR. GOGO: He's not even easy to get along with.

But you know, Mr. Chairman, it's one thing for a government to announce a program, and it's quite another thing to make it work. If anybody has made any program work in this government, it's the Minister of Housing and Public Works. I suggest that he has probably delivered as many or more units, both of senior citizens' self-contained units and other units, in the opposition's constituencies as he has in any other. Why is it they can't stand up and say, well, minister, you've done a good job. I don't understand that.

DR. BUCK: You don't even understand the democratic process.

MR. GOGO: And I don't pull teeth.

But let's look at the record just for a minute. The government in '75 ran on a platform, and if I'm not mistaken the number one priority was housing. They recognized the hierarchy of needs of people: food, clothing, and shelter. Maybe the reason they recognized that was it hadn't been done for so long. I don't know why not, but I do know they appointed the man as minister, they gave him this challenge, and he's delivered.

Look at the record. Look at the record in terms of Canada, America, and Alberta, just over a couple of years. In America they delivered about eight units per 1,000 people. In Canada, where it was a priority of the government of Canada, they delivered 11. But in Alberta over 22 per 1,000 were delivered. Now surely that's a record to be proud of, and even the opposition should be.

They talk about rural Alberta, the increase on the agricultural scene, the increase of the agricultural prices, and being responsible. Well, it wasn't the agricultural policies that produced over 10,000 units in rural Alberta in terms of shelter; it was this government and that minister. That's who produced it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Oh, nonsense.

MR. GOGO: It's fine for the Member for Little Bow to talk nonsense. It's fine. [interjections] I don't profess to be smart. I know last year there were over 35,000 migrants into Alberta, and probably in '68 there were 35,000 a year out of Alberta.

I am quite proud of the fact that the minister is one who responds. As I recall at policy conventions of the Progressive Conservative Party, when he was asked to support a method whereby the payment of municipal taxation should be deducted, he approached the federal government. He's been trying to sell the federal government. The fact they haven't listened is not his fault, but he's tried. I just get a little uptight when I see members of this Assembly, even though they're in opposition, fail to recognize, to give praise where praise is due. If there's one minister in this government who has an extremely proud record of delivering programs that are promised by the government, it's the Minister of Housing and Public Works, and I think we should all be proud of him.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, already there's jockeying going on for the minister's position if the minister leaves for Ottawa. [interjections] It's just obvious that a government that's been in power for seven years, that has become so arrogant that it's trying to tell this Legislative Assembly that you should not question any decisions this government makes, you should not question any expenditures this government makes . . . I would like to say to the hon. Member for Calgary West, or Lethbridge West . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Calgary West, too.

DR. BUCK: . . . that maybe the hon. Member for Lethbridge West would have done all the people of Alberta a favor if he had got the nomination for

Lethbridge federally, so he could go down to Ottawa, because the responsibility in this Legislature, Mr. Chairman, is not just to take everything *carte blanche*. The government has 69 puppets there who can pat the minister on the back. I'm going to tell that Member for Lethbridge West that it's not our responsibility on behalf of the people of Alberta just to sit here and let everything drift by. If the Member for Lethbridge West doesn't like the questioning, he can leave. We won't miss him at all.

You know, we would be shirking our responsibility to the people of Alberta, Mr. Chairman, if we were just to say, well now, Mr. Minister, my, aren't you doing a fine job. Nothing is so good that it can't be improved. No legislation is so good it shouldn't be questioned, or amendments suggested.

So to the hon. Member for Lethbridge West: what a bunch of poppycock. If the minister's doing such a good job, we just want to help him along so he does a better job. That's all. You know, the minister is responsible for the expenditure of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. The members of this Legislature on the government side start thinking all that money is theirs. That money doesn't belong to them. It's entrusted to them to spend it on behalf of Albertans. I'd like the government to remember that, Mr. Chairman. [interjections] Right. I'd like them to remember that.

Today I got a note from the hon. Minister of Agriculture; he sent some information to me. I'm not telling any secrets. It's just an indication that we have to remember that the funds we are looking after are not our funds. They belong to the people of this province. We are representing them.

So for the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, I'd just like to say if he doesn't like this process he can leave. We won't miss him. People of Lethbridge West wouldn't even miss him. They might miss the Member for Calgary West a little, but he can always be replaced. As a matter of fact, it's too bad the Minister of Housing and Public Works is leaving, because when the Premier steps down, as he said he will after the next election — probably in 18 months is my guess — I'm sure the Minister of Housing and Public Works would have been the first man to throw his hat in the ring to take the position of the hon. Member for Calgary West.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The people forced him.

DR. BUCK: That's right, he'd be forced. We might have to read three volumes of those famous speeches of the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works.

But I just want to close, Mr. Chairman, and say there is a responsibility on our side of the Legislature, and we will fulfil that responsibility.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, could we be responsible now and get back to the estimates?

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Back to the estimates. On another subject, senior citizens' lodges. We have two very well-run ones in my constituency, and we have 20 new beds. My comments are to the minister. A couple of ideas and trends might be developing.

This fall I had the opportunity to visit a lodge in

east-central Alberta. Mr. Minister, I was surprised to find that the average age in the lodge was 79. When the lodge program was first implemented in the province, I believe the age was around the 65 mark. I think we're moving into a trend in rural Alberta where senior citizens are definitely entering the lodges at an older age. I can understand why. Your programs on self-contained units, senior citizens' housing improvement have certainly kept them in their homes for a longer period of time.

But I was also surprised, Mr. Minister, in talking to the senior citizens in our lodges, it seems their number one priority is to get out of the lodge and into a nursing home as soon as they can. Their concern in getting into a nursing home is: they have some protection if someone has a heart attack and no medical facility is close by. They tell me that when a death occurs in a lodge, the morale certainly drops. It takes about two or three weeks to pick up again.

I realize this is a little out of your department, but a suggestion: perhaps your colleague the minister of social development could enter into discussions with the medical profession for a contract that, say, a clinic would send a doctor in once or twice a week to reassure these people that they're okay.

It seems in our area — and of course it's difficult to get into the nursing home. I have a town in my constituency where the senior citizens have proposed an idea to me. They would like to see a combination lodge/nursing home type of accommodation. I realize we have one or two in the province. They have proved to be extremely expensive, but they have been extremely good health care.

I would like the minister's comments on that idea from Daysland. Is there merit in a combination nursing home and lodge, and have we now perhaps reached the maximum of lodges needed in rural Alberta? There are some occupancy rates out there. Perhaps we've now reached the point where we should move our emphasis into other forms of accommodation, nursing homes instead of lodges.

Thank you.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, very quickly, I think the average age that has been given to me in regard to lodges across the province is 84 years.

First of all I would like to say that what the government is trying to provide in the area of housing for senior citizens is alternatives. We're not trying to suggest that senior citizens should go to one type of house or another type of accommodation. We're trying to provide alternatives. We have a very specific policy of keeping senior citizens in their own houses as long as they possibly can stay there. That's why the \$1,000 home repair program was instigated. It's been very effective in terms of delaying the movement from their own homes into government-sponsored accommodation.

Then of course we have the self-contained apartments, which are becoming very popular. This is probably the most popular type of housing.

But, Mr. Chairman, in the last couple of years we have also implemented the core housing incentive program, called CHIP, which is building a large number of apartments. As a matter of fact, I think we budgeted about \$80 million dollars last year to the Home Mortgage Corporation. Half the units are rent regulated, and half are generally one-bedroom, or

some bachelor. A large number of these units with the rent regulated below \$250 a month are going to senior citizens. So this is the third alternative senior citizens have. Besides their own homes, government-built and -rented senior citizens' apartments, CHIP apartments, are becoming quite popular. I think the Kerby Centre has recommended a very large number of senior citizens for these rent-regulated suites under the core housing incentive program.

Of course, the fourth alternative is the lodges, and the fifth is the nursing homes.

I should indicate that Mr. Miniely and I have looked at the possibility of a combined nursing home and lodge. More primarily; we know we have a lot of land associated with lodges throughout the province, and this land can also be used to build a nursing home. I've asked the Senior Citizens Homes Association of southern Alberta to give us a brief on the interrelationship or the integration of a nursing home with a lodge, and how it could be done in an appropriate way.

There are differences. The fire code, for example, is considerably different. I think you have to provide a considerably longer time to evacuate a nursing home than a lodge. As a result, the escapes are different. In fact, the width of the hallways is different, because you have wheel chairs in one and not necessarily in the other. The catering facilities are somewhat different, because you are dealing with a different type of clientele.

At the same time, medical facilities are required, but without too much difficulty we can provide medical facilities on a part-time basis in the lodges. I think some of them are in fact doing it. We have medical facilities on a part-time basis in some of our senior citizens' self-contained apartments. For example, Carter Place in Calgary has a part-time medical facility, providing a nurse on a part-time basis to that large complex. So there is an evolution, a fairly substantive movement in this direction.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, I wish I had been able to speak a little sooner. When I motioned, I wanted to speak in reference to the hon. Member for Little Bow when he made the statement that the minister is patting himself on the back for something that was going to happen.

I would like to mention that in 1965 I was one of 1,200 school trustees, municipal and county councillors, and various other individuals from local government who sat at a seminar when the premier of that day bluntly told us that within 10 years, 85 per cent of the population of this province would be in the two metropolitan cities, and nothing could be done about it. It was shaping up very quickly. Had the previous government stayed in office, I don't think it would have taken 10 years. At that time there were already circles on the map, which towns and villages had to be taken off. Between Lloydminster and Edmonton there was a circle around Lloydminster, Vermilion, Vegreville, and Fort Saskatchewan. The other towns and villages had to die within 10 years.

The decentralization programs of this government, to provide a balanced growth, have really worked. I don't think it was ever intended that the two metropolitan cities were not going to grow, but if they were, they would not grow at the expense of rural Alberta.

In my constituency every town and village, with the exception of one, has grown in population. Take the little village of Chipman. In 1963 they had a population of 161; the present population is 299. If two more families would move in, the population would have doubled inside of four years.

These are the results of our decentralization programs. There is no way the hon. Member for Little Bow can stand in his place and say things had to happen that way.

MR. ZANDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the minister one question. First of all I certainly wish to thank the minister, who made it possible to provide water and sewer to four centres in my constituency. This would not have happened had it not been for the understanding of that portfolio and its minister to come forth so these communities could grow.

Mr. Chairman, I think there are more name plates of the hon. minister on more public structures, such as senior citizens' housing, lodges, homes, and self-contained units throughout the province than of any other minister of that kind in all of Canada. I think for criticism to be launched against him certainly is not thankful for the service the minister has rendered.

DR. BUCK: Tell me one other province that has \$6 billion in the bank.

MR. ZANDER: I think you could almost say that's good management, if you have the homes and the money left over for future development.

But in Vote 6.4, the \$5,407,000 that is set aside for land banking, would the minister indicate whether there is a formula or structure set up whereby certain moneys have been allocated to smaller centres and larger centres, or is there a selected committee established for that purpose?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, there are two land banking programs. One is capital funding and the other is income account funding. The one in which capital is allocated is land banking and land development for residential purposes, and the capital allocated to that program this year doesn't appear in the estimates. That capital, allocated through the Alberta Housing Corporation, is a total of \$24 million. That's the land banking and land development program for residential development through Alberta Housing Corporation with the municipalities; there is a capital allocation of \$24 million this year.

There is a second land banking and development program between the Alberta Housing Corporation and the municipalities. That is the industrial land development program, which has \$5 million allocated to it — I'm sorry, and that's also a capital allocation. What's done with that program is: with the co-operation of five other ministries, but primarily through the departments of Business Development and Tourism and of Municipal Affairs, serviced industrial land banks are being provided to the smaller centres and funded through the Alberta Housing Corporation, through this program, to give them the opportunity to attract industry to their towns.

There is such a demand for this program: I think somewhere over 40 communities have now applied. It's a case of us having to establish priorities in terms

of the allocation of funding to a certain number of communities per year. It's intended to build this \$5 million to about \$25 million, then have the fund revolve so it is accessible to the municipalities on a revolving basis to increase their industrial land banks.

Under the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation there is of course a residential lot development fund. But that is straight mortgage to the private sector. A total of \$25 million is allocated to that fund, I believe, for residential land development through the private sector.

So one can't suggest in any way that the provincial government isn't relating to the municipalities in a pretty major way in terms of land banking and land development in partnership with them for residential construction, secondly for industrial development. Thirdly, a substantial fund is provided to the private sector so that house builders can get back into the land development business, primarily in the smaller centres.

MR. ZANDER: A supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister briefly outline the approach that has to be made by a municipality to get into the program, not only for the information of this House but for the information of the hon. Member for Little Bow?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, the residential land development program is eminently described in this pamphlet, which he can have. Indeed the industrial land development program is described very adequately in this pamphlet, which is available and has been distributed. And the land assembly and development program is very adequately described in this pamphlet, which has been available to the hon. members for some time as has an excellent description of all programs. These pamphlets and programs are made available to all municipalities. They're sent to them on a regular basis, so they have them available at all times.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the minister a question related to the senior citizens' lodges. The lodge in Bow Island has almost completed an addition with a number of extra rooms. I looked at these rooms a few weeks ago, and their size seems quite adequate in comparison to the old lodges. I wonder if the minister would recommend to the older lodges, with the appropriate monetary support if any would be needed, taking the double rooms, which are not, all that big for two people, and making them into single rooms so our senior citizens would have a little more space in which to live, in the older parts of the older lodges.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, very briefly: the board of directors of the Alberta Housing Corporation recently passed by resolution a two-part policy. The first part is that if there is only one senior citizen in a double room, he or she pays the rate of a single room. However, if there is a waiting list at the lodge, a second person has to be given access to that room. If a number of double rooms have single people in them and one person comes in and wants a room, the one that was used as a single room for the longest period of time will have to accept the second tenant.

Agreed to:	
1.0.1 — Minister's Office	\$115,160
1.0.2 — Deputy Minister of Public Works	\$117,960
1.0.3 — Deputy Minister of Housing	\$74,500
1.0.4 — Housing Policy and Program Development	\$816,180
1.0.5 — Administrative Support	\$824,100
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support	
Services	\$1,947,900
Total Vote 1 — Capital	\$17,000

Vote 2 — Financial Assistance for Housing

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, could I ask just two questions under Vote 2. One is under the handicapped home assistance program the minister announced. The question I'd like to ask is: has he been approached by landlords, or has the minister given any consideration to extending the program to apartment buildings, to modify the buildings to improve access for handicapped tenants?

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, another question: as far as the Canadian home insulation program is concerned, I understand at the present time they have to contact Ottawa by phone when they make application. Is Alberta going to set up an office to accept or handle these applications? Has anything been done in this area?

MR. YURKO: In regard to the applicability of HAP to apartments, it's basically limited to home-owners, though a clause in the available brochure says:

If the applicant does not possess title or proof of ownership to the dwelling, he may still be eligible provided that he is the owner for all intents and purposes and does not pay rent.

So apartments are not applicable at this time. Let me go through it again.

Single family dwellings, duplexes, triplexes, four-plexes, townhouses, condominium apartments and mobile homes are eligible.

So if you own a portion of one of those complexes, you are eligible.

There is some degree of flexibility in the program. The minister has the opportunity to make some decisions that relate to special cases, as there has been in the senior citizens' home improvement program. I think we would tend to err on the part of being generous in dealing with the handicapped, rather than being too restrictive in connection with this program.

The province is not involved in any way with the Canada home insulation program. It's a federal government program. But my understanding is that you can apply to Central Housing and Mortgage Corporation in Edmonton. You don't have to apply to Ottawa or Montreal. The cheques come from Montreal, but you can make application through Central Housing and Mortgage Corporation in Edmonton. If people phone my office, they can get the address and phone number of Central Housing and Mortgage Corporation, where they can apply directly.

Agreed to:	
Total Vote 2 — Financial Assistance for Housing	\$14,836,835
Total Vote 2 — Capital	\$8,000

Total Vote 3 — Planning and Acquisition of Government Accommodations	\$56,150,000
Total Vote 3 — Capital	\$2,440,800

Vote 4 — Planning and Implementation of Construction Projects:	
4.1 — Administrative Support	\$5,671,500
4.2 — Advanced Education and Manpower	\$19,090,000
4.3 — Agriculture	\$573,000
4.4 — Attorney General	\$12,835,000
4.5 — Business Development and Tourism	\$360,000
4.6 — Culture	\$3,629,000
4.7 — Energy and Natural Resources	\$2,118,000
4.8 — Environment	\$11,366,000
4.9 — Executive Council	\$380,000
4.10 — Government Services	\$366,000
4.11 — Hospitals and Medical Care	—
4.12 — Labour	\$500,000
4.13 — Recreation, Parks and Wildlife	\$6,045,000
4.14 — Social Services and Community Health	\$18,812,000
4.15 — Solicitor General	\$12,670,000
4.16 — Transportation	\$2,117,000
4.17 — Treasury	—
4.18 — Housing and Public Works — Multiple Use Facilities	\$41,858,000
4.19 — Multi-Departmental Services	\$2,585,000
Total Vote 4 — Planning and Implementation of Construction Projects	\$140,975,500
Vote 4 — Capital	\$140,975,500

Total Vote 5 — Operation and Maintenance of Waterlines	\$700,000
Total Vote 5 — Capital	\$40,000

6.1 — Support Services	\$7,456,000
6.2 — Staff Housing	\$4,042,000
6.3 — Subsidized Housing for Low Income Albertans	\$35,080,000
6.4 — Land Assembly and Development	\$5,407,000
Total Vote 6 — Housing for Albertans	\$51,985,000
Less Revenue From Non-Budgetary Sources	\$23,136,000
Net Operating Requirement	\$28,849,000

7.1 — Support Services	\$3,897,000
7.2 — Mortgage Lending	\$56,635,000
Total Vote 7 — Mortgage Assistance	\$60,532,000
Less Revenue From Non-Budgetary Sources	\$56,910,000
Net Operating Requirement	\$3,622,000

Capital Estimates:	
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$17,000
Total Vote 2 — Financial Assistance for Housing	\$8,000
Total Vote 3 — Planning and Acquisition of Accommodation by Lease or Purchase (IDSS)	\$2,440,800

4.1 — Administrative Support	\$5,671,500
4.2 — Advanced Education and Manpower	\$19,090,000
4.3 — Agriculture	\$573,000
4.4 — Attorney General	\$12,835,000
4.5 — Business Development and Tourism	\$360,000
4.6 — Culture	\$3,629,000

4.7 — Energy and Natural Resources	\$2,118,000
4.8 — Environment	\$11,366,000
4.9 — Executive Council	\$380,000
4.10 — Government Services	\$366,000
4.11 — Hospitals and Medical Care	—
4.12 — Labour	\$500,000
4.13 — Recreation, Parks and Wildlife	\$6,045,000
4.14 — Social Services and Community Health	\$18,812,000
Total Vote 5 — Operations and Maintenance of Waterlines	\$40,000
Total Vote 6 — Housing for Albertans	—
Total Vote 7 — Mortgage Assistance	—
Total Capital Estimates	\$143,481,300
Department Total	\$247,081,235

DR. PAPROSKI: May I make one comment. On behalf of the constituents of Edmonton Kingsway, and I am sure of all the citizens of the province of Alberta, I'd like to rise to compliment the minister not only on the management of his department, but most important on the manner which he translated his department's policy to affordable, available homes for all citizens, with major thrusts to upgrade existing stock in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, for senior citizens' home improvement, and now of course the new home adaptation program, including other major thrusts for senior citizens' accommodation including nursing homes, the ability of the minister and his department to translate dollars into a direction of need is second to none. I'd like to leave that on the record.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, it would be appropriate for me to suggest that there are people within government, the civil service, who are entrusted with the management of very large sums of money: Indeed, the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation was entrusted with the handling of some \$318 million last year, and this year has been allocated some \$292 million of capital funding for housing programs throughout Alberta. The Alberta Housing Corporation had some \$182 million of capital funding last year. I know they have some \$357 million worth of ongoing projects throughout the province. That's being done with just a handful of people almost, some 230-odd people. This year they're being asked to undertake the management of some \$185 million.

Because of accelerated projects, the Department of Public Works has been allocated over \$140 million worth of public works projects. But if we add to that the projects being done by the department under the Alberta heritage savings trust fund, their responsibilities rest for in excess of \$200 million, which is a very large and difficult test.

In the Department of Housing itself we have some very complex grant programs and some very complex policy programs. The Department of Housing is responsible for establishing and reviewing all housing policy and programs through the two corporations. Therefore they not only have a big budget, but in fact some very large responsibilities in the area of policy.

The whole division of realty in itself has the responsibility for engaging all the space for the provincial government, renovating all space, and buying land for public works projects. I think you will find that in their area they're responsible for some \$60 million or \$70 million.

Mr. Chairman, added together this is close to \$800 million of capital and operating account handled primarily by in the order of 700 people. That is a terribly large and difficult task, and very complex in management.

I want to say for the record that we have within the department and within the two corporations some very dedicated, very knowledgeable, and very capable employees of the government of Alberta. It is not possible to put together a team of this kind in the shortest possible time. It takes years of experience and years of dedication, co-operation, and just getting along, one with another, to have a team of this nature work efficiently and under the most rigorous conditions, recognizing that mistakes can readily be made if proper management practices are not implemented.

I want to compliment these people, of whom there are 14 or 15 up in the stands, for doing a remarkable job of organization, reorganization, and management in the last several years in terms of undertaking and handling this responsibility on behalf of the people of Alberta. They are to be congratulated for the dedicated and professional civil servants they are. When I spoke earlier about an unresponsive bureaucracy, which I did in the Canadian context, I was in no way referring to the people working in the Department of Housing and Public Works and the two corporations, because I think their record of responsiveness is second to none.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the estimates of the Department of Housing and Public Works be reported.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Before we vote on the motion by the hon. minister, if you would turn back to page 47 of your capital estimates, there were four estimates we missed.

Agreed to:

Capital Estimates:	
4.15 — Solicitor General	\$12,670,000
4.16 — Transportation	\$2,117,000
4.17 — Treasury	—
4.18 — Multiple-Use Facilities	\$41,858,000
4.19 — Multi-Departmental Services	\$2,585,000
Total Vote 4 — Planning and Implementation of Construction Projects (IDSS)	\$140,975,500

[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 resolution, reports the same, and asks leave to sit again:

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31,

1979, amounts not exceeding the following sums be granted to Her Majesty for the Department of Housing and Public Works: \$1,947,900 for departmental support services; \$14,836,835 for financial assistance for housing; \$56,150,000 for planning and acquisition of government accommodation; \$140,975,500 for planning and implementation of construction projects; \$700,000 for operation and maintenance of water-lines; \$28,849,000 for housing for Albertans; \$3,622,000 for mortgage assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply further reports the following resolutions which were considered on April 17, 1978, and reports the same:

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979, amounts not exceeding the following sums be granted to Her Majesty for the Department of the Environment: \$2,446,205 for departmental support services; \$13,510,929 for pollution prevention and control; \$7,053,246 for land conservation; \$26,905,483 for water resources management; \$5,588,191 for environmental research; \$917,836 for

overview and co-ordination of environment conservation.

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979, amounts not exceeding the following sums be granted to Her Majesty for the Department of the Solicitor General: \$2,036,990 for departmental support services; \$32,942,085 for correctional services; \$43,843,801 for law enforcement; \$13,603,561 for motor vehicle registration and driver licensing; \$1,540,000 for control and development of horse racing.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 10:26 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]

