

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Wednesday April 23, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 35****The Commissioners for Oaths
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to introduce Bill No. 35, The Commissioners for Oaths Amendment Act, 1980. The proposed Bill introduces into this legislation provisions that would make it an offence to carry on the office of commissioner for oaths without being licensed under the Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 35 read a first time]

Bill 36**The Notaries Public
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave to introduce Bill No. 36, The Notaries Public Amendment Act, 1980. Provisions similar to those described with respect to Bill 35 are also included in this Bill, as well as certain provisions with respect to the holding of the office of notary public by students at law.

[Leave granted; Bill 36 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file with the Legislature Library a document containing the signatures of some 330 residents of the town of Peace River and community supporting the United Nurses of Alberta in their request for a salary increase.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I thought it important at this time, because the Environment Council of Alberta will be holding public hearings across Alberta within the next month and a half with regard to the handling of industrial wastes, that I should again highlight the importance of the public hearings and participation by the people of Alberta. In doing so, I would like to table Hazardous Waste Management in Alberta, which was prepared by a waste management committee.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. SPEAKER: Before introducing a special guest in the Speaker's gallery, I should apologize for having attached the wrong portfolio to the hon. Attorney General when I was putting his motion. It wasn't my intention, at

least not in the absence of the Premier, to switch any portfolios.

I'm pleased to be able to introduce to the Assembly someone who is well known to most of us, a former colleague representing the constituency of Calgary McCall, Mr. George Ho Lem. I'd ask him to rise and receive our welcome.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing to you, sir, and to the Assembly, approximately 90 grades 5 and 6 students from McKee school in the constituency of Edmonton Parkallen. I might say that I've had the advantage of visiting McKee school on occasion, and it's a particular pleasure that the students are now able to visit the Assembly. I would therefore ask them and their group leader Mr. Befus . . . You know, they put us in this position, Mr. Speaker: the form doesn't say whether it's Mr., Miss, or Ms. I will ask that person to be so kind as to stand along with the students and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, four ladies who are developing an increasing interest in the affairs of the Assembly. They are Donna Clark, Margaret Ethier, Aileen McKerness, and Dallas Szarko. The reason they're developing an increasing interest in the Assembly is that they're representatives of the United Nurses of Alberta. They're in the public gallery. I'd ask them to rise and be recognized by members of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Nurses' Strike**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. I'd preface my question by saying that yesterday the Attorney General indicated to the Assembly that the action taken by the United Nurses as far as the back-to-work order passed by the government — that court action was being followed by the nurses. This morning the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care was indicating that unless the court deals with the matter very quickly, the minister will seek additional remedies through the courts to have the nurses back on the job. What events have taken place in the dispute since yesterday that have led the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care to announce today that the government is now contemplating additional legal action?

MR. SPEAKER: We're getting close to the limitations of the sub judice rule. If the hon. minister is able to answer that question without referring to any matters which may become the subject of argument or comment before the court, then I would assume it would be in order for him to answer. Otherwise the usual rule that we don't deal in this Assembly with matters before the courts would apply.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, in view of your comments, I don't think I would be able to answer that question.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly if the government has changed its position

from yesterday? Is the government itself taking legal action, a legal initiative, on this question of getting the nurses back to work in Alberta?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the government's position remains the same. We believe that a state of emergency does exist with respect to the health care services provided for Albertans, and that it's essential that the nurses return to their jobs at the earliest opportunity. We believe the action the Executive Council took and the order which was subsequently passed are legal. We're prepared to respond in court very quickly to the action initiated by the United Nurses of Alberta in order to resolve that dispute. Obviously, if that action can't proceed very quickly, then it's incumbent upon us to proceed in other ways very quickly.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. I asked the hon. minister to indicate to the Assembly in what other ways the government is planning to act. I raise the question because the minister has indicated publicly outside the Assembly today that the government does plan to take other action. I think it's only incumbent upon the minister to indicate to the members of the Assembly what that action is.

MR. RUSSELL: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, that action would obviously be taken through the courts.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. With respect to the efforts of the United Nurses of Alberta to contest the government's back-to-work order, yesterday the hon. Attorney General indicated that the government would be willing to proceed quickly, and that indication was given by the minister today. Is the Attorney General in a position to advise the Assembly whether lawyers for the Crown have sat down at this point with lawyers representing United Nurses of Alberta to see whether the court action dealing with the contest by the United Nurses of Alberta can be held earlier than the normal time, which I believe is 10 days?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has asked about the manner in which there might have been contact between legal counsel acting for the government of Alberta and legal counsel acting for the United Nurses. I'm not certain in what way contact may have taken place today, whether by telephone, if that, or in any other way. I can tell him that no notice of any proceedings was served until today, and that the documents that were served are under review at the present time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In view of the service of the notice of intention, is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether the government of Alberta is going to agree to hear this matter before the normal 10 days? Are we in a position to do that? In view of the importance, is the minister able to give the Assembly some time frame, as well as the options that the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has alluded to outside the House?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think in any such case, and certainly in this case, it's in the interests of the parties that the normal time for the hearing be shortened. I would anticipate that will be arranged in this case.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. Is the Attorney General in a position to give the Assembly any time frame at all — two or three days, or is there any assessment at this stage — in view of the urgency of the question?

MR. CRAWFORD: In view of the urgency of the question, Mr. Speaker, I would expect that a hearing could take place as soon as Friday.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It flows from the ministerial order the hon. Minister of Labour submitted, as well as the order in council. In view of the fact that Section 4 of the ministerial order allows bargaining to continue even during the course of 163 going its course of action, is the minister in a position today to advise the Assembly whether the government is prepared to commit itself to finance any voluntary settlement that might be reached as a consequence of bargaining between the Alberta Hospital Association and the United Nurses of Alberta? In view of the fact that we've already committed ourselves to finance an arbitration award, is there a commitment to finance any voluntary agreement that might be obtained?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think I've answered that question on earlier occasions, indicating that of course that financial commitment in past years has always flowed, whether it was reached voluntarily or imposed by binding arbitration, as it was in 1977. The dollars have always been there. In the events that hospitals boards haven't been able to meet those commitments and have run deficits, those deficits have been met. With respect to this order committing the dispute to binding arbitration, I think the commitment is clearly there, that the arbitration would be supported by financial dollars as necessary from the government.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care or the hon. Minister of Labour. It really deals with Section 4 of the ministerial order, which certainly does not invalidate in any way the process of reaching a voluntary settlement under the terms of this ministerial order. Bearing that in mind, has the minister taken any initiative to get the parties back to the bargaining table? And will the government agree to support fully a voluntary settlement, as the minister has already clearly indicated that the government would fully support an arbitration award?

MR. SPEAKER: The second part of the question, of course, is clearly repetitious.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, to the first part of the question: once the government has determined that an emergency exists, by virtue of Section 163 and following of The Alberta Labour Act, then it is declared that the parties should resume their activities as per prior to the beginning of the dispute. That being the case, and inasmuch as there followed from that order a procedure which would resolve the dispute, it's not possible for the government to be doing two things at the same time, in my view. And in that event, it is not the government's policy to try to continue to bring the parties together. We have exhausted — and I have repeated in this House how many attempts were made to bring the parties together in

earlier stages of negotiations, right up to the point at which that order was issued.

So I have to say again that we, at that point, provide a different resolution for the dispute. That procedure for resolution contemplates — in the event that the parties cannot agree among themselves or presumably with the assistance of the chairman of the tribunal, the tribunal would then issue its findings.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In view of the wording of Section 4, where it says "where the disputes have not been settled by agreement on or before", and alluding to the minister's answer, is the government taking the position at this stage that the government of Alberta will not continue to actively attempt to get both parties to the bargaining table to reach a voluntary settlement, and is simply going to leave this to the chairman of the arbitration tribunal, when in fact Section 4 indicates that agreement could be obtained?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview forgets a very important item. First of all, the responsibility to resolve this dispute rests with the United Nurses of Alberta and the Alberta Hospital Association. That order makes it possible for those parties to come together and resolve that dispute, should they so wish. As a third party in an assisting capacity, we have endeavored in every way we could determine to assist the parties to come together. When it appeared certain to us that we had an emergency, we responded by changing the nature of the procedure which would be followed henceforth. That in no way precludes the parties from resolving the dispute, should they so wish.

But I reiterate for the benefit of the hon. member, Mr. Speaker: any efforts in mediation require the voluntary assistance of the parties responsible. That voluntary assistance has not been available to us in the way which was necessary to respond positively to the dispute. If the parties should change their views on that, they know where each other's offices are, and I'm sure they could resolve the dispute.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary from the hon. member, followed by a further supplementary from the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Labour or the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. In view of the statement yesterday by the chief of bargaining for the United Nurses of Alberta, Mr. Renouf, that in fact the United Nurses of Alberta would be willing and ready to go back to the bargaining table to attempt to resolve this dispute on a voluntary basis, has there been any effort on the part of either minister to canvass the Alberta Hospital Association to see whether that organization would be prepared to commence bargaining, also to commit this government to the last-dollar funding required to finance a settlement?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure of the time frame for which the hon. member asked whether there's been any canvassing of the Alberta Hospital Association. But there were efforts made, prior to the issuing of the order, to determine if there could be movement on the part of either party. Both parties were contacted. Those efforts came to a negative response. In other words, the

parties did not indicate they were prepared to move.

Mr. Speaker, on the other item of the financing I wish to reaffirm, so that the hon. member does not lose sight of it, that when I was in attendance, the issue at the bargaining table in all respects was not whether money was available, but what money would be required to make both parties mutually agreeable. That is a totally different question. That is a question of what should be the value of nursing services in the province of Alberta. Obviously, there were two different views on that value. That's quite separate from whether there's sufficient money, which was never in question.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to pose just one further question to the Minister of Labour. Could the minister indicate to the Assembly why there was no involvement by the minister on this question from 7 o'clock Friday morning, all day Saturday, all day Sunday, until 1 o'clock Monday, when the cabinet passed the order? Why didn't the Minister of Labour attempt to get the groups together during the period of time the strike was in process, before the government passed the order? I raise the question with the minister because many nurses feel that in fact the government simply stopped the negotiating process and the government's attempt at the negotiating process [interjections] during the period of time, and simply waited for 1 o'clock Monday afternoon, when they passed the order.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader took a moment or two to express several assumptions, most of which are wrong. Perhaps I should correct the statements he has made. First of all, the spokesperson for the United Nurses of Alberta has been clearly identified as Mr. Renouf. Mr. d'Esterre was in contact with Mr. Renouf. Because the Alberta Hospital Association organizes in a different way, I was personally in contact with the president of that association on at least two occasions during that time to determine if there was movement on the part of the association.

Mr. Speaker, I want to underline: we didn't even stop dealing with the negotiating committee; I went right to the president to invite any observations about the possibility for further negotiations. During all that time, I spent the two days of Saturday and Sunday in my office so that I was readily available to either party. No party approached me by telephone, in addition to the fact that we had approached them.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the difference in their positions, in view of the fact that I was always available, as was Mr. d'Esterre, and both parties knew where each of us was, and in view of the fact that we initiated to them requests for possible changes in their attitudes on the various items in dispute, I do not know what other initiatives could have been taken if we were to hope for a voluntary settlement.

Child Care — High Prairie

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Last week I raised the question within the minister's department of the situation at High Prairie. I'd like to explore that matter more fully. My question to the minister concerns the duty of the Department of Social Services and Community Health to instruct houseparents and foster parents how to delegate their contracted responsibilities, and to oversee the pro-

cess. What is departmental practice regarding the counselling of contract employees about the process by which they can delegate authority?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, when asked last week about the process used both in the contract with houseparents and with substitute houseparents who are brought in, I indicated that the substitute houseparents must be acceptable to the supervising social worker — acceptable to, approved by; either terminology would be appropriate in this case. In terms of the relationship between the department's regional office, the social workers on the front line, and the houseparents who are operating on a contractual basis, certain procedures are followed as part of the ongoing process. With regard to substitute houseparents, again those procedures are followed to ensure that adequate procedures are adhered to by both the houseparents and the substitute houseparents.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the minister would be: were these procedures followed in the High Prairie example I raised in the House last week, with regard to the Petersons?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. What specific criteria did the Petersons and the supervising social workers use to assess the suitability of the substitute parents who were approved in this case at High Prairie?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated in a previous response, the basic criterion is followed across the province, which is a procedure followed by officials within the department in their conversations with prospective houseparents and, again, once those houseparents are approved, as to the suitability of substitute houseparents.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Has the minister or the Attorney General now heard from the RCMP? Has a decision been made as to whether or not charges will be laid?

MR. BOGLE: To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, charges have not been laid by the RCMP at this time.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister or to the Attorney General. Is the RCMP report finished? I ask the question in light of the minister's saying that charges have not been laid. Has the RCMP recommended to the government that no charges be laid, or is the investigation continuing, or is the Attorney General's Department waiting to make a decision as to whether charges will be laid?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd just ask the hon. member to clarify, if he might. Was the question specifically in relation to the juveniles involved in the group home? Yes?

That matter is still under review and consideration, and a final decision will be made within a relatively short period of time with regard to charges and the nature of any charges, if laid. But it has not yet been finally taken.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. I take it from that answer that the RCMP has finished its investigation and has made a recommendation to the Attorney General's Department, and a decision is then

being made in the Attorney General's Department whether or not charges will be laid?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, the investigation has been completed. It may be that a few details with respect to it still require some sort of second-stage checking. But my belief is that it has been concluded and that a decision with regard to charges will not be long.

Trapping Industry

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife, and ask where the government stands at this stage on the proposals of the Alberta Trappers Association for recommendations and changes in The Wildlife Act in the province, as well as a trappers' compensation board.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, we are looking at the aspect of trappers' compensation, particularly when resource development moves into an area and a trapper's livelihood is somewhat disturbed by the industrial activities. We have been meeting with the industry and with the Trappers Association and are endeavoring to set up some form of compensation with which we'll be able to compensate the trapper for the loss of his livelihood.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Given the fact that trapping is an industry of some importance — \$12 million last year in the province, and some potential for growth — is the government giving any consideration to the specific proposal that a trapper's interest in his registered land be clearly defined, not unlike that of a person who has mineral rights or a company that obtains mineral rights?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, we haven't looked at that aspect. In view of the fact that a lot of these people are mobile, that they move around some, we are looking more or less at the aspect that when he's in a specific area, we will look for compensation depending on the amount of damage assessed because of industrial development.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to assure the Assembly that the government will in fact complete the review of the recommendations and will have a clear statement of position for the trappers' annual meeting this year, which I gather is in June?

MR. MILLER: I can't give a definite commitment of that kind. We are carrying on discussions, and we would hope to be able to come up with something at that time. But right now I just can't say definitely.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The minister is not able to assure a policy statement before the trappers' convention; is the minister able to assure the House that at least there will be a clear position on these proposed recommendations before any of the major projects now undergoing review actually commence?

MR. MILLER: Yes, we have had discussions with the trappers' associations and with some of the industry

people. We are looking at being able to have something put forward before the major megaprojects are in place.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question to the minister. In the government's review of compensation for trappers, is the government's position at this stage that compensation should, in fact, come from public funds, or will it be the view that compensation should come from private companies? Obviously, in some cases that will be worked out, but in other cases difficult. Who in fact will finance a trappers' compensation board, and will there be an assessment of industry in the area?

MR. MILLER: At present, Mr. Speaker, we are looking at some form of assessment on the industry and the developments that are taking place, recognizing of course that there will be an appeal procedure whereby we would have a review committee set up to deal with each individual application as it came forward and to assess the amount of damage a specific development has caused.

Rapeseed Moisture Levels

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Just recently the Canadian Grain Commission announced that rapeseed moisture content is going to be reduced from a level of 10 per cent to 10.5 per cent. Has the rapeseed growers' association of Alberta contacted the minister in this regard?

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We had the opportunity to meet with the growers within the province and to discuss their points of view with regard to the reduction in the moisture content.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister contacted the Canadian Grain Commission with regard to the changing of the moisture content? It is my understanding that they intend to increase the moisture content further.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, we've had the opportunity not only to pass on the views of the growers themselves but to add to the comments in regard to the reduction in the moisture level. Of course, there is an input cost that we feel the industry certainly wouldn't want to warrant at this particular time.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. One reason the name of rapeseed was changed to Canola was that it had elements of erucic acid and glucosinolate, which caused cancer. Could the minister advise the Assembly whether the change in moisture level will have any impact on the level of erucic acid or glucosinolate?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the erucic acid is in the basic rapeseed itself. Of course, through upgrading the basic levels of seed sown in this province, we've almost removed the question of erucic acid in rape, or Canola.

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I would like to ask the minister if any thought has been given to compensating the growers for drier rapeseed. If they are going to knock it down, say, 1 per cent, it makes quite a

difference in weight. Is any compensation going to be given to the growers? I was also wondering if this is going to set a standard: the drier the rapeseed, the higher the price that will be paid?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, there's more than one question there. I suppose the best answer is that the industry itself has agreed that they are not in favor of lowering the moisture content, have made that information known, and of course have pointed out various aspects — that reduction in moisture is a factor in input costs, and also the change in the basic pricing formula.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware of the Canadian Grain Commission making changes in grains other than rapeseed, as far as moisture content is concerned?

MR. SCHMIDT: I'm not aware of any at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

Handicapped School — Calgary

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, with regard to the Christine Meikle school in Calgary. I understand there's a new ruling as of September 1, 1980, that any student at the school over the age of 18 must leave the school and go out on their own. I was wondering if the minister has been advised of that new policy. And what discussions has the minister had with the people in Calgary?

MR. BOGLE: No, Mr. Speaker. I'm personally not aware of that matter, but I'll certainly look into it and see what involvement I or my department might have.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. When he is reviewing this matter, would the minister also check that the 40-some students who will no longer have access to Christine Meikle school will have the opportunity to go to some type of adult education program or training program after September 1, 1980?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'll include that in my review and assessment.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Would the minister also check and assure himself and us in this Assembly that those students who could be put into day programs will have access to approved residences to live in Calgary while they are in training programs?

MR. BOGLE: I'll certainly look at that aspect, Mr. Speaker. By the nature of the hon. member's last question, it may well be that part of it depends on availability of group home spaces. But I'll include that in the review, with the other two items raised by the hon. member.

Mentally Ill — Incarceration

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Yesterday I asked the minister with regard to the incarceration of individuals at Grande Prairie, and the minister indicated

he'd check into the matter. Has the minister had a chance to, and can he report to the Assembly?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to review the matter with my colleague the Solicitor General, and he may wish to supplement my comments.

Under The Mental Health Act a person may be detained. If the detention is under Section 34, which is by the police, then there's a provision which allows for up to 72 hours to transport the individual to a mental facility. If a person is detained under Section 34, the police themselves must escort the patient to the mental facility, whereas if a person is detained under a certificate by a physician, it could be via ambulance.

In the particular circumstances as raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday, there are cases in Alberta where individuals have been held in police cells. I'm advised that in no case has that exceeded the 72-hour limit allowable under the Act, and in all cases a physician is requested to visit the individual who is being detained within the first 24 hours.

In the vast majority of cases the patient is transferred to either Alberta Hospital, Oliver, or Alberta Hospital, Ponoka, or one of the psychiatric wards at an active treatment hospital within the province. Of course there are no psychiatric beds in the Grande Prairie hospital at present, although by provisions made through the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care with the local hospital board, it's my understanding that 10 beds will be made available during 1981. When the new regional hospital is completed there will be a psychiatric ward in that hospital. That, Mr. Speaker, is the primary reason that several people were detained.

There is one case I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker. Approximately two months ago, because Alberta Hospital, Oliver, was full at the time, the police in Grande Prairie were asked to hold an individual for a period longer than 24 hours, but certainly not longer than the 72. In that interval of time the patient was transferred to Alberta Hospital, Oliver.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the minister. What action has the minister's department taken following the representation made to the department by the Grande Prairie mental health council? They made representation to the provincial mental health council. What actions have been taken by the minister's department since that time to stop this practice at Grande Prairie?

MR. BOGLE: To be clear, Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated, under Section 34 of the Act, if a person is deemed by the police to be out of control or a danger to himself and/or others, then the police may detain the individual. In some cases, and again under that section of the Act, the police themselves must transport the individual to the mental facility. In some parts of the province it is not possible to transport the person, depending on the time of day or evening it happens to be, and depending on the availability of police within the area. Therefore, the practice of detaining someone is something that has happened in the past and will happen in the future.

The key, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that in areas where there is sufficient growth — and the Grande Prairie region is one example — we work in concert through our sister Department of Hospitals and Medical Care with the local hospital board to ensure that psychiatric beds are available within that area. That's now being worked

on. It is part of the overall plan, as I've previously indicated to the minister.

But I don't want to leave the impression, Mr. Speaker, that there will not be some future point in time when this practice will not be followed in a community in Alberta. It's the only system we've been able to identify to date which is workable under the circumstances of availability of manpower and transportation.

The key thing, and I'll mention it again, is not a case where an individual is detained in a police cell and left unattended for a period of up to three days. The practice of the RCMP is to call a physician in. In some cases the individual is released upon examination by a physician. In other cases, upon the recommendation of the physician in consultation with the police, the person is transferred to a mental facility for formal examination by officials at that facility.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, let me put the supplementary question to the minister this way: Mr. Minister, once the matter was raised with your department by the Grande Prairie mental health council, what steps did the department take to ensure that individuals who find themselves in that situation in Grande Prairie will be transferred to Oliver at the earliest possible time? What steps has the minister's department taken since this matter was raised with the department some months ago?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the department will continue, as it has in the past, to work closely with the regional mental health councils, the provincial mental health council, the Solicitor General's Department, and the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care to ensure that we're using as humane a procedure as possible. In the case of Grande Prairie, until the 10 psychiatric beds are in place at the Grande Prairie hospital, we will continue to rely on transporting patients from the Peace River area to Alberta Hospital, Oliver, or another facility within this area. There's no short-term solution to that issue until those beds are in place in Grande Prairie, and we're working on that at the present time.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Would the minister assure the Assembly, then, that henceforth his department will make every effort to guarantee that people who are in jail in Grande Prairie under the kind of circumstance I outlined yesterday and the minister has spoken of today — to get those people to Oliver or Alberta Hospital, Ponoka, if that's the most desirable place, at the earliest possible date; and that it won't be a matter of there not being enough money to get people there, or personnel? Will the minister give us that kind of assurance?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the procedure followed at the present time is to do that very thing: ensure that individuals are transported at the earliest opportunity, if deemed to require that kind of assistance. To ask me to ensure that there are going to be suitable police on duty in a given community at any given time is something beyond my authority, or anyone else's in this Assembly. We're doing our very best to meet the need.

DR. C. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the minister assure us that these patients are being held in the correctional areas at the present time only because they are a danger to either themselves or others?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The criterion that must be used if the detention is as a result of actions by the police is on the basis that in the opinion of the police the individual is either out of control or a danger to himself and/or others.

CLERK: Orders of the Day.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to request leave, pursuant to Standing Order 29 ...

MR. SPEAKER: I apologize for interrupting the hon. member, but I overlooked that the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower wished to supplement some information he had previously given the Assembly. I regret that I overlooked that.

Chemical Plant Closure — Calgary

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question with regard to the closure of the Canadian Industries Limited plant in Calgary, and I indicated that I was under the impression that a manpower adjustment committee might have been set up. I wish to advise the Assembly that a manpower adjustment committee was not set up with that firm, as the company had decided to form its own internal relocation committee in conjunction with its local unions.

The services of our manpower services division in Calgary were offered to the company and its employees. The assistance available to the affected employees included career counselling, industrial training, and referral to other Calgary employers. Placement assistance is offered in co-operation with the local Canada Employment Centre.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member might proceed now under Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: EMERGENCY DEBATE

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again I rise, pursuant to Standing Order 29(1), to request leave to move adjournment of the Assembly to discuss the present situation relating to the dispute between the United Nurses of Alberta and the Alberta Hospital Association. I have copies of this for the Government House Leader, the Leader of the Opposition, the Speaker, and the Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, in my view there are four reasons why we should set aside the business of the House today to discuss this critical question facing Albertans. Three of those reasons involve the urgency, as I see it. The fourth deals with whether the normal procedures and mechanisms of this House are such that we would be able to deal with this matter in the normal routine business.

Mr. Speaker, the first reason is that, in my view it is much better if we can reach a voluntary settlement. Yesterday the spokesperson for the United Nurses of Alberta made it very clear that that organization would choose, and would hope, they could go back to the bargaining table and complete the discussions leading to a settlement on a voluntary basis. In view of the fact that

one side has given a very clear-cut statement of willingness to participate, I think that's an important consideration.

In addition to that particular question, if we are to have the discussion and the importance of it underlined, it seems to me that negotiations have to have two sides. The other side really deals with the Alberta Hospital Association having a clear-cut commitment from this Legislative Assembly that, should a voluntary agreement be reached over the next several days ...

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but it would appear to me that his remarks at the present time assume that the request for leave to debate has gone through the Assembly, been given the necessary approval, and he's now debating the topic. At this stage of the discussion, I would suggest that one of the relevant points is to discuss the urgency of the matter without going into its merits or the position of either side.

MR. NOTLEY: With respect, sir, that was exactly the point I was coming to.

As far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of some genuine concern throughout the province of Alberta. As a matter of fact, just a few minutes before the House opened, I was advised that the hospital in one of the communities in my constituency will be formally closed down as of 3 o'clock. Throughout Alberta the people are concerned about this particular dispute.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is whether the Legislature should discuss it in the form of an emergency debate. I would say that part and parcel of assessing this concern is whether we can reach a voluntary settlement. A voluntary settlement is crucial to the discussion of that concern. The other day in this Assembly, we had the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care indicate that apparently some 200 nurses in Calgary had requested forms to resign. In the city of Grande Prairie at a meeting on Monday night, a number of nurses came out and indicated they were prepared to resign. No matter how you cut it, we've got to try to reach a voluntary settlement of this dispute if we're going to maintain morale among nurses in Alberta so our health system can be carried on. [interjections] In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the reason an emergency debate is necessary is that the Legislative Assembly must clearly state that we want to see negotiations commence again.

Mr. Speaker, the fourth point I want to deal with is whether the normal procedures of the House facilitate this kind of emergency debate. Members on the other side may say that we have estimates: we have the estimates of the Department of Labour; we have estimates of the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care. But there is no way of forecasting when those estimates may come up. It's possible that they may come up in the next several days, but it may be several weeks. The question as to the urgency of the issue — ask any person in the city of Edmonton or the province of Alberta: should this Legislature wait until such time as the normal operation of the Legislature allows the estimates to be discussed? Quite frankly, I think most people in Alberta would say, no, we want to see the members of the Legislature taking initiative on this question far before that.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, hon. members on the other side may say there's always the possibility of putting a resolution on the Order Paper. That's true. But the earliest that that could be called as an opposition motion would be next Thursday. And I would say to hon.

members of this Assembly that, again, the people of Alberta — the nurses, the hospital board members, and the overwhelming majority of the people — want some action long before next Thursday.

No, Mr. Speaker, in terms of critical concern throughout Alberta, in terms of the ability to focus a discussion, the normal procedures of the House in this instance will not suffice. This is one of those cases which clearly fall within the jurisdiction of the Speaker to render a judgment that this at least should be put to the House as a subject sufficiently important, sufficiently urgent, that the members should be able to decide today in the normal course — 15 members can rise — whether they wish an emergency debate.

Mr. Speaker, I would say in closing that the people of this province expect the members of this House not to sidestep the issue but to accept fully our responsibilities. The only way we can do that is to proceed this afternoon with an adjournment of the normal business of the House, to underline and recognize the importance of a voluntary settlement to this very important dispute.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question of urgency of debate, two days ago the government expressed its view that the situation with respect to the nurses' strike in Alberta is, in fact, an emergent one. I suggest it may well be that the people of Alberta will now be more encouraged than they have been before, that other hon. members of this Assembly share the view that the matter is indeed emergent, and with respect to which there is urgency.

Mr. Speaker, on that basis my view would simply be expressed this way: if it's Your Honour's opinion and decision that the matter is appropriate, we should simply put the question.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the matter before the House, might I say that my colleagues and I support the position that the debate should go ahead here this afternoon. Certainly from the standpoint of urgency, it seems to me that the point has been well made on both sides of the House. There is no question that no higher priority can be given to any area other than health care. Not only the morale of nurses in the province, but confidence in the whole health care system are extremely important, it seems to me.

Might I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if it is your decision that this debate can go ahead this afternoon, we would certainly welcome that and will participate in the debate. But I might further suggest to you, sir, and to the government that, immediately following that debate, we call the estimates of the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care; rather than go ahead with Culture or other departments we have before the Committee of the Whole — be it tomorrow, or this evening if members want to move ahead on unanimous agreement — we get into the estimates of the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care. Because it's there that this Assembly can take action by voting on the moneys appropriated or moving to have increases, if increases are warranted in an area.

MR. SPEAKER: There are some difficulties with this motion. For one thing, the topic has been covered and re-covered, referred to and referred to again on many occasions in the question period in the last few days. I realize that's not the same as debate, but I think hon. members may agree it's not entirely facetious to say that included in some of the questions and answers there is a

good deal of debate.

Another difficulty with the motion is the fact that at least one aspect of this matter is before the courts. There may be some lack of understanding as to why this Assembly does not deal with matters before the courts. It's simply this: if members of the Assembly indicate a certain opinion with regard to a matter that's before the court, and a court decision follows, there can be one of two difficulties. If the court decision agrees with the opinion expressed in the Assembly, then it may be said by people who don't understand the independence of our courts that the court was influenced by the Assembly. If the court does not follow the decision or opinion expressed in the Assembly, it may be said by other people that the courts were bending over backward to emphasize their independence and deliberately didn't follow a course which had been previously indicated in this Assembly. As I say, that is a particular difficulty with regard to this resolution.

There is one other aspect to it which I think is also not generally understood. It applies not only to this resolution but to other motions for emergency debate. It's this: in discussing the motion, I hear hon. members — especially the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview — saying there should be some initiative taken in this Assembly; that it should accept fully its responsibility. I'm sure all members agree those are two desirable things.

But under our rules, the nature of a motion for emergency debate is clearly such that no decision is reached. As far as I know, this is true of all parliaments that follow, as we do, the British tradition, the Westminster tradition. As far as I know, they all have provision for emergency debates. But in all cases no decision is taken. The motion is not put to a vote. All the Assembly decides, if the Speaker finds the motion to be in order, is whether the matter should be debated. It's a debate pure and simple, with no decision arising from it. In fact, no vote is taken at the end.

In that respect, some of the arguments that have been put forth in support of the motion are erroneous, because they indicate there should be some kind of decision on the matter in the Assembly, and this is not the vehicle for a decision of the Assembly. Any member who wants the Assembly to make a decision on a matter doesn't follow the means, under this order, of having an emergency debate. That is done by means of a resolution, an ordinary motion, which is voted on.

Quite apart from those difficulties — and it wasn't my intention to create any degree of suspense with regard to the matter, but I did think it very important that we understand clearly the nature of this kind of debate, that it doesn't lead to a decision, and that we are dealing with a matter which is before the courts. Apart from those two difficulties, I find the motion to be in order.

But I would say this: if the Assembly agrees — and it takes 15 members to do that — that discussion of the topic should proceed, and there should be an airing of it, I would respectfully ask all hon. members to try to keep in mind the question which is before the courts and to stay away from that question completely in discussing the topic under debate.

In view of what I've said, does the Assembly agree that the debate on the motion should proceed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: There being no voices contra, I call on the Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In leading off debate on this very important item, I would first of all say to members of the House that we have to look at our health system throughout the province of Alberta and very carefully recognize that we face shortages of nurses down the road. Mr. Speaker, in some hospitals in Alberta we are already facing shortages of nurses.

Mr. Speaker, if the province of Alberta is to be able to have a first-rate health system, we must encourage people in the profession to stay in that profession; we must induce other people to enter the profession. The only way we can achieve that goal is to make sure that wages and salaries are competitive, not only with the private sector but also with other provinces. In the 10 minutes I have in this debate, I don't want to go over a litany of comparative salaries across the country. Suffice it to say that we do not compare very well at this stage. We rank fifth among the provinces. Even with the offer made by the Alberta Hospital Association, we would move from fifth to fourth, but on October 1, we would still rank fifth.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of retaining registered nurses in this province is not hypothetical. In the city of Grande Prairie, for example, many nurses are saying quite frankly: why should we continue to work in Alberta when our wages are substantially below the wages of people who nurse just a few miles down the road in Dawson Creek, British Columbia? I have the same situation in the hospital at Spirit River, which is 55 miles down the road [from] Dawson Creek — although the quality of the road at the moment is certainly not an inducement for people to travel to Dawson Creek. Notwithstanding that, the fact of the matter is that salary levels in this province have lagged behind.

I know this government has committed itself to a policy of public-sector salary guidelines. I've quarrelled with that policy since it was announced in 1975 by the then Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Leitch. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that there is a time when those policies catch up to us. I suggest to members of the Assembly that those policies have in fact caught up to us now. Because we have not kept pace with salaries and wages in other provinces and in the private sector, we have a very militant group of nurses.

The hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care realizes how concerned nurses in this province are about a fair settlement. He also realizes, in studying the statistics, that salary and wage levels have not kept pace with the inflation rate and, in fact, that the real purchasing power of nurses is less today than it was in 1975. So the question of settling this dispute must be very clearly related to a settlement that not only restores purchasing power to the nurses of Alberta but recognizes the need to be competitive with other provinces in Canada. I guess I have to underline again the British Columbia experience. My constituency is so close to the B.C. border that nurses in all Peace ridings, I'm sure, but particularly in mine, have been very blunt in making comparisons between Alberta and British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get into the rights and wrongs of the case before the courts. That is not my intention. The judgment will be made at some time by the Court of Queen's Bench as to whether the government's back-to-work order is in order. But quite apart from that judgment is the issue of whether collective bargaining now can commence. That can exist regardless of how the Queen's Bench rules on the efforts of the United Nurses of Alberta to contest the government's order in council

and the ministerial order thereunder.

I would say to members of the House that before we can reach a voluntary settlement, we have to set aside the hypothetical and get right back to where it really counts: between the Alberta Hospital Association and the United Nurses of Alberta. The Alberta Hospital Association gets its last-dollar funding from the province of Alberta. The only way a voluntary settlement can be reached is for the government of Alberta to say clearly in this House: there are no ifs, ands, or buts; any settlement that is reached, whether it's 27 per cent, 22 per cent, or whatever it may be, will be financed in total by the government of Alberta through the estimates or, if need be, even special warrants of this province, so that it won't have to come from other elements of the hospital budget.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour indicated today in the House that that really wasn't the problem. With greatest respect, I say to the Minister of Labour that in talking to hospital board members in the province, that is a concern to them. If they have to go through the cumbersome appeal procedure, and if they have to risk perhaps paying for a higher nurses' settlement from other elements of the budget, they're concerned about it. I don't know if the people who talked to the minister were concerned, but I certainly know that some of the people who talked to me are concerned about it.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has already quite properly said in this House that if there is an arbitration award by Mr. Justice Brennan, the government of Alberta is clearly going to commit itself to pay for that award. And I respect that. Clearly, we have to abide by the law, just as we expect the nurses to, just as we expect the Alberta Hospital Association to.

But having made that commitment in the House, Mr. Speaker, I say in the most sincere way I can, that the government should also clearly commit itself to say to the hospital association and the nurses: if you can reach a settlement over the next two or three days, that settlement will in fact be financed totally, the same as an arbitration award would be. If we made a clear and unambiguous commitment to finance a voluntary settlement, that would do more than anything else to get the two parties back to the bargaining table.

I hope we don't have to go through the agonizing process of a long, drawn-out court hearing. I'm not going to comment on that, but I do want to stress that I can't imagine a member in this House who wouldn't want to see those two parties at the bargaining table, discussing ways and means of resolving this dispute voluntarily. The nurses in Alberta feel very strongly, and rightly so, that the back-to-work order was unfair. It's not a question of its legality, but that it was unfair, because they feel their salary levels are not adequate. In fact they feel that nurses are worth more. For those of us who have to be concerned — and all members, government and opposition alike, have to recognize that the bottom line of any system is: will it work; not the arguments that could be made on one side and the other, but will it work? And the only way our health system is going to work properly is if we have adequately paid nurses who feel they are being treated fairly. That's the crucial issue at this time.

I implore the government today to commit itself clearly to do the one thing that will make collective bargaining work; that is, to say that if a voluntary settlement can be reached, through the last-dollar funding of the Assembly, without having to go through all sorts of appeal procedures, that money will be there in the case of a voluntary

settlement, just as it would be in the case of an arbitration award.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this emergency debate this afternoon, I'd really like to make four points. The first point, to you, sir, and to members of the Assembly, is this: the present situation we are going through right now, the strike and then the government issuing the order on Monday at 1 o'clock for the nurses to go back to work, is really an overflow or leftover from what happened in 1977. Clearly, if there's one thing that many nurses have impressed upon me, in addition to a fair salary — and I'll have some comments on that later on — is that there was a great feeling of dissatisfaction with the way this thing was handled in 1977. What happened is that following the 1977 situation, when the nurses were ordered back to work, steps were not taken to sit down with the nurses and the Hospital Association, to take some steps, to take some great care that three years from '77 we wouldn't be involved in a similar situation in 1980.

I can think of no other facet of Alberta society, no other group in Alberta, that finds themselves put back to work by the government's using the Labour Act in 1977, and a similar procedure imposed on them again in 1980. One can argue that perhaps it had to happen the first time. I don't buy that point of view, but it could be made. But for us in this province of Alberta to have to face the realization that in the course of three years nurses have been ordered back to work twice — and I stand to be corrected, Mr. Minister of Labour, if another group has had the Labour Act used on them in the course of three years, as the nurses have. I urge this government to ask itself very clearly what steps were taken to prevent what we're involved in now.

Back in December, the nurses asked to sit down with the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care to talk about the guidelines and some flexibility in the guidelines. As he indicated in the House yesterday, the minister said he didn't think it was appropriate to do that at that time. Well, the minister may not have felt it was appropriate, Mr. Speaker. But if the minister didn't, the Premier, Treasury Board, or someone should have. The hospital boards, the hospital people who talked to me, find themselves very clearly, if I might use the phraseology, between the devil and the deep blue on this issue. If they agree to a settlement which is seen by the government to be excessive, and they rely on the government for last-dollar financing, they're in trouble.

On the other hand, it seems to me the approach the hospital boards have taken is to make an offer to the nurses that the government has said they will support, and not be prepared to go further than that. Clearly in the course of this dispute, Mr. Speaker, we've seen that it isn't a matter of the nurses being at the throats of the hospital boards or the hospital boards at the throats of the nurses. Basically it's a matter of negotiations between the United Nurses of Alberta and the government of Alberta. We're dealing with a regrettable situation today because steps were not taken following '77. There wasn't an attempt to build some of the confidence which was destroyed in '77.

The second point I want to make, Mr. Speaker: it is the view of some people, inside and outside the Assembly, that with the government's passing of the order in council Monday, the nurses are to be forced back to work. But let me just remind members of this: the government can pass that order; the courts can make a decision. But the

nurses can tell us how long they're going to work in our hospitals. We can pass all the legislation in this Assembly, but unless we have the good will of the nursing profession on a long-term basis, they can tell this Assembly and hospital boards how long they're going to be involved in the nursing profession in this province. When we see more than 200 nurses picking up resignation applications from Calgary Foothills, a government run hospital, that should say something to a lot of members on both sides of the House. The point has to be continued to be made: we have not gone back and done the repairing of fences following '77.

Mr. Speaker, I judge that I have some three minutes left. The third point I want to make is this. On Monday when I was in Grande Prairie talking to individuals about this very matter, a father came to me and said his daughter, who is finishing high school this year, is going to be a lifeguard at the swimming pool in Grande Prairie and will be receiving \$7.25 per hour. We have to ask ourselves, what are nurses worth? My colleague continually wears the button, Nurses are Worth More. There's no question that in this province of Alberta, with the kind of resources we have, we can't be satisfied with being number four or five in paying nurses.

We've got to meet the competition. That will come as a jolt to some people. It's going to be costly. But if we are to have nurses in place, the health care professions in place, for three, four, and five years down the road when this massive hospital building program is finished, then we've got to develop a reservoir of good will between government, the Legislature, the nurses, and hospital boards starting right now.

I plead with the Minister of Labour, with the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, and with every other member in this Assembly, that it should be somewhat of a major disappointment with all of us that in the course of three years we've used the Labour Act on the nurses twice. That clearly has to indicate that from the standpoint of labor negotiations, and the standpoint of trying to develop a trusting relationship between the groups involved, this government has not done that job. Nurses look at the welshing there was last year on the baccalaureate program at the University of Alberta as just one more example of a commitment that was given and was drawn back. I say to members in the Assembly that best we be very wary of the kind of labor practices we follow with the nurses in the province of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling on the hon. minister, may the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview revert to Introduction of Visitors? We have a special guest in the gallery.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. NOTLEY: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. It's not very often that I have the opportunity to introduce one of my partisan political colleagues, albeit from another jurisdiction. In the members gallery, so that he can gaze down on the government members, is Mr. Bob Rae, who is the NDP finance critic in the House of Commons, and his wife Arlene. I wonder if they would stand and be recognized by the members of the Assembly.

head: **EMERGENCY DEBATE***(continued)*

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, in participating in this very important debate, I think I should commence on a note, raised by both hon. members in the opposition, that had to do with the question of confidence: confidence as between individuals, as between parties. In this dispute, that has been a very great concern of mine. As a new minister it was my concern approximately a year ago when I was appointed. To that end I had a list made of the leaders of organizations with whom I should meet at the earliest opportunity, whether or not there was a problem, just so I would know who they were and be able to talk to them in the event there was a problem. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, back in December, I took the opportunity, when it came, of inviting to lunch with me the leadership of the United Nurses of Alberta. I had a most pleasant lunch with them, and had that opportunity to build some confidence. During the course of that lunch, some of the problems they felt were coming, were outlined to me.

Mr. Speaker, at that time there had been a considerable amount of negotiations on a one-to-one basis between the two parties responsible for this dispute, the United Nurses of Alberta and the Alberta Hospital Association. Subsequently a conciliation commissioner was appointed. At neither of those stages was any appreciable progress made to resolve the over 150 dispute items, and that's a very great indicator of the massive problem involved in this dispute.

On January 10, because in my view there had been a breakdown, I took an unusual course of action and invited both parties to meet with me in an effort to uncover the problem; why could there not be sufficient confidence between the parties so that they, the responsible parties, might be able to make some initiative and some advance on their own? We were unable to find the key to that difficulty. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I took another unusual step. I invited the president of the United Nurses of Alberta and the chairman of the employee relations committee of the Alberta Hospital Association, who is elected, to meet with me so that I might introduce them to one another and we might have a conversation, and perhaps we could find a key. One party declined to participate in that meeting.

Mr. Speaker, subsequently we appointed a conciliation board that ran its course and reduced the number of items in dispute to approximately 10. With the onslaught of mediation, which commenced during the time when it was indicated publicly that the conciliation board findings were unacceptable, at the point when the deputy minister could not complete the mediation, I again became directly involved on a personal basis, as I indicated to the House. I met through the evening and one night with the parties, explored each item in dispute with each party, identified what it was and tried to identify the rationale behind the difference so I might have a better understanding what it was and why there couldn't be agreement.

Mr. Speaker, following that, as I've indicated to the House, before the strike commenced I felt that because of the very grave nature of this dispute, which affects the health and lives of Albertans, I should again call both presidents in with whomever they wished to bring. Those meetings were held, and during them I reviewed a number of things with each party. I reviewed with them the gravity of this situation of a potential strike to the integrity

of the collective bargaining system. I reviewed the importance of the maintenance of health services, because it could affect the health and the life of every citizen in this province.

I reviewed the importance and the significance to the profession of nursing, because surely a strike does not enhance professional character in the eyes of many people. I reviewed with the Hospital Association that same feature with respect to the function and responsibility of hospital board members. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I asked both parties what, if any, suggestions they had to advance to me on how we could make progress in the dispute. In both cases, I was given no positive suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should just identify some of the problems and some of the successes. Towards the end of mediation, we identified three major items in dispute. One was the level of salaries. In talking with the Alberta Hospital Association, I had carefully checked with them as to their rationale. Their rationale was to have salaries comparable, fair, and just. At no time did they raise with me the question of funding. They were concerned to be responsible board members. Now, they may see that responsibility, and what is fair and just, in a different light than the nurses, or perhaps than I. That's another question. But at no time was funding ever given as an excuse for not resolving the dispute. The dispute turned on the question of what was fair and just in their view.

Mr. Speaker, a second item: the nurses had requested four weeks' vacation after two years. That apparently took on a very major significance to the Alberta Hospital Association. We were unable to resolve that particular question.

The professional responsibility clause: we made very great progress, Mr. Speaker. In our estimation, we resolved the points of principle involved in that, and agreed there had to be some system; some minor disagreement on procedure.

Mr. Speaker, another grave item of concern was resolved. It had to do with an assurance of every third weekend off, with a minimum 56 hours on the weekend for nurses. Apparently that was a major improvement, I'm told. I understand that is resolved, as is the fact that there will be a dental plan, 50 per cent paid by the two parties. The question surrounding that is whether it will come in, in mid-1980 or mid-1981.

Mr. Speaker, when it came time to look at the situation, and the Executive Council faced the decision of whether we could allow the dispute to go, again we were confronted with two problems. On the one hand, we have the integrity of the collective bargaining system; on the other hand, we have the responsibility to look out for and to accept that there has to be regard for the health and lives of the citizens of this province. It's a very grave situation when as large a portion of the health system goes down as is presently the case in Alberta. We weighed that very carefully and very heavily. But to reassure members, I say again that we were most concerned about the integrity of the collective bargaining system. We made the decision. There's been question about whether notice was served the way hon. members would like it to have been. I have here a copy of the service card.

Mr. Speaker, I just received a note that I have one minute. According to my watching, I have two minutes left.

AN HON. MEMBER: Three.

AN HON. MEMBER: Quick, quick.

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to take up any time to comment on that.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can omit the service of notice. I've already covered in question period that in fact 20 minutes' notice was given. I have the signature of one M. Ethier on the receipt.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. minister, it seems to me the question of notice may be one of those that is before the courts. Perhaps we should go on to another aspect of the matter.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In that event, I would just like to make a brief comment on arbitration. The provision that is being set up for arriving at a resolution and a determination of what is fair and proper, is an emergency tribunal. That tribunal will be, as per the order, if it goes forward, a justice of the Court of Queen's Bench — the same court, Mr. Speaker, to which the United Nurses of Alberta have appealed for a rendering of a fair decision on the validity of the actions which they have put before it.

Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that that arbitration will not be fettered in any way by any guidelines. An undertaking was given that the government would fund whatever the determination of the arbitration board was. That is substantiated by past practice in the Bowen report in 1977. At that time, nurses were under Anti-Inflation Board guidelines. The judge or the tribunal at that time came in with an award which exceeded the guidelines, and this government brought to this Assembly a special Bill to remove the nurses from the impact of the guidelines so that the nurses could receive the full amount of that award. It took time to do it, but we went to the extent not only of paying the amount of money in the award but of producing a special Bill and passing it in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my time has run out. I would simply say that I have made every effort I can to resolve a very difficult dispute. We have now put it into the fairest means of resolving the dispute that we know how to do. We have done that, having regard to our concern, first, for the integrity of the collective bargaining system and, secondly, for the lives and health of Albertans, which at a point in the dispute has to take, and is surely, the most important consideration at this point in time.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to offer some comments on the discussion before hon. members. I think it's important to emphasize that the use of the collective bargaining process, and the respect we ought to have for that process, has been put very vigorously to this House on many previous occasions, especially by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Also, the respect for local autonomy, and non-interference by the heavy hand of government on autonomous boards, I think has been made one of the four major issues of the official opposition party. When those autonomous boards have that full and complete authority, are providing what is deemed an obviously essential service, and at the same time are getting all their funding from the government of Alberta, it's very difficult to allow the full and complete collective bargaining system to run its course. If this system and the services provided weren't essential, I think the concern by members as to

how long the dispute might run or the work stoppage could be in force would not be of the interest and concern it is today.

The collective bargaining process started approximately six months ago; October 16, I believe. So it's run for six months, and today we've heard the plea: why not let the voluntary collective bargaining process resume? I think we have to ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker: in the provision of this essential service, where services have been withdrawn, to what extent can the government, in attempting to act responsibly, allow that collective bargaining process to continue? Is six months reasonable? Is there a hope that the parties will reach agreement? Based on the reports my hon. colleague has given, we're very pessimistic that they will.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard the argument that a commitment of X dollars or X per cent raise ought to be given to one or both parties as the level we would support, and that the parties would go into bargaining with either or both of them knowing that. Surely it is evident that that would make a mockery of the collective bargaining process. How could two parties bargain if the ceiling provided, which comes from the only source of funding, i.e. the government, is known? It would make a mockery, a sham, out of collective bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, I've tried to say in this House on many occasions that whatever past commitments or agreements the AHA has made with its various bargaining sectors, have been met. The example of 1977 has been used. I've used past budgets of all the hospital boards in the province. We've referred to the making up of deficits by the boards which did run into difficulty. I really don't know what more assurance we can give. Obviously we can't say to the hospital boards: it's safe for you to go to 32 per cent, and we'll fund that. Where does their bargaining position go with respect to the UNA and with respect to the other bargaining agencies waiting their turn to reach the bargaining table?

I think another specific example that ought to be mentioned is the very important case of equal rights for equal work applying to the registered nursing assistants. As I recall, the government acted very quickly with a special warrant for \$22 million to reach the commitment and obligation it had as a result of bargaining, and as a result of the ruling of the courts. So I think the red herring raised by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, that there can't be bargaining there or trust because there's some fear that the dollars won't follow from the government once agreement is either reached voluntarily or imposed through arbitration, is nonsense. The record simply doesn't show that, and I think the parties know the government will meet its financial obligations. There's no question but that it will.

I said we are dealing with essential services. The Labour Act clearly outlines the responsibilities of the government in that respect. Our judgment, Mr. Speaker, has been criticized and questioned in debate with respect to the timing of the action we took Monday morning. I want to share with hon. members some of the reporting I was getting during that very worrisome period from 7 a.m. Friday until Monday morning. Over the weekend, I think it was fairly optimistic. The hospital boards and administrators were fairly confident: we can manage for 48 hours; it looks like we can get along okay for a couple of days; we've arranged to do this; we've done this. The government did what it could by having extra stand-by air ambulance service available. So steps were taken, and we were fairly confident that it would be all right for the

United Nurses of Alberta to conduct a legal work stoppage. And they did.

However, Sunday night, four calls to my home in Edmonton, after I left my office, began to give me some concern and worry. I arranged to meet with my cabinet colleagues on Monday morning. Before I met with them I got more reports. I'd like to read verbatim from some of the quotes I was getting. Sitting in my place Monday morning, see if you wouldn't have been concerned about the lives and health of Albertans: managing okay, but staff starting to get very tired; can probably cope through today, pretty tired; coping but tired; director of nursing is alone, and she is wearing down; three deliveries overnight, okay but tiring; okay but staff feeling very heavy; three terminal cases with minimum staff looking after them; a worrisome weekend; we are at 90 per cent occupancy, but we've got all the heaviest cases from northern Alberta. And it goes on and on: health care will start to deteriorate in one to one and a half days; situation is straining; biggest worry is monitoring our intensive care unit patients. I've got pages of those reports, Mr. Speaker.

On that basis I took the recommendation to cabinet that the stoppage of this essential service by the nurses had probably gone on about as long as we could permit it to, and that the only recourse we would have is to refer the matter to a distinguished member of the bench, who would hear both sides of the argument and then render a decision which would be binding on all parties. And of course the financial binding goes on the government.

Mr. Speaker, during this time I'm very concerned. I've been made aware of three families who attribute family deaths to the withdrawal or depletion of nursing services in their particular cases. As you can appreciate, those are very difficult calls to deal with. But there are at least three deaths in the province during the course of this work stoppage, that the families believe have been caused by the stoppage. So we've got to deal with that kind of thing, and I think we all have to act responsibly.

Nurses are needed. There's no question about it. And we're going to need more than we have at the present time if we're going to make the expansion of our physical system of facilities workable. We know we need the profession. We are now going through a difficult period with respect to reaching agreement on salary and other working conditions. We're working with a new union. This is their first time at the bargaining table in Alberta. They say nurses are worth more. I don't think anybody in Alberta disputes that. The question is: how much more? We think there is a fair way of deciding that. We're hoping very vigorously that the nurses will return to work, because sick and dying Albertans need their services. There is no way we can replace them, and we recognize that. It's a very delicate situation.

I think the last step available, under the circumstances outlined by my colleague and me, is clear, quick, and fair. It will give both parties another chance to fully air their points of view and a fair and binding decision to be made. Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind the nature of the services in question, I'm very hopeful that the parties involved will decide that that's the course that should be followed and that reason and respect for the law would prevail.

I want to close by saying that when the tenseness and emotion of this dispute are over, I'm optimistic that by working together with the nurses' professional organization, the AARN, we can resolve some of the other very important matters affecting the profession, which are out-

side the bounds of remuneration and holidays and those kinds of things. I do not mean to downgrade those latter items, because they are important. But I think they'll be resolved through this bargaining process.

I'm confident that by working with the AARN, we can once more make nursing an attractive profession for young Albertans to enter; for immigrants to Alberta, who move here as a result of our economy, to enter; and that it will be helpful for various hospital boards to recruit nurses, as needed, from other jurisdictions. We want to build a good system, and we're counting on co-operation with the profession to make it work. In my meetings with the executive of that association, I come away with the feeling that by dealing that way with them, we can make it work. But I recognize that in the tenseness of this particular situation, we simply have to somehow get the nurses back to work and assure them that they will be given a fair payment. Because nurses are certainly worth more.

MR. SPEAKER: If there are no other members?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to give the government backbenchers an opportunity to get up and express their views.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Chair is willing to see to that.

DR. BUCK: Fine. I just wanted to give them the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, that's all. We don't seem to be hearing anything from them.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make one or two points on the statement of the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care about the autonomy of our hospitals. This may appear to be such, but the hon. minister well knows that the provincial government gives the hospitals funding. That's hardly complete and total autonomy. In essence negotiations should have been going on with the United Nurses of Alberta and the minister's department, because really that's what it boils down to.

One thing we must not lose sight of is that the nurses of this province have been subsidizing the health care system in this province for too long. That's basically what it boils down to. But it's the responsibility of society as a whole to provide health care services to this province, not just one sector having to sacrifice and subsidize this system. To the hon. Provincial Treasurer, who's shaking his head: that is really what has been happening. The nurses are now faced with the situation [where] they feel very strongly that if they don't catch up now, they never will. It would be very, very difficult.

I do not want to be too hard on the government, because I know they have some problems. If they change their own financial guidelines, that gives them some problems down the road. But when one sector of society or one professional group is behind, then we have to use different measures than just ordinary budgeting procedures.

We have 400 to 450 nurses in short supply in this province at this time. What is the situation going to be when the new hospitals come on stream? Where are we going to get those staff members? Mr. Speaker, why are the nurses who are out there now in civvies, the retired nurses, not in their uniforms? I'll tell you why. The profession just doesn't pay enough. That's why. It's just that plain and simple. So if we are going to provide staff for the new hospitals and catch up with the shortage of

staff now, we have to pay nurses what they are worth.

It's very interesting to find out that the cross section of the voting population of this province at this time is behind the nurses. That is very, very unusual in a strike situation. Most unusual. That should say something to us as politicians, and say to the government that they would be on safe grounds opening the guidelines to make sure that nurses are compensated more adequately than they now are.

The last point I want to touch on, Mr. Speaker, is this matter of confidence. When a profession, a business group, or any group loses confidence in the mechanism and in the system, then we will be hard pressed to recruit young Albertans to go into nursing.

In conclusion, I think the nurses of this province have been subsidizing the system, have been grossly underpaid, and last, Mr. Speaker, the province of Alberta and the taxpayers of Alberta can well afford it and are willing to pay. I think nurses are worth more.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make one or two comments with regard to this emergency debate. Number one, I think the people in Alberta who need care certainly have the compassion of the nurses who are striking at the present time, of the administrators and, I'm sure, of the government people here. I don't think that's the argument we have to be concerned about. The amount of remuneration, the salary level being considered for the nurses, is the matter at hand. I'm sure that in the negotiations, when you compare the income to the nurses in British Columbia — it's very difficult for anybody in the nursing profession to deny that, when we have assets and funds at our fingertips here in Alberta that British Columbia or any other province in Canada hasn't got at the present time. We have access to the funds, and I think the economy of Alberta can stand the demands being requested at the present time.

But the point I'd like to make in this debate that I think is different from what has been touched on up to this point in time is with regard to the collective bargaining process and maintaining integrity in that particular process. In these negotiations there are three players: the Alberta Hospital Association, the United Nurses association, and the government of Alberta. Under normal circumstances in the collective bargaining process, you have the employer and the employee groups negotiating. But in this particular situation we have a third party, the government of Alberta, that in a real sense is the employer, but is saying that the negotiations are taking place between the Alberta Hospital Association and the United Nurses of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, this creates a situation which is very, very difficult. The government has the funds; they really have the last say. But, as they have indicated, they are not directly involved in the bargaining process. How can the bargaining process work under those circumstances? I think the government of Alberta should consider that particular problem. It's not only going to be with the nurses, but with other health professionals in the province of Alberta. The university institutions could have the same difficulty in the collective bargaining process as has occurred in this situation.

What about the Alberta Hospital Association in the politics of the negotiations? One of the things they have been fighting for in the last two or three years is autonomy: the right to make some of their own decisions, the right to collect some of their own funds, the right to self-determination within the hospital a board is responsible for. But have they got that at the present time? No,

they haven't, Mr. Speaker, because they have no right to raise funds. All the funds come from the provincial government, and whatever decisions are made are determined by the ground rules of the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care. So that's their position at the present time. They're saying, we're trying to do our best, but we really haven't got control of the dollars. The United Nurses association in these negotiations are saying, look, our salaries are lower; we are worth more. And I don't argue with that at the present time. They have good citizen support, and the position they're taking is inevitable and, I think, the right position at this time under the circumstances. The government of Alberta, which believes in last-dollar finance to the health care system, has to face up to the problem as it is and admit whether it's going to meet the demands being presented to it at the present time.

As I analyse it, the problem in the whole collective bargaining process and the position we're at at the present time, rests with the government of Alberta. The government of Alberta is key to the decision and key to what happens today or in the next few days. Even if we are in the stage of arbitration, the government is still key to potentially bringing together the Hospital Association and the United Nurses association here in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I think our debate today is certainly necessary. It's urgent at this time. Some quick actions by government and some good, sound, logical thinking can even bring it to a head at this point in time. But there are problems the government must deal with on a longer term basis so the integrity of the whole collective bargaining process can be protected, and certainly can be ensured in other situations that deal not only with the nurses' association but with universities and other bodies that are sort of semi-autonomous from government.

MR. SPEAKER: There being no other members apparently wishing to speak, the debate is concluded under Standing Order 29.

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

10. Moved by Mr. Koziak:

Be it resolved that the Select Standing Committee on Law and Regulations meet with instructions:

- (a) to give consideration to the need for the following regulations established pursuant to Section 5 of The Licensing of Trades and Businesses Act, being Chapter 207 of the Revised Statutes of Alberta 1970, as amended:
 - Alberta Regulation 190/78
 - Alberta Regulation 192/78
 - Alberta Regulation 195/78
 - Alberta Regulation 198/78
 - Alberta Regulation 199/78
 - Alberta Regulation 200/78
 - Alberta Regulation 204/78; and
- (b) that the committee do meet for the purpose aforesaid at the call of the chairman at such times and places as may from time to time be designated by him; and
- (c) that the committee do report during this session of this Assembly their considerations and recommendations for the need of the regulations cited.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, in moving Government Motion No. 10, may I be allowed the opportunity at the outset — and I know my colleague the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly would like me to — to relay his thanks to you, sir, this afternoon for including in prayers of the day your special appeal on his behalf. I would also like to state how proud I am of the members of this Assembly, who have put aside their political differences and come to the aid of one of their colleagues in his hour of grief.

Mr. Speaker, in asking hon. members to support Motion No. 10, perhaps what I should do at the outset is indicate that there is some meaning behind the numbers that are listed. Hon. members may be confused by the fact there are, I believe, seven specific regulations listed. To assist hon. members in reaching a conclusion when voting on this motion, I should indicate that those seven represent the licensing regulations for bowling alley businesses; commercial printing businesses; flour- and feed-milling businesses; barber shop trade — that's the hairdressing business; margarine-manufacturing businesses; meat-packing businesses; and saw-mill businesses. Those are the specific businesses the numbers in the motion refer to.

I should also bring to the attention of hon. members the response of the government, contained in a ministerial statement read in this Assembly on May 1, 1978, by my colleague the Hon. Graham Harle. This was in response to the Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly on Regulations, which was chaired by Mr. Zander. In particular, I would like to remind hon. members of the response of the government relative to the scrutiny of regulations, and the recommendations made with respect to the scrutiny of regulations. That response includes the following:

Further, the Legislative Assembly may refer any regulation to the Standing Committee of the Assembly on Law, Law Amendments and Regulations, and such reference may be made by a resolution moved by any member of the Assembly.

Having regard to that response, Mr. Speaker, I'm making the motion for the Standing Committee on Law, Law Amendments and Regulations, to consider the need for the continued licensing by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, under The Licensing of Trades and Businesses Act, of the listed businesses.

The final item I would like to bring to the attention of hon. members in considering their position on the motion is the remarkable agreement reached by the Prime Minister of Canada and all the first ministers of provincial governments in this country in February 1978. In particular, that agreement included the following article:

The burden of government regulation on the private sector should be reduced and the burden of overlapping Federal and Provincial jurisdictions should be eliminated.

So I also raise this matter with the Assembly, pursuant to the agreement reached by the first ministers at that meeting in February 1978.

With those brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, I urge all hon. members to lend their support to this motion.

[Motion carried]

head: Committee of Supply

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

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

Culture

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the minister any opening comments?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, Alberta Culture will continue to serve the people of this province through programs and services already in place under our cultural development and historical resources divisions.

I would like to draw to the attention of the Assembly that a major extension of services this year will be the revision of our financial support for public libraries, to encourage the development and implementing of co-operative library systems. Library services to handicapped Albertans and the provision of material in 29 languages other than English will receive increased support. Efforts will be directed to providing better access for rural Albertans to collections in major libraries, so that all citizens may be able to enjoy improved library and information services.

This year we will be naming the first members to the Alberta Order of Excellence. This honor will recognize those persons who have rendered services of the greatest distinction and of singular excellence for or on behalf of Albertans, and whose contributions cannot be adequately recognized under existing provincial programs.

We will also be providing a one-time, \$2 million grant to the Glenbow-Alberta Institute to provide visible storage space to carry out the consolidation of current and recently donated collections.

Continued support will be given under our international assistance program, to match dollars donated by Alberta citizens to help people in third world countries meet the basic needs of life. In the past year, 44 agencies received approximately \$5 million.

Other programs provided by Alberta Culture will receive continued support, with dollars allocated to take care of normal inflationary pressures.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$261,877
1.02 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$112,300
1.03 — Financial Services	\$441,201
1.04 — Personnel	\$87,972
1.05 — Planning and Development	\$202,763
1.06 — Communications	\$112,294
1.07 — Department Library	\$75,298
1.08 — Records Management	\$43,664
1.09 — Executive Director for Finance and Administration	\$48,968
1.010 — Special Programs	\$463,504
1.011 — Legal Services	\$38,583
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support	

Services \$1,888,424

Vote 2 — Cultural Development:

2.1 — Program Support	\$279,159
2.2 — Visual Arts	\$1,274,527

23 Performing Arts

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Can the minister indicate the policy as to which students receive

assistance and which do not? What is the overall policy for assistance to our young artists who, say, have to go down to Toronto or even overseas? What program does the minister have in place, and what are the criteria as to who gets assistance and who doesn't?

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. We have a certain percentage: 10 per cent for a group, and 5 per cent for travelling, for groups travelling out of province. They apply to the department. There are forms that need to be filled in. We have certain dollars allocated for this. I would like to think that there might be more dollars in it, but we do run out of dollars in this one area. It is a very popular area.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Out of all the applications the minister's department receives, can the minister indicate what percentage of the applications we would be covering now? Is it 10, 20, 80 per cent?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. I'll have to get that percentage. I don't have that percentage at my fingertips at the moment.

DR. BUCK: Can the minister give us any indication of how close the budget we have comes to covering all the people who make applications? Does the minister have that information at this time?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, I don't have it, but I'll have it before I finish my estimates this afternoon.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, can we hold that part of the vote then?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Some of the performing arts groups come in from other provinces such as Ontario, and so on. How are they selected? Is there a budgeted amount for those groups to come into the province, and then a tour established? Is there a screening committee; is there someone who recommends them before they come into Alberta? Hopefully, I'm on the right vote. I'm not sure.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: The groups that come to perform in Alberta usually are covered — I shouldn't say "are covered". I'm not aware that we take care of too many groups that come from out of province. I'll have that whole area of groups coming in and out checked, and their percentages, for opposition members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll hold 2.3 then?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Agreed to:

2.4 — Film and Literary Arts \$336,560

2.5 — Library Services

MR. BORSTAD: I would like to say how much I appreciate the minister's increase in library funding this year. Having sat as a library board member over the years, I realize the constraints they have had on them. I think this increased per capita allotment this year is going to greatly improve the library system across the province. The in-

creased per capita grants will greatly assist the libraries in my area, and encourage further development in the regional libraries in the north. So I wanted to commend the minister for those funds.

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I would also like to express my thanks to the minister for taking such concern on regional libraries for the rural people. On behalf of the regional library board for my area, I would like to say they are very happy with the program.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some complimentary remarks as well. It's partly on the fact that in the discussions on the estimates last year, this was a particular interest of some members who were at that meeting. I would like to encourage the minister to keep on with the good work. Maybe next year we'll see a further increase in this particular allocation.

Thank you.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, just one short question to the minister. In light of the fact that it's taken this government about 10 years, I think, to realize that we were in a great catch-up situation in this province — I guess you can blame the previous and the present government too for that; I don't think we should blame just one government for it. But in light of the fact that we've been in a catch-up situation, can the minister indicate what projections the minister or the department has as to the further increase of library services in the province? What is the 3-year, 5-year, or long projection for our libraries in this province?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: I think the hon. member realizes that forming a co-operative library system does not happen overnight. With the additional staff that has been added to the department, hopefully we will be able to work in all areas of the province to permit and promote the co-operative library system. I know that many libraries throughout the province are interested, and hopefully we will be able to work together to achieve this.

Agreed to:

2.5 — Library Services \$8,013,613

2.6 — Cultural Heritage

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. Can the minister, not too briefly, outline what is happening with the Ukrainian cultural village at Elk Island park? I would like to know if the minister could indicate the long-range plans for that project, the progress we have made in the last two or three years, and the projected expansion to the project.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Over the last few years we have spent approximately \$3 million on the Ukrainian village. This year the driveways, administration building; the demonstration, the library, the facilities for viewing some of the artifacts from the people in Alberta, the foundations of some of the buildings, will be finished. We do not plan to do any major building at the village this year. Last year we had a fantastic increase in visitors to the village, and this year again we will be having tours and guides on duty for the summer. At the present time we have six staff members who are out there full-time. So we are coming along slowly on it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I would like to know what sort of philosophy is behind the project. Is it to make it an active Ukrainian village, serving ethnic foods, or is it just going to be something you look at? The reason I bring that to the minister's attention is that in touring some facilities across the country — especially one in the maritimes, that was an authentic reproduction, I guess, really a replica, with period food — and with Elk Island park and the village being in close proximity to basically over half a million people, has any thought been given to going in that direction? All us good Ukrainians could go out and have a little kobasa, perohy, and stuff, you know. It's taking a little while to teach other people the fineries of that kind of cooking. I'd like to know the long-term ideas and the projections: when this will happen, and if it will happen.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Hopefully it is going to happen. We intend to have Ukrainian foods. We intend to have a model hotel, a store, a church: one of each, a typical Ukrainian village. As you said, many visitors to the province go to Elk Island. Hopefully they'll enjoy the facilities at the Ukrainian village.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Is there any assistance to the Fort Edmonton replica and the project in Fort Edmonton, in the city of Edmonton? That is an excellent facility and an excellent project down there. I guess it's a good thing that a person has visitors from out of province or out of country. That way it always gives you an occasion where mother and the children drag father and the visitors down to see the facility. I was down there last year, and I think it's an excellent project. I would like to know what assistance, if any, the city of Edmonton receives from the department of Culture?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Yes, they get a grant each year from the department of Culture for operating some of the buildings in the fort.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Are there any capital appropriations, or are they just operating?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: No capital grants down there at all; it's just operating.

DR. BUCK: [Not recorded] been in consultation with the appropriate people in the city of Edmonton as to what will be going on? Will that be entirely funded by the city of Edmonton, or will there be provincial involvement?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: This past year, we gave grants to Fort Edmonton towards the operating cost. They're going to be building a small railway station and a [railway] to take people from the parking lot into the fort. We are assisting them with the operation of these facilities.

Agreed to:
 2.6 — Cultural Heritage \$1,479,809
 2.7 — Cultural Facilities \$750,133

28 — Film Censorship

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, when is somebody going to sit down and review the different categories of films we have? Some of them are absolutely silly. My 20-year-old daughter takes her 16-and-a-half-year-old brother and a

couple of friends, and that's not good enough. In some films they do say the odd "damn", and they're rated: Must be accompanied by adult. I would like to say to the committee at this time that it's about time the minister got hold of somebody in that area of responsibility and sat down and did something realistic. The way it is now is really silly. That's the only word I can use for it. When was the last time we had it reviewed, and when are we going to review it again and get some reality into some of the categorizations?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Hopefully, we'll have some good news. We have done a review of the classifications, and I will be presenting them to my colleagues for their approval.

Agreed to:
 2.8 — Film Censorship \$163,049

29 — Major Cultural Facilities Development

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, can the minister give us a further breakdown of these?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: One of our grants last year, of course, was to the performing arts centre in Calgary, to the tune of \$7 million. Also in this amount we have approval of professional fees to provide funds for consulting services to performing groups. The Alberta Art Foundation and their acquisition of pictures are also in here.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. In light of the fact that this is our 75th Anniversary, can the minister indicate if any consideration was given to putting facilities, sort of equivalent to the ones in Edmonton and Calgary, in Grande Prairie and, say, Lethbridge? Was any consideration at all given by the department of Culture and any direction given possibly to cabinet, to have lasting memorials of our anniversary, equivalent of the two 50th Anniversary facilities in place now? I'm proud of them, not because I was in the government at that time; I'm proud of them as an Albertan.

I guess we'll have the Premier's reflecting pool out here, which may be a lasting monument, I don't know. The Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower wants to bronze the Premier. Other than that, it doesn't seem we'll have any lasting mementos of our 75th Anniversary. Was any consideration given to two facilities such as this, one in the north and one in the south?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: I think the hon. member will be aware that we as a government said we would not be providing moneys for capital buildings. But the per capita grant given to the various municipalities — i.e. Grande Prairie or Lethbridge *per se* — could have been used for a building if they so chose. I note with great interest that the city of St. Albert is using its per capita to build a cultural building for the community. I heartily endorse that.

Agreed to:
 2.9 — Major Cultural Facilities Development \$1,004,556

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll hold the total on Vote 2 until we get the information for 2.3.

Agreed to:

3.1 — Program Support	\$308,930
3.2 — Archaeological Survey	\$652,340

Vote 33 — Archive Acquisition, Preservation and Storage

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, how is our friend Roloff doing? Can the minister indicate what stage negotiations are at, how much money it's cost us, and how much money the minister projects it will cost us to wind up this rather controversial affair?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. Out of last year's budget, we spent \$1,309 for travel and subsistence in Rome by the provincial archivist.

Right now we have not heard from Mr. Beny. We have given him a deadline until June 15. At this time we don't have any further costs. Of course if he accepts our proposal to buy the Canadian content, we have offered \$27,000 for that. But as I said, we have not had any indication whether he's going to accept that.

DR. BUCK: Surely, Mr. Chairman, the minister is not standing in her place and telling us that all we have spent is \$1,300. That includes the legal consultation and all the other consultations the minister has had? Is the minister telling us that \$1,300 is all that's been expended?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: I have to say to the hon. member that we have received no bills from our attorney who was handling the case. I'm sure that when we get some direction from Mr. Beny, if he's going to acquire the collection, we'll get the total bills for the appraisers who looked at the collection and for legal fees.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The minister says \$1,300 for travel. How many people went to Rome?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Just one, Alan Ridge. That was for his travel to Rome and his accommodation for one week while he was in Rome.

Agreed to:

3.3 — Archival Acquisition, Preservation and Storage	\$751,703
3.4 — Financial Assistance for Heritage Preservation	\$5,419,179

3.5 — Historic Sites Preservation

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Chairman, if I might direct a question through you to the minister, and I hope I'm under the right vote here. It relates to the location of an historic site in the constituency of Calgary Forest Lawn. It is the Stewart House site, which is presently occupied by a firm of architects, Jack Long and associates. For the information of other members, this site is located along the Bow River and is very near the location of the original Fort Calgary.

This particular site has been designated. The difficulty the owners of that property are experiencing relates to the question of compensation. Because once a site has been designated in this manner, it very significantly affects the ability of the owners of the property to deal with it in any

way. I wonder if the minister could give some indication to the Assembly as to the policy of the government with respect to the question of compensation once we've had designation of an historic site.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Jack Long purchased this house in 1969. He restored it, and some years later it was designated. So there is the question, I think, that at the moment he feels he should have some compensation because we have designated it and he has put some money into it. It is in the hands of our solicitors.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Chairman, could the minister advise, notwithstanding that this particular site question is in the hands of solicitors, what the general policy of the government is in respect of compensation once an historic site has been designated.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: As far as actual compensation is concerned, we have not paid actual compensation for a building. We do pay a certain amount each year for renovations. They can have them in a mass amount, of \$75,000 over a 5-year period, or a price of \$5,000 for \$25,000, whether it is an historical, a provincial building, or a — I can't think of the name; I'll get it in one minute though for you, John.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A final question on this subject, Mr. Chairman. Could the minister advise as to whether the government is reviewing its present policy, as enunciated by the minister, with a view to compensating owners of designated historic sites on a basis in line with the present fair market value of the property, taking into account the fact that once a site is designated, the owner is really no longer in a position to realize fair market value by selling the particular site.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, there is program with the federal government on compensation and taxation for restoration of buildings. It was one of our major topics at the meeting of culture ministers in St. Andrew's. I'm afraid to say that with a change of government, it did not receive the attention we hoped it would. I have had indication in the last week that the question of some kind of tax break if one is restoring, or working on or buying buildings, is definitely in the offing in the near future. But at this time, we've had no return on it from Ottawa.

Agreed to:

3.5 — Historic Sites Preservation	\$876,602
-----------------------------------	-----------

3.6 — Historical Resource Facilities

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister. Do you have an update, or any information on the Stan Reynolds Museum, and is the department working to acquire any portion of that?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Hopefully this Thursday or Friday, a member from the Department of Agriculture and one from our museums will be going out to meet with Mr. Reynolds. We have been in conversation with him. Some of us are going out to see the collection as soon as the House adjourns. We are in the process of establishing what it will cost to operate the collection, to house it, and

the whole procedure. Yes, we are dealing with the matter right now.

Agreed to:

3.6 — Historical Resource Facilities	\$3,225,829
Total Vote 3 — Historical Resources	

Development	\$11,234,583
-------------	--------------

Vote 4 — International Assistance

MR. L. CLARK: I was wondering if the minister could explain where this money is going into international circles, as far as culture is concerned. Just give us a breakdown on it.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: To my hon. colleague: the moneys raised by agencies in the province, which last year happened to be 44, are matched dollar to dollar. They are sent to third world countries. The moneys are not spent here in Canada; they actually go over to third world countries.

MR. PAPROSKI: Another question, Mr. Chairman, if I may, on that particular topic, which I think is so important in view of the fact that we're participating in such a vigorous way [in] international assistance. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the committee where we stand relative to other provinces in assistance for international care.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: We lead the country. There is not another province that comes anywhere close to Alberta in the amount of moneys given to third world countries.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 4 — International Assistance	\$4,914,741
---	-------------

5.1 — Planning and Administration	\$6,011,792
5.2 — Anniversary Grants	—

5.3 — 75th Anniversary Programs

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, just a short question to the minister on this particular topic. It's in regard to the applications for the medallions that are being sent out. Possibly the hon. minister in charge of that [could] reply to this. I find that many of our senior citizens have failed to fill out the first application that went out. I was in a nursing home, when I was last down there and I brought a list up to Edmonton. Very few of them sent their application forms back. Mr. Chairman, my question is: will there be a follow-up to these applications that don't come in? Is there any method of checking on our senior citizens' applications, or will there be a deadline as to when they can make their application, if they make their second application when it's brought to their attention?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, as the minister responsible, I might attempt to reply to that. It is a very good question. I think it is best to answer it by saying that something in excess of 70,000 of our elder citizens are over 75 years of age. Because of difficulties we've had in determining a method of getting out to them and discovering who they were, we, after a lot of consultation

through the 75th Commission, then to the Health Care Insurance Commission, agreed to use their mailing list to get the inquiries out. As we assured the House last week, the list never became the property of or available to the 75th, or to any other government department, but was used solely as a mailing list through the hospital insurance commission. So we used that once, and 70-odd thousand inquiries or questionnaires went out. Something in the neighborhood of 50,000 are back right now, so there are obviously 20,000 or 25,000 more to come.

The follow-up: in the computer system, there is a code number indicating who the inquiries went to. Through that system it will be possible to determine who has not responded to the inquiry. Whether the Alberta hospital insurance commission will allow us to use a smaller list for a second mailing, is something we haven't yet determined. We will be doing our best to get all citizens who may be entitled to a medallion, a scroll, or whatever, to get their information in so a determination can be made. We have not yet concluded whether we will use a second mailing, or whether that system will be available to us.

I urge all members to do as the hon. Member for Bow Valley has; that is, to meet with his constituents in the senior citizens' residences, or whatever, and ascertain who has responded and who hasn't. If that can be reported to us, either directly or through the members, every effort will be made to assure that any qualifying pioneer citizen will get the gold or silver medallion.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, just one more question to the minister. I realize there's going to have to be a deadline on these applications. Has the minister set a deadline as to when the applications are to come in, or will there be a surplus of medallions for, say, some of our senior citizens who apply at a late date?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I regard that as a representation by the member, and I'm very glad to have it. In this uncertain area, we probably need a little bit of flexibility in how many medallions we should order; they are of some cost. We had set the weekend of September 1, being the origination of the province, as the appropriate time to get the medallions out, Mr. Chairman. So we will be aiming for that time. But if applications come in later than that, I think we would use every effort to honor them and see that the citizens got their medallions.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. There's still one aspect of the medallion program that bothers me; that is, that the government in its wisdom — I'd like to say "very brilliantly" — arrived at the three different categories. It seems to confuse everybody. A senior citizen who is 74.5 years of age, who has lived in Alberta all those 74.5 years, gets a scroll — which I'm sure the minister has indicated will be very nice — but a person over 75 years of age who's only lived in Alberta three years, gets a silver medallion. If I was that Albertan, born and raised here for 74.5 years, I think I would be upset. Really, Mr. Chairman, that's what the senior citizens are trying to bring to the minister's attention.

I suppose it's probably too late to do anything about it. The minister, in his wisdom, should have just had the gold medallions for people who were born before 1905 and resided here all that time. They get the gold medallions, and everybody else gets a scroll or a silver medallion. That would've saved the government a lot of headaches. It would've saved them a lot of bad feeling on the

part of some senior citizens. I would just like the minister's comment on that observation.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I'd be very happy to comment on that. I'll be much less combative today than I was yesterday in responding to his very combative inquiries.

Could I first respond to an earlier question he asked the Minister responsible for Culture. He suggested there should've been a major building in each of two of our newer cities. If I can just add to the answer of the Minister responsible for Culture, that certainly was one of the considerations that went through our minds and was involved in our discussions. I as a Calgarian, from one of the major metropolitan areas, certainly was happy to have the Jubilee Auditorium that was donated to that city in 1955. But our government, I guess through decentralization and other means, has attempted to recognize that the province is much bigger and broader than two major urban centres. [interjections] Therefore we wanted to give each of the communities, small and large, the opportunity of doing their own thing. That is the basis of the budget of the 75th.

Responding to the question and recommendation that everyone over 75 should have a gold medallion, and everyone between 65 and 75 should have a silver medallion, those were possibilities. They were certainly considered. At some point you have to reach a judgment, and I suppose someone could quarrel with whatever judgment you reach. Had we given everyone over 75 a gold medallion, it would have been something like 70-odd thousand gold medallions, if my numbers are correct — a tremendous number. We think the silver medallions will also have a considerable impression on the recipients. Therefore, our judgment was that we should give the gold only to those who were born here, and the silver to everyone who came here since.

I think he's putting a wrong emphasis on the three years. We have said that everyone not born here, but 75 years of age or more, will get a silver medallion — and this is the key thing — unless they came here within the last three years. Mr. Chairman, the emphasis the member is putting on it, that we're going to give everyone a medallion — there's an inference that everyone here under three years is going to get one. The real decision is that everyone over 75, not born here, and a Canadian citizen, will get a silver medallion unless he only came here within the past three years. It's an exclusionary thing rather than the other way around. I think that's where many, many people, including the hon. member, are falling into a trap and perhaps misunderstanding the program. [interjection]

The other thing I would like to say is that I think the scrolls are just magnificent. I've met many, many people who are enthused and writing in. I think many more are writing on how they are looking forward to receiving that document, than they are the medallions.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister responsible for Culture indicate the minister's role in the celebration of the 75th Anniversary?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Is the member asking what my role is?

DR. BUCK: Yes.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: My role is chairman of the cabinet committee in charge of the special visitors who are coming into the province; the encyclopedia; the programs that are being done by the Department of Culture, which is a festival of the arts; the visual arts; the song contest; musicals. I think that's my responsibility.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, can the minister indicate when the Canadian encyclopedia will be completed and to whom it will be circulated?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Yes. We hope to have a free copy out to all the schools, the libraries, and our foreign posts abroad by late 1984 or early 1985.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. What parts of Canada? All the schools in Canada?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: All schools in Canada. The French schools in Quebec will be receiving a copy of the encyclopedia in French. Schools in the province of Alberta that have bilingual programs will receive both an English and a French copy of the encyclopedia. All university libraries, all libraries, and all foreign posts abroad that are manned by the Canadian government.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, can the minister please indicate the cost of the encyclopedia?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Our share of the cost of the encyclopedia is \$4 million.

MR. L. CLARK: To the minister. Due to the great popularity of the pins, flags, and everything that has been going out to the constituencies, they seem to be in a little short supply. I was wondering if that would be remedied in the future; if there's going to be an ample supply of pins. They have been very, very popular in the constituencies.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I thank the member for his remarks. I think the pins are just great, at minimal cost. There were ...

DR. BUCK: That's not the question. The question is: when do we get the bloody things?

MR. McCRAE: Thank you, Mr. Member, for the re-explanation of the question.

There were some production problems in mixing the dye, it being a three-color pin. The production problems have been corrected, and the supplies are coming through. I believe 100,000 or more came in within the past couple of days. So there should be a good supply for all Albertans who are looking forward to receiving them.

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister. Are you referring to the plastic pins or the metal pins?

MR. McCRAE: The plastic pins, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would elaborate on when we might expect a more ample supply of the metal pins.

MR. McCRAE: I believe the metal pins are all in stock right now, Mr. Chairman. There may be an error in that,

but I think they are in stock. There was a very limited supply intended for distribution. Whatever supplies there were, I think, are already out with the members or others who are eligible for them. Supplies of the more expensive pins are available for purchase from various supply houses. The 75th Commission would make the names of the manufacturers or suppliers available to you, sir, so that you might purchase as many as you wish.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. For the VIP pins or the metal pins, do we have to go through Members' Services, or do we have to beg to get some pins, Mr. Minister?

Will the hon. minister answer that question, or does he refuse to answer?

MR. McCRAE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I've never known the hon. member to beg for anything. But if he has a request for pins, I would suggest that he go to the 75th. If pins are available and he's entitled to them, he will be given them. In terms of the more expensive pins, the metal pins, I think a limited supply was available. They have probably all been distributed to those who are entitled to them. He probably received 10, and beyond that you would be expected to purchase your own; not beg them, sir, but purchase them. A number of supply houses in the province would make them available to you for the purchase price.

DR. BUCK: Can I ask the minister a very innocent question? Does he contemplate purchasing his pins?

Mr. Chairman, to the minister of Culture. Can the minister of Culture indicate if she has given any consideration to asking the Commissioner of the 75th Anniversary to appear before the Committee, so we can question him directly as to how the program is proceeding?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: I'd like to inform members that on Monday afternoon between 5:30 and 7, all MLAs are being asked to attend a briefing session at the 75th Commission, where we can discuss where we are in the various programs. The various personnel in the 75th Commission will be reporting to us. An invitation will be delivered to all members before the week is out. I'm just giving you warning of this.

DR. BUCK: I thank the minister for that notice. Quite obviously the minister has had many of her responsibilities removed, but some of us have responsibilities. At least we thank the minister for that amount of advance notice.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to correct an answer I just gave. In terms of the VIP pins, 10,000 are on order; 9,000 are still to come, as of my last report. On the metallic pins, 10,000 were ordered and 5,800 are still to come. So there will still be some for distribution. I'm not sure; I don't think they're going to hon. members, but they will be available to appropriate members of the public anyway.

Agreed to:	
5.3 — 75th Anniversary Programs	\$6,159,474
5.4 — Cultural Programs	\$7,059,000
5.5 — Recreational Programs	\$2,041,000
5.6 — Alberta Homecoming	\$2,376,625
Total Vote 5 — 75th Anniversary Celebrations	\$23,647,891

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, on the vote that's being held, it's fine if we proceed, and the minister can give me that information.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: I have information right here. On the number of applicants who apply for grants, about 30 per cent of the applicants are approved when they apply.

To the Member for Little Bow, who asked about the sponsoring groups outside the province, they are done in conjunction with the Canada Council. They are ones like the Peking Opera and the Little Angels from Korea, that type of thing. But they are done in conjunction with the Canada Council.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the Minister of Municipal Affairs for presenting me with a 75th Anniversary pin. I've run out, and I appreciate that very much.

Agreed to:	
2.3 — Performing Arts	\$4,156,809

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I have another pin, from the Minister of Environment. I'm doing pretty well. [laughter]

Agreed to:	
Total Vote 2 — Cultural Development	\$17,458,215

Department Total	\$59,143,854
------------------	--------------

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, I move that the estimates of the department of Culture be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports as follows, and requests leave to sit again.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981, sums not exceeding the following for the department and purposes indicated:

The department of Culture: \$1,888,424 for departmental support services; \$17,458,215 for cultural development; \$11,234,583 for historical resources development; \$4,914,741 for international assistance; \$23,647,891 for 75th Anniversary celebrations.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is proposed that the House sit tomorrow evening in Committee of Supply. The estimates of the Department of Environment will be called at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:26 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]