

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTAhead: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**Title: **Friday, April 28, 1978 10:00 a.m.****Department of
Advanced Education and Manpower**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 251
The Land Commission Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a private member's bill, Bill 251, The Land Commission Act.

Mr. Speaker, the principles contained in Bill 251 are: number one, to establish a five-person land commission; secondly, to set out clearly the protection of prime farmland from both urban sprawl and industrial development.

[Leave granted; Bill 251 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table replies to motions for returns 125 and 163.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, 17 years ago teacher Mrs. Ilnicki brought her class to this Legislature, and has every year since. With Mrs. Ilnicki today are one of the parents Mrs. William Banack, the school bus driver Mr. Banack, and 26 grades 7 and 8 students. Mrs. Ilnicki represents a small community in my constituency that is no stranger to this Legislature. I would ask the 7 and 8 class from the Round Hill school, teachers, parents, and school bus driver to rise and be introduced to this Legislature.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly a class of grade 10 students from the Stony Plain high school. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Le Bray and their counsellor and teacher Miss Regan. They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask them to stand and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure again to introduce a second class, 30 grade 5 students from the elementary school in Stony Plain. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. MacPherson. They are in the members gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to the Members of the Legislative Assembly the government of Alberta's decision to amend regulations governing the natural gas price protection plan to reduce energy costs at postsecondary institutions which qualify under the regulation.

As the largest consumer of natural gas among postsecondary institutions, the University of Alberta will immediately benefit from this regulation change by having its natural gas bill reduced by approximately \$0.5 million annually. Other postsecondary institutions will benefit as they become larger consumers of natural gas, and thereby qualify under the regulation for The Natural Gas Rebates Act. The change for the University of Alberta will be effective January 1, 1978.

A large public institution like the University of Alberta uses in excess of 2 billion cubic feet of natural gas annually. It provides energy to its own physical plant as well as to the University of Alberta Hospital, the W.W. Cross cancer clinic, the Alberta Research Council, St. Stephen's College, and other greater campus users.

Under the natural gas price protection plan, Mr. Speaker, institutions were allowed a rebate on only the first billion cubic feet of natural gas consumed. The effect of the new regulation will be to remove the 1 billion cubic foot ceiling, thereby making its application to postsecondary institutions consistent with its application to other public institutions primarily funded by the provincial government.

**Department of
Energy and Natural Resources**

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a ministerial statement regarding a northern Alberta energy resources research building. I would like to advise the members that cabinet approval has been given to the construction of a proposed northern Alberta energy resources research building, to be located in the town of Devon, about 20 miles southwest of Edmonton. The building will provide approximately 50,000 square feet of office and laboratory space, including a three-storey pilot plant, and will house the activities of two major programs concerned with coal research in Alberta.

The first involves the coal mining research centre, an entity set up under the terms of the Alberta/Canada energy resources research fund, with input from the Alberta and federal governments, The Coal Association of Canada, and private coal companies. The centre's prime objective is to develop new methods, or improve existing ones, for the mining and cleaning of Alberta's extensive thermal and metallurgical coal deposits. Emphasis will be given initially to projects directed towards upgrading the quality of Alberta's plains coal, treating coal spoil piles to improve reclamation, and improving underground mining technology for the economical recovery of the deeper, less accessible coal deposits of the province.

The second program encompasses the existing coal-related research activities of the Alberta

Research Council. These include studies of the composition and potential uses of the many types of coal which are found in Alberta, and investigations of the potential for conversion of Alberta coal to synthetic gas and liquid products for use as fuel and petrochemical feedstocks. Additionally, the new building will house the coal technology information centre, recently set up and operated by the Research Council to provide governments and industry with ready access to new developments in coal extraction, conversion, and reclamation technology.

The cost of the research centre is estimated at approximately \$5.5 million, including architects' fees and site development costs. The design and construction will be under Alberta Housing and Public Works, with mid-1981 as the target date for completion and occupancy.

The construction of the Devon building is a step in bringing together two groups of closely related research activities, and the new facilities will go a long way towards expanding and upgrading the amount and quality of coal research being done in Canada. Also, the project is another step towards helping to make Alberta the energy research centre in Canada.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Hospital Construction

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, who announced this morning, I understand, a new hospital to serve the residents of Edmonton and the county of Strathcona. Can the Premier outline to the Assembly what areas of specialization this new hospital in Edmonton, which the minister announced outside the House this morning, will be serving as far the greater Edmonton area is concerned?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think that matter could be dealt with much more appropriately and effectively by the minister during the course of his estimates.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier: is the minister going to be in the House this morning so that we'll be able to question him on the matter?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I would just have to repeat the matter. The minister will not be in the House this morning. We'll be coming to his estimates shortly, and the question can be put to him then.

Hospital Budgets

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then a supplementary question to the Premier. In light of the fact that the minister's estimates will be coming up shortly, would the Premier pass on to the minister our desire to have the operating budget allocations for the active treatment hospitals, auxiliaries, and nursing homes in Alberta, along with the medical care capital funding programs the minister has available in his budget for this year, so we can discuss those in the estimates? I'll file copies of our request for the Premier and for

the Assembly, so the minister will have that information when we deal with his estimates.

Coal Research Centre

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the second question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It flows from the announcement made this morning with regard to the Devon research centre. I raise the question in light of the concerns expressed to me in Grande Cache, where they were told not long ago by their own MLA that it would be at least one year until the government made a decision on this matter. The people in that area have been working on a very detailed presentation to the government, which I believe got to the government Monday or Tuesday of this week.

Why were the people in Grande Cache advised that it would be one year before the government would make a decision on this matter, so that they obviously didn't have an opportunity to get their presentation to the government so there could have been a detailed consideration of Grande Cache's situation?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether the assumptions of the hon. Leader of the Opposition which preceded his question are correct. However, I certainly did receive very strong representations from the MLA representing the Grande Cache area. I also received a brief from them. It was certainly given full consideration, as were the representations from the MLA for the area.

MR. CLARK: A supplementary question to the minister. In light of the fact that you received the most recent of those briefs Monday or Tuesday of this week, how can you tell us that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. leader please revert to the ordinary parliamentary form.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the minister received the most recent of those briefs Monday or Tuesday of this week, how can the minister indicate to the Assembly that in the course of two days the Grande Cache brief was seriously considered?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, Grande Cache as a location was seriously considered over a fair period of time.

Coal Marketing

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister, still dealing with the area of coal. Has the government given consideration to extending this swap concept that the government has talked of as far as our resources, namely gas, going to the United States for some concessions on agricultural products? Has Alberta explored that concept as far as Japanese interests in the tar sands are concerned, really to say to Japan that if Japan is in fact serious about investment in the Alberta tar sands, will they take a larger amount of coal from Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, a tenuous supplementary to the original question, but I'd be happy to reply to the question in any event.

I think the Leader of the Opposition should be clear that the government of Alberta is not requesting a swap. The government of Alberta will release natural gas under natural gas removal permits if it's surplus to Alberta's needs. If it is surplus, it doesn't have to be replenished. It is surplus; therefore we do not require a swap. The swap feature is evidently to be placed as a condition by the federal government under the National Energy Board's recommendations. Alberta is interested, though, in getting greater access and fairer treatment for trade matters with the United States, if we are going to sell natural gas to the United States.

Up to now, we have not explored any ties between development of coal with the Japanese and development of the oil sands.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has representation been made to the Alberta government by the government of Japan or Japanese interests on having a piece of development of future tar sands plants in Alberta, or the Cold Lake proposition?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I've not had any indication regarding the Cold Lake project. However, over the years various Japanese interests have been expressed in the Fort McMurray type of oil sands. Recently Petro-Canada, which holds some interests in the oil sands leases, has been negotiating with Japanese interests to carry out some research in the area. However, that research would have to go through the regulatory process in Alberta, and therefore is not yet at the stage to be considered.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the government prepared to consider the concept of placing a condition on future plants that would go ahead with Japanese interest: that approval would be tied to Japan and the industries in Japan taking a larger portion of coal from Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I gather it's a proposition the Leader of the Opposition is asking be given serious consideration. I'd certainly be pleased to do so.

Coal Research Centre (continued)

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. minister. Since the coal research centre is going to be of benefit to the entire province of Alberta, and since it couldn't be placed in other than one place, would the minister give the major reasons Devon was chosen?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, there was a fairly detailed assessment. It had to do with access to airports, universities, research facilities, and paved highways — Highway No. 2 south of Edmonton, Highway No. 16 west of Edmonton to the Grande Cache, Coal Valley, and Cardinal River areas; Highway No. 2 south to the Coleman, Drumheller, and Lethbridge areas, where coal is; and Highway No. 13 towards the Forestburg development. As I said before, the two airports for maintaining contacts with research groups elsewhere in the province, in Canada, and overseas — Edmonton industrial airport, for access to

Calgary, Grande Cache, and Lethbridge; library and computer facilities; water — it's a good source of water, Devon being on the North Saskatchewan River. It had to do with the quality of life, schools, hospitals, churches, shopping, and recreation facilities. A great number of these were judged, and many locations were considered. Also, a key factor was the government's policy of decentralization of new government institutions outside the two major centres, which are now growing very dramatically.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you very much. One further supplementary. Did I understand your statement to indicate that the Canadian government and the coal industry were contributing to the capital costs of the centre?

MR. GETTY: No, not to the capital costs of the centre, Mr. Speaker. The capital costs of the centre, though, are going to be partially funded from the energy resources research fund, which is built on export tax moneys we were able to negotiate with the federal government in the past during the export tax arguments and negotiations on pricing. That fund is some \$96 million, to be expended over five to eight years in energy research.

MR. TAYLOR: Just one further supplementary, if I may. Will this be the outstanding coal research centre in Canada? Is there anything comparable anywhere else in Canada?

MR. GETTY: We would like it to be, Mr. Speaker. However, it's not yet built, so it's difficult for me to judge. Certainly our intentions are for excellence in coal research.

Oil and Gas Industry

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources could explain the 300,000 barrels of oil daily in western Canada that are now declared surplus, if this problem of shutting in production is going to get worse over the next few years.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it's possible that over the short term it could get worse, if we continue to find additional reserves of conventional oil and gas. However, in our discussions with the federal government, one solution is to allow more of Alberta's conventional oil to flow into the Montreal market, which now has a pipeline capacity of 550,000 barrels a day and is using only 250,000 barrels a day. Therefore that would be a natural market for Alberta's shut-in oil.

MR. STROMBERG: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When light oil from the Syncrude plant and other developments in that area comes on stream, and it's a guaranteed market, and the predictions of the oil industry are production cuts of 30 to 40 per cent from some pools in the next five years, does the minister see a slowdown of drilling activity in our province?

MR. SPEAKER: We're quite obviously getting into the area of opinion. Unless the hon. member would like to get some facts relating to his concern, perhaps he

might deal with the matter outside the question period.

MR. STROMBERG: Maybe I could rephrase it. With the prediction of cutbacks in some pools, has the minister any plans or predictions that might help the oil industry?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the negotiations I mentioned with regard to increasing the flow of oil to other parts of Canada through the Montreal pipeline will be a natural thing about which we should be able to convince the federal government. It seems to me that 300,000 barrels of oil per day, or any part of that, will reduce imported crude oil and have a dramatic bearing on Canada's balance of payments deficit.

MR. STROMBERG: My last supplementary. Does the minister foresee a slowdown in the amount of drilling activity in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: I think it's quite obvious that the hon. member should either pursue his own research on the matter or deal with the question outside the question period. It is of course a question of fact whether a minister has an opinion, but to explore that opinion in the question period is another matter.

Alcan Pipeline

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to either the hon. Premier or the hon. Provincial Treasurer. On December 12, 1977, when the restraint program was announced, the Provincial Treasurer indicated that there would be an increase in capital works projects to take advantage of the slowdown in construction activity which will occur until construction begins on new major projects in the private sector. Was the government referring either generally or specifically to the Alaska Highway pipeline?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, that was one of the possible major projects we had in mind at that time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. At this stage in its planning process, is the government proceeding on the presumption that the Alaska Highway pipeline project will proceed?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think the obvious answer to that question is that in matters of this nature which involve primarily external factors, the government has to have flexibility in terms of its planning. There are a number of major possibilities that have been discussed in this Legislature over the course of this spring session, of major projects that can occur and start up over the course of 1979, '80, '81, '82, in that time frame. Our best judgment is that we should plan on the basis that a certain number of them may go. They may not all peak at the same time. Even if we might like to, we can't control the precise timing in the way we would prefer for the very best overall position for the economy of Alberta.

But as the Provincial Treasurer has noted, there is a small but distinct drop in overall construction activity from the private sector during the period we fore-

see, including 1978. That's why we have such a large capital program in this year's budget. We will be assessing these factors as they go on. I'm sure hon. members are aware that due to the variety of external factors, we have to be flexible in responding to that sort of planning.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. On Monday of this week the Premier indicated that the energy bill now before the U.S. Congress may delay the project for up to a year. Is the Premier in a position to advise whether the government of Alberta has reviewed the decision, I believe, of U.S. regulatory agencies or the regulatory commission, denying the application by several American gas utilities to include investment in the pipeline in the rate base, and the impact that that decision will have on the capacity of the participants to raise capital for the project?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, a number of factors are involved in the question of financing. We have periodic meetings with the major management representatives of the pipeline company. These factors vary from time to time. For example, a few days ago we were speaking about the problems within the United States Senate. I believe Senator Jackson has now been able to arrange a compromise that might be endorsed by the conference committees of the Congress and by both the House of Representatives and the Senate, which will be a positive feature.

The matter raised by the hon. member with regard to the financing strikes me as being a factor. But I've been led to believe, subject to checking, that the key factor will be the nature of the pricing involved in terms of the transmittal at the producer side and at the purchase side, and whether or not it is clear that it's obviously going to be a viable project.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I find it very hard to comprehend how, over any extended period of time, the United States can leave that important source of natural gas literally in the ground when they're in such a difficult supply position. Even though there could be delays, I'm optimistic that that project will proceed to the benefit of the economy of both Alberta and Canada.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. What appraisal has the government of Alberta made on the apparent breakdown of negotiations between TransCanada and the Foothills Pipe Lines group in terms of the Canadian section of the line? Have we assessed it? Have we appraised it?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to answer that question. I think it's a very positive move forward for the pipeline project.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. The Premier indicated that discussions have been held with management people on the pipeline. In the government's discussions with the participants, has there been any further discussion of Alberta debt participation in the pipeline project?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no, there hasn't been. There's nothing further we can report on that matter.

School Discipline

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Education. There's been a great deal of discussion throughout the province of more effective discipline in our schools. I wonder if the minister could inform this Assembly if his department is reviewing the idea of retaining the strap in our school systems.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, two things. About this time last year I shared with the province, in a news release, information flowing from a study on discipline done by Dr. Clarke. That study on discipline had taken some time, and was a very careful look at the concerns of parents, administrators, teachers, pupils, and the general public relative to discipline and perhaps what should be done for the future.

Generally speaking, the respondents to the study, or at least the major group of respondents, were satisfied with the degree of discipline in schools. If there was any tendency, it would have been toward indicating that perhaps discipline was a bit too lenient. However, the majority of respondents fell within the category of accepting the level of discipline in the schools.

There was no reason, from the study, for us to change both the responsibilities as provided for in The School Act and in general policy that the responsibility for discipline rests with the local school boards.

MR. KUSHNER: A supplementary question to the minister. Would the minister inform this Assembly if he has received correspondence from citizens generally in Alberta, in regard to tightening up discipline and possibly replacing it, if it would be acceptable, with a cane?

MR. KOZIAK: No. As a matter of fact, I think the hon. member is a little late on this, because there was more of a ground swell on the question of discipline a number of years ago, which led to the initiation of the study by Dr. Clarke. Since the release of the results of that study, I would say my correspondence would not indicate any ground swell of opinion relative to discipline.

Housing Programs — Funding

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. It relates to the recent revision in federal housing policy which involves direct loans going to municipalities on some of our housing programs. Could the minister advise the House of the position now in regard to this new policy? Is it going to be acceptable to Alberta?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I think what the hon. member is referring to is the January 31-February 1 housing ministers' conference held in Edmonton and chaired by Alberta, where the provinces proposed, at Alberta's urging, a system of global funding of all federal/provincial housing and community programs. I'm pleased to report that the federal government has responded favorably to that. We're pleased they have

responded favorably, and I've so informed the federal minister.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I understand that public housing will get 100 per cent of federal financing on 90 per cent of the cost, if other governments will put up the remaining 10 per cent. Will Alberta be willing to participate in such a scheme?

MR. CHAMBERS: Actually, Mr. Speaker, that's not correct. At the present time the federal government provides 90 per cent of a loan for capital construction to AHC or a municipality for a community housing project, and operating deficits are shared 50:40:10. But the federal proposal is that the federal government extricate itself from the capital financing area and be involved only in the housing subsidy area. Actually, we're presently in the process of evaluating the significance of this proposal in Alberta. However, I might add that we have received assurances that the traditional methods of financing will continue through 1978.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister consulted municipalities or the housing industry in regard to the federal proposals?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, of course the global funding proposals were made public at the conclusion of the conference in Edmonton on February 1, so I am sure municipalities are aware of the principles of the global funding proposals. However, department officials have had regular consultations with municipalities.

Water Safety

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of my concern for water sports safety, particularly with the forthcoming summer recreation season, I wonder if the minister would consider having his department review advertising presently being aired on Alberta TV stations which depicts the unsafe use of high-speed motorboats. The operators are shown without life jackets, and otherwise driving motorboats without due regard for other water users.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I could take a look at that matter. My initial reaction would be that perhaps the requirements for what types of safety precautions should be taken in boats relate to jurisdiction in the federal area.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wonder if the minister would consider making representations to companies using the type of television advertising which would encourage the unsafe use of motorboats in water sports, so that people in Alberta would not be encouraged to use that type of unsafe conduct on the waterways of this province.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I have heard the representations of the hon. member.

MR. HORSMAN: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. I wonder if the minister and his department have any programs in place, to deal with this forthcoming summer recreation season, which would encourage Albertans to use the waterways of this province in a safe and prudent manner.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that we have any specific programs in place that relate to that. But certainly from the standpoint of the department officials, we're aware of some of the problems that relate to water safety regulations for lakes, and we want to ensure that proper signs and the like are there, so that hopefully we can get, if I can say it, the adult use of the waters in a safe manner.

I might add that our department has instructed the members of the RCMP to clamp down on what appears to be some increase in driving on water, if I can use the term, and drinking.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister, and I ask the question in view of the fact that I'm afraid one of these days a boatload of boys or girls is going to be upset through the bad use of these motorboats. Could a pamphlet be issued, or signs on lakes where motorboats are permitted, that they stay a reasonable distance away from rowboats operated by young boys and girls?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I think that's a good suggestion and, in part, is now being done. But we may take a look at improving and speeding that up.

Police Officers' Safety

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General and relates to a question I asked yesterday that I felt was taken a little lightly by the Premier, and was sort of deflected to the basic definition of federal/provincial jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Solicitor General relates to my concern and, I think, the concern of other people with regards to the lives of enforcement officers in this province, for which he holds the responsibility. I was wondering what steps the minister's department or the minister is taking to protect the lives of police officers in the province of Alberta?

MR. FARRAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, of course there's no magic wand in this area. Any law enforcement officer is at risk. I commend the hon. member for his concern in this regard and hope that members of the public also have some sympathy for the dangerous role police officers have to play.

Certainly we continually review procedures in stopping strange cars for various reasons, the action the policeman should take as part of his training. We have discussed the question of whether we have two-man cars as opposed to one-man cars on some shifts, and the possibility of shotguns in cars for support as opposed to side arms and pistols. The whole range of tactical response is under constant study.

So far as the penalties on offenders are concerned — which, as I recall, was the main purport of the hon. member's question to the Premier yesterday — this is certainly a federal issue. You can ask my personal

opinion if you like, but it's not under provincial jurisdiction. I have to confess that we have many hot potatoes of our own and are not anxious to take on another.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the minister certainly has predicted my next concern, and that is for representation to the federal government on behalf of the enforcement officers of the province of Alberta. Would the minister take on as a personal responsibility or a responsibility for this government to say to the federal government that it's time we reinstate capital punishment? Would the minister take that on?

MR. FARRAN: Well, representations to other levels of government are usually done by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

AN HON. MEMBER: So far, so good.

DR. WARRACK: He's the only one who isn't here.

MR. FARRAN: As I see it, the big problem here is not so much the question of whether or not there be capital punishment; the question is the advisability of the new trend in the penitentiaries to something close to an actual lifetime sentence, and the fact that under some of the most severe penalties parole is not admitted, at least for a very large number of years.

Then, of course, they get into the question of how discipline can be maintained when the prisoner has so little hope of early release and has so little to lose if he attacks a correctional officer. That is really the problem. Some countries solved it by having communities of offenders in remote places. We have many remote places in Canada. It's a little colder than Devil's Island was, but that is one of the possibilities as opposed to incarceration in buildings in built-up areas.

It's a federal problem. I don't mind giving my opinion, but it really belongs with the federal government.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. I think the matter is serious — I'm not sure we were laughing at the seriousness of the question — but this last year seven RCMP officers have been killed in Canada in various difficult situations, just outright murder. Along with that, the Canadian Police Association is saying . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member appears to be debating the matter in the wrong Assembly. [interjections]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my apologies for maybe taking some privilege in talking with regard to a federal matter, but the intent of my question is to add representation to the Canadian Police Association and the enforcement officers of Alberta with regard to this question. I feel the minister's office has a lot of authority and prestige within that area, and I'm asking him . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The ordinary way to achieve that purpose — although I hesitate to see motions on the Order Paper which relate out and out

to matters of federal jurisdiction, that would be one way for the hon. member to deal with the matter. The question period is not the time to debate issues either federal or provincial. As far as making a representation to the minister is concerned, the hon. member has achieved that, notwithstanding the rules of the question period, to a rather abundant degree.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Has the minister made any representation of this kind to the federal government?

MR. SPEAKER: This is a repetition of a question the hon. member has already asked.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Just for clarification. My earlier question was requesting representation. This question is saying, has he done anything? [interjections] I guess he hasn't.

MR. SPEAKER: I wasn't aware of that nuance. But if the hon. minister wishes to answer the question briefly, perhaps he might.

MR. NOTLEY: The answer is no.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, really the answer is no. But such subjects are discussed at meetings of provincial ministers of justice, both attorneys general and solicitors general.

Natural Gas Consumption

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this to the Minister of Utilities and Telephones. It's been reported by the president of Canadian Western Natural Gas Company at the annual meeting that the average consumption of natural gas for residential and commercial customers has declined about 7 per cent in the last year. I wonder if the minister has any information as to whether there has been a province-wide decline in the average residential consumption of natural gas and, if so, the reasons for that decline.

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, it's true that there now seem to be some indications emerging that the people of Alberta are becoming more energy-conscious than they were before, and are taking actions as individual citizens to conserve energy. We notice in the figures coming in under the natural gas price protection plan that, consistent with the observation made by the Member for Calgary Bow, there seems to be an action by people to try to conserve energy. I think that's a very positive step, and something we very much hoped would happen.

DR. WEBBER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the \$110 million allotted to the natural gas price protection program for the benefit of residents of Alberta, and this possible reduction, is it the minister's intention to recommend any change in the current 75 per cent coverage of natural gas price increases?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, not at the present time. It's entirely possible that the budget allocation for the present fiscal year could be exceeded if we have one of the winters that Albertans call traditional. We had

a somewhat milder winter this year, and two very mild winters prior to that. So even though energy conservation action seems to be under way by people of Alberta in their individual decision-making, it may very well be that the full \$110 million proposed for this fiscal year will still be required. If the weather's cold enough, even more might be required.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It relates to his ministerial statement this morning. Am I to understand from the announcement that other postsecondary institutions in Alberta, such as the University of Calgary and Mount Royal College, currently benefit from the natural gas price protection program?

DR. HOHOL: That's correct. The rebate system works in such a way that the first 1 billion cubic feet of gas consumed is on the rebate schedule. The effect of today's announcement is to remove the ceiling so that very high institutional users continue the benefit beyond that ceiling. So certainly the assistance is there. When the institutions reach the ceiling, which has now been removed, it simply won't be there, and the benefit will continue beyond it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly how many institutions in Alberta are using more than the 1 billion per year and will now benefit under the removal of the ceiling?

DR. HOHOL: At this moment the University of Alberta is the only one that uses in excess.

Teachers' Salaries

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. It's with regard to current . . . Is the minister listening? It's with regard to current salary negotiations, where in some instances the increases are into the 8 and 9 per cent range. I wonder if the minister could indicate the present attitude of the government with regard to those kinds of increases at the present time?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I can do more than one thing at a time. I can listen to the question and write a memo, just for the hon. member's information.

Secondly, with respect to the question itself, our fiscal guidelines for this year are that we would hope wages and salaries would be negotiated at an increase not in excess of 6 to 7 per cent, thereby not leading us along the dangerous trail of ever-growing inflation, and not leading the private sector, still under controls, down that same dangerous trail. The indications are that although a couple of school jurisdictions in fact settled at amounts higher than the fiscal guidelines before the announcement of our guidelines — as a matter of fact, one settlement I'm aware of has been concluded within the guidelines that have been indicated throughout the province. The government's position is of course that these are fiscal guidelines, and our grants reflect those guidelines. They are not legislative guidelines, and there

are no sanctions by which the government will interfere with the normal collective bargaining process.

However, should the school boards, in their generosity, agree to settlements beyond the fiscal guidelines, they should be aware that the responsibility for making good their agreement will rest with their taxpayers, reflecting the supplementary requisition that will then have to be levied against all the assessment within their jurisdiction.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. The teachers of Alberta would love you to display to them the same brilliance that was just displayed a few moments ago.

But I would like to ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, if he or any of his officials have met with any school boards in Alberta to impress upon them that the boards will be supported by the government when they hold the line at this 6 to 7 per cent guideline.

MR. KOZIAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have met with representatives of the school boards of the province and have indicated that that support is there. The meetings we had would indicate that the school boards as well are concerned with the direction that inflation might take us, relative to their ability to offer programs for the students of the province.

I don't know if the hon. member was in his seat during the study of the estimates of the Department of Education on Wednesday. But I did provide information on the relative position of teachers' salaries in this province compared with the consumer price index. As the hon. Provincial Treasurer pointed out during his remarks in this question period at an earlier date, that shows that increases in salaries in this province have generally exceeded the cost of living index. As I pointed out, the increase in the consumer price index from 1970-71 to 1976-77 was about 59 points. The increase in teachers' salaries was substantially higher, 17.6 per cent higher than the increase in the consumer price index over the same period of time. So when we're talking about catching up, we have to look at the overall period involved.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the minister. The minister indicated in his last response that there would be a form of support for the boards. Could the minister clarify for the Assembly what he meant by the term "form"? What type of form were you referring to in supporting the boards in this endeavor?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the support was one of mutual agreement, whereby we would govern our affairs on the basis of the guidelines that were announced and not jeopardize the position of the boards by disregarding them ourselves. The first indication of that support was the agreement, not only of the members of the government but of the members of the opposition, to hold their increases to 6 per cent for the course of this fiscal year, which I think is a very significant indication of support.

MR. SPEAKER: We're running out of time. I've already recognized the hon. Leader of the Opposition. If the Assembly agrees, perhaps we might have a short question and a short answer. And the hon.

Solicitor General would like to supplement an answer, if the Assembly agrees.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, the question may not be so short, and I'm sure the answer won't be. So I'll use the question the first part of next week.

Water Safety (continued)

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, the question about policing motorboats on lakes was answered by two of my colleagues. But there are two more of us who know a little bit about the situation, the hon. Minister of the Environment and I.

The RCMP enforce the small vessels act, which is a federal law, with quite a large contingent of officers and police boats. The contingent has been increased by some 20 per cent this year, and the enforcement of the law on the water is being enhanced.

The hon. Minister of the Environment, who may also want to supplement, has been chairing a committee on water bodies in general. The concept there is that we should have some sort of zoning on some water bodies to separate the swimmers and the rowboats from the more dangerous high-speed motorboats. No two lakes are the same, so they have to be treated in a separate fashion. Quite a bit of deliberation and consideration, therefore, has to be given to the method. Municipal by-laws pertain on the shore. The question of life belts in boats is enforced by the RCMP.

Unfortunately the federal government has allowed its system of boat registration to fall into a state of disrepair, and it sadly needs bringing up to date. In basic concept it's something similar to the registration of motor vehicles, but the files haven't been kept up, and boats that are no longer used are still in there as deadwood and so on. The federal government must fetch that registration system into practical use.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

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

Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$131,385
1.02 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$82,405
1.03 — Administrative Support	\$55,910
1.04 — Financial Administration	\$594,480
1.05 — Personnel Services	\$284,120
1.06 — Research and Systems	\$468,895
1.07 — Public Communications	\$203,260
1.08 — Legal Services	\$50,350
1.09 — Special Projects	\$64,260

1.0.10 — Library Services	\$44,740
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$1,979,805
Total Vote 1 — Capital	\$9,620
 Vote 2 — Recreation Development:	
2.1 — Program Support	\$355,795
2.2 — Financial Assistance	\$29,024,000
2.3 — Recreation Planning	\$320,356
2.4 — Recreation Program Development	\$1,752,478
2.5 — Regional Recreation Consultation	\$1,096,530

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister what is being done with the revenue Alberta receives from participating in Loto Canada. Could the minister indicate some of the organizations that are using this money in his department?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, I have to go back a little bit, and I'll try to make it as short as I can. The Olympic Lottery fund was the start of the return of some funds to the province of Alberta. The basic concept behind the use of the Olympic Lottery was to assist in the training and related activities of athletes, officials, coaches, and managers for the various games — the Olympic Games, the Canada Games, the Commonwealth Games, and the Olympiad for the Disabled.

Now the final disposition of funds from that particular fund, the Olympic Lottery fund, was just recent. I believe it was February this year when the last \$78,000 was provided to the 10 sports that are training for the Commonwealth Games.

To date the receipts from Loto Canada are deposited in a trust fund. Roughly \$500,000 — I believe it's just over that — is in that particular fund, and we would assume at the moment we're going to be using that on the same bases for the training of athletes, coaches, officials, and the like for games of that type at the moment.

Someone asked me why it wasn't spent. It wasn't a case of being received, and then to be spent; we hope to have a request from the various associations, relative to the likes of either a Canada Games, the Olympic Games, or the Commonwealth Games.

Agreed to:	
Total Vote 2 — Recreation Development	\$32,549,159
Total Vote 2 — Capital	\$28,308,000
 3.1 — Program Support	\$1,467,780
3.2 — Operations and Maintenance	\$10,600,571
3.3 — Parks Construction	\$2,155,500
3.4 — Public Education and Interpretation	\$426,550
3.5 — Parks Planning and Design	\$1,971,262
Total Vote 3 — Provincial Parks	\$16,621,663
Total Vote 3 — Capital	\$2,630,810

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Little Bow has requested leave to revert to introduction of visitors.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS** (reversion)

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Clover Bar, I'd like to introduce through you and to the House 62 students

from the grade 6 class of Fort Saskatchewan elementary school. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Sprague and Mr. Mandrusiuk, as well as six parents acting as chaperones. One of the students in the class is the son of my hon. colleague Dr. Buck. Bob is somewhere in that group. I haven't spotted him yet. We certainly welcome them to the Assembly today, and I'd like them to rise and be recognized by the members.

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (Committee of Supply)

Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife (continued)

Agreed to:

Vote 4 — Fish and Wildlife Conservation:	
4.1 — Program Support	\$2,382,850
4.2 — Wildlife Services	\$2,839,460
4.3 — Fisheries Services	\$2,246,560
4.4 — Public Services and Enforcement of Resource Regulations	\$3,291,350
4.5 — Conservation Education	\$560,030

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, just a quick question on this. It's with regard to the Buck for Wildlife program. How much of the allocated fund for the Buck for Wildlife has been spent, and what has it been spent on?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, I don't have the specific details. I would be quite happy to get them for the hon. member and provide them to him. I don't have the total amounts right at hand.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 4 — Fish and Wildlife Conservation	\$11,320,250
Total Vote 4 — Capital	\$334,480

Capital Estimates:

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$9,620
 2.1 — Program Support	\$1,600
2.2 — Financial Assistance	\$28,281,242
2.3 — Recreation Planning	\$2,430
2.4 — Recreation Program Development	\$14,803
2.5 — Regional Recreation Consultation	\$7,925
Total Vote 2 — Recreation Development	\$28,308,000
 3.1 — Program Support	—
3.2 — Operations and Maintenance	\$466,020
3.3 — Parks Construction	\$2,155,500
3.4 — Public Education and Interpretation	—
3.5 — Parks Planning and Design	\$9,290
Total Vote 3 — Provincial Parks	\$2,630,810

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the minister a question in regard to the cost of vandalism in our parks, and I'm citing one. I know we had substantial damage in Fish Creek.

Another question: what number of students is the minister's department hiring through STEP this summer?

MR. ADAIR: I have some figures relative to the vandalism costs, and I'm not just sure where they are right now. I had them sitting in front of me last night, but I'll have to see if I can find them before we're finished, Mr. Chairman.

Relative to the number of students we are hiring: we utilize the recreation work experience program, and I don't have the exact number. I believe 190 were hired last year throughout the province by the various municipal authorities for rec. work experience under the summer temporary employment program.

Agreed to:

4.1 — Program Support	\$45,680
4.2 — Wildlife Services	\$120,740
4.3 — Fisheries Services	\$79,530
4.4 — Public Services and Enforcement of Resource Regulations	\$81,030
4.5 — Conservation Education	\$7,500
Total Vote 4 — Fish and Wildlife Conservation	\$334,480
Total Capital Estimates	\$31,282,910
Department Total	\$62,470,877

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, I move that the estimates of the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife be reported.

[Motion carried]

Department of Social Services and Community Health

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. minister have any opening remarks?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, I have, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I always look forward to the review of my estimates and the opportunity to answer questions which members may have in their minds. Prior to the detailed study of them, though, I would like to take this opportunity to express on behalf of Alberta citizens the pride and reassurance, I guess, that I feel as I've travelled around the province in my capacity as minister of this department, visiting the various institutions and groups and agencies who work and try to solve people problems and help people.

I would refer particularly to some of the meetings I've held during the course of this past year in southern Alberta. When I visited Raymond and Clareholm, I was most impressed with the care, attention, and enthusiasm with which the public service employees there undertook their work. This is evident wherever I travel throughout the province, and it isn't often that I have the opportunity to say to them, on behalf of the people of Alberta whom they serve, that it's very much appreciated. As I said before, Mr. Chairman, I find it reassuring to find the care, concern, and dedication that's evident throughout every area of this particular department.

I would also like to express publicly appreciation to senior officials in the Department of Social Services and Community Health. I have found their encouragement and enthusiasm, their dedication, and particularly their capability, a great source of strength during the course of the work I do in my department on behalf of the people of Alberta. The strain on

them has not gone unnoticed or unappreciated by me and, I'm sure, by many with whom they come in contact.

Out in the front lines, as I consider it, we have the public health units and their employees, who are front and centre in delivering the preventive programs, along with the preventive social services areas of course, which are working more directly with the municipality but which directly touch the lives of people and are of great interest to me and members of this Legislature.

The advisory councils that I have — the mental health advisory council, the senior citizens' advisory council, and the family planning council are only three of those that give advice to the department and to the officials in the department. Their work is voluntary, by and large, and respected and very much appreciated.

I have nothing further to say along that line, Mr. Chairman, because I am sure there will be specific items that people will wish me to comment upon or talk to me about, and so I look forward to joining with the other members of the committee as we study my estimates.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to raise four separate areas during the course of general remarks on the estimates of this department. May I just begin, Mme. Minister, by saying I share some of the sentiments you express about the staff of the department. I'd just like to take this opportunity to say that in the Peace River area, where I have occasion from time to time as an MLA to deal with both the office in Peace River and the office in Grande Prairie, I have found a very co-operative attitude, and I think it should be noted at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move from there to deal with the separate questions I wanted to raise and bring to the attention of the committee and the minister. The first is with respect to home care. I don't think there's any question that everyone in this House supports the principle of home care. While one of the advantages of home care is clearly the possibility of saving some money for the general hospital system — in other words, instead of having somebody in a bed at \$100 or \$150 a day, you have a home care program — I would say to members of the committee that that is only a side benefit; it should not be the reason for home care. I think the home care approach should go much beyond just the proposition that we can save a few dollars in the operation of our hospital system.

I'd like to raise that point, Mr. Chairman, because as I look over the estimated program and the expenditure of \$3 million this year, leading up to \$14 million by 1982, I ask the minister, and I say this very sincerely: are we planning for enough money to really do the job, to fully meet the requirements of an adequate home care program? When the announcement was made, we clearly had very high expectations throughout the province, and properly so. But as I look at the \$3 million beginning, or even the \$14 million this program will increase to by 1982, I really wonder whether we are providing sufficient funding.

Now at this stage I gather home care shall include home nursing services and homemaker or home help services, but it may include — and I think the impor-

tant thing is to put in quotation marks "may include" — such things as speech therapy, occupational therapy, respiratory therapy, dressings, drugs, biologicals or other related preparations, handyman services, meals on wheels, or transportation services. And I would say to the minister, again underlining this, are we providing enough money to really launch a fully comprehensive home care program?

I look at the entrance requirements, Ms. Minister. They're very high, in my judgment. Two certificates are required: one from a doctor, one from a local co-ordinator. But even after those certificates are obtained, the person "may" be admitted to the program. So we're setting very high requirements.

Similarly, as far as handicapped people are concerned — and unfortunately I was not able to be present at the meeting of the committee for the handicapped with the minister that was held, I believe, two or three weeks back. But in looking over the information they brought to the minister's attention, it's my understanding that there's some concern on the part of the handicapped that, unless we're dealing with a short-term medical illness, it will be difficult for handicapped people to obtain benefits under the program.

And so, to the minister: it strikes me that while we have quite properly created a good deal of excitement and, I think, very high expectations, are we providing enough money in the program to follow through on those expectations? I think it would be a mistake for us to look at home care as just a simple substitute for active treatment, auxiliary beds, hospitals, as a way to save money. Admittedly, one of the arguments for home care is that perhaps it can provide a side benefit of lower cost care. But it's care in the home environment which is so important to the psychological well-being of the individual, as well as the physical well-being.

I'd like to move from there to raise some questions on the whole issue of the new day care policy. As I understand it, we're moving away from the concept of day care under PSS. What will happen now is that we're going to work out a subsidy arrangement that will follow the parents from one place to another. But the difficulty, and it strikes me that there are quite a number of difficulties, is: what happens if that local community is not in the program? Let us say that a young couple is living in the city of Edmonton; they have their children attending a private day care centre or, for that matter, a public day care centre; they obtain the subsidy, 80 per cent of which is assumed by the senior level of government and 20 per cent, if I'm not mistaken, by the municipalities. But they move from the city of Edmonton that would be in that kind of program to a municipality not in the program; it could be anywhere in the province. All of a sudden, while they are left with the impression that the subsidy is in fact portable, it really isn't unless the municipality they move to is in the program. If the municipality decides, for budgetary reasons, that the 20 per cent is beyond their reach, that they can't raise that kind of money, it's my understanding that the couple that moves from an area with the program to a municipality that is not part of the program suddenly finds their subsidy isn't portable at all.

Now I may have misunderstood the regulations, but this is the way I would read it at this stage: unless a municipality is in the program, unless they are pick-

ing up that 20 per cent, then parents are out of luck.

The other thing that strikes me as being a little disturbing is what is happening with our PSS centres. I have had an opportunity to look through several of them in the city of Edmonton, as well as the excellent PSS facility in the community of Peace River, and there is really no doubt that the quality of service in our preventive social service day care centres is first-rate. I don't know whether it was the minister or someone else who indicated we had the Cadillac variety. I'm not sure that's true, because I think one of the advantages of proper day care is not just to look at day care as a convenient babysitting service. I think it really has to be looked at as part of the beginning educational process for a child, and I see us making a rather serious mistake in looking at day care essentially as convenient babysitting for working parents.

Therefore I think we have to ask that the standards not only of care — fire protection, cleanliness, the health regulations: the obvious standards that nobody is going to challenge — but beyond those standards I would say to the minister that we have to look at the component of the program. Are we enriching the experience of the children during that stay in the day care centre? I have seen some of the PSS centres in Edmonton. Even though the costs are high, I would say without any doubt that yes, that is an enriching experience.

I first went to one of the day care centres several years ago. I hadn't been in a day care centre until I had an opportunity to tour this one, and I had the attitude of a lot of members of this House and, I think, many members of a sceptical public. We sort of look rather askance at day care, or perhaps some people do, and I must confess I saw day care as not too much more than a babysitting service. But when I saw what was being done at these centres and the kinds of programs that were being carried out, I realized that day care can be much more imaginative than simply looking after kids from 9 to 5, as has often been the case.

Now I raise this because under the new regulations I gather we're going to have to — well, I guess the best way of putting it is, evict some of the children in certain of the PSS day care centres. Because I gather there is now a regulation that you can have only a certain percentage of subsidized children in the centres. That's going to mean that many of the children in the present centres in Edmonton at least are going to have to be displaced, because that's what the people tell me. The minister shakes her head, and I'm pleased. I'd be very interested in her response to that, because I would hope that would not occur.

When I looked at this regulation, I really wondered how you were going to make it workable, particularly in an area like Boyle Street for example. If you set a regulation that says you have to have a certain percentage of unsubsidized parents, there are going to be certain localities in this province where that just isn't feasible, and you will have unused spaces. So I'd be interested in the minister's comments on that subject as well.

Mr. Chairman, I may have some follow-up questions on day care and home care. I'd like to move from that issue to a rather troubling question, and this was brought rather dramatically to my attention as a consequence of a letter from a constituent. This

individual had a daughter who committed suicide. That's a terribly traumatic experience for a parent. Because I knew the woman, after she wrote the letter I became perhaps a little more interested in the subject than I had been before. We've all had a peripheral interest in this kind of thing, and I did some research into the question of suicide in Alberta.

It's rather a striking situation at the moment, Miss Hunley, that in my view cries out for some remedial action. For example, in 1976 there were 318 suicides in this province for the 15 to 34 age group. The suicide rate for young Albertans has increased 50 per cent. Based on the official statistics, setting aside all the questions of deaths that are actually suicide but aren't categorized as such for insurance reasons, because of the family and what have you, suicide is now the second cause of death in Alberta for people between the ages of 15 and 34. That is really a rather alarming statistic.

The other thing I find equally disturbing is that the suicide rate among native people is approximately five times as high as the rest of the population. This information is from the task force the minister authorized. I don't know how they can arrive at this, but the task force on suicide came up with some estimated costs of suicide and self-injury in the province of Alberta, and it's really quite striking. They estimated lost income or productivity at \$61 million; medical costs at \$2.6 million; examiner cost at \$55,000; and police cost at \$77,000, for a total annual cost of almost \$64 million as a consequence of suicide, lost productivity, cost to the medical system in this province.

Now I look at the government's moves in this area, and while I think it is fair to say we have set aside \$73,000 for the AID service in the province, I say to you, Miss Minister, I'm not sure we're going far enough here either. Look at British Columbia, for example. They are committing about \$650,000 in the current budget for just a slightly higher population than ours; Saskatchewan, approximately as much for half our population. I'm not saying we can run around with a bag of money and solve the problem, but I am saying that funding the kind of prevention can be of assistance particularly to our young people, whether it be somebody at a telephone or the community aid service.

There are some specific questions I would put to the minister. The task force report was some time ago. Is it going to be government policy to issue a paper on suicide prevention and treatment? Secondly, the pilot project has been set up in Edmonton, but to what extent are we going to go beyond that? Thirdly, how long will the project in Edmonton have to function on an experimental basis before suicide services are set up in other major urban centres? Crisis intervention centres exist only in Calgary, Edmonton, and Fort McMurray. Is the government taking steps to set up a co-ordinated system of crisis intervention services with appropriate follow-up in other urban centres as well?

I raise this matter, because with the pressures of rapid growth, one of the inevitable side effects will be pressure, particularly on our younger people. The statistics seem to bear out that the highest rate of suicide is among younger people. I do not think we have the responsibility of coming up with some sort of panacea to solve it. No one is suggesting that's

possible. But it seems to me it is a problem we have to be cognizant of, and take whatever steps that are reasonable to try to remedy it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The hon. member has covered some of the topics I wanted to comment on. Rather than have the minister respond now, if I make my comments then she could possibly respond to both of us, if that's satisfactory. Maybe we'll save a little time by using that process.

I'd like to comment on five areas: one, with regard to the evaluation techniques that go on in the department; secondly, with regard to urban development and some related social problems; thirdly, with regard to child abuse; fourthly, day care; and fifth, I want to comment again on the suicide concept and prevention, and ask some questions in that area.

With regard to evaluation, earlier I directed a memo to the minister requesting information. In your response to the memo, there's an indication that many hours, like 1,200 hours, would be required to determine what was actually happening in some of these programs. My concern was that I thought many of the questions raised in that request to the minister contained information collected on an ongoing basis by the department, such as the total number of people on social allowance in some of the programs for the services for the handicapped, the staff/client ratio, the educational level of some of the clients, the success rate of clients seeking employment, the success rate of clients at job training. I felt those were the kinds of details that would be needed in evaluating the programs.

I've noted from the estimates just one situation that would concern me. Maybe a technique like this would be a useful benefit. I compared the expenditures in Michener Centre, relative to Hillside. As I understand the concept, Michener Centre is an in-house, live-in type of treatment and process, working with the mentally retarded and the mentally handicapped. Hillside is more a residential area and a program where the people can live in the community, go out to work, and also receive some type of counselling services. When I compare the expenditures in these two areas, I note that when we look at the staff of Michener first of all — 1,773 people are on the staff of that institution; over \$25 million being spent. The ratio of staff to dollars: for every one person on staff, \$15,320 is being spent in care and work with those individuals. When you compare that to Hillside or the more community type of operation, we find the staff-to-cost ratio is one to \$20,995, or just about \$21,000.

The feeling most people have is that when these persons live in a residence and work in the community where they obtain some of their own support, it's supposedly at a lower cost and most likely of more benefit to that particular individual. Examining the costs and evaluating them in a very simple way, I find that just doesn't seem to be happening. So the conclusion, you say, is maybe it's better to use centres such as Michener. Maybe we're caring for them more directly and it's not costing as much. That may not be a good conclusion, but it seems to indicate that. I'd appreciate if the minister would comment on such a situation. Does that occur in other community-based types of organizations?

The other situation I find with regard to institutions

such as Hillside — and I've talked to a couple of people who have used Hillside accommodation. The feeling was that the large number of staff was available during the day, but at 5 o'clock or whenever they quit work there was minimal staff, one or two people on for the evening. During the day a number of these people were out working on jobs when they really didn't need the consultative type of care. They didn't have good supervision in the evenings, when they may have needed some type of personal direction. I'd like the minister to comment on that.

My concern is, one, the specifics I've raised. But two, how do you evaluate the effectiveness of some of these community-based programs? From the response I received in the memo, that 1,200 hours is required to gather the information, I feel it must not be at the fingertips of the minister nor at the management level of the department at the present time. It seems we're going to commit ourselves to millions of dollars of expenditure for these community-based programs, but really not evaluating what they're doing. I'd appreciate the minister's comments.

The second area I want to relate to is the urban development in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary. What type of special direction is she giving her department to meet some of the problems being raised or just created? I'd like to use one example I received by phone call just yesterday in my office. I understand this example has been brought to the attention of the department. The person is meeting with the mayor of Edmonton in a few days, next Tuesday I believe. The person is a block parent. I think we all understand the concept of a block parent: that's a person who supervises and helps children in need as they're walking up and down from school to home, assists other parents who may not be home when their children are out on the streets.

This particular person lives in the Beverly area, Abbotsfield, where I understand a lot of low-income housing, high-rises, are being built; little area is left for a park or playground. Many people with low incomes, many single parents with children, are locating in that area. We're asking the parents to go out to work; some of the parents are going to work. We're finding that a play area isn't available because so much building is going on.

This person said to me that the children, at very young ages, are wandering the streets with no one to relate to, no one to relate back to them. Gangs are being formed, and they're having a lot of problems with juvenile crime in the area. Last evening I watched a program on CBC where they found instances of the very same type of thing in the city of Edmonton, and indicated that government at the municipal or provincial level was not reflecting on this problem that's bursting forward at this time.

This lady was saying, what do I do; who do I talk to? I said, I think the best thing I can do is raise it in the study of the estimates, have the minister's reaction to it, and maybe we can focus in on this particular problem. I have a further list of details.

It is one of the problems I think we have to face. The study I presented in the Legislature last fall, or a year ago, indicated that many of those concerns were out there because of the rapid housing development and the rapid inflow of population to Alberta at the present time, not only from rural areas but from other

areas of Canada. That's the second area.

With regard to day care and the regulations, I'd like to raise some questions. Under the new day care regulations, I understand there's a stipulation that all day care workers should have satisfactory formal training or experience in day care. I wonder — and I believe this relates to the member's questions — if the minister would comment on the government's feeling at the present time, relative to the definition of experience and formal training. I wonder how the regulations would affect family day homes.

Thirdly, at the present time there seems to be indication that parents are requesting advice on what to expect from a day care centre: what level of education, training, and activities, or is it a babysitting institution? They're raising these questions. I wonder what commitments the government has made with regard to providing educational services, counselling services, or personnel — I think that would be the better question — personnel who could assist the parents in obtaining good information with regard to day care.

The last question I'd like to raise is with regard to middle-income families who may not qualify for subsidies. Under the new regulations, what consideration are we giving to that group of parents at the present time?

The fourth area was with regard to child abuse. I understand that after we examined the child abuse registry, there has been a drop in the number of cases of abuse that have been reported. I wonder if the minister could advise whether this drop was due to a real decline in child abuse, or is the reporting process breaking down once more? Also, the minister has carried out a campaign to reduce child abuse, and I wonder if she could comment on that.

Are there any plans to set up a registry for wife-battering? I understand that's a concern across the province. If the minister would even like to comment on husband-battering, I understand that husbands are rising to their feet and saying, where do we fit into this whole concept?

The last topic was with regard to suicide prevention; the member mentioned the study. I'd like to ask the minister, in support of his request, what the plans are with regard to that suicide study and what follow-up will be taken.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, perhaps with the minister's indulgence I would follow the two members opposite and make some comments on related topics. Then she could reply to all three of us at the same time.

There are a number of points I want to make, and questions to ask. Generally they relate to the issues that have already been raised by my colleagues opposite. First is home care. As I have said before, I appreciate the resolution introduced by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. I want to go on record again as urging my colleagues in the Legislature to consider, for future modification of the program, the introduction of a maintenance component. As I said in the Speech from the Throne, in my particular constituency, in the Boyle Street community, I think that is a most important consideration. I think all members should consider the impact of that in their own constituencies.

The thing I wanted to discuss at a little more length

is the question of day care. I have followed with some interest the developments of the last three years approximately, first in terms of changes in the regulations; secondly, changes in the financing; and, thirdly, as a result of those two, the increased accessibility to day care which children in the province are going to enjoy.

I want to say again that I regret very much that my colleagues in the Legislature are not personally familiar with day care, an unfamiliarity that apparently extends [interjections] beyond the bounds of the government, to the opposition. I think I am correct in saying that I'm the only member in the Legislature who has ongoing personal family experience with day care programs. I think [interjections] it's going to be necessary for my colleagues, or possibly for me to make my colleagues more aware of day care. It's important to realize that social circumstances are changing, that it is unlikely that the thrust of our community is going to change in any time frame that is relevant to us in our consideration of either a budget or legislation. Much as the hon. member from Sherwood Park might like things to be the way they were five or 10 years ago, it isn't going to happen. I think all of us . . .

MR. ASHTON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, my wife has operated a day care centre for six children for quite a number of years, and I resent the suggestions that we don't have any experience for that program.[interjections]

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, that is precisely the point I am making. I believe I am the only member in this Legislature who, either out of desire or necessity, has raised children to the age that they attend school using as a major support of my family a program of day care operated by someone other than my wife. This is clearly a social case in which the Legislature suffers from the homogeneity of its members, not only in terms of their social background but in terms of their age. What it means is: aside from the fact that I'm the only person here who has used day care, most of you have very limited social contacts with your peers who are of the same age as yourselves and the same social background. You've got very limited social contact with anybody else who uses day c a r e . [interjections] It's an assumption to which I would welcome rebuttal from any members of the Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: You're going to get it, Dave.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, that is only the first point I wanted to make about day care. The second point I want to make is that our perception of the family is changing. In terms of developing a day care program we, as members of the Legislature, should also be aware of the fact that our society is changing.

One of the arguments against day care has historically been that the family is the proper place in which to socialize the child. First of all, that's a practical impossibility for increasing numbers of families in our community. Secondly, even if it were an economic possibility, I'm not sure it continues to be socially desirable now as it was 20, 30, or 40 years ago. I think it is a fact that the nature of the family has changed, that the family is not so stable as it was

some time ago. It is not so involved in its community as it was some time ago. Therefore it does not expose children to the variety of adult images it did some time ago. It is more alienated than it was 10, 15, or 20 years ago. Even if it is economically possible for the family to be the primary moulding or socializing experience of the child in our community, given the nature of the family today I'm not sure that's a desirable thing. I think we should consider that very seriously.

A couple of days ago I happened to notice an article in a newspaper which pertained to something the hon. Member for Little Bow [said]: abuse of the child is less and less physical abuse and more and more psychological abuse. While the nature of abuse is changing, the incidence of abuse continues to increase, and it continues to be at the hands of parents. If that is a fact, I think we should give serious thought to the implication that has on the role of the child in our community.

The third thing I wanted to comment on very briefly was the Boyle Street/McCauley study being done by the city of Edmonton in two communities contained within my constituency. Core area, like Boyle Street, is defined largely in terms of its negative functions or attributes. I stand here as the member for those communities to say they are rife with negative functions and attributes. There's no doubt about it. But those are not the only things that are happening in those communities. Positive things are happening; or, if they are not, positive things could be happening.

The function of the community is important, not only to the city but to the province as a whole. The Boyle Street/McCauley area is a primary recipient of new Canadians when they land in Edmonton, or indeed in Alberta. It is a primary recipient of people coming to the city from rural or northern areas, or from other provinces. As such, whether we like it or not, it is the first point in which those rural people, those people from other provinces, and those new Canadians, are socialized to life in urban Alberta. A socializing process goes on there, and is going to condition the activities and attitudes of those people for the rest of their lives in this province and in Edmonton. I think that's something we should be aware of. In view of the fact that it's important for us to be aware of it, I hope the department is following and contributing in whatever way possible to the work being done with the Boyle Street/McCauley study.

Three communities down there are geographically coterminous and don't touch each other in any social way at all. It's a very interesting phenomenon to observe.

The fourth thing I wanted to touch on very briefly was community-based treatment centres and residential centres. As a Member of the Legislative Assembly, I simply want to say I am distressed by reports that emanate from various communities around this province from time to time that the presence of a small, community-based treatment centre or residential centre is unacceptable to them. We have to be concerned with the alcoholic, or the mentally ill, or the mentally retarded, and we certainly have to do something about it. We certainly can't continue to do it in massive institutions like the Alberta Hospital, Edmonton, or the Alberta School Hospital in Red Deer. But it had better be done in another

community and not in this community. As Members of the Legislative Assembly, and presumably as active citizens in our community, I hope that is an attitude we will address ourselves to in the most forthright possible way, as actively as possible, explaining to the people in these communities that it has to happen. It has to happen in a community, and in some cases it has to be their community. And in the long term they are going to benefit from it, not suffer.

The last thing I wanted to touch on very briefly was research and evaluation. I thought a number of very legitimate points were made by the hon. Member for Little Bow. I have two concerns: first of all, about contracting out research. I'll just pose it as a question to the minister. Could she comment on the policy of her department with respect to the contracting-out of research?

Secondly, I have a concern about evaluation. It seems to me an incestuous relationship that the department responsible for administering programs is also responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of the programs. I would appreciate it if the minister, in making comments about evaluation, would speak not only about the evaluation of private and voluntary activity, but also about the evaluation of departmental activity, and about whether or not the evaluation of departmental activity might be one of the things that could be contracted outside the department.

With those remarks, I'll thank the hon. members very much for their indulgence and offer them the opportunity to reply to my comments on day care.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to be as long as the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands, but I do have a few comments I would like to make.

I'm glad the Member for Little Bow is sitting opposite me today, because from time he has referred to this research report that I believe was prepared on behalf of his office. In my view, Mr. Chairman, that was about the most sloppy, poorly researched, conflicting piece of material I have ever had the misfortune to read. Frankly I think it was a terrible waste of our tax dollars.

I'm concerned that the member would take that and use it as a vehicle to point out what we on the urban scene are not doing. I would like to mention to the hon. member, and I think the minister will probably comment on it, that it is my understanding that the city of Calgary is moving in this direction toward the inner-city problems. I understand the social service department is working with the hon. minister's department on trying to do something with the very serious problems that exist in our city. But when you take the position the hon. member did, I get a little concerned, and I'm glad of this opportunity to make this comment.

I would like to say, too, that it's funny how the wheels of fortune turn in politics. I remember in the summer of '71, sitting at a table in the Bowlen Building in Calgary. The hon. Member for Little Bow was then a minister. I was a city alderman, and we were pleading with him for capital money for the meals on wheels program. We had a city building we had bought for land assembly, and we wanted to put in a meals on wheels program which was going to help the inner city. He had just returned from a trip to the Scandinavian countries. At that time, he wanted us to do two things: he wanted us to put the

meals on wheels program into the Y, and he suggested we could have the city of Calgary fire department deliver the meals. Perhaps the member will recall that conversation. Fortunately, the citizens of Alberta had the good sense to throw that government out. We then were able to move in the direction we were, get money for that meals on wheels centre, and it's been doing a good job in the city of Calgary today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the hon. member that those of us from the city are conscious of what's being done. I'd just like to mention that I had to represent the province at a function on Wednesday this week, at which I presented a tray on behalf of the Jaycees who had given an award to the member of the mentally retarded association in the city of Calgary, a citizen volunteer group that was doing work to help those citizens in distress.

To the hon. minister: I have one concern, home care, and that was raised by the Member for Calgary Buffalo. The minister has had this message several times, and I don't want it to be a case of *ad nauseam*. But I would like to say to the minister that I have had no requests for home care from those who have a health problem, but I have had several requests for home care from people who are nothing more than infirm.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on day care. In spite of our age gap, I'd like to point out to the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands that, first of all, I've been actively engaged in day care activities for 11 years. I was chairman of the committee that first brought day care to the public sector in Calgary. For six years my wife and I have been directors of a non-profit day care centre, and we'd love to get off the board. And my daughter is using day care facilities. So, to the hon. member: some of us here are conscious of your problems, and we're very sympathetic.

DR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to expand a little bit. We've heard from all the political parties now, except the Liberals. [interjections] We'll get Mr. Taylor in later.

But I would like to comment a little on what the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairway was talking about: the high expectations of people for home care, and that in many ways it looks after the psychological well-being more than the organic problems people will have in home care.

I was involved in home care long before anybody ever called it that. We used to do house calls, 14, 16 a day; we delivered babies in slums. And any day that anybody wants to start talking about going back to those days where you went to a house in a hurry and the blood met you at the bottom of the stairs, with no facilities, no equipment — I don't ever want to go back to that. And I don't want to see this program ever lead us back to that. There are some cases where people should be in institutions where the proper equipment is available, and I don't want this to take away from it.

On the other hand, I think it has an awful lot of merit. At the moment the senior citizen who gets pneumonia immediately goes to a hospital. With our present knowledge of drugs and care, there is no reason whatever why a lot of these people shouldn't be kept at home. You put them into an institution that's costing anywhere from \$80 or \$100 a day, up

to \$250 or \$300 a day. I think the way to deal with this, as I have expounded before, is to have people pay a little. I have expounded the 10 per cent theory — that people should pay 10 per cent of the cost — and this way they know the actual cost of that care.

Home care should not have any charge on it. In this way, if somebody suggests going to hospital — well, that's going to cost me \$10 a day. I can stay at home and it won't cost me anything. In this way you can encourage people to stay at home and not use the expensive facilities, and not have to keep on adding, and adding, and adding to them *ad nauseam*, as the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight said.

The other parts of our system that are really out of whack . . . You can go into a hospital or an auxiliary hospital free, gratis, and for nothing. It doesn't cost you anything. But you put some poor old soul in a nursing home and it costs them \$6 or \$8 a day. So what's happening? We get this big demand for acute beds, and when you say, well, what you really need is a nursing home. Oh, we don't want a nursing home. We have an acute hospital and an auxiliary hospital, we want to expand those. Basically the reason is that people don't want to pay that \$6 a day. It's absolutely ludicrous that we make people pay in a very low labor-intensive institution such as a nursing home, and we don't make them pay a cent for the really high-cost facilities we have. Medical science has added an awful lot of years to people's lives, and I think some way or other we in government have to start putting life back into those years. I think this is a way that we can at least start on it.

As regards day care, I'm one of those who does not run a day care centre or doesn't have a wife running a day care centre. So I don't think I have problems that way. You know when I had children the age of those of the hon. member of Edmonton Highlands, we put our baby in a carry cot. We both worked hard. We took that baby down to the office, and she lay in the back and kicked and groaned and cried like every other child. We did our work at the same time, and that was our day care centre.

I think one of the things we should possibly look at as well — we're looking at children from three to six years of age . . . I started school at four years of age — just barely four — and I think there's a place here if we're going to start an educational type of facility that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview talked about. I think we should be looking at starting children in elementary schools not at six but at five — not in every case, it should be flexible. I think we may have a little overload for a year or two, and that would sort out. It would also solve the problem at the other end. We've got problems with teen-age drinking in the schools. If we start them at five, they'll be through school at 17, away from the drinking age, and solve our problem. We don't need to change the age of majority or the drinking age or anything else; just start the kids at school a little earlier, let them finish a little earlier, and they're out and gone before the drinking problem has really got under way.

As regards the suicide problem, it's a very major problem in my area. But basically suicide is a problem of an affluent society; it's anachronistic in that way. In Dachau, in the concentration camps during the war, there were hardly ever any suicides. Under very, very extreme stress, people funnily enough don't commit suicide; it's the stress of affluence that

gets into the suicide problem.

I think we have to get some counselling going. There's no point in a social worker going out and handing our welfare recipients a cheque, saying I'm sorry, I haven't time to talk to you. What they need more than that cheque is somebody to sit down, talk to them, and get them away from their loneliness. One of the problems a minister has is getting enough staff to do this, and I realize it. But the complaints I get are: the social worker doesn't have time to talk to me, nor has anybody else. Of course this is the problem in our urban centres too, that people are isolated. In the smaller centres, all right they can talk to the nurse, the doctor, or a hundred and one other people whom they know — go to their priest. You know the greatest psychological impact that we ever had was in the days when the Catholic church still had confessions, and people could go and spill their guts out to a priest.

AN HON. MEMBER: They still do.

DR. WALKER: They still do, but not nearly as often. You could go to a priest and . . . I'm not a Catholic, I never did it, but . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: You don't know what you've missed.

DR. WALKER: You could go and tell him all these things in confidence, and he would then announce that all your sins were resolved or renounced or whatever. You know that person went out of there feeling really good. Now they go to a \$100-an-hour psychiatrist; he sits there, lets them spill their guts out and, at the end of it, gives them a lot of psychotherapy and stuff, and they go out, often not feeling a darn bit better than they did. We're replacing a voluntary system that we should have supported more with an expensive system that we have to pay for.

On child abuse, the hon. Member for Little Bow brought this up, and I agree. We are possibly getting more psychological abuse, but having been involved in many of these, the big, big problem we all have — the social worker, the police, and the doctors — is trying to prove it. I recently had a 14-year-old boy run away after being beaten by his father. He ran right across the town in 30 below weather. I kept him in hospital three or four weeks after that with enormous frostbite of his toes and feet and everything else. But to try to prove this — we involved police, social workers, everybody. The end was that we would all watch carefully, but we couldn't prove a thing. And we can't prove a thing.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands talks about the family being the basic unit. Sometimes I wonder. If you ever take an Indian child and send him home to his family every evening after school — there he has drunken parents, they speak Blackfoot all the time, and he's not exposed to the English language we're trying to educate him in. That child just doesn't have a hope. But in the days when we used to send them to the boarding schools — religious, be it all, it didn't matter — they got away from that. Those kids who are now the products of those federal boarding schools are away better off than some of the children we're busing into our white

schools every day. I think the possibility of having boarding-school types of schools for these underprivileged children is something we should be looking at.

The wife-battery bit came up for a while. You know, it used to be that the wife was the chattel of the husband. I'm glad to say those days are fast disappearing. In fact now sometimes the husband is the chattel of the wife.

On urban development problems, we talked about the low-income housing and the problems there, and I agree with the Member for Edmonton Highlands when he said that we can try to get community areas, community institutions, halls, or whatever, with people working locally. I think we do have them in the rural areas. As far as alcohol and drugs are concerned, we have our AADAC centres, and these are highly successful. We're working now on detoxification centres. I think a logical extension of these in the city areas would be a very good thing, and we try to break down cities into smaller communities.

I think that's about all I would like to say on it. I'd be interested to hear the minister's response to all these presentations.

MR. PLANCHE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have one brief remark to make. I don't have any particular expertise in this area.

I think perhaps this Assembly owes a great deal to a lot of the people who are slogging it out in some of these institutions. I had an opportunity one day to go with the minister to Margaret House in Calgary, and I was very much impressed with the quality of work going on there and the dedication of the people. In the dollars and cents thing, I guess we too often forget the people who are out there really trying to get it done.

What I wanted to say, however, was: for the better part of this year I've been noticing there has been a great deal of reference to the single-parent family as the villain of the piece. It seems to me that whenever the subject of discipline, wayward children, or whatever else comes up, the "kick me" is always the single-parent child. I wonder if the minister could comment on whether there's any statistical information to prove really that there ... I know, for instance, a lot of single parents are doing an excellent job of raising their families. I think it's unfortunate that that term has been used so freely, and I'd wonder if the minister had any statistical information perhaps to back that up, as to whether or not it's a fact in proportion to what is being discussed.

MISS HUNLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll try to deal with these in the order in which they were originally presented and, in the process, sweep up the other questions raised by other hon. members.

I'm pleased to talk about home care, provide some elaboration on it, and allay the fears of hon. members that we have not adequately budgeted for it. I believe we have. There was intensive study of home care within the department and also with other interested groups, of course. We have done an extensive survey and review of it, based on our experience with the existing pilot programs and with the information we had in hand. I believe it was adequately researched and properly presented as part of my budget presentation.

What hon. members seem to be looking away from,

or beyond, or not seeing, are the many other helping agencies that are doing some of the things about which concern was expressed today, the home chores and so on. I found that when we did a review of the home care programs that were our pilot programs and it was reported to me, nearly everything that is being talked about is being done in some manner in the community. Surely we don't want to replace the existing agencies. For example, in many areas PPS deals with specific concerns that relate to senior citizens, for whom home care is our prime target at the present time because that's where the greatest need is.

We also surely don't want to do away with the volunteer component. Too many times we've been accused of stepping in, the government doing the things the volunteers used to do. Just last week I heard on the radio of a Kinsmen program in one of the smaller communities where they were going out to do lawns and gardens for senior citizens as a particular project. Surely we can look toward such agencies as that, but as soon as we start to pay for it, somehow or other you lose your enthusiasm. I don't think many of us want to go out and work for the minimum wage or whatever it happens to be, but we might do it for nothing. I've heard many people say, I wouldn't do that for a million dollars but I'll do it for nothing, because they care and they want to be a volunteer, and they don't want to tarnish it with being paid. So let's not be too hasty to move in and replace the volunteer component and the other agencies who are working there.

I believe the \$3 million we have budgeted for this year is adequate. We have to allow time for take-up. Some communities are not exactly even geared up. They're starting to get enthusiastic or interested, but some are not geared up and ready to take advantage of the funding available to them.

But I will say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to members of this committee, that I consider this particular program one of the greatest challenges for administrative and co-operative skills that my department has ever been faced with. It will be a real test of their administrative ability, and their ability to encourage and negotiate with the other agencies. I have so indicated to the health units, which is the funding agency, and of course through them to the PSS groups, that this is a very great challenge we all face, to do what we all would like to do, about which we're all so enthusiastic, and not come to hate it when it gets out of control. Yes, the restrictions and the regulation to begin with are rather narrow. That was done deliberately, because it's much easier to allow it to grow and allow the ingenuity and the capabilities of those people out there who are and will be delivering the services. They're very ingenious, and I've noticed with great admiration the many ways they find to deliver services to their people.

The word "may" is included in many instances in the regulations: they "may" include physiotherapy. How can I require that they "shall" deliver physiotherapy when there isn't a physiotherapist maybe for miles around? Desirable, yes; eventually, I feel sure, but I think we need to say "may" so that the local communities can best adapt according to their resources and deliver the service to their neighbors, because that's how the thing was designed.

We've tried to build in as much flexibility as possible. I just have great confidence in all those people out there who are interested in this, that they will make the system work, and that the funding will be found to be adequate. I guess only time will tell. But if we don't start with a proper background and a clear understanding of what the restrictions are to begin with, the thing can rapidly get out of hand. I have experienced that. Hon. members will recall that one of the experimental programs was really very expansionist-minded and found itself in financial difficulties. But they were able to look at their program, look at their clientele, encourage earlier discharge from the program. I am sure hon. members know that the first two weeks of a program are free, to encourage easy accessibility for short-term care.

The one thing we must be aware of is not to build in expectations of our citizens and those who need home care that it will never be necessary for them to go to an institution. Because if the costs they require become prohibitive, it will be necessary for the local community to take a look at that individual case and suggest that maybe home care is not for you; your needs are so great, and it will be necessary for you to seek institutional care.

We regard it as a preventive measure. I agree with the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that it's not financial; it's social. The social impact is very great. The preventive value is very great. It does have, and I will expect it to have, some impact in the long haul over the cost of institutional care. But we have not sold it on those grounds; we have not talked about it. It comes in as an extra lay-on in the health and helping area. So I think that speaks for itself, that we are not expecting the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care to pay the cost of home care. It's an add-on in my budget, and I was so pleased and proud finally to be able to announce it after so many years of work.

In relation to day care, I'm afraid the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview — I don't think he misunderstood the program, he just doesn't understand the system and how things are working in this province. At the present time we have the PSS programs which operate day care centres, the publicly operated ones. We also have private ones and a few, I guess, church-sponsored, non-profit. Basically they are PSS-oriented, which is publicly supported. But not everyone in Alberta belongs to PSS. Not all municipalities have ever joined that, although now with an additional amount of funding in my budget those who are waiting will be able to. But that may not be their first priority. They may wish to get into the senior citizens, or youth work, or whatever, as long as it's preventive. They determine what they want, and if day care isn't one of their needs you may never be able to qualify for a day care centre, period, or a subsidized one. But surely this will open the door for some entrepreneurs out there, and subsidy can be available in either a day care centre or in a home care centre — in relation to child care, not in the home care program I was talking about. We've made allowances for that.

No person in Alberta will ever be able to say, I have a right to subsidized day care, because private enterprise may not offer it, the municipality may not offer it. That was never the intention to begin with. I was just delighted we were able to make available \$6 million additional funding in this very important pro-

gram. That's over a doubling, Mr. Chairman. I believe the parents will select. I think there's some merit in additional information and perhaps creating an awareness — consciousness-raising, if you want to use such a rather dramatic term as that — of what's available, what they might expect from a day care centre. I think this will help do that. I think the private operators will rise to meet the needs the parents say they want for their child. And the subsidy then is available for low earners.

The hon. Member for Little Bow has asked about the middle-income earners. It was not the intention to subsidize everyone for the day care program; I don't think it's necessary. But surely it's necessary to help those who don't have available a space in a publicly subsidized day care centre, or don't have access to a day care centre at all; perhaps to make that available for them. Then it can spread across this province. We intend that it's as flexible as possible. We've attempted to build that into it.

The PSS system: we have a five-year, phasing-in program in which they can take a look at how they're developing it, how it can meld with this one. I think this has perhaps caused some concern in those whose children attend the PSS programs.

I've met with the operators of the publicly operated day care centres, and I appreciate and respect them for their very strong views about how much and what training should be offered children. But that's only one side of the picture. I guess there happen to be as many sides as there are individuals, and they vary from the parent who is quite willing to have a child cared for in a safe, clean place where they feel comfortable to those who wish a more enriched one. I would say to those parents, then encourage the private operator, and the private operator will charge what the system requires. There will be a limit on the amount of subsidy we're prepared to pay, but there's surely no ceiling on what parents are able to pay for what they want for their child.

The total number of spaces in an area: in some attempt to monitor the system and be able to budget adequately for it, we have said that of the total spaces available in a municipality there should be 50 per cent subsidized and 50 per cent unsubsidized spaces. That's the total spaces, not the spaces in every day care centre.

We've talked about training as opposed to skills. Once again there are the two views. Many people have said, I just want someone who will love and care for my child. What's the matter with someone who has raised her own children, who doesn't necessarily have the educational training but does care for children, knows how to manage them, and will care for them in a proper atmosphere? Why shouldn't that person be allowed to care for my child? I have to say I agree with them.

So what we're attempting to do, rather than require an official training certificate — and hon. members will know that colleges are now offering training in this particular area — I think we should not forbid those who are well trained and experienced. Through the university, which we will fund, it's our intention to have an assessment committee draw up the guidelines for what we should expect of a person to be registered as a child care worker. That is presently under way. The members on that committee, by the way, represent the public at large as well as the

private day care centres and the academic staff. I'll look forward to receiving their report before too long, because of course we expect this to be implemented at least by July 1, perhaps before.

As we talk about suicide — and the hon. Member for Macleod made some very valuable comments regarding it — truly it's a sad thing when anyone commits suicide, but we all seem to be even more upset over the suicide of the young. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview said it was the second-highest killer. He didn't tell you what the first was. The first is accidents. I think that speaks to us in a very dramatic way about life today in Alberta, and what it's like out there. I don't know that anyone has a pat solution. At least our examination of it and the substantial research that was done really didn't come up with any pat answer, because there are no pat answers for human problems.

The Samaritan program was one which was highly talked about, but even it has failed in some areas. There are thoughts that match those of the hon. Member for Fort Macleod which talk about affluence, and that suicide rises with affluence and diminishes when society is no longer as affluent, but that's only one philosophy on it.

Yes, we've funded a suicide pilot project, but I think we need to take a look at it and let it work. We have had some difficulty in recruiting someone to undertake it, spearheading the project. It is now under way. It's done through the AIDs, as was mentioned in Edmonton, and it's an attempt to link all the helping agencies, of which there are many. We will learn what we can from that, but I don't know, and it would be very irresponsible for me to stand in this House and tell anyone that there is an answer anywhere. That doesn't mean we shouldn't look for it, but I think it's just another one of those very difficult human problems. Maybe we can learn something from the Edmonton experiment. When we do, it would be my intention, if I'm still in that position, to broaden the project and see if it can work in other areas.

I think the problems of suicide on the Indian reserves are common knowledge. I don't know how many accurate statistics we have about it. But I believe the offer that my colleague the Minister Without Portfolio responsible for Native Affairs placed before us the other day could help in that area if the federal government decides, and the bands decide, that some of the things that can be done would be helpful.

The evaluation techniques: the hon. Member for Little Bow was referring to the information which he had been good enough to request from me in advance, and the fact that it isn't evaluated in the manner in which he would like to obtain his information. We do get reports from the agencies we fund, but they are not as specific as was indicated in your request for information. We get reports as to the success, how many people have graduated from a program, and so on. Those reports are provided to us.

Whether we should be evaluating our own systems, of course, I agree with some of the comments made. So we often look outside, although I can't be specific or give the numbers of studies, or the numbers of approaches we've made to outside agencies to evaluate or advise us on the various programs we have. I would have to get specific information on that, because I can't readily bring it to mind.

The hon. Member for Little Bow additionally was referring to a comparison between Hillside and Michener Centre, but that's a very difficult comparison. It's like comparing apples and oranges. I'd be happy to go to Hillside with the hon. member some day so he might better experience what Hillside is like. That's a very intensive program. It's geared to have the individual prepare to live in the community, and the success ratio is much higher than we have from the Michener Centre. They are higher functioning in many instances in Hillside, though of course we've gone to a group home concept at Michener Centre as well, but they just don't actually compare accurately enough to use the dollar sign as being indicative of whether or not it's doing the job.

I visited Hillside, and I have to say I was very pleased with it. We have some failures there, as we have everywhere. Some people can't live outside the single men's hostel or outside an institution. We have one, I believe, in a mental hospital in Edmonton who could function in the community, but he just falls apart. And these situations we will always have with us.

I'll have to enquire with regard to the nighttime supervision at Hillside, because I don't have that information at my fingertips.

Regarding urban development and the problems which all cities face regarding the downtown city core, or in any area where there is a gathering together of people, I appreciate the remarks of the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands, because they all have a character and quality of their own. There will always be such locations in any city or even in any larger towns. They are part of the fabric of the community. Many of the things the hon. member talks about really are a responsibility of the city. How a city develops, zoning, and so on is the responsibility of the city. I believe they are conscious of that, and are assured of co-operation from my department.

We now have one person who has for an assignment liaison with the city, city commissioners, various agencies, and so on, in an attempt to better bring together the helping agencies, and see what is a provincial responsibility, what is a city responsibility, what is a community responsibility, and what is a joint responsibility. It won't go away. I would imagine if all growth ceased in this province and we became like some of the other less affluent provinces in which not much is going on, I would be very surprised to learn that they don't still have in those older cities the same type of problem we try to deal with in as sensible and humane a way as possible.

An hon. member referred to child abuse and the drop in the number of cases. I'd like to think some of our preventive measures are working. We now have and are developing in the department an early-intervention group that will deal with parents at risk.

Then I will refer to the hon. Member for Calgary Glenmore with his question about single parents or broken homes. I don't have accurate statistics. That's one of the things I find we really do need in the department. It was one of my goals in this year's estimates, but not as high a goal as home care, day care, additional spaces, and more PSS money. It was one of my goals to attempt to get better statistical gathering information. So we don't have it quite as exact as perhaps would be very useful for us in our planning and administrative process.

But yes, the majority of children who come into our care come from broken homes, not necessarily from the single family where the mother is working or on social assistance. But in 1971, 39 per cent of the children admitted to child care institutions came from families with two parents, and 61 per cent approximately — because, as I've already said, of our statistical gathering information — came from broken homes. By broken homes I mean not only a parent living alone, but where there was a mixture; the father was away and back. It just wasn't the kind of family life we all have felt might be the answer to some of these things. It isn't necessarily, or we wouldn't have the question about wife-battering.

We're living in a violent society, I fear, and we don't have a solution for that either. There are many helping agencies out there where a woman can turn, or a man, as the hon. member mentioned. Our early intervention can help there too. We don't have as many bodies as possible, but once again there are helping agencies in the communities. I would encourage hon. members to encourage the helping agencies. The United Way is having some financial difficulty, but they do a great deal of fill-in work. They work with our department.

So there is help out there from the parish priest, the social worker, and the neighbor across the fence who cares. It has to be a joint effort, because this or any government doesn't have all the solutions to human problems. That doesn't mean they don't try and are not trying to solve them. With your approval of the estimates I've placed before you, I hope you'll find that within the additional moneys allocated there will be additional resources to help deal with the many urgent and pressing problems that have been raised by hon. members.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services:

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we go on I have a couple of quick questions here. With respect to the level of the provincial support for the subsidy, on reading over the regulations I understand that the municipality may set the maximum *per diem* level. But how far do we go in sharing the 80 per cent of the subsidy? I've heard figures of \$100 and \$180 quoted. Has that been finalized yet?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Chairman, no, it hasn't. That's being negotiated, because in some areas they are able to provide a good service for a reasonable sum and we don't see any reason to force the price up. That's partly the reason we have a requirement that some people who pay the full shot will also have children attending the day care centre. That's being negotiated with the municipalities. Also, I don't think we should use public moneys if a service is being provided which is really unnecessary. Maybe it's extremely expensive because only a few people wish to participate in it. I think that's where the municipal role will come in, in order to determine what's a reasonable price.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I could just follow that up. There could then be a variation in the level of subsidy from point to point? Once the negotiations

are completed, will there be a fixed maximum for the province, or will it vary? If one community has a lower set of costs on the average than another, then the figures would be adjusted accordingly?

MISS HUNLEY: We've attempted to build in as much flexibility as possible in that. Those negotiations are going on and we'll have to be watching them closely, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the situation in Medicine Hat. This applies to the maximum of 50 per cent, and preferably not more than 40 per cent of the children in the day care centres will be from subsidized centres. My understanding — the Member for Medicine Hat can correct me if I'm wrong — is that in Medicine Hat the only centres there are PSS centres, that there are no private centres. What would be done in a situation like that as far as this regulation is concerned? Is there going to be any flexibility in the implementation of these regulations?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Medicine Hat has already brought that to my attention. Yes, I've said we hope there'll be enough flexibility. Many of the municipalities have been urging more money in PSS because they thought that was the only way to get some day care subsidy for the low earners in their municipality. I think this is a very helpful way because if the need is great the private operators will start a day care centre. It will be eligible for subsidy; the municipality doesn't have to raise money for capital. The municipality will be able to tax that because it's a business. So it will be an asset to a municipality, while still able to help the low earners and those who are not able to earn at all.

MR. NOTLEY: But at this point, Miss Hunley, as far as community . . . I use Medicine Hat as an example; there may be other communities. Until such time as private operations gear up, this regulation would be held in abeyance then. The department would not be insisting that the 50 per cent category be met?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Chairman, that's right. I'll remind hon. members that we've said there are five years for the program to settle down and for us to take a look at how it can best work.

Agreed to:

1.0.1 — Minister's Office	\$136,930
1.0.2 — Executive Management	\$744,980
1.0.3 — Departmental Financial Services	\$2,606,070
1.0.4 — Research and Planning	\$1,350,630
1.0.5 — Senior Citizens' Bureau	\$378,940
1.0.6 — Personnel and Staff Development	\$2,035,980
1.0.7 — Public Communications	\$420,720
1.0.8 — Departmental Administrative Services	\$2,790,740
1.0.9 — Management Audit	\$367,695
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$10,832,685
Total Vote 1 — Capital	\$88,415
2.1 — Program Support	\$2,343,820
2.2 — Public Assistance for Aged	\$16,141,000
2.3 — Public Assistance for Single Parent Families	\$100,381,000

2.4 — Public Assistance for Physically Handicapped	\$29,311,000
2.5 — Public Assistance for Mentally Handicapped	\$9,218,000
2.6 — Public Assistance for Employables	\$31,261,000
2.7 — Public Assistance for Special Groups	\$5,187,010
2.8 — Purchased Services and Agency Grants for Children	\$30,940,000
2.9 — Residence and Treatment in Institutions for Children	\$7,741,970
2.10 — Purchased Services and Agency Grants for Adults	\$564,010
2.11 — Residential Accommodation in Institutions for Adults	\$3,054,150
2.12 — Development Projects for Metis	\$2,180,840
2.13 — Regional Counselling and Delivery of Programs	\$20,443,280
Total Vote 2 — Social Allowance and Specialized Social Services	\$258,767,080
Total Vote 2 — Capital	\$428,690
Total Vote 3 — Senior Citizens' Supplementary Benefits	\$41,869,800
Total Vote 3 — Capital	—

Vote 4 — Vocational Rehabilitation Services

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, votes 4 and 5 have been reorganized and so on. I wonder if the minister could comment on the reasons for it within her department.

MISS HUNLEY: We've done a considerable amount of reorganization in the department, Mr. Chairman, in the vocational rehabilitation services and the care for those who are not involved in that. The vocational rehabilitation services include the opportunity core, all the work which we need to do in order to make possible the employment of individuals, particularly those who are handicapped or physically disabled.

So that's the intention of doing that. We felt it was a better way to manage the department, and that was the purpose behind it.

Agreed to:

4.1 — Program Support	\$129,250
4.2 — Regional Delivery Services	\$1,178,220
4.3 — Agency Grants and Purchased Services	\$4,222,480
4.4 — Vocational Opportunities for Disadvantaged Adults	\$2,283,600
Total Vote 4 — Vocational Rehabilitation Services	\$7,813,550
Total Vote 4 — Capital	\$53,010

Vote 5 — Services for the Handicapped

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister: in Vote 5, the area of residences, community residences are funded. Some of the information brought to my attention indicates that the social workers at the residences often recommend to some of the clients or the people using the residence, such as Hillside, that if their jobs have ended, for whatever reason, those persons go on welfare rather than take unemploy-

ment insurance benefits for which they are eligible. My feeling on that particular point is that if we're trying to put them into normal circumstances and treat them like normal individuals, why would a case such as this occur, if it does?

MISS HUNLEY: If it's occurring, I agree with the hon. member. I would have to inquire. He has made a very nebulous statement considering the great numbers there are. That wouldn't be our policy, because our goal is to encourage people as much as possible to be independent and that's part of the independence. I agree with you completely. I can't do anything more than take it as notice and see if I can find out if it does occur and where.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could comment on that. There have been times when I've recommended this. When a person is applying for unemployment insurance and it goes on and on and on, sometimes into five weeks, and there are kids getting hungry, and there's no food in the family, I've recommended that they get welfare. It takes the unemployment insurance a long, long time. Sometimes those slips are lost, and you can't let people starve. There is a proper place for welfare, and if most of these people are able to pay it back later, fine. But they can't starve. I think there has to be some upping of and some much more rapid treatment of unemployment insurance, and then we might not be in this awkward situation. But I want to speak on behalf of the welfare officers who are realistic to know they can't let these people starve waiting for something to come from Winnipeg.

MISS HUNLEY: I appreciate the comments of the hon. Member for Drumheller. Fate being as it is, maybe he'll be in a good forum where he can debate unemployment insurance and the unnecessary delays that occur, because I agree with him.

I believe the hon. Member for Little Bow and I are talking about a little different matter. We're not talking about emergency treatment, because when emergency care is needed I want and I expect the department to react to the people in a positive manner.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the minister indicated some reports were made by the various institutions I referred to in my request, and it comes under this vote. Would the minister be able to make available to me some brief copy of those reports made to the department, in whatever form, so I can assess the situation better? If I feel there's more detail, I could come back to the minister and get that type of detail. I think that most likely would be adequate for my needs at this time.

MISS HUNLEY: I'd be glad to do that.

Agreed to:

5.1 — Program Support	\$346,150
5.2 — Community Development and Referral	\$1,223,390
5.3 — Agency Grants and Purchased Services	\$7,003,000

5.4 — Residence and Treatment in Institutions

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask a question there. I understand some of the institutions that come into this category have had surpluses in their budgets. I was wondering how the minister handles situations such as that. An example that was brought to my attention, the WIRTC I believe, had a fair sum of surplus money because they didn't use it. How does the minister handle such a thing?

MISS HUNLEY: I'm familiar with that particular instance. We felt that since they had a surplus and there were always other needs, it would not be illogical for them, particularly if they had generated the surplus through their retail efforts, shall we say — it would not be unreasonable for us to expect them to use that surplus and then turn to us again if at any time they needed it. And when I use "retail", I mean the various fund-raising and manufacturing projects they have. I think it's important that these be self-sustaining if they can, because that's one of their goals.

Agreed to:	
5.4 — Residence and Treatment in Institutions	\$34,432,550
Total Vote 5 — Services for the Handicapped	\$43,005,090

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, prior to closing that vote, could the minister comment on the Michener Centre, the VS Services, as to the success at this point in time and how things are working out?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, we've extended the contract for one year, Mr. Chairman, based on the performance of that operation down there. The hon. member I know is aware that we didn't quite achieve our goal the first year, but that happens to be an ongoing economy that we are able now to implement in the institution. We've been able to divert 54 positions to the health side, where we sorely needed them. And yes, we are satisfied with the way it's settling in and the services being provided.

Agreed to:	
Total Vote 5 — Capital	\$386,130

MR. R. SPEAKER: I raised the question in the House, and the minister said she would comment with regard to the Cerebral Palsy Association and the grants available to that group.

MISS HUNLEY: My position has not changed on that. I had a very good meeting with the president of the Cerebral Palsy Association, and I still believe some programs can be developed which embrace all those who are physically disabled or mentally handicapped and which would assist that particular organization. I resist splintering any more than we already have. I didn't find that a very attractive stance that I took, although I think he understood it. I feel that by jointly working with the many handicapped groups, there are other ways we can all achieve the goals we'd like to achieve on their behalf.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress, and ask 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 Recreation, Parks and Wildlife: \$1,979,805 for departmental support services, \$32,549,159 for recreational development, \$16,621,663 for provincial parks, \$11,320,250 for fish and wildlife conservation.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration a certain resolution, and reports progress on the same.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 1:02 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]