

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Tuesday, May 5, 1981 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 26****The Engineering, Geological and Geophysical Professions Act**

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 26, The Engineering, Geological and Geophysical Professions Act. This proposed legislation consists of an entirely new Act based in part on the existing Act, but also encompassing the principles contained in government policy on professions and occupations, and taking into account the concerns of groups in the allied fields such as the architects, technicians, technologists, and land surveyors.

[Leave granted; Bill 26 read a first time]

Bill 38**The Architects Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'd also request leave to introduce Bill No. 38, The Architects Amendment Act, 1981, which outlines a number of amendments to The Architects Act, 1980. These amendments reflect the further agreement reached between the Alberta Association of Architects and the Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists of Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 38 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table a regulation under the electrical protection regulations; as well, Alberta Regulation 200/80, which is the adoption of the Canadian Electrical Code, with amendments.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the following reports: first, the financial statement of the academic pension plan fund of the University of Alberta, December 31, 1979; secondly, Grande Prairie Regional College financial statement, June 30, 1979; for that same fiscal year, the following public colleges: Grant MacEwan Community College, Lethbridge Community College, Medicine Hat College, Mount Royal College, and Red Deer College; and the financial statements ended March 31, 1980, for the Banff Centre for Continuing Education, Athabasca University, the University of Alberta, the University of Calgary, and the University of Lethbridge.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. KNAACK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to be able to introduce to you and to my colleagues in the House 80 members from grade 6 of Richard Secord school. From personal knowledge I can say that Richard Secord school is one of the really fine schools in my constituency. Two of my children attend there, and they really are an example of our fine educational system. I welcome the group leader, Louise Heggerud, and the members, and would invite them to stand and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased this afternoon to be able to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 16 students from Crescent Heights high school in the best constituency in the city of Calgary. It also happens to be the best high school in the city of Calgary, simply because the hon. Member for Calgary McCall, to my left, and I at one time were students there. The place seemed to increase in prominence ever since we left.

They are accompanied by their group leader, Mr. L. Mack, who also happens to be the son-in-law of the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, Mr. A. Campbell, and the student council president, Miss Natasha Rascenin. I'd like them to stand, please, and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

DR. C. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 32 grade 7 students from the Vilna school. I'd like to say that they have priorities similar to mine. They started off this morning visiting the Aviation Hall of Fame. Now they're at the Legislature to see the government in process, are going swimming this afternoon, then stopping at McDonald's.

Mr. Speaker, the 32 students are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Ash from Vilna, who has had her class here the last three consecutive years; Mr. Nixon, also a teacher; Mr. David, the bus driver; and Mrs. Klippert, Mrs. McGinnis, and Mrs. Popiwchuk, parent supervisors. I'd ask that the group stand and receive the welcome of the House.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Ambulance Services**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my first question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has to deal with the government's shameful inaction on the question of ambulance service in the province. To refresh your memory, hon. member, I'd like to quote a directive of this Legislature passed in 1974: recommended the government give consideration "to study and make recommendations upon all aspects of ambulance service in . . . Alberta." This was passed by this Legislature. In light of the fact that this resolution was passed many years ago, when is the government going to take action on providing a province-wide ambulance service?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated in the question period on earlier occasions in this House, it's my hope that we will be able to announce some elements of an ambulance program in the not too distant future. I've indicated that the matter has been under active considera-

tion by committees of cabinet during the past several months, and I believe some progress is being made. Certainly since the time the hon. member has alluded to, we've developed and refined an excellent air ambulance service in Alberta which is second to none in Canada. The ground ambulance program remains one of complexity.

In the meantime I can only reiterate that it has always been a municipal responsibility. If some municipal governments in Alberta feel they're not getting adequate ambulance service, it's their responsibility to improve the service for their citizens.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate if he has received a recent report on ambulance service? If so, will that be tabled in the Legislature?

MR. RUSSELL: I can only guess at what the hon. member is referring to, Mr. Speaker. He has probably read page 1 of the *Journal* today. I don't know what that report is. I don't believe I've received it. I talked to the reporter who wrote the story, and he was unable to identify it or where he got it. However, a number of working papers have been done, as the hon. member can imagine, in support of various alternative programs, which I have presented to my colleagues. It would not be the intention to publish those.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly, in his study of the problem of providing ambulance service to the people of this province, is there a possibility we are losing patients because of a lack of paramedical support in our ambulances?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how to respond to that kind of question. Saying that because a certain service is lacking or not provided to a certain level it's probable that so many people are dying per year, is highly speculative. I'd be very reluctant to agree with that kind of conclusion until I had some sort of very good data or statistics in front of me. I think it's no secret the world over that those areas that have developed highly sophisticated paramedical services are really able to bring extensions of the hospital to the scene of the illness or accident, rather than having to transport the patient to the hospital. There are obvious advantages in being able to do that.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a short supplementary to the minister. In light of the fact that the minister has indicated he is studying the problem, can he indicate if in looking at advanced life support systems as to the basic life support systems, he has had an opportunity to compare the two systems in place in this province — one in Calgary and one in Edmonton? Has the minister had an opportunity to study those two systems?

MR. RUSSELL: I would say that only the obvious comparisons anybody could readily make have been done, Mr. Speaker. I've mentioned before the great array of levels of ambulance service that exist in Alberta and the reasons for that, I think directly related to the three kinds of suppliers of the service: the voluntary association, the commercial company, and the municipal government. Certainly the one in Calgary, which is probably

the best ambulance service in the province, is one that I think other cities could emulate very easily.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, if I may. Is the minister in a position to outline to the Assembly why the government was not able to follow up a statement made in the House on October 12, 1978? This was not in debate, rather in Oral Question Period, by the then Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. I quote from page 1299 of *Hansard*:

I anticipate that the finalization of ambulance policy will be a natural follow-up to the announcements on hospital facility construction and policy which I anticipate making before the end of the current year.

October 12, 1978, Mr. Speaker. What specific obstacles precluded the development of an ambulance policy as outlined two and a half years ago by the minister's predecessor?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I can't speak with authority and detail for the things that occurred in the ministry from the time that was said until I took over the responsibility. I think the things indicated by my predecessor have happened or are in the process of happening.

The massive capital works projects related to the hospital field have been organized by way of the planning manual. The first phase of the program has been developed, in excess of \$1 billion. And extensive follow-up work has been done in the field of ambulance service. I mentioned earlier that since that period, the refinements to the air ambulance service have been made. More recently there were minor adjustments in benefits insofar as ambulance coverage for all Albertans under the hospital benefits program is concerned. That was done a few weeks ago. In addition there has been consultation with all the outside sources involved in the provision of ambulance services in the province, as well as extensive work done within government among a variety of departments which have a direct interest in the service.

I mentioned earlier that I have had proposals to committees of cabinet on several occasions. But I'm not the only minister bringing forward proposals, and these have been exceptionally busy times during the last year. I can only confirm that I've used every opportunity that has been available to me to try to make some progress on this program. In the meantime that shouldn't stop municipalities from improving their services if they have identified weaknesses. That has always been their responsibility and remains so today.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A supplementary by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by another supplementary by the Member for Edmonton Kingsway, then a final supplementary by the Acting Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NOTLEY: Could the minister advise the Assembly what assessment has been made of other systems? We have the British Columbia system, which is a provincially organized system. We have the Saskatchewan system, which is integrated: co-ordinated by the province but undertaken by the municipalities, with grants being made available. What assessment has been made by the government of these other systems, particularly in light of the Alberta Medical Association's view that the ambulance system is essentially an extension of the hospital and health care system? To what extent is it the view of the government that the bearing of the cost of an ambulance

scheme must be at least in measure the responsibility of local governments, as opposed to the right of every Albertan, whether they live in a municipality that has a lot of money or a municipality whose finances are not strong enough to support an ambulance system?

MR. RUSSELL: That's a fairly complex question, Mr. Speaker. Naturally I have the description of existing ambulance services in other provinces and, from the other provinces, comments giving the pros and cons of all aspects of those services. As the hon. member pointed out, it ranges in the extreme from, on the one end of the scale, a complete service to all citizens by way of a provincially owned ambulance service to, at the other end of the scale, the mix we get here in Alberta.

I'm not sure how to answer the part of the member's question referring to the right of every citizen to have access to ambulance service, and the aspect as to how much of the cost of that should be picked up by the municipal government. That's one of the points under consideration. I think a number of obvious ways are easily identifiable to members, whether you go forward on the basis of a PSS program, an 80:20 kind of funding formula, a per capita financial measure of support, in fact no support at all, or take the whole thing over. There's such a wide variety of choices that it's really hard for me to comment at this time which one might be best.

In the development of an ambulance program, we're also attempting to get a basic life-support system in place in the province prior to upgrading everybody to an advanced life-support system. So it's not going to be something that's done quickly or suddenly insofar as advancing from where we are now to an ALS system.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether the provincial ambulance service policy will have the regulations and standards set strictly by the province alone, and not by the municipality?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that's one of the important principles under consideration. Several departments are involved in one way or another with legislation and/or regulations that have a direct bearing on ambulance service. One of the major questions is whether or not there ought to be new legislation that brings all of that into one package.

DR. PAPROSKI: A final supplementary on that point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Final supplementaries by the hon. [Acting] Leader of the Opposition.

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would also indicate whether the provincial ambulance service policy will be a combination of provincial and municipal dollar support? Or has that decision been made yet?

MR. RUSSELL: No, that decision hasn't been made yet. It's one of the major principles to be resolved in this issue. It's very difficult to make straight comparisons with other provinces. Because there's such a broad array of provincial/municipal financial support and arrangements in the provinces across Canada, it's not really fair just to take ambulance service in isolation; you have to look at other programs as well.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a final supplementary.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The final supplementary now by the hon. [Acting] Leader of the Opposition. I think we've spent quite a bit of time on this topic, and we have a number of people wanting to ask [inaudible].

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my final question is to the minister. In light of the fact that it seems quite obvious that no legislation will be in place this spring, at this time can the minister give an undertaking to this Assembly and the people of this province that by this fall there will be a commitment by this government to have a province-wide ambulance service?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the only commitment I can give is to keep trying to progress with the points I've mentioned, and see if we can't develop a satisfactory means of instituting a basic life-support system across the province. But I have to get back to where I was in the first question: if there are identifiable weaknesses in communities, it's the responsibility of those communities to look after those weaknesses, not the province.

Caucus Committee Reporting Procedure

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the hon. MLA for Cypress, Mr. Hyland. As chairman of the water management cover committee, I would like to ask the hon. member if he can indicate what specific information the irrigation committee was looking for when they went to Israel, Hungary, and Rumania?

MR. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I suppose the hon. leader should begin by indicating on what basis he's directing a question to a member who is not a member of Executive Council and is not declared as being a representative of one of the agencies and commissions for which members are responsible, such as the Research Council and the like.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I was always under the impression that when public funds are expended, the people who expend those funds answer to this Legislature. It is on that ground that I've asked my question of the hon. Member for Cypress.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As the hon. Government House Leader has indicated, the members of Executive Council and those who are designated as board members reporting to a minister but have already been designated within the House by the minister responsible as acting in that capacity, are responsible for answering questions in the House. So actually the question is out of order, unless you wish to address it to the minister.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, then I'd like to ask a question of the hon. Government House Leader. Can he indicate to this Legislature and the people of this province the policy of the government as to the reporting to the Assembly by supposedly caucus committees that are spending public funds gathering information?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, caucus committees, as such, do not undertake such duties. When a member is involved, it is potentially the involvement in a delegation or mission of the type where a minister and others are

involved. A member may well be involved in something like that. But it is not a caucus matter; it's a matter of the member being involved in a particular type of mission or delegation.

I might say that I'm not familiar with the circumstances of the visit the hon. member is asking the Member for Cypress about.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, when the Government House Leader doesn't know that government members have been on a junket spending taxpayers' money, the matter is more serious than I thought.

My question to the hon. House leader: is there any set policy as to the expending of public funds by government caucus members, and not reporting to this Assembly? Is there or is there not a policy?

MR. NOTLEY: On missions that are representative of both sides.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I answered that question. The repetition of it with slightly greater heat doesn't change the nature of it. It's already been pointed out to the hon. acting leader that the minister involved, in whatever area of activity is involved, is always available here to answer any questions in regard to such matters.

That particular visit was not something for which I, as Attorney General or Government House Leader, have departmental responsibility. I presume it would be the Minister of Agriculture. Had the hon. member begun there, he might at least have been referred to the appropriate source to get his information answered.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's out of place in any way to say that, in light of the type of provocative presentation involved in the question, I need only assure the hon. acting leader that, as he well knows, and particularly as he well knows at the time estimates are before the House on a day-by-day basis, questions of public expenditure are matters that are given the very fullest examination and made the subject of every bit of information that can possibly be produced when hon. members ask.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my hon. learned friend the Government House Leader was not listening very well, because I asked what government policy — I wasn't asking about the amount of money expended; we can do that in estimates.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my question of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister indicate what specific information this caucus committee was trying to ascertain when the minister, I presume, sent these people on their junket?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, irrigation in the province of Alberta is of very keen importance in the production, as in the past, certainly in the future. The water management program that has been started, and the Department of Agriculture's interest in upgrading the irrigation system as it exists in the southern part of the province, has created for not only members of the water management committee but indeed all hon. members, the question in regard to upgrading, as to whether the direction of upgrading and carrying water in the channels and systems of channelling that exist in the southern part of the province is the ultimate in the direction of the movement of water.

Secondly, in the areas of research, we as a province have of course been in the irrigation business since the

start of the province. But compared to other countries that have been in irrigation for a much longer period, certainly the information they've been able to gain over the period of years in salinity due to water seepage, the different methods of movement of water in channellization, the use of both cement and plastic pipe, which have been used in Europe and Africa much longer than we have in this province — the opportunity for the members of the water management committee to avail themselves of that knowledge and expertise certainly enhances their input and helps us collectively in making the decisions we have to make, on behalf of all Albertans, in the expenditure of funds towards irrigation.

I only have to remind all hon. members that the agricultural portion of the five-year irrigation program exceeds the \$100 million mark, and that's for upgrading the channel systems themselves. The storage of water, both on stream and off stream, is almost three times that amount.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the fact that when we send people on these junkets we are sending them with some expertise, can the hon. minister indicate what irrigation background or expertise the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood had, to accompany the members on this junket? [interjections]

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, once one becomes an elected representative, although the responsibilities may be great, I don't think the requirement to be an expert in every field is necessary. One must remember that as an elected representative one must pass judgment on decisions that certainly go far beyond the realm of our individual expertise. Certainly the opportunity to help in seeing is believing, or to have the opportunity to see and hear from experts in the field, lends to the decisions that have to be made. I think perhaps elected members find that's the best route to go. We're very fortunate that we had the opportunity for them to have that information and the opportunity to share with us, so that perhaps some of the expenditures we make are in the right direction in the total aspect of irrigation.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my last supplementary is to the hon. Government House Leader. In light of the fact that the minister has had a moment or two to reflect, can the hon. Government House Leader indicate to the Assembly if the government has now taken a change in direction and that government caucus committees paid by the taxpayers of this province will at all times report to the Assembly?

MR. COOK: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The question the hon. member is posing is clearly out of order. It's been dealt with by the hon. Government House Leader and shown to be factually inaccurate in its premises, and therefore should not logically be put.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it would really matter to the hon. member if it was logically or illogically put.

The question to the Government House Leader is: does the government have a policy that applies to the government side of the House which indicates that the hon. members on that side of the House can establish caucus committees, spend public funds, and not report to the Assembly?

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I object on a point of order. The hon. member has recorded his allegation for the second time in the same question. I would like a ruling from the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. Acting Leader of the Opposition would ask a direct question.

DR. BUCK: Very directly, then, Mr. Speaker, to the Government House Leader. Will or will not the government make public, in all instances, information that is gathered by government backbenchers at the expense of the taxpayers of the province?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's disinclination to define carefully between logical and illogical is well understood by all members in the Assembly.

With respect to his question, I would only say that when members who happen to be government members, as distinct from opposition members, undertake ...

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The point is that there are legislative committees and caucus committees. The hon. Government House Leader better not waffle on the issue. This is not a legislative committee I'm referring to.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to give due attention and respect to the point of order raised by the hon. member. I see Your Honour has also given due attention to it by not making any further observation after he sat down.

I would just say to the hon. member that when members do work on behalf of a minister, a delegation, or a mission, where they are properly included, we're not talking about the responsibilities of any caucus committee; we're talking about the involvement of a member of the Assembly. If the hon. member will get off ... Maybe what we should do, Mr. Speaker, is order one of the ambulances for him out of the first question he had because, at this hour, so far we're only on the hon. acting leader's second question.

In any event, caucus committees exist for caucus purposes. The purpose about which the hon. acting leader asked his questions ...

DR. BUCK: Pay them out of PC funds then.

MR. CRAWFORD: ... do not relate to matters of caucus committees. I don't know how often I have to say that before it finally gains some presence inside wherever it should be.

MR. BATIUK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. When the hon. Member for Clover Bar stated, does the government release any information when any members go on a junket, if the hon. member would follow his Votes and Proceedings, on April 3 the Minister of State for Economic Development — International Trade tabled the cost of an 11-day tour taken by the three members and a report of the irrigation committee. I think that should be available to the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order. I am asking the hon. Government House Leader if all caucus committees that expend public funds table their reports. That was the question. If the hon. Member for

Vegreville can't understand that, that's his problem, not mine.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the question has been asked several times, several answers have been given, and it's been explained. If any more information is required, it could be placed as a question on the Order Paper.

RCMP Investigation

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Attorney General. Bearing in mind the seriousness of sections 324 and 326 of the Criminal Code of Canada, dealing with forgery, is the minister in a position to confirm that the RCMP security service, under its Operation Checkmate in the early 1970s, forged and distributed three letters on Communist Party of Canada letterhead separately purporting: number one, that the Communist Party of Canada was instrumental in the formation of the National Farmers Union and would attempt to manipulate NFU delegates during a 1970 convention in Winnipeg; number two, that the May 1970 convention of the Canadian Labour Congress held in Edmonton was being infiltrated by agents of the Communist Party of Canada; and number three, that among a listed set of names of 35 prominent Edmontonians, including clergymen and other concerned citizens who had participated in sending a Vietnam war protest telegram to Ottawa, several were members of the Communist Party of Canada or were active communist sympathizers? Is the minister able to confirm whether or not the government of Alberta has received any information pertaining to these three items?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, when I first heard the question, the hon. member asked if I was in a position to confirm certain things that he then set about to read to the Assembly. The short answer would be no, I certainly can't confirm all of what he has just read.

If the question is, is there any truth to any of what he has read, and am I in a position to respond in that context, the answer would be that I can certainly respond in connection with the extent to which I feel able to deal with the question of Checkmate. Checkmate was certainly a highly controversial matter that obtained a high degree of public interest over a period of a year or so.

Over a period of time, I have made a number of public statements in connection with that, Mr. Speaker. I'm certainly pleased to make the same statements here in the Assembly. They had not been asked about until now. But the circumstances are that when the series of what were known as either dirty trick operations or mischievous types of operations on the part of the RCMP was made a matter of some considerable public discussion, the question arose as to whether any of what was done constituted a crime and, if it did, where and if there should be any further investigation and prosecution. Some months ago we received from the federal Solicitor General's Department the beginnings of certain information meant to help us, as those responsible for the administration of justice in Alberta, decide that question of whether anything was done in the course of Checkmate that should be made the subject of any criminal prosecution.

In the course of receiving that, two cases were identified as potentially involving the administration of justice in Alberta. We quickly dismissed the first because it was evident that whatever was done, no crime had been committed. That was absolutely, abundantly clear to

anyone who looked at the circumstances. There was a slightly further involvement in the second one, in that there was a possibility that a forgery had been committed. That involved a letter which referred to the Communist Party of Canada and may have been termed mischievous in the way it was used.

I might say to the hon. member that if a forgery occurred, it did not occur in Alberta. Therefore, the question of any forgery charges would not be a matter for the administration of justice here. All that appeared to have occurred in Alberta was that the document, if it was forged, was distributed here. Considering the number of years that have passed and the nature of what I still consider to be a mere mischievous act in distribution of the letter here, it was my conclusion that it was not something that called on us to lay criminal charges in the interests of justice.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I make reference to Section 326 of the Criminal Code, which indicates that anyone who, "knowing that a document is forged, uses, deals ... or acts upon it", which would include distribution.

My question very directly to the hon. Attorney General: in view of the fact that forgeries, which are a violation of the Criminal Code, were apparently used to discredit organizations in this province, is the minister now in a position, as a result of what should be our effort to clear the air, to advise the Assembly whether the two organizations affected by this kind of activity were, one, the National Farmers Union of Alberta — a perfectly legitimate organization — and two, the Canadian Labour Congress?

MR. CRAWFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to confirm that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Subsequent to receiving this information, what steps has the hon. Attorney General taken to assure himself and the government of Alberta that this kind of tactic — distributing forged documents — which is a violation of 326 of the Criminal Code, is not happening now?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I suppose if something is being distributed publicly in sufficient numbers, it may well come to the attention of many, many Albertans, and that might deal in part with the question of what information there is about whether similar things are happening now.

On the larger question: as a result of Checkmate, senior officers of the RCMP long ago indicated that after the event they questioned that type of policy. No doubt some of this arose as a result of the hearings held by the McDonald commission in respect of the RCMP. I believe I'm correct in saying that senior officers of the RCMP indicated that they did not consider this type of activity to be appropriate for the force in carrying out their duties in respect of security services, and that that type of activity was not being carried on at the present time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could this be the final supplementary, followed by the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General has indicated that he has received reports. My question to him was somewhat different.

After receiving the information that this kind of illegal activity had gone on in this province, albeit some years ago, and had hurt innocent people and organizations, was any representation made by either the Attorney General or any other responsible official of the government of Alberta to the Minister of Justice to indicate our concern at this kind of activity proceeding in Alberta, and to have the assurance from a responsible official in the government of Canada that no other type of similar activity would be condoned by the government of Canada by any agency of the government of Canada, that in fact illegal activity would not be condoned for whatever purpose?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the whole question of the operation of the security services is a continuing matter of debate in the area where the responsibility lies, the government of Canada. I'm sure at the present time they treat this as a matter which is still deserving of current discussion and debate. I have no doubt they're waiting for what will perhaps be the interesting observations of Mr. Justice McDonald. The issues have received all sorts of airing. Without being able to say to the hon. member now what commitments may have been made by the Minister of Justice or the federal Solicitor General in respect of their responsibilities, my memory of the matter is that on the point raised, senior members of the force have indicated that this type of activity is not being engaged in.

The hon. member's question dealt with what assurances had been sought from the Minister of Justice. That is a matter which no doubt they continue to consider current, but they have not provided any particular assurances. I would only assume that they're as aware of the issues and problems as everybody else in the country, and they're looking to see what recommendations may come from the McDonald commission.

MR. NOTLEY: One final supplementary question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The final supplementary has already been heard. We'll have the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn.

LRT Funding

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Transportation. It arises from a statement made yesterday by Commissioner Cornish of the city of Calgary, to the effect that not only has the provincial government refused to approve additional funding for an integrated LRT system presently in Calgary, but it has also refused to allow the city to make use of some \$50 million already received by the city from the provincial government. It has refused to allow them the use of those funds for some preliminary work on an integrated LRT system.

My question to the minister simply is: can the minister verify the accuracy of that statement and, if so, could he advise the Assembly the basis upon which the province has taken that position with respect to funds already forwarded to the city of Calgary?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to hear that, because we've given the cities much more flexibility than they had initially when this six-year program was announced, so they could move funds around inside the system. On the specific of this, I would have to take the question as notice.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister advise whether he is giving consideration to speeding up the time frame for review of the south leg or to eliminating it entirely, given concerns that any delay in proceeding with an integrated LRT system in Calgary will cost an estimated \$59 million per year of delay, on top of the present estimated price tag of \$257 million for the north leg, and the additional concerns that any review of a one-legged system is unlikely to provide any meaningful results?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, the operation and success of the LRT is not necessarily premised on serving two or more areas at the same time. In the experience we've had in Edmonton, for example, we have the starting point and the destination point, and they relate to specifics from the outlying area to the centre of town and from the centre of town to the stadium area, which seems to work pretty well. So it isn't totally a matter of one section relying on the operation of another, although I can believe that it would help.

As far as the comment that each year adds another \$59 million to the price tag, I really can't deal with that because, as I've said before, the departmental responsibility lies with those things we can deal with. When you start talking about accelerating the program to the degree that it involves — for example, just for LRT alone — more money than I have in the budget for this year, then it's obviously a bigger decision than just a departmental one.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary question.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A further supplementary to the minister, if I might, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise whether his department will at least provide specific performance criteria to the cities of Calgary and Edmonton so they at least will know what test of performance they have to meet for the provincial government and can proceed as quickly as possible to meet that performance requirement and, hopefully, minimize any delay in proceeding with an integrated system.

MR. KROEGER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we're quite prepared to do that, although the specifics of the criteria would relate to the kind of use we have a record of. The use record we have in Edmonton at the present time indicates about 15 per cent of capacity, which in itself would tend to make you believe that we should move very carefully before we expand much more.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A final supplementary.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That was the final supplementary question. The time for the question period has expired, and I regret that a number of members have been unable to ask their questions today.

We've had requests from the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower and also the Member for Spirit River-Fairview to revert to Introduction of Special Guests. We also have a request for the chairman of the private Bills committee to introduce a motion. Would the House agree to these proceedings?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly 24 students visiting Alberta from *la belle province*. They are participating in the Quebec/Alberta student employment exchange program and are in attendance here as part of their orientation to Alberta.

These students have been placed in jobs in the Edmonton and Calgary areas in the following Alberta government departments: Advanced Education and Manpower, Agriculture, Energy and Natural Resources, Environment, Housing and Public Works, Recreation and Parks, Social Services and Community Health, Solicitor General, and Utilities and Telephones. A reciprocal program is taking place in Quebec for Alberta students. The jobs emphasize meaningful work experience and an opportunity for the students to develop their second language skills.

The young men and women are accompanied by Monsieur Benoit Lemay and are seated in the members gallery. I would ask them all to rise and receive the warm traditional *bienvenue* of our Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I have a second delegation I would like to introduce, without any attempt at French. I am pleased to introduce to you, and through you, more visitors to Alberta from other parts of Canada. The further education services branch of my department is hosting a meeting on national adult basic education, at which representatives from other provincial governments are exchanging information and identifying concerns.

They are: Mr. and Mrs. Percy Barrett of Newfoundland, Dorothy Hicks of Prince Edward Island, Ann Marie Downie of Nova Scotia, Bill Richardson of New Brunswick, Paul Montpetit of Ontario, and Echo Lidster of the Yukon. They are accompanied by Bill Shields from further education services. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to be able to introduce Ian Waddell, the hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway in the House of Commons. Mr. Waddell is the energy critic of the New Democratic caucus in the House of Commons. He's seated in the visitors gallery, and I would ask him to stand and be recognized by the members of this House.

head: **READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS**

MR. KNAAK: I'd like to move that the petitions for private Bills I presented yesterday be read and received. In the interest of saving time today, I also move that the reading of the actual petitions again be waived by the Assembly.

[Motions carried]

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, with regard to questions and motions. Before I deal with Motion for a Return 118, could I ask the acting Leader of the Opposition whether he is prepared at this time to make the amendment to Motion 118 agreed to by the Hon. Leader of the Opposi-

tion, or will he wish it to be held until the return of the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition, I would ask that 118 be held on the Order Paper.

MR. HORSMAN: Thank you. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I would move that questions 111 and 122 be held and that motions for returns 113, 117, 118, 120, 121, 123, 124, 125A and 126 all be held on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

116. On behalf of Mr. R. Clark, Mr. Mandeville moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:
- (1) a copy of the qualifications and experience requirements by the job descriptions for all Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund senior service investment staff positions;
 - (2) the job classifications and salary range for these positions;
 - (3) without disclosing the personal identity of those involved, a general description of experience and qualifications of each senior investment staff officer employed during the fiscal year 1980-81.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this motion for a very brief period. I would like to do so because a similar motion came up in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund select committee of the Legislature last fall. At that particular time this kind of motion attracted some interest from members of both our own party and opposition parties.

I'm supporting this motion, and I'd like to explain the distinction between the discussion in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee of the Legislature and the support for this particular motion moved by Mr. Clark. The initial concern with respect to the way it was introduced into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee was that in fact that motion asked for confidential resume information of individuals working in the department. I don't support the disclosure of personal, confidential information now, nor did I at that time. My support, and I hope this House's support, will be conditioned on the premise that the information is given in such a way that it does not disclose personal and private information.

The second important difference in this motion is: this is where it should be raised, and I believe the total Assembly deserves the information as it is commuted to the public. The Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee of the Legislature has a particular mandate. That mandate includes reviewing the annual report, considering the investments, and making recommendations. It's not part of the responsibility of that forum to debate whether or not any individual has the qualifications to be employed by the department. That's the responsibility of the minister, and he's accountable to this Assembly. So again for that reason, I support this motion as it is presented here. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I still have some problems with the motion. As the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud said, the matter was debated quite

thoroughly in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee.

My concerns are these. The number of people involved in this is probably small. It doesn't take too long to identify an MBA from Harvard and a fellow with a doctorate from Toronto if there's only six or seven on the committee. It's not hard to take the experience record and where they've been educated and tie the qualifications to particular individuals. My other concern is why this data is needed. These employees follow general guidelines. If the opposition is not happy with their performance — the investment record is not the fault of the employees but rather the general policy under which they operate. The other thing I'm concerned about is that possibly it can be used in a willful, destructive way. I hope it won't be. Lastly, it is probably going to frustrate or hinder the government in getting and keeping good people who can make substantially greater sums of money in the investment world than working for government agencies and being subject to any pillorying in the public sector.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, we had quite a debate last fall in the heritage trust fund committee on this particular subject. I just note in section (3):

without disclosing the personal identity of those involved, a general description of experience and qualifications ...

The salary range for the positions: I note that we already have the salary range for all deputy ministers, assistant deputy ministers, and senior officials of the government of Alberta. So we have that kind of information for other people in the decision-making process in the civil service. I would argue that the people of Alberta have a right to information on qualification and experience requirements, first of all by the job descriptions. Surely there can't be any quarrel with that.

Again, with the qualification the Member for Olds-Didsbury has submitted, "without disclosing the personal identity", I can't imagine how anyone could say this information should not be made available to the public of Alberta. We have a right to know the qualifications of people who are handling hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars. The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight has suggested that the government is accountable. Yes, you bet they're accountable. But part of that accountability is whether or not we have in place the kind of personnel able to make the best day by day decisions. And when you're dealing with large amounts of money, the qualifications of people doing the investing is going to be crucial. That kind of general information is not only perfectly appropriate in the public domain but absolutely essential if we are to be able to genuinely hold the government accountable, as they must be for investment of the heritage trust fund.

In my view the motion by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury is completely in order and appropriate. I hope members of the Assembly will support it. However, I regret that that information was not made available last fall and that committee members voted against it. I would remind them that several years before the same kind of information had been volunteered in a meeting of the heritage trust fund committee. Let's try to make as much information available to the public as possible. After all, the money of all the people of Alberta is at stake here, and investment decisions are of interest to all citizens of Alberta.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty whatsoever with this motion. Surely it's valid, important, and proper that such information should be made available. With the erasing of the individual's name, there should be no difficulty. In order that citizens of Alberta can judge whether that individual is proper, good, capable, and able — and I'm sure he is — I feel very strongly that that information should be available so citizens at large can make that judgment. I have no hesitation supporting the motion.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to say that I support this motion. During committee meetings, I attempted to pursue this information as well. This motion says it would be desirable to have the information "without disclosing the personal identity of those involved". I think that was our intent at the time. We didn't want to trespass on anyone's privacy or compromise anyone's dignity in asking for the information.

I'd also like to reiterate that during those committee meetings the Provincial Treasurer volunteered to give the information. In subsequent meetings it was pointed out that the prior Provincial Treasurer had not only given that information in a general way but in more detail than was asked. I see no harm in supplying information like this, even though one member pointed out that it could be used in a destructive way. You could also say that automobiles can be used in a destructive way, but that doesn't preclude others from using them in a beneficial way.

I believe this could be beneficial to us too in assessing the responsibility of the government in the management of the trust fund. Therefore I support the motion.

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the motion, I don't have great concern or difficulty with it, perhaps with this observation. I think there is and certainly ought to be a job description for various positions, particularly key positions. It might well be that minimum standards for anyone filling key positions should be clearly articulated — and I'm sure they are. However, in reviewing the activity of the heritage trust fund, I hope politicians would not draw into their unique likes or dislikes a highly capable, qualified staff and eventually destroy or at least take away the edge of that highly skilled staff from wanting to remain on staff simply because of the attempt of perhaps using that as a football. I would just caution that.

I think it's not only sufficient for us to very seriously consider and very carefully weigh the fact that the individual should be protected from being used in the political arena, if you will, or even in the media, unless there is a gross derogation of responsibility. I certainly share the concerns raised by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight that where you have a highly concentrated staff that is small, there may well be some easy identifiability of people.

Having said that, I support the motion, with the qualification that we should be absolutely satisfied we are not going to deleteriously affect these people who in most or all cases are doing a very, very credible job for the citizens of Alberta.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I didn't think this motion was terribly productive in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I haven't changed my view on that, except to say that the test of productive use of time does not seem to hold to motions for returns in any event. But I would voice the

same caution and concern that the Member for Calgary McKnight voiced. The staff is small. The confidentiality of the people involved will certainly be stripped away very easily. In fact the debate in the House has probably served to do that already. So I caution the House that in view of this motion, we're setting a very bad precedent to put into the public arena servants of the government whose responsibilities are technical and are perhaps being unduly compromised when we take this direction in motions for returns.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, I can advise the members of the Assembly that this motion is acceptable to him, and the information which has been requested, and in the form it has been presented, will soon be available to members of the Assembly after passage of this motion today.

I do think it important to add just a note. The points made by members of the Assembly in this discussion are valid. It is important that we recognize the rights of our civil servants, employees of this government, so that their entire future with the government not be jeopardized. But the motion is acceptable and therefore I would urge that members adopt the motion for a return.

[Motion carried]

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

205. Moved by Mr. Hyland:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the Alberta government to reject the market assurance plan (MAP) as recommended by the advisory committee to the Canadian Wheat Board.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, in my opinion MAP would affect the farmer of Alberta and western Canada like no other program that has been proposed for many, many years. It would have a long-lasting and detrimental effect on the farmer. I think members will show that through their participation in this motion.

To my understanding MAP originated after a production symposium in Saskatoon approximately a year ago, a symposium that my research indicates was composed of advisory committee members to the Wheat Board, some scientists, and an expert in the field of grain marketing. The symposium lacked farmers *per se* — that's not saying that the advisory committee aren't farmers, because they have to be elected. But farmers from other farm groups that have representation throughout the provinces ought to be on the advisory committee to the Wheat Board. A couple of months after the symposium, or approximately that amount of time, MAP came out. Sometime after that, through a number of advisory committee meetings throughout the provinces, this program came to the farmers for their acceptance. Needless to say the majority of farmers in Alberta wished, and indicated at most of the meetings, that the plan be rejected.

Basically the plan calls for the selling of your crops before the end of the crop year, which is July 31. You will receive storage payment for any crops on your farm that are committed at that time. Looking at the system of grain transportation in the U.S., I understand that most of the time they have opportunities to sell whatever amount they wish to by March of almost every crop year. So by March the crops they have grown the previous year

can be in the elevators, and they can have the cash in their pockets. In the States they have a free enterprise system. They seem to be able to move the grain. Even in paying the full cost of the movement, the farmers there seem to come out either equal to the cost we get per bushel of grain or a few cents ahead. Yet as I said, they are paying the full cost of movement of the grain.

According to MAP, the shortfalls in moneys that would be needed to operate the program could be picked up by the federal government. If this alternative were accepted — I'm sure we would all agree that if the federal government put substantial moneys into the operation of the system, they would want control. Right now, where would they get the money? Well, we see them buying Petrofina. We can say they paid too much for it — that's a matter of debate, I guess. Then they decide to invoke a levy, an extra tax on the price of gasoline and natural gas to pay for it. Would this in fact happen to MAP? Would they invoke an extra charge on the handling of wheat to pay for it? Or would they invoke an extra charge on the handling of another commodity to come up with the substantial amount of cash that would be needed to operate this program?

The other alternative is for the farmer or operator or user of the Wheat Board to pay for the cost of operation. Right now the farmer pays the cost of operation of the Wheat Board. It comes from the final price that we as farmers receive for our grain. If this were the case, we would be paying ourselves in one hand and taking it away with the other. So there would be no gain to the farmer in his pocket.

From some of the information in my research, I've been able to 'guesstimate' that the cost of carrying a tonne of wheat would be approximately \$7.40 a year or 23 cents a bushel, if my figuring is right. Like most farmers, I still have trouble with the concept of how much area a tonne of wheat takes up versus how much a bushel of wheat takes up. I see some of my colleagues nodding their heads; they have the same problem. But \$7.40 a tonne or 23 cents a bushel to hold a bushel or tonne of grain for a year is indeed a substantial amount of money on your income. So depending on the alternative taken — if the farmer were paying for the operation of the program, then even though you're getting some money for storage of any grain you hold, obviously when the final payment comes you'll end up with approximately 20 cents a bushel less for your grain. So with the Wheat Board paying the cost, the net advantage to the farmer would not be that great, yet the responsibility for operation of the Wheat Board would still be with the Wheat Board. The farmer would have no more direct input to the election or appointment of members than he has now. He would still be able to elect the advisory committee, but he would have no control over the members of the Canadian Wheat Board.

According to the MAP proposal, Mr. Speaker, the quota system would be abandoned in favor of a call or demand system of grain, mostly for wheat. You would be called and told when and where to deliver your product. Feed grains would be in a different position. Ultimately they might end up with a demand or call system, or they could indeed stay even on a quota system to allow them to come in. I would suggest Alberta would be at a distinct disadvantage under that sort of system because of the substantial amount of feed grain grown in this province. Other provinces, especially Saskatchewan — their basic, main crop is hard wheat. Our wheat production is not as great as theirs. We might get rid of it on the demand

system, but I would suggest we would be in severe difficulty when trying to market feed grain on that system.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, some arguments say that feed grain would not necessarily be in the system. But we have seen the federal government come into areas of jurisdiction of the province and invoke special taxes — the national energy policy — in our rightful field of natural resources. If they were funding MAP and had control, I would suggest that they would indeed move in and put feed grains under MAP, and the farmer would not have any choice. We have seen some movement by certain segments of the industry to move feed grains under the purview of the Wheat Board. This would remove the natural advantages Alberta feeders have. With MAP going into existence and the feed freight assistance for feed grains that already exist to Ontario feeders, we might end up killing the feeding industry in Alberta. In Alberta today we have a good cow-calf industry. We have a fairly good, progressive feeding industry, but at the present time it is running into problems and losing anywhere from \$100 to \$200 on a fat animal because of prices and interest. This will even lessen their advantage in being here, and we will be moving substantial, maybe even more, quantities of grain out of Alberta than we presently are.

Mr. Speaker, I've asked a few farmers who have been farming for a number of years how many years in the last 20 they've had grain, wheat, in storage on the farm. I think the general answer is that a certain amount of their crop is usually left over three years out of four. The amount left over may vary. Some years they may have a high carry-over; some years it may be low. The only way they can keep the carry-over low is to seed other crops, rape or barley feed or feed wheat, they can sell directly to the feeders that don't interfere with their quota deliveries in the elevator and use their acres on their quota allotment. That way they can keep their grain carry-overs lower and maintain the cash flow they need to operate. If such a system as MAP came into existence, quite likely this would be prevented. The ultimate of the system would be that in time you could easily be told what you were going to grow, what was needed in the market place. Thus, you would have to grow so many acres of wheat.

Really, Mr. Speaker, the farmer who is farming the soil is the one who knows what his farm will produce best. Some areas can produce wheat, and some can produce feed grains, some can produce both. When you're sitting in an office in Ottawa or Winnipeg and making a decision on the amount of grain needed for the market, I'm sure you wouldn't realize the difference in the areas of the province. The directive would go out that this area has to grow whatever the grain may be, and it may not be the area for it. As I said, all of us involved in agriculture in Alberta know that certain areas grow certain grains better than others because of soils, moisture, and the farming operations carried on.

Mr. Speaker, typical of some of the thinking in eastern Canada of shipping all our raw products down to eastern Canada, I note that this quote is attributed to a westerner. It was suggested, by a person who used to be a member of the House of Commons, Jack Horner, at an unnamed party convention a short time ago in Edmonton, that we were not using our money in the heritage trust fund wisely by buying hopper cars; rather we should buy a thousand livestock cars for the same kind of money. As I've said, it's typical of that kind of thinking: you ship the raw product to other parts of Canada to have it processed. I would suggest we would have a new

train, maybe three blue and gold colored livestock cars going down the tracks, and in between every three blue and gold livestock cars we would have to have one or two of our hopper cars filled with our barley, paid for at compensatory rates, going down to other parts of Canada so they can feed our product. Then our feeding industry in Alberta begins to die. Remarks such as that and proposals such as MAP indeed worry the feeders and farmers in Alberta.

Research shows that the possible cost of such a program as MAP would be about \$500 to \$550 for a permit holder. As I've said, somebody is going to have to pay that \$500. By the time you multiply that by the number of farmers in Alberta, your cost for such a program would be very high. If it is not the farmer, whoever is paying that kind of money is going to want a lot of say in the operation of the program.

The thing that is hard to understand about the program though, Mr. Speaker, is that you read the proposals and feel that somehow surplus in supply is going to increase production. That is hard to understand. I think all members would agree that the easiest way to increase production would be for the Wheat Board to move the grain, to find new products to sell to new areas that need the grain. I think if that happened, the farmer would then grow the grain because he would have a market to haul it to, the elevators would be accepting it, and the free enterprise system would work as it does in other parts of the world.

One thing I haven't said yet: all rural members realize that elevators in rural areas are full of grain a good majority of the time. You can't deliver when you have quotas. If all grain was under the system, whether it was an on-call system or whatever, the delivery and transportation system still wouldn't be improved. Because you're concentrating on governing production, and not movement and selling of grain where the concentration should be. I would suggest that if such a program would have been put into existence — and we all realize that the Wheat Board and the advisory committee to the Wheat Board have said that this program will not come out this crop year. It will not be used until such a time as the west requests it. I think that's the important thing about today: that the profile is maintained, and that the farmers realize they have to keep the pressure up, saying they don't want this program, so the Wheat Board does not try to bring back this program at another time through the back door.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, I think the difference between the proposed MAP program and the program of free market through the Wheat Board — we had a discussion in this Legislature a number of weeks ago, and as many members have said, the dual marketing system can be summed up in the words the Premier made during an address at the Conservative convention in Calgary this year. It really follows back to what our conception of Canada is: freedom of choice versus centralistic state control of the country. Mr. Speaker, the MAP program is centralist control of the system. Freedom of choice would exist in a dual marketing grain system.

The Wheat Board often doesn't seem to like to handle grains that aren't in sufficient numbers. I mean feed grains, soft white wheat. The soft white wheat growers have had a long, hard battle with the Wheat Board for many years in order to get them to accept soft white

wheat as a part of the system, a part that can be contracted and marketed, and they still do it. My feelings on soft white wheat and the Wheat Board are a matter of record in *Hansard*. A number of times I've talked about my conversation relating to soft white wheat with Mr. Jarvis, the chief commissioner of the Wheat Board. If they're not interested in these marketing needs, maybe they should let them out from underneath the Wheat Board and the associations can market themselves. I'm sure there are markets there. If they're too small for such a big organization, let some of these things away from them so the associations can try to market themselves, as happens in parts of Canada where the Wheat Board doesn't have jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, just to illustrate, the Premier stated in this Assembly on May 8, 1978:

The fourth recommendation is that there be a board of governors of the Canadian Wheat Board and that such board include direct appointees of various provincial governments primarily involved in the grain trade.

Again this illustrates that we need people who are closely involved in the business to provide direction. I'm sure that if we had active farmers involved in the business at a decision-making level, at the Wheat Board level, the discussion between the advisory committee and the Wheat Board would have happened in such a way that this program may never have got outside the walls of the advisory committee meetings.

Mr. Speaker, I think one thing such a program would create is business for the paper industry. To exert such control over an industry, the amount of paperwork involved would be enormous. Just to give you a bit of background: I've got a very good friend who sells loader motors, sprinkler engines, and sprinkler parts. The amount of paperwork in that is just unreal. Taxation has to be paid on every engine sold. The person has to sell it, fill out an end user certificate, a tax certificate signed by the farmer, and send it back to the federal tax department before they can get their money. We all know that when you owe the federal tax department money, they let you know right away. When they owe you money, that's a different story. It takes a little longer for delivery. Stuff such as sprinkler equipment, a riser for a sprinkler system, or a latch or gasket for a pipe goes out on every bill you have. You might have one or two on a bill worth \$3 or \$4. You need to have an end user certificate, with the land location and everything, signed by the farmer, or else the businessman has to pay the tax. So if they go to that kind of detail for that, you can imagine what they would go to for such a program as this when they're exerting control.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read some short quotations from letters sent to me by my constituents, just to illustrate to the Assembly what the farmers in my area think of this program. These are not form letters. They're individually written letters from the farmers. One reads:

I feel MAP is a grab for agricultural control as much as NEP is a grab for our resources.

Another one:

The M. A. P. proposal as we know it reeks of socialistic philosophy which is a detriment to the free enterprise system we have today. We feel that improving of transportation of our commodity and higher prices will provide a strong incentive for increased productivity of all grains.

Another letter, Mr. Speaker — I won't quote from it. I'll quickly summarize it. It says much the same thing, but

also draws the line that the only person who may benefit from this program will be the steel industry, because they'll be able to sell a great many more steel bins to store the grain.

Mr. Speaker, I note that you sent me a note saying I have three minutes left; I presume it's probably two minutes by now.

AN HON. MEMBER: One minute.

MR. HYLAND: Okay. The important thing to realize with such a system — and we look at exhibit no. 9 from the Canadian Wheat Board annual report of 1979-80. Mr. Speaker, I think it really illustrates the problem: market development money spent by the Canadian Wheat Board, \$17,347 in '79-80; in '78-79, \$48,500, a reduction of almost two-thirds. Why? We can only assume that maybe next year they thought it might be less because the MAP proposal would be in place and they wouldn't need market development; they would control the production. That's an opinion.

It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that two other items in the budget of the Canadian Wheat Board have less money spent on them than market development: weather surveillance and the dues to the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange put together amount to slightly more than the amount spent on market development. Even the upkeep of their office equipment is better than twice the amount spent on market development. I think that illustrates the problem farmers face and why we should reject such a program as MAP by the Canadian Wheat Board. It will be detrimental to the farmers and the farming and feed industries in Alberta, and we urge the Canadian Wheat Board to forget such a program and get on with market development. Surely \$17,000 in a \$17 million cost of administration is minimal for market development. They should proceed with that, instead of spending all that money and coming out with such a program.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to get in on this debate regarding MAP and the whole concept of government control. It's often been said by officials that MAP is simply a voluntary vehicle where those who want to participate can, and it should be of no great consequence to the rest of us who are free enterprisers and want to do things in the customary, Alberta way.

Well, when you look over the details of MAP — as sketchy as they are, certainly not in any way structured so the farmer can understand, let alone anyone else — it doesn't say who's really going to pay for it. They say probably the federal government, the Canadian Wheat Board, or both. If it's the Canadian Wheat Board, it's not a voluntary system any more. It would mean every one of us as producers would be paying for it. Some of the people MAP would probably benefit would be the central Canadian feeders, as the hon. Member for Cypress has quite clearly pointed out. We're plagued with the Crow rate. Even though the Crow had some advantages in the stability of moving grain in the past, it certainly has no relevance now. We're simply caught up in the overall problem of having railways pay the way, and I don't think anyone should be expected to other than perhaps governments. If a subsidy is going to be paid, the governments should be the ones doing it, not an individual company or group. With MAP, farmers would certainly be the group paying.

Furthermore, if you were a volunteer to MAP, nothing I have read says you'd get paid for any storage in your granaries. You'd have to buy the new granaries. It doesn't say you'd be given any benefit of weather or road conditions when called on to sell your grain; no clarification as to spoilage, losses, storms, health, or whatever. Whenever I see something that's come out of central Canada . . . They say the advisory committee has come up with this program. I don't really believe that for a moment. I think we have some people who certainly advise the advisory groups as to what they want, if they want to stay on there. Then we have the fellow in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, a hazy argument if there ever was one, who keeps everybody hopping and wondering what he's going to come up with next.

Mr. Speaker, Trudeau clearly dictates what's going to happen in Canada.

DR. BUCK: Can't you say the Prime Minister?

MR. LYSONS: Take it any way you want to, hon. Member for Clover Bar. My colleagues know who I'm talking about, and I'm sure my readers back home would know who I'm talking about. In the last federal election, a candidate for the office of Prime Minister said he would satisfy western Canada by double-tracking the railway from Winnipeg to wherever. Well, that wasn't double-tracking. It was double-crossing, side-tracking, or double-talking. But it certainly has no relevance to us here.

Along with our neighboring province, we bought 1,000 hopper cars. We thought this was clearly going to be a benefit to us and we could do some things, maybe change some things. Then we find out that those boys down there say, look, those hopper cars are going to be under the control of the Canadian Wheat Board, like it or lump it. You know, one of these days we may just have to stand up to Ottawa and . . .

DR. BUCK: Separate.

MR. LYSONS: No, I think there's probably a little better way than separation, although I couldn't honestly say to the hon. Member for Clover that separation hasn't crossed my mind. It certainly has, but we should probably be a little more patient than just quitting. I don't like quitters. I like people who will stay in there and fight. If we can afford to, maybe we can hang on for another three or four years until some people realize that perhaps these programs and others the federal government is talking about just aren't what we want.

For one thing, it would be interesting to find out what the American railroads would say to us if we hauled these hopper cars into Montana, or wherever that railway comes up from the U.S. into western Canada, and said, okay, we'll spot those cars in the United States and truck the grain from southern Alberta onto those cars. I know that wouldn't be possible yet, but it would be an interesting argument. A thousand hopper cars could move most of the grain from southern Alberta. That makes 10 trains. It would be a very, very interesting proposition.

The Canadian Wheat Board can work. With honest, political influence, there's no doubt in my mind that the Canadian Wheat Board can work very, very well. The Canadian Wheat Board is a victim of a federal system that's weighted in favor of central Canada. Let's call a spade a spade. When we realize the make-up of the government in office in Ottawa — 74 members are from Quebec province alone and 73 other members are from

the rest of Canada — that means we're clearly governed by the province of Quebec. There's nothing wrong with that, except it attacks us in a way that I'm sure no individual constituent from Quebec would imagine. I don't think the average person in Quebec would think that they had such a dominant influence over our lives.

MAP probably satisfies the wheat farmer in southern Saskatchewan. It would give him some stability. They don't have the weather conditions we have and the variety of crops we grow here. But it's not the way for Albertans to go. A dryland crop in southern Saskatchewan, or southern Alberta for that matter, will produce about 20 or 25 bushels of wheat to the acre, and that's considered a pretty good crop. It's not unusual for those of us who live in the good farming area to get 50 and 60 bushels of wheat to the acre. So clearly we are at a double disadvantage right there in the fact that the way the quota system is, the farmer in Saskatchewan can sell almost all his acreage compared to what we could sell half of here.

When we look at the program, as sketchy as it is, it's interesting that they make no allowance for the different roadbed systems we have. In my area we have three CN lines, and the grain moves off those very, very well. But we have one CP line. When we were able to sell a nine-bushel quota, the farmers along the CP line were able to sell 2.9 bushels. That's just not fair. That grain was tied up for months and months. No MAP is going to cure that. It would be very sad if those people who signed up to MAP could get their grain moved to market and those of us free enterprisers who didn't put grain in MAP couldn't deliver that grain out of sheer orneriness. I believe that right now there are people involved in the federal government who would be ornery enough to make us hold that grain.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I'd like to suggest that we take one more run at buying a railbed or several railbeds as highways.

DR. BUCK: Try the CP, Tom.

MR. LYSONS: I don't think we'd want to buy a particular company, but a railbed. There's probably no other transportation system that isn't subsidized. Take our airports. Being on the airport caucus committee, I see where we spend millions of dollars every year in building rural airports. Everybody's happy with that. No one complains because we're spending millions of dollars a year to build rural airports. We have waterways. No one complains about developing waterways, federally or even provincially for that matter. Everyone's hollering for us to build more roads, including the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

DR. BUCK: Even Tom.

MR. LYSONS: No, I was pretty happy with the roads the last couple of years. [interjection] That makes it interesting. You're in a tourist area down there. You don't want to go driving through our country without having a good look at it. Your problem is that you don't want to look at it upside down.

The way the railways are structured now, Mr. Speaker, they have to pay property tax, income tax, the same as any other company. We don't have anyone charged income or property tax for highways or airports. Either we buy a railbed or, in typical Alberta tradition, I'd rather we strike out on our own and build a railway somewhere so we can get out to tidewater; have the CN, CP, B.C. Rail, or any other company put their trains on

it. If they weren't able or didn't want to compete that way as far as grain is concerned, we have a thousand hopper cars we could slide on there pretty quick and maybe fire up — I think some some of these big farm tractors could pretty well pull a 100-car train. In fact I guess they have just about the same amount of horse power in Big Jim, as they call it.

But we're captive to the railways through the Canadian Wheat Board. We can truck our grain from the prairies to the coast with no problem from the Canadian Wheat Board. But try to get a boxcar to put it in. You can't do it. As far as the farmer is concerned, everything you touch with the railway has to go through some federal agency. But we don't have to do that with the highways.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all hon. members to really study MAP and to discourage it at all possible times, because with this Ottawa government, clearly we can never hope to enjoy any amount of equity or fair treatment.

DR. BUCK: Would the hon. member who spoke permit a question?

MR. LYSONS: Yes.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking says he's contemplated separation. In light of the fact that we have inland terminals, terminals at the coast, and the government is building other terminals, has the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking given consideration to the cost of building our own railroad between the province and the west coast?

MR. LYSONS: No, I haven't. I've gone so far as to ask a company in Hungary for prices on a belt that would haul grain to Prince Rupert. I haven't got the information back. I asked for a quote on a 1,000-mile long belt. I don't know whether I'll ever hear about it.

To the hon. member for Clover Bar, I don't think we necessarily have to worry about — that we just look at our own coastline for a railway. There are other ports on this continent. If we try to tackle the mountains, we've got a job on our hands. But there are other ports. The costs of building a railway aren't nearly as high per mile as what the CN may tell you.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. [interjections] May I ask the hon. member a question? That's all. He can say either yes or no. Will the hon. member permit another short question, Mr. Speaker? [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, in indicating that there are other alternatives to move grain by rail, is the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking saying that we should be looking at going through the United States and then back up to the west coast, or would we market the grain through the United States?

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, if I may answer that question, I'm not suggesting any particular proposition. I think we should keep our options open. If we can move grain by air cheaper or better, then let's look at that situation. Of course I have no capsulized plan or program, but I don't think you would expect me to stand here and tell you about it if I did. Furthermore, when you asked me if I had contemplated separation, there are many things you can separate from.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, now that we've had the debate on the debate, I'd just like to talk about MAP for a few minutes. Due to the amount of negative producer reaction, the MAP program has been shelved at this time. The understanding though is that we're in only a temporary holding pattern, so it's imperative that we maintain our vigilance. I have to wonder what the ultimate aim of MAP is. If this is a means of insidious federal intrusion into control of agricultural production, then the concern voiced by the agricultural community and my constituents is well founded.

For years western agriculture has been the victim of preferential tariffs, selective freight rates, unequal subsidies, and a captive market. The one overriding problem which must be solved is the transportation of products. In a landlocked province with the mountains blocking our access to tide water, movement of products is our number one concern.

For example, I received a letter from the canola association last weekend which outlined their problem with the preferential freight rates, which are detrimental to the processing of rapeseed in Alberta. For instance, the rate for raw rapeseed is \$5 per tonne, yet the processed product is \$27 per tonne. The problem with MAP is that it does not address the serious problem of transportation and creates many unanswered problems of its own.

First, since the movement of grain is the key to meeting export commitments, how can MAP work unless these transportation problems are resolved? Secondly, the farmers pay all storage costs for grain. So are they paying themselves to store the grain? Third, the Wheat Board doesn't have advance funds to purchase and store grains. So where are these funds coming from, and how can they afford it at today's interest rates? Fourthly, what happens when the Wheat Board has grain stockpiled all over western Canada and can't move it to an export position? Who buys the next crop and where is it stored?

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

The view that the MAP program causes more problems than it answers is shared across many borders and provincial boundaries. Let me read a letter — just an excerpt — from the *Grainews* in Birch Hills, Saskatchewan:

There is no question that 50 per cent more grain *could be* produced. There is a real question, though, whether 50 per cent more grain *will be* produced, unless the farmers can be assured they will be able to sell all the grain they want to sell when they want to [sell it]. But will they get a price that will yield them a . . . profit?

The real problem, for years, that has limited our production has been the failure of our grain marketing and handling system to move the grain we do want to sell. For example, in 1979, the [Canadian Wheat Board] admitted to losing \$750 million in sales because they could not get the grain into the customers' boats.

MAP will do nothing to solve that problem of transportation.

So some of the questions are: a small army of civil servants will be required to police and operate the MAP scheme. No mention is made of how much this administration will cost, nor who will be stuck with the bill. MAP does not specify how much will be paid for storing the grain on our farms, or again, who will pay the price.

MAP assumes that you can scientifically plan when to plant, what to plant, and when to reap it. For instance, in

a paragraph from page 9 of the Canadian Wheat Board Secretary Maureen Hunter's speech to the symposium:

"Since the young farmer probably offers the greatest potential for expanding production over time, most of this technological guidance might be aimed at him. And if a 'planned production package' could be developed, tailor-made for the individual farmer, possibly it could be tied to a realistic five-year or ten-year financial plan . . . This would help to ensure that the farmer has the resources to do what the productivity experts say can be done."

Mr. Speaker, that doesn't take into consideration if it does rain, if it doesn't rain, if it freezes, or if it snows before you get the crop off.

A second letter from Milk River. Supply management plays an important part in the MAP program.

The implications of MAP for independent farmers goes deeply. If controlled by the CWB in its present form, MAP will lead to production controls by the mid-80s. The particular people advocating MAP feel centralized planning and *orderly marketing* are necessary . . .

The logical outcome of a system like MAP . . . provides no *advance* [payment], no target volumes, and *preseeding* contracts [which will cause] oversupply.

From the proposal, it is unclear who will pay to carry the oversupply each year — the Canadian Wheat Board pool, the federal government or, as we suspect, the producer.

Again, he asks the same kinds of questions asked by my constituents and those of the Member for Cypress and the Member for Vermilion-Viking. How is grain going to be transported? What is the mechanism for storage of grain crops? How will the price to feeders be set? Will elevator companies get 10 cents or 15 cents per bushel from sales that now normally go directly from the farm to the feeder? Would MAP promoters please spell out, for example, the logic and cost/benefit of introducing such a program? And exactly how will oversupplies of grain be financed?

MAP takes for granted that farmers can plan tilling, seeding, and harvesting in advance by some scientific formula. Every farmer knows that mother nature and the weather dictate the time allocated for each of these activities and whether or not there'll be a crop, except for irrigation. In the Three Hills-Calgary area, I understand they got a million dollar snowstorm last night. Isn't it a million dollars if you get snow at this time of the year in southern Alberta? I believe it is. [interjection] Two million.

AN HON. MEMBER: Cash or kind.

MRS. CRIPPS: Cash or kind. Well, it was very kind of mother nature to send rain, because we certainly needed it. [interjection] It's moisture.

MRS. OSTERMAN: However it comes, it's all right with us.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's right.

A letter from southern Alberta talks about this very problem of farmers being able to plan:

The farmer knows his land better than any scientist or government employee. He knows from a lifetime of experience how to match increased production costs to returns realized on an open, competitive . . . market.

Generalizations in MAP of proposed cropping methods, such as using fertilizers, doubling the amount of stubble-in crop, or how much — if any — changeover to zero-, or near-zero-tillage, cannot be taken seriously.

The last question I want to re-emphasize is the carry-over of surplus grain. What happens if the initial payment is \$5.50, the grain is carried over to the next crop year or the next crop year, and at that time the sale is only \$4.50? This happened in 1929 and can happen again. The foreign market for our grain really dictates the price. It is a matter of supply and demand. There is demand, Mr. Speaker. If markets are available, farmers have proven they will increase the supply. The main problem still remains the efficient transportation of our grain to the ports. Mr. Speaker, MAP totally ignores that problem. I hope you'll support this motion.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the debate this afternoon on this most timely, important issue. MAP has been shelved for some time. However, Gordon MacMurchy, Saskatchewan's Minister of Agriculture, has urged the advisory committee to reconsider and continue putting the plan forward. I think this should concern all producers in the province of Alberta, because even though it's shelved for a while it will continually be brought back. So the debate today on this issue is very, very timely indeed. The Canadian Wheat Board minister, Hazen Argue, said he felt the committee initially made the right decision with MAP and predicted that the last has not been heard from MAP.

I farmed for some time. In the past when the Wheat Board said to do one thing, I always did the opposite. My grandfather told me that if you really want to succeed in farming, the first thing you have to do is do the very best job you can managing the soil and putting in the crop. The good Lord will take care of the rain. But the next step is to do everything opposite to what the federal government or the Wheat Board tells you.

A successful farmer has to know a number of things. I'm convinced that one is certainly to do the opposite of what the federal Minister of Agriculture tells us. It always seems that the laws of Canada have been fashioned to perpetuate the movement of raw materials to manufacturers in central Canada. The manufacturer manufactures them into usable goods, exports some of them, and sends the rest to us at an increased price. Any threat to that status quo brings measures to ensure that we don't change the system, regardless of the cost to the country or whatever dangers there might be to national unity. So when the federal government comes up with MAP, another program we had a few years ago comes to mind. Called LIFT, it was supposed to mean lower inventories for tomorrow. At that time farmers in my area said "LIFT IT", which means less income for today including tomorrow. So any idea that the federal government is doing us a favor by coming out with MAP should quickly dispel any thoughts that that could be true.

I look at what the Alberta government is taking today at the hands of the Ottawa government's raid on our oil industry. Consider that the oil industry is now being hit by taxes put in place by the Ottawa government so returns to the industry on a barrel of oil in Canada make it better for companies to go to the United States. That is where they've been going. I wonder if someday they'll put a tax on farmers, a tax on a bushel of wheat. I wonder how much concern they'll have then for the income pic-

ture of farmers. It sure would be difficult for us farmers to move our land to the United States.

I read an article the other day which said that in 1934 it took 16 steers to buy a certain car in western Canada, while across the border in the United States it took four steers to buy the same car. [interjection] No bull was included in that. I think that's factual. We not only paid more for cars in 1934; we continue to pay more for them today. We continue to pay more for clothing and for everything we get from central Canada, compared to what we can buy in the United States. It makes me wonder.

When we talk about the oil industry, people in all parts of Canada today are beginning to realize they have natural resources of some kind and are going to be vulnerable. There certainly is a growing awareness in the petroleum industry that it's being taken away from Alberta by Ottawa. The doors are open for confiscation of profits from potash, timber, electricity, and minerals. The most vulnerable of all, Mr. Speaker, is the food industry, because several commodities already are subject to national regulation in production, pricing, and merchandising.

People in the province realize that food production will quickly become one of the most important industries in the future, and we should do everything possible to ensure that the freedom to develop it in the most efficient way it can remains. I know that producers in this province want to maintain freedom to develop. I consider the pioneers who came here. They broke the land, planted, and developed an industry like agriculture. They came here to be free and operate within a free enterprise system. It would be sad indeed if at this time we were to lose those freedoms.

In letters from constituents after MAP was announced, many things were brought out. One letter stated:

A maximum opportunity exists for a substantial contribution to the growth and development of Alberta by the agriculture industry.

The letter went on to say:

We think, however, that in order for the industry's great potential to be realized it must be freed from the shackles of various monopoly elements that constrain it. Democratization of Alberta's farm industry can only take place with the active support of the government of the province and we urge you to aggressively provide support in every manner possible.

Coming to freedoms, go out and look at the job the farmers in Alberta are capable of doing, and the strong stand the Alberta government has taken. Roy Atkinson, the former president of the National Farmers Union, called Alberta's Minister of Agriculture the chief villain of the anti-MAP campaign. I think it's an honor to be called the villain of the anti-MAP campaign. MAP is supposed to get farmers in an all-out production effort. Believe you me, if you want an all-out production effort, just stand aside and we'll grow it. But you'll have to get out there and sell it, because we'll grow and deliver it.

The only benefit of MAP, I would think, is to the granary manufacturing industry. Can you imagine the Wheat Board buying the grain, storing it on your farm? Where are you going to store it? Because if their sales ability in the future is anything like it has been in the past, you're going to need somewhere to store it. At the moment they have the terminals to store grain, and we pay demurrage on ships, and they're storing it in the elevators, and now they want to store it on the farms.

Where will the incentive be to move that grain? It's going to be stuck in our granaries. Now I know that if that grain is in my granaries, and it's my grain, I check it regularly to make sure that no bugs have got into it, it's not damp, the roof hasn't sprung a leak, or nothing has happened to it. I make sure I put the granaries in a spot where they're not going to get flooded. But if that grain belongs to the Wheat Board, I can assure you that I'm not going to pay that close attention to it. So guess what? Since I won't pay attention to it, an army of 'Trudeaucrats' is going to be out there to make sure it's in good condition. Can you see the nightmare we're going to have in the future with that kind of thing? It seems absolutely crazy to me.

Where's the money for all this going to come from? It's going to come from the Wheat Board. So the Wheat Board buys the grain from us, puts it in storage in the elevators, ships it, deducts all the expenses, and then we get a final payment. What kind of final payment do you think we're going to get after they've stored it on our farms and spoilage and all that nonsense goes along with it? I can hardly believe anybody would consider anything more ridiculous than MAP concerning those things alone. Instead of having storage on the farms, wouldn't it be a better idea for the Wheat Board to get out there and aggressively sell some of this grain? If they put up the quota and got out there, we'd get it to the elevators; we'd get it to export somehow.

Last March I was in Bahrain. They'd like to buy soft white wheat from us, barley, canola meal, canola oil, premixed poultry feed, and they have the cash to buy it. They're right on tidewater, so delivery really isn't a problem. But guess what? The Wheat Board hasn't talked to them for 14 to 17 years. Is that getting out there and aggressively selling something? That's one reason I think we need a dual marketing system. We can get out there and sell some of this grain and not have it all tied up under the Wheat Board's control, because it seems they can't get out there and do it. They also have been telling a number of countries that we don't have any soft white wheat, but they neglected to tell the farmers in southern Alberta, particularly in the irrigation areas: grow soft white wheat; we've got a market for it.

Also the idea of MAP to control all feed grains — we get all the barley under the control of the Wheat Board. By being able to control the feed grain industry, Mr. Speaker, can they also then control the livestock industry? Alberta produces about two-thirds of western Canada's barley production, yet all the barley for export for the last 40 years has been under Canadian Wheat Board control. Since I started farming, when things got tough I always had a little barley to sell. I could take it to the feed mill or the feedlots and sell some of it to get money to pay some of the bills. But now when you have to go through the Wheat Board and they control it in the elevators, are the feedlots going to have to go to the elevators and pay a 10 or 15 cents handling charge to get that barley out because I can't deliver it directly to them? It doesn't make any common sense.

When we're talking about MAP and the impact it's going to have on producers, I have to talk a bit about expenses that agricultural producers go through. An article a couple of weeks ago showed January 1980 prices as compared to January 1981 prices: for example, fertilizer in 1980 was \$162 a tonne for 34-0-0, and it was \$200 a tonne this last January; 11-50-1 fertilizer was \$266, and now it's \$356. V-belts are up 20 per cent, antifreeze is up 22 per cent, and twine is up 32 per cent. A 100-

horsepower tractor that sold for \$35,000 in 1980 is now \$41,000; a 170-horsepower tractor that sold for \$58,000 in 1980 is now \$67,000, and the combine is up the same amount. Look at the increased costs and these inputs to agriculture, and look at MAP and what it is supposed to do. It says buy grain from farmers. Now why in the world do they want to buy grain from farmers, with our own money? If they'd get out there and sell it, we'll produce it, we'll deliver it. They don't have to come and buy it that way.

There are a lot of risks in agriculture, not only high prices but a number of other things. You work long hours, you have to have a lot of faith in the weatherman, and you have to put up with a lot of risks. But one of the risks I don't think you should have to put up with is somebody in Ottawa, who doesn't know and doesn't really care what's going on, telling you what to do. Almost every farmer today is in debt because of buying land and everything else, and except for long established farmers it's difficult. Can you imagine the impact on young, beginning farmers if the Wheat Board goes on that present course?

Another thing that concerns me is that the Wheat Board doesn't have to open up its books to anyone. There's MAP — where are the final payments? So we argue about those final payments, but the Wheat Board doesn't have to open up its books to anyone. Does that make any sense? When the Wheat Board is supposed to be out there selling grain, the elevators are plugged. If the elevators were empty and they came to us with some kind of program like that, it would make sense. But not only do they want to stockpile food in the elevators and all over; now they want to stockpile it on the farms instead of getting out there and selling it. It's one way to put up a smoke screen. If you're paying attention to what you're doing over there with MAP, you're not paying any attention to them not selling the grain.

When you're farming you also have to watch because the income tax department is always there with its hand out, wanting a little of it. If you don't have any flexibility on when you're going to deliver that grain and when you're going to get paid for it, guess who's going to get the income tax? Guess when they will come out wanting delivery? Just before December 31. Also I think you'd be so tightly controlled, you'd have those 'Trudeaucrats' measuring your granaries. I have some neighbors who get very high yields in the fall, but when they go to deliver it they don't have as much grain. I wouldn't say farmers don't always tell the truth, but who is going to judge how much grain is where? MAP is supposed to be an all-out effort to meet the 30 million tonne export market by 1985. If we're talking about exports, why is it necessary to have storage on farms? Also with MAP comes an element of production controls. Certain land I have grows great winter wheat and great barley, but it won't grow spring wheat or flax worth anything. So guess what? I'm probably going to be told that I have to grow flax there.

How about their getting to work on and solving the transportation issue. One of the foremost incentives you could create is to increase both the market for the Canadian Wheat Board in its current mandate and its products' ability to reach markets. One method of increasing those markets would be to implement a freedom of choice approach to exporting Canadian grains. It certainly would be difficult to argue that a dual system would result in lower prices to producers.

It has been said that the government of Alberta has no alternative to MAP to offer. That certainly isn't true,

because MAP itself doesn't even address the real issues. It doesn't address international sales. It skirts around just about everything in a half-baked approach, because right now the Wheat Board has total control over exporting grain. So it's an error in logic, Mr. Speaker, to defend MAP by claiming that farmers would respond by selling to the Wheat Board. We don't have any alternative right now.

I'd like to close by saying something about what happens when you have too many controls. The other day I read that a farmer in the United States produces food for 59 people. A farmer in Russia produces food for 10 people. That farmer in the United States produces food for 59 people, yet it takes only 23 per cent of the income of the people of the United States for food. In Russia, where one farmer produces enough food for only 10 people, it takes 51 per cent of their income to buy food. That tells you something about what controls do.

So I certainly support the Minister of Agriculture in his approach to MAP, and the hon. Member for Cypress for bringing this motion forward. I certainly support it.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this resolution, I must say that my remarks may be somewhat shorter than expected. I spoke earlier on a resolution I brought in which was very close to MAP, urging the government to consider withdrawing from the designated area of the Canadian Wheat Board. The only reason I brought that resolution was the proposal by the advisory board of the Canadian Wheat Board to bring in the market assurance program, MAP.

I had the opportunity of meeting with a few members of this advisory committee. Because they made it abundantly clear that MAP is going to go ahead, that is one reason I so quickly brought in my resolution. If this were brought in, I felt very strongly that Alberta should consider withdrawing from the designated area. The advisory board, which among themselves could not agree on the plan — they weren't sure exactly how it was going to go ahead, but they told us that it's a really good plan and we should accept it. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview mentioned we should not oppose it because the advisory board is elected people throughout the province. Nevertheless I still feel, and always felt, that we need a dual market system. At present we must sell our milling wheat to the Canadian Wheat Board, and I didn't overly object to it. But we are able to sell our other grains, coarse grains along with canola, to whoever we want to. Being a farmer myself, I can see that it's advantageous in this manner. I actually have got rid of almost all my grain. I sold my canola to the milling plants with a 26 bushel quota. They just as good as took all my canola at a reasonable price; at least I felt it was a satisfactory price. The rest, the wheat — I agree it went to the Wheat Board.

So in this condition, I think our marketing system is really not too bad, and I would never have thought to oppose it. When you see that the quota of canola to the pools was only 3 bushels just six weeks ago, and the indication was that it was not going to go up any more — what would 3 bushels have done? Well, it has gone on. It went on to 6 bushels. But what is that 6 bushels? I don't think it would cover the cost of the production alone. What does the farmer do with the other 22 or 25 bushels he raised?

Mr. Speaker, I really feel that the resolution I brought in was the reason for the shelving of MAP, because it was shelved two or three days before my resolution was

brought into the House. So if it did anything, I think it did what it was intended to.

When MAP was first proposed, I thought it looked reasonably good because it had a few objectives that looked reasonable. It would be an incentive to produce more grain, and we know that a hungry world is waiting for much more food than we can produce. They would pay the storage, which probably would have put a few more bucks in the pockets of the farmers; advance payments. But the real problem was who was going to pay the storage. It was something new. Well, the answer was that the Wheat Board was going to do it. Who is the Wheat Board? It's the farmers' own pocket. So it would have created another bureaucracy, another federal building with probably another thousand people to do the bookwork. So actually for every penny the farmer would have received in storage, he may have had to put two or three out of his other pocket to pay for it.

When we see that Alberta produces 50 per cent of all barley feeds in this country, and feeds 65 per cent of the barley right here in the province, it would be a real detriment to the feeders in this province. At present I know that close to 50 per cent of the barley is going from producer to feeder. I really think this is a good way. If the farmer had to commit his grain to the Canadian Wheat Board under MAP, the feeder would only be able to purchase that barley from the Wheat Board. It would have to go through the elevator system, and at present I think the tariffs are 15 cents per bushel. In that case, chances are it would rise considerably. In a case like that, a farmer would not be able to sell grain to his next door neighbor.

Sure, they say MAP is necessary so the Wheat Board would know what stocks are available so they could make plans for future markets. But they also say it's going to be voluntary. The figures from these Wheat Board advisory meetings indicate how many oppose MAP. If this is the case, there would be so few who would commit themselves, I don't think the Wheat Board would have any more information than it has today.

When the Member for Bow Valley mentioned in his remarks that 83 per cent of the barley is handled through the Canadian Wheat Board, that's certainly an indication to me that farmers in Alberta are willing to deal with the Wheat Board and not a free market. I think the hon. member's figures were a little wrong because I have the Wheat Board statistics. If I may read them, Mr. Speaker: the Canadian Wheat Board preliminary figures for the '79-80 crop year indicate that the total supplies were 13,355 thousand tons, the carry-over was 2,36 thousand tons, and the supplies available were 11,319 thousand tons. Board control was 37 per cent, non-board control was 45 per cent, and 17 per cent was otherwise. So these figures do not jibe at all with the statements by the Member for Bow Valley.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview made a few comments, although he's not in his place today. When you're in favor of a dual market system, it's rather strange to use that in arguing that we withdraw from the Canadian Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, we have a dual market system for our coarse grains today. We can sell to the board or whoever we want. It's different from wheat, but I mentioned earlier that I was not going to oppose that.

Another area the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview stated was about the Murta task force, where Mr. Schellenberger, Mr. Murta, and Mr. Knight were proposing MAP. This is not right, because I attended the meeting and spent almost two hours with the three gen-

tlemen. The reason for the program they were trying to initiate was that many farmers in central and northern Alberta and Saskatchewan have threshed utility wheat for two consecutive years. They couldn't sell it for milling and had no buyers for feed. So the intention of the program the hon. Don Mazankowski set up was to find a way to advance money to these people so they would not go totally out of business.

Another area: the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview said that 90 per cent of the farmers support MAP. Well this is definitely wrong. Had he said that maybe 90 per cent of the NDPers support it — and I think that would have been exaggerated — that may have come closer. Mr. Speaker, when I look at the statistics of some of the meetings, and I don't have them now, in the Viking Wheat Board advisory meeting format there were 38 [for], 138 against, and 35 abstained from voting. In Vulcan there were eight for MAP, 400 against, and none abstaining. In Innisfail there were five for MAP, 184 against, and 15 abstained. In Westlock there were 35 for MAP, 68 against, and 25 abstained. The total for MAP was 86; the total against was 790. Now I would suggest that even if it was 90 per cent of the NDPers, it should have been more than that. If there's only eight NDPers in Vulcan — my God, the Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife better initiate some programs so that species doesn't become totally extinct.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview was mentioning the concern of the farmer that MAP would help along, and that our government should show more concern for agriculture, I wish he would have mentioned who is creating much of the cost for agriculture when he refers to energy, gasoline, and so forth. When we see that a year and a half ago the Conservative government brought in a budget with an increase of 18 cents tax on gasoline with a freeze of two years, the hon. Member for Oshawa quickly brought a non-confidence motion because 18 per cent on gasoline is far more excessive in two years. It's just barely more than a year that the Liberal party has taken office, and gasoline has increased by more than 40 cents. But we don't hear the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview mentioning that.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that MAP is not intended to help the farmer. I think we have to look at transportation and markets. You look at storage: the first thing, you're going to build up surplus; and once surplus builds up, you're going to find that the price declines. I think the former Minister of Transportation saw in his wisdom, and made a commitment to Canada, that within five years his goal was to increase markets by 50 per cent, with a 20 per cent increase the first year. Despite the problems that occurred in his first year of administration, he did reach a 20 per cent increase in the transportation of grain. I truly feel that before the five years would have come, the 50 per cent would have been realized.

What has MAP got? What objective or goal have they got? We don't hear of any objectives anymore. Furthermore, when the hon. member mentioned that we have people on the Wheat Board advisory who are elected by 35,000 farmers — well we have, but we have a dictator of the Wheat Board who is not elected; he is an appointed person who directs. If totally elected people were running it, it would have been a different show. But I still believe that the person in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board is trying to lead the farmer down the golden path, and MAP was one nice way of doing it. Sign your name, commit yourself, and we'll look after you.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I wish to express my view that I'm going to strongly support this motion.

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to speak on Motion 205. I would like to compliment the Member for Cypress for putting it forward. The motion simply recommends that the government reject MAP as recommended by the advisory committee of the Wheat Board. I was going to take this opportunity to mention again that my riding grows 9 per cent of the grain in Alberta, and that the farmers would be getting \$26.63 a bushel if we'd had our 9 per cent raise like the rest of the economy. But I won't do that today.

Instead I would like to stick fairly close to the motion. Because everybody else has talked about almost everything but right on the motion, I would like to stick pretty close to that. I'd like to start out by saying that we've got to start where we are now. What powers does the Wheat Board have now? At present the Wheat Board has control over our elevator system. That means they do not buy grain directly from the farmers. They allow the grain companies to buy the grain and handle it, and then they buy it from the grain companies. The Wheat Board also has the authority for exporting all the grains. In 1970 they also put in the Canada Grain Act, which defined feed mills and seed plants as elevators so they could thus control all the grains that flowed back and forth, into and out of the feed mills and seed plants. So the Wheat Board has tremendous control over our grain industry at present in all the designated areas. And all the western provinces are designated areas. Of course Ontario isn't designated, so it doesn't come under the control of the Wheat Board, and they have a much freer market than we have.

Maybe we should also look at what MAP will do, and what it really means, to the farming community. In my and actually many people's estimation it is an inventory control program. If you're going to control inventory of any product, first you have to control the production. So the next short step from inventory control would of course be production control. Now I'm not here to say that production control is good or bad. We have many industries today that control their production. The auto industry and the farm machinery industry control their production. Some might say, why shouldn't the farmers control their production? But there is a difference, because the farmers do not actually control the production. A government agency is controlling their product, and not the people themselves, as in the auto industry.

I guess you'd have to go back and say, how are they going to control the industry? What's the key to controlling the production of the grain industry? It's not easy. I think the Member for Macleod touched on it some. There's only one way that you can control the production of a grain industry, and that is with contract growing. In other words, you're a farmer and you want to grow wheat this year. You would go in and get a contract for so many acres of wheat. I'm sure the Member for Macleod has had experience with contract growing. As a farmer, I know I had. We've grown everything from canary seed to mustard, buckwheat, and something else they make perfume out of that wasn't too successful. But when you control production, you must have a contract to grow it. Contract growing is how you control production. This works pretty well.

MRS. CRIPPS: What if it doesn't rain?

MR. L. CLARK: I was coming to that. The hon. Member for Drayton Valley is always a little impatient.

First, if I might, I was going to say, if it works well. It works well if you have about three or four things going for you. One is that you have to have a very accurate market forecast. You have to know how much of the product you can sell, which I don't believe the Wheat Board has at the present time. You also have to know how much production comes off the acreage you're going to allot for contracts. I don't believe the Wheat Board has the expertise to forecast accurately how much can be grown on an acre of land. I think only the farmers can do that. Then we come to the weather. As the Member for Drayton Valley said, the weather is a very important factor, because nobody can really forecast production accurately unless you know what the weather is going to do, and nobody knows just what's going to happen on that. Then of course, as some of the other members have mentioned, we have the ability to transport it to market, which we have not had in the last three years.

If the forecast is correct, the market forecasts are correct, the production forecasts are correct, and all works well, of course the system works well. It has happened that way for me on a contract. But what happens when you have a bad year, you have good markets and poor yields? The people at the controls don't want to blame it on themselves, so the next year when you go to get a contract they say: well, I don't know about you; you didn't do very well last year; you couldn't really fill your quota as we expected; and I don't think we'll give you a contract this year. That's very important, because that becomes part of the control.

Say the weather co-operated but the market forecast was wrong. I've had this experience too. At one time I had a large contract for growing mustard seed. We had a tremendous crop of mustard, all no. 1 seed. I hauled it in. I had quite a time talking them into taking it. I said, it's not mine, it's yours; we grew it under contract, and we're hauling it in. We hauled it into the elevator and put it in a special bin. It was supposed to be my grain in that bin and nobody else's. Then they were arguing about buying it, because the market was poor, they couldn't get rid of it, they couldn't seem to get a boat or something built on the west coast. They had hundreds of excuses. But then we finally talked them into taking it. I sold a quarter of it, all no. 1. It worked very well. Then down the road a ways they said, well, you can sell the rest of it after the first of the year; it'd help us out and might help you out. I'm always willing to help out my income tax a little, so I agreed to that.

I went down after the first of the year to get my cheque for the amount I had, the other three-quarters, and the next thing I knew the grade had gone down from 1 to 2. I'm sure anybody who knows mustard knows that that drops you, at that time a dollar, which was a third of the price.

This concerned me a great deal, so I went down to the government graders in the elevator at Lethbridge and we had a discussion about this grading system they had. I hinted very strongly that maybe he'd taken a little under the table, because he'd graded it as 1 and all of a sudden it was a 2. We ended up as not the best of friends, and I went back to the elevator company. I got to the elevator company and said: if you're not going to sell this for the amount you offered, I had it in a special bin; I would now like my mustard back. They said, well, that mustard is long gone; it's out in Europe someplace. I see some of the members laughing who've had something to do with this,

but . . . So I said, well, you bring it back or else pay me for no. 1. I thought that might get some action, but it didn't. They had their lawyer there. They had a little meeting with the lawyer over the table. It ended up . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: A meeting under the table.

MR. L. CLARK: Yes, under the table. I ended up unfortunate enough that they took \$5,000 or \$6,000 off me like taking candy from a kid. That kind of made me a little angry at the time. Of course it was a good lesson.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that why you support MAP?

MR. L. CLARK: Anyway, to return to contract growing, there's nothing wrong with it. If you have a limited, specialized crop, people are willing to take a chance on it, and the farmers are willing to deal with whoever they wish to deal with, it's a good way. But if you are dealing with a difficult company, dealing with one person, and you had trouble on the one contract like I did — I don't think that mustard company would've given me another contract, no matter how well I proved myself capable of growing mustard seed.

The point is, if you're going to control the production and the inventory, you have to put in a contract system. That's the only way you can do it. Then you'll find yourself dealing with government officials who are handing out these contracts. With the experience I've had — and I'm sure some of the other members here who've had a farm as long as I have have had the same experience — what worries me as a farmer is what the price of these contracts will be and on what basis the best contracts will be let out to the farmers. Are we going to let them out on ability? Are we going to let them out on need? Is it going to be on money under the table or political favors? If you belong to a certain party you get a contract; if you don't, you're out? This is something you have to look at when you're dealing in this sort of area.

I've had two very competent farmers in my district phone me especially today. They took time out from seeding, I hope because it's raining down there. Anyway they phoned me and wanted me to inform our Minister of Agriculture that they were one hundred per cent behind his statement that if they were going to force MAP on us, we should withdraw from the Wheat Board's designated area. I guess that takes you down to how you withdraw from that.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I have time to finish this. I wasn't supposed to say too much, but I would like to say one more thing. I would again like to compliment the Member for Cypress for bringing it forward. I would also like, on behalf of the Assembly, to ask every member here to support this on behalf of the farmers out there in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. member, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that when the members reassemble at 8 o'clock, the House be in Committee of Supply.

[Motion carried]

[The House recessed at 5:30 p.m.]

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

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

Department of
Social Services and Community Health

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will please come to order. Has the minister any opening comments?

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It was not my intent this evening to spend a lot of time on opening comments. As hon. members of the Assembly will be aware, I did speak to the Budget Address and I did go over a number of the very major highlights of the departmental estimates at that time.

I want to make one correction to remarks I made at that time with regard to the new positions in the department. I broke down the number of positions approved by RFD and special warrant prior to April 1 of the current fiscal year as 651, and indicated that of the remaining 494 positions, primary emphasis would be on child welfare and on services for the handicapped. One other very important area should have been included in that list. That's in the area of mental health; in particular, the new forensic unit at Alberta Hospital, Edmonton, where a major staff increase will occur.

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Leading off my comments on the Department of Social Services and Community Health, I'd like to deal with five or six different matters, first of all, the percentage of the budget that is allocated to Social Services and Community Health. I want to deal for a few minutes with the question of increased staff and staff morale. I'd like to deal with day care, in particular after school care spaces. I want to say a few words about foster care, talk for a minute about the men's hostel in both Edmonton and Calgary, and then deal with the question of PSS.

Mr. Chairman, last night the Minister of Education talked about how one might compute statistics, and I thought some of his points had merit. I just quote from the Blues:

It seems to me that the two best measures we can use — that is, measures that have attempted to apply common standards from one province to the other — are the measures of Statistics Canada and the measures of the Council of Ministers of Education of Canada.

Mr. Chairman, while I welcome the increase in the Social Services and Community Health budget we have before us, I would just remind members of the committee that this still brings us to just a fraction of a shade less of the percentage of the total provincial budget we had in 1979. So while we are doing better than last year, marginally better than the years '75 to '79, we are still just a shade behind the percentage in 1979. None of us would argue that simply throwing money at problems is going to solve the problems. But on the other hand there is no question that between 1975, especially, and 1979, as a

result of this government's restraint program, the Department of Social Services and Community Health was, in my judgment at any rate, restricted in its capacity to cope with the problems you find in a growing province. I don't think one can compare the social difficulties in a province like Alberta, with the boom on one hand, with a provincial economy in other parts of the country where there isn't that pressure of growth. One can't solve all these problems — no one suggests we can — but in my judgment Social Services here has a much greater responsibility at least to have the capacity to attempt to deal in a sensitive way with the problems inevitably associated with rapid growth.

Mr. Chairman, when one looks at the figures from Statistics Canada, one finds that on the basis of the 1979-1980 estimates, rather than Alberta faring near the top we rank seventh among the provinces in the commitment to social services. So while there is an increase in the budget this year, an increase that I personally welcome, I don't think any of us can sit back and say, whoopee, happy days are here; we've got the kind of funding needed to cope with the problems we face, from both the rapid and buoyant conditions of the last several years and now the pause. As the minister well knows, in certain areas of the province even the pause is creating pressures on the family. The breadwinner is out of work, and so pressures are created. How do we build up that kind of family support in our social services delivery system?

Mr. Chairman, the second area I want to deal with is the question of staff. The minister and the government have made much about the fact that we are hiring additional people. I laud that. I think it's long overdue, particularly in the area of child welfare workers. But while we are adding to the staff, I think it would be wrong if we didn't stop and assess the question of staff morale in the Department of Social Services and Community Health. Because that is an important question: not just an issue of more people, but the question of whether or not there is good morale.

I have the results of a questionnaire by the EAR committee survey, Calgary north district office, April 16, 1980. While we're talking about something that's a year ago, I raise it in discussing the estimates because we still get the same kinds of concerns brought to the attention of my office. First of all with respect to orientation and job training:

With regards to initial training when a new person begins with the Department, 80% of the social workers, 64% of the clerical, and 80% of the supervisors felt their initial training was inadequate to do a competent job.

II Overlap of positions

In the area of overlap when one person leaves a certain position and a new person takes over, 100% of the clerical, 100% of the social workers and 70% of the supervisors agreed that the present system is inadequate for continuity of service.

III Job satisfaction

... In the comments section a large number of social workers expressed many concerns about poor working conditions such as high caseloads and insufficient time to do a proper job.

Then, of course, along with these observations that the EAR committee brought to members' attention is the chronic complaint of people working in the public sector generally of the impact of the restraint policy on salaries in the public sector. While I would not lay that policy

totally at the doorstep of the minister, the minister shares with the government the responsibility for a restraint policy. But there is no doubt, as witnessed by the illegal cessation of services last July, that notwithstanding the salaries negotiated last year, there is widespread dissatisfaction with the salary arrangements in the public service. Much of that dissatisfaction remains.

Mr. Chairman, I want to move on from there to make several observations about the day care system in this province. As I recall *Hansard*, last spring I argued in the debate during the estimates that we should have a quality improvement grant. I'm pleased to see that announcement was made, in partial measure at least, not during the spring session but somewhat later. The fact of the matter is that we still have to look at our day care and after school care systems in the light of this government's policy with respect to young mothers, a policy that says that unless there are very clear medical, psychiatric, or psychological reasons otherwise, after four months the mother has to go out in the work place.

Now the minister has defended that policy. His predecessor defended that policy. It seems to me that if you're going to argue for that kind of program, then we have to have in place not only a day care system, but equally so a functioning after school care program that is adequately set up. In the case of the child who's just been born, after four months an after school program doesn't apply, but it does to other members of the family who are perhaps in that category. It seems to me that we have to look at this question of day care and after school care in light of the government's own policy, which is controversial but which the government is stuck with; that is, that mothers must get out into the work place as soon as possible and no longer than four months unless there are unusual circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, just before moving from the question of after school care, looking at the most recent figures I have, surely we would have to agree that the after school care program is not adequate in the province. Surely it is not adequate when I see the subsidized after school care program figures. I believe these are from the minister's own department: Edmonton, 540 full-time, part-time 2, for a total of 542; Calgary, 668 full-time, 17 part-time, for a total of 685; other district office areas, 99, for a total of 1,326.

Now I know that if one looks at all the children eligible for after school care, you could get some horrendous figure. Let's set that aside, but just look at the numbers who will be needing after school care. I say to the minister that we have to do a much better job than we have. In talking to several Calgary city council members, there's no small amount of frustration on this question of after school care, and the part of the after school care program that the local levels of government are going to have to shoulder.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to discuss foster care for a moment and say to the minister that, frankly, I for one appreciate the dispatch with which the government moved on the major recommendations in the Ombudsman's report. It's not an easy thing to replace senior staff personnel. But in fairness, while one must admit that action since that report was issued has been satisfactory, one has to ask where the government has been all these years. We had the Catonio report in 1972. As I look over the Catonio report and compare it to the Ivany report, there is a remarkable similarity in recommendations. In 1972 the Catonio report:

Your Committee believes that an effective prevention

program must be an integral part and a cornerstone of any effective foster care program. A successful and dynamic foster care program calls for measures in prevention whose goals are to reduce the number of children coming into care.

That's 1972. Almost a decade later, 1981, we find the Ivany report saying:

The Department should develop a clearly articulated statement on the philosophy of foster care and the intent of its legislated programs. Without establishing such a philosophy, an acceptable standard of care — measured in the quality of performance — will not be forthcoming, and the Department will continue to lack the direction needed to alleviate existing problems associated with child neglect and abuse, and ultimately, with foster care.

So almost a decade after Catonio says there must be a clearer articulation of where you're going, in 1981 Dr. Ivany is saying the same thing.

On child placement, Catonio said in 1972:

Stability in foster home placement should be a cornerstone of the foster care program. Multiple placement should, wherever possible, be avoided. Whenever a child comes into care and requires foster home placement, every effort should be made to ensure that the initial placement is a correct one and that a maximum degree of permanency will be attained.

Then a little further on:

To implement the principle . . . The establishment of receiving and assessment centres throughout the province to be strategically located to meet the needs of urban and smaller centres as well as the cities. These centres to be staffed with trained professional help . . . The recruitment of specialized and trained foster parents equipped to cope with children suffering from emotional or handicap problems.

Well, Mr. Chairman, in 1981 we have Ivany saying:

A planning committee should be established, which would have a format similar to those in other provinces, to consider the long-term objectives for the child in order to avoid the "drifting" syndrome. Placement of a child in a foster home should be a decision made by a group of [people] directly affecting the child's care and future.

A little further on, Mr. Chairman, Catonio in 1972:

A review and alteration of present methods of home-finding, screening and matching.

A very important observation by Catonio. A decade later, in 1981, Ivany says:

That consideration be given to hiring individuals professionally trained as investigators . . . I respectfully recommend that the department initiate dialogue with the Attorney General's Department with respect to the amicus curiae function and, in particular, to determine whether or not it might be possible for such legal representation on behalf of the child to be extended to promote the involvement . . .

On staffing and case loads, Catonio in 1972:

In some regions the work load situation is critical and immediate measures to rectify it must be taken.

In 1981:

Since the Department's own policy guidelines, suggesting at least one visit per month to the children, are not being followed, the Department's management should obviously be aware there is a problem. Accordingly, management must look at staffing requirements and workload expectations.

All this was available to the government in 1972.

In-service training: without going into that in detail, essentially the same proposal was made by Catonio that Ivany makes in 1981.

Native children, in 1972:

An in-depth program of prevention using the above facilities and wherever possible staffed with trained Native workers. A field training program sponsored by the Department of Health and Social Development on Reserves for social workers with a predominantly Native case load.

Ivany in 1981:

Wherever possible, Native children should be placed in Native foster homes. When treaty Indian children are apprehended, their band should be immediately notified and then given the opportunity for input into decisions affecting the child.

And then several other recommendations which are similar with respect to the placement of native children.

The point I want to make is that in 1981 we finally see some action. Why was it not possible to get some action from 1972 until 1981? That seems to me to be the question that must be answered, Mr. Chairman. Nevertheless we are now beginning to make some progress and, frankly, I applaud that. Better late than never, I suppose. But nine years is a long time in this important area.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to deal with one other aspect of the social service area before I get into PSS, and that is the hostels. Quite frankly I was rather surprised to receive this memo of January 14, 1981, with respect to the two-week limit. It's from Mr. R. H. Morrisette, director, income security branch, to E. Deering, administrator, single men's hostel. Mr. Chairman, I don't think anyone disagrees that every effort should be made to encourage unemployed employables to work. That has to be the objective; no question about that. But in many cases that involves counselling. It involves having work available for the people who, for the most part, are unskilled. You're not dealing with skilled people who end up in men's hostels. You're mainly dealing with unskilled people who have problems. The Member for Calgary Millican doesn't agree. Well, in the centres I've been in I would argue that point, hon. member, because I think there are people who have psychological problems to a certain extent and people who lack skills.

But the point is, what do we say? We say that after two weeks, we're going to ship them to either Gunn or Youngstown. Fortunately it does say "or other appropriate facility", but I question whether we have any other appropriate facilities. I've been to both centres, Mr. Chairman. Gunn and Youngstown are accommodation centres for basically dysfunctional adults. When you have people coming into this province, to say that if you aren't able to find a job in two weeks, we're going to ship you out to Youngstown . . . I appreciate what the Youngstown people are attempting to do; I've gone through the centre. But you get someone who is here from another part of the country and isn't able to find a job, and you take someone in their early 20s and ship them to Youngstown — really. They're not going to find a job in Youngstown or Gunn. Why are we in such a rush to get these people out? No one is arguing that the objective should be to get the unemployed employables working. Surely it should be. But you're not going to get them working by shipping them out to Youngstown and Gunn, unless we assume that all these people are just one hundred per cent drifters and there's no way to deal with them other than the crowbar or two-by-four approach.

Mr. Chairman, I just don't think that is the way to deal with it, at least not from the information I've received in talking to a number of social workers in the minister's own department.

Before dealing with the PSS question, Mr. Chairman, I want to say one quick word about the level of support. I have the basic social allowance schedule here. I thought we had a pretty significant statement on page 31 of the Ombudsman's report. I want to read all of it so I don't mislead members of the committee:

Compounding this problem is the degree of stress attributable to economic factors. A sizable proportion of these families served by the Department are prone to financial strain. In Edmonton, in 1980, for example, a single mother with one child received maximum social assistance benefits that left her approximately \$2,375 below the official poverty line, as set by Statistics Canada. In comparison, this same family unit, if it lived in Vancouver, would have found itself \$1,885 below the poverty line. In Regina, the deficiency would have amounted to . . . \$1,439. Fortunately, the Alberta Government has recently increased benefits for such a family unit needing social assistance. However, this action was taken because of the province's high accommodation costs, not because of the inequalities mentioned above.

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the fact that we have moved up the level of support, the fact that we have this kind of information . . . Some people could sit back and say, well, that's the way it should be. Somebody on assistance should live \$2,375 below the poverty line. That way we'll get them out to work. Give them a shovel and have them go to work. That sort of red-neck attitude is very popular. But we're talking here about a single mother with one child.

We're talking about a philosophy. I always thought, in any event, that one thing basic to this government's approach to social services was the preservation of the family. We can't just talk about the Waltons' definition of a family unit: you know, we have a nice happy family in the hills, everybody is working hard, and grandfather and grandmother live in and do their bit of the sawing and what have you. That's very nice, but we have all kinds of family units. A lot of them are single-parent family units. What are we doing to provide the infrastructure to help those people when the Ombudsman — not an opposition politician, but the Ombudsman — says that last year in the city of Edmonton a single-parent mother with one child was living \$2,375 beneath the poverty level?

It's not something we can be casual about or smile about, in my judgment, Mr. Chairman. I say to members of the committee, no one is suggesting that you want a schedule which is going to have people living off the fat of the land. But surely there's a difference between that and a level of support that guarantees poverty level and beneath the poverty level status for people who are unfortunate enough not to be able to work, or a young mother who chooses to want to be with her family; that is, if she can get by the four-month regulation the minister's predecessor brought in several years ago.

I want to deal with the question of PSS before concluding my remarks. There are some good aspects to Bill 7. I want to deal with Bill 7 a little more when we get into the discussion of the Bill, but it's relevant to this extent, Mr. Chairman. We've had the minister in the House, and others, say that we want to see decentralization; we want to see more local input. That's desirable, because social services should be decentralized. One of the really good

things done by the Barrett government in British Columbia was the community resource board concept, where we had all the agencies of government brought under the umbrella of local boards. So we had local input, and we didn't have this we-and-they proposition. I think it's one of the really important initiatives taken between 1972 and 1975. I think I can speak with some authority, because the cities of Dawson Creek and Fort St. John are just across from my constituency. I am in both communities frequently and have had an opportunity to see how the resource board concept worked. I would categorically say that it worked extremely well.

But when I look at Bill 7, Mr. Chairman, holy cow! Instead of being allocated locally, all the power here seems to be concentrated in the hands of the Lieutenant Governor in Council:

The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations

- (a) respecting the determination of what constitutes a program under this Act;
- (b) respecting the determination of the costs of the establishment, administration and operation of a program under [the Act] and the manner of calculating those costs;
- (c) respecting payments . . .
- (d) respecting the establishment, administration and operation of programs by municipalities;

Imagine that. Respecting the establishment, administration, and operation of programs by the municipalities: all the kinds of things we get into in our fights with Ottawa over these cost-shared programs, where the strings are pulled by Ottawa and we have to develop our program to fit their conditions. We're now saying that provincially, as I read this Act.

- (f) prescribing qualifications for and standards and methods of work to be maintained by municipal family and community support services workers;
- (g) prescribing any conditions that must be met before a payment . . . can be made;
- (h) prescribing the manner . . . of payments . . .
- (i) respecting the audited financial statements . . .

Mr. Chairman, no question, important initiatives in community oriented programming of social services are vital. Any thrust, if you like, in the area of family and community support services must involve substantial community involvement. But, holy cow! As I look at this Act, Mr. Minister, in the name of decentralization you've presented to the Legislature — and it's relevant because you're asking us to pass your estimates — a proposition where there is going to be enormous power in the hands of the cabinet. That doesn't strike me as being decentralization.

In general conclusion, I would say to the minister that while I think we've made some progress in the last few months, especially in the area of foster care, we still have to examine the issue of morale in the department. I think more work has to be done in the area of after school care. I frankly disagree with the approach on the men's hostel. While we've got the right kind of rhetoric in the family and community support services program, it seems to me that underlying it is still too much power at the centre, notwithstanding what we've heard about the minister's efforts to decentralize his department.

In many ways these estimates are perhaps the most important estimates we're going to be dealing with during the spring session of the House, because in 1981 we're in a position where the pressures in Alberta society are very

great. No one expects the minister to be able to solve our high divorce rate, high rate of alcoholism, high suicide rate, and that all these things can be dealt with by government programs, as if by magic. No one is saying that. The minister is smiling. On the other hand I say to you, Mr. Minister, that your department has suffered by the restraint program. Your department has suffered by six years of unimaginative leadership, crisis managed oriented type of leadership. Unless we can replace that with a more clearly defined thrust that emphasizes maintaining the family, however tattered that family may be — unfortunately that is the cruel reality of many families in Alberta today in 1981 — your department isn't doing its job.

I conclude my comments by saying that while I think we've seen some progress in the last year, such that I don't reckon I'll be moving my annual motion to reduce the minister's salary, I would argue that there is still an awfully long way to go.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. minister wish to answer the member now?

MR. BOGLE: No, Mr. Chairman. I think I'd rather hear general comments from other members and then deal with them prior to proceeding on the various aspects in the votes.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few remarks with regard to the study of foster care in the province of Alberta. I would like the minister to respond to a couple of questions. I was sort of impressed when the report came out, and there were 40 recommendations. But what really puzzled me was that the minister immediately announced that 30 of those would be implemented almost immediately and another five or six would be implemented within three or four months. I'm assuming that maybe the other four or five would not be implemented at all for some reason or other. Somehow I believe that the minister and the department must have been working on this for some length of time. If the study took seven months, with a staff of I don't know how many, and then as soon as the report came out the minister indicated that already they're going to be implemented, I wonder whether the minister could advise whether those implementations would have been made if there had been no report of the Ombudsman. Were there communications between the minister of the department and so forth, or were two groups working on the same things?

As I say, it seems that many a time somebody gets the credit for something they didn't do. I personally believe that the minister has done a good job. No doubt his department did a good job with him. But the portfolio there and what we see happening throughout the province, I don't think anybody would be able to have everything just right. I can't believe that anybody will say the minister could be totally right or totally wrong. It's the same with me.

So these are the things I have in my mind. Had there been no recommendations, would they have been implemented anyway?

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Listening to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, one would get the impression that all is bad in this department. It's far from that. He indicates that the budget may not be adequate and as a percentage of the

total budget, it's changed somewhat. The hon. member certainly refuses to acknowledge the fact that the budget has increased substantially over the years. One per cent of \$6.7 billion is a lot more money than 1 per cent of \$2 billion, as it is in other provinces. I'm not suggesting for one minute that it's only 1 per cent of the total budget. Of our total budget of \$6.7 billion, the budget in this particular department is \$842 million, \$0.8 billion. When you hear the hon. member talking about it, you'd think there was a cutback or something in this department.

For the record, so that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview does not create some false ideas here: social allowance, an increase of 17.5 per cent to \$213 million; child welfare services, a 35.9 per cent increase to \$80 million, in round figures; specialized social services, hostels included, a 62 per cent increase to \$6.9 million. You can go on and on. A 53 per cent increase in vocational rehabilitation; services for the handicapped increased by 28 per cent; treatment for mental illness increased by 25 per cent; general health services increased by 19 per cent; community social and health services increased by 35 per cent, and so on.

Mr. Chairman, you wouldn't get that impression listening to him. You would think we're cutting back, and it's far from being true. I don't think it's a fair comment by the hon. member, because he gives that impression when he speaks on television and the citizens may actually believe it if they don't have the figures in front of them.

Let me swing to day care, Mr. Chairman. The hon. minister, one must recall, has enriched the program very, very substantially. Yes, he responded to studies and reports which indicated that we may not be as good as other provinces, and properly so. But he has responded to the extent that now day care has been enriched to a standard that exceeds all other provinces in Canada. You know, you just don't do that overnight. You must be sure there is a need, and we recognize there is a need. I'm sure the minister has done that, recognizing the changing mode of living: two parents working, the recognition of single parents in our society, and the working mother. Therefore there is a response, and I'm sure that response will improve over the years as necessary.

I think the hon. member probably had one valid point in his whole discussion: that something more can be done in after school care. However, those children are older, and maybe it's more a want than a need. I wonder if that should be evaluated very carefully before the minister makes any thrust in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member talks about foster care as if there was really something terribly wrong with all the foster care that's been provided in this province over the many years. The hon. member should maybe be reminded that foster care has been around for a long, long time. Many foster care parents have been doing an excellent job, and the children have been cared for in an excellent way in spite of the problems. Yes, there are problems. The problems were brought to the front, and the minister has responded. I remind the hon. member for Spirit River-Fairview that the Cavanagh board of review was set up by the minister when he recognized the problems in the community.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, with the response that has already been made by the minister to the Ombudsman's report, and undoubtedly the recommendations of the Cavanagh Board of Review set up by the minister as a result of the concern expressed in the community will be responded to, it would be very naive of any member in this Legislature to believe that would be it; there will be

more problems. Problems will recur and continue to recur when you are helping people in any way. There is no way you can eliminate all the problems associated with that kind of care. However, everything should be done to eliminate or minimize the number of related problems.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to underline again to the minister and members of the Legislature that we must not forget — because all too often in this mixed up area of a few problems that are very important and significant, and we're all very hurt by it — that many, many people, volunteers and foster care parents, are doing a fantastic job and should be commended for their excellent work. Those few odd problems that occur should be picked up from time to time, but unfortunately they will be missed.

The hon. member makes an issue of hostels as if there were something terribly wrong in this area. There are problems. There are problems in every department in every province in Canada and in the federal government. Nothing can be perfect. But those people who are asked to leave after two weeks are given an opportunity to get employment, to get vocational training, to be motivated. They choose not to. There is a direction; they're of that direction. Most of them are transients, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman. We all know that. It's not a question of saying "out" and that's it. There are many opportunities in the work force. Besides, if an individual wants to work in this province, for practical purposes there is 100 per cent employment. There's just no excuse. That person knows darn well he can work and can get a job tomorrow morning. All the hostels will assist in a very positive way to try to find employment if they so choose.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview speaks of level of support. He speaks of the poverty level, and he speaks of dollars only.

MR. NOTLEY: It's a good place to start.

DR. PAPROSKI: Just listen to this, hon. member. The poverty level — when you talk about dollars only, you can get that impression. But he doesn't cite accommodation increase in value and the fact that more dollars are provided for that. Oh, he did cite that. He said we provided more dollars for accommodation. But how about the food, clothing, shelter, utilities? How about the fact that this province will pay for the mortgage of a widow or single parent who stays at home, and not take that back, not deduct it from their social allowance? How about the free medical care? How about the drugs? How about the specialized appliances? How about the subsidized day care? How about the training to work? How about the public health care? It's not just the dollars. Let's not be deluded by those kinds of comments.

In fact, the opportunity to seek employment in this province — I know many on social assistance in my constituency are very pleased for the opportunity, not only that they can work but the opportunity to be trained in the various areas and still receive social assistance during that period.

Mr. Chairman, he talks about all these problems. Of course he doesn't cite the senior citizen support, whether it's the rental rebate, the property tax reduction plan, no medical premiums, the pioneer repair program, or other people-support programs.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure that blurring is not left unanswered. I'm sure the minister would answer it anyway, but just in case he decides to go on a specific program and be more technical about cer-

tain things, I think it merited those remarks. It's not so bad. The department is doing a very good job. The volunteers are doing a very good job for that department. The professional people and staff in that department are doing an excellent job: the foster care people, the day care people, and so forth. I think they should be commended, and it should be underlined. The few problems that have occurred already will be corrected, but will recur again because human beings are interacting.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MACK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address very briefly the question of in-service training. I'd like the minister to respond to the concerns raised by the Ombudsman with respect to that, and what progress is being made in that particular area where staff that is brought on stream in the various large-component departments — because it is an extremely large department. If my memory serves me correctly, I believe it employs something in the area of 8,000 employees, most of them highly professional and skilled people working in those areas. It would be of great interest to all hon. members, as well as to the public at large, if the minister could respond as to some of the initiatives he might have put in place prior and subsequent to the Ombudsman's report.

I happen to believe that part of the morale problem, if there is or was one, could be directly related to a specific area if staff is ill-equipped to undertake their responsibilities on a day to day basis. The sheer lack of confidence in the work place could generate a degree of frustration, and perhaps rather than having job fulfilment, the reverse takes effect simply because of the staff not being totally prepared to assume or undertake those responsibilities. So I would appreciate it if the minister could comment on that.

I would like to respond briefly to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. He raised some points, unfortunately most in the negative. Part of the morale in the work place — and this is for the benefit of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview — is simply because very little positive is being said, and all that is being said is negative. It has an effect on the staff in the work place. They're sort of damned if they do and damned if they don't. They don't really know when they're doing right and when they're not, because publicly they're perceived and placed in the same ball of wax and all condemned without a fair hearing and a fair trial. The hon. member sort of sets himself as the champion of workers, and his comments and remarks are directly negative to the people in the work place.

That concerns me because I have a great regard for working people. By and large, I think 99.44 per cent are doing a very honorable job and discharge their responsibilities in an honorable manner. Casting those kinds of aspersions must be responded to with a great degree of concern. No one wants to be in a profession or job in the work place where they're constantly being condemned, perhaps because of a few who have not discharged those responsibilities fully.

I repeat what I said a couple of nights ago: money does not totally buy job fulfilment. It is a very important element. A salary is extremely important, but in itself does not provide the rewards in the work place or job fulfilment. Perhaps if it were going to be scaled, it would be somewhere down toward the bottom of the scale.

I think most people who are extremely successful, be they professionals or otherwise, providing services such as this very large Department of Social Services and

Community Health, are committed because they have the empathy for the people they serve. They recognize that their responsibilities are to serve. They're also called upon to make judgments and to counsel. There's been a suggestion that there's no counselling. There's a tremendous amount of counselling out there. It has been my personal experience that sometimes counselling doesn't even work. You have to have a little bit of motivation.

So I believe that it depends largely on how the guidelines are interpreted; for example, whether the two week period is going to be enshrined in stone and applied to the masses or the total number who are there, rather than using — discretion being the greater part of valor. If in fact discretion was not there, I would have some concerns with the hon. member. But I do not believe it's going to be applied in that manner. I believe there will be a tremendous amount of empathy. I believe there will be many opportunities for people to find employment. One of the greatest rewards of a human being is one who can hold his or her head high and, rather than being on the dole, be a contributor to society.

Speaking then in support of the workers who actually have to pay for the services which are being provided, I think we have a responsibility there as well. We have a budget of \$843 million in that one department, a very substantive increase from last year. Mr. Chairman, I personally have some concerns with the large increase of staff, 1,153 if my memory serves me correctly, in that one department alone. That concerns me because it almost indicates that we have been totally unresponsive to the total sum of what we were attempting to do. The vast infusion — if the minister might be able to respond as to the steps that would be employed to phase these people in. Are they going to be phased in all at the same time, or will it be a period of time so there's adequate training, orientation, and exposure. I think it's extremely important that we do not suddenly have an influx of a large bureaucracy which, at times, could remove the challenge in the work place from the professionals by just having too many around. Mr. Chairman, if the minister could respond to that, I would certainly be most appreciative.

I have concerns. We have so many, many excellent programs in place; for example, the senior citizens. The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway responded to that, and I'm not going to be repetitive. But I do have three senior citizens' lodges in my constituency, and I visit them about four times a year. Certainly at Christmas and Easter time I make a point to visit them, because I think they're the most precious people going. They're extremely happy and well looked after. The staff in those places — and I repeat this because I believe we have to encourage our staff rather than constantly browbeating them. If we have problems, let's address them. But let's not condemn the total sum, because the majority is doing an excellent job. I speak now for those who are located in Edmonton Belmont. I'm acquainted with them, and they're doing an excellent job. They're certainly to be commended. I stand here supporting them without any equivocation.

I think many of our seniors are still in their homes today because of initiatives of the government, not in spite of it. Their homes are beautiful. They can work in their gardens, and have their flowers. They have the personal feeling and reward of not having the feeling of being institutionalized, particularly too early, when they do not require any personal care. I would hope we would continue to be sensitive and constantly monitor other initiatives we might initiate in order to be able to encourage more of our seniors to remain in their own homes. The

reason I say we should attempt to develop new ideas is simply because a home for a senior citizen who does not have a family could also be a prison. So it's not only to keep them in the home. There have to be other elements to make sure they're looked upon and visited. If there's no family, there have to be other agencies to ensure that this is in fact attended to.

Day care: I don't disagree with the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I think the after school day care — and I visited one or two of them in my constituency, where there was a declining enrolment in the school and they converted some of the school space to a day care where the children were brought in by the parents prior to school. They were there for lunch and after school. So we are working in these areas. They're probably not as broad as they might well be. But certainly we're not totally bereft of those kinds of programs. The nice part about it is that it's community operated. Many volunteers work in that. I think that is the difference: a volunteer working with their children and other neighbors' children will, in my judgment, provide far superior care than a hiring.

So I believe we have to continually involve the community, because the public purse will not carry the burden. It will automatically deteriorate if it's totally placed on the government. But, not only the question of deterioration, it's a matter of removing the opportunities for communities to continue to be involved. I support the community efforts. I support all the volunteers in the community, and would encourage them. I think this is the area where the government can play a very major role, rather than establishing institutions for kids to be brought to, so that the parents can go and do whatever they think they want to do, including work.

Native children: I have some concern about the hon. member's understanding that the band council should be notified if a parent — surely he's not suggesting that the parents of the native child are not responsible.

MR. NOTLEY: No. Read the Ombudsman's report.

MR. MACK: I believe the parents should be the first ones notified if in fact their child needs some special care. The parents can communicate with the band council; there's no problem there. When you start by-passing the parents, I think you're starting to create problems out there with the native community, rather than helping them.

Mr. Chairman, I've taken more time than I had anticipated. I thank you for allowing me to speak. I certainly applaud the minister for the courage he's exercised and for the ability in having that kind of an increase in his budget approved by cabinet.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to bring one or two things to the attention of the minister. First of all, even though the minister's had a bit of a rough ride, to put it very kindly, since he's taken over the department, I'm not sure if it's because the minister was incapable of running the department or the department's been running itself for too long, to try and figure out why the minister's had such a difficult time. But I wish to be fair and say that it is one of the largest departments of government. So there are going to be problems that the minister just can't keep his finger on all the time. That's one of the hazards of the business, Mr. Minister and, you know, you have to take the good with the bad. It seems you've been getting more bad than good. But some of the directions the govern-

ment is proposing to take are positive. I'm not the one to stand here and tell the minister about all the great things that I think they're doing, because all those people over there stand up and say: I thank you, Mr. Minister, for the new park; I think you're a great minister because I've got a park and he's got a school and . . .

Mr. Minister, I do want to say that I'm pleased to see that the government did not do away with preventive social services. They didn't want to see any vestige of some of the good programs the former government had, so they studied preventive social services. They didn't think they should give the former government any accolades at all, so they changed that to family and community support services. Be that as it may, I am pleased to see that the government is concerned that in an increasing population, a very mobile society that we have in Alberta, they were not so shortsighted as to do away with the program. I was very alarmed to think that if the government was going to do away with that program, what were they going to put in its place?

I think the movement to regionalization is probably positive, but I have a little difficulty trying to figure out why Lethbridge was not used as a centre rather than Coaldale. I'd never want to accuse the minister of — I think that just happens to be in the constituency of Taber-Warner, if I'm not mistaken.

MR. NOTLEY: What happened to John over there?

DR. BUCK: I think some of these decisions were a little partisan. And McLennan — I think an area other than that could have been picked. But you know, some of the boys need a little plum now and again, so I guess these things are part of the difference between winning and losing.

Mr. Minister and members of the committee, I hope the move to decentralize is not just tokenism and that we try to recognize local autonomy. If there's any way to defeat the family and community support services program, it's to centralize power. This government is great at talking about decentralization. They decentralize agencies and move them around the province, but they maintain the control. To me, that is the danger. It's fine for this government to say, we are on a decentralization program, but they're centralizing more power, in all departments, all walks of government. If there's any major failing of this government, it's that they don't seem to trust local autonomy, be it at the school board, hospital, or municipal level. I hope that doesn't happen at this level.

One positive recommendation I would like to make to the minister is that we should really decentralize our welfare program. I know one of the criticisms made to me as a member of this Assembly is that the mechanism of too much centralization is quite often just a matter of walking in and having a cheque written. Even the young people say: you know, if it's a little tough at home, we know the way the system works; if you're over 16, you just skip out and go to the city, tell them the song and dance routine, how tough things are at home, and you're on the roll. I think if we return that to the local level, people in those communities know what is going on. If we want to cut out some welfare abuse, this would be a good place to start.

On the Ivany report, one of the flaws, as I'm sure has been indicated, is the inadequate scrutiny of foster parents. But at the same time as I say that, Mr. Minister and members of the committee, probably 99.9 per cent of the foster parents in this province couldn't be more

dedicated people than if they were looking after their own natural children. I've had many dealings with many of these people. For years they've been saying, you know, we look after these children uncomplainingly, but we would like to have a little assistance. If there were some type of mechanism, Mr. Minister, where we could have a floating group of people who could be seconded once, twice, or three times a year to come into a home where there are 8, 10, or 12 foster children, so these foster parents could have the odd — and they say, even if we had two or three weekends a year when we could really take two or three days off, it would be appreciated. This one person, who happens to be a farmer, said: when you're fostering, it's almost like being a dairy farmer; you're married to those cows 365 days a year, because they don't stop milking when you take a holiday. It's the same thing. These children have to be looked after and supervised year round. If we could look at some kind of system, the foster parents certainly would appreciate that.

Of course the workload social workers have has been a chronic problem in this province. Nobody, the former government or the present government, can hide from that fact that our caseworkers have been severely overworked. Having said that 99.9 per cent of parents — you couldn't get better foster parents. There are always going to be the ones who cause us problems. I know we can tighten up the scrutiny and monitoring of who we take as foster parents, but that is really difficult. I empathize with the minister and appreciate that we're going to have some problems.

I know that politically it's great to jump on the minister, but I also have compassion for the large job that has to be done by the department. That's the part of politics that I find very difficult: just to have a run at a minister or a department when I know in many instances they have an impossible task. Having said that, Mr. Chairman, it is still the responsibility of that department and that minister. A few heads have rolled. I guess that's one way the minister gets the attention of the department, that the minister is going to try to run the department.

On the Cavanagh commission, I don't know. I apologize to the committee for having to be a few minutes late. I'd like to know if that report is going to be made public, and if it isn't, why it wouldn't be. I think it's in the interest of foster children, foster parents, and the people of this province to know what that report's going to indicate.

One area that really makes me question this government's concern about people on low incomes is their largesse in the \$10 a month increase in assured income for senior citizens. I really hope it doesn't break the bank, Mr. Chairman. To me, that was a slap in the face to the pioneers of this province. I suppose it's fine to say we're going to give senior citizens an increase. I suppose the larger increase will come in two years, just before the next election. But, Mr. Minister, we shouldn't be playing politics with people's lives. With inflation everything goes up, rents, food. Many of these people are in dire straits. So if there were ever a time in history when we want in some small way to reward those people who were the pioneers of this province, who made this province — and it wasn't Premier Manning or Premier Lougheed who invented oil in this province. It was the hard work of those pioneers that made this province great, and we must never forget that, Mr. Minister.

One other area where I felt either I was not doing my job, or the minister or someone did a snow job on me, is the situation of the spouse over 65 who has extended

medical care benefits, and his wife is under 65. I've been bringing the situation up for many years. I was under the assumption we amended that Act last year so that when the spouse over 65 died, those benefits would continue. I found out that they are only continued for 30 days after the spouse dies. Now if there's one area where we have to continue this assistance, that is it. It's a drop in the bucket as far as the amount of dollars involved, but it places great hardship on the surviving spouse. There just should be no hesitation in that area. I sent a personal memo over to the Premier when the hon. Helen Hunley was the minister, and the Premier said we will look after that. The minister said we will look after that. This government said they would look after that. Nothing has happened, except to extend the thing for 30 days. I would certainly like the minister to indicate what is going on there. Mr. Minister, if I am in error on that legislation, I would certainly be pleased to be informed. [interjection] Hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, is it so or is it not?

Mr. Chairman, in the area of the International Year of Disabled Persons, I notice that \$350,000 was allotted. I don't think that's sufficient to do the job. I would also like to have a look at a brief put out by the Edmonton social planning council claiming that 200 sheltered job industry placements are needed in Edmonton for people who are not capable of work in the work place as we see it. We certainly need ongoing programs and vocational training follow-up procedures for these disabled people.

Mr. Chairman, it is a large department. It affects many, many people. It's a department that requires a great amount of compassion, at times tempered with firmness. I know every government about every third year says, we're going to get rid of the welfare bums. That pacifies the taxpayer for another year or two. That goes in cycles. We have to have firmness and still we have to have compassion. So it is a difficult job. Mr. Minister, our role is to bring some of our concerns to your attention.

With that, I welcome your observations and will certainly be involved in the votes as they proceed.

DR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The few comments I would like to make this evening follow from the member who just spoke. I think those of us who sit on this side of the House as well as those who occupy a good portion of the other side were pleasantly surprised and commend the member for his kind comments, especially with respect to foster parents, in addition to some of his comments on behalf of the minister and his difficult task in this interesting and diverse department.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

One comment was made that in terms of decentralization this particular government doesn't really trust local autonomy. I must comment that in the two years I have been privileged to be part of this government, I've been pleasantly surprised to see how much they do value local autonomy, especially with regard to boards of education at the municipal level, to allow those groups to fulfil their mandate within their particular jurisdictions.

The whole pressure of in-migration within this province obviously is such that it makes it very difficult for various departments of government to cope, and I suppose this department in particular finds the greatest challenge in trying to deal with in-migration and trying to keep in place the various infrastructures necessary in dealing with

people components.

I was interested in listening to the half-hour sermon of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and I haven't had to listen to too many sermons lately. I know that during those 30 to 35 minutes he at least twice invoked "holy cow". I don't know if he's taken on some kind of new religious experience, but if anything I found that a lot of the comments were typically "holier than thou".

In the course of his comments, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview made two sweeping generalizations with respect to the discussion concerning single men's hostels. I believe he was referring in particular to Gunn and Youngstown, that these were places strictly used for people who were totally dysfunctional. Having visited Gunn fairly recently, I really believe the member is doing a disservice to those temporary residents presently in Gunn, because a tremendous number of them are functional. I would agree that perhaps their level of functioning is quite definitely far less than that of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. Nevertheless I really believe that to say they're all dysfunctional is too sweeping a generalization.

Again, I think we have a sweeping generalization with respect to those persons who move through the hostels, whether in Calgary or Edmonton. The member did catch me shaking my head at that point, because I think he was saying all of them were unskilled transients. We could at least narrow that down. A tremendous number do have minimal skills. Obviously a tremendous number are coming in from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and I think that one of the elements seen at the hostel in Calgary is perhaps a need for a counsellor who is fluent in French. Perhaps they could be housed over in the youth hostel, which is only two blocks away from the single men's hostel. I have visited both those hostels on a number of occasions because both are within the constituency of Calgary Millican. I offer that as one suggestion to the minister, that perhaps we have someone who has a high degree of fluency in French on staff in the Calgary hostel in particular, because that would help. It probably applies to Edmonton as well.

One matter that does occur — and I think it is a difficulty within the department — is that the counsellors at the Calgary and Edmonton single men's hostels are there for a variety of reasons. Obviously one of the reasons must be to try to help in finding employment. I find it a bit disconcerting, to say the least, that the majority of the counsellors are only there during the daytime, when the residents aren't supposed to be within the facility. That just makes no sense whatsoever to me. It's far more important to have the counsellors there in the late afternoon and through the evening hours to be able to set up a series of appointments and interviews and to make suggestions whereby the counsellors or additional staff could make contact with various industries the next day. So I can concur with that aspect of the comments and the concern raised by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview with respect to the single men's hostel.

One of the interesting things we wait the developments of this year and next year will be what impact the new detoxification centre will have in Calgary, once again located in Calgary Millican. It helps to make the constituency exceedingly challenging, especially when these kinds of components raise certain fears in the minds of various people who happen to share the neighborhoods, whether it be the single men's hostel or the detoxification centre.

When in the constituency last weekend I noticed that

the detoxification centre seems to be coming along. I am hopeful you will make some comments on how the completion of the detoxification centre will affect the policy with respect to the single men's hostel in Calgary.

I believe the first year I was in this Assembly I raised the matter of the single men's hostel in question period and with various memos and discussions with the minister. I know the policy that the persons using the single men's hostel should be encouraged to leave after two weeks has been in place for some time, because there is a varying profile of the users of these facilities. Some who are using the facility would be called hardcore, difficult to house. In most instances, these would be persons who are quite elderly, and quite frequently would have very severe alcohol problems. But that's only one component of the users of the single men's hostels. A tremendous number there are legitimately seeking employment. I believe that in the period of time that this new two-week stay policy has been in place in Calgary, in actual fact this truly has been successful in speeding up the process of moving through and making more spaces available for more persons to move in. Now that may just be a particular function of Calgary lying on the Trans-Canada Highway, where an awful lot of the in-migration from both east and west is occurring. But I find that after this last period of time, I really cannot challenge this policy of the two-week stay in Calgary. But that also keeps in place that the counsellors have to be willing to work with the difficult to house, because those senior persons — and perhaps the detoxification unit will give us more information as to how we can deal with that particular problem.

Another aspect of the single men's hostel of course, whether in Calgary or Edmonton, is native transient persons. Sometimes that involves alcohol, but with no higher frequency than when it involves alcohol with white persons.

I would briefly like to commend the minister and the department with respect to changes that have taken place within some of the institutions under the ambit of the department, in particular the action with respect to the staff increases at Michener. That can only lead to better conditions there. Having been there, I believe that in Michener, as in the other facilities which fall within the department that I have been privileged to visit under the Social Care Facilities Review Committee, I really believe that the morale is — I think I should put it this way — surprisingly high, when you consider the comments made by the Member for Edmonton Belmont or the kind of flagellation that has taken place over the last while.

I think it's indicative of the professionalism of all those workers, the child care workers and all the professionals within the department and working in those facilities, that they can put up with that kind of — whatever phrase you want to add in there — bombardment which has taken place. Because inevitably one would think that it has sort of worked something like the Chinese water torture on them, and a lot of them able to say, well, what's the use? Nobody thinks anything good is being done. As other members have commented, including the Member for Clover Bar, the point is that a tremendous amount of good is being done. There is great empathy, great sensitivity, and a great diligence on the part of these persons working in those places.

The same thing can be said for the group homes, whether it be for the physically or the mentally handicapped, or those who work in workshops throughout the province or in juvenile detention centres. The kind of pressure upon these persons day after day after day is

really so considerable that obviously, in some personal cases, there will be burnout. As we checked with other facilities across the country, the burnout syndrome here in the province is no worse — and that's surprising — than it is in other provinces. We take it back to what this department is all about. It's talking about people. It's not a thing you can pin down, quantify, put on the scales and measure; the variables that occur in terms of interpersonal relationships, difficult enough with persons not placed in the position of being in a Michener, a Ponoka, an Oliver, or a group home, where they have other kinds of social behaviors which make the whole situation much more difficult.

So I too would like to commend all those persons in this province, the volunteers and the department people, as well as the persons who work in those facilities, whether large in size or group homes. For example, last Friday afternoon two of us from our committee visited two group homes for mentally retarded adults, located in the greater Edmonton area. Going through the door, no matter how many times I've been to a place like that, one is struck by the sensitivity of the staff working with the residents. I'm sure the Member for Spirit River-Fairview joins us in having that word of appreciation for those in the department involved throughout this difficult work, also the front line people who are dealing in terms of the group homes or the larger institutions.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of comments I'd like to make. When I sit here and listen to all the doom and gloom, I wonder if any programs in the department are any good. I would like to comment about a few of them.

I appreciate the assistance received by Kroken House from the new provincial program and for the program that was assisted in order to get it in operation. Recently they received word that a \$100,000 grant from the Clifford E. Lee Foundation will now provide them with a permanent home in Grande Prairie, so I think the problem has been solved for the women in Grande Prairie as far as a women's hostel is concerned.

The senior citizens have expressed their appreciation for increased funding for their programs. I've heard it said that the seniors are not receiving the attention they should, but that is not what I hear from the ones I talk to in my area. The opportunity corps in northern Alberta is working and filling a real need in many communities and, I believe, should be expanded to several other communities. When it is tied in with the employment relocation program, I believe it gives many of the unemployed in some of the more isolated communities an opportunity to join in the workforce and remove themselves from those social service rolls.

While I'm on my feet I might also say that I appreciate the co-operation between the Northern Alberta Development Council and AADAC. Alcohol is a major problem in northern Alberta, as it is in other areas of the province. We look forward to facilities in the form of detox and rehabilitation centres being developed in the north that will look after our citizens, to relieve our hospitals and keep the citizens at home rather than send them south to some of the treatment centres.

I believe the day care program is working well, but some mechanical changes are needed to aid some of the smaller communities. Costs of day care centres and their operation are higher in northern Alberta than the provincial average. Centres in northern Alberta, especially in

some of the smaller communities, are finding a shortfall.

I might also mention that the 21-day absentee clause is causing some problems. For instance, a woman who was working seven days a week with three days off talked to me. The day care operates five days a week. She puts her child in day care for five days, then has to find someplace else to put it for two days. Then when she has her three days off, if she doesn't put her child back into day care for those three days, she affects her 21-day absentee clause. I think this is something that could be managed somehow. It's not working for her; she has a problem. When the single parent is home off work, I think the child should be able to be with her parent.

I guess that's about all I had. I'm more concerned about the 21-day absentee clause, which causes a problem for some people. Some of the ladies I talked to are working for government on a job seven days on and three days off, and it affects their 21-day absentee. So I'd appreciate the comments of the minister.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Chairman, I'm really going to disappoint the hon. Member for Clover Bar, because I'm not going to tell the minister what a great fellow he is. I think he already knows what I think about him. Instead I want to say a few words about the staff who work in these institutions and provide the care for some of the people who aren't so fortunate as some of us as regards physical and mental health. The hon. Member for Calgary Millican said it much better than I. He said a lot of the things I wanted to say, so I won't repeat them, because he's much more eloquent about it than I am.

Before I speak about these people, I want to comment on a few remarks of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview; that is, the gloom and doom member. He was quick to quote what Barrett did in B.C. a few years ago. But I notice he didn't mention what has gone on with his buddies in Saskatchewan, where last year there was a minus 2 per cent budget for the care of the physically and mentally handicapped. I do not want to have a negative attitude towards Saskatchewan, because that's where I was born and raised, lived for a good many years, and worked in the mental health field for a few years. I was back last year, and they have made tremendous strides in the last 40 years.

AN HON. MEMBER: In spite of the NDP.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: You said it.

I want members to know that we do not have to apologize or take a back seat to anyone for the care of our physically and mentally handicapped in Alberta. As a member of the Social Care Facilities Review Committee, I've made many calls on Alberta institutions and care facilities. Most of the staff are quite content. They have a few concerns now and again, but I would say not a bit more than any other job-related facility. I found the majority to be very sensitive to their charges, very dedicated and interested.

It takes a very special person to do this particular kind of work. The care for these people takes a very special and sincere person. I want to commend them, because they deserve the appreciation and support of all Albertans. They do sometimes feel they are being unduly criticized, as an across-the-board sort of attitude. They feel some opposition members and columnists put them all in the same category of being incompetent and indifferent. Those who are dedicated and feel so strongly about them feel they are human beings, and they are sensitive to that.

They think it's an unfair type of criticism.

If you haven't got the message so far, I want to reinforce it: those people out there are doing a tremendous job for the people in this province who aren't as fortunate as some of us with our mental and physical capabilities.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry to get in, but I'll be very brief on this point. I just want to clarify a comment I made regarding the problems and the difficulty with the problems the department has. It's clear — in my mind, anyway and, I'm sure, in many members' minds — that when you have 9,000 man-years of employees seeing many different thousands of people over the year with special needs, young and old with special problems and difficulty in the socio-economic group, et cetera, et cetera, and different backgrounds, one would expect such problems. I hope I did not give the impression that the problems must occur. Clearly, problems are likely to occur and must be corrected and responded to. A system must be applied and improved on an ongoing basis, because there is intense interpersonal and human variation that is very difficult to deal with. Hopefully, with this kind of ongoing surveillance, evaluation, and re-evaluation on an ongoing basis, most of these problems will be minimized, if not completely eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make two other points that I didn't make in my last comments. One, I'm very pleased that the minister responded to vocational rehabilitation. I had the privilege of being asked by the minister to review some of the areas that I consider very important. I recommended to him, with other members in caucus, and the minister responded quickly and decisively. For the record I would just like to thank him for that. I'm sure the many, many volunteers in this area and the many adults and people receiving vocational rehabilitation are thankful for that. I'd like the minister to comment, if possible, on what changing policies in this area are contemplated in the very near future.

One final comment: the survival benefits. Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that if ever the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway is thankful, I am thankful for that. Last year I asked the question regarding survival benefits for senior citizens; that is, survivors. With a little nudging — not very much nudging, as a matter of fact — we have Bill 33, if the hon. Member for Clover Bar would look at it. I'm sure he has now.

DR. BUCK: There may be some amendments to it.

DR. PAPROSKI: I'm sure many amendments can be made to it. But in either case it's brought forward, and widows or widowers between the ages of 60 and 65 will receive senior citizen benefits. I'd like to ask the minister if these seniors will be directly informed, and whether these benefits will be retroactive. Of course, that could be answered when the Bill comes up. In either case, these seniors are truly thankful, Mr. Chairman, not only in Kingsway but across this province. The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway is truly thankful for that. In conclusion I would only comment that it's just this type of Bill, which benefits a few people but a very important group in our community, that makes an MLA's life worth while.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the hon. Member for Clover Bar, when he talked about the rapid rising rental for senior citizens he forgot to mention the fact that we have rental rebate, which has increased from \$500 to \$1000 a year, and just recently announced the

property tax reduction plan for senior citizens, which has increased from \$400 to \$600. I think that's very consequential.

Thank you.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a brief comment to the minister, to have on the record that I appreciate the efforts of the minister and his department with regard to the 30-bed attached unit for the medically fragile in Fort Macleod. I think the minister and his department, working together with the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, have come a long way in putting the package together. I think the minister will agree that the Fort Macleod hospital board, also working under new circumstances — because when you're building a new hospital and attaching a unit, you're working with two departments besides — are to be commended for their patience and all the efforts they have expended in those areas.

I'd also like to say, Mr. Minister, I appreciate the efforts and the programs from your department and how well they're working in my constituency. The problems that have arisen have been taken care of quickly by you or the regional staff in the Lethbridge office. I just want on the record that I appreciate that.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislative Assembly, thank you very much. I have to admit that I feel a little bit helpless looking at this. Tonight we're going to pass a budget of \$825 million. That's a lot of money, and I'm not sure what it exactly means. The reason I have to apologize is because I don't have much expertise in this area. I can't say if this is good or bad. But I've sat here tonight — we have three members on this side, and about 35 other members here. I look in the gallery and there's maybe half a dozen up there, and I don't know how many civil servants up here. But one would think that the people of Alberta would have a great deal of interest in what's going to be done with \$825 million. It is the third largest department in the government, after Hospitals and Medical Care, and after Education. It represents about 11 per cent of the total budget.

What bothers me is that of the 35 members on the Conservative side who get up and speak about this budget [inaudible] say that the comments from these members are nothing but gloom and doom, nothing but sermons. I don't know that everything they're saying is right or wrong. But I don't think it's all bad. I think it would behoove the members of this government to pay some attention to what they're saying, because the things I get from the public demonstrate to me that not everything this government does is great and not everything in this province is copacetic.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

The minister got up to introduce his \$825 million and made only three or four short sentences. I think that amount of money deserves a lot more. I like the way the Minister of Economic Development started out. His first line was, the framework within which this department will operate is . . . In one short sentence he underlined the philosophy of that department, and every program thereafter followed logically in sequence.

I don't know what happens with this budget, and I wonder if the minister could perhaps elaborate a little bit on the underlying philosophy of the department when he

gets up to make his comments. The programs outlined in this budget will take their direction from that philosophy, and it will integrate the degree of dedication that the government will have to those programs.

One of the words presented to the minister was "crisis" management. A way to measure the degree of crisis management in the government is to consider the long-range or long-term planning the government is doing. I would like to ask the minister, if I could ever get his attention, just exactly what long-range planning the department is doing in regard to social services for Albertans, and to demonstrate the attention the government is paying to long-term planning. Perhaps we could contrast two things: first of all the long-term planning done in the last year. Perhaps the minister could indicate what major studies were undertaken, what the subject areas were, by whom they were done, and how much they cost. What percentage of this total budget was dedicated to that long-term or research type planning last year? Of this \$825 million, how much is allocated for long-term planning for this year? What subject areas will they address? What problems will they attempt to identify, and what solutions will be researched and assessed?

I'd also like to know how much of the \$825 million will actually get into the hands of recipients. We know how much money is going out, but how many people in Alberta actually receive something? What is the efficiency ratio in there? Just how efficient are we? We've heard comparisons about per capita expenditures in the province tonight. It was pointed out by one member that Alberta was seventh in terms of all the provinces, before Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia. I don't know if that's meaningful or not until we can determine how much money or how many direct benefits recipients in Alberta get.

The last two things I'd like to ask you about: one, what the plans are for the emergency shelter in Calgary; secondly, what the time frame now is when we as MLAs could expect to receive the Cavanagh review report.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the minister now like to respond to the participants?

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll attempt to respond to the questions raised by hon. members during the debate on the estimates thus far this evening. A number of members from various parts of this Assembly have commented on remarks of other members of the Assembly, and I'll try not to repeat what's already been said.

In response to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I want to start from a philosophical base by indicating that, in my view, it would not be appropriate to measure the success or effectiveness of a department like Social Services and Community Health by the amount of dollars spent alone. I say that because if we look at one statistic alone, the number of social allowance cases in this province vis-a-vis our sister province of British Columbia, we can quickly see how the figures may be thrown out by tens of millions of dollars. In this province we have a case load which fluctuates between about 30,000 and 31,000 cases per year. The figure in British Columbia hovers in the 75,000 to 77,000 cases per year. One can easily see how very quickly figures may be distorted: a province with approximately half a million more people than ours, yet a case load in social allowance of some considerably larger numbers.

I look forward to specific comments hon. members may have on the various aspects of the votes as we go through the 10 votes of the department and the various elements of each vote. Rather than responding to those specific matters now, I think I'll keep my comments general and respond specifically at the appropriate time.

I want to draw The Family and Community Support Services Act to the attention of the hon. members, as we won't be dealing with it under one of the votes. The comments the hon. member, or any other member from the Assembly, has will certainly be welcome when we do go to second reading of that very important Bill.

The hon. Member for Vegreville asked a very pointed question with regard to the Ombudsman's report. He further sent me a little note and asked if I could be honest in my answer. I'll try very hard to keep my response brief and to be very frank with him. I have stated in this Assembly that it is my intention during the spring sitting of this session to table a response to that point in time as to progress in implementing the recommendations in the Ombudsman's report. Whether the recommendations have caused certain actions to be undertaken or whether those actions were undertaken or in the process of being undertaken by the department, is something I will leave each member to decide for himself based on the information provided.

I was extremely pleased by the comments of the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway in his very strong support for the foster care program in this province, in particular for the people in the front lines, our foster parents. The system would not work without their support and continued dedication. That's it in a nutshell. Youngsters who through no fault of their own in most cases would have no alternative other than to be cared for by the government through a series of group homes or other facilities and institutions.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont had some concerns with the number of new employees, specifically with the in-service training recommendation of the Ombudsman's report. Although I would rather not deal with the Ombudsman's report in any detail — but if hon. members wish, I am certainly prepared to — as I am going to table an interim report with the Legislature, I would like to make a brief comment on the matter of training, as it is of interest to the hon. member. Effective February 1 of this calendar year, funding was provided to establish two training centres, one in Calgary and one in Edmonton. We were in the process of engaging the American Humane Association, a non-profit society based in Denver, with over 100 years of history and a very solid reputation across America, to assist the department in the in-service training of employees. The training is well under way for child welfare supervisors. That commenced on April 13 and will be completed by this October. Most, if not all, of our child welfare workers will go through this training program during the fall of this year and through the winter, spring, and summer of 1982. We are working very closely with the Alberta Association of Social Workers on fine-tuning the program.

On the matter of employees within the department, I draw the hon. member's attention, as I would that of the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, to the comments I made in this Assembly on Monday, April 27, when I spent in excess of 20 minutes going over the highlights of the department budget. I did that specifically during the Budget Address so I could spend more time than I would normally spend on an evening like this. I highlighted

those areas. So the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo may wish to look at *Hansard* and will certainly see the areas where I've placed priority in terms of focus for this department.

I've also dealt with the matter of the approximately 1,142 new employees. The hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont will note that some 651 of those positions were in place as of April 1 of this fiscal year. They were positions approved by special referred-for-decision requests to cabinet and approved by caucus. The funds were approved through a special warrant. Of course the final approval to make any temporary position permanent rests with this Legislature. That's why they show up in our estimates this year as a total, aggregate figure of 1,142.

The hon. Member for Clover Bar spoke with some pride of the PSS program in this province. Of course he has every right to, because he was a member of a government that took a bold step, introducing a program no other province in this country, then or now, has followed the lead on. Again, I'll look forward to debate on second reading of the particular Bill.

One comment made by the hon. Member for Clover Bar which I think is particular cogent to the discussion this evening is that some relief should be provided for foster parents. It's a matter we've addressed through those individuals operating group homes for handicapped or other children with special needs. I believe it's the kind of thing we can take a good hard look at in terms of foster parents as well. I believe the circumstances are quite different, yet I can see the need. Of course we envisage the foster children being part of the family unit, and in normal circumstances the children would be with the family on any holiday taken. But if there are some very special circumstances, then certainly that's a matter that I believe could and will receive further attention.

The question was asked whether the Cavanagh Board of Review final report will be made public. The answer is yes, it will. The process the government will follow will be parallel to the Kirby Board of Review, in that all the reports made by Mr. Justice Cavanagh will be made public.

On the Alberta assured income plan for senior citizens, I would remind the hon. member that for a single person the program has increased from \$45 a little over a year ago. We brought in a supplementary request last year at about this time increasing the rate to \$75, and now it's increasing to \$85 per month, which is a top-up to those funds a senior would already receive under the old age security and guaranteed income supplement plans.

Under sheltered workshops initiatives, I might mention this is an area of great concern and interest to our government. We are working hard with the volunteers who are providing this much needed service throughout the province.

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican made some comments on the single men's hostels and the detox centre. I would ask the hon. member to hold that question until we get to Vote 11, when my colleague the Member for Lethbridge West, who's also the chairman of the board of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, will be pleased to respond in more detail.

The hon. Member for Grande Prairie spoke of Kroken House. I'd like to stop for just a moment and share with other members of this Assembly who aren't familiar with Kroken House what a wonderful job is being done by volunteers in the city of Grande Prairie. A number of women got together, managed to scrape up a few dollars,

rent an old house in the downtown area, patch it up, and provide a much needed service for women and their children. I'm pleased that we're able to implement a permanent program. I might mention that the personal experience I had when visiting Kroken House, speaking with the women receiving care, talking to the volunteers, certainly had an impact on our final decision as part of government in terms of this direction in a much needed area.

The hon. Member for Highwood brings a great deal of expertise to the Social Care Facilities Review Committee. As others have on other occasions, this evening you've heard of the interest and dedication this gentleman has in both his experience as an M.L.A. and his past experience in one of the mental facilities in another province. I certainly appreciate the support and input received and the very candid and frank comments given by the hon. member.

The Member for Calgary Buffalo has asked a number of questions relating to long-range planning and philosophy in the department. He went on to ask about various studies prepared during the past fiscal year. Certainly not wanting to be argumentative, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that the appropriate place for information on studies or any other long-term planning conducted in a fiscal year which is now passed, when we are debating the estimates for the present fiscal year, could best be dealt with on the Order Paper. If that is the case, I'll certainly co-operate with the hon. member.

Again there were questions on the Cavanagh Board of Review and when we might expect the report. It is my understanding that the hearings and committee meetings across the province are taking place now. Various groups which have submitted written requests are either presenting their material in a written form or presenting the material and appearing personally to present their particular cases. I have no timetable, nor do I have any jurisdiction as to when Mr. Justice Cavanagh and the committee should report. We certainly have indicated that if the committee wishes to provide an interim report, we would welcome it. Hon. members are aware that in the Speech from the Throne this year, we indicated that certain proposed amendments to The Child Welfare Act would be put to the House this fall. Prior to that, input and advice will be sought from the Cavanagh Board of Review.

I'd like to sum up my comments by trying to respond in a very brief nutshell my own personal philosophy of the direction of this department and, I believe, the views shared by my colleagues in the government caucus. We should do everything we can to help those who cannot help themselves. We should not take away local or individual initiative to take care of oneself. We should provide the support where it's needed. We should assist and not direct. And we should ensure that the volunteer and private sectors are given every opportunity to participate as fully and equitably as possible in this province, because they're the very people who have made this province what it is today.

MR. NOTLEY: Before we get into specific votes, I'd like to deal with several observations made by other hon. members during committee study. The hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont raised some comments about native children in the foster care program and implied that I had somehow suggested that native parents shouldn't be notified but in fact the band councils should be instead. Of course, I didn't say that. It's always nice to be able to argue points when you can state what your opponent has

said.

What I did do was to draw to the committee's attention page 49 of the Ombudsman's report, which goes into the recommendations with respect to children of native origin. The Ombudsman does not say, and no one is saying, that the parents of children should not be notified. He is saying, on page 49, that "When treaty Indian children are apprehended, their band should immediately be notified ...". That's fair enough. That's in addition to the notification of the parents. The point that I think has to be made here is that because of the whole cultural tradition of the native people, there's a community interest, that in addition to the notification of the parents, the notification of the band is important as well. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I just think that makes good sense and is not an effort to do a run around the parents or undermine the relationship between the child and the parents at all, but is a recommendation followed by the Ombudsman which, in my view, has merit. I see it as such.

I want to deal with one point the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway raised about social services as a percentage of the total estimates. I did not outline the specific figures, but I think it's probably worth giving the figures, because the hon. member took exception to my comments. We're 12.32 per cent of the budget this year, up from 11.35 last year, a little less than 1 per cent. But it's not equal to the 12.35 per cent of budget in 1978-79, which was just before the last election when we were fattening people up for the election. Notwithstanding the improvement in the budget, we are still slightly below the percentage allocated. [interjection] Yes, 12.35 in 1978-79 compared to 12.32 this year. So we're still not quite to the level we were in '79, notwithstanding the ballyhoo from the government about all the strides we're making.

I just want to deal with one other item, because it's an important one, before we get into the general discussion vote by vote. That is a suggestion that several hon. members have made. The Member for Edmonton Belmont made it, the Member for Calgary Millican implied it, and I believe the Member for Edmonton Kingsway mentioned it. That is that somehow the criticism that has been levelled at the performance of the government in this regard is an attack on the people who are working in the field. That's just absolutely not true. The fact of the matter is that we are lucky, no question about that, with the dedication on the part of the people who are employed by the Department of Social Services and Community Health. The Ombudsman makes that point very strongly in a report where he is not very complimentary to the government's overall performance. But he underscores the valued service of literally hundreds and hundreds of employees of this government.

To a large extent, the criticism that has taken place in the last two years has been directed at the policy initiatives and the overall responsibility of the government; criticism, quite frankly — to the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont in particular, but to other members — that is directed at this government. The members who have responsibility are sitting in this House, not the people who have the task of carrying out the policies that are developed by the government caucus and by the minister. There should be no confusion that the attacks that have taken place — in the media to a large extent, and certainly on my part in this Assembly — are not directed to the good social workers and the people who are trying to do the job on the firing lines. It's the inadequacy of funding and policy development, which are the responsibility of the government. Quite frankly my

criticism is directed to the people in this House, not to the people who are doing the work outside. [interjection] No, that's certainly not, and the hon. Member for Kingsway knows ... [interjection]

Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Member for Kingsway is, as usual, out of order. But if we ever insisted that he follow the rules, he wouldn't have a chance to say anything.

The fact of the matter is that the criticism — I know the government's a little sensitive — is directed at MLAs, government members, and people who are responsible for developing policy, not the people who are given the awesome task of trying to make do with the results of inadequate preparation of policy and inadequate funding by this government. Where do the hon. members of this committee think the concern comes from, to a very large extent, to opposition members and the press? It comes from people working for the department who have concerns and say, we have to try to make changes and improvements.

So I make that point, Mr. Chairman, because there should be no misunderstanding that the criticism I have directed is clearly in this House, and not outside.

MR. MACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Very briefly, I'm very pleased that I was able to discharge my responsibility as an elected official to place the record straight and to give credit where credit is due. I'm glad the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview had to take additional time now to do what he should have done when he stood up in the first instance. He did not qualify any of his remarks. I was certainly not going to sit here on behalf of some 8,000 employees out there who are doing a very, very professional and a super job in serving the public, serving Albertans. It's fine to be a spokesman, or supposedly usurp that authority for people, and then condemn them. I don't believe in that. By and large, I believe they're doing an excellent job. I think we should give them credit for the work they're doing. So if I didn't do anything else tonight, I'm glad we got the record straight.

Thank you.

MR. SINDLINGER: Could I please have supplementaries on three questions I asked, Mr. Chairman? The first was in regard to the benefits recipients in the province received. The response of the minister was that there was something like 30,000 or 31,000 case loads. If I divide that into the budget, it indicates that each one received something like \$28,000. My initial question was: as a measure of efficiency, how much of the money actually got into the hands of the recipients? If \$28,000 is directed toward each one, did they receive \$28,000? Obviously they didn't. Did they receive \$1 each? Obviously they didn't. But somewhere in between there must be some measure of the efficiency of the department in terms of the benefits distributed throughout the province, and perhaps you could address that please.

If you'll have patience with me, I have two more. The second regards the long-range planning. I was concerned with that, not specifically the studies done last year. However, in order to gauge the long-range planning that would be done this year, we have to measure that against some bench mark. Perhaps if we measured it against the studies done last year, we could determine whether or not there will be more or less long-range planning this term than last year. In any case, if the minister would undertake to provide the Assembly a list of the major studies that were done, by whom and at what cost, I think that would be helpful too.

The third is a small point regarding the Cavanagh commission. It was pointed out that we would be getting their report when it was completed, but your time frame for that was not mentioned, or I didn't feel that I got it. Perhaps you could indicate when you expect the commission to report.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the first question and the very specific questions as to the benefits various recipients might receive from the budget, it's my understanding that that's the very nature of the process we're going through. We go through a department on a vote by vote, element by element basis so that the very specific, detailed questions may be asked at the appropriate time. Certainly with regard to concerns the hon. member has, whether with regard to social allowance payments, support for handicapped, special programs of support for the elderly, other income support programs, we can best deal with those in the various elements of the 10 votes of the department.

With regard to the planning question, again I would suggest that we will deal with that very appropriately in Vote 1, under 1.1.4, research and planning. At that time I'll be pleased to discuss the kinds of planning. Hon. members can certainly appreciate that much of this is still in the tentative stages. We're at the beginning of a fiscal year. We feel that some studies are necessary; others are still in the possible category. As I've indicated, if the hon. member would place on the Order Paper questions he has as to past studies, I'll be very pleased to respond to that matter at that time.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Minister, in regard to the studies and your undertaking to provide them once they're put on the Order Paper. On the other hand, there's still the problem in my mind in regard to the measure of the efficiency or effectiveness of the department. Here tonight we will initiate a \$28,000 per recipient benefit. Somewhere from the top to the bottom there has to be some measure of what the recipients get. The minister says we can look at individual votes. I appreciate that the minister may not have the total amount at his fingertips, but perhaps if sometime during the votes he could undertake to give us that total measure on the total number, the \$825 million, not the components. Obviously if you can get at the components for each vote, it follows that you can get at the total \$825 million.

Agreed to:

Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services

1.1 — Central Support Services

1.1.1 — Minister's Office \$260,310

1.1.2 — Executive Management \$1,511,330

1.1.3 — Departmental Financial Services \$5,482,250

1.1.4 — Research and Planning

MR. NOTLEY: Perhaps we could get answers to the questions from the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo at this point, if the minister could give us a detailed explanation of the research programs that have been under way, the studies that have been commissioned, what has occurred in the past, and what is anticipated in the current budget.

MR. BOGLE: I'll certainly comment on the 1981-82 budget estimates and divide the research work into two categories: first, those studies which have been deemed necessary, and we are moving either in the approval process of the contracts or of the work to be done; second, those areas where we think further research has to be done but we haven't yet sorted out the exact questions we want answers to.

In the first category, a decision has been made that two studies are necessary. The first is tied in with the regionalization and decentralization of decision-making within the department. That is a study to give various members of the department, a select group of people — approximately 320 employees ranging from the minister, members of his staff, senior and middle management, as well as people within the district offices — an opportunity to have input in the decentralization of decision-making. It's a failure-tree analysis to try to determine all the possible things that may go wrong so that before we move with the massive transfer of decision-making, we have addressed the majority — and we're the first to acknowledge that no matter how good the study is and how much input we've had, there will still be some areas that haven't been tapped. We also want to ensure that outside individuals, people who do not work in the department but who work closely with the department — I think of groups like the Alberta Association of Social Workers, the Alberta Association for the Mentally Retarded, just to name two of many, many diverse groups that would be given an opportunity to have that kind of input.

The second study will be to assess the co-ordinated home care program. As hon. members know, we're now in the fourth year of the program. Complementary programs are offered by many municipalities. We want to assess where we are with the program and how we should move with the second or other phases of the program. Those are the two studies deemed necessary to this point in time.

Other areas of concern centre on child welfare, in terms of research; a need study in the physically handicapped, mentally retarded area; residential support services for the handicapped; day care; home care entry evaluation; protection cases in child welfare — to name the studies contemplated at this time. I would not by any means want to suggest that the list is complete at this point. Other matters I'm sure are currently under discussion within the department at various stages, which have not yet been brought to my attention. That's as complete as the list is at this point.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I could ask a supplementary on that. Can the minister give us approximate figures for the two major studies that are definite at this stage? We've moved from \$2,700,000 forecast to \$3,655,000, so obviously we must at least have ballpark figures at this stage. I'd like to know as much as possible what the estimate is for the two major studies, and then whatever additional information the minister has with respect to the other areas the department is looking at.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that either of the studies have been finalized to the point yet where we actually have a final cost. I know that the decision has been made and approved to proceed in that direction. Very clearly in the department emphasis is being placed on research and, wherever possible, doing that research on a contractual basis. That's as much information as I can provide at this point in time.

MR. NOTLEY: Just beyond that, a further supplementary. With respect to the two that have been, I guess, announced by the minister tonight, first of all, to what extent is the one dealing with regionalization going to be contracted out, and to what extent is that going to be essentially an in-house type of survey and research?

MR. BOGLE: We intend to contract out all the studies I've alluded to this evening.

MR. NOTLEY: Are you in the position at this stage to advise the committee, Mr. Minister, who in fact is going to do it? Have we gotten to that point, or is it just something that's going to be done in the next period of time? Do we have a firm in mind that would be undertaking the study? I would think that this study on reorganization or regionalization can be one of the most important studies that this committee can consider before we vote the estimates, because it's going to have a tremendous impact on whether this program flies or not, to put it in colloquial terms. I hope the Member for Calgary Millican won't get too upset at that. At this stage do we have any firm in mind to do it?

MR. BOGLE: To my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, no contract has yet been signed on either of the studies. I know that we've been working very closely with Sage Institute of Canada, who specialize in a failure-tree analysis in terms of problem solving, but I do not believe that at this point in time a contract has been signed on the major study within the department. In terms of the second study, on the co-ordinated home care program, I'm quite certain that has not yet reached that point.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview asked the question that I was mainly interested in; that was, what portion of that budget would be allocated to in-house studies and outside consultants? Inasmuch as it's been asked, I just want to indicate my interest in it, and follow with a supplementary. Could the minister indicate what the policy is in regard to tendering these projects, and what the policy is in regard to accepting, receiving, assessing, and evaluating bids on the projects? I ask this in light of a study which was done on emergency shelters in the province by the gentleman from Camrose. Perhaps you could indicate what the policy is in regard to asking and not asking for bids.

If I may, one final while I'm here. The minister might also indicate what preference, if any, is given to Alberta-based consultants as opposed to Canadian-wide consultants.

MR. BOGLE: It's not part of a written policy on preference, but certainly I have shared my own feelings with senior management in the department that preference should be given to western Canadian based companies. However, I point to the Howath study on sheltered workshops. In that case we contracted a firm from Toronto. The reason was that within the past six or eight months they had done some very specific work in that area for, I believe, an association in eastern Canada. Therefore it was felt that the firm not only had the expertise, as did some other firms, but also the knowledge of the most recent study.

In terms of tendering, the first criterion that must be met — and I've shared again with senior officials in the department — is that we must be perfectly satisfied that

the rates are competitive. Most rates, as I'm sure the hon. member is aware, are based on either an hourly or a daily rate, with other expenses. In most cases certainly we do tender. That is the preferred route. If a time factor is involved and it's felt that the results of a study are needed in a very short period of time, that practice may not be followed. If it's a case where one particular firm has very strong expertise, again we have to be perfectly satisfied that the price of the contract is within the range that we have been signing with other firms or, in discussions with other departments in this government or in other provinces — because much of that information is being gathered in the other jurisdictions as well — satisfy ourselves that we are not paying a higher price than is the going rate.

MR. SINDLINGER: If I may elaborate on the question then, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, is there a monetary level above which it becomes either departmental or government policy to call for tenders, and below that level it's up to the discretion of the department whether or not to call for tenders on a project?

MR. BOGLE: Any major study undertaken by the department must receive the approval of the minister. We have been using a \$50,000 figure within the department. When the pertinent information as to a firm is brought forward by the assistant deputy minister of the planning secretariat, that's part of the information contained therein: the amount of the contract, the circumstances, and if it hasn't been tendered, why. If I am satisfied and other senior members of the department are satisfied with the arrangements, then we proceed.

Agreed to:

1.14 — Research and Planning	\$3,655,470
1.15 — Senior Citizens' Bureau	\$522,770

1.16 — Personnel and Staff Development

MR. SINDLINGER: Could the minister please indicate what type of development is involved in this?

MR. BOGLE: Much of the in-service training alluded to in the opening remarks by various members of the Assembly will be covered in this area. When we're bringing new staff on stream, in-service training is to ensure that they're familiar with the total system. I could make specific references to the RFDs which were approved during the past fiscal year and implemented between then and the present time. Support to reduce child welfare case loads, support for the child abuse hotline program, support for the district offices, new staff for child welfare as well as day care implementation, support for the Public Guardian's office, are the primary areas of emphasis in terms of the volume increase.

Agreed to:

1.16 — Personnel and Staff Development	\$4,628,930
1.17 — Public Communications	\$1,218,580
1.18 — Departmental Administrative Services	\$4,923,180
1.19 — Management Audit	\$505,900
Total — Central Support Services	\$22,708,720

MR. NOTLEY: I don't know at what point the House Leader wants to adjourn for the evening, but it seems to me that we're getting into the area of regionalization, are

we not? Either in Vote 1 or someplace, I'd like to get into some discussion on how the government proceeds. We were talking about the study that's going ahead, but we've gone somewhat further than that. Perhaps I could just be advised where we can discuss it. It strikes me we'd discuss it under this vote, but if not I'll hold it till a little later.

MR. BOGLE: Actually the only new positions that have been sought and approved for regionalization and the decentralization of decision-making would be located on 1.1.2, under Executive Management. Eighteen new staff positions have been sought and are within this budget. In other words, we feel that the decentralization of decision-making that will take place, the six regional offices that will act as nerve centres, in many cases we're talking about staff who are now in the field. To give an example, the regional managers of social services — we now have regional managers in the field. The same is true with rehab services and mental health. We're basically talking about six new positions to be created at the Executive Officer I level, those being the regional directors within the areas, administrative assistants for those regional directors, and clerical support. The other positions are all within the budget. There's no other place within the vote or the other votes where the decentralization of decision-making shows up as a specific item. If the hon. member wishes to discuss it, we could do so at this point or at a later time.

MR. NOTLEY: We could do so now, but I just want some indication from the Government House Leader because we're getting into a fairly big area here.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, if I can interpret the question from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview as anything remotely connecting a suggestion that the committee might rise and report, it would enable me to do at least one thing in the course of the year that he wants me to do.

MR. NOTLEY: You can even get unanimous agreement.

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the intention is to continue with Committee of Supply and the estimates of the Department of Social Services and Community Health. Perhaps it's also timely to mention that the House will sit on Thursday night, and Committee of Supply will continue. Whether or not it will be Social Services and Community Health at that time is a matter that has yet to be determined. In any event, I could indicate that nearer the end of the week the departments of Energy and Natural Resources and Government Services are among those we're considering, as well as Social Services and Community Health.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. House leader. If the Department of Social Services and Community Health were completed tomorrow afternoon, we would be going into Energy and Natural Resources Thursday night. Is that what the Government House Leader is indicating?

MR. CRAWFORD: That would be the most likely department at that time, Mr. Speaker.

[At 10:31 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]