

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, May 7, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **PRESENTING PETITIONS**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition to the hon. members of the Legislature from 861 petitioners in the Berwyn and Grimshaw districts of Alberta requesting that the government of Alberta review its decision concerning the relocation of the Berwyn hospital from Berwyn to Grimshaw.

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 that Standing Order 77 be waived to permit the following Bills to be introduced in the Assembly but not considered by the Private Bills Committee until the fall sitting: Bill Pr. 4, The Keith Dial Adoption Termination Act; Bill Pr. 5, The Alberta Foundation Act; and Bill Pr. 7, The Warren Dean Boyd Adoption Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly wish to deal with the report now? No objection? Does the Assembly agree with the report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 50**  
**The Mines and Minerals**  
**Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, The Mines and Minerals Amendment Act, 1980. The purpose of this Bill is to bring about an important policy change to provide that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may, if they consider it in the public interest to do so, fix the maximum amount of petroleum production from Crown agreements or Crown leases for any month specified in the regulation.

[Leave granted: Bill 50 read a first time]

**Bill 224**  
**The Solar Energy Development Act**

**Bill 228**  
**An Act Establishing**  
**the Right to Sunlight**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce two Bills that represent companion pieces of legislation: Bill 224, The Solar Energy Development Act, and Bill 228, An Act Establishing the Right to Sunlight. Both Bills are designed to underline the importance of moving in the area of alternative energy, particularly solar energy.

[Leave granted; Bills 224 and 228 read a first time]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, today I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, 80 students and 30 adults who, after rigorous debating competitions in their home provinces and territories, are in Alberta this week competing in a national seminar. The theme of debating sessions throughout the week focuses on energy and natural resources, a very topical subject. Just this morning the association held its own model parliament, so I do hope its time here today will provide further insights into parliamentary procedure.

Mr. Speaker, before asking the group to rise, I would like to give special recognition to Wayne Tingley, conference chairman, and his very hard-working committee for the tremendous organizational efforts that have gone into this seminar. I would now ask all the delegates to rise and receive the very warm welcome of the House.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Fuel Oil Supply**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Transportation. It flows from concerns reaching our office concerning a shortage of diesel for the transportation industry in the province. What discussions have taken place between the minister and representatives of the trucking industry in the province of Alberta? Has the minister been able to give any assurance to the industry that there will be sufficient fuel to meet legitimate Alberta needs?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, while we've had very minor discussion with the contractors, I think the question would more properly be handled by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, we in the department have been monitoring for some time the question of product supply for the province of Alberta. My last review of reports on that indicated that while the supply situation was difficult, barring some unexpected developments we anticipate there will be an adequate supply.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. In the course of the monitoring the minister's department has been doing, has it been brought to the minister's attention that several — and I

say several rather than many, although I suspect it's many — bulk agent dealers in rural Alberta have been advised by their suppliers that in fact they are not able to take on new bulk customers unless they get approval from their supplier, because of the shortage of fuel?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure there are difficulties of that nature which may well arise from a particular supplier's refining capacity or access to refined products. In my earlier answer, I was really responding to an overall provincial situation as opposed to individual supplier problems.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Has the monitoring which the minister's department is doing indicated that by the latter part of this year, or certainly the early part of next year, Alberta may have as much as a 4 per cent shortfall in the overall gasoline, diesel, and fuel products needed for the province?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of projections one could use with respect to product supply and demand. I guess the particular projection that one's judgment indicates is most likely to come about will determine whether one reaches the conclusion that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has reached. I don't know that I can expand on my earlier answer, which was to the effect that from the monitoring we have been doing, our conclusion is that while there undoubtedly will be tightness in the supply situation, we feel that barring some unexpected events or an untoward rise in demand, we will be able to meet the supply requirements.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Has it been brought to the department's attention in the course of the monitoring that some retail gasoline outlets in the province are now considering staying open for a shorter period of time during their business days than they have in the past because of a lack of product supply, and that some companies are already taking steps to prepare for that in late summer and early fall?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall any reports indicating that particular retail gasoline outlets, which was what I understand the question to have referred to, are contemplating shorter business hours. But the monitoring to which I referred was more at the refinery level, as opposed to the particular retail outlet level.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. In the course of the monitoring which the government has going on in this area, has any specific monitoring taken place with regard to the agricultural industry and the impacts there? I raise the question because of dealers, not only in my own riding but in other ridings, who have been told they can't take on new customers. Is there any monitoring at that level, as opposed to simply overall refinery capacity?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, the monitoring was not at the retail outlet level; it was at the refinery capacity and refinery output level. It would, of course, involve monitoring of the diesel required by the agricultural community.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the hon. minister aware if any international flights are stop-

ping at the Calgary or Edmonton international airport and refueling there, then going on from Calgary or Edmonton, in a manner which would be taking on additional fuel to what's been the standard practice for a number of years in the province?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I don't have any specific information on that. But certainly that really touches on the larger question of the significantly lower product and oil costs in Canada than those which currently exist in the United States. I'm sure that all across Canada, throughout the Canadian border, there is some flow of product from Canada into the United States, simply because United States consumers are finding they can buy it in Canada significantly cheaper than in the United States.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Followed by a supplementary by the hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods, then a further supplementary by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question to the minister. What steps has the Alberta government taken to assist in the enlarging of the refining capacity in the province? I raise the question in light of the fact that from the research we've been able to do, the problem seems to zero in on the refinery capacity in the province. What steps has the government taken there, and what companies are next in line to get approval as far as either increased or new refinery capacity in Alberta?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked that question, because we have of course taken steps to encourage the industry to increase its refining capacity in Alberta. Currently, a number of applications are either actually before the Energy Resources Conservation Board or on their way there. But I would be hesitant to identify in the Assembly all the companies which may be considering expanding their refining capacity or indeed putting in Alberta refining capacity . . .

DR. BUCK: Shell in Fort Saskatchewan.

MR. LEITCH: . . . until those intentions are made public by the companies, either by way of application to the Energy Resources Conservation Board or otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. PAHL: The hon. Leader of the Opposition asked my first supplementary. The second supplementary would be to either the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources or the Minister of Economic Development. Is there anticipated or will there be in place a program to monitor the so-called leakage of refined product from the province? If there is that program, or a measure of understanding of that rate of leakage of refined product, could either minister suggest what the prescription would be to solve that leakage problem?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, we do not have a program in the Department of Energy and Natural Resources to determine the movement of product out of Alberta into the United States, which the hon. member has referred to

as "leakage" in his question. I think the reason for not having such a program is in part tied to the second part of his question which was; how do you cure the problem? I think you cure the problem by getting the price up to where it's comparable to what it is in the United States. Some months ago we thought that might have occurred relatively imminently, Events over which we had no control ensured that that didn't happen. We will now have to wait a little while to see what might happen in the future.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to either the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has the minister received any information about foreign air lines which are refueling at Mirabel Airport, and does that concern gas produced in Alberta?

MR. NOTLEY: Then we can go to all the other airports.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I have not received any information on that aspect, except what one may hear through various media sources as to whether the gasoline or other fuel taken on board those aircraft at Mirabel comes from Alberta oil. I'm not certain, but since appreciable amounts of Alberta oil go to the Montreal area, I would think the chances are very high that it does.

#### **Gaming Regulations**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Attorney General. It's with regard to the report of the Citizens Advisory Committee on Gaming. Has the Attorney General received the final report?

MR. CRAWFORD: I believe it's the final report, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. CLARK: Will that supposedly final report be tabled in the Assembly?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, no consideration has been given to that yet. A report was provided to me a matter of a very few days ago. In answering the hon. leader in the way I first did, I suppose it's possible there could be a subsequent document of some sort; I'm just not sure. But this is the report we have been waiting some months for. My guess is that it would be handled in the same way as the First report.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then to the Attorney General, dealing with the question of the report's being tabled in the Assembly. I take it from that answer that the government is not prepared to table the report in the Assembly?

MR. CRAWFORD: I didn't express the matter in exactly the same way the hon. leader did. Maybe we could just say that it is under consideration. But I see no reason to treat it differently than the first report in the same series.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. What timetable has the government now worked out for dealing with the recommendations, either implementing certain recommendations or rejecting other recommendations? What timetable is the government looking at? And in light of the report's not being tabled in the House, when can we expect a rather definitive breakdown on the

recommendations to be implemented and those not to be implemented?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is an important question and, of course, requires a great deal of consideration. The only answer I can give at the present time, though, is that as soon as caucus time is available, in order that the relatively extensive and complex recommendations in the total areas of both the reports now before us — as soon as those can be considered in the way they should be, we would move as quickly as possible to the new policies and statements or copies of regulations or the like, which I know people are anxiously waiting for. It may be possible that something can be added to the ability to do that early rather than late, by implementing obvious portions that can be implemented without reference to other interrelated items.

But to try to pin down an actual timetable would be very difficult. I would prefer to look at the most recent report a little longer before trying to make that estimate for the hon. leader.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the government at this time giving consideration to establishing an Alberta gaming commission, or perhaps to rephrase that, going the route of setting up a commission which would look after and be responsible for gaming in the province? I draw the comparison to either the Racing Commission or the Liquor Control Board. Is the government considering that as a serious option at this time?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the possibility of establishing a commission is one of the items being considered. Precisely what its structure or terms of reference would be — I think one could speculate that it would of course be very closely tied to the type of activity going on at the present time and, if one is created, would be a body that fulfils a continuing policy recommendation role, as well as perhaps a regulatory one. However, I say again that no decision has been made on that. I believe the matter has been discussed publicly before, in those terms. It's one of the things under consideration. If I didn't say it before, whether that would be a part-time or full-time agency is not resolved.

#### **Municipal Finances**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question was for the Minister of Environment, but I'd like to direct it to the Provincial Treasurer. It's with regard to the municipal water program in the province of Alberta. At present, the Department of Environment is broke and is unable to meet some of its commitments with regard to financing some of the water projects. Towns have let contracts, motors are running, and construction is ready to begin, but money is not available. I wonder if the Provincial Treasurer has examined this program and is ready to take some quick steps to make the money available?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hesitate to endorse the original assumption of the hon. gentleman, which I think is wrong. However, I certainly will look into the matter and take whatever steps are necessary.

DR. BUCK: How's the cash, Lou?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Would the minister make a commitment that either through a

special warrant — and this is asked in a very serious vein, because the matter is serious; nine or 10 communities are at this stage and can't proceed. Would the minister consider the action of a special warrant, or bringing necessary supplementary estimates into this Legislature to take care of the issue, this week if possible?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I could make that kind of commitment, but I certainly will look into the matter and will deal with it appropriately and with all due dispatch.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the Provincial Treasurer report back to the Assembly tomorrow with a plan to take care of the issue at hand?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, either I or another minister will report back to the Assembly at an early, appropriate time.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the Provincial Treasurer indicate why not tomorrow? Why not? You know, if you're going to your job fast and look after your responsibility, why not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

DR. BUCK: It takes a long time to count the cash.

MR. HYNDMAN: This is one of the major programs of wide benefit to the province, so we'd certainly want to make sure all the facts are available.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if it's so important, why are we short of funds today?

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, with regard to the Local Authorities Board borrowing. These very same municipalities are unable to complete their loans or borrow . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the hon. member continues, I'll have to call a vote on this question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we need a vote.

To the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Would the minister check with the Local Authorities Board, which is the minister's responsibility, to look at possible ways that the municipalities that are of concern are able to arrange for interim financing in a short period of time? They can within three weeks to a month. Would the minister check to see that quick financing can be made available to these communities through that agency?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Local Authorities Board advised me this morning that the board has handled 802 applications for municipal financing during the last 12 months. Applications are then forwarded to the Municipal Financing Corporation, where money is now being loaned at the rate of 9 per cent. The normal course of action is that about 98 or 99 per cent of those applications flow through the board without any reference to my office. However, there are occasions when municipalities have problems. Many of those occasions result in contacts with MLAs who advise me of the details, and I'm only too happy to follow up.

But, Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to ask the Local Authorities Board to hunt through all the applications that may be around to see if some have been delayed longer than others. If the member would provide me with the details of the communities he's aware of that have applications before the Local Authorities Board, I'd be only too happy to look into it with all dispatch.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister's answer. I want to make it clear to the minister: there was an inference that I was criticizing the Local Authorities Board; I'm not. They are doing an excellent job.

Mr. Speaker, to the minister. My question — and it's partly a statement, I guess — is that the Local Authorities Board needs a signed agreement between the Department of Environment and the local community before allowing for interim financing. Would the minister just check to see whether other types of arrangements could be made in this period of time that wouldn't require that interim, formal agreement between the Department of Environment and the local authority?

MR. MOORE: I can check on that, Mr. Speaker, but I still would be pleased if I had an example of some of the towns involved in this type of problem, so it would be easier for me to track it down.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the minister has my commitment. I will give him names of towns.

#### Impaired Drivers

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Solicitor General, with respect to the matter of persons who lose their driving privileges as a result of liquor-related offences, and whose livelihoods are based upon being able to drive and are thereby placed in jeopardy. The question specifically is: can the minister advise the Assembly whether he is giving active consideration to a dual driver's licence system, whereby someone whose livelihood is based on their driving a vehicle will not be placed in a situation of double jeopardy, but would be able to continue to drive a vehicle during the period of a licence suspension, for the purposes of their employment only?

DR. BUCK: Maybe they should quit drinking.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, there is no present intention to make any change in the legislation that applies to that circumstance. I know it has been an area of a great deal of public discussion. I'm sure the hon. member and others who are interested in that idea will, in due course, present me with suggestions in that regard.

#### Forest Fires

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It's a follow-up to questions I posed to the minister on May 5 with respect to forest firefighters in Alberta. Is the minister able to confirm to the Assembly that present wage rates for firefighters in Alberta are \$3.95 an hour, with no provision for overtime?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, without checking, I couldn't confirm the particular numbers for wage rates. I can confirm to the House that the matter was reviewed a few

weeks ago. On that occasion an increase of some 8 per cent was provided, as I recall.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I've received no inquiries or questions about the wage levels. I recall the hon. member's questions of some time ago implying that there may have been a shortage of personnel because of wage levels. I've nothing to support that view. I think I can advise the Assembly that one of the difficulties we've had in coming up to complement this season is that the fire season hit us much earlier than normal. In the past we have recruited personnel for firefighting from such institutions as NAIT and SAIT, and secondary educational institutions, which of course have not yet completed their studies and students aren't available.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could also respond to two questions the hon. member asked me earlier. One was about the arrangements we have with other provinces with respect to firefighting. We really have two arrangements: one by way of formal agreement, which we have with the adjoining provinces, the state of Montana, and the federal government with respect to the Northwest Territories. We also have informal arrangements whereby all the governments co-operate to try and bring to bear the maximum number of personnel and equipment on any particular fire. In short, there's a sharing of the firefighting resource among those governments whenever it's practical and possible to do so.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the other question I was not able to give full details on when it was asked related to the use of seconded persons or inexperienced firefighting personnel. Our general practice is to have those persons work behind the fire lines. They really free up experienced firefighting personnel, who then move to the fire scenes. In the question to which I am now responding, the hon. member referred to an unfortunate incident in Ontario where inexperienced people called in to fight a fire were themselves caught in the fire. In that respect the hon. member's information is different from mine. My information is that those persons were not commandeered or seconded to fight the fire. They had been in the forest area for other purposes, and unfortunately were caught by the fire.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The minister indicated there had been an increase of approximately 8 per cent. What assessment was made of wage rates in other provinces when the government made the decision to increase the rate from, I believe, \$3.60 to \$3.95 an hour? In particular, the rates in British Columbia, where firefighters are paid \$5.20 an hour, and that is presently ...

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member intending to make the assessment or comparison now which he's asking the minister about?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will then put the question to the hon. minister and ask specifically: was any consideration given to the \$5.20 an hour wage rate in the province of British Columbia when Alberta reviewed its wage rates?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I will try not to embellish my answer as much as the hon. member embellishes his question. I am not able to agree with the numbers he quotes. They may be accurate; I don't know. I can assure the hon. member that at the time we were considering wage levels in Alberta, we took into account all the

factors that would be relevant in determining those wage levels, which as I recall included a review of the wages paid in neighboring areas.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has there been any shift in the balance this year between certified or trained firefighters and non-certified firefighters as a consequence of the present wage policy? In fact, are we dealing with a higher percentage of non-trained people than has been the case traditionally in this province?

MR. LEITCH: We may be, Mr. Speaker; I'd have to check the numbers on that. But I would suggest to the hon. member that if we are, it may well have more to do — and, I would suggest, much more to do — with the fire situation than the number of personnel we've recruited, rather than the reason he has assigned.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has any review been given by the government to the question of recreation facilities in forest staging camps, particularly the one in Lac La Biche? People do have to stay there for up to two weeks. In view of the general practice of the oil industry to have recreation facilities in their staging camps, what consideration has been given by the forestry people to this issue?

MR. LEITCH: I'll check into that, Mr. Speaker, and respond to the House later on.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Labour. Given the decision by the government two years ago to turn down a request by the Metis Association of Alberta for some form of union to represent firefighters, has the government considered any other method that might be developed to allow some form of bargaining with respect to wages and conditions by the certified, trained firefighters?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, subsequent to that decision the matter has not again been raised with the government.

#### **Hazardous Materials — Transport**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Transportation. It has to do with the transportation of hazardous chemicals by rail. Can the minister indicate what input his department has had into the presentation of the federal government's Bill C-18?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, in previous months we have been working not on Bill C-18 but on C-25, as it was known then. I can't add anything new, except to say that we are specifically zeroing in on the movement of hazardous goods by truck rather than by rail. Perhaps it would be useful for the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who is responsible for Disaster Services, to comment; or perhaps the Minister of Economic Development, who has more to do with the rail end of it than we do.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the hon. Minister of Economic Development or the Minister of Municipal Affairs indicate the government's position as to its input into the proposed federal Bill on the movement of hazar-

dous chemicals by rail? What input has the provincial government had?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the director of Disaster Services, Mr. Ernie Tyler, has been involved quite extensively in discussions with federal Transport officials and with other provinces with respect to not only the Bill which may be shortly before the House of Commons, but also the regulations which might flow from that legislation respecting the movement of hazardous products. I can only say there's been a lot of contact. As to specifics in terms of whether we agree totally: I know we have some concerns about certain aspects of the proposed legislation and regulations, but I would have to do some checking, and perhaps get further information from the member as to what particular aspect of that legislation — which is very broad — he is concerned about.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Transportation or the minister responsible for Disaster Services. Can either hon. gentleman indicate the present policy of this government regarding the inspection standards for rail cars travelling through the high density urban areas in this province?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, once again, the standards with respect to the movement of hazardous goods by rail will be contained in the federal legislation and the regulations attached to it. The Minister of Transportation may want to elaborate, but I'm not aware of the present provincial standards, if any, in Alberta — or any other province for that matter — with respect to the movement of hazardous materials by rail.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Transportation, from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who is responsible for Disaster Services: can the Minister of Transportation indicate to this Legislature if there is or is not any inspection procedure in place in this province at this time?

MR. KROEGER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the comment I'd like to make now with regard to the Bill on the movement of hazardous goods: I had a discussion with the federal Minister of Transport in which I was not going into specifics of how the system should work, but rather the need for moving a Bill through as rapidly as possible. At the moment, I wouldn't be able to go into detail on the question of how the inspection works, specifically for railways. The Minister of Economic Development might want to supplement the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, nobody has answered any question yet.

MR. NOTLEY: It's an administrative matter; nobody knows.

DR. BUCK: So I'll keep asking until they answer the question. The question ...

MR. SPEAKER: Hardly. The hon. member is aware that questions are ordinarily asked once. There's no ...

DR. BUCK: Well, then I expect it to be answered, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member's expectations are not part of the rules of the question period.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I want to know explicitly: is there any agency of government in this province responsible for the inspection of rail cars that are moving hazardous chemicals? Is there or is there not, Mr. Speaker?

MR. NOTLEY: Walt, that's an administrative matter. That's not their responsibility.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that under advisement and let the hon. member know.

MR. R. CLARK: Nobody's responsible.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. Can the minister indicate if that minister's department has any inspection service in place to protect the safety of workers in the yards who are assembling cars carrying hazardous chemicals?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member. My colleague has taken that question as notice. As to the effect, or any concern of workers in Alberta: yes, the occupational health and safety division inspectors are always available any time there's a concern about the safety of Alberta workers.

DR. BUCK: They're not doing anything.

#### **Calgary Olympic Bid**

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Recreation and Parks. In view of the minister's past verbal commitments to support Calgary's 1988 Olympic bid, would the minister please indicate if, in conversation with the Calgary Olympic development commission, they've discussed how their plans will change or their course of action may be altered due to the statement by the Canadian government that they will boycott the Moscow Olympics?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, in my brief meeting with the Calgary group yesterday, that subject was not discussed. But I noticed in conversation that their spirits were high, and they were proceeding on schedule with their bid.

#### **Trades Training Facility**

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It follows up a question I asked earlier in the spring sitting of this session. I wonder if the minister has now selected a site for the new Edmonton and region trades training centre that I understand will train some 3,000 students annually for our expanding and buoyant economy.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, as members are aware, a special committee has been established, headed by the former vice-president of the Northern Alberta Institute of

Technology, to review all aspects of that particular institution, including the location. As yet, no recommendation has come forward.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would also indicate to the House whether he has had representation from Edmonton council, as he has had from me, to locate that centre in Edmonton or, minimally, in Edmonton and region.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, no representations from the city of Edmonton have yet been received by me that I am aware of. In any event, when the institution is located, it will not be in the city of Edmonton.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, that's new information. I thought the minister was still open on that question. I hope that maybe the committee is.

DR. BUCK: Don't you discuss these in caucus, Ken?

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, another supplementary to the minister. I wonder if the minister is considering, in his policy directive, accelerating the completion of this trades training centre, in view of the fact that so many tradespeople are needed in the very immediate future.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the program is expected to be completed at the earliest possible date. I indicated when I made the ministerial statement on capital allocations that it was a very high priority, in recognition of the need to train highly skilled workers. For clarification, I indicated that it would be located in the Edmonton region, but not within the corporate limits of the city of Edmonton as they now exist.

DR. PAPROSKI: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. A final, final supplementary. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House again whether he would consider accelerating it to earlier than the three- or four-year time frame he indicated before, in view of the immediate need for tradesmen in our society, with the expanding economy.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the institution will be built and on stream as quickly as possible. Every effort will be made, as was indicated in the budget and in my ministerial statement, to give this new facility a very high priority in the next few years. If it can be built sooner, all the better. But a realistic time frame for planning and programming of that institution has to be kept in mind as well.

### Hog Marketing

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate today whether any special information has been requested of the Foster committee, with regard to the hog policy in the province of Alberta and its reflection on a short-term policy to look at some of the problems we're having at the present time?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, if I gather the intent of the question, in the meetings the Foster [committee] has held throughout the province, I'm sure it has received submissions from individuals and groups with regard to

their views on conditions in the hog industry today. I'm sure they have given some suggestions to the committee with regard to some of the solutions, as they see it, in the short term and indeed the long term. I had an opportunity for just a moment to discuss some of the submissions to date, and that is indeed true. There are many and varied suggestions as to how to solve both short term and long term.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I wonder what effect the present circumstances would have on the timing of a new policy, when we recognize that the difference between the Toronto and Edmonton markets has been as high as \$10 to \$11 as of today. How does that influence the decision of the minister?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the timing of the Foster report with its recommendations to me is not a factor in establishing the deadline for a review, a report on whether it be a short-term problem, and the move to succeed in accepting and solving the short-term problem that exists. But I'd point out to you that I believe the spread Toronto price and indeed the price in the province today has reached, I suppose, a record level.

The discussions I had this morning with, first, the board itself, with some suggestions as to trying to decipher the differential between the two have left, I suppose, not much of an answer other than that the packers feel they are now in a hog war in Toronto. The number of buyers, of course, available for bidding in Toronto certainly exceeds the number here in the province. So at the present time, until I have an opportunity to discuss further with two of the major packers in Toronto, I have no answers as to the large discrepancy. Of course, that discrepancy is as large with the Winnipeg market, and indeed with the United States as well. So it's being established as a singular market, and sits out there rather outstanding.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate what criteria he is looking at to use in the determination of a short-term or long-term type of policy?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, as I stated before, the suggestions have been many and varied. They cover the total aspect from shared insurance programs, to straight-out and outright grants, to interest-free money, to dozens of combinations.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The minister indicated there was a price war in Toronto, a war that is basically being fought with producers' money from western Canada, in my view. To the hon. minister: as a result of this disparity, what specific instructions have gone to the Foster committee in the last several days to consider interim recommendations that might assist the minister in coming to a conclusion on a short-term policy? Has any instruction gone to the chairman of the review committee?

MR. SCHMIDT: No, Mr. Speaker. The independent review committee have the terms of reference under which they are to carry out their review, and there have been no changes.

### Beef Marketing

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. When the minister met with Eugene Whelan, the federal Minister of Agriculture, was there any discussion with regard to exporting more of our beef to foreign countries?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the subject of beef was touched on slightly. Because of the meeting and the time element, many areas were just touched on and mentioned. On behalf of producers here, we pointed out the problem that exists with our own producers with regard to the effects the open import of beef from other countries can have on the industry, and suggested that perhaps a program of import restriction would have to be considered if we were to safeguard our own industry within this province and within Canada.

### Hog Marketing (continued)

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the fact that our friend the chairman of the committee is struggling along on \$1,000 a day, can the minister indicate if he has now set any deadline as to when he wants the Foster committee to report to the minister? Or is it going to be — you know, forever type of thing, at a thousand bucks a day?

MR. JOHNSTON: What's the question?

DR. BUCK: The question is, Dick: has he set a deadline?

MR. NOTLEY: Not forever, but later.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the question about a deadline has been put to the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I was waiting my turn.

DR. BUCK: The farmers have been waiting longer, Dallas.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, we have set no deadline. No deadline was established: sufficient time to hold the meetings and bring forth the recommendations in those areas that we feel are necessary. I have not changed nor have we set a time limit, but understand that we can expect a return probably early during the month of June or before, depending upon the interest that's taken and the reports that are brought in as the committee sits in Edmonton. The meetings throughout the province are now completed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. In my assessment, I'm not sure the committee will be able to come back with the answers, but the two criteria would be the farmers' financial position and the hog market industry, as such, and its part in the Canadian market at the present time. I wonder if the minister could indicate what mechanisms are in place to evaluate when the hog farmer is in a difficult

position and; when that point is reached, when the minister will be making a decision that we must come in with some type of short-term policy?

DR. BUCK: When they all go broke, Dallas.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, there's no magical formula which decides whether a farmer is in trouble, but indeed the farmers themselves are providing the type of information that would give one the opportunity to look at the industry in total. The industry in total is not tied in any move we make as to the Foster report.

MR. NOTLEY: A final supplementary question to the hon. minister. The minister indicated that the government would not necessarily wait for the Foster inquiry before moving on a short-term program, and I can certainly agree with that. It could be some time before we get the Foster report. My question to the minister is: what other mechanisms has the minister set in place, besides the Foster inquiry, to evaluate the short-term policy options that the government will be considering?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, we've had the opportunity to discuss with all the producers across the province the various methods and means which they feel would be of some support to the industry. Indeed we have the opportunity to discuss the industry itself, as represented by my colleagues, and an opportunity to review all the various submissions that have been made, both written and verbal.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my . . .

MR. SPEAKER: We've gone past the time for the question period. If the Assembly agrees, I did recognize the hon. Leader of the Opposition a moment ago.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

### Energy Resources Legislation

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I want to direct a question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. I've had an opportunity to look at the piece of legislation that was introduced today. I'd like to ask the minister if he could outline briefly to the Assembly what has convinced the Alberta government that it now needs to introduce legislation of the nature of Bill 50, which goes far beyond the existing, accepted right that the province has in fact to control production from the standpoint of conservation. My question to the minister is not on the principle of the Bill, I might say to hon. members, but to ask the minister what events have taken place that have forced the government to bring in this piece of legislation — a piece of legislation, I might say, which was not predicted in the throne speech at all.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, no specific event or set of circumstances prompted the introduction of the Bill. It simply appeared to me that there was a shortcoming or defect in our overall resource legislation.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to conservation measures now in the legislation, and that is right. But they are conservation measures administered by the Energy Resources Conservation Board and deal solely with the question of physical preservation of a resource; that is, not producing it in a way that would damage the



resource or reduce the amount which would be recoverable. But there's never been a capacity in the legislation to make a policy decision on the level of resources that should be produced at any given time.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition would be aware that with respect to petroleum the situation is different from natural gas. We do have in legislation a conservation or security of supply provision with respect to natural gas, administered by way of recommendation through the Energy Resources Conservation Board, which ensures that there is a supply of natural gas for the long-term needs of Albertans before recommending to Executive Council the authorization of exports of natural gas from the province of Alberta.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Three Hills revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MRS. OSTERMAN: Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, a class of grade 10 students. I have to explain that, fortunately, 36 of them are here; unfortunately, the remainder of the 85 who were supposed to be here are casualties of a broken down bus. So I'm afraid I can only introduce 36 of them at this time. They are from the Prairie high school, which is associated with the Prairie Bible Institute in Three Hills. They are accompanied at this moment — the people who are with them, at least, are Bernie, his two children, and wife Marlene. Bernie is the social studies teacher. They have sort of taken the liberty, I think, of ferreting their two children away from classes today. They would have been accompanied by two counsellors, Steve Winkler and Grace Detweiler.

I would like all the students to rise, please, and receive the cordial recognition of the House.

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

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

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

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

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I believe the Minister of Social Services and Community Health would like to make a statement before we continue with 7.4.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday in responding to a question in the Assembly by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I indicated that the Premier had met, along with me and the Minister responsible for Native Affairs, with the president and executive

of the Federation of Metis Settlements. That information is not accurate.

A telephone conversation did take place between the president of the association and the Premier of our province. A meeting followed, attended by my colleague the Minister responsible for Native Affairs, members of the Federation of Metis Settlements, and me. The latter part of the information I provided yesterday, though, is accurate: we do see that meeting taking place through the normal caucus committee approach sometime in the foreseeable future.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify an item which arose in Vote 5. The hon. Member for Lethbridge West asked about comfort allowances. I inadvertently indicated we might more appropriately deal with the item under Vote 7. There are two different types of comfort allowances, and I had momentarily forgotten that. Under Vote 7 — and the response I gave the hon. member is accurate — there is a comfort allowance for individuals in institutions like Michener Centre. But because there are extra facilities at that institution — movies are brought in, recreational facilities are present, and a hairdresser is present — the comfort allowance provides more for out-of-pocket expenses. On the other hand, a comfort allowance is provided to individuals who require extended care in our nursing homes. I believe that was the thrust of the hon. member's question, and I misunderstood that.

The comfort allowance in extended care facilities is adjusted annually. I've looked at the past four years to see how it has fluctuated. For 1980-81 it will be \$47 per month. That's an increase from '79-80, when it was \$42 per month. In '78-79 it was \$38, and in the '77-78 fiscal year it was \$36.

With those two clarifications, Mr. Chairman, I will be pleased to go on. I believe we are on Vote 7.4, Residence and Treatment in Institutions.

#### **7.4 — Residence and Treatment in Institutions**

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the minister that is supplementary to the questions I asked on Michener Centre on May 6. Could the minister advise what new plans, if any, are being implemented at this time to reduce the size of the wards and to improve the staff/client ratios?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, at the present time and as a direct result of, firstly, a request by the Alberta Association for the Mentally Retarded and, secondly, an inspection of the facility by two members of this Assembly — the hon. Member for Red Deer and the hon. Member for Calgary North West, who visited Michener Centre at my request, met with the executive of the facility and certain staff members, and reported back. As a result of the meetings the two MLAs had at Michener Centre, in part passing on information from, I believe, a constituent of the hon. Member for Calgary North West, as well as information provided to us by the Alberta Association for the Mentally Retarded, we have added 37 staff. They are going to work in one of the very large lodges at Michener Centre.

In addition, approximately \$1 million of renovations will take place over this fiscal year, handled by Housing and Public Works to break some of the larger units into smaller sections. It's a program we think is exciting. A lot needs to be done. I believe I indicated yesterday that some longer term possibilities have to be addressed with

regard to Michener Centre and its use as a facility. But certainly, to reinforce what I said yesterday, the facility has served Alberta well for a good number of years, and it has a long history yet to come.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Just at the end yesterday, we talked about mini-institutions. The minister responded about the possibility of a mini-institution in Edmonton sometime in the future, or one in Edmonton and then, regionally, possibly two in the northern part of the province. I wonder if the minister could indicate the time line for that, whether in the next two years, three years, prior to the next election — that's a good mark date, I guess.

Along with that, I wonder if the minister would explain the background of the mini-institutions, their purpose and function, and relate that to the concept of group homes. A lot of people indicate, in their philosophical attitude toward care of this kind, that group homes could possibly fill a need. Maybe the minister could elaborate on the general argument going on in the public at the present time: mini-institutions versus the capability of group homes.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I think the best way to respond to the questions by the hon. Member for Little Bow would be to look at what we are presently doing with Baker Centre in Calgary. As all hon. members of the Assembly are aware, Baker Centre currently has 198 institutional beds. The overall plan we are looking at calls for total replacement of Baker Centre's 198 institutional beds, the transfer of 20 beds from Red Deer's Michener Centre to southern Alberta — so there will be 10 beds each in Fort Macleod and Bow Island — and providing for future expansion and parent relief of 50 beds. So in total we are looking at something like 268 beds, which we see as being required.

Now the critical question is: of the 268 beds, how many of the clients could adequately be housed in group homes, and how many require institutional care because of unique medical situations? That's an issue the department wrestled with — some of our professional expertise; we have a pediatrician on staff and one other physician with special expertise. We looked at what's happening in other jurisdictions. We looked at an example in Saskatchewan, where they attempted to move with one pilot project on a group home setting, and haven't gone any further. The costs are very high, and it hasn't proven to be as desirable as it was first thought it might be.

Basically we came up with a formula of 148 beds that could be located in communities. The majority would be in the city of Calgary, but in other southern Alberta communities as well: at least one facility north of Calgary but south of Red Deer, and possibly two or three south of Calgary, someplace in the Lethbridge/Medicine Hat regions. So the majority of clients will be housed in group homes. That brings us down to the most difficult. If it were a pure black-and-white case, it might be much easier. But life isn't black and white. There are a lot of grays, a lot of color. It reminds me of a skit in the department recently.

Therefore, it is deemed that we require 120 beds to accommodate those fragile individuals who are multihandicapped and medically dependent. The concept we wrestled with was: do we build one large facility in Calgary, or do we build a combination of facilities? What we are proposing, what we are doing, is building one 60-bed facility in Calgary, which will handle the needs of

Calgary, and the two 30-bed facilities in southern Alberta. So no one will see his youngster transferred from Baker Centre in Calgary to either Fort Macleod or Bow Island. And no one who is now taking care of his youngster at home or has his youngster in a group home should worry that he's going to wind up back in an institution. A combination of spaces which will be provided for multihandicapped, medically dependent individuals, some additional space for expansion and, thirdly, some parent relief space: that's the overall concept.

MR. R. SPEAKER: [Not recorded] . . . comment on the Edmonton time schedule.

MR. BOGLE: I was so excited about what we're doing with Baker Centre that I didn't respond to that part of the hon. member's question. I've indicated openly that Eric Cormack Centre which, as the hon. member knows, is part of the old Misericordia Hospital site a few blocks west of here, is really not a long-term solution, although there is no time line at present. I am excited that the openings of the three facilities indicated should be sometime in late 1982 or early 1983. I think that's an appropriate time.

There is no time line as to when decisions will be made as to the Eric Cormack Centre here in Edmonton, or what might follow it. I have indicated that it might be appropriate to follow the example we're using in southern Alberta, that rather than building one large facility here in Edmonton, we look at a facility to handle the needs of the city of Edmonton and the immediate area around Edmonton, and two smaller facilities, possibly one in northern Alberta and the other in eastern Alberta. But no time line on those at this time.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. There'll be a requirement for more professional staff scattered about the province for the many institutions and the regional type of institution. In the flowchart that should be in place somewhere along the line, is the minister at this point in time preparing staff, hiring staff, giving them special training, special background, special experiences in this whole field, so the high quality of care required will certainly occur in regional centres such as Fort Macleod or Bow Island, because this is a concern of many people with the concept.

MR. BOGLE: And it's a very valid concern. It's the very reason that while I was making the offer to the two hospital boards in Lethbridge on Friday last. Dr. Dick Short, one of the senior officials in the rehabilitative branch of the department, was meeting with the staff at Baker Centre in Calgary to share government's plans for the future with them. We hope that a good number of the staff will transfer to the new facility in Calgary. It may well be that some staff members will be interested in going to either Fort Macleod or Lethbridge. That would be most desirable. In total we see approximately 32 staff associated with direct care of clients in the two facilities, along with about eight additional staff — dietary, house-keeping, and so on.

Yes, it's an important matter. But I'm sure the hon. member recalls my earlier comment that this is a phase-in period. We don't anticipate opening any doors for approximately three years. The phase-in will be between the three- and five-year period. We are taking steps now to ensure that adequate staff will be in place. We'll be working closely with the two hospital boards in Bow

Island and Fort Macleod, as well as the hospital board in the city of Calgary,

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, a brief question and a comment. I believe this comes out of this vote, regarding The Dependent Adults Act, Does it cover that area and concern? I wonder if the minister would indicate that.

MR. BOGLE: We dealt with that in Vote 1.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, we didn't deal with the present status of Com-Serv in Lethbridge, the wind-down of the old board and the initiation of the new board. Maybe the minister could comment on that and, secondly, comment on the functions of this new advisory board that's in place and the types of projects the minister sees it becoming involved in, in the next year, Thirdly, is an assessment centre or facility, or a function similar to the Com-Serv function, going to be put in place in Lethbridge, through this advisory committee or some other mechanism, so there isn't a vacuum in that whole area, in the Lethbridge area?

MR. BOGLE: Briefly, Mr. Chairman, in the press release of December 21, 1979, I indicated the government's decision with regard to the discontinuation of funding to the experimental project known as Com-Serv. As the hon. member will recall, that commitment was made three years earlier by my predecessor. We evaluated Com-Serv very carefully. Com-Serv achieved many good things.

Our challenge now is to build on that success. In part, the new board's functions will be similar to Com-Serv's. However, Com-Serv dealt only with medically handicapped youngsters. The new board's mandate is to deal with all handicapped people, medically and physically handicapped. Use of the centre will be voluntary. The primary functions of the board are twofold: number one, to administer the centre, to provide some of the services Com-Serv presently provides, and to look at other services. The second main thrust of the new board will be as an advisory body to the minister. One of the first things I want the new board to look at will be a matter of mutual interest to the hon. member asking the question; that is, the regulations on the Alberta assured income program for the severely handicapped. I raised that with them at our meeting last Friday. I also emphasized the importance of being advisory and the information being confidential. But I'd like that kind of input from a group of lay people. I think we've put together an outstanding board, with representatives from a variety of communities around southern Alberta, from all walks of life, and all backgrounds. I think that will be a real strength.

The importance now is to ensure that in the next five months, when Com-Serv is winding down its activities and the new board is assuming its responsibilities, that that's done orderly. To achieve that end, we had a joint meeting with the two boards last Friday, followed by a visit to Com-Serv's present office. They'll meet some of the staff. Some staff may be recruited into the new centre. To ensure that the boards are working together — and I was very pleased with the comments made by the new chairman of the Citizens Resource Centre Board, when he said he anticipated they would not be making any decisions for the first six months; they'd be learning, listening, meeting with Com-Serv and other such organizations, our regional department staff. In that sense, I think we face an exciting challenge.

I'm not sure I understand what the hon. member means

when he refers to an assessment centre. No programs will be provided by the new board. One mistake Com-Serv made was when it got into programming. On the other hand, the primary task of the board, in carrying out its local responsibilities in administering the centre, will be to help parents get through the maze to the appropriate level of service — whether it's with our department, a sister department, a school board, a hospital board, a health unit, or an agency — to help parents, so we can avoid some of the duplication and some of the cracks in the floor which now exist. That's the primary challenge.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to comment on that. One of the strengths I saw in Com-Serv was the fact that a parent who had difficulty placing the child in the appropriate agency could come to Com-Serv and, through discussion, determine where the child could be placed, where it could receive the best help. If that agency reacted, Com-Serv could back up the parent and the child, and try to move the child into place. Many young people from my own constituency have gained some excellent help through that mechanism.

One of the things that has happened under the present circumstances — one, I see it as a difficulty the advisory committee is in and, two, I think some of the agencies are again going to back off to their own little empires and protect themselves, and the poor parent will be left out there to wander through the maze of services and facilities. The advisory committee can say to the parent, through the Com-Serv staff there: look, we have no programs; you must go to program a, b, or c. But the advisory committee has no clout, and that's what happened to Com-Serv. The Com-Serv agency, as such, started out as an experimental project. The department cut it loose, and it was out there all by itself. There was no relationship between — and I'm not blaming you as the minister, but previous ministers didn't know that Com-Serv was out there trying to perform a function. All of a sudden, Com-Serv realized it had no place to attach itself. That's when the department in Lethbridge, the school board, and the other vested interest groups said, it's time we put the heat on Com-Serv; it's trying to direct our traffic too much. And conflicts occurred. The role Com-Serv was trying to play was on a collision course unless it had some kind of authority behind it.

What I'm suggesting to the minister at this point is that if some agency, whether it's this advisory committee that's working with the Com-Serv group, the facility that's there, or some other agency, or the department itself, is trying to co-ordinate services for parents with children who have mental or physical handicaps, the minister, through the department, must give that advisory committee or agency some authority and back it up. Otherwise, it's just going to fail. We're going to find parents frustrated and not knowing where to go or how to handle things. The school board in Lethbridge is going to react the way it did already. The department — a fine man carrying on the department in Lethbridge, an excellent regional director. But the fact is that he protects his interests. He and the director of Com-Serv and others were in conflict because the authority lines were not clear.

The minister should consider and think about the present arrangement he's described. If this advisory committee is to work in a co-ordinating manner, it must have authority from the minister and must be able to communicate to the minister and say, now look, this agency in your department is not co-operating, this school board is not co-operating, this private group over here is not

co-operating; we need some help. There are going to be times when the minister will have to take sides. If an advisory committee is really a co-ordinating body to perform a function, and if it's not be frustrated down the road, I believe it needs the minister's commitment to that effect. Otherwise we're just going through a game and a sort of series of manipulations, and putting in time that isn't going to work.

Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister: that's advice from my point of view and from my observations and involvement in situations just like this. The minister will have to decide whether this advisory committee is really meaningful. If it is, give it some authority through his office. There are times when he is going to have to move in and bull his way through to make sure the child and the parents get the help they need, and that the agencies listen to the department. Otherwise, the learning we gain from Com-Serv will all fail. The good things will fail again, and two or three years down the road this advisory committee will be lost in the woods and we'll go back to the traditional techniques of the department doing its own thing, the school board doing its own thing, other agencies around Lethbridge doing their own thing — not co-ordinated.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I was concerned at the earlier comments by the hon. member. But when he went on to explain what kind of clout he actually meant, I felt fairly comfortable because that's in keeping with my thinking and, I believe, the thinking of our colleagues from southern Alberta, in terms of what they feel the new board should achieve.

The real challenge was — and, as I'm sure all members are aware, a number of alternatives were put forward. One was to strengthen Com-Serv. Give it the mandate; give it the legislative and regulatory clout to go in and tell a school board, a hospital board, or what have you, what to do. That was considered, and we're not proceeding in that direction. It's not my intention to have our advisory board walk in and tell the Lethbridge public school board or any other school board how to handle its affairs.

What is important is that if the board finds there's a lack in our programs, a crack in the floor that someone is falling into, or that they're not getting the kind of co-operation they need, they're really going to have three avenues that I can think of, to try to correct that situation. The first, and most appropriate avenue is through the regional office. At the meeting last Friday, I had the individual you referred to, Dale Merchant, a very fine individual, present. Our soon-to-be-selected co-ordinator for rehab services in Lethbridge will work very closely with the new board; will not be part of that board but will work closely with them so that, hopefully, a number of issues can be ironed out right at that level.

Secondly, we've tried to ensure that, wherever possible, we're bringing together expertise on the new board with people who have some persuasion. They have a reputation in their respective communities, so that the expertise is there. For instance, three of the nine new board members do not have handicapped children. That surprised some of the groups we've discussed the matter with. Do you have to have a handicapped youngster to appreciate the concerns, to want to help? Of course the answer is no. The first approach, then, is through the regional office.

The second approach will be through MLAs in southwestern Alberta. I'm encouraging the board to meet with MLAs, on at least an annual basis, so they can share their

concerns with members from that part of the province. The third approach is directly with the minister. The chairman of the board is someone I know very well and communicate with well. I know that if there's a problem and he feels he needs to get hold of me, he won't stop at calling my office; he'll call my home in the evening if he has to. We'll talk. So the communication will be there. In addition to that, at least once annually I'll have a meeting with the board, presumably in Lethbridge.

So I feel the clout, as the hon. member refers to it, will be persuasive in terms of getting things moving. If we as legislators from southwestern Alberta find that a program is not in place or that something isn't working well, the message is coming to us from a source — it may be coming through the department in any event, but it's coming from yet another source.

Agreed to

7.4 — Residence and Treatment in Institutions	\$43,499,600
Total Vote 7 — Services for the Handicapped	\$57,426,460

Vote 8 — Treatment of Mental Illness:

8.1 — Program Support	\$2,291,890
8.2 — Regional Diagnosis and Treatment	\$7,877,390
8.3 — Purchased Services and Agency Grants	\$2,908,680

#### 8.4 — Residence and Treatment in Institutions

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we call the vote on 8.4, I wonder if the minister could bring us up to date on where things stand on reports we've received concerning psychiatrists and their new arrangement with the provincial government. I gather that they're going to be paid directly, as physicians would be, from Alberta Health Care and that they're going to be allowed to practise outside their normal working hours. I have several questions with respect to that. I suppose the first would be: could we get some confirmation from the minister as to what the offer is? I assume it is now before the psychiatrists and contract doctors. Secondly, I'd like to have some indication as to what role, if any, the minister took in initiating this change in government policy. Over the weekend, the minister was given some credit for the changes. Perhaps we can start there.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, first of all I'd like to relate back to what's presently happening at the facility. This covers Alberta Hospital Edmonton as well as Alberta Hospital Ponoka. Psychiatrists are on staff in a variety of ways: some are members of the public service and therefore are in salaried positions; some are on a contractual arrangement with the department, and as such they negotiate for time off, holidays, and so on. There are clauses with regard to overtime. The desire of a number, but not all, of the psychiatrists for some period of time has been that there be greater flexibility in terms of the remuneration that's allowed. To be very basic about it, as one psychiatrist put it to us: if I wish to work 18 hours a day, I want to be paid accordingly. That seems like a fair and straightforward proposition.

The present situation is to find a level. Obviously, if you're working in a facility like Oliver, it's not the same as operating a private practice on Jasper Avenue, where the clients walk in through the door. At Oliver you have

your clientele right there. On the other hand, if you're working in a facility such as one of our mental hospitals, you don't have the overhead costs a private practitioner would have. Therefore, what's being looked at is a portion of what is paid to a private psychiatrist in the field.

I cannot be more definitive as to numbers, because I think those issues are currently being discussed. I can say that, John Forrester, the Assistant Deputy Minister of mental health services has been acting as a negotiator, if you like, between the psychiatrists on staff and officials in the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care on the proposal. He's worked very hard over a number of months to try to resolve this issue. In all fairness, I don't believe I was able to say one thing at the meeting I had with the psychiatrists that wasn't already put on the table by Mr. Forrester and/or others from the department. Maybe what was important was hearing from the minister the assurance that it wasn't any kind of gimmick or stalling tactic; that we were serious about the conditions, and were trying to improve conditions so that psychiatrists be given an opportunity to choose an option — not to take the best of a number of options, but to choose an option.

I believe some members of staff may choose to stay on a straight salaried basis. We should maintain the ability to keep some individuals on a contract basis, if they so desire. The third approach, a sessional approach or fee for service, is currently being looked at very seriously. In fact, I think we've now made the breakthrough on the policy parts of the issue; we're working on the details. I'm very pleased. I think it's going to give a better approach to the delivery of the service in the system. From my point of view, if an individual . . . We need psychiatrists; there is a desperate shortage, not only here or in Canada, but across North America. If we have a dedicated individual who's prepared to put in the extra time working in the institution or facility, by all means let's ensure they're given fair and adequate remuneration for their efforts.

MR. NOTLEY: Just so I'm clear in my own mind, because I think some of the reports we heard may have misled us. As I understand it from listening to the minister, what we will have, if the psychiatrists agree — and I gather the ball is in their court; they are in the process of deciding whether they accept the proposals on the table — is two or three different categories. One will be psychiatrists who are in fact members of the public service, who will receive so much an hour. Are these the people who, reports indicated, would be getting so much an hour for, I believe, the first 40 hours and, beyond that, so much an hour for other hours they work? So that will be one category.

I gather the other major category would be psychiatrists who would work on some kind of contract basis, either on a sessional basis or on a contract basis, where they would be able to work a certain amount of time for the public at one of the institutions and then practise on their own. Am I correct in that? If not, perhaps we could have it clarified.

MR. BOGLE: The first thing I should make clear, Mr. Chairman, is that currently a number of options are available and used. So it's not a departure in that sense. I think a more basic way of putting it is that we will have one more option, one more opportunity, one more selection available.

Secondly — and I didn't provide the information that I probably should have — it isn't a case now of negotiating

back and forth between psychiatrists on one hand, the department on another, and Hospitals and Medical Care on a third. I appointed a committee, which has representation from the psychiatrists, a representative from Hospitals and Medical Care, and is chaired by our Assistant Deputy Minister of mental health. That committee is working on the fine tuning of a number of programs at the present time.

I can't comment further on the question of private practice, other than to say, as the hon. member is aware, that an individual who currently practises privately is allowed a certain amount of time at the facility. Whether there'll be a change in that is something I can't comment on at this particular time. I know the discussions are under way. The key issue was the sessional payment. Rather than being paid on a per-patient rate, as I understand it, we'll be looking at an hourly rate — so there's no misunderstanding with that: relative to the way a general practitioner or even a specialist in private practice in the non-psychiatric area would bill a patient or medicare.

MR. NOTLEY: I think the minister has basically answered the question, but there's still one aspect I'm not sure of; that is, we would still have two basic categories. We would have psychiatrists and doctors on contract with the government of Alberta, who would work on a per-hour basis for a certain amount of time, but would have the option to back to their offices and practise outside their working hours. That would be one category, and we've had essentially variations of that category before.

Where I'm not quite sure I follow the minister is with respect to those psychiatrists or doctors who choose to work directly for the government. Would they be able to work outside their work for the government under this new arrangement?

MR. BOGLE: I can't give a definitive answer to that at this point in time. I know a concern was expressed to me by one member of the medical profession who has been an employee for a number of years. Her concern was that she did not want lose her pension plan benefits. Although the overall plan we were discussing would be desirable for many, from her point of view, she wanted to stay in the position she was in. I gave the assurance that individuals who, for a variety of circumstances, feel they're better staying on a salary basis, would do that, fully recognizing that anyone who chooses to go on the sessional basis is like any other private entrepreneur. They make their own pension plan arrangements and other such arrangements. I can't be more definitive to the hon. member at this point, as a number of discussions are under way through the joint committee I previously referred to.

MR. NOTLEY: Those who choose the salary arrangements, though: would the new salary levels be based on the equivalent of a per-hour rate, or would it in fact be an adjustment of the salaries? I raise it because I don't see that we would even be able to allow those people who work as members of the public service to work outside unless we changed The Public Service Act. Because there is a provision in the Code of Conduct and Ethics about working in your area of expertise outside of normal working hours. So as I read it, people who choose the option of continuing as public servants, with their pension benefits — and I don't pretend to be a legal expert on it — would not be able to work outside the system

unless some amendment was made to the Act or at least to the code of conduct.

MR. BOGLE: I agree, Mr. Chairman. I assumed earlier that our discussions as to individuals who might wish to work outside on a private practice basis — I'm not aware of anyone. I don't think there's a single person. [interjection] There are some? I'm advised there are. I was not aware of anyone working on a salaried basis who was also on a private practice basis. I'll get more information on that matter and report back to the committee at a later time, Mr. Chairman.

Agreed to:

8.4 — Residence and Treatment in Institutions	\$42,244,830
Total Vote 8 — Treatment of Mental Illness	\$55,322,790

Vote 9 - General Health Services:

9.1 — Program Support	\$5,586,700
9.2 — Communicable Disease Control	\$3,991,480
9.3 — Special Health Services	\$297,040

#### 9.4 — Rehabilitative Health Services

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, is this the area where the new Alberta aids to daily living program comes in? The minister indicated earlier about an advisory committee being established, composed of representatives of the community and the professional groups. I was wondering what state that committee's in at the present time.

MR. BOGLE: Very close to being formulated, Mr. Chairman. A number of nominations have been received by a variety of professional organizations. As well, a number of lay nominations have been received. In the very near future, I hope to be in a position to complete the recommendations and formalize the list. That, of course, will be followed by subcommittees, so that individuals who are concerned about special apparatuses, for deaf people, as an example — there will be a subcommittee looking in that particular area, and will advise the provincial advisory committee accordingly.

Agreed to:

9.4 — Rehabilitative Health Services	\$13,311,970
9.5 — Vital Statistics	\$774,930

#### Total Vote 9 — General Health Services

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, just before we close. In the process being established, with the subcommittees and advisory committee, will there be some type of appeal route through which recipients of the services can appeal?

MR. BOGLE: To be clear, the committees I'm referring to are advisory committees only. They will not be setting policy and will not be dispensing services. The actual aids to daily living delivery system will be through our health units across the province. There will be an appeal mechanism for individuals who feel their cases have not

been adequately dealt with. But the delivery is through health units.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 9 — General Health Services	\$23,962,120
--	--------------

#### Vote 10 — Community Social and Health Services

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want to pass by day care without making a few observations and comments. First of all, as I understand the present government's position — and this has been debated in the House before, also in committee, I believe — the government is very strongly of the view that there should be one set of standards which would be uniform throughout the province, that the subsidy arrangement would follow the child, and that over three years, according to the ministerial announcement, we'll have a phasing out of the subsidy arrangements for deficits in publicly operated day care centres which were formerly operated under PSS.

Mr. Chairman, two or three things about the government's day care policy come to my mind. The first is the question of standards — and one has to look at the issue of training. As I understand the government standards in Alberta, no formal diploma is required, but rather one year's experience. I recall that the minister indicated in the House that what may be appropriate in an urban area is a little difficult in a rural area. Therefore, the standards have to take that into account. But I would say to the minister: is it not possible, when one looks at other provinces, to have standards which would insist on at least some level of training? It's my understanding that both British Columbia and Saskatchewan insist on at least one year of education, supplemented by experience. While I suppose it's a legitimate argument that there's a difference between Milk River and Lethbridge, or between Rycroft and Edmonton, if a policy can work in Marshall, Saskatchewan, or Maple Creek, Saskatchewan, or Dawson Creek, British Columbia, then it seems to me that we are able to address the question of whether, in setting standards for training, we can go beyond one year's experience. That's the first point. Perhaps the minister can make notes of these and answer them collectively.

Then there's the question of the child care ratio. In discussions I've had with some of the publicly operated day care operations — of course, they have a much lower child care to instructor ratio, and of course their costs are somewhat higher. It's my understanding that in the day care centre at HUB at the university, for example, the average cost is about \$300 a month per child, with \$175 that is going to be paid by the province. The minister can correct me if I'm wrong, but the way I've been able to figure it out, the grant is up to \$175, with \$40 coming from the individual family. But with a cost of about \$300 per child per month, the director of this particular day care centre advised me that they're going to have a fairly significant deficit of approximately \$3,000 a month, or three staff salaries.

The ministerial announcement indicated that for a phase-out period, funds will be available to cover those deficits. Also, additional funds will be freed up because of the policy of the subsidy following the child, as opposed to the former one. Instead of it being 80:20, it will now be 100 per cent funded by the government. Basically, I support the principle that we should, in fact, be funding people programs, not from the property tax, but from

taxes that are more related to the ability-to-pay principle. Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the problem comes in at the level of what happens when this phased-out deficit program takes full effect, when the deficits in the publicly operated centres continue to rise — they have over the last period of time, and I think it's almost certain they will continue. It seems to me that at some point — maybe not this year, but certainly three years from now — even with the money that is freed up from the province's taking up 100 per cent of this subsidy related to the child, there is going to be a point where communities that have publicly operated day care centres with very high standards, as they have in the city of Edmonton, are going to have to pick up the cost of an enriched program, not from sources of revenue related to the ability to pay, but from sources of revenue that a municipality has at its disposal, which to a very large extent is property tax. While municipalities may not have to cross that bridge immediately — I've gotten conflicting accounts from both Edmonton and Calgary; I'm not sure when they're going to cross that bridge — it would seem to me, whether it's this year, next year, or three years from now, inevitably they're going to get to a point where the cost of maintaining the extra standards will have to fall back on the property tax payer. Mr. Chairman, I would say frankly that that concerns me.

As I read the ministerial statement, we indicate there are going to be up to two years to consider moves to improve standards. If memory serves me right, I believe the minister indicated it's possible that an agreement could be reached before that time. But, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, we've already had three studies, if I'm not mistaken. We had the Horowitz study on day care, which I believe was 1978. We had the study by Dr. Doris Badir, and we've just completed the MLA task force study. I guess I would say to the minister: why do we wait another two years on this matter? The Horowitz study was fairly clear. It's my understanding that the Badir study recommended more stringent standards. I'm not sure what the MLA task force recommended, because it hasn't been released, to my knowledge anyway. That's a question I would put to the minister: why another two years?

Similarly, the question of a day care registry. I understand there's some difference of opinion between the government and at least some of the colleges on this. One reason it's going to be held up is that at least some people in the field are of the view that there should be at least a one-year diploma, plus the year of experience, as opposed to just the year of experience, in order to establish a registry. I ask the minister to comment on that, if he would. As I have been able to research the matter, Mr. Minister, in British Columbia and Ontario, accreditation not only requires a diploma and experience, but in fact must involve observation in the same sense as teachers must, at some point before they get their certificate, go through the process of a superintendent inspecting them. That being the case, I really wonder whether we can't move a little more quickly in increasing those standards, and if perhaps there's not some very clear link between the delay in the registry and the delay in improving the standards.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

I'd like to make two other points on this question, Mr. Chairman. We note that the absence time has been increased three days, from 18 to 21 days. Beyond that there

is, I would say, a rather cumbersome approach to appeals. Frankly, in the discussions I've held with the people in Edmonton, I gather that in Edmonton you can have five days without any explanation, and one month with suitable explanation. It's my understanding that this system has worked very well.

Mr. Chairman, I raise that for two reasons. We've all heard rumors that one recommendation in the MLA task force, which hasn't been released, is that this absence policy should in fact be at least 30 days, or perhaps even abolition of the clause. I don't know if that's true or not. Perhaps the minister would like to inform us when he answers my comments. It might even be better if he released the report. I'm sure we'd all be interested in taking a look at it.

I want to dwell for just a moment on this absence factor, because it seems to me that even 21 days is somewhat punitive. Whether we like it or not, we're living in an era when there are, regrettably, a large number of divorces and marital breakdown is a rather unfortunate fact of life. Where that occurs, and the husband is in one place and the wife in another, it's not unusual that they stagger their holidays, for example, so that the children can be with the husband for his holidays and with the wife for hers. With the city's system, it would be relatively easy to work out. But it seems to me that with this new 21-day provision, what is going to happen is that if the husband takes the children for two or three weeks for his holidays, when the wife wants to deal with it — that's usually how it's going to happen, because normally the children are with the wife — she's going to have to go through this cumbersome appeal process. It seems to me that is just adding something, and I really question how valuable it is.

Similarly, if the child is out of the centre for any more than three days, there must be a medical explanation. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I can think of many occasions when children would be out for four or five days with a bad cold or something. It's not necessary to take them to a doctor. It's certainly not necessary to take them back to a day care centre where taking the child back too soon could cause problems in the centre. Why go through this process? It seems to me that to have to take that child to the doctor in order to get a certificate is going to cost in two ways: first of all, it's going to cost the taxpayer, because that child has to be taken to a doctor when that might not normally have to be the case; and it's going to cost the parent, in most cases the mother, because she may very well have to pay whatever second bill the doctor is charging. I would question why that's necessary; we'll get into the question of second billing on another occasion, Mr. Chairman.

DR. PAPROSKI: Not for an absence slip. You don't get charged for that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, we don't know what will happen in the future. The issue is really rather more important. The absence slip is still going to cost Alberta Health Care something. My point is, why go through it? This is the thing. In discussing with the city of Edmonton, they say their system has worked very well. For the life of me, I can't see why it's necessary to go through this involved process. If there are good and logical reasons for it, and if the MLA task force committee argued persuasively for this policy, then I'd be glad to hear it. The rumor is that that wasn't really what they argued for. But I'm sure we'll have that clarified in a moment or two.

Mr. Chairman, might I just conclude my remarks by saying to the minister that I've quarrelled with him before over the basic policy of one, uniform set of standards in the province. I felt there should be some flexibility so that in areas that want to enrich their standards, it would in fact give them an incentive to do so. Basically I still hold that point of view. But knowing this government is of the view that the standards should be uniform across the province and, in order to achieve that, some of the areas with better standards are going to have to enrich those standards from local funds, I put this to the minister and to the government caucus: why do we not consider a standard plane, as the government is making available, then instead of this complicated backing out of the subsidy program and what have you, why don't we consider an improvement incentive scheme which would be supplemental to the basic standards and would be available to both public and private day care centres? We wouldn't have to draw the line between the PSS centres and the private centres.

For example, I think of methods that might be adopted by some of the private operators who, I know in talking to several, are very conscious of the need to try to improve the service they provide, and have better training. Through an incentive program, we could perhaps assist them with training people on staff so they improve their service. Why not a two-tier approach? We have two-tier approaches in other ways; we have two-tier approaches all the time. Why not consider that as an option, which doesn't commit the government to PSS publicly operated centres or private centres, but would in fact be a supplemental amount of money which would act, if you like, as a thrust and an incentive to improve the quality of day care in the province. We have the basic standards across the province, which provide a minimum, but then we have a quality incentive grant to improve the standards. It seems to me that that kind of two-tier approach would go some distance to meeting basically the objectives that I understand to be the government's, as well as the concern of some operators about the present policy.

MR. BOGLE: I wonder if there are any other comments before I respond.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, two things with regard to day care. One, I'd like to comment with regard to standards across the province. When the minister indicated in the announcement that day care licensing will be handled by the province, one of the feelings I had was that it cut local involvement at that point in time — the local authority: the city of Calgary, city of Edmonton, city of Lethbridge, other authorities — from being involved in establishing any kind of licensing standard. Maybe the minister could comment on that. I felt that we cut the ties of local involvement of the local authority. In doing so, day care now becomes a program between the provincial government in Edmonton and the local community. When I examine day care, it is really a program that should relate between the parent, the child, that local institution, and a local government, so that whatever the social needs anywhere in the province, the system can adjust to those particular needs.

As I examine the program here. I feel that even the licensing, the standards, and the supervision — which come from the provincial level. I understand — will take away this relationship within the local community. As I understand it, if parents wish to appeal, they must appeal

to the provincial level of government. If the day care people wish to appeal or make some representation, it's to the provincial level of government, not to the local level of government, to local elected officials. I'd appreciate the minister commenting with regard to that concern.

The other concern I want to raise is with regard to deficit funding. I wonder what impact would be placed on the municipalities after the three-year, phase-out period, which ends on July 31, 1983. At that point in time, will the municipalities be required to pick up deficits? If so, how will the province be involved in that? Or is the municipality or private agency on its own?

Along with that, Mr. Chairman, I have a series of 30 questions about day care, with regard to information I would like to have from the minister. About 20 of these questions were directed to the minister's office, through the minister's executive assistant. That was done last December. The office was reminded in mid-January. At this point in time, we still haven't got responses to these questions.

What I'd like to do, Mr. Chairman, rather than go back and forth, one at a time — because that would take all afternoon, and I'm not sure the minister would have all the information at his fingertips — is give the minister a list of these questions, and maybe [get] a commitment from the minister that we could have a response to them as quickly as possible, so that we can not only evaluate the new program the minister has placed before us, but also possibly assess where we would stand on day care facilities and the day care program throughout the province of Alberta.

Some of the questions I've been concerned about are: the place of the municipalities, the place of the federal government in funding some ongoing day care programs. What about the place of preventive social services at the present time? Does the new funding system exclude day care from preventive social service funding agreements? Do day care units, particularly in Edmonton and Calgary, support such a change? It is my concern that the cities have not totally accepted what is going on. Is the \$215 adequate? Some of my information is that support per seat in a day care [centre] is up to \$290. Will other levels of funding be available to day care? What about the family fee of \$40 for one or more children? Will low-income families have certain considerations with regard to that? The day care registry is a concern for me.

Along with that, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of itemized things I'd like to know about, such as the number of licensed day care centres, applications, licences that have been denied or revoked, spaces that exist across the province, numbers that are on waiting lists. What is the appeal procedure? How many staff are employed in day care facilities? And a number of specifics that I feel my office and I need to really assess what is going on in the whole day care area.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, there are 30 questions in all. We feel they are important and would appreciate the minister's response, either today or as quickly as possible after the study of estimates.

MR. BOGLE: First, on the matter of the communication, Mr. Chairman. A week ago when we began my estimates, I well recall the Leader of the Opposition making a passing reference to a number of unanswered memos that had been sent to the office, and that was a concern. On returning to my office. I asked that a thorough check be made, because I was not aware of any unanswered memos from the official opposition. There was one out-



standing issue from the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, because we were gathering some information, and that's since been forwarded to him. To my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, no memos have been forwarded to my office by members of the opposition which have not been responded to.

I don't wish to get into a long harangue over the questions the hon. member is presenting today. I'll be pleased to take those questions and see to it that a response is made. But I want to be very clear that unless the hon. member has information I don't have, no such request has been made in the past in the form of a memo. We have no record of it in our office. If the hon. member wants to respond, then I'll go on.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the best of my knowledge the memo has been sent, and we thought it had arrived at the minister's office. As I mentioned, the second piece of information I had is that there was a follow-up telephone call to the minister's executive assistant, requesting the information. At that time it was confirmed, by intent and by telephone, that the information would be conveyed to our office. I'll check it as well and confirm that my information is accurate. I believe it to be accurate at this point in time. There's no strategy in my presentation to mislead the minister about the memo being answered or not. The point still holds that I haven't the information to these questions.

MR. BOGLE: I'll certainly see to it that response is given. And if the member wishes to check back, I would appreciate that as well. We know we're having problems with the Canada Post Office; I certainly hope we don't have a problem with mail travelling between offices in this building.

The specific questions raised by the hon. member referred to licensing. I'm not sure the hon. member is aware, but the cities of Edmonton and Lethbridge have never been involved in licensing; only the city of Calgary. Approximately two years ago, an offer was made to all municipalities in the province to provide licensing, and the province in turn offered to pick up 100 per cent of the cost of licensing. Only the city of Calgary responded to it. Because the offer was not accepted by a number of municipalities, it's now felt that it's better that we have a uniform system of licensing across the province; that there be one licensing agent, the province itself. In terms of what we're looking at, I believe the budget for the city of Calgary during the last fiscal year was something like \$93,000, and included three inspectors. So I don't think licensing should be confused as a major issue or as a matter of local autonomy. I don't see it that way at all.

On the deficit funding question, clearly the formula which has been presented is to give notice to municipalities that wish to maintain their own day care centres at standards above provincial standards, that they can clearly see the amount of support they will receive above and beyond other day care centres operating in the municipalities, and so it's quite clear that as of July 31, 1983, the final support by the province will have been provided on a subsidy to day care centre basis. Subsidies will continue to flow directly in terms of following the child.

I note that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, who posed a number of questions, is not in his seat. Unless other hon. members wish that information in *Hansard*. I'll be pleased to respond to the hon. member via written correspondence.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I want to make some very brief comments regarding some of the comments the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview made regarding the incentive aspect. I hope the minister considers the aspect of incentive as it is now; that is, strictly to obtain the children to enter day care is an incentive. The other aspect is to maintain a situation that the children, parents, and the operator understand and are happy with. Again, that in itself is an incentive. To maintain that licence and standards, and to augment various programs for children in a day care [centre], whether it be private or public, is again an incentive. And to continue that position relative to other day care centres is. I feel, an incentive in itself.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the minister should not need any other incentives at this time. The minister has indicated on a number of occasions that this program undergoes ongoing evaluation, as do all programs. Over a year or two of performance, this could be evaluated and changes could be made as necessary. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I think the most important singular thing that has not really been talked about to any great degree is the need for increased spaces under the present licence and standards, which will be tested over a period of time. I think an increased number of spaces is the main consideration. I hope there is some way, in consideration over the next few months and years, that this increased need will be met by some program the minister may have up his sleeve.

Agreed to:

101 — Community Social Services

\$27,382,400

#### 102 — Community Health Services

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Chairman, because of the shortage of health care professionals in northern Alberta, especially in some of the smaller centres and more isolated areas, I was pleased to see in the Speech from the Throne the increase in the dental program this year. But looking at the figures — I don't know whether I'm looking at the right ones — there doesn't seem to be as much increase as I thought there would be, according to what was in the Speech from the Throne. I would ask if the minister might elaborate on the dental program this year: how much is it going to be increased, and what areas will those mobile trailers and/or dentists be covering?

MR. BOGLE: As the hon. member is aware, the program has a number of facets. For the past few years, we've had an agreement with the dental faculty of the University of Alberta to provide service to certain underserved areas of the province, and that was done through one mobile unit. That is now being expanded. The original unit is being replaced, and one additional unit is being put on the road. So we will have a total of two units. In addition there will be support staff for that facility.

We have a program in place now, and it was referred to in the Speech from the Throne, whereby communities which do not have a resident dentist but have a population sufficient to support a full-time dentist, may be assisted. Dentists are unlike doctors, in that a doctor may locate in a small town where there is a hospital, for relatively small capital outlay, because the doctor is able to use most of the equipment and facilities at the hospital.

A dentist does not have that advantage. The dentist must provide his own equipment. We believe this has been a deterrent to some dentists' locating in areas where they are not sure they can make an adequate return to sustain themselves.

The plan that's been put forward is that we locate first in a number of communities which have an acceptable population base. We approach the community and make an offer that if the community would provide a serviced lot, the government would put a fully equipped trailer on that lot and a dentist would be able to use it, paying a minimal fee over the first two years. At the end of the first year and a half, the dentist would either have to make a commitment to the community to stay, and make alternate arrangements for space, or move on. The commitment to the community would be for a maximum of two years, and then the trailer would be moved to another community. Hopefully by doing this we will be able to assist communities to attract dentists who will then locate in the communities and provide a much needed service in northern Alberta, and also southern Alberta.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get an answer to how many dollars are being spent on the dental program this year — the increase over last year.

MR. BOGLE: Approximately \$1,003,000, if we're looking at ... Excuse me, I'm including the new hereditary disease program, which is not part of it.

Looking solely at the dental program: capital expenditure for the new dental program — the dental clinics, trailers, and so on — approximately \$800,000; and expansion of dental services to underserved areas, approximately \$223,000. So it's in excess of \$1 million.

Agreed to:

102 — Community Health Services	\$51,057,860
Total Vote 10 — Community Social and Health Services	\$78,440,260

#### **Vote 11 — Alcoholism and Drug Abuse — Treatment and Education**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any special comments here?

MR. BOGLE: As this is a rather unique vote, in that it deals with the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, and our colleague John Gogo, the Member for Lethbridge West, is chairman of that committee, I think it appropriate that the chairman give some elaboration on some of the new programs. He may wish to make some opening comments, or he may wish that we go through it on a step-by-step basis.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a few remarks with regard to the government policy of appointing a member of the Assembly to chair the Crown agency and point out, in a peripheral way anyway, some of the activities of the commission that would assist members in understanding, perhaps in a better way, what the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission is all about.

I think it should be very clear that the record of AADAC is a proud one. It's been on the Alberta Statutes in a definitive way in its present name since 1970. I think it's had extremely good leadership over the years, under its executive director and chairman Mr. Wilf Totten, who's the equivalent of a deputy minister. It was only with the change of policy announced by this

government in 1979 that I came to the position of chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it's probably important to point out how I as the chairman view some of the problems and concerns with regard to alcohol and drug abuse in the province of Alberta, and what steps are being taken: not enough, in some people's opinion; in other's, perhaps too much in trying to ameliorate the problem we have.

Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, if members recall, just two weeks ago the annual report of AADAC was tabled in the House. On the inside cover is a map showing the activities, in a physical way, of AADAC throughout constituencies in Alberta. I should point out that the prime objective of AADAC is to attempt to develop healthy attitudes and behavior changes — that's a delicate word, I suppose — which preclude the abuse of drugs, which would include alcohol. This is achieved in several ways: one, through a line department organization. We have five regional offices, in Grande Prairie, Edmonton, Red Deer, Calgary, and Lethbridge. Attached to these offices, under their jurisdiction, are area offices that deal in many of the members' constituencies. I know from experience that members of AADAC have made contact with the members, with a view to providing better service to their constituents.

Since the time I've been chairman, I've had the opportunity of a fair degree of travel through the province, and have met many of the staff. They are truly dedicated people. Until you've had an experience with people who have had an alcohol or drug problem, I don't really think members understand the significance of what some of these people go through in long hours of listening and counselling.

We then operate institutions in the province for in-patient treatment: Henwood, which is adjacent to Edmonton; the David Lander Centre, named after Dr. Lander, in southern Alberta, in Claresholm; then we have the Alsike farm concept, west of Edmonton, which deals mainly with the public inebriate.

Mr. Chairman, I am proudest of the role of the volunteer in AADAC. As a matter of policy, AADAC over the years has adopted the position that alcoholism and alcohol abuse are really community problems, not problems of government. Government cannot really control public attitudes in a very substantive way. The role AADAC has been following, and will continue to follow, is to respond to needs within communities around Alberta, where organizations recognize they have a problem and want to do something about it. I think the financial assistance we give to private agencies, through the province, some 35 of them at a cost of \$3.5 million, has helped in a very significant way, and it's unique to Alberta, within the Canadian context of operating this type of program. I think it's been very successful and will continue.

One cannot talk about alcohol abuse problems without mentioning Alcoholics Anonymous, an organization that's been going for many years and is a great fellowship. There may be members of this Assembly who are members of that organization, which by its very nature is anonymous. Just a year ago, Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of speaking to the annual AA roundup in Calgary. It certainly led me to believe that perhaps that's where the Progressive Conservatives should have their convention, because 1,500 people were seated, and there was room for another 200 in that great convention centre that Calgary somehow wants to replace with a bigger one. I think the characteristic of so many Albertans being prepared to help their fellow man is demonstrated through the AA movement.

Obviously, there are other problems in the province, such as drug abuse, marijuana, LSD, problems with young people. Health care costs alone are very difficult to measure. There are people who believe that perhaps three or four out of every 10 hospital beds in Alberta are occupied by people with those problems. That remains, I guess, for some definitive study.

Looking at the year ahead, and that's why we're in the

estimates, AADAC clearly is on the record as believing that if we're going to reduce the incidence of alcohol and drug abuse in Alberta, it has to come through influencing people. To do this, we are very pleased and proud that the government of Alberta has seen fit to allow us to expand our intent in the area of prevention. This year in the estimates we have a substantial amount with regard to developing that tool which we believe happens to be the most persuasive, when you recognize the type of politicians that are elected across Canada through television; that is, hiring television to do it. We think and are banking on that being a very influential instrument with the coming generation.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply close by saying that we haven't changed the attitudes of people to this day. Even though the medical profession has accepted alcoholism as a disease, the stigma is still attached. There are still those who, for whatever reason, are reluctant to enter treatment. There is a common belief that the alcoholic is the fellow who is down and out. From what I've learned, the alcoholic we have in our society wears a white shirt and tie; many of them in the professions. Somehow it's changing public attitudes to remove that stigma, to encourage those people to seek treatment, be it within the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission or elsewhere. Only with the final realization of one saying, there's got to be a better way than the way I'm doing it, is one going to enter treatment.

Mr. Chairman, with those remarks I would encourage members, if they have questions, to pose them to either the Minister of Social Services and Community Health or me.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, with respect to the general topic of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, I'd like to say that I very much appreciate the work been done by that particular agency. I feel it's one agency we can be particularly proud of in this government. In my opinion, it has achieved a great deal with a relatively small budget, and is continuing to assist Albertans to deal with the problem which, as the hon. Member for Lethbridge West has indicated, is growing year by year.

I have, however, one continuing concern with respect to the expenditures of that commission, and that's with respect to the seven-day treatment centres, the recovery centres that are used for the purpose of helping people who are intoxicated dry out, and then send them back onto the street. I've long been concerned that we spend a great deal of money in that area, that could be more adequately dealt with through a more long-term program. While I recognize that they also exist within the general AADAC program, I still question whether we are correctly dealing with those funds when we allow only seven days for a person to come in and go out with a limited amount of follow-up.

Therefore I pose two questions: first, is it the philosophy of the commission in the coming year to move away from the seven-day program to longer term programs and, two, if that is not the case, can the hon. Member for Lethbridge West or the hon. minister indicate whether the commission has been successful in having a greater number of those individuals who come into the seven-day treatment centres referred for long-term treatment than they had in past years?

Thank you.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm particularly pleased at what I've seen AADAC involved in, in the past year. I think it's sad that we really need AADAC in our society. It's an underlying problem.

I'd like to raise two particular areas that I am concerned about. The first is the serious problem of alcohol-related accidents on our highways. I note in this vote that \$181,000 is spent on a media campaign. Is the problem of alcohol-related accidents going to be highlighted in a media campaign, or does

AADAC have another approach they're going to use?

The second question that I have is about the drinking age. I'd like to know the position of AADAC on that. Also, drug and alcohol abuse among our youth is growing. I'd like to hear the Member for Lethbridge West or the minister respond as to how they see their role in that in the future.

The third one, Mr. Chairman, has to do with life-style advertising. I feel there should be a ban on life-style advertising that shows that it makes you a better cowboy if you drink beer.

DR. BUCK: You would have been here in '72, when the government changed all that.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: I can talk for myself, thanks, Walt. [interjection] Is the media campaign you're talking about in this vote going to address that issue in some way, to counterbalance life-style advertising?

DR. BUCK: Without a debate in the Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I might enumerate for hon. members a considerable list of people who want to speak. Right now we have Edmonton Kingsway, Calgary McCall, Camrose, and Grande Prairie, in that order.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, a very important topic, of course, and I recognize the time is drawing near. So I'm sure we'll all try to be brief.

Mr. Chairman, I just have to say a few words on this particular topic, recognizing that it's a major public health problem, ranking with cardiovascular disease, cancer, and accidents. It is a major item. Mr. Chairman, I think some of the statistics that have been quoted before by the now chairman of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission should be placed on the record for citizens to read and indeed hear. Before I start on these statistics, I want to echo the remarks he made about the previous chairman, the very great importance of voluntary help in this particular area, and all the staff and the work they've done.

In 1958, Mr. Chairman, there were 547 liquor outlets in Alberta. That year, 16 million gallons of liquor were sold at a cost of \$63 million. Ten years later, in 1978, 1,864 outlets — three times as many. During that year, over 43 million gallons of liquor were sold, at a cost of \$400 million. Mr. Chairman, we know and the citizens out there know there are many other factors regarding increased consumption than merely increasing the outlets. But there is no doubt in anybody's mind — the retailer, the members of the Legislature, or the citizens out there — that by simply increasing the outlets and making it available, there is in fact an increased consumption, recognizing that the population in the province of Alberta has increased, but that is not the only or even the major factor.

Another statistic that I'm sure the hon. Minister of Transportation and all members of the Legislature would support, is the fact that about half of the 600 fatal traffic accidents in Alberta last year were alcohol related — an interesting and very important thing to remember. Mr. Chairman, the cost to the taxpayer of alcoholism and the related problems, whether it be law enforcement, health care, welfare, and other alcohol-related expenditures, is well above the \$134 million the government lists as profit. Mr. Chairman, other statistics show that it costs the government from \$4 to \$8 for every dollar they "make" on alcohol.

This is not speaking, Mr. Chairman, of the immeasurable misery and social breakdown, the work loss — the work loss is not even measured in this; hours, days, weeks, months, and so forth — the social stress, the suicide rate, and so forth, that are commonly related to alcoholism. It has been stated that 40 per cent of people occupying hospital beds have alcohol-related

problems: again, a very important item. As I recall — and the hon. chairman of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission may want to substantiate that — in 1972, when we first took office, there were approximately 60,000 known alcoholics in this province. We all know those are the known, reported cases. Usually 20 to 40 per cent more are not reported.

So these are the type of statistics we're faced with with this particular vote. I hope this vote is never ignored as trivial. I'm sure we're not doing that. Probably a lot more time should be spent on this vote. But we're very conscious of it in the Legislature, and I'm sure proper attention will be given in other ways besides here in the Legislature or committee.

So, Mr. Chairman, those are my brief remarks. Alcoholism is a top public health problem. The question I'd like to [ask], after making these particular comments, is: with the youth and the younger and younger age groups involved in this concern, Mr. Chairman, what programs is the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission carrying out, specifically to target for this particular area of young people, in the way of prevention, diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation, or teaching? In fact, what is being done in public relations to indicate to all members of our society, all our citizens, that this is an illness, indeed a serious illness. It's nothing to be ashamed of. It's something that has to be treated. What can we as citizens do to help the public at large? It's not merely the white-collar members of society; it crosses all the barriers, all members of our society, all people.

One final question, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to know what the chairman would feel about this: when an alcoholic is known, and is established beyond any question to be an alcoholic, are there any considerations of an involuntary treatment program? I realize that civil rights are being touched here, but then we take the licence away when you break the law two or three times, or whatever the rules are. When we in fact know a person is an alcoholic, we know the possibilities and probabilities of the dangers and hazards regarding driving and so forth. What are we doing regarding that particular type of consideration; that is, involuntary program and treatment? Because the alcoholic, unfortunately — and it could hit any one of us — just has no control. He has no control, and he just can't help it. He needs help. Yet, unfortunately, members of the family, doctors and the medical profession, and health professionals, can't do anything about it unless that person voluntarily presents himself to the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission or to some other helping profession. I'd like to hear some comments on that. These are my very brief comments.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, to the minister and to the chairman of AADAC. Few occupations in the community are more aware of the alcohol problem than the police. Having served half a lifetime. I'm very cognizant of them, I can tell you. The last year I served on the Calgary force, the members of that force attended over 5,000 domestic assaults. It's a little bit more than a statistic. There's more tragedy, more heartbreak in the domestic quarrel than any other. I would say that the overwhelming percentage of them were alcohol related. But the point I wish to make, Mr. Minister, and more or less a question: during those years in the police service, we had very, very little contact with AADAC. In fact, it was just in the last very few years that a member of AADAC saw fit to come down to police headquarters to interview persons in for alcohol-related offenses.

But through the total career, we had a very close association with the Salvation Army. I have tremendous respect for that organization. The cures or successes I saw were absolutely dramatic. I think they serve a most useful purpose in the scheme of things. Quite possibly, they reach a clientele that AADAC doesn't, and I wouldn't like to see their efforts downgraded. So I would like to ask, Mr. Minister: is there liaison between

AADAC and the Salvation Army? Does your department support them, either financially or in any other way? If not, I would like to see such support established.

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I suppose we're fast becoming a nation of alcoholics, and the work of your board ...

MR. LITTLE: Speak for yourself.

MR. STROMBERG: No, I'm not speaking for myself, Andy; I'm speaking on your behalf and a few others'.

Mr. Chairman, to the minister and the chairman of AADAC: on behalf of the citizens of my constituency, I'd like to express our deep appreciation for the opening of the AADAC office in the city of Camrose. Also for your information, this office is now concentrated in the schools, and has just about covered every school within my constituency. The recognition given to AADAC, not only throughout Canada but throughout the world — I don't know if you're aware, but AADAC is called to attend conferences throughout the world, to set up programs, especially throughout Canada and in our far north.

Through AADAC, I think we have probably the best operating program in North America, but we're not funding it through research. AADAC has to rely on research being done in Switzerland and in Ontario. Mr. Minister, perhaps in another year consideration could be given in the budget, so that maybe we can lick this through research, get this monkey off of a lot of people's backs.

Thank you.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to congratulate the chairman of AADAC. I think this is a very important vote. It's a very serious problem across the province. I know it is a considerable problem in the area I come from.

I would like to ask the chairman if there is any consideration of expansion of the detoxification centres in northern Alberta, and will there be any increase in AADAC workers? I believe right now the workers, in the north anyway, are very much overworked. I think that program should be looked at, and there probably should be an expansion of workers. I would like to recommend that to the chairman.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one or two brief comments on this. I'm really quite amused — well, I guess I shouldn't be amused, because it's a very serious matter — how government members can stand here in their righteous indignation about how serious the alcohol problem is, when this government — and I was trying to get this point across to the hon. Member for Macleod — without any reference to this Legislature, to the people of this province, brought in regulations that permitted advertising alcoholic spirits on radio and television.

The point the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway made — when we look at the records of increased consumption, increased outlets, and the attitude people out there have, that it's the good life. Well it's not much of a good life when you're down in the gutter from alcohol-related problems.

But I just want the record to be clear, Mr. Chairman: it was this government that changed that regulation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few remarks. First of all, I'd like to congratulate the hon. Member for Lethbridge West. I appreciate how much time and effort he spends at the job he has taken on.

I have about 20 years' experience in medical practice in this province. During that time, there's no doubt that there's been an

increased awareness of the problem of alcoholism by the general public. There's also been a much greater awareness of the problem of drug addiction, in particular the dangers of hallucinogenic drugs. In other words, the educational program the commission runs is working to some extent. Unfortunately, so far there's not been a corresponding decrease in the medical and social problems that result from excessive use of alcohol. In one year, some 18,500 drivers' licences were suspended for alcohol-related driving offences.

Recently there has been a return of interest by adolescents and young adults in the use of very dangerous hallucinogens and amphetamine analogues. Those of us who were practising in the late '60s and early '70s, and who dealt with the tragic effects of those drugs during those years, might well shudder at the prospect of going back to those problems in the numbers we had at that time.

Another problem I'd like to address is the effects of the chronic use of marijuana and hashish, which by recent research have very definitely been shown to cause long-term, if not permanent, effects on the very mental functions that humanity has so much appreciation for and so values: those functions of creative thought, decision-making, and comparative reasoning. I would like, publicly and officially, to deplore the new federal government's intention to decriminalize — if that's the right word — the use of this drug, as this decriminalization will be taken by the youth, and possibly by the general public, as a measure of approval by the federal government of the use of marijuana and its toxic derivatives.

In view of these concerns, I would like to express my appreciation at the increase in the total budget of the commission of some \$1.7 billion — \$1.7 million, rather; you get used to dealing in billions in this place. I'm particularly happy to see the allocation of some \$180,000 to a media campaign. I'd also like to mention the new programs at High Level and Frog Lake, and the above-average increase in the allocation to Poundmaker's Lodge.

My medical experience with the activities of the commission has largely been with the two area offices in Edson and Grande Cache, in my own constituency, and also with the tremendous benefits many people get from their four weeks at Henwood. I've had everybody from truck drivers to accountants at Henwood, patients of mine, and the vast majority have derived considerable benefit from that institution.

I have two questions I would like to put to the minister or to the hon. Member for Lethbridge West in his capacity as chairman. I would like some breakdown of the some \$0.5 million increase in finance and administration, under Vote 11.4, I think, also the relatively static amount for education and information, although I realize that the \$180,000 increase allocated to the media campaign in fact represents some 26 per cent increase in the total educational information services of the commission.

Thank you.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate members' interests in the function of AADAC. I'd like to attempt to answer them in the order they were presented. First of all, with regard to the Member for Calgary Currie raising the matter of the detoxification or recovery centre, and referring to the seven days, as opposed to longer programs. We at AADAC have felt for some time that detoxification could well be carried out best in the home. But when one looks at some of the incidents of abuse that take place there, it more than justifies the role of a detoxification centre — in police language, generally referred to as a drunk tank — where someone is allowed to sober up.

To get an appreciation of why they don't go into treatment, Mr. Chairman, look at the alcohol recovery centre here in Edmonton as an example, the number of repeaters that keep coming back in. We with the commission believe the strength of

alcohol treatment lies in the voluntary concept — those who wish to go into treatment. When they come into the detoxification centre, some of them obviously are in a condition that you really can't get very close to them. But before they've reached the point where they want to leave, every effort is made to persuade them to go into a treatment program. There is feeling that if you try to put everybody in a treatment program, the sheer numbers would preclude those who sincerely want to go into treatment. We would have long line-ups at our in-patient treatment centres. I'm not saying that more could not be done, with emphasis on getting more people from the detox centres. But at this point in time, particularly in Edmonton and Calgary, we find that the best mix is the present mix.

In regard to the Member for Macleod raising the alcohol-related accidents, certainly they are a concern. We hope to influence behavioral styles in a direct way, as a result of programs we hope to adopt about a year from now, assuming the government of the province sees fit to endorse the campaign we're now in the process of developing.

It's interesting to point out that the state of Michigan, which went through the phase in North America in '70 and '72 of lowering the drinking age, raised it from 18 to 21 about a year ago. Whether it's coincidental or not, I don't know — definitive data are not available, and one of the things you arrive at in the job I'm in, is not to make quick decisions based on minimum data; you have somehow to try to sift through why the data are the way they are. But in Michigan there was a dramatic drop in alcohol-related accidents and fatalities with young people.

The Member for Macleod also raised the matter of the drinking age. Perhaps it's important to point out that the government of Alberta prior to this one, in 1970, saw fit to lower the drinking age from 21 to 18. Right or wrong, that was the judgment of the legislators of the day. A general wave across Canada saw that reduction. Since then we've seen moves by New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, and Ontario to raise the drinking age to 19. However, two provinces remain at 21, Newfoundland and Nova Scotia.

I don't really know, Mr. Chairman, because the information available is not that definitive, but we at AADAC have a position that raising the drinking age has to be viewed — has to be viewed — in the context of the age of majority. Sometimes emotions seem to take over and indicate that if only you were to raise the drinking age, by the stroke of a pen you'd solve the problems. That's not true. Therefore, the position of the commission, not necessarily mine personally, is that you must be very cautious in raising the drinking age, if you're trying to achieve something other than simply creating lawbreakers.

The Member for Macleod also made reference to: will we be dealing with life-style advertising? When he says that, I think of Preparation H and sanitary pads, that I see on television. If that's life-style advertising, perhaps we want to move very cautiously. What we want to do, Mr. Chairman, is try to develop with young people, particularly at the elementary school level — here in Edmonton, we've found that about 45 per cent of youngsters in grade 7 are drinking; in grade 8, about 80 per cent. With respect, Mr. Chairman, most of them don't inherit those pressures from their peers; they inherit them at home. If citizens and parents of this province somehow don't get the message that they have a primary responsibility to introduce positive life styles at that age, frankly I don't know what the government can do.

The Member for Edmonton Kingsway, in his capacity as a physician and as a man who I know has had long interest in the problem of alcoholism, has raised some interesting points. In the interest of time, I'll just comment on two. One is the involuntary treatment program, where you could use compulsion. If you talk to those who are in the business, compulsion just doesn't work. As members know, British Columbia tried to adopt by statute a mandatory heroin treatment program. It was not only thrown

out by the courts; it is now before an appeal court in Ottawa.

What we're doing for young people, though, I feel is exciting. One example would be the Catalyst Theatre, that tours Alberta putting on programs in our school system. Another is the Punkerpine Puppets, which create very favorable impressions with the youngsters in the school system.

The Member for Calgary McCall has a wealth of experience with regard to alcohol-related problems. I'm happy to say that the Salvation Army, or the Sally Ann, has done and is doing a tremendous job in assisting AADAC in carrying out its mandate. We will continue to assist the Salvation Army in any way possible. This year we're funding the Salvation Army in Red Deer for the first time, in recognition that they are very capable of carrying out that role.

It's always a pleasure to listen to the Member for Camrose, and I appreciate his comments with regard to the commission board going to his fair city to open that area office and hold its meeting. He mentioned research. Frankly, that is a concern, Mr. Chairman. To date we tend to look for much guidance to the Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario, which spends about \$13 million a year in research.

The Member for Grande Prairie raised the issue of detoxification centres in the north. I recognize that's an important issue to him. When you look at the growth of the north, it becomes a focal point for many Albertans, recognizing the economic activity. I'm proud to announce that just next month the Pastewy centre is opening a centre in Fort McMurray. At the moment we have one in High Prairie, which is very successful. I would simply say to the Member for Grande Prairie: give us a proposal. If the need is there, the desire is there, and the citizens are prepared to act, then I think we're prepared to respond in kind.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Edson is very perceptive in pointing out as a physician that we see the rapid increase in things like death from related causes, such as alcohol and cirrhosis of the liver, going up at an astounding rate. He makes a point about marijuana. Those who have read the Le Dain commission have probably observed that back in those days the content of tetrahydrocarbonol, or THC, was about 0.5 per cent. Today it's imported from Columbia, and so on, and is 4 to 5 per cent — very strong. This morning, I couldn't help but notice a bumper sticker on an Edmonton street. Maybe it tells us something about our attitudes in Alberta; it reflects, perhaps in a cynical way, the attitudes of our young. It read: "God made marijuana. Man made booze. Who do you trust?" It tells us something about the cynical attitudes that prevail today.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Edson asked about the \$0.5 million increase in support services. That's a somewhat easy explanation, in that for some years, since 1974, the members of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission have been members of a pension plan. It's finally caught up, and there had to be a transfer of payments of about \$0.5 million. I appreciate the cabinet priorities committee recognizing and granting that in the budget. That would account for the increase.

If there are any other questions. Mr. Chairman, I'd be pleased to answer them. Thank you.

Agreed to:	
11.1 — Program Support	\$2,744,997
11.2 — Treatment and Rehabilitation Services	\$5,773,242
11.3 — Education and Information Services	\$739,529
11.4 — Direct Financial Assistance to Private Treatment Agencies	3,539,759
Total Vote 11 — Alcoholism and Drug Abuse — Treatment and Education	\$12,797,527

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have Vote 1.1.6, which we held. Was there some extra information there?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. A couple of questions were asked that I couldn't respond to at the time. The first related to contract employees. Last year there was an estimate of \$30,220. The position was occupied for a portion of the year only, and that's why the difference. As it is now occupied, we anticipate it will be filled for the full year. It's involved with inner city problems: a liaison officer with AADAC, the Solicitor General, and our department.

Secondly, questions were raised regarding professional/technical fees. I can respond to the member by indicating that a variety of studies will be sought, including areas like development of employment assistance scale, evaluation of impact on home care programs, review of home care program and background, review of programs for the elderly, disadvantaged impact study.

There was also one bit of information asked on Vote 4, on eight managerial positions which are no longer paid by the vote, but are now paid by the trust at the request of the settlements. The money that's saved will be directed back into settlement projects.

Agreed to:

1.1.6 — Personnel and Staff Development	\$2,428,400
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Staff	\$42,478,440

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move we stop the clock in order that the chairman of the committee can make his report.

[Motion carried]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests 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, with regard to tomorrow's business, given the prospect of unanimous consent, which I think can be verified tomorrow afternoon, we would be proceeding with Committee of Supply in the afternoon, and from 9 o'clock in the evening, for reasons I gave yesterday. The departments would be Social Services and Community Health, including the supplementary estimates. Tourism and Small Business, and Municipal Affairs. Hospitals and Medical Care, and Housing and Public Works would be next.

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