

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Wednesday, April 30, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I have the special privilege today, as a result of our mission to Korea, to introduce to you Dr. Woong Ki Kang, the president of the Korea Energy Research Institute; Mr. Yoon Bae Kim, the director of research of the Korea Petroleum Development Corporation; Mr. Sung Kim, the manager of the production division of the Korea Petroleum Corporation; and Mr. Jae Heung Yu, the manager of the overseas energy resource division of the Korea Mining Promotion Corporation. They are accompanied by Mr. Paul King, our newly appointed international trade director for the Pacific Rim area. May I ask the visitors to take our best wishes back to the Minister of Construction, Mr. Choi Chong Whan and to Mr. Yang Yoon Sae, the Minister of Energy and Resources. I ask the Legislature to welcome these distinguished gentlemen.

head: **PRESENTING REPORTS BY  
STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES**

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 81, the Private Bills Committee has had under consideration certain petitions for private Bills that did not comply with Standing Order 77, and recommends to the Assembly as follows.

With respect to Bill Pr. 8, The Stockmen's Memorial Foundation Act, the committee recommends that the Legislative Assembly waive Standing Order 77 in order to allow the Bill to be introduced and proceeded with at this sitting. With respect to Bill Pr. 1, The La Fondation de l'Association canadienne-française de l'Alberta Act, and Bill Pr. 3, The Alberta Wheat Pool Amendment Act, 1980, the committee recommends that Standing Order 77 be waived to permit the Bills to be introduced in the Assembly, but that the Bills not be considered by the Private Bills Committee until the fall sitting.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly wish to concur in the recommendations of the committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, could I introduce to you, and through you, 68 students from the Quebec exchange program with M. E. LaZerte. The Quebec students are from Charlesbourg, a community which is very close to Quebec City, and the Edmonton students are from north-east Edmonton. They've had a chance to exchange visits

with one another. The Edmonton students were down in Quebec two weeks ago; the Quebec students are here for a week.

It's very appropriate that they're here during the referendum campaign, and that they appreciate our very deep appreciation for Quebec's role in Confederation and our real desire to have them remain in Confederation. *Je veux dire simplement que l'Assemblée veut dire que les étudiants québécois sont ici dans un temps très important pour la Confédération. C'est notre désir de voir la province rester encore dans le Canada.*

I would like the Assembly to give them a warm round of applause as I introduce them and ask them to stand and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, may I please introduce to you, and through you to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, 35 students from a high school in the riding of Calgary Buffalo, Ernest Manning senior high school. It was opened in 1962. The students are attended by two of their instructors, Hazel Brown and June Fox. Among the students are Perry Toms, who used to babysit my children, and Thomas Coats, the president of the students' union. There are also three senior basketball players in the group, and all they can say about this year is that they're looking forward to next year. May I please ask them to rise and receive the cordial welcome of the House.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, approximately 25 grade 6 students from Trochu Valley school. I'm very sorry that I haven't had time to spend with them this afternoon, but I know they will be enjoying their visit to the capital city of this province and to our Legislature. Accompanying them is Bill Cunningham, who is in charge of that lot. He doesn't look any the worse for wear, considering that the trip is probably about three hours long. With him and assisting him are supervising parents: Mr. and Mrs. Norman Hoppins, Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Guard, Mrs. Eileen Schlauch, and Mrs. Harriet Siltala. I know they're very pleased that with them in Trochu is the regional director for our 75th Anniversary for a good percentage of the eastern part of our province. Would those students, teacher, and supervisors please stand and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of Housing and Public Works**

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to announce today further initiatives by this government to stimulate construction of new housing units in our province and to improve the affordability of housing for our citizens.

The high demand for housing in Alberta has created problems here that are unique in Canada. In addition, the federal government's cancellation of the special capital cost allowance provision for multiple-unit residential buildings, its cancellation of the NHA assisted rental program, and the current high interest rates are taxing the market's ability to provide housing where and when it is needed. In response to these conditions, the following eight measures are being instituted with the co-operation and involvement of four government departments and

two Crown corporations.

Two of my colleagues, the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health, will present to you three major efforts to assist those Albertans who can least afford to pay their increasing costs of rental accommodation. The hon. Provincial Treasurer will also put forward a proposed incentive directed at increasing construction of multiple-unit residential buildings in our province.

I have the opportunity of outlining four stimulative measures that involve the Department of Housing and Public Works, the Alberta Housing Corporation, and the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation. I think it is important to note also that the measures I am about to present are in addition to the \$505 million dollars recently allocated to the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation's family home purchase program and the core housing incentive program.

The first stimulative action I wish to announce, Mr. Speaker, is the initiation of the Alberta municipal housing incentive program. This new program is designed to help rapidly growing municipalities pay their costs of expansion, and to encourage them to streamline their current subdivision approval processes. The province will offer unconditional grants to municipalities ranging from \$1,000 up to \$2,000 per unit for each new housing unit that meets certain density criteria, once pre-established levels of production are exceeded. Housing production in the current calendar year will be measured against the average annual housing production of a municipality over the preceding three-year period. It is estimated that as much as \$15 million will be directed to Alberta's municipalities in the 1980 calendar year with this stimulative initiative.

These grants will be paid depending on the rate of housing production. For production in excess of 50 per cent of the base level, but less than 75 per cent: \$1,000 per eligible unit. For production from 75 per cent of the base level, but less than 100 per cent: \$1,500 dollars per eligible unit. For production of eligible units once 100 per cent of the base level has been reached, municipalities will receive \$2,000 per eligible unit.

In order to encourage the economic use of land, minimum density levels have been established to qualify for this program. For the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, a minimum of 10 units per net acre, or 24.7 units per net hectare, must be met. For other municipalities, a minimum density of 8 units per net acre or, if you will, 19.8 units per net hectare, will apply. These density levels will allow most row housing, duplexes, apartment projects, and modest single-detached units to qualify for grants.

I would also like to mention that the construction of mobile-home lots in subdivisions and mobile-home parks will be eligible under this program.

The Alberta municipal housing incentive program will come into effect on July 1, 1980, but will include all eligible housing starts since January 1 of this year. Alberta Housing and Public Works will forward the necessary program information and forms to municipalities by the July 1 start-up date. I am hopeful that they will take advantage of this incentive to increase the supply of affordable, medium-density housing.

Mr. Speaker, another measure that I am pleased to put forward will benefit Alberta's municipal non-profit housing corporations.

The existing Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation program that is currently providing loans to Edmonton's

and Calgary's non-profit housing corporations will be allocated an additional \$27.5 million. As of July 1, 1980, these municipal corporations will be able to obtain loans from the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation to finance up to 250 more rental units in each city. These units are designated for low- and moderate-income individuals and families, and are in addition to the 200 units per city that have already been budgeted for this purpose. Subsidies that will reduce the interest rates on these loans down to an effective rate of 2 per cent will be provided by the provincial rather than the federal government.

The success of this program depends on the co-operation of the two municipalities that are currently involved, and it is hoped that the increased assistance will promote more mixed-income housing in our two largest urban centres, where there is an ever-increasing demand for modest-income rental units.

Mr. Speaker, in order to increase the supply of rental units in communities and neighborhoods where zoning permits conversions. Alberta Housing and Public Works will be initiating a new program called the Alberta home conversion program. Under this program, owners who want to convert part or all of their home to self-contained suites or light housekeeping rooms will be eligible for low interest loans.

Guaranteed loans up to \$10,000 per unit will be made available, for renovation costs only, at financial institutions participating in the program. These loans will be renewable annually and will have a 10-year amortization period for repayment. Subsidies will be provided by the department to reduce the interest rates on these loans down to 12 per cent. Participants will be eligible for a subsidy for a maximum of five years. In order to qualify for both the guaranteed loan and the subsidy, an owner must rent the converted suite or room for at least six months in the first year after renovation, and for a minimum of nine months each following year. Of course, all renovations must meet the standards and zoning by-laws of the municipality.

Since the effectiveness of the Alberta home conversion program depends on the commitment of the individual home-owner to convert his home, a public education and awareness program will be undertaken by the department in areas with low vacancy rates that are currently zoned for legal conversion. This program will also encourage builders constructing homes in new subdivisions, where zoning permits, to design and build homes that can readily be converted to suites if the home-owner wishes to do so. The home-buyer can then apply for the low-interest loans to complete the conversion, and provide himself with additional income to meet his mortgage payments. All municipalities in the province will be eligible to participate in this program, and it is expected that up to 500 conversions will be initiated in its first year of operation.

Mr. Speaker, the next housing initiative will provide another option for those senior citizens in our province who require affordable rental housing. The Alberta Housing Corporation, in addition to providing approximately 2,000 senior citizens' self-contained and lodge units in this fiscal year, will reinstate a previous program that assists private non-profit groups to build housing for seniors. The corporation will be allocated an additional \$9 million to provide grants to non-profit groups to help them build up to 500 housing units for seniors. These grants will cover as much as one-third of the approved capital cost of new senior citizens' housing units.

In addition to this supplemental funding, non-profit sponsors may apply to the Alberta Home Mortgage

Corporation for loans to cover the remaining cost of their project. Loans obtained from the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation for this purpose can be amortized over a 50-year period, and will be made available at the current core housing incentive program interest rate, recently reduced to a low 8.75 per cent.

The non-profit organization must acquire its own land, or acquire a long-term lease on land for its building, in order to qualify. If the sponsoring group already owns land for this purpose, it can be contributed as equity. The non-profit groups then assume the responsibility for the design and construction of the units.

We intend this program to help non-profit groups help themselves, to give them more autonomy in owning and operating housing projects designed for seniors.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that these initiatives are in addition to the substantial budgetary allocations to housing programs presented in the provincial budget speech. The measures I have outlined provide municipalities, non-profit groups, and individual Albertans with significant encouragement to participate in increasing the supply of affordable housing in our province.

#### Department of Municipal Affairs

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to add to the announcements put forward by the Minister of Housing and Public Works.

Mr. Speaker, since 1973 the government of Alberta has been involved in assisting all citizens of the province through the provisions of the Alberta property tax reduction program. This program removes the school foundation tax levy on all residential properties and most farmland, and provides special additional assistance to senior citizen home-owners and senior citizen renters.

Senior citizen home-owners will continue to benefit from the program. Reduction in the school foundation mill rate recently announced will reduce the school foundation requirement, and consequently increase the net benefit to the home-owner.

During 1979 the senior citizens' renter assistance program was altered to increase the grant to \$500 from its previous level of \$250. Today I would like to announce further significant changes in the renter assistance grant for senior citizens. Senior citizens living in rental accommodation where the maximum rent is set by the government, or where the government sets the rent as a percentage of income, will continue to be eligible for the \$500 per year amount. Mr. Speaker, grants to senior citizens living in private rental accommodation will now be increased from \$500 to \$1,000 per year.

Senior citizens who have rented accommodation for 120 days during the year and who have not received home-owner benefits for the same year will be eligible for assistance. The program will not apply to those persons resident in nursing homes, auxiliary hospitals, or active treatment hospitals.

A brochure and appropriate application form are now being prepared. They will be available by mid-May at all municipal offices, senior citizens' lodges, treasury branches, senior citizens' drop-in centres, and from the Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, it is anticipated that more than 19,000 senior citizen renters will benefit from this new initiative. This action will increase the assistance to senior citizen renters to over \$25 million annually.

#### Department of Social Services and Community Health

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to announce enrichments to two programs administered by the Department of Social Services and Community Health. More than 84,000 senior citizens in Alberta will benefit from the increases to the Alberta assured income plan, while up to an estimated 14,000 handicapped Albertans will receive increased support through the assured income for the severely handicapped program. The provision of this additional \$27 million will effectively assist both senior citizens and the handicapped to meet the anticipated increase in the cost of rental accommodation.

At present, the Alberta assured income plan provides a supplement of up to \$47.20 per month for senior citizens who qualify for the federal guaranteed income supplement. Effective July 1, 1980, the maximum benefit available under the Alberta assured income plan will be \$75 per month, an increase of almost 60 per cent.

The assured income for the severely handicapped program was implemented in 1979 to enhance the life styles of severely handicapped Albertans between the ages of 18 and 65. The present maximum benefit under this program is \$385 per month. Effective July 1, 1980, the maximum amount payable to eligible Albertans will be increased by \$30 to \$415 per month.

Mr. Speaker, I feel privileged today to announce that our government, through the Department of Social Services and Community Health, has responded to the needs of very special Albertans by increasing the benefits available under the two assured income programs.

#### Treasury

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, a further significant incentive contained in the eight-point housing supply package just announced by my colleagues is a new Alberta rental investment incentive program. The program will provide a major stimulus to apartment and condominium construction by making available an estimated \$35 million of incentives to Alberta investors during 1980, and a further estimated \$40 million of incentives during 1981.

The new program, which will be available both to Alberta individuals and to corporations, will allow a credit of 5 per cent of the amount invested in the construction of qualifying multiple-unit residential buildings started between January 1, 1980, and December 31, 1981. Details of the program will be announced shortly.

Mr. Speaker, the eight housing initiatives in the package announced today will alter the 1980-81 financial plan, as outlined in the April 2nd Budget Address. Additional budgetary expenditure, to be authorized by supplementary estimates, will total \$61.7 million for 1980-81. As a result, the estimated 1980-81 budgetary surplus is reduced from \$309 million to \$247 million. These initiatives together represent a further housing commitment for this year of \$96.7 million and, in addition, make available \$41 million in loans for capital construction.

Mr. Speaker, Alberta faces housing problems which are unique in Canada. This shelter package of eight major initiatives will increase significantly the supply of affordable housing in Alberta in the months ahead.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in rising to respond to the four-barrel housing announcement that the government has just brought forward, might I say in general terms I commend the government for taking a number of

initiatives that I think will have a positive impact for many Albertans. I want to say to the government that basically I see the program announced today to be of assistance certainly to senior citizens and to people on the assured income plan. If I could be so frank, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, I see the program really to be Alberta's version of a capital cost allowance. I'm pleased that the government has seen it appropriate to move in that direction. To the Minister of Housing and Public Works, I certainly see some positive aspects in the announcement he has made.

Suffice for me to say that, Mr. Speaker. Let me add that it seems to me that with this announcement made today, which will leave us with a surplus of \$247 million plus whatever additional revenue will come to the province after a new oil pricing agreement, there are still three groups in my judgment that we should very seriously look at. I think the announcement made by the Minister of Housing and Public Works will do a considerable amount to see that the housing industry continues to move. That's highly desirable. All members who were at the recent HUDAC session certainly couldn't help but be impressed by the point of view put forward by the people there.

But in this announcement we are not addressing the problems of those 25,000 Alberta families who are in the process of renegotiating mortgages right now. As enthusiastic as government members are about the announcement today — as I've said, there are several good aspects in that announcement — we still have not come to grips with the problems of those 25,000 Alberta families. I would urge members of the government caucus and members of the cabinet to see if there isn't an additional step that can be taken to help those 25,000 families who have to renegotiate their mortgages this year at rates that are going to increase 5 or 6 per cent, given mortgage rates today.

The second group that will not benefit from this are people who own apartments who have to renegotiate their mortgages this year. It would seem to me that the 12 per cent which the Minister of Housing and Public Works used in his remarks would be a target figure we could use for both groups who are involved in this remortgaging: families, and owners of rental accommodations. There should be some commitment from people who are owners of rental accommodations that rent would be kept at a reasonable rate.

Mr. Speaker, from a very quick reading of the government's announcement today, the third group that will not benefit directly are those people on fixed and low incomes who are not senior citizens. It has been drawn to my attention that the government does have a program available to members of the public service where they have government housing, and there is assistance as far as some subsidization to government employees who rent government housing. Given the financial position we are in in this province, it seems to me that people in low-income and fixed-income groups who will not benefit from the announcement made by the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, or from the other announcements, are the third group really left out of this announcement today.

I want to conclude my remarks by saying I commend the government for several features of the announcement. But I would urge members on the government side of the House to look seriously again at the problems of those people who are renegotiating mortgages, both homeowners and individuals who have rental accommodations.

and at the third group of people on low and fixed incomes who will not benefit from the program directly.

## head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Labor Negotiations

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in leading off the question period today, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Labour. Could the minister indicate to the Assembly the status of negotiations between the construction industry and the various unions? I ask the question because, as I understand the situation today, the construction labor relations group is in the process of voting on the possibility of a lockout, and a number of the unions involved have already taken a strike vote. I ask the minister to bring the Assembly up to date on where things stand and what role the minister's department is playing.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I believe the status of the negotiations can best be described this way. The negotiations have been proceeding for several months now. There was an understanding as between the building trades council, which represents all the construction trade unions, and the construction owners, represented by the Alberta Construction Labour Relations Association. Two collective agreements have been arrived at, one last evening, and one a week ago. The one last evening I presume to be a memorandum of agreement.

Mr. Speaker, each day there have been discussions and about five different negotiating sessions, continuing today. Within the last 24 hours, I have had discussions with the president of the building trades council and with the president — I believe that's his title — of the Alberta Construction Labour Relations Association. As a consequence of those discussions, other meetings are going on today involving the Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour in his capacity as mediator at a rather larger meeting than a trade-by-trade negotiating session.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Might I say I'm pleased to hear the minister indicate that he himself has been involved in discussions at the level he indicated. Mr. Minister, as a result of the discussions going on on a broader basis than trade by trade, will it be the government's intention to look at any changes in The Alberta Labour Act that might be recommended by either group to facilitate this kind of approach more directly in the future?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think the approach that is occurring now is one which, first of all, both parties have mentioned to me as a possibility in discussions over the last 10 days that might be effective in their given circumstances this year. Relatively few items are left in dispute, and it is thought by both parties that this may be a very advantageous procedure at this point in time.

Mr. Speaker, both parties have indicated some proposals for amendments to The Alberta Labour Act. I have indicated to them that I would not review those in any detail until after this round of bargaining is completed, because we want to observe what happens in this round of bargaining.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister on the question of a change in

the Labour Act. Mr. Minister, should members of the Assembly conclude from that comment that the government's target for changes in the Labour Act is on course, if I could use that term, or on track, and that the timing will be that amendments to The Alberta Labour Act will be introduced at the fall session this year? I ask that question in light of comments the minister made during the discussions last fall during the firemen's debate, when the minister indicated there was a review of the Labour Act. At that time we received the very definite impression that we'd be looking at a major change in the Labour Act this fall.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is referring to an analogy to a railway track, the review of the Labour Act is on track, but there are many yellow lights on it.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, in light of the yellow lights. Mr. Minister, very specifically then, is it the government's intention to enter legislation at this spring session on the Labour Act?

MR. YOUNG: No.

MR. R. CLARK: Good.

#### **Recreational Facilities — Calgary**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Premier, in light of the anticipated announcements tomorrow from the great city to the south, Calgary, with regard to recreational facilities. My question to the Premier is: have there been discussions between the mayor or senior officials of the city of Calgary — let me put it that way — and the Premier or senior ministers in the government regarding the possibility of the province's funding a portion of a coliseum in Calgary, if that receives the highest priority? I asked the question of the Minister of Recreation and Parks last night. He indicated that the government would be prepared to look at a one-third, one-third, one-third basis.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, all I could usefully answer on that question at the moment is that naturally discussions have occurred with various municipalities with regard to facilities that are required, particularly if those facilities involve application for major events. I'm sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition recognizes the government's extensive support for the Commonwealth Games held here in the capital city of Edmonton, and is also aware of the bid by the city of Calgary for the Winter Olympics in 1988, which involve a number of facilities.

So to answer the question precisely as it was put: yes, there have been discussions between the government and officials in the city of Calgary, but nothing more that I could be helpful on in advising the Legislature at this time. We haven't had an opportunity yet to read the report by a Calgary citizens' committee on various priorities, which I gather has been presented today.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Mr. Premier, given the comparison with the Coliseum in Edmonton — and my recollection is that the Coliseum was not a significant portion of the Commonwealth Games as far as Edmonton was concerned — would the province look at funding a similar kind of structure in

Calgary on a basis separate from Calgary's Olympic bid, whether it's successful or not?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, responding to the start of that question, I would have difficulty concurring that the Coliseum was not a significant part of the project construction for the Commonwealth Games in Edmonton. Our view is to look at these projects. We haven't reached any firm decisions with regard to the Olympic bid by Calgary, which would certainly be a bid very significant to all of Alberta, and very relevant if we could hold the Winter Olympic Games in this province, outside of national parks. In our judgment, there may be different conditions with regard to the degree of federal government support that could be anticipated today, not by way of any equity but only by way of some realities.

#### **Government Accounting Practices**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. It flows from discussion this morning in Public Accounts concerning that observation by the Auditor General with respect to the Department of the Solicitor General, where officials of the department had deliberately transferred money from one vote to another. In view of the importance of it, has the government of Alberta itself, including the Executive Council, given formal consideration to this matter, as pointed out in the Auditor General's report? And what steps, if any, will be taken?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Auditor General's report and the questions that were answered in the House, on my perusal of it, it was certainly a very high endorsement of the financial management of the government. But the specific raised by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview I'd have to refer to the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, that item and a number of others contained in the Auditor General's very useful report are being reviewed by the various ministries. Appropriate action will be taken, and I would imagine that review of these items will continue in the Public Accounts Committee. We'll look forward to seeing what that committee recommends. In the meantime, over the course of the weeks and months ahead, we'll proceed appropriately to carry out and put into effect those recommendations in the report which we see as appropriate. I'm sure there will certainly be a report by the Auditor General next year as to the status of those various items which were referred to in his first report this year.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Subsequent to this information — and I believe a letter has been sent to the hon. Solicitor General, or at least the deputy minister of that department — has the government of Alberta through the Treasurer's Department submitted any letter or communication to financial officers of government departments? I understand that in this case the person was in fact second in command as a financial officer. Have there been any general rules or prohibitions sent out in view of the importance of deliberately shifting from one vote of this Legislature to another? Has that been considered by the government at this time?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, this kind of monitoring of internal control is a constantly continuing operation. I don't have any personal knowledge of what has been done, but I imagine some steps have been taken. I'd be pleased to check for the hon. gentleman and report back.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question, and perhaps the minister may have to take this as notice. The Auditor General indicated that the three people who were directly involved in this effort were no longer employed by the department. My question is to determine whether they are still in the service of the Alberta government in any other department.

MR. HYNDMAN: I'll take notice of that, make inquiries, and report back, Mr. Speaker.

#### **Weather Modification**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. It relates to weather modification, and I guess it comes more to light with the unusual weather pattern we're having in Alberta at the present time. The minister indicated earlier in the Assembly there would be an announcement with regard to a weather modification program or a program to increase precipitation in some of the areas of southern Alberta. I was wondering if the minister could indicate the present state of that announcement and decision.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, some time ago the government had the opportunity to continue a five-year program in weather modification with the option to expand the program, which for the last six years has been basically in hail suppression. The opportunities to expand that program [were] in the weather modification aspect or the enhancement and control of moisture, and indeed the snow pack.

The broadening of the program itself, of course, is an entirely new concept to the weather modification program as administered over this last six years. Recognizing the fact there have been groups of individuals carrying on weather modification in the actual control of moisture conditions throughout the southern and southeastern part of the province, it was our intention to join with them and to establish an area that would give us the opportunity of expanding the weather modification program.

In light of that expansion program — first of all recognizing the amount of time required to phase in that program, the areas concerned, the physical aspects of the compilation of equipment that would be required for ground generation, and the administrative portion — it was felt that that part of the program would take most of 1980 to phase in to the total program itself. And of course the snow pack addition, the third aspect, would give us the opportunity to wait until later this fall, when one could work into that situation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister, and maybe the minister has answered this part of it. Will the program that will be put into effect be using the ground generator technique and/or the cloud seeding technique?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the technique that's been used in the past has been basically ground generation in the control of moisture. The aerial seeding aspect has been tied most directly to hail suppression. In light of the

research aspect, we feel that perhaps there is an area, once we have the opportunity to establish that basic area within the province, to have a combination of ground generation and aerial seeding to give the Research Council of Alberta the opportunity to assess the combinations, having some information on the individual applications as they appear.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate what type of funding arrangements have been finalized at the present time for this program?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the total program has been funded in a block, and will be contracted by the Research Council of Alberta. I couldn't give you the breakdown offhand of what the three various aspects would be, first of all, as to the amount and the phasing-in procedures and the costs involved. I would suggest that in light of the phasing-in procedures and the interest that is generated throughout certain parts of the province, which perhaps will be part of the overall area used for ground generation or a combination of both, and the time elements that we're faced with at the present time, and judging that ground generation is of course dependent on and is crucial at various times of the year — the month of May being a prime part of the season when ground generation becomes very effective — we have indicated our willingness to share with some of the existing organizations that would like to carry on a smaller interim program, pending the overall evaluation and fitting into a much larger expanded program. We have shown our willingness to co-operate with those on an interim basis for this year only, both financially and in sharing the knowledge that would be gained.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention to assess the effects of the program on the high moisture areas of Alberta also?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, in the area of total weather modification it would be imperative that we look at both the high and the low, because basically the part of the hail suppression program that involves that part of the province also covers and affects a part of the province that has average to above-average rainfall. It would be our hope to monitor the results of seeding in both areas, both from the effect of hail suppression and from moisture control.

MR. R. CLARK: A supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister, what form is the evaluation going to take? I raise the question in light of the concerns being raised. I'm sure to the minister several times, about having the assessment done only by the Research Council. Because rightly or wrongly, there's a fairly sizable group that feels perhaps there may be more objective groups than the Research Council to look at the success of the program.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, over the years I guess the success of the hail suppression program has been tied jointly not only to the Research Council but to a very effective organization using individual farmers on a volunteer basis throughout the province and throughout those areas that collect the data for the hail suppression program: the collection of the physical aspects of hail, the times of the storms, the amount of precipitation. In many

cases, they have kept records with regard to the amount of rainfall, temperatures, and that information is made available. If we continue — and it is the intention of those individuals who have carried out that program voluntarily over the period of years to continue to do so — that information is on the spot; and that, coupled with the research aspect, should give us a reasonably good balance in the measurements.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister: then the assessment of the program will be a two-pronged assessment? One is really the assessment which has been organized and carried on by the Weather Modification Board, and the other the research carried on by the Alberta Research Council, and the two will be of somewhat equal balance when it comes to looking at the final success of the program?

MR. SCHMIDT: Certainly the two reports would have to be assessed, and would provide the basis for the foundation of any basic papers with regard to research, because of the difficulty in trying to collect that data without the use of the system which has been established, which is completely voluntary.

#### Housing Programs

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. It concerns Albertans who are presently renegotiating mortgages at today's interest rates. Does the minister have any indication of how many home-owners renegotiating their mortgages are facing financial strain at this time?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, not specific figures. The member is aware, of course, of our policy of tackling the affordable supply and the fact that today under our family home purchase program the interest rate is 13 per cent, and for the core housing incentive program, 8.75 per cent. It was mentioned in the federal budget that the federal government would act to assist those unable to bear the burden of renegotiating their home mortgages in the present abnormal situation so that, and I quote, the spectre of foreclosure will be avoided. I think that's appropriate in view of the federal government's high interest rate policy.

I was also interested to read this morning in a media report that the federal minister was looking at meeting with national financial institutions on May 9, I believe, to try to work out some sort of graduated mortgage payment plan. Hopefully, something will arise from that. We will watch with interest. I might add that we are of course continuing to monitor and watch the situation, and will assess the future need.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Today's announcement of the Alberta home conversion program, if I understand it, is for converting homes into suites. My concern is in rural areas like counties. For example, what would be the criteria to qualify for the \$10,000 loan to renovate a farm home for a suite?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the plan is open to any municipality. There are density criteria, as I mentioned in the statement. The density criterion is 10 units per net acre, and the net acre excludes roads and open spaces. By

the way, that is the same figure that was used in the previous federal program. The density has been reduced to eight for rural municipalities, mainly in view of the generally higher densities that prevail in those areas.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether the effective interest rate has in fact changed recently under the Alberta family home purchase program, because he mentioned an interest rate that was rather confusing to me.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the question, the policy of the Home Mortgage Corporation has been to adjust the interest rate up or down from time to time as conditions warrant. The current rate has prevailed for some time. For the family home purchase program, it's currently 13 per cent.

DR. PAPROSKI: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If there is a full subsidy, what will the effective interest rate be, or has that changed?

MR. CHAMBERS: The subsidy is of course very heavy indeed, Mr. Speaker. At \$12,000 income, it's \$290 per month for a starter home, for example. As well as that subsidy, the current interest rate is 13 per cent.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, to clarify further, with the full subsidy the effective interest rate would then be not 12 or 13 per cent, but something considerably lower?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, yes, that would be one way to look at it. One might say alternatively, I guess, if you compare with going interest rates of 16 per cent, that the true subsidy is significantly higher.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, my question might be a supplementary to the previous questions. It follows along with what the Member for Bow Valley was saying, so forgive me if I'm just seeking further clarification. The question is to the Minister of Housing and Public Works regarding two of the programs he mentioned today in his ministerial statement, primarily the Alberta municipal incentive program and the Alberta home conversion program. I'm sure these are very significant programs for the city of Calgary.

Would the minister please clarify for me if, under the home conversion program, apartments would be classified as part of the assessed number for municipalities under the new municipal incentive grant program.

MR. CHAMBERS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, they would. The intent of the government is, of course, that these units are additional housing units, in effect. They should or will provide good accommodation for families, as any other housing unit would. Therefore, logically they ought to qualify. Furthermore, I think that should motivate municipalities.

MRS. FYFE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In order to determine the base line, I wonder if the Minister of Housing and Public Works could tell the Assembly if all housing starts over the last three years would be totalled to find an average? Would this include public housing? Or exactly how would they determine that base line?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the housing starts used in the base line would include all housing units, including apartments and so forth, without regard to density. In other words, it would be the total housing starts averaged over the three years. But once the 50 per cent bench mark was reached, the density requirements would prevail.

MRS. FYFE: I was wondering if there was any further consideration to perhaps providing incentive for those communities that have been growth areas. Perhaps it is very difficult to accept a higher percentage of growth or housing starts within their communities.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I think one of the advantages of the graduated system that we have announced is that high growth areas will likely exceed the base line, the 100 per cent number — in other words, the average of the past three years. Therefore, they will be receiving in that case the \$2,000 grants, which I think are a significant stimulus to construction.

#### **Rental Investment Incentives**

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I wonder if he could explain whether the housing incentive tax capital cost allowance is in fact a deduction against income or a deduction against tax payable.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, that's a good question. We are working out the details of the delivery system on the program. The simplest and best way would be of course through the system of the Department of National Revenue in Ottawa. They administer the Alberta renter tax credit, for example. We asked them if they would administer this program. Early indications are that they will not. We have asked them if they would reconsider that. If they will not agree to do so within a very short time, we will be looking at alternate delivery systems which could relate to and effect the kind of program on which the hon. member suggested the question.

MR. KNAAK: Supplementary on the same point to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. Speaker. The federal government has set a precedent in differential tax treatment for different provinces, depending on need. I think the obvious example is the capital cost allowance for investment in certain areas, which varies from close to 20 per cent in the Atlantic provinces to a IOW of 7 per cent in Alberta, because there's a perceived need for this investment in the maritimes and not in Alberta.

The question is: has the minister approached the federal government for a reverse application of this treatment with respect to the capital cost allowance for housing? In other words, the province of Alberta would receive the capital cost allowance treatment against personal income in the same way — a sort of positive discriminatory way — that the capital cost allowance is dealt with.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, let me just put on record that the communiques from the western premiers' conference, which I tabled, did in tact speak to the question of capital cost allowance with respect to multiple-unit residential buildings. I think the premiers took a very strong stance in encouraging the federal government to move in that direction along the lines we have outlined, and the Premier either has or will be

communicating that directly to the Prime Minister very soon.

In terms of the other initiatives the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud has suggested, I think there is some merit in the broad concept he has described. I have to admit that I have not thought through the ramifications, but I'm sure that both the Provincial Treasurer and I will take that as a good recommendation.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation wishes to supplement some information previously asked for.

#### **Mine Safety Inspection**

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, to a question the hon. Leader of the Opposition raised on April 17, which the Premier took as notice, I wish to assure the Assembly that all mining operations in the province of Alberta are up to date with regard to inspections, and that all divisional recommendations are being lived up to.

#### **Underground Coal Mines**

MR. DIACHUK: Another question that I took as notice, from the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest on April 18, was with regard to the number of underground coal mining operations in the province. I wish to advise the Assembly that there is only one underground mine in operation in the province of Alberta at the present time.

#### **Housing Programs** *(continued)*

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works on part of the announcement today — a very important announcement, I thought. I'd like to ask the minister whether the so-called basement conversion will, in fact, change the rezoning in municipalities, or will encourage the rezoning for increased use of basements for suites.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I should clarify that we used the words "home conversion" because it could be basements or any portion of the home in which suites or light housekeeping rooms were constructed. Again, I pointed out in the statement that obviously it has to apply where the municipality's zoning so permits.

I would hope, though, that the program as announced will motivate municipalities to effect this very useful form of housing. If you look at the trend in housing densities over the past several years, especially in Alberta, in Calgary and Edmonton, the densities have been dropping appreciably until they're now under three per household. We have very large and beautiful homes in Alberta, and I would think this is an area where some significant changes could be made in terms of providing good affordable housing for people, often in older areas with good transportation access, and in assisting people to make mortgage payments. This is an obvious way to help the home-buyer pay off that mortgage.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I hope the municipalities take note.

Thank you.



**ORDERS OF THE DAY**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have received certain messages from His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, which I now transmit to you.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order! Stand up in the galleries, please.

MR. SPEAKER: His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor transmits supplementary estimates of certain sums required for the service of the province for the 12 months ending March 31, 1981, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Please be seated.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table three copies of Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure (A) 1980-81, reflecting the four ministerial announcements today on housing.

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

**Bill 30**  
**The Hospital Debt Retirement Act**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 30, The Hospital Debt Retirement Act. This is the Bill, of course, that will by its passage wipe out all outstanding debentures for capital construction of hospital and nursing home projects throughout Alberta, and from here on put the system on a pay-as-you-go basis, a situation unique among Canadian provinces.

[Motion carried; Bill 30 read a third time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor will now attend upon the Assembly.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair]

head: **ROYAL ASSENT**

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order! His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

[His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor took his place upon the Throne]

HIS HONOUR: Be seated, please.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly has, at its present session, passed a certain Bill to which, and in the name of the Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

CLERK ASSISTANT: Your Honour, the following is the title of the Bill to which Your Honour's assent is prayed: Bill No. 30, The Hospital Debt Retirement Act.

[The Lieutenant-Governor indicated his assent]

CLERK ASSISTANT: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to this Bill.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

[The Lieutenant-Governor left the House]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will please come to order. We have certain estimates to consider this afternoon.

**Department of Recreation and Parks**

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, last night in the course of my estimates, in answering a question from the Member for Bow Valley, I stated that funds available for Tillebrook park would be \$470,000. That was incorrect. I'd like to correct the record. The funds available for construction at Tillebrook will be \$590,000.

The second item: in a question from the Leader of the Opposition, I suggested that the Alberta Schools Athletic Association would be receiving over \$100,000 from my department. That figure is incorrect. The total figure to the Alberta school association in 1980 should read approximately \$70,000.

Thank you.

**Department of**  
**Social Services and Community Health**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the minister wish to make some opening comments?

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to begin by commenting on a couple of changes in the senior management of the department over the past year, and to welcome our colleague the MLA for Lethbridge West, John Gogo, as the chairman of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission. This, as you know, is a departure from the way we've operated in the past, and is consistent with a number of changes made by government in moving MLAs into chairmanship positions. I welcome the addition of Mr. Gogo as chairman of that important commission.

In addition, within the department itself I'm pleased that late last spring we had as a replacement for Dr. Charles Hellon — who retired from his service with government and is now actively involved in private practice on Vancouver Island — John Forrester appointed as the new Assistant Deputy Minister of Mental Health. More recently, a very valued member of our team, Dr. Sheila Durkin, has joined us as the Deputy Minister of Community Health Services.

Mr. Chairman, as the department is divided into 10 Votes and the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission is represented in the 11th Vote, I would propose that we follow the same general format we followed last year in that we go through the estimates on a vote by vote basis. Therefore, I would ask the indulgence

of my colleagues in the Assembly that any questions they may have pertaining to a specific program be held and dealt with when we're on that particular vote. I'll be pleased to go through the votes very briefly in these introductory remarks that I'm now making, Mr. Chairman.

In Vote 1, I'll draw specific attention to public communications. There may be some questions as to the significant increase in that area. We are very pleased with the new program we're launching on a public awareness campaign — the rights of children, the responsibilities of parents in society. We'll deal with that during Vote 1.

Moving on to Vote 2, members will note very substantial reductions in a number of public assistance programs. These reductions are primarily due to a transfer of responsibility from public assistance to the assured income for the severely handicapped program which will appear in a later vote.

Vote 3, child welfare services, again, will note significant increases in support for community and family services, contracted residences, and residents in institutions.

Under Vote 4, special social services programs, we're looking at services that are provided for hostels and other adult institutions, developments on the Metis settlements, and purchase of services on a grant basis to agencies.

Vote 5: the announcement today, Mr. Speaker, will have a significant impact upon this particular program, our support to senior citizens. It's in Vote 5 that we have the support for the assured income for the severely handicapped program — as you note, a very substantial increase prior to today's announcement.

Vote 6, vocational rehabilitation services: again, agency grants and purchase of services are up very substantially, by more than 25 per cent.

Vote 7, services for the handicapped: again I draw the attention of members to agency grants and purchase of services.

Vote 8, treatment of mental illness: purchase of services and agency grants representing a 63 per cent increase — very significant. Some very challenging things are happening in this particular section of the department. Our new forensic unit being developed at Alberta Hospital, Edmonton; the recently announced brain trauma centre that will be constructed at Alberta Hospital, Ponoka; and our work with the various organizations throughout the province.

Vote 9, dealing with special health services and rehabilitative health services — again, some substantial increases, Mr. Chairman.

Vote 10, community social and health services: our support for PSS, for health units, and the two city boards of health is covered in this vote.

The 11th Vote is not the department itself but rather the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission. From time to time I will be asking the chairman of the commission to comment on some of the programs which are being developed and initiated by the commission and some of the very positive approaches being taken.

With those opening comments, Mr. Chairman, I will respond to questions.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, in opening remarks on the Department of Social Services and Community Health, maybe I should outline our approach to the estimates before us. We would like to cover five or six areas rather intensively. If the minister wants us to go into the votes, that sort of format, maybe we can adjust to that. Our intention was to take each of the areas at this

point in the discussion and work back and forth with a group of questions. Maybe after those five or six areas are cleared, the estimates would move through very, very quickly. That was the format we wanted to follow. Our purpose in today's discussion would be strictly to gain information, data, and material with regard to the estimates. We feel we won't complete Social Services and Community Health, and would want to look at completion Friday, if at all possible. There are a number of pieces of information we would like to have, and we'd like to raise those questions. So we're open to whatever format, and I think we can adjust.

What kinds of general concerns do we see within the department at the present time? Maybe the minister can respond with regard to these general remarks.

First of all, as we observe some of the things happening in the Department of Social Services and Community Health, I think we note that the department itself seems to be on a trend of bringing things under more central control, or more departmental control. Yesterday's announcement on day care was one of those announcements. As we go through our questioning, we'll certainly illustrate other examples. But with the funding, with this general feeling coming out at the present time, we feel there is this trend towards centralized control, even in the whole area of preventive social services, I could say. This is one of the programs whose initial stages I was involved in where local communities were involved. As I talk to various preventive social service groups, I'm finding that they feel that they're not being recognized, and that they're on the trend to being phased out at this point in time. As I say, I can give other examples.

The second thing that I think is happening because of that very fact is a change in emphasis in the department, moving away from a trend started a few years back from maintenance to rehabilitation, then the area that's a little more difficult to grasp, the whole area of prevention. We felt there was a trend in Social Services and Community Health programs towards an emphasis and a priority on prevention. But our feeling at this point in time is that that trend is reversing to one of maintenance and just looking after the basic things that have to be looked after. It's back to square one; rather than being progressive, it seems to give an indication of being rather regressive.

Those are two of our general criticisms at the present time. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of questions we want to ask, keeping those two general comments in mind. As I say, our purpose in today's examination of the estimates is to seek information. We have quite a long list of questions we will ask about various programs and aspects that we feel are very important at this time. Certainly on Friday, we want to come back to our questioning.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, before we go on, I might just respond to clarify procedure. In addition to being worth while, I certainly think it's standard practice in our Canadian and of course the British parliamentary tradition that at the beginning of a minister's estimates, a number of general questions are asked about the philosophy, the moves the government's making in particular areas. I'm very pleased to respond generally to those questions at this time. My concern is that specific, detailed questions, which may be more properly dealt with in the various votes, be dealt with when we get to those items, as they were last year. It would be unfortunate to go into PSS, for example, in a very specific way now, when we're dealing with Vote 1, when the same matter

will come up in Vote 10.

But in terms of general parameters, the general ways in which we're going, I'm more than pleased to do that. If hon. members in the Assembly have some other questions, I'll take those and attempt to respond later this afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we agree, then, that we'll have, a general discussion to commence these estimates, then specific ones will be related to the votes as we come to them?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, certainly I have quite a number of specific questions, but I would like to make a number of general comments as we address the estimates of Social Services and Community Health this afternoon.

I might just say at the outset, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that I was pleased to hear the government's announcement today increasing the assured income. I think that's certainly a step in the right direction. However, the point that I think has to be underlined is that we need some sort of mechanism to adjust that assured income to the cost of living. The guaranteed income supplement is adjusted periodically as per the cost of living. In the case of some of our other pensions, the ones I'm most closely associated with or at least most knowledgeable about, Workers' Compensation pensions, are adjusted periodically as a consequence of a minister's advisory committee, whose recommendations to the minister are then brought to the Legislature. But whatever form is taken, I think there has to be some mechanism in place for periodic adjustment of the assured income.

Mr. Chairman, in my general observations this afternoon, I'd like to deal with a number of areas. One would be my concern about where this government sees Social Services and Community Health in the overall scheme of things. Then I'd like to deal with the question of ministerial responsibility, and then look at the question of standards in manpower.

Mr. Chairman, on the question of where this government sees Social Services and Community Health, in introducing my remarks I would just go back to what I thought was an encouraging change in initiatives by the former government when Mr. Strom became Premier in 1969. We had the development of the human resources concept, and a very clear commitment in the white paper of 1968 that as far as the former government was concerned, the most important resource we had in the province was our human resource. In a sense I suppose that's self-evident.

But as a consequence of that position paper we saw a number of important initiatives. Among those initiatives were the development of preventive social services; a move away from welfare in a custodial sense to a different approach to public assistance, one that emphasized rehabilitation, as the Member for Little Bow indicated, and then prevention. Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, and I say this in a non-partisan way, in my judgment that direction was consistent with the goals of the white paper.

Now what has happened in the last few years? I would submit that in many respects our Department of Social Services and Community Health has not really been able to respond very well to the boom taking place in the province of Alberta. I don't quarrel with the vast majority of people who are working in the department, who are dedicated public servants and do a very good job. I'm

going to come to that in a moment. But I think it is really a question of the priority that the government places on it. The minister can look at financial statistics and indicate that there's been an increase in budget. That is correct.

But at the same time the increase in the problems we face with the tremendous boom in Alberta of 1980 is just so enormous that I would argue we have to have a very clear commitment from the government that the department is not simply going to be doing the best job it can, but in a sense is going to be, if you like, an advocate for the unfortunate in our society, the people who aren't protected by professional organizations, strong unions, or a position of influence in society. And there are a large number of those people, Mr. Minister. It seems to me that it's especially incumbent upon the Department of Social Services and Community Health to take that kind of activist role. Mr. Chairman, with great respect, I don't think that has been forthcoming. Now I'm not suggesting that we run around throwing money at every conceivable problem that develops. But I do think there are a number of areas where we have to shift our emphasis in a very significant way.

One area is this question of how we deal with people on the Metis settlements. Without going into the debate that occurred last year, there are certain things that still concern me. We had a report by the provincial Ombudsman. Contained in that report were some very, very sharp words, words which made it clear that one of the problems — I have the direct quote here from the Ombudsman's report, but I probably don't need to get that technical. Certainly the thrust of the Ombudsman's statement was that there was low morale in the Metis development branch because it hadn't been given the priority it should. I look at the budget this year, Mr. Chairman, and I see that there's an increase of only 6.7 per cent. With great respect, here is one of the major recommendations of the provincial Ombudsman and I don't see any follow-up.

We've got the committee that the hon. Member for St. Paul is co-chairing, but the minister well knows that the Ombudsman's recommendation on that committee was not that we have a committee co-chaired but that we have a committee chaired by an independent person. We have the problems with the debt reduction money, which has been paid into an account and, depending on what kinds of procedures are worked out, may eventually get to the settlements. But I would ask, and I put this to the minister in the question period the other day: was the government's decision to say to the people in the various settlements, you must have plebiscites, you must have referendums, or you must have public meetings to decide how the money is going to be allocated or at least to get approval — was that a decision made as a result of counsel from the lawyers representing the government saying, it's very important that you do this, or was it essentially a political decision made by the government caucus?

If it was a political decision, quite frankly, Mr. Minister, I don't have as much respect for it. I don't agree with the government's general position in handling this resources claim, but quite apart from that, I could at least understand the position if it came as a result of advice from the government's legal counsel. But if it wasn't from legal counsel, why in heavens name are we saying to the people on the Metis settlements: you have to go through the process of conducting referendums, plebiscites, or

public meetings?

There are very few municipalities in this province, Mr. Chairman, that would want to go through the process of having a referendum on how the municipal debt reduction money is going to be invested, determined, or spent. I would say to the minister: why are we going this route? It is creating obstacles. I've talked to people from the Federation of Metis Settlements and they are going along with it not because they want to, Mr. Minister, but because there's no other choice. Rather than building bridges of understanding, this behavior just . . . Frankly, I just fail to see why the government is taking that direction.

When we deal with general questions, I think we have to look at the overall issue concerned in the northern regional treatment centre, particularly the limits of behavior modification. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as I have listened to various people defending the government's position, I've sensed that we have taken a very clinical approach to behavior modification, quite divorced from the moral and ethical implications of behavior modification. Behavior modification can range all the way from something that is totally acceptable and reasonable to the kind of situation in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. But the key in determining behavior modification is the ethical and moral framework in which these schemes are undertaken.

I would just have to say to the minister, Mr. Chairman, that even in Dr. Thompson's report — and I've read the report — there are certain things that really disturb me. This was the man who carefully reviewed the dog food eating incident. He made this observation in his report. He was able to conclude that the forcing of a child to eat dog food laced with Tabasco — and this is the relevant point — "does not represent an unacceptable form of treatment". This is Dr. Thompson. Now how can we have people in the department advising the government of Alberta in any kind of position at all making this kind of statement? Frankly, that's the thing that amazes me. I read the report. He makes an honest effort to deal as fairly as he can with the situation, but contained in it is no sense of moral outrage at all. What happened?

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if we're going to look at behavior modification, it cannot be divorced from a sense of what is considered right and wrong, the old fashioned values of what is right and wrong. You don't need a PhD or a MA in social work to know that giving kids dog food laced with Tabasco sauce is wrong. It's wrong. Why do we have people who, with great respect, are sort of being neutral? Well, not neutral; that wouldn't be fair to Dr. Thompson. But at least saying it "does not represent an unacceptable form of treatment."

Mr. Chairman, going beyond that, as I look at the chronology of events — correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Minister, because I wouldn't want to be unfair to you. As I understand the events that led up to this northern regional treatment centre controversy, on November 13 the Hesses, the young couple who became the centre of the controversy, took their complaint to the regional director of Social Services, Mr. Scotney, in Peace River. I might just say that in dealing with Mr. Scotney over the years, I have found him to be an excellent public servant and a person of some very real integrity. In doing that, Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman, they were simply following sections 41 and 42 of The Child Welfare Act, which is very clear: any person who has reasonable and probable grounds to believe, or believes, that a child has been abandoned, deserted, physically ill-treated, or is in

need of protection shall forthwith report the grounds of such belief to the director or to any child welfare worker in the department.

So on November 13, we had the complaint to the department. It wasn't until the December 14, as I understand it, that the minister was informed. The minister shakes his head. I'd be very pleased to hear when the minister was informed, but I understand that the minister was not informed of this until approximately a month later. If the chronology is different, then I think the minister has an excellent opportunity to set the record straight in this initial discussion.

Before we vote the estimates, the point I want to make to you, Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman, is: what happened here? What happened? When the complaint of this particular incident by these two young people went to the department, it would strike me that the department would immediately contact superiors in the department and the minister would be notified. After all, eating dog food and being forced to urinate in one's blanket are not normal practice. It's the sort of thing that is obviously shocking. What I still cannot gather is why the department would not immediately come to the minister and say, look, we've got a very real problem.

In question period six weeks ago, when this matter was raised, the minister said they had ordered it stopped. Fair enough. I appreciate that. But the ordering of it stopped is not the only step; it's the first step. I acknowledge it's the first step. But the follow-up must surely be to contact the minister and say, look, we've got a horrendous situation on our hands. From anything I've heard in the debate in this House, I'm not satisfied that had it not been for the fact that the young couple in question contacted the Ombudsman, and the Ombudsman, I understand, informed the director of child welfare on December 11 — had it not been for that procedure, it may well be that the minister would never have known about it. Before we vote money, in my judgment, we have to have a clearer idea of what the lines of communication are in this government.

Another thing that disturbs me is that even though Section 41(1) of The Child Welfare Act says that a person shall forthwith report, as the Hesses tell me — and I met with them and discussed this matter in some detail — when they first had a chance to talk to officials of the department in Peace River at a meeting several days after the notification was made available, at that time it was indicated that the department would like them to be foster parents. A few days later that was apparently withdrawn. Why was it withdrawn? Do we have an enemies' list? Were the Hesses suddenly on an informal enemies' list, Mr. Chairman? I hope not.

I think we have to have some very clear answers in this Assembly as to what happened, why the minister wasn't notified, and why the Hesses somehow found that the invitation that had been given to them by the department was changed all of a sudden after they contacted the Ombudsman.

Mr. Chairman, I raise this because what took place in the province of Alberta was, I think, a sense of outrage. I appreciate the fact that the minister himself has indicated in the House his sense of outrage. We all do. But why was the system so cumbersome that we weren't able to deal with it more quickly? I think that's the thing that has to be dealt with.

Just before letting the minister off the hook entirely, I understand that the Thompson report was dated February 29. It is my understanding that the minister was

not able to read that report until March 10. Mr. Chairman, we all know that in public life we're busy people. Sometimes paperwork tends to pile up. But there's a difference, Mr. Minister, with great respect; paperwork and paperwork. The minister's got some down there I'm sure will take him 11 days to read. I would suggest to you as minister that as a result of the request for the Thompson report, I find it passing strange that it took 11 days for the minister to be able to read the report — from the date of the report which, is February 29, until March 10.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman, I think a number of other issues arise out of this question. I am pleased to see that the department and the government of Alberta finally recommended, on the 17th, the Cavanagh Board of Review. I'm hopeful, as most Albertans are, that as a result of the Cavanagh Board of Review, we will have much better child welfare legislation than we have to date. I would just remind the minister that the first response I saw to that question was a statement on the 11th attributed to the minister. Maybe we can't always believe everything we see in the paper, but on the 11th the minister indicated that no review was needed. To his credit, six days later, on the 17th, the review was announced. As I say, we all hope that the recommendations of that review will allow the province of Alberta to move forward impressively in the area of child welfare legislation.

I just have one other general area that I want to deal with, Mr. Chairman. Before moving on to that area, just summarizing what I've said: there are a lot of unanswered questions on this Peace River regional treatment centre thing, and the whole way in which Metis settlements have been treated since the last estimates. In the case of Westfield, I think there's been some improvement. In the opportunity we've had to research this, there's been some improvement at the Westfield centre. But the bottom line is that in our system of government, the minister must accept full responsibility. When we get to that point several days later, I'll probably have an opportunity to say more about that.

On the question of standards and manpower requirements by the department: Mr. Chairman, as I look at the estimates I find that, faced as we are with some very serious problems, we're not increasing our manpower by any significant amount. We're increasing it, I understand, by approximately 1 per cent, as I look at the statistics we've been able to compile from the estimates. Considering the demands on this department's time, holy cow. Holy cow. I think we can do a little better than that. No one's saying that we want to go out and hire hundreds and hundreds of extra civil servants, but the question is: do we need additional people? I'm told by social workers that yes, indeed we do need additional people. For example, it's my information that in the Edmonton area the average child welfare caseload, according to the professionals, should be 50 clients per worker. In Edmonton they have an average of 80. This is information I've been able to obtain. The professional standard should be 50.

Three or four weeks ago, we had some mothers on the steps of the Legislature going after the minister because of the Miranda Phipps tragedy. I can't help but think, Mr. Minister, that one of the reasons that occurred is that we've got too few people trying to do too much. In the discussions I've had with people in the minister's department, I can't help but feel that they are overworked. They

have caseloads that are too big, and they aren't able to give the attention to those caseloads that, as workers, they would like to.

So, Mr. Chairman, in summarizing my initial comments, it seems to me that what we see in 1980 is, in many respects, a department that really is not moving forward in any kind of dramatic way to deal with some of the problems that are going to be more acute in Alberta as a consequence of the boom. Even the increase the minister will point to in his estimates — an increase of 18.9 per cent, but actually an increase of 16.2 per cent over last year's estimates. If you take out the one area of the assured income for the handicapped, which I fully support, but you take out that increase which is now in place and you find that the actual increase is going to be about 8 per cent. The minister shakes his head. Just look over the estimates. It's very clear as, I see it. The increase of about 8 per cent is not going to allow us to do the job. The minister smiles. I don't think it's a smiling matter. The problems we've had over the last year, I submit, are not going to be ... We hope we don't find another year with a scandal every month in the Department of Social Services and Community Health.

But let me tell you, unless this department has the funding to be able to do the job properly, unless we are able to compete for qualified people and maintain standards of people working in the department by paying them enough, then we're asking for trouble. The minister is going to be facing the newsmen, facing the Legislature, and facing angry Albertans who will be calling for his resignation next year, as they did last year.

The minister is one of the few politicians in Alberta to earn something that really hasn't happened since, I think, the late Mr. Brownlee was Premier of Alberta, when every newspaper in the province called for his resignation. I think there hasn't been such unanimity among the press corps on a matter until the present situation. [interjections] Some of the backbenchers don't like that; that's too bad. Let them get up and defend him. That's fine; that's their problem.

But, Mr. Chairman, I'm saying to this government and to the minister that Social Service and Community Health, with the problems faced by Albertans in 1980, has to have a higher priority. It has to take a more activist position. If it doesn't, it will not only be the minister but the entire government that will have to take the political fallout.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I felt that it would be appropriate to make a very few comments. I'm certainly in agreement with keeping to the procedure that has been outlined, and respect the wishes of the Assembly that we will direct specific comments under the votes. However, looking back over the past year, and I would only do that with some background and experience to speak about the future, because as I, possibly naively, understood the estimates, it was looking ahead and not looking back. Therefore, I feel very proud to speak at this time, to say this government is definitely prepared to meet the needs and priorities in this department, in this province. And this priority of the government is people. It is all Albertans.

There is an additional responsibility for all of us in Alberta. That's to assist Albertans who cannot themselves function at their optimum level. Again I say that is a priority of our government. In these introductory remarks there have already been many statements alluding to many different issues, such as our priority about the

low morale and staff, shocking practices, many questions raised about the system that we have, that we condone certain behaviors of individuals.

I'm not certain about the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, exactly what his background is or if he has worked in any of these institutions or in this particular area, but I can certainly attest to the fact that I have been involved in this area in my lifetime. Unfortunately, I have witnessed shocking procedures. It certainly doesn't mean that anybody who is involved in them or sees them or has to cope with them condones them. As long as we are dealing with individuals, the physical or mental health of any citizen, there will be times when actions are taken or procedures occur that, as I indicated, are not approved procedures.

Also, I think one of the factors that influences this area very severely is our increasing new knowledge. This is coming out every day. As responsible Albertans and members of this Legislature, I think we do respond to the new knowledge and techniques.

Another point was raised about the amount of money in the estimates. Again, I'm very proud to look forward, hopefully, to working with the minister and members of his department, because I think money is there to indicate that there will again be a high priority in all areas under this department.

One point that was not mentioned — it is not only the government that wants to be involved in meeting the needs of the Albertans in this area. Frankly, it's the citizens out there. It's the parents, members of the community, the volunteer organizations. They, too, all want to have a voice in the plans, developments, and care of these Albertans who need added assistance. They are also prepared to assist financially in this way.

So in this year I am looking forward, as I'm sure other members of this Assembly are, to not looking at the problems but identifying the concerns and meeting the challenges before us.

MR. BATIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Listening to the comments over the last little while, I thought I just have to get in and express a few of my own. There seems to have been a lot of controversy over some of the happenings, whether it was the Peace River treatment centre or at Westfield.

I would like to mention, Mr. Chairman, through my time as a Member of the Legislative Assembly I have served on a Hospital Visitors Committee. Our job was to go to these health care centres throughout the province and make recommendations to the minister. We did go through a number of them, particularly the one in Red Deer. I must commend the previous administration that they did find accommodation, even though I feel it was not the best — one institution with almost 2,000 under one roof — but still there was some provision.

I know our Hospital Visitors Committee made strong recommendations to the minister of the day to look at decentralizing these areas. It was not fair that all the handicapped children of the province be in one particular area. It made it very inconvenient for many parents even to visit them. Some had actually neglected and even stopped ever going to see their children. This was one of the recommendations. It has been going in this direction, and it's helping quite a bit. I have such a home right in my constituency, and I know how it serves the people. The volunteer workers have done well for it, and it's going in the right direction.

What really bothers me, particularly when the hon.

Member for Spirit River-Fairview has brought it up earlier and today, is that the minister will again be asked to resign. Many times I wonder who should be the one to resign. It wasn't very much different. Not too long ago the New Democratic Party in Calgary was asking their member to resign for making statements about disclosures under the election Act, that they had failed to do it. That was definitely a fault of the leader. A leader of a political party didn't see that his candidates fulfilled it. None of our candidates failed in that. [interjections] I would sooner think that any politician who is a leader of a political party and in 15 years is able to get his own seat, that's the one who should probably be thinking of resigning.

Nevertheless, the capability of the Minister of Social Services and Community Health has been questionable. I think it is not for any member, whether in the opposition or anybody else, to ask for any resignation. The Premier has that prerogative. If he feels his cabinet members are not doing a suitable job, it's up to him. He appoints them, and he should ask them to resign.

However, I can honestly say that this portfolio is such that it requires a terrific amount of sacrifice and so forth. I'm sure that if the Premier were asked today to point his finger at six of his top men, the Minister of Social Services and Community Health would be one of the six.

Also, when these problems erupted, we saw that the minister was concerned. Very shortly, Bill 27 was introduced to provide this, to try to refrain such things from happening again. As I say, regardless of what, I think the minister has done a tremendously good job. There are problems; there will continue to be problems. One who doesn't do anything never does anything wrong. So we just have to accept it.

Thank you.

MRS. CRIPPS: I have to commend the minister for the people programs which are the responsibility of his department. Many of the programs are designed to assist Albertans in their own homes and communities, such as the health units program, home care programs, preventive social services, the homemaking program, and the aids to daily living. I was pleased to attend the official opening of the Wetoka health unit on April 25. This represents service at the grass roots.

I also received a note last week that a mental health officer will be resident in Drayton Valley. Again, this is service at the grass roots. But I hereby give due notice that I will continue my efforts to have a social service office with a resident worker established in Drayton Valley.

Crisis services are momentary and immediate, and that necessitates that they be locally situated. I'm pleased with the trend of decentralizing services to local areas. There are inherent problems in decisions being made at local levels, but that's a risk we have to take. Is it better to have mistakes made trying to humanize the welfare system than to have the disadvantaged closeted in mausoleums where Albertans don't know what's going on?

Years ago the girls in my area used to get two jobs, because their friends knew of the jobs and they went to work there. One was in the Red Deer centre and the other in Ponoka. The horror stories those girls tell of the hundreds of people closeted in those mausoleums were tragic.

We're trying to humanize the welfare system. Sure mistakes are going to be made. I'll grant you that. The problems we have had in the last year couldn't have

happened if Social Services hadn't attempted to decentralize and humanize these services. I commend the minister for making an attempt to do this.

Thank you.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, recognizing that we're not going to finish the minister's estimates today, or perhaps even get them started, there is one thing I would like to ask the minister to do. When we come back to the estimates next day, whether it's following four government announcements to kind of . . .

MR. NOTLEY: Diffuse.

MR. R. CLARK: . . . gloss over the minister's estimates, there is one thing I would like you to give very serious consideration to between now and then.

MR. NOTLEY: The Government House Leader is smiling at that one.

MR. R. CLARK: That's to give to the Assembly the minister's assessment of ministerial responsibility. Today in the House we had an announcement by the minister, a basically good announcement, as I indicated earlier. The minister said:

I feel privileged today to announce that our government, through the Department of Social Services and Community Health, has responded to the needs of very special Albertans by increasing the benefits available under the two assured income programs.

Yesterday we had a ministerial announcement by the minister where, once again, he and the government were taking the credit for an announcement with regard to day care. On this occasion, though, one may not want to take so much credit for it later on. We have the announcement made by you yesterday, sir, and the one made today where, in the last paragraph in both announcements, the minister makes the point that he is pleased to see the adjustments of these policies, and the minister stands up in the Legislature and takes credit for making these announcements, which is reasonable. The reason I ask the minister to come back Friday, after he has had a chance to clearly think out in considerable detail what is meant by ministerial responsibility, is that in my judgment one of the problems the minister has is realizing that in standing up in the House before the television cameras and making the announcements about more money for day care and more assistance for the assured income plan, somehow he feels he doesn't have to take responsibility for what goes on in the department.

I'm prepared to hear the minister out, to hear this new kind of ministerial responsibility that would be totally inconsistent with British parliamentary tradition. But I say to the minister now: be it Friday or next Monday afternoon or evening, whenever the spirit moves you — sometime before finishing these estimates and preferably before we vote on Vote 1 — I think it's incumbent upon you, sir, to indicate to this Assembly what you see as ministerial responsibility. If one is to accept the comments made from your office, on some occasions by your Executive Assistant but also by you, clearly the idea you have of ministerial responsibility and what's regarded as the traditional British parliamentary approach to ministerial responsibility are totally at variance, as I interpret the statements.

So, Mr. Minister, I want to be as straightforward as I can with you. If you care to read a statement into the

record, I would welcome that. In light of the past year, it seems to me there is a very definite need for that kind of statement to come from you, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could make one other comment. My colleague the Member for Little Bow, who was previously minister, is certainly familiar with a number of the senior officials in the department, not the chief deputy minister but senior people in the department. They are known to be very capable, dedicated public servants. I get a very definite feeling, Mr. Minister, that there is a communications problem someplace within the department. The kinds of things that are happening at the grass roots level and, I understand, are coming up through the system, are getting cut off someplace. Whether they are being cut off at the chief deputy minister's office, at the Executive Assistant's office, or where, I can't conceive of anybody being minister of a department who wouldn't be saying to his civil servants: first of all I want to hear the bad news; then I will hear the good news later on if there is time. But someplace along this whole system there seems to be — I'll put it this way — a total foul-up in the communications within the department. The kinds of things that are going on . . . One could use many examples. We'll use the Metis file thing, sir. It had to be a very embarrassing situation for you to come to the Assembly and not know what was going on the first day. We come to other situations where the minister down in his own constituency is hit with this thing at Peace River, not being able to respond adequately and initially defends the behavior modification techniques and then later on changes the whole situation. The minister's Executive Assistant defended those techniques here in Edmonton. Well, that's the minister's office.

Someplace in this whole system there is a breakdown in communications. Mr. Minister, at \$59,000 a year, the buck-passing stops at your desk, sir.

MRS. CRIPPS: I would just like to ask the Leader of the Opposition if he doesn't concede that the minister certainly has been given his share of blame for any incidents that have taken place in his department over the past few months. I would also like to note that there certainly doesn't appear to be a communications gap between the department and those leaders.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Highwood.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I want an opportunity to respond to the question by the Member for Drayton Valley.

The hon. member asks if I feel the minister has received sufficient blame — I think was the right term — for the things that have gone on during the last year. Certainly the hon. member knows that the minister is responsible. The minister, I am sure, will confirm this. Repeatedly we've sent memos to the minister's office asking for information on a whole variety of questions and, in many cases — we'll list those next Friday — we're still waiting for answers in a whole variety of areas.

To the Member for Drayton Valley: the minister is the one who is responsible. The hon. member shakes her head, whatever her interpretation of ministerial responsibility is. But the minister has to take the responsibility for things when they go wrong, just as the minister took credit today when he stood in his place and announced the changes in the assured income plan, when the hon. Member for Drayton Valley banged her desk frantically.

MR. NOTLEY: Agreed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, also on a point of privilege. In raising the comment, the hon. member has made an inference, if I gathered the comment correctly, that staff of the Department of Social Services and Community Health are passing on information and not being loyal to the minister. I want to make it very clear that I know of no one in that department who is doing that kind of thing. The many people I have historically dealt with over the years as a minister of that department and as an MLA have never ever made any kind of contact to that effect. There isn't anyone. I think that inference given by the member is totally unfair to the departmental staff, and just not correct at all.

MR. NOTLEY: On the point of privilege, too, I am pleased that the matter has come up, because there should be no misunderstanding. Information we have obtained, at least in my office, is information in the budget or information that provincial organizations such as the social workers' provincial organization have made freely available to anyone in their public role. The suggestion that members of Social Services and Community Health are in any way breaking their oath of office is totally incorrect; totally, completely incorrect as far as my office is concerned, and the official opposition indicates that's true as far as their office is concerned.

With great respect to the hon. Member for Drayton Valley, it's not going to get the minister off the hook by trying to look for a bogeyman in the Department of Social Services and Community Health. We are well served by a department staff who, for the most part, are people of rather outstanding ability, who are working very hard and, as I think I tried to mention at the end, often with casework loads much greater than is reasonable under the circumstances.

What is at stake in this debate — right now — is ministerial responsibility and the responsibility of the elected members in this Legislative Assembly. I don't think there should be any effort to try to smudge the reputation of public servants working in the Department of Social Services and Community Health. As the Leader of the Opposition indicated, the buck has to rest at the minister's desk in terms of ministerial accountability, but with all the members of the government caucus in terms of responsibility to the people of Alberta. Until such time that we as opposition members are satisfied that these questions are properly answered, I think we have a duty and a responsibility to keep these estimates going, even if it's going to take us the next two or three months to get through them.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say that the two hon. members have come up with two rather vigorous impromptu speeches, and so be it. I didn't interrupt at any point, even though no point of privilege was involved. I say that now in the context of a point of order in order that I can make the point.

For what it's worth, I heard no search for any bogeyman, as the remark was made. However, be that as it may, and placing whatever interpretations, which I don't agree with, that hon. members in the opposition have, clearly a question of privilege relates to the privilege either of the Assembly or of the individual member. So both hon. members, in full flight of oratory, were completely out of order at all times. [interjections]

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the eloquent effort by the Government House Leader: it wasn't members of the opposition or the Member for Spirit River-Fairview who raised the matter. It was the government backbencher from Drayton Valley who made the inferences.

Mr. Chairman, I simply make the point to you, sir, that in my capacity as Leader of the Opposition, I have not had one official from the Department of Social Services and Community Health come to me and provide me with information with regard to the actions in that department. On several occasions, when the minister has been out of town, and one occasion I recall very definitely, when I phoned the minister's office, the minister was not available. I talked to the chief deputy minister, and the comment was something like, and what do you want today? After that rather brisk exchange we had — one which was a bit unexpected; frankly — the chief deputy minister did make it possible for officials of my office to visit Westfield on the very same afternoon.

But I want to have the record extremely clear. I even go one step further and say to the Member for Drayton Valley: we are fortunate enough to have an office of the Department of Social Services and Community Health in Olds, and the staff in that office have gone out of their way at no time to discuss any of these issues with me, nor I with them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Government House Leader was correct that there was no point of privilege, but there was a point of order by the Member for Little Bow and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. It wasn't a point of privilege.

I recognize the hon. Member for Highwood.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make a few observations here. The first one is that the only person who doesn't make any mistakes is one who doesn't do anything. And I'd ... No, I won't say that. [interjections]

I am very concerned about the reasoning the Leader of the Opposition uses in his remarks. He objects strenuously to the minister taking any credit for anything that's good, but immediately anything comes up that he considers not to be good, he thinks the minister is the one who is responsible. That's exactly what he said this afternoon. He also insisted that the minister was posturing this afternoon before the cameras. I notice this afternoon that six people from the media are up in the press gallery. I wonder what the Leader of the Opposition was doing this afternoon.

MR. R. CLARK: Oh, I arranged for the whole thing.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: I'd like to inject a little positive note into these departmental estimates. There's something that was really good ... [interjections] I notice there's a lot of static when I'm trying to say anything, but we let them speak without too much interference.

This past year I was very pleased to have the minister visit the Stampede boys' ranch, which is west of Longview. That's a place where there are 14 young teenage boys who have had problems with the law. It's one of the minister's responsibilities. They're trying to rehabilitate them into our society. It's a wonderful program. The minister came out to view that situation, because the operator of it thought he had some problems and the



boys thought they had some problems. The minister came by helicopter, and what a day that was for those boys. The pilot of the helicopter was very co-operative. He explained the helicopter and showed it to them. They continued to ask the operator and, whenever I see them, when is the minister going to come out again to bring that helicopter so they can see it?

They're clever young fellows. They realize they not only had a chance to look at a helicopter inside and out but that some of their concerns were seen first hand by the minister and appropriate action was taken — which in this case happened to be good, at least in my opinion. The owner and manager of that ranch was very pleased and quite happy with the dedication and concern of the minister toward his charges. I might say that the minister has a real friend out there.

I could tell of other instances, too, where the minister has come to my constituency or/and by phone calls looked after problems that were out there. As I say, a department the size of that can't be all bad. There are some good aspects of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud wish to speak?

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Chairman, I was trying to get in on the point of privilege or order, but the ruling was made prior to my opportunity. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did the hon. minister wish to make some comments?

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will attempt to comment on the general questions and concerns which were raised. There are some very specific items which I'll be pleased to deal with at a later time. I very much appreciated many of the comments made. The hon. Member for Little Bow raised concern about what he saw as a move towards centralized control by the department, a fear, a concern that: are we moving in fact in an area that will give more control by government, more control out of Edmonton on the lives of people throughout the province? That was a valid concern expressed by the hon. member.

On the other hand the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview expressed his concern that we aren't hiring enough people, that although the budget is increasing and we have an 18.9 per cent increase in our expenditures, the number of additional staff members is negligible. I think that adequately reflects philosophical points of view. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, as a member of a party that has views to the far left, might like to see very centralized control, might like to see considerably more people brought into government and programs administered by government. The hon. Member for Little Bow represents a political point of view in which he wants to see, if I may to the hon. member, things done in the local communities, a contractual arrangement wherever possible. That's very akin to the views I have.

I was asked very specifically by the hon. Member for Little Bow a year ago — in fact it was on June 26, 1979. During the estimates at that time, the hon. member said he'd be very interested to know what priorities the minister had established for change in the department. He went on to indicate the reason for this was so a proper evaluation could take place over a period of time. At the time I thought it was a very good and fair question. My response was to list several items, but coming down to a

single denominator, that of prevention. Programs aimed at prevention.

During the estimates I'm going to be very pleased to get into some of the things we're doing in the area of prevention; for example, the review of preventive social services, the work we're doing on health legislation with the local health units and the two boards of health, the work we're doing with the provincial advisory board on mental health and the various regional boards, and the review of their role, mandate, and functions — all looking at the area of prevention, what we can do to prevent problems from developing. It's an exciting challenge, and I look forward to it.

So from my point of view we are moving very dramatically. I'll continue the thrust started by my predecessors in moving from merely custodial care, through rehabilitation to prevention.

In terms of the central control question which was raised, during the many votes of the department we will see that yes, there are a few additional staff increases, but that much of the money is on a contracted basis with a private group, with a non-profit society or organization, so that they in turn can provide the service in the home community.

Some general concerns were mentioned with regard to the Metis settlements, and I'll be pleased to go into those in detail in Vote 4. There are some very exciting things happening with the Metis people in this province. No, I'm not totally satisfied that we're moving as fast as we might, and there are reasons for that. But a number of extremely positive aspects are taking place.

The area of child care in general is one which was raised by some of the hon. members in the Assembly and specifically Dr. Thomson's report. We as a government have initiated two major thrusts in this area. First, and long before the incident at Peace River became known, a decision was made by government caucus to move with a social care facilities review committee so that a group of citizens on a committee would act to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health in a way similar to the health care services review committee, very adequately chaired by one of our colleagues the hon. Catherine Chichak, with the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. There would be a system of direct reporting to the minister — to the minister — so that information which is pertinent to standards, to quality of care, to concerns in general is reported in that way. Not through the department, but to the minister.

More important, following the very dynamic and progressive step taken by our government in the early 1970s, the establishment of the Cavanagh Board of Review following the example of the Kirby Board of Review so that we can closely examine, through three Albertans who are well known, have a solid reputation, and certainly have the interest — so that they may delve into the matters involved in the care of children, looking specifically at The Child Welfare Act and The Social Care Facilities Licensing Act, looking very specifically at what other jurisdictions are doing, what we can learn from our neighboring provinces, looking at foster homes in the province, and a multitude of other specific responsibilities, and to ensure that in no way the Cavanagh Board of Review might feel hampered or restrained in its ability to seek out information which the board feels is important. In the ninth condition, we've indicated any "such other matters that the commissioners consider relevant in order to ensure a full and fair review and to enable it to make a report and ... recommendations ..." and so on. Very

important, I think, in terms of our commitment, our feelings as a government in this particular area.

Before we do get into the specifics of Vote 3, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview may wish to refer to *Hansard* of March 21, 1980. It could be that the hon. member was not in his seat during the entire question period, when I did answer some of the specific questions he has again raised today but will be pleased to go through those again at the appropriate time.

The Leader of the Opposition has raised the question of ministerial responsibility, and I will attempt to give in a nutshell my feelings as to exactly what ministerial responsibility means. I will recall the questions asked in this Assembly by the hon. Member for Little Bow as to ministerial responsibility. I said yes — and it's in *Hansard* last June — yes, the minister of a department is ultimately responsible for the actions within that department. The difference between policy and administration must be very clear to all members of this Assembly. In a department such as ours, where we have 8,000 public servants and a contractual arrangement with many hundreds in addition to that, there is a difference between policy and administration.

And yes, I stood in my place yesterday and was very proud to announce some basic changes to day care. I was even prouder today to stand and talk about some of the things that we as a government are doing to help some very deserving Albertans, to help senior citizens most in need, to help severely handicapped Albertans. Yes, I am proud of that. I'm equally proud that the decisions on all three examples I've used were made in our government caucus. Those are policy decisions, and they reflect a view of this party and this government.

In terms of how we communicate within a department, that's a challenge for any minister in any jurisdiction regardless of political affiliation. It's an exciting challenge here because of the number of public servants and the many, many thousands of dedicated people we have.

I had an exciting experience Wednesday of last week when, for the first time — and some may criticize that this should have been done earlier — I sat down with 10 of our 42 regional directors. I was corrected by our chief deputy minister a couple of days ago. We had 41 districts; we now have 42, and one or two more are contemplated. We now have 42 districts in the province. I had an opportunity to sit down with 10 directors from a portion of the province. A very exciting dialogue took place for an hour. As the minister, as the head of the department, I expressed my feelings as to how I felt they should be communicating with MLAs, all MLAs. I shared my concerns with them about communication from the department, from the regional offices, to ensure that information is flowing back and forth.

But most important, Mr. Chairman, I tried to communicate that because we're a people department, because we deal with so many of the problems in society, very difficult decisions must be made daily by the social workers and the many, many other dedicated people in our regional offices. On any given day we have 50 referrals on child abuse. Difficult decisions must be made. The worst possible thing that could happen would be for those dedicated Albertans working in the Department of Social Services and Community Health to feel gun-shy, to stop making those tough decisions. It's imperative that we continue to do that, to be bold and aggressive, as long as the primary consideration, our most important, single concern, is the care and the safety of the client — not whether a group home parent will become angry because

a contract is being terminated and may go public, or because someone else may feel upset that they're losing something they think they should have, but to ensure that the client and the client's interests are taken care of and protected.

So basically in terms of ministerial responsibility: yes, exciting and challenging. The good times and the bad times are there. But it must be clear that if mistakes are made by professional people in the department and they belong to professional associations, then we will, as we have in the past, refer those matters to the association. If the individual does not belong to a professional association, if the mistake was one of out-and-out defiance of policy, then that individual has in fact made a career decision. If the mistake made by the individual within the department was honest, a value judgment error, and they're carrying out their duties, then that will be taken into consideration along with all other factors. It will not be a case of wielding an axe at will to try to pass the blame onto someone else. It's very important, Mr. Chairman, that we have that kind of balance in a sensitive department like Social Services and Community Health.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Mr. Minister, in your outline of ministerial responsibility, you made the distinction between policy and administration. I want to read *Hansard* carefully, and if you want to read *Hansard* or make any adjustment to what you said today, I would urge you to please do so Friday. But, Mr. Minister, I took from what you said that, yes, the minister is responsible for policy decisions. Mr. Minister, where is the responsibility for the day to day administrative operation of the department?

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm prompted to make a few remarks in view of the comments by opposition members. I'll try to be very brief.

Surely the most important and central point the minister has outlined and repeated, and some of the other government members have repeated, is that there should be no doubt in our minds about the excellent work the variety of workers in that department are doing; for that matter, in every department in government, but particularly in Social Services and Community Health because of the people activities that are so wide-ranging, whether it be the nurse, the counsellor, the vocational worker, the rehabilitation worker, the mental health worker, the dental hygienist, the worker with alcohol and drug problems, and so on. I'm sure I've missed many. These people have to be congratulated and complimented over and over again. If anybody has ever worked with people on a direct, front-line, day to day basis, they'll appreciate the difficulty that entails.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to raise that point and underline. If people have not worked with people and the difficult problems they have, they can't fully appreciate the type of stress and strain they're under on a day to day basis. You just can't leave at 5 o'clock, or whatever shift of 9, 10, 12, or 7 o'clock in the morning, and go home and detach yourself completely. These people have to carry some of those problems home with them, mull them over, and come back the next day or the next shift and work on them. So I want to underline that compliment, certainly from the government members' side.

Mr. Chairman, regarding the item of accountability, I'm amazed that the question is raised by the Leader of the Opposition, who has been in this House longer than

most of us. Surely he should not be able just to ask the question. Maybe he should be able to relate the answer and the response. I didn't hear a response on what he really expects the minister to do. I'm going to try to test the Legislature, if you wish, to see if this would meet that criteria. The minister is accountable for his actions. He's accountable to respond, to explain, to correct, to modify, and he's accountable to bring about policies and programs. He is also responsible to be accountable to this Legislature on a day to day basis, as we have seen. The questions asked of the minister to account for and explain the problems across this province in the various segments of his department have been explained. More than that, they've been acted on to correct, to adjust, and to modify.

But, Mr. Chairman, to ask a human being, a minister, to be responsible on a day to day basis for every action of every employee in his department — and my understanding is that there are some 7,501 permanent full-time positions and over 8,000 man-year authorizations — is an impossibility. Surely no opposition members or citizens of Alberta would expect the minister to be responsible on a day to day basis for all activities. However, if the minister directed such activity — for example, the northern regional development centre — then indeed he would be responsible to explain himself in the Legislature, to the Executive Council, and surely the action and the results would be obvious.

But, Mr. Chairman, the minister has indicated over and over again that he did not direct that kind of activity. I know he hasn't. He's talked to many of us privately. His sensitivity and hard work and willingness to correct and respond to provide programs, for example, regarding day care that he announced yesterday, and today the assured income increases for senior citizens and the handicapped — to correct those deficiencies when he hears of and is aware of them. What else can a man be expected to do as a minister? I suggest that if the Legislature asked any of us as ministers to do anything more, I wonder whether anybody in this country or land would be a minister. That would put him in a position that would make him quite inhuman.

So these are my brief remarks regarding the minister's responsibility and, as I see it, Mr. Chairman, accountability — accountable to be responsible for the activities of his department, and to explain, correct, and modify as the case may be.

Another comment, Mr. Chairman: the hon. Member for Little Bow indicated that we're going towards central control. I'm just amazed that that kind of thing could come out in this Legislature after all the decentralization activity we've been carrying out. The one example — I'm only going to use one example because we want to get on with the business of the day — is day care. Just yesterday it was announced, Mr. Chairman, that the subsidy is going to follow a child on a 100 per cent basis, and the parent can take his children to any day care centre where the subsidy applies, and it allows the children and the parents to move around freely. How much more decentralization can you get? It's not only to the municipality, it's right to the parent and the child — to allow those parents, whether they be single parents or parents that need to go to work if they so choose, and gradually get off social assistance; truly a preventive program.

Regarding the general comments of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, after all the programs that have been announced just in this session let alone any other, the suggestion that there should be a cost of living

adjustment — well, Mr. Chairman, simple mathematics. If we just simply sit down for a few minutes, any cost of living adjustment would never match all the adjustments we've carried out. We're talking about the adjustment with respect to rental assistance, assured income for senior citizens, assured income for the handicapped, handicapped support generally, and increased medical support for those in need in a variety of ways. I think that surpasses the cost of living adjustment by far. So, you see, Mr. Chairman, what I'm trying to say is that the cost of living adjustment would not be adequate. It has to be better than that, and we're doing it better than that.

Then I heard from one of the other opposition members — I've forgotten which one, and I wish I could cite him for that comment. He said that there are increased problems due to the economy and boom. Well, boy, are there ever. The hon. minister knows that. This is why the humming activity of people programs across this province. We are all aware of that. Surely, the member could not be serious that the government is not advocating programs for the needy. If he is, Mr. Chairman, then his interpretation must be convoluted in the most extreme way, because I can't see it. When we just list them very briefly: the senior citizens' support, the handicapped support, the social assistance support, the aids to daily living. What about no medical premiums for senior citizens and those in a lower income group? Have we forgotten already? How about the effort for people programs, to de-institutionalize them from mental facilities and bring them back to the community? How about the group homes for handicapped, to bring them back to the community? Of course, that isn't decentralization, that's centralization, I suppose the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview would say. Well, I think that's decentralization in the ultimate degree, right back where the individual and family live, where the parents and relatives can see those children who are handicapped. I heard nobody mention The Dependent Adults Act, a model legislation across Canada, where in fact we've provided guardianship for those in need over the age of 18.

These are my comments, Mr. Chairman. I thank you very much.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with the question of ministerial responsibility. But before getting into that, the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway made some observations about the assured income. What I think is important, hon. member, is not that we have a government that plays Santa Claus every five years, but that we have some kind of systematic adjustment of the assured income. [interjections] Oh well, the oohing and aahing over there. The fact of the matter is that Conservative members in the federal House, to their credit, have recognized that the guaranteed income supplement should be adjusted to the cost of living, and that's a sensible way of doing it. It seems to me that if we're going to move ahead — and I applaud the increase today; I indicated that — but surely we're going to have some method of adjusting the assured income program so that as the cost of living goes up, the real purchasing power of that \$75 doesn't go down. To have to wait for five years for any major increase . . . I remember this Legislature in 1975 approved the assured income program. For us to have to wait without periodic adjustments, whether it's done on a quarterly basis as I believe the guaranteed income supplement is, or on a yearly basis as we normally do with workers' compensation — with the exception of last year, when it was for a year and a half — or

whatever, there should be some method to adjust periodically pensions such as the assured income.

Now, I want to deal with this question of ministerial responsibility. There's no doubt on any part of the government members here that ministerial accountability means that the minister can stand up and take credit for the successes. Everybody's agreed on that, so there's no question. The Leader of the Opposition agrees on that; I agree on that; the minister agrees on that; the chorus back there agrees on that. So we're all very happy that when it comes to a good announcement, when it comes to announcing sunshine and roses, the minister can be the good news bearer.

The question then relates to what happens when things go wrong, as from time to time they do in this rather complicated world of ours. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there are probably four major areas where ministerial responsibility must apply. The first is if something goes wrong as a result of budgetary defects, because it is the responsibility of Executive Council, through the minister, to make proposals to the Legislature with respect to budget. If problems arise as a consequence of budgetary decisions, the minister must accept responsibility for that. Let me give an example: the young ladies who were out on the doorstep with respect to the Miranda Phipps tragedy. It would not be fair to lay the individual decision of a social worker at the minister's doorstep. On that score, I would say that the minister cannot be responsible. But if as a result of budgetary problems, social workers have too big a caseload and are not able to undertake their professional duties to the best advantage of their training, then that is something that can be laid at the doorstep of the minister.

Let me give you another example: the question of every conceivable problem arising in every conceivable contract situation in the province is perhaps not something you can dump at the doorstep of the minister. But if there is a budgetary problem — in the case of the northern regional treatment centre, a clerical error lead to problems at that centre. The inability of the department to deal flexibly enough with that clerical error, in my view, is something that can be laid at the doorstep of the minister. So the minister must accept full responsibility for any of the deficiencies of government budgetary policies as they apply to his department.

The second area, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, is that the minister must accept full responsibility for any policy defects. The minister was very happy to announce in the Legislature the day care policy. All the members of the government could bang their desks in approval. To the extent that there are problems and deficiencies with that policy, the minister must accept full responsibility. Those problems will, no doubt, arise.

Relating it back to both Westfield and the northern regional treatment centre, the fact that we had not developed clear-cut guidelines — we are now. We applaud the fact that the Cavanagh board of inquiry has been appointed, but that was not as a result of the minister bounding back from Taber and saying, you know, we're going to appoint the board of review. His first response was to say no review was necessary. Finally, public opinion built up the case for the board of review. But that doesn't alter the fact, Mr. Chairman, that as a result of no clear-cut guideline being in place, we had the problems developing over the reasonable limits on behavior modification. The minister must accept responsibility for deficiencies in policy. If those deficiencies lead to problems,

those problems must quite properly be laid at the doorstep of the minister if our system is going to mean anything at all.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to budgetary decisions and policy defects, the minister must be ultimately responsible for any problems that result as a consequence of failure in the communications within the department. If deficiencies in the method of communicating are evident, the minister must accept responsibility. In dealing with the questions I raised, the minister said they're all answered in the March 21 *Hansard*. I can assure the minister that before we get through the estimates, they will be answered in somewhat more detail. In my view they were not answered fully at all on March 21. We'll take whatever time is required to explore fully the nuances of those answers. So the minister has to accept responsibility for any deficiency in communications.

One other area is perhaps a little less clear, but is pretty fundamental. If actions take place in a department which go beyond the accepted norms of a community — and I realize this is difficult to define — and are clearly outrageous decisions, then it seems to me that it isn't good enough to say, that's just a professional problem; we'll let the professionals look after that. The minister must ultimately accept responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the political science lecture we had from the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway. Might I suggest to him, with great respect, that his learning in this area might be somewhat improved. I don't think his observations defining ministerial responsibility will go down as a be-all and end-all.

Mr. Chairman, the question of who accepts responsibility not for every decision of every single one of the 7,500 employees, but for the problems that are created as much as anything by defects in budgeting, policy, and communications, as well as decisions that clearly challenge the public concept of right and wrong . . . If our system is to mean anything, Mr. Minister, if it isn't just to be play-acting here but really mean responsible government in its largest sense, then the minister has to accept the flak that comes his way. He has to be prepared not only to answer but to accept the bottom line, which is that the buck is on the minister's desk.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, in response to the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition about day to day operations in a department, I suppose the best way to answer is to ask the hon. member to go back some 10 years to when he was Minister of Education, go back to a situation west of Edmonton when a school floor collapsed. I well recall, from speaking with an individual who was directly involved, that the hon. member who was then Minister of Education went out and visited the school and spoke with officials. It was quite clear, at least to this one individual, that the minister had not received all the information as to the background situation. The individual went on to say that he didn't necessarily feel that the minister should resign because of that; no. But he did accept as ministerial responsibility the minister's overall concern for policy, and he worked on that issue. I recall, and I'm sure the hon. member will recall, that particular incident.

Going over the list of four points from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, any one of which might cause a minister to resign. I will be interested to discuss them with my hon. colleague the Minister responsible for health and social services in Saskatchewan. Under these criteria, I can think of at least one category

where the hon. member's party colleague would resign, and that's in terms of budgetary restraints.

MR. NOTLEY: Fair enough.

MR. BOGLE: Saskatchewan does not have an assured income for the severely handicapped program. So under that criterion, I suppose he should resign. I'm not sure. Maybe the hon. member wishes to write a thesis on the whole matter.

Going through budget reviews and how many staff are required. I guess the question could be asked of my colleague the Minister of Education: what's the proper ratios in the schools? You could ask 10 people and get 10 different views. Or in hospitals: how many nurses do we need per patient? The whole list of things — value judgments. That's one of the reasons we discussed it in this Assembly. [interjections] I'll let the hon. member comment in due course.

Going on to communication, that somehow the minister is responsible for all communication within the department. I outlined an example of direct communication. I think it was a very positive step. I know some of my colleagues do it; others are contemplating it. I think that's good. But to suggest that if there is an error in communicating something from a regional office to the office in Edmonton, it is the minister's responsibility ... The policy of how the communication takes place, Mr. Chairman, is very important. The actual communication? An administrative matter. That's why I've got competent people.

The last point is a catchall. If you can't get them on any of the other three, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is going to catch them on the last point, which is a real hodge-podge of things. Not only is the minister responsible for each and every action taken by the many officials in the department ...

DR. BUCK: Don't worry, Bob. Nobody gets fired by the government

MR. BOGLE: That's the way it operates.

Very clearly, Mr. Chairman, we go back to the basic point on ministerial responsibility, from my point of view: separation between policy and administrative matters. We work closely with the people within our departments on administrative matters, constantly reviewing and updating. The same sense with the government caucus in terms of policy issues, reviewing and updating as those needs occur. That's the process.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, despite the presumed fairness of being able to continue the responses back and forth, I think the committee should rise, report progress, and ask 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 progress thereon, and asks leave to sit again.

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, I believe I indicated earlier to hon. members that it's not proposed to sit tomorrow night. The business for Friday would be continuation of Committee of Supply with the same department.

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

