

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Title: **Monday, April 19, 1982 2:30 p.m.****Western Canada Lottery**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. SPEAKER: Today I have the honor to introduce to all my colleagues in the House Mr. Austin Zvoma, Assistant Secretary of the Parliament of Zimbabwe. He's accompanied by Mr. Gordon Barnhart, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly in our sister province of Saskatchewan, and by Mr. David Mitchell, Clerk Assistant for Procedure in the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan. I'd like to ask if they might stand and receive the welcome of the House.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon it's a pleasure to table with the Assembly the 1981 annual report of the Environment Council of Alberta.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I'm pleased to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 68 grade 6 students from Rudolph Hennig school in Fort Saskatchewan. Accompanied by their teachers Mr. Bill Lopka and Mr. Ron Fraser and by parents Mrs. Malthy and Mrs. Abbott, they are seated in the members gallery. I'd like them to rise and receive the recognition of the Assembly.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Member for Edmonton Whitemud, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 41 grade 6 students from the Brander Gardens school in Edmonton. Accompanied by teacher Mr. Inglis, they are in the public gallery. I ask them to rise.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, through you to the members of the Legislature, I would like to welcome 30 Calgary students who are all politicians. They are student council members of 26 different grades 6, 7, and 8 classrooms in the Sir John A. Macdonald school in Calgary McKnight. With them are their group leaders Martha Crane, Sharon Klint, and Larry Elashuk, who is the vice-principal and is exhibiting the kinds of economies we're used to in Calgary: he's also the bus driver. Mr. Speaker, I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Culture is with regard to the Western Canada Lottery Foundation, the Alberta division. I wonder if the minister could indicate whether there will be changes with regard to the distributorships across the province. I understand that at present 13 private entrepreneurs do the distributing. Is consideration being given to changing that to distributors or vendors being employed by Western Canada Lottery?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, there will be no change with the distributors for the next three months. We are continuing in the same manner we have in the past. As for what will happen in the future, we will be having meetings with the distributors, the Alberta division for Western Canada Lottery, and the caucus committee on lotteries.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate whether recommendations have gone to the Premier and other cabinet ministers, with regard to a new format and a contract with the various distributors across the province?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: I have received copies of it, and I think most of my colleagues have looked at the proposed new contract.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate whether the new contract was initiated by the minister or by someone else?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, the contract is with the Alberta division of the Western Canada Lottery Foundation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate whether the intention of that new contract is to have the various distributors and 80 to 100 commercial salespersons become salaried persons of Western Canada Lottery?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, earlier I did say that discussion is going on. Right now, I can't say if that is going to be so or not. I did state that the manner in which lotteries are being done right now is going to continue the same for the three months. During that three-month period, we will be meeting with the distributors and with the Alberta division.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate whether the alternative I am outlining in my questions is being considered for the new contract after July 13, 1982?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, that is one of the concepts, but I can't say right now if that is going to be accepted. It will be up to the caucus to discuss it and make a decision.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate whether a caucus committee has already been appointed to talk about this

proposed new contract? Who are the members on that caucus committee?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: There is a committee, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps the caucus chairman would like to indicate who his members are.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not sure question period makes caucus chairpersons the equivalent of ministers, for the purpose of answering questions. Perhaps the information could be sought privately or in some other way that would be in order.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Sorry, Mr. Speaker. I'll make sure the Leader of the Opposition receives the names of the caucus committee.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate the reasons for changing the present contract to the proposed contract, in which the private distributors would no longer exist and commercial salespersons would become employees of Western Canada Lottery? Could the reasons be enunciated in this Assembly?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition could get that information from the Alberta division. They have the contract at the moment, and the licence. And as I stated, please: the distributors are continuing in the same manner for three months, and we are meeting with them. I can't go any further than that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate whether the government or Western Canada Lottery have a set of guidelines for distributors and for retail policy directives, such as is set out in the province of British Columbia? Does the Alberta government or Western Canada Lottery, which is the responsibility of the minister, have that type of manual?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: There is a policy, and that is of the Alberta division of Western Canada Lottery.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Could the minister table the proposed new contract in this Assembly, for consideration by members of the Legislature outside the Conservative caucus, so we could review the contract and look at the reasons we're taking private entrepreneurs out of the field in Alberta?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, we have not decided if they're going to be removed from the distributorship. But I will certainly ask the Alberta division. If they wish to have their contract tabled, I'll do so.

#### **Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my second question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It's with regard to the Walter C. MacKenzie health centre. It's my understanding that consideration is being given at this time to phase two. I wonder if the minister could indicate whether a decision has been made on whether or not to proceed?

MR. RUSSELL: No it hasn't as yet, Mr. Speaker. We are looking at various alternatives. I'm meeting with the board, and discussions are still going on.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. A number of the contracts expired as of April 15. Are those contracts to be renegotiated, or will they go to tender? What is the present status of those contracts?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, just to clarify the situation, there are no contracts which expire. The hospital board obtained firm estimates, by way of tenders, for a shell. They were to expire on the 12th of this month if no decision was made. Of course, that date is now past, but no contracts as such were involved.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. One of the considerations or concerns is with regard to the space for research. I wonder if the minister has looked at a proposal that I believe he has received, with regard to the future of research in that centre?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes I have, Mr. Speaker. There's a fair amount of confusion about what is meant by research space in that facility, whether it's pure or applied research space; that is, carried on at the lab bench or at the bedside. As it's been built so far, the hospital has a great deal of bedside research space available.

The hospital board did appoint a joint committee, which involves the university board of governors as well as the hospital board, to develop that report on research space for us. I've just received it, and that will be one of the factors given consideration when a decision is made on phase two.

#### **CIL Explosion**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. minister responsible for Disaster Services. Can the minister indicate to the Assembly what involvement Disaster Services has had in the investigation of the recent CIL explosion?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, on Sunday morning, shortly after the explosion occurred, the city of Edmonton disaster services officer contacted Alberta Disaster Services, as they are required to do, and relayed information with respect to the extent of the explosion and the fact that a fire had occurred or was in the process of burning but was well under control by the Edmonton fire department. Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, Disaster Services has no further responsibility at the present time.

It may be that my colleague the Minister of Labour, who is responsible for fire prevention, may want to comment further upon what investigation might be carried out by the Edmonton fire department or by others.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I apologize to the hon. member who is the MLA for that area, but that approximates on my constituency as well, so I thought I'd ask the question. I'm sure the member will have a question to ask too.

I would like to know if the hon. minister responsible for Disaster Services can indicate, first of all, what damage has been done to the surrounding community as a result of the explosion.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot and would not attempt to give a full report in that regard. Indeed I'm not really sure it would be my responsibility to do so. Such a report would be developed by the municipal authorities concerned and reported to the Minister of Labour, I believe, in due course.

MR. HIEBERT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I know that the hon. Member for Clover Bar often shares the same bar, but not the clover and the gold.

My question, relating to the same incident, should then be directed to the Minister of Labour. Could the minister indicate what discussions are taking place between inspection branch officials, CIL officials, fire fighters, and so on, in making a full assessment of the incident and the causes?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I can advise that after the explosion yesterday morning, officials representing the pressure vessels branch of the Department of Labour were on the scene, and are still there today. They will be concerned to identify the cause of the mishap and how a repetition may be avoided in future. As well, there is close co-ordination between fire department officials and the boiler and pressure vessels officials. I expect a report, but it may be some time before we have a complete report which identifies, with absolute certainty, the concern that created the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I should add that the company has had a history of very safe operations and has been most cooperative in all relationships with the Department of Labour. As I understand, they have their own firefighting capacity, which they integrated with the city force, to the extent that they shared information and understood how each would operate in a situation such as this.

MR. HIEBERT: A supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to advise whether the preliminary investigation has determined whether the detection systems were adequate or were functioning properly?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, there is no information as to what caused the problem; nor is information available as to why, if there was a malfunction, the problem reached the point where it produced the explosion. Obviously, it would seem that something did not function the way it was supposed to, but that's speculative for the moment. I imagine that we will not be able to provide any definitive information for some time.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister responsible for Disaster Services. Can the Minister of Municipal Affairs indicate the co-ordination among the petrochemical plants in the area, to make sure that if there's a major disaster, other plants in the area that have firefighting and related equipment assist the plants that are in difficulty?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the area falls partly under the authority of the city of Edmonton now and partly under the county of Strathcona, but an emergency response plan to disasters is developed by every municipality. In this particular case, it would have been the city of Edmonton. There is also a very specific, co-ordinated effort among all the owners in the refinery area, with respect to such occurrences. In the question period, I cannot provide a detailed explanation of the emergency response agreement that is in place, but there certainly is

one. I'd be pleased to provide the hon. member with further information with respect to the type of emergency response which exists for that particular area.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. I'm not concerned about the details; I just want to know if one is in position, similar to what the the petrochemical complexes in the Fort Saskatchewan area have.

MR. MOORE: Yes indeed, Mr. Speaker, a very detailed plan is in existence.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

11. Moved by Mr. Johnston:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta express its assent to the Constitution Act, 1981, proclaimed in Canada on April 17, 1982, by Her Majesty the Queen.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in moving Motion 11, I'm sure all members of the Assembly recognize that as of last Saturday, Canada's constitution now resides in Canada. This has been a long process. Many of us have had an opportunity to be involved at various times, and all of us in this Assembly have had an opportunity to express our constituencies' points of view, the view on behalf of the citizens of Alberta and, I guess, our particular feeling as to what it means to be a Canadian with our own fundamental law. That difficult 115-year period of conflict ended Saturday, April 17, particularly because our search for an amending formula was solved and, after 115 years, our constitution was able to be returned to Canada.

On the weekend, I think all Canadians were very proud to have Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II visit Ottawa and provide the final royal proclamation to that piece of legislation, which required process through Westminster in London. But I think it was particularly symbolic that she was here to bring it back to Canadians and, in a very important way, give final independence to our country; to allow us total dominion status among all the large countries of the world, and now be able to make our own constitutional changes within our own country through the institutions and the processes which are truly Canadian. So it was more than just a symbolic move; to many people who took in the event, I think it was a very emotional move. It's very heartening to know that the debate in this Legislative Assembly was significant and, in fact, contributed dramatically to the changes which were effected in the constitution.

Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt that the British North America Act of 1867 has served us well as our fundamental law for more than a century. Of course, that is the heart of our new constitution. We should be fully aware that the amendments in that legislation, which fully set out the division of powers between the provinces and the federal government, are a very effective outline of a very strong federation which has now had a history of experience and which, in my view, is working fairly effectively in terms of Confederation. I think the principles established by the British North America Act must be continued in this new constitutional Act. It is a matter of legislative record that the principles, the legal aspects, and the traditions of the British North America Act will be

continued in the constitution and are now part of our basic law in Canada.

As I noted, a division of powers between the provincial and federal governments is always a difficult aspect of any federation. Through the period of 1981, we have seen many extremely competitive difficulties between the two governments. For example, we saw the difficult energy time, coupled with a very difficult constitutional time in 1981. But from that, I think we can say that we have resolved some of these problems. For example, for the first time in our history, we have seen the conventions really play a big part in our constitutional law. Those conventions were recognized by the Supreme Court decision and are now quite clearly part of our fundamental law. They cannot be changed by interpretation of the courts, because that classic piece of judicial interpretation will remain with us forever.

Other institutions and conventions will be there as well. We all have the history of parliament, the way in which it operates, the way in which the executive operates and, I think more importantly for most of us here in Alberta, the fact that the monarchy remains within our governmental system and Queen Elizabeth II plays a very important role as the Queen of Canada. Those are the institutions and traditions we all honor and which we all grew up with, and I hope they will all continue for as many years in the future as we can imagine.

The BNA Act has not been diminished in any sense by the fact that it has been merged into the Constitution Act. In the case of the citizens of Alberta, I think we can be assured that under the the Constitution Act, we now have more protection than we may have had under the British North America Act. Quite clearly, when the province of Alberta became involved in 1976, most recently with respect to the constitutional debate, it was our objective to ensure that any changes in the constitution — whether by actual constitutional changes or by interpretations — would not take away that feeling of confederation, that need within Confederation, which I think all Albertans expected us to protect. Those principles — the principle of equality among provinces; the rights that we now have would not be removed — were maintained by our government, and were maintained through a very hotly contested period. I can assure you that the province of Alberta did not take lightly the alterations to the compact of Confederation. In my view, we protected very clearly and very effectively the jurisdiction which is ours and which will continue to be ours.

Let me note that in this Assembly, I think we are unique among assemblies in Canada. We have a broad range of backgrounds, broad differences in cultural understanding, and we represent different parts of our province. Even in a debate in this Assembly, we can see those perspectives outlined, we can see a sharing of views, and we all become more understanding of the ways our whole province operates. If we magnify that 10 or 20 times, in terms of various parts of our country across Canada, I think we can see as well the multicultural make-up and the very diverse nature of our country. All of that has been brought together in this Constitution Act, and will remain as a very important heritage to us.

As well, I think it is clear to say that we in this Legislative Assembly had a very definite opportunity to debate the principles in the constitution. All of us know that over the past four or five years, Harmony in Diversity was the key philosophical and government position. It was introduced by the previous Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, now the Provincial Treasurer.

It was well debated in this House and, I think, well understood by the people of Alberta. As I said previously, the debate was not carried just in this Assembly but was quite pervasive through most of Canada, through most of Alberta. We had citizen participation; a lot of activity, a lot of debate on what should be in our constitution. I think those principles are reflected there, and I certainly think the people of Alberta, in particular, understand what is in the constitution and how it safeguards their rights and ensures the future for them.

There is no doubt that the process was a difficult one in terms of constitutional change through 1981, as I said. There were attempts by the federal government to move unilaterally against the province. There were attempts to change the jurisdiction of this Legislative Assembly by the Charter of Rights. Had it not been for the recommendations of our Premier and the determination he as the leader of our government gave to us, these changes would have taken away our jurisdiction. We would have had a different responsibility than the one we can now say we have today, and we would have worked under a different uncertainty in terms of our jurisdiction for the future. Fortunately that did not happen. The process was reversed. The federal government, along with all other provinces, recognized that participation by the provinces was key and that they must be involved in these changes which would dramatically move the jurisdiction of the provinces. In fact, that has been the case, and I think that will be a key result of this difficult period in 1981. But I think it reflects the results of a determined government and reflects the result which will not be reversed, in terms of equality of the provinces and the way the provinces make up Confederation.

I previously outlined the history of the constitution in Alberta, in the debate on Motion No. 15 that we had here on November 18, 1981. I'll not repeat what is a matter of record, Mr. Speaker, but I can give my assurance that I am more convinced than ever that Alberta has become stronger in its jurisdiction, while the rights of its citizens are more secure from this day forward than ever before.

Let me just note the amending formula. We've all had an opportunity to think about the way jurisdiction could be changed by the majority of provinces or the majority of the population. We all have a feeling of the possibility that our rights could have been eroded under an amending formula wherein two thirds of the provinces, representing a larger percentage of the population, could change the fundamental law. But as you well know, it is the Alberta amending formula which is in the constitution. That protects our jurisdiction forever. Should this Legislative Assembly object to any change recommended by the majority of other provinces and the federal government, by resolution of this Assembly we have the right to opt out of any change which would detract, reduce, or take away existing rights.

We can all note the difficult time we had to secure our resources, under the Resources Transfer Act of 1930. We all know it was on our minds that the possibility may have existed that the resources could well be taken away from us again. However, that is not the case. We have equality among the provinces, and we have the clear protection of the resources. Both as members of this Assembly and as citizens of Alberta, we can all take pride that it is the Alberta amending formula which is included in the constitution, and that agreement among the provinces to include that amending formula triggered the patriation of our constitution back to Canada, a conundrum which has faced Canadians for over 115 years.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, Canada has a Charter of Rights which sets out some fundamental freedoms. I think it clearly sets out the way people are protected from governments. To a very great extent, that enhances the very important human rights protection legislation of this Assembly. As I noted, the Premier suggested that we must protect the jurisdiction of this Assembly; that is, we could not have parliamentary supremacy eroded by the courts, and we would not transfer to the courts the responsibility of elected people. That responsibility stays with this Assembly today, as a result of the notwithstanding clause. That was a difficult argument suggested by the Premier in November 1978. The support in that period was not too enthusiastic. But as you well know, that has now been reflected again in the Charter of Rights in the constitution, and it saves [for] this Assembly the right to legislate in its own jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, recognition of the equality of women is also reflected in the charter. That does not suffer the notwithstanding clause. It stands by itself and ends a long period when the rights of women were perceived as, and in fact legally were, less than the rights of men. Again it was at the insistence of the province of Alberta that that change was made.

Mr. Speaker, the protection of existing Indian and Metis rights is also clearly established in the constitution. Because we attached such a high priority to resolving this issue, the provinces and the federal government agreed to a first ministers' conference. In fact, that has been written directly into the constitution. From Alberta's point of view, we will adhere to that responsibility and obligation. We'll do our best to carry forward and join the native leaders in our province in forming and finding the resolution for their constitutional problems. I hope it can be achieved. It is one of our major priorities over the next year.

Equalization: one of the important ties of fiscal federation is the way equalization works in this country. Equalization does not take away from provinces like Alberta. It simply means that we share a responsibility with other provinces, other regions, and other people in other parts of Canada, to provide them with a similar level of services and opportunities within their own jurisdictions, at a reasonable level of cost. We have talked about the great deal of conflict in terms of developing equalization formulas, and the way a fiscal federation can operate, but that is a result of the way our federation evolves and the way problems are debated. None the less, there is in principle the fact that equalization will continue, and that will be a means by which federal revenues will be shared among the provinces. In fact, it is the first time that has been written into the constitution. Clearly, the province of Alberta supports that principle.

So we have a sense of pride and identity in this new constitution, Mr. Speaker. I think we can say we are now Canadians. We have an autonomous dominion. We're able to deal with the problems which confront us, in terms of constitutional change. We have an opportunity to remove the vestige of colonialism which may have been perceived or may in fact have really existed. We now have our own constitution. I believe Alberta is ready to deal with the changes in the constitution which still remain before us. I believe that Alberta will as ever be ready to participate, to provide leadership where necessary, and to debate fully, on a public basis, any changes which may be suggested.

I already mentioned the question of natives. Of course, we'll be involved very directly in that in the near future. I

can add to it the suggestions we have had from many Albertans, with respect to an area such as communication, perhaps even looking at the Senate and the very broad range of questions which still remain to be solved.

I have said that we have made the first step. We brought home the constitution, with an amending formula. We provided an opportunity to debate what Canada is, from a federal point of view. And, quite clearly, we've had an opportunity to express the views of Albertans, as reflected by this Legislative Assembly, in the formulation of this new constitution.

So I think that over the past year, we resolved what many people considered to be an impossible task. Yes, deals were made. Yes, I suppose there was ample opportunity for trade-offs. Not everybody won their positions or had them well protected, but we've knitted together a fundamental law. As I said, in my view it's stronger than the constitution we had before. It goes further in protecting the jurisdiction of the province of Alberta in such areas as resources, property rights, and cultural rights. It very clearly protects, in a further and more specific way, the rights of the people of Alberta. In that sense, I think we can all be proud of the resolution of the constitution.

Mr. Speaker, although I was not here, I had the opportunity to read the brochure on the Canadian constitution, which was tabled. I hope all Albertans have had a chance to read it. We tried to provide a symbolic and informational brochure to commemorate the constitution in Canada. I hope Albertans have a chance to read it and perhaps even save it, as a significant memento of the constitution. I know we are very pleased to have been able to circulate that to all Albertans over this past weekend, as part of our participation in the constitution of April 1982.

Mr. Speaker, with this constitution, with this debate we've had in this Assembly, I think Albertans and Canadians can now move forward to other challenges which exist. I've indicated our obligation to deal as effectively as possible with other constitutional changes. I know that in the future we can deal in a better way with the challenges we face, in terms of the difficulties in our Confederation. But one of the fundamental hurdles is behind us. I simply feel that now that history has been recorded on April 17, we've established our true identity. We have proclaimed what is a proud day for Canada and a proud day for all Albertans.

I look forward to the debate. I'm sure other members would like to participate and give their views on what happened this past weekend.

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a few brief remarks to the Assembly, on this very special resolution. The hon. Leader of the Opposition will be back in a minute or two, but I would like to indicate to the Assembly where I stand.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Canadian from sea to sea, and that will never change. This is a large country. It is a difficult country to govern. It has a diversity of regions, a diversity of people; it's a melting pot of nationalities from throughout the whole world.

Why are we not proud to be Canadians? I guess because we're such rugged individualists, it seems to be our uniqueness in this country to have a great propensity for complaining. But surely we as a people have matured in this great Canada of ours. We should be putting more effort into keeping this country together than trying to tear it apart.

As a Canadian living in this great province of Alberta, I'm appalled at some of the attitudes in this province. I was very upset when we had a Canadian province talking about separatism, and I am very disappointed that we have some of those rumors going about in this province. What are we trying to do? Are we so disillusioned with our federal government, are we so upset with our provincial government, that we want to wreck the entire country? Are we using this form of blackmail to make eastern Canada listen to us? Mr. Speaker, instead of threatening to leave, we should be promising leadership, because this is too great a country to have people threatening to separate.

Mr. Speaker, I look with great shame and great dismay at people who are aspiring to political office telling half truths, and in many cases outright lies, to try to achieve political ends. I have great confidence that the people in this country and this province will understand that the whole country is more important than people trying to better themselves politically. Some people don't seem to understand how the people outside a certain region perceive you when you're flirting with separatism. I know that if I were president of a banking institution in Montreal, Quebec, Toronto, or the Maritimes, and I were thinking of moving my headquarters to Alberta and saw this flirtation with separatism, I would say: hold it; what is going on? These are some of the dangers people who flirt with separatism don't seem to understand. Quite obviously, they would never give this message to the people they are trying to woo.

As of this day, Mr. Speaker, I will never ever speak of being a Ukrainian Canadian; I will speak of being a Canadian, period. I would like to tell a story that indicates that. I have a very good friend with the last name of O'Kane. When his wife had their last baby, they had to fill out a form. They came to the section that says nationality; he put down "Canadian". The nurse said, I can't put that down. He said: well, I'm a Canadian; that is my nationality, that is my wife's nationality, and that will be the nationality of my child. She said, I can't put that down. He said, well, then just put "nationality unknown". Mr. Speaker, we are Canadians; we are not hyphenated Canadians.

As a person involved in the preservation of the culture of the ethnic group I belong to, I sometimes think we get a little carried away in wanting to become more Ukrainian than Canadian. Let's preserve those cultures, but let us remember we are Canadians. In the United States, when you ask those people south of the 49th parallel what they are, they say: we're Americans. They don't say, we're Polish Americans or Italian Americans; they say, we are Americans. Our background might have been Italian or of some other racial origin.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great country. And I challenge the people in this province to go some place besides Alberta and Hawaii. If they go across this great country, they will understand what I am saying. I am saying to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and the Minister of Culture, one of the greatest programs we had in Canada, implemented by the federal government, was when our young people were going back and forth across this great land. Mr. Speaker, that was a tremendous expenditure of the taxpayers' money. Let's get the young people, because if this country is going to survive, it's going to be through our young people, not through the politicians. Sometimes I think the politicians haven't done a very good job.

It is a great country; it has a great people. So the last

word I want to say and reinforce: let us as citizens and legislators of this great country do more to build up the country and work for the unity of this country than to break it down.

I stand in my place, and I wish to say that I am a Canadian from sea to sea; I will always remain a Canadian from sea to sea. Mr. Speaker, I am asking all the members of this Assembly to work towards making this a unified country, even though we have differences of opinion at the bargaining tables when both levels of government meet, at social functions, and at parliamentary conferences. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the greatest countries in the world. Let's be proud to be Canadians first and foremost, and forever.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. EMBURY: This afternoon I am very pleased to speak to this resolution and, with the members of the Assembly, reflect on the weekend procedures in Ottawa. It is with a sense of pride to all Albertans that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, the Premier of our province, and the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs represented Alberta this past weekend. Albertans, along with other Canadians, were grateful for the opportunity to view the ceremonies surrounding the visit of Her Majesty the Queen and Prince Philip.

It was significant that the actual formal ceremony was held outside. This provided many Canadians with the opportunity to be right there in Ottawa to catch a glimpse of Her Majesty and to witness the formal part of the ceremony.

Unfortunately, far too many Canadians had only a fleeting interest in the proceedings. This happened for many reasons. First of all, the total issue of the constitution and the ties to Britain is very complex, not one easily understood by all Canadians and Albertans. Secondly, the very long debates and the publicity surrounding the actual agreement unfortunately created in the minds of many people a mistrust and a disinterest. Thirdly, the pressing problems of the Canadian economy, the high interest rates and the drastic downturn in the oil activity in our province, due to federal policies, cast a shadow on this great auspicious occasion.

Certainly no one wants to belittle the proclamation of our constitution. I believe the Member for Clover Bar certainly alluded to the feelings of the people in this province. But frankly, there is still a great concern out there about why our constitution had to come back to Canada at this particular time. So many people you talk to in your constituency will say, what was wrong with what we had before? Were we not well protected when the constitution was in England? Why have the Prime Minister and his government taken this particular time in history to shield the pressing concerns before Canadians?

Fourthly, the absence of the Premier of Quebec: there is a hint of sadness when one realizes that a total province was not represented by its premier at the formal part of the ceremonies. When one recalls the referendum in Quebec in May 1980, it is known that there is a strong feeling among the people of Quebec to remain part of Canada.

Interestingly enough, in 1981 a similar event — but not yet of the magnitude of the referendum — took place in Quebec for 49,222 registered nurses. The board of directors of the Order of Nurses of Quebec, which is the professional nursing association, recommended that Quebec nurses should no longer be part of the Canadian Nurses' Association. A vote on this issue was held.

Fortunately for all nurses in Canada, the nurses of Quebec rejected the proposition. This was indeed a very dramatic and grave concern to all nurses across Canada. Of the 135,097 members of the Canadian Nurses' Association, Quebec nurses have played a major role in the development of our national association, through their membership and leadership.

One can only speculate what was behind this proposal for the nurses of Quebec. First of all, there were internal budgetary concerns within the professional association. Also, of significant proportion to the nurses of that province was the general feeling of separatism and unrest. Needless to say, it was a great relief to all Canadian nurses that Quebec will remain part of their association.

In June of this year, the Canadian Nurses' Association will be holding its annual meeting in St. John's, Newfoundland. Those of us privileged to be there will anticipate a great feeling and bond toward our fellow nurses. Hopefully, we can work together and move on to the challenges before us, as no doubt this is the expectation for our country and our future constitutional changes. If you recall, the Prime Minister stated this on the weekend, when he said: there is much work to be done. It is not the completion of the task but renewal of hope; not so much an ending but a fresh beginning.

In her speech, Her Majesty the Queen expressed pleasure that the equality of women was accorded full respect, that disabled people are protected against discrimination, and that the rights of the aboriginal people are recognized, with full opportunity for further definition. While all Canadians who viewed the ceremony would no doubt share my pride, one special event would be of particular interest to women in Canada and, above all, to members of the nursing profession. Dr. Huguette LaBelle, Undersecretary of State, participated in the formal part of the ceremony. At one time, Dr. LaBelle was the principal nursing officer in the government of Canada, also past president of the Canadian Nurses' Association. Following the speeches by the Prime Minister and Her Majesty the Queen, and the formal signing of the proclamation, Dr. Huguette LaBelle read the proclamation. Dr. LaBelle was, and still is, well respected by members of the Canadian Nurses' Association. Many women across Canada who are nurses follow her career with great interest, as a symbol for all women. Dr. LaBelle illustrates what one person, a woman, can do and attain in the government of Canada.

The Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs outlined very concisely, but very well, what the return of the constitution to Canada means to all Canadians, particularly to Albertans. One of our responsibilities will be a continual communication process, for all Albertans to understand the significant milestone that has now been reached. It is significant to really gain an appreciation of the basic principles: that all provinces will be equal; that our natural resources are protected; that traditional rights, such as property rights, are protected; and that the supremacy of the elected legislatures, rather than the courts, will remain.

One of the issues that has caused great concern to many Canadians — and it certainly was expressed by some people in my riding — was, would this mean that the Queen would no longer be our Queen? I think that it is very significant for Canadians to appreciate the fact that the Queen will still be retained as Queen of Canada.

Many Albertans and Canadians who know little of our constitution now, or knew of the historical development of our constitution, at least have developed an ongoing

interest, and have asked, and will continue to ask: what does it mean to me? The Member for Clover Bar stated that he was proud to be a Canadian; he certainly spoke those words, and everyone in the Legislature would agree with him. He wants Alberta to remain part of Confederation. I would only say to him that that has happened due to the strong leadership of the Premier of our province. Yes, we did sit down at the negotiating table, and it was a very long battle over many of the issues. But fortunately for the leadership of our province, we can be very proud today that the constitution has returned to Canada and that we can accept the terms in that that constitution agreement. It is certainly not the end; it is the beginning of a new phase. We know that there will be many ongoing constitutional conferences. The Queen again stated in her address one of the concerns: yes, the aboriginal rights are protected, but there will be a future redefinition of those particular concerns.

As a member of the Legislature, I'm very proud of the significant role our Premier played in the constitutional debate. Albertans will long remember that due to his supreme efforts, we have brought back to Canada a constitution that will ensure and guarantee that we will truly be a federation where the government of Canada and every province will be equal and will work together for our future.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few remarks with regard to this resolution. The first thing I'd like to say is that we must start from where we are. We now have a Canadian constitution, the Canada Act; it's in place. We have a framework for revision and for adjustment.

I've said earlier in this Legislature, in speeches with regard to the constitution, and at the time the Premiers agreed, that that framework for the patriation of the constitution and the Act being in Canada was a necessary part of the Canadian federation and that it was time we made our laws in Canada, changed our constitution in Canada, negotiated and compensated as Canadians, as elected representatives, whether we represent the federal Parliament or provincial legislatures. Even in saying that, though, I think that we in this Legislature — and as well in the House of Commons — must recognize that our job has only started. We haven't finished or completed a job; we have only moved the decision-making to Canada, completely in Canada at this point in time. I believe we should immediately look at some of the necessary changes. The government of Alberta should take on that responsibility and initiate the work.

Three areas need our attention. Firstly, there is concern with regard to property rights. Albertans are not convinced that property rights are protected as adequately as they should be. I think Albertans are saying and directing their government, or directing elected members of the Legislature, that property rights should be spelled out in that Canada Act as an area that is protected for all of us as Canadians, and that those rights will not be violated in any way. As has been pointed out earlier in this Legislature, I believe, the history is that some of the provinces disagreed. The Prime Minister of Canada says that western Canadian premiers didn't want to add the property rights. Whoever it was in the past doesn't matter. I think it's incumbent upon governments today and in the future — the next few years — to take on that responsibility and bring in that amendment to the Act.

The second necessary area is with regard to the right of better representation in western Canada, and representa-

tion here in Alberta. The population shift has occurred to some degree, and recent announcements indicate that we will have more Members of Parliament in western Canada. But that still doesn't satisfy our need in terms of equal, better, and effective representation in the House of Commons in Ottawa. From my point of view, I certainly support looking at a regionally elected Senate with an enlarged representation that would balance the power of the Senate and balance that power with the House of Commons.

Through that mechanism, Albertans could feel better elected. Too often we in Alberta hear that when the votes are taken in Toronto, we might as well forget about voting, because we know whether the Liberals or Conservatives are going to be our federal government. That could change by better use of the Senate, of elected personnel in the Senate, and a Senate that would have elections every two years or on a rotation basis, so we would have a continuous change in that representation.

The third area that should be worked on and needs immediate attention is indicated under Section 37 in the Canada Act, where native and aboriginal rights will receive the recognition those various groups desire. I think it's incumbent upon not this government but the federal government to deal with that effectively and as rapidly as possible.

Those are the immediate things I see that not only must Alberta work on, but certainly must be the responsibility of a federal government. This Lougheed government must recognize that. If those changes are not initiated prior to the next election and are not placed on the platform, directions, or objectives of this Conservative government, I think other parties will be seeking a mandate to obtain those very fundamental changes in our constitution. Those changes are being demanded not only via political parties but by the populist movement that is rising up in the province of Alberta and in western Canada as a whole.

I think westerners are saying that they want equal opportunity in this country. They are asking that three basic changes must be taken into consideration. First of all, political changes: they feel a lack of representation from western Canada in Parliament, as I've already indicated. In the next election, it is proposed that the west will have 90 seats. Ontario will have 105, and Quebec 79. Ontario and Quebec have 184 seats, which means that political representation in our House of Commons or in our Canadian government is out of balance. Western Canadians are not going to stand for that.

Secondly, western Canadians want economic changes, in terms of their freight rates. Because they live in the west, they have to freight their goods some distance. They're concerned about that, concerned about the fact that for goods processed in central Canadian markets, western Canadians pay the freight rate back to western Canada. Western Canadians want greater access to international markets. They feel that the centre of Canada in terms of international markets, Toronto and Montreal, must change; that our goods and products, not only from the oil and gas industry but from agriculture, must receive equal representation, equal opportunity, in these international markets.

Western Canadians want access to national markets. Mr. Speaker, I guess the best example I can give is the present circumstances in the sale of Alberta oil. Offshore purchases of oil by eastern refineries are holding down the market opportunity for Alberta oil. To all of us in Alberta, that's not satisfactory. A week and a half ago,

the minister Mr. Lalonde announced that he had told the eastern refineries and they should buy more oil from Alberta; they should not buy as much offshore oil. But that's all he did, spoke to them in a meeting. In terms of effectively being concerned about the sale of Alberta or western Canadian oil, his words were not that effective. We in the west lost.

Central or eastern Canadian refineries are buying off shore oil for anywhere up to \$9 a barrel cheaper, when you figure in the subsidies, than they're getting it from Alberta. In terms of a business opportunity, they're going to continue to do that. But if we believe in western Canada having equal opportunity and that the federal government or western Canada stops subsidizing these companies so they can buy off shore, then it takes some action by government to recognize that there is western alienation, a western discrimination in terms of federal policy and with regard to the access we have to our own national markets, specifically for oil. Other examples could be given, with regard to farm produce as well.

What else economically? The federal government and central Canada — and I said this in an earlier speech and, I believe, in 1978 — considers the west as the hinterland. That concept has grown up through the ages: we in the west supply raw materials and goods that are processed in central Canada; those in turn are shipped back to us, and we act as the consumers.

Mr. Speaker, that type of image for western Canada must stop, because that does not allow us the maturity and recognition for the industriousness and capability we have in western Canada, and certainly doesn't recognize the economic capability and opportunity we need in Alberta and western Canada. So, Mr. Speaker, Albertans are concerned with that type of framework in which we work under this present federal constitution.

Third is with regard to a cultural attitude of western Canada. We in western Canada are of a different origin than central Canadians. Our origins are multicultural. Six out of 10 Albertans are of an origin different from English. Often we are put into the mold of this English/French relationship. As western Canadians we're saying, look, we speak English; we come from many backgrounds, but we are Canadians under those terms of reference. We keep asking the central government in Canada, why then do you try to fit us into this English/French mold? That's one of the basic reasons many westerners and Albertans feel the need for one language. They say, we speak English in western Canada; why do you fit us into the two-language system when we're not demanding that; you're not listening to us; you are telling us the framework for us to live within as Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, that is the problem with regard to all three of those concerns of western Canadians: political, cultural, economic. Over the last number of years — 40, 50, 60, 70 years — the federal government has not listened to what western Canadians have been saying and has not responded to those three basic general needs I have outlined. That continually causes an alienation of western Canadians with the rest of Canada. I think the challenge lies with us — not only in Alberta, not only with the Lougheed government, but each and every one of us — that we use some common sense and fight for these kinds of rights in a very sensible way, in the near future and in the future ahead. If we don't, if we as politicians are not able to listen to those very basic cries at the grass roots, those forces will cause the break-up of Canada. That would be a most unfortunate situation.

Mr. Speaker, it isn't any political party as such that can

cause dissension within Canada. It is issues of concern basic to all individual Albertans and western Canadians. Today and in the future, the challenge for any political party lies with those concerns. The political party must be able to listen and, in turn, translate that message into an effective federal system of government, a better Canada.

I would make the point I made some time ago in this Legislature, that it was necessary to patriate the constitution, to establish a framework upon which these kinds of changes could be brought about. We do have that opportunity, Mr. Speaker. But if Ottawa or this present government in Alberta sits in a very complacent way and ignores these very basic cries from the people of Alberta and the west, Albertans will not stand for it. Albertans will not allow any government to ignore their rightful place in Confederation. That's what our democracy is built on. That's what the representative system is built on: people directing their governments to meet certain basic needs. If that government doesn't meet that need, one, they can take the government out of power and, two, a government that says they can represent the people better in a certain way can then take on that responsibility. Even at this point in our history, I question whether the government presently in this province is listening to those very basic concerns. And with even greater doubt, I question whether the federal government is hearing western concerns. It is time that this whole environment in western Canada and in Canada be assessed by the politicians.

In Alberta, the questions arise: are we or are we not being treated fairly? Do we or do we not need a party that will separate or call for independence of a province or for western Canada? Why are people saying that at the present time, Mr. Speaker? We have a new Canada Act. Why are people saying that? They're saying that because of the three reasons I outlined and, as well, because their politicians are not listening. But Albertans are saying that the need for a referendum is only there when the elected representatives are not listening. If they're not going to listen to us, we must take more drastic action. As a last resort, they are prepared to go to a referendum and look at the question of western independence.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's a sad situation that that kind of environment may be created today and may be created in a few years. But it is an environment that can be avoided if this government, or some other political party that has the capability of dealing with the concerns of western Canadians, takes the right steps. I think the opportunity is there for change that can meet the needs of Albertans. That is the challenge that faces not only us as present legislators but future governments that may sit in this Legislature.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in support of the motion today, I want to touch on two particular points. If I may, I'll deal with one very quickly before I come to the issue of property rights, which has been raised on many occasions in this Assembly and just now, once again, by the Leader of the Opposition.

The first point I wish to touch upon, the role of the monarchy in the future, has already been raised by the Member for Calgary North West. This is one of the very difficult things that all of us as people in public life have difficulty interpreting to the Canadian people when we hear distortions being spread about with respect to certain aspects of our new constitution. One of those distortions being spread about this province and Canada relates to the role of the monarchy in the future. I stand in this

Assembly, proud to say that I am a strong believer in the constitutional monarchy. I believe that applies to all members of this Assembly, since we have sworn an oath.

I want to say that I was very upset and disturbed the other morning, listening to the constitutional ceremony from Ottawa, to hear an exceptionally well-qualified — I thought — commentator say that the ordinary amending formula with respect to amending certain aspects of the constitution applied to the role of the monarchy. That is not true, and I want to deal with that. Section 41 provides this:

An amendment to the Constitution of Canada in relation to the following matters may be made by proclamation issued by the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada only where authorized by resolutions of the Senate and the House of Commons and of the legislative assembly of each province . . .

And those things are:

(a) the office of the Queen, the Governor General and the Lieutenant Governor of a province . . .

In other words, unanimity of the federal Parliament and each province in this country is required before any change can be made in the office of the Queen. That is important for all of us to understand, particularly since some people, for whatever reasons I don't know, are spreading about this province the notion that there has been a change in the role of our monarchy and the constitutional monarchy as it affects this country. People who do that are doing a great disservice to this nation.

Now I'd like to deal with the second point. The Leader of the Opposition raised it this afternoon. He told us that people are concerned about the issue of property rights. With a good deal less enthusiasm than November 10, last fall, when he supported a similar resolution, he suggested that a number of things have to be done. That's agreed. It's agreed upon by the premiers of the provinces and the government of Canada that certain things need to be changed.

Then he went on to tell us that Albertans are concerned about the role of property rights, that they are not being properly spelled out in the new constitution, in the Canada Act, and he wants it changed some way. When the Leader of the Opposition does that, Mr. Speaker, he is ignoring the fundamental facts relating to property law as they exist in Canada today, that we have the new constitution, as they existed in 1867 and before that, as was so very well spelled out by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs on April 6 of this year, in the debate of his estimates. But for the record, once again let's retrace what has happened with respect to property rights. Let's get it clear for the Leader of the Opposition, who, for the time being, leads what is left of his party and what is left of the previous government. Let's make it clear that as a leader, he has a role to come out and level with the people of the province as to exactly what the facts are with respect to property rights.

Common law, as it developed over centuries in the United Kingdom, made it very clear that the right of the individual to hold property is one of the fundamental rights enjoyed by people in that country. In Great Britain first, that right spread across a quarter of the world, and certainly into Canada. In 1867 and the years leading up to Confederation before the BNA Act was passed, under one of the fundamental aspects of a federation, there was a division of powers between the central government and the provinces. Not everybody is a constitutional lawyer, a constitutional expert, but surely every Canadian must

have heard of Section 91 and Section 92 of the British North America Act; and Section 93, which I'll touch on very briefly. What does Section 92 say, and what has happened to Section 92 of the British North America Act in today's constitution?

First of all, Section 91 deals with the rights of the federal government. Then Section 92, under the heading Exclusive Powers of Provincial Legislatures, says:

In each Province the Legislature may exclusively make Laws in relation to Matters coming within the Classes of Subject next herein-after enumerated; that is to say . . .

It goes through a list of them. Then it comes to Subsection 13. And what does that say? It says:

Property and Civil Rights in the Province.

In other words, the rights of the province, of the Legislature of the province of Alberta, are exclusively to deal with the subject of property rights in the province of Alberta.

Now what has happened to Section 92 of the British North America Act in the new constitution? They remain exactly as they are spelled out in the British North America Act. There has been no change whatsoever. The Charter of Rights affects those exclusive jurisdictions and responsibilities of this province not at all. Those who go about this province saying otherwise do a great disservice to the people of Alberta and to the people of Canada.

The same thing applies to the question of education under Section 93 of the British North America Act, which spells out — and this is of particular concern to me because of my responsibilities to this government, and to my colleague the Minister of Education — that:

In and for each Province the Legislature may exclusively make Laws in relation to Education . . .

Is anybody going about this province today suggesting that that has been changed by the new constitution, except those laws relating to language instruction, which is clearly spelled out to be subject to the qualification "where numbers warrant"? There's been no change there. Yet there are people who tell us that property rights are not protected.

Mr. Speaker, we recall that this constitution has been debated in this Assembly on many occasions, occasions on which I had the opportunity to participate in the debate and occasions on which I had to listen to what was being said by members of this Assembly — not only members of the government but members of the opposition. I recall the resolution in 1976 and have reviewed the debate. I recall that the now Leader of the Opposition supported our resolution in 1976, as amended by the Official Opposition. I recall as well that on November 24, 1980, by a vote of 70 to 1, a resolution was passed by this Assembly, which very clearly laid out the position of this government and, I think, clearly expressed the feelings of the people of Alberta. I quote part of that:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta support patriation [of the British North America Act] with appropriate safeguards for the protection of provincial rights, proprietary interests, and jurisdiction . . .

Surely that resolution, passed by a vote of 70 to 1 in this Assembly, is of great significance today.

DR. PAPROSKI: Who opposed it?

MR. HORSMAN: As I recall, the only one who opposed that resolution was the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame.

MR. HORSMAN: The fact was that from that point on, we went forward into a series of very difficult negotiations, armed with the knowledge that the issue had been debated in this Assembly in 1976, put before the people of Alberta in the general election which followed, and armed with the resolutions which subsequently were dealt with in this Assembly. It was quite clear that the last thing in the world this province or this government was prepared to do was back away from that resolution, and we did not.

So I go back to the question of provincial rights. Surely the right to legislate with respect to property rights remains solely that of this Legislature, and rightly so. I am aware of the arguments that went on, by very distinguished Canadians, that we should not even have a charter of rights at all. Many of those arguments were well founded, based upon the whole aspect of common law and the British parliamentary system. That's one of the reasons we sought and obtained the notwithstanding clauses with respect to the Charter of Rights that are now in the constitution. But why those same people who didn't want a charter of rights at all come before the people of Alberta and Canada today and say that we must have property rights included in that charter, is beyond any comprehension of mine. Surely, if properly understood by the people of Alberta and Canada, it is beyond their comprehension as well. The fact is that our property rights are protected.

I can go through the statute books of this province to show just how they're dealt with. One of the most important pieces of legislation ever passed by this Assembly was the Land Titles Act, which provides for this province, among others — the province of Saskatchewan has the Torrens system of land tenure as well — indefeasibility of title. Property rights in this province are protected through Acts such as that.

But I want to add one additional Act that is overlooked, ignored completely by those who argue that property rights in this province are somehow in jeopardy. I want to turn the attention of members of this Assembly to the first Act passed by the government led by the Premier of this province. That is the Alberta Bill of Rights, now in the *Revised Statutes of Alberta 1980* as Chapter A-16. Let's see what it says. And remember that this is the primacy piece of legislation in Alberta and cannot be overridden unless a subsequent Act provides specifically that it operates notwithstanding the Alberta Bill of Rights. In the last 10 years, legislation of that nature has never been passed by this Assembly.

Under Section 1, it says:

It is hereby recognized and declared that in Alberta there exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely:

- (a) the right of the individual to liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law . . .

Mr. Speaker, it's clearly spelled out as the primacy piece of legislation in this province. The Alberta Bill of Rights makes specific reference to the protection of property, and passed by the only legislature in this country that has the constitutional responsibility and authority to make and pass such laws with respect to property.

Mr. Speaker, reference has been made to the Diefen-

baker Bill of Rights and its reference to property. Anyone who knows anything about constitutional law knows that the Diefenbaker Bill of Rights made reference only to property under federal government jurisdiction and not to property rights under the jurisdiction of the provinces. That refers to such rights of property as may be enjoyed upon land owned by the federal government — in national parks, military bases, and in territories — but not within provinces, where there is constitutional responsibility and jurisdiction for property rights.

So it's clearly spelled out in the British North America Act and, without any question, continued as part of our new constitution. Those who argue otherwise do a great disservice and mislead the people of this province in a way I find deplorable. I thank the hon. Member for Clover Bar for having said that in his remarks today. I hope he can persuade the leader of his party and educate him on the subject of property rights, so he won't be going about this province misleading the people in any way as to what the facts are.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude on that subject by quoting what I said on November 10 last year. You will recall it was on the eve of Remembrance Day, and we were debating a resolution of a similar nature to that before the Assembly this afternoon. Perhaps I should have gone farther than I did at the time, but to me it was so self-evident that the constitution contained protection of property rights by having them remain the sole jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures. Perhaps I should have gone farther, but I didn't think it was necessary. But today I think it is, in view of the distortions and misleading statements made throughout this province by certain political parties and people who should know better than to do what they are doing.

I said then:

... Mr. Speaker, I want to say to those concerned about the subject of property rights that it is important to recognize that property rights remain, as they have since 1867, the responsibility of the governments of the provinces. I say to anyone in Alberta that that is properly where they should lie and should be the subject of control by the elected representatives who sit in this Chamber now and in the years ahead. That will give the best protection of property rights for the people of Alberta they could possibly hope for in our Confederation.

That is as true today, when we have that new constitution, as it was on November 10, when I spoke those words in this Assembly.

Today I added a number of arguments — the facts — to buttress that statement. I come down finally, in the most conclusive way, by quoting, as I did earlier, the protection provided to all Albertans with respect to property rights in the Alberta Bill of Rights. That's where I want property rights to remain, and not be part of the Charter of Rights of Canada and thereby become subject to interpretation and adjudication by any other level of government, or by the courts interpreting the law in such a way as to make law, as can occur when charters of rights are in force. If at any time it were to become part of the Charter of Rights, I would urge in the strongest possible way that we apply a notwithstanding clause to the issue of property rights, so they might legitimately remain, as they have since the founding of this country, the constitutional responsibility of every member of this Assembly now and in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, that is the truth about property rights,

and those are the facts. I urge hon. members to support this resolution.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, it's a great pleasure to take part in debate on Motion 11 and to express assent to the Constitution Act, 1981. To express assent is to put my emotions somewhat mildly. The celebrations of last Saturday, April 17, 1982, and the proclamation by Her Majesty the Queen, signified an event just as important as the day in 1867 when her great great grandmother proclaimed the British North America Act, which founded our nation. Along with other members, I spoke in the debate last November 10. I'm going to try to be brief, not repetitive, and try not to be too emotional about the situation.

In this Assembly I represent the people of the Edson constituency, and they are just about as diverse as this country. They — either their parents or grandparents, or they themselves — come from all corners of the world. But on this particular occasion, perhaps I may be so bold as to say that I can represent those Albertans and Canadians who were not born in Canada but who came either as children with their parents or, as Anne and I did, as a conscious decision as adults, who came to Canada because of what it represented to us — its opportunities, its freedoms and, in particular, its diversity and its acceptance of the diversity that exists within the country.

I come from a country which is governed by the Mother of Parliaments, in Westminster. As I said last November, perhaps because of that I was somewhat more accepting of what existed in Canada when I came here in 1955: the constitution we had, the British North America Act, and of course the unwritten part of that constitution, the now famous conventions.

One has to look at that constitution, written and unwritten, to understand why so many have come to the shores of this country from all corners of the world. They've come from parliamentary democracies; they've come from constitutional monarchies. But they have also come from countries with much more totalitarian forms of government. Perhaps those who come from those countries have been more appreciative, in the past, of what they have had in our country. Perhaps it's because of that, that during the last several years and months, those people have been more appreciative of the process, the sometimes painful process, we have gone through during those years and months.

The freedoms and opportunities that exist in a parliamentary democracy and a constitutional monarchy are unique in the history of mankind on this planet. They've developed over a long period of time, starting in Greece, and they have resulted in countries where individual freedoms and the right to be different are much more widely recognized and accepted than they are in some other countries. Canada has perhaps been more fortunate than many countries in the opportunities it has given to its people, and it has always tried to do it with fairness. In the past, there have been attempts to try to write it down, either in John Diefenbaker's Canadian Bill of Rights or in the Alberta Bill of Rights. But one always has to consider that what is written down is not the total. There has to be a willingness on the part of people to accept individuals in all their shapes and forms, and their natures.

Canada has perhaps done that better than most countries, and that is why it has become such a diverse nation. It has accepted the individual differences. In particular, it

has allowed national groups to retain their differences within Canada. We talk about multiculturalism and the two founding nations of Canada. The reason we talk about them so much is that those societies and values continue to the present day, whether it be Ukrainian dancers or Chinese food, whether it be haggis or whether it be the English with their own peculiar characteristics. But we have retained all those cultural assets, because we have had a willingness to accept them.

I spoke earlier, in the brief remarks I intend to make, about our unwritten constitution and the conventions. Now included in the constitution are not only the British North America Act and its amendments, the Canada Act and the Constitution Act, but those unwritten conventions also continue to be a part of our constitution. Those conventions have not been abolished.

Mr. Speaker, during the period from 12 to 18 months ago, you and five other members of this [Assembly] were remarkably fortunate people. Six of us travelled across this country, a very large country. I was the only immigrant in the group — I believe the others are all Canadian-born — and I had an opportunity that I regret not many immigrants have. I had the opportunity to really see the diversity of this country. As I think I've said before in this Assembly, I spoke to university presidents, bus drivers, premiers, and housewives, about what their country meant to them. We expressed what Albertans felt in Canada, but we also listened to what other Canadians felt about their country. I found — and I think the other members of the committee found — that this is a much more diverse country than I had recognized before. The concept, the very essence of a federation is its diversity, culturally and regionally, and is very well represented by the provinces. That diverse federation is what makes Canada. That's what makes it different from any other country on this planet of ours.

In his remarks, the Leader of the Opposition commented on property rights. Until I spoke to the recent Premier of the province of Prince Edward Island, in Charlottetown, I had no concept of the importance of provincial property rights to that smallest of all our provinces. The forebears of the people of Prince Edward Island lived through the days of absentee landlords. Had we entrenched property rights as a federal jurisdiction, rather than their remaining with the provinces, as it has always been, those concerns of Prince Edward Island would not be under the control of the parliament of Prince Edward Island. They would be elsewhere, and that small province could very easily be bought by people from other parts of Canada. They would return once more to absentee landlord status.

I'd like to speak now with some emotion, Mr. Speaker, and it has to do with what I can see across this Chamber. In this Assembly, we now have a separatist member. He has chosen not to be here during the debate on this motion, and he has left in his place something that I personally find unacceptable; that is, the Alberta flag flying at half-mast. Speaking as an immigrant and now a Canadian and a member of this Assembly, I find that offensive. I find it offensive to the people of Alberta; I find it offensive to the people who have worked so hard for our constitution; and I find it particularly offensive in the Legislative Assembly of this province. I would like to raise the flag to its top and put beside it the Canadian flag that was on the desk of the Member for Calgary Buffalo and is now on the desk of the Member for Clover Bar. If it is possible to make that a formal motion of the Assembly, I would do so.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing I would like to mention at this time, on a somewhat emotional basis, is that having travelled this country with you and other members last year, I find some difficulty when people speak about English Canada as being the nine provinces and the two territories other than the province of Quebec. Of course, being a Scot by origin I find the words "English Canada" perhaps somewhat less acceptable than other people. But a few minutes ago, I spoke about our diversity. Perhaps in a more jocular fashion than my recent remarks, I could say that English Canada is not one entity. It's multicultural; it's represented by many national groups who have come to this country. It is represented by nine provinces and two territories that are just as different individually as the province of Quebec is from the province of Alberta.

In closing, I would like to comment about the fact that our Queen, the Queen of Canada, in her remarks last Saturday, recognized the part played not just by the Prime Minister but by the premiers of this country; not just by the Houses of Parliament in Ottawa but by the provincial legislatures and provincial governments. When one takes those remarks of our Queen, it's difficult to accept some of the derogatory remarks made about the process of arriving at the constitution. Does it really matter if some of the negotiations were concluded, or at least almost concluded, in kitchens? I don't know where John A. Macdonald held his negotiations. With the reputation he has, I don't think it was over a cup of tea. But the result in 1867 was surely a constitution that was very acceptable to Canada at that time. Whether the negotiations took place in backrooms or in kitchens, surely the negotiations completed last November 5 showed just as much wisdom as those in 1867 and preceding that year.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time, Canada is now truly a self-governing federation; a federation of equals, individually and regionally as represented by the provinces. I would like to think we can use our new constitution so that that federation, based on a framework of equality, will improve and change over the years for the benefit of both present and future Canadians, in all regions and in all provinces of our country.

Thank you.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the resolution now before this Assembly, I'd like to deal with my remarks in the context of the constitution of Canada as it now exists. The constitution of Canada, according to Section 60 of the Act proclaimed by Her Majesty the Queen on April 17, is in fact the Constitution Acts, 1867 to 1982. I think it's important that all Canadians and Albertans clearly realize that our constitution now encompasses not only the Act signed last Saturday but what was formerly known as the British North America Act — now titled the Constitution Act of 1867 — and all changes to that that have taken place up to and now including the Constitution Act of 1982.

I would like to deal briefly with the constitution as it exists and the history that has motivated its coming to pass, starting with the Constitution Act of 1867, or the British North America Act. It's interesting to note that many of the events surrounding the 72 resolutions passed in Charlottetown in 1864 that resulted in the British North America Act being proclaimed on July 1, 1867, had similarities to the ceremonies we saw last Saturday. Indeed we saw fireworks; soldiers paraded and bands marched, or vice versa. There was a ceremony that many Canadians came out in thousands to support. On the

other side, it's interesting to note that some French-Canadian members of that new Dominion of Canada, along with some people from Nova Scotia, paraded against the signing of the British North America Act, saying that to be part of a nation of what was then 4 million people would jeopardize their culture and heritage. It's interesting that one newspaper in New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, wrote: Born on Monday last at 12:05 a.m. (premature) the Dominion of Canada, the prodigy known as the infant monster of Confederation. We can see some similarities today. Some Canadians, a minority — very few in fact — had concerns about that Act passed in 1867, as there was some expression of concern with the Act passed on April 17, 1982.

If we look briefly at what that Act in 1867 accomplished, it was to establish the Queen as head of our government, the Governor General as her representative in Canada, and Lieutenant-Governors as representatives in the provinces of Her Majesty the Queen, or the monarch at the time. Very importantly, it established a division of powers, a series of clauses in the constitution. Briefly, the federal government was given regulation over trade, unemployment insurance, taxation, postal service, military, fisheries, currency, banking, Indian people, and criminal law. The provinces were given authority over education, welfare, municipalities, and a number of other sections, including property rights, so eloquently referred by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower.

The 115-odd years that have transpired between the signing of the British North America Act, or what is now known as the Constitution Act of 1867, and last Saturday, saw a series of changes to keep in tune with the times. It also saw a number of attempts to bring the constitution of Canada home, starting in [1927] with Mackenzie King attempting to bring the premiers together. The problem there, was the amending formula, as it was in 1931 with R.B. Bennett, and in many subsequent meetings that took place. So we had an evolution of the constitution that's now in place in Canada, taking place up to and including the round of talks which began to form what is now the Constitution Act of 1982.

I think it's important to note that the discussions that took place began with many concerns. Those concerns were underlined and identified in extreme ways when in October 1980, the Prime Minister mentioned on television, in passing, to the Canadian people that he was willing to move unilaterally, against all parliamentary tradition, against all the history of the country, in establishing a Canadian constitution if that was not agreed to by the provincial premiers. Mr. Speaker, I believe what followed from that point must represent some of the finest hours Albertans have had.

Indeed we will never forget the Canadians and those Albertan Canadians who fought in World War I and World War II to hold this nation together. But at this time, on this day, when we pass this motion — as I believe we should and will — we must not forget that Albertans fought, from that 1980 date on, for a constitution that is here today in full. We started in this Assembly, with four other provinces, in opposing the federal actions in the Supreme Court. Albertans from all walks of life began to write letters to their fellow Canadians and to British parliamentarians, and to speak to them, travel, present petitions, and at their own expense give tours across this nation, to make sure that we didn't have a constitution, as the Prime Minister had originally presented, which would have made us a second-class prov-

ince and would have jeopardized our rights and privileges.

With the hon. Member for Edson, who spoke just before me, and with you, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to travel the country, following to some extent much of the work done by Canadians in this country. Particularly on the tour I took through southern Ontario, I was absolutely convinced that those letters, phone calls, and speeches from Alberta businessmen and other individuals helped a great deal in helping all Canadians recognize that we needed a constitution that treated each province fairly and that looked at the problems and difficulties Canada has in the context of a federation, not one state run out of Ottawa alone. I was further convinced, Mr. Speaker, on a trip you invited me to take to Britain, where I had a chance to talk to many British parliamentarians who had been receiving 50, 100, 150 letters from Canadians, many of them — in fact often the majority — Albertans, who had written outlining their concerns with the constitutional package the Prime Minister had attempted.

Another major aspect of that process was the discussions of the council of ministers through which the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs had an opportunity to lead this province. From observing part of those discussions, I have to say that without question this province owes a great deal to the Premier of the province in leading much of the nation into the provisions of this Act as they now stand; also to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, who played a very dynamic, definite leadership role in the negotiations bringing together the other provinces, first as several provinces, then as eight, and finally as nine signing this accord to give us the constitution we have today; a difficult task in a nation with interests as diverse as this.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a brief look at some of the provisions in this Constitution Act of 1982, which we add to the others to make the constitution of Canada. Are there concerns? Indeed there are. I have concerns, as did people in 1867, about the BNA Act, as Canadians have had in different parts of the country to different provisions throughout history. There's no doubt that native people have concerns about this Act, although it emphatically protects their rights as they now exist. But we have established a process through which in a conference we'll discuss the very complicated issue of their land rights, which many native people have trouble coming together on, and other issues.

Of course, the problem of Quebec's not having signed this agreement is a grave one for Canada. That represents a very large percentage of our population. I think we should all be concerned that that didn't take place. It is interesting to note that the separatist government of Quebec, the one government that didn't sign it, has allies in this province who also oppose the Act, ostensibly for different reasons, but on a similar basis, because they want a separate country and, in participating in signing an Act that brings the country together, to some extent sign their own political death warrant. I think there's some political expediency there. I believe that in this document, the people of Quebec are protected fully and as completely as other Canadians. I'm sure that the majority of the people in that province who do not believe that now, will come to believe it.

There are some concerns with respect to the legal challenges that will likely take place to aspects of the Charter of Rights. I'm sure that some of the people who've questioned the fundamental rights, and have suggested

that lawyers will have an addition to their income as a result of that, are correct in many respects. The saving grace for this province is not only the rights that are included, or those which I think every citizen of this province would want, but also that we have something called a *non obstante* clause or, for those of us who aren't lawyers, the notwithstanding clause. It says that tomorrow in this Legislature we can pass a Bill that clarifies any of the sections defined in the fundamental rights or legal rights, and make sure that they represent the feelings of the people of Alberta. That was a crucial part of the constitution that was necessary.

Mr. Speaker, a very important provision is included in this Constitution Act. Section 26 indicates that despite the rights outlined in this particular Act, they shall never be construed as taking away any existing rights and privileges in the country, thereby cementing the Constitution Act of 1867 with the changes made in between and the Act passed on Saturday. It clarifies the issue of property rights, which the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower dealt with in some detail, and which I won't repeat. But clearly, property rights have existed in this province and country since Confederation and, by the passage of this Act, now exist to an even firmer extent than they did before. I find it highly ironic that the group of individuals claiming that property rights do not exist and should be written in this Act, want to separate from Canada, because by claiming that those property rights should be in this Act, they in fact say that we should move them from provincial to federal jurisdiction; ironic in the extreme, that a separatist organization would want to take away the rights of property as proclaimed by this Legislature and put them in the hands of federal interpretation, be they the courts.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure hon. members have read a number of other sections. I think the amending formula is of extreme importance, and it's been dealt with very well by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Many Albertans may not realize that there are in fact two aspects of the amending formula in this Constitution Act of 1982. One we haven't often mentioned requires unanimous consent of all provinces and the federal Parliament. Again, I don't know how any individual reading this particular Act could at any point claim there's any jeopardy to the monarchy as part of the Canadian system of government. Clearly in this Act, with an amending formula that requires 10 provinces and both Houses of Parliament, is the protection of the Queen, the Governor General, and the Lieutenant-Governor. No change can be made to those offices by anything except unanimous consent across this country.

The other section — which is a major achievement and which in effect writes in stone for all time that this province can control its jurisdiction, rights, and powers — is the amending formula, which says that while seven provinces representing 50 per cent of the population, with the federal Parliament, can make changes to the constitution, no change can be made in the province of Alberta if this Legislature passes a motion saying that it is null and void. That is declared fully and clearly, and perhaps more than any other way protects rights such as property for time and eternity.

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the provisions of the Act which make me excited about it, which make me proud to have participated in some small way, as have all Canadians, in bringing together this Act. It makes me proud of the Albertans who fought vigorously for this Act, and with no question won the battle to protect their

rights and jurisdiction.

Is there much to do? Yes, there's no doubt about that. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition and others who've spoken, that this is the beginning. Many Albertans are now saying: without question we now have our rights fully protected, and we would now like to look at ways in which we may have even more influence in the direction of this nation as a whole.

I personally would support significant changes to the federal Senate. My preference would be for an elected one that had powers to safeguard the rights of provinces, and would have power over many appointments to federal boards and agencies, possibly even over certain ministers of Cabinet. I'm sure we would have a great degree of difficulty getting that through certain parts of this country, but none the less it is one which might protect and balance the provinces in the future.

I would like to see the government very seriously consider, with the input of Albertans, evolving a package that will go on with that next phase of these constitution Acts which started in 1867, and which proceeded with a great step forward on April 17, 1982. I suggest that some body, perhaps some small committee of prominent Albertans, bring together the thoughts of Albertans and, first of all, make sure that Albertans know what's in the current constitution, take suggestions as to the direction we should go and, perhaps as early as the fall, recommend to this Legislature how we might proceed in pressing home the advantage we've won in taking in hand the constitution Acts, 1867 to 1982, and adding to them even more strength for this province.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I'll conclude my remarks by saying that I think we owe a great deal of thanks to every Albertan who participated in developing this. It gives us a strength, a permanence, a clear guarantee that in the past has been unclear. We owe a great deal of thanks in particular to the leader of this government and to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs who, in the last, very difficult couple of years, piloted this through.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I certainly urge every member of this Legislature to vote in favor of the motion now before us.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to get into this debate but, after listening this afternoon, I too want to make a few comments. First of all, I strongly support the resolution. I'm not going to comment, as have some of my colleagues, by quoting various Acts and parts of Acts. Today, I'd like just to talk from the heart.

I spent six years of my life in the air force. Many of my colleagues in this Legislature spent similar amounts of time in either the army or navy. When war was declared, we didn't sit around and debate whether we should go; we just went. The reason we went was that Czechoslovakia had fallen, the Rhineland had been occupied, and Poland was finally being occupied. We realized we were fighting for democracy and freedom.

I must confess that I don't share the feelings of the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs with regard to the constitution. Not being a lawyer, I didn't have any concerns about my freedoms, my property rights, or anything else. I just assumed I had them, because I was part of a nation that used to be part of the British empire. We inherited their parliamentary system and English common law, and I felt that as time went on, my rights would be protected. I realized of course that the BNA Act wasn't in Canada, and we did have to vote for

certain things to Britain, but I felt that in time we would work that out. All this was foisted on us by Pierre Elliott Trudeau, the Prime Minister of Canada who, when war was declared, didn't even feel it was in his best interests to go. So he didn't bother going.

I would like to point out that particularly during the Second War, many citizens of Quebec were members of the air force or navy; many were members of French regiments. By joining those particular units, all these people were available to go into any theatre of war in any part of the world. They were not conscripts; they were not draft dodgers. Like the rest of us from other parts of Canada, they were volunteers.

As I said earlier, I'm speaking from the heart, and I do have the concern that 25 per cent of the Canadian people were not represented by their Premier in those ceremonies on Saturday. We still have a festering sore in our midst. I noted that the ordinary people from the province of Quebec who were there, whom they spoke to as the TV cameras moved through the crowds, were mostly Anglo-Saxons. I didn't see a single French Canadian who was there by his own volition.

One concern of the province of Quebec is that in spite of Bill 101, the number of people working in the French language is actually declining. Their leaders know they have a problem. Our challenge is to make sure that when they vote for separation, which the Premier of Quebec announced he was going to bring forward again, the people of Quebec feel they are still part of Canada. A lot of people say, well, last year the vote was passed with a good majority. But I point out to you that a lot of the Anglo-Saxon people have since been transferred out of that province; a lot of the people who voted were of my generation, and the natural course of events is taking care of them. The next time around, we may not be as fortunate on that vote.

One reason I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, is that I want to take this opportunity to personally praise the Member for Lethbridge East for his fine work over the past several months — I think he's taken more out of his life than perhaps he realizes — and likewise our Premier, in taking up this struggle. As time goes on, I think we'll realize that this issue is more important than the energy issue, for which our Premier has also fought a good fight. But I would like to make a few comments with regard to what the Leader of the Opposition said. He said we have to listen to the people. I suggest we are listening. He said that we could have an elected Senate. Well, back in 1921, Mackenzie King ran an election on Senate reform, and it hasn't changed very much since.

He then said we should have recall by vote of citizens, or we should settle issues by referendum. He's really saying that he would like to take some bits and pieces from the American system of government, and try to interpose them in the parliamentary system we enjoy in Canada. You can't have it both ways. We live in a federation, and if you believe in democracy, obviously the majority of the people is going to control the votes. Sure we can fight and struggle and do all these other things. But just go back in Canadian history and the progressive movement that came after the First World War. Mackenzie King was smart enough to take it over and stay in office. Later we had the CCF, which became the NDP. Then we had Social Credit. These were all protest movements. They all sprang up, and they've all died. I hope the present separatist movement has a similar fate as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a federation. I hope we believe

in democracy. Regrettably, depending on your point of view, Mr. Trudeau has effectively ruined the Liberal Party in every part of Canada except Quebec and parts of Ontario. We don't have an opportunity to have people participating in the government of Canada because of that huge block of votes from the province of Quebec. Quebec has other unique positions: it always has three members of the Supreme Court; it has people in the Senate; it has representation in the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we will consider anything the Leader of the Opposition would like to bring forward, if he can convey to us how he would see us allowing the people of western Canada to become more effectively represented in Ottawa. As the hon. Member for Calgary Currie mentioned, I know there are certain agencies, boards, and institutions that are federal in nature, and hopefully we will be represented on them more than we have in the past. When I saw some of the people before the television cameras, I think the only way that's going to become effective is by a change of government in Ottawa.

I would like to close by saying that I'm concerned that the hon. Leader of the Opposition keeps making these comments. Unfortunately, to me, he's so imbued with the American way of life and the American system of government that he seems to forget that we don't live under that kind of system. I think he's doing a disservice to his constituents when he suggests that we can have parts of their form of government, which are not unique to our system, and which would really destroy our parliamentary system as we know it.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure many would have been disappointed if I didn't stand and take my place; maybe not.

I think the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight has vividly brought to the attention of many members of the Assembly the exact point I've made in this Legislative Assembly many times: the lack of representation that western Canadians, and Albertans in particular, have under the democratic system of this country. He again brought to the attention of members of the Assembly the lack of concern the government of central Canada has for western Canadians and Albertans. It was also brought up by the hon. Member for Calgary Currie that our system certainly isn't perfect, and that we have problems. I'm glad they brought those things up.

Today we live in a country where western Canadians or Albertans go to the polls, cast their ballots, and have no vote. The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight talks about the Leader of the Opposition wanting to implement American policies in the Canadian system. Let me say this: any time something works, and if it can be implemented, only fools would not use that system; only fools would turn away from something proven to be more effective than the system they have. We're very selfish in representing our constituents when we close our eyes to new ideas and ways of solving the problems we face.

I think April 17 will go down in history as one of the saddest days we've ever experienced in this country. Again, I find it amazing that it's only in the areas I travel that people are concerned. I travel the length and breadth of this province, and everywhere I go I hear that people are concerned. For a long time, only one particular group seemed to care about these property rights. I find it interesting that members of the government turn their ears to the counsel given by many legal advisers throughout the country now, from judges and solicitors who

come forth every day and express the great concerns they have for the constitution of this country, who express the fact that there are many dangers — not just one — in that constitution. Property rights are only one area that can destroy us. It's not from Western Canada Concept; it's from people who aren't even members of the Western Canada Concept Party, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight talked about a Prime Minister who had so little regard for our country that during the Second World War he refused to defend this land. I find it interesting that he has so much faith in that man today that he can stand up and defend a constitution basically implemented by that Prime Minister. I wonder if he thinks a Prime Minister who, with the constitution, can take total control of this country, will have as much regard for Canadians now that he has that power in his hands as he had when he refused to fight for this country:

In time of real or apprehended war, invasion or insurrection, a House of Commons may be continued by Parliament and a legislative assembly may be continued by the legislature beyond five years if such continuation is not opposed by the votes of more than one-third of the members of the House of Commons or the legislative assembly, as the case may be.

Through that constitution, the Prime Minister is given more control than any prime minister in the history of this country. I'm pleased the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight brought out the consistency of the Prime Minister in dealing justly with Canadians.

Bill C-94 is another example of the total lack of regard the central government has for the people of this country. We have those who are valiantly trying to curtail Bill C-94. But because of the political structure of this country, it will never be stopped. More infringements upon our rights: we have some 3,500 orders in council; we have metrication through an order in council. I wonder how the members of this government are going to justify to their constituents what went wrong when we don't have any guarantees left; when, in fact, as Alberta goes to the table to try to get a good deal for Alberta, it can't be negotiated.

The fairness of the constitution is related somewhat in the bilingual clauses. Always English, proportionately this province certainly has many languages more than French. However, thanks to the government of the day, we now have French forced on the people of this province.

MR. STEVENS: Rubbish.

MR. KESLER: It's not rubbish. [interjections] As hon. members recognize, many Albertans today are being refused employment through federal agencies in this province; it's taking place even now. Perhaps they should get out and talk to people who have not been hired because they were not bilingual.

This day our constitution returned to Canada, but it was returned in such a flawed state that it is worthless to most Albertans. This is the constitution the Prime Minister had to tell the Members of Parliament in Westminster to hold their noses and pass. British parliamentarians knew it was a document flawed in many areas. We have a Charter of Rights this government assented to in which we have no guarantees of one of our most fundamental rights in a democracy: property rights. I suggest that

many of the hon. members consult with legal experts who certainly are concerned about those property rights.

AN HON. MEMBER: I don't agree with you.

MR. KESLER: Hon. members on the other side of the House claim they cannot understand my stance on property rights. The reason they cannot understand my stance is that they do not listen. I should outline just one more time why I think the constitution is so fundamentally flawed in its omission of property rights.

Property rights are an inalienable human right. They are not a right given to anyone by government. You had the right; you have the right. No government has the right to tell you it's a right they have given you, and as such they should be recognized in the constitution of this country, if Albertans are to remain a part of this country. Why a person seeking independence would worry about property rights in the constitution was brought up. Well, I suggest the reason is that when independence takes place, the people of this province will still have something. Let us have a statement that Albertans can have property rights in their constitution. Let us take the issue to Albertans in a referendum, and ask them: if property rights cannot be put into the constitution of Canada, are you in favor of creating a new state where Albertans' property rights can be guaranteed in the constitution?

Another issue which concerns me is the entrenchment of language, and I've already mentioned that. "Guarantees bilingualism in the province of Alberta" — guaranteed, to a province that speaks English. Why do Albertans need that? French is only one language among many others spoken in the province of Alberta. Besides our primary language, English, we as Albertans do not need French entrenched in the constitution. The people of Alberta do not need a government in Ottawa which is officially bilingual. They need a national government which cares, which listens to all of them, regardless of the language they speak. And I suggest they need a provincial government that listens to them when they speak.

Hon. members talk about going to the people now: we'll go to the people and get some input to the constitutional changes. Why didn't they go to the people before, and get some input?

MRS. EMBURY: We did.

MRS. FYFE: Many times.

MR. KESLER: The hon. members feel that if they have a caucus meeting, they went to the people. [interjections] When you go to the people, it'll be interesting to find out the results.

AN HON. MEMBER: It sure will.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, if they cannot have a government that cares within Canada, then I suggest that they have one without Canada.

Some areas need revision. I think that history has proved it. Perhaps the hon. Leader of the Opposition has already touched on them. One is a Senate elected by region, so that the entire country has proper representation. Perhaps another would be a Supreme Court where all provinces have recognition. The list goes on. But I wonder why, prior to the negotiations on the constitution, the government of Alberta did not prepare a list and present it to the central government of this country, so

that they could have presented it to the people of Alberta and said: these are the things we want before we'll support bringing home the constitution; these are the things we'd like to see in place to guarantee that the province of Alberta has a future in this country.

After the fact is often too late. My concerns are that it will be too late again, not because of my total mistrust of the government of Alberta, but because never in 115 years has the central government of this country bowed to the needs of Albertans and western Canadians. I think the constitution's coming home will not change that and, in fact, gives more power and a greater degree of latitude for the Prime Minister of this country to destroy democracy and erode those rights that traditionally have been Albertans'.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury permit a question?

If the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury is to lead Alberta out of Confederation, can he indicate to the Assembly under which constitution Alberta would be operating?

MR. KESLER: The province of Alberta will be operating under the constitution that the people of this province will put together. That will be decided at conventions of Western Canada Concept, and there will be input from the people of this province on what they want in a constitution.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit just one more short question?

Would the hon. member indicate to the Assembly and the people of Alberta if he would be leading Alberta out of Confederation in consultation with other members of the western provinces, or just Alberta?

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, the answer is that we would certainly work very closely with the other provinces of western Canada. We would be in consultation with them, so that finalization would be in accordance with plans so that they could be brought in as a unit.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, as has been said on the occasion of other debates in this Assembly, the constitution which binds together a people is not so significant in its words on paper as it is in the attitude the people of the nation display towards its preservation.

For example, the British have no written constitution. The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury might enjoy considerable success in the United Kingdom, persuading them that because of the deficiencies of a written constitution — in their case, because of the complete absence of a written constitution — they should all be concerned about their future well-being, and that Kent should withdraw from the United Kingdom as quickly after Scotland as is possible. Of course, the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury knows that he wouldn't be successful with that argument in the United Kingdom, because the people of the United Kingdom have almost a thousand years of experience, based upon the idea that their constitution resides in their heart, in their mind, in their attitude towards their government, and in their government's attitude towards them.

Much as we would like to think it, the well-being of a nation does not depend upon anything that we write or fail to write. It depends upon the attitude we have towards our nation. If our attitude is that we will forget 2 million square miles of territory, 300 years of history, and

22 million people with whom we have lived, then that dictates one course of action for Alberta. If our attitude is that we are going to continue to be a part of one of the most blessed lands on earth, if we are going to continue to share the good as well as the bad with 22 million other Canadians, and if we are going to carry into the future what we have gained from the past, then the future course for Alberta will be very, very different.

I was born in a very small community just outside Ottawa: Perth, Ontario. I lived my first two years, which of course I don't remember, in Quebec, because my father was attending McGill University. It was in Quebec that my parents met and married, one having been raised in Atlantic Canada, and the other at Thunder Bay — then Port Arthur — at the head of the Great Lakes.

I came to Alberta at the age of 2. As a very young man, I had many opportunities to travel throughout this country. In that respect, I have been more fortunate than most. I consider this land mine from one end to the other, from St. John's, Newfoundland, to Victoria. I love the country, and I love its people. That's sometimes a little difficult, but I do. As an adult, and in this Assembly, I represent many electors who are here by choice, immigrants who could well have stayed in some other land, and have come here because of the opportunity they believed they would find. And to a man or woman, they believe the choice is well made.

I am a Canadian. But to understand what that means requires me to tell you that I am an Albertan first. I am a Canadian; I am in my core an Albertan, and that Alberta experience defines what it means for me to be a Canadian. I have stood at a point in the foothills, west of Claresholm, where you could look west right into the face of the Rockies. You took one step around, and you could look out over 500 or 600 hundred miles — at least it looked to be that much — of flat prairie, untreed, rolling away to the Lake of the Woods area. I have flown into Hanna, Alberta, in November when it looked like the most desolate place on earth. You could not help but admire the courage, perseverance, and breath-taking humanity of the people who chose to make their lives there, chose to make it a human community, chose to make it a place where people could live. I have walked into Garden River, Alberta, in April, over a road that was nothing more than a Caterpillar track from the airstrip to the community, wearing gum boots that had to be pulled out of the mud with your hands with each step.

I have been raised on W. O. Mitchell. I have been raised to understand something of art in this province through the contribution of the Banff School of Fine Arts. I have been raised to understand something of sports because of the Edmonton Eskimos. And that makes my experience as a Canadian different from the experience of a Nova Scotian, a Quebecois, an Ontarian, or a British Columbian. I have been in Nova Scotia in the fall, to the Quebec winter carnival, to Expo '67, and all through the Great Lakes basin. I consider them to be part of me. I consider the citizens of those areas to be my compatriots in this country, but what those experiences mean to me is not what they mean to the Canadians who live there. Our experiences are different, but they are equally real, equally vital, and equally Canadian.

This debate reminds me of an excerpt from a poem by T.S. Eliot, *The Hollow Men*, and I'd like to read just one stanza:

Between the conception  
And the creation

Between the emotion  
And the response  
Falls the Shadow

The shadow is there for every one of us in every day of our lives. And on April 17, 1982, there is, as always, a shadow touching every single Canadian, individually and as citizens of this nation. But that shadow will not deter me, and it will not deter most members of this Legislative Assembly. I regret profoundly that it will deter one hon. member. Much remains to be done. There is much that is imperfect. Great challenges remain to be overcome. But those challenges are going to be overcome within this nation, Canada. The potential of the nation is going to be realized.

I am 36 years old, and in the time that remains to me, with other Canadians in whom I place my trust, this country will be moved from conception to creation. We will direct our energy towards creation, not destruction, and we will make a nation that will live in our hearts, that will be recognized around the world for the opportunity it gives to every man. It will be a great nation. Great as Alberta is, the nation we make will be greater than this province, and every single one of us will participate in the making of it.

Thank you.

[The question being put, Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Isley	Pengelly
Anderson, D.	Johnston	Planche
Batiuk	King	Purdy
Bogle	Kowalski	Reid
Borstad	Kushner	Russell
Bradley	LeMessurier	Schmidt
Buck	Little	Shaben
Carter	Lougheed	Sindlinger
Chichak	Lysons	Stevens
Clark	Mack	Stewart
Cookson	Magee	Stromberg
Crawford	McCrae	Thompson
Cripps	McCrimmon	Topolnisky
Diachuk	Miller	Trynchy
Embury	Moore	Webber
Fjordbotten	Musgreave	Weiss
Harle	Oman	Wolstenholme
Hiebert	Osterman	Woo
Horsman	Pahl	Young
Hyland	Paproski	Zaozirny
Hyndman	Payne	

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not aware of any member in the Chamber who hasn't stood. There would appear to be no purpose in asking those opposed to the motion to stand. I therefore propose we await the count from the Clerk.

Total: Ayes - 62

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it's proposed that the Assembly sit this evening in Committee of Supply. The Department of Recreation and Parks will be called first, and after that, if there is time, the Department of

Government Services, the Solicitor General, and Utilities and Telephones. I remind hon. members that in the event we reach 8 o'clock tomorrow night, that sequence would be varied for the reason of the schedules of some of the ministers involved. The Premier will be dealing with Executive Council at 8 o'clock tomorrow night. Our schedule will be interrupted if that happens.

Mr. Speaker, I move that when the Assembly reconvenes at 8 o'clock, it be in Committee of Supply, and that the House now adjourn until the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

[The House recessed at 5:25 p.m.]

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

#### head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will please come to order for further consideration of the estimates.

#### Department of Recreation and Parks

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I believe on Friday last we were looking at the total amount for the department.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before we move on that vote, I'd like to pose several general questions to the minister, particularly with respect to the Dunvegan campsite. Right now the campsite is not being used as a provincial park, although there is some planning for a major provincial and historical park at Dunvegan. I wonder if the minister might fill in for the members of the committee just what planning is now under way with respect to Dunvegan.

The Dunvegan historical society held a meeting several weeks ago. Representatives of the department were present. We're given to understand, as a result of representation made at that meeting, that some fairly substantial planning has been given to a major project at Dunvegan. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, we could ask the minister to respond and outline just what has been done to date.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before the minister answers, I wonder if we could have some order in the committee.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure I have the information for the hon. member in regard to the Dunvegan campsite. On Friday last I announced that we were taking over 68 highway campsites in the province. I will be circulating a news release to all members so they'll know which ones are in their constituency. We're hoping the private sector will come forward and help us take care of these sites. But as far as I know, I don't have any plans

in my office relating to Dunvegan. I'll certainly check that out and see just what we are planning, if anything and when, and get back to the hon. member. I'm not aware of anything right now.

Agreed to:

Department Total \$95,447,520

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I move that the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### Department of Government Services

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the Minister of Government Services any opening remarks?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks about the Department of Government Services.

It's a large department. It grows in relation to the size of government, and government of course grows with complexity, the burgeoning population, and the expansion of programs. I guess it's been four years since I've come to the department, and I've grown very fond of it. It covers a variety of functions, a number of services to various departments of government. I think it performs with a good deal of enthusiasm and understanding of the public purse and the fact that we've got to have respect for the taxpayers' dollar, and also, I think, with a professionalism that really is somewhat out of the ordinary. In short, Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased. I hope my colleagues in the other departments are, because the services are primarily for them.

I've tried to visit all centres where we have a government operation each year. Because of the number of locations and the variety of operations we have, that is difficult to do. But I am able to cover a lot of the ground. As I said, I'm very impressed with the quality of the people and their dedication to the province and the government they're employed by.

As all members know, the departmental services are provided through six appropriation votes, as well as a revolving fund which provides almost half the services to government on a charge-back basis to the various departments we are servicing. I would like to briefly cover some of the six votes.

Maintenance and operation is basically the caretaking of buildings that are owned or leased. We have roughly 27 million square feet, 2 million plus square metres. There's an increase of 9 per cent this year, with a manpower increase of about 2.2 per cent. We continually strive to increase the amount per square footage that each man in the employ of the Government Services Department maintenance and operation is in charge of. I think we've been very, very successful in that. Their productivity has increased annually. We accomplished that through dedicated service and the process of contracting out. The department is very cost conscious.

One area we have tried to save money in is energy conservation. We got onto that a number of years back. Of course your greater savings are when you first get into the system. It can be accomplished through computerization and better manpower management — simple little things like client department employees turning off the lights or better managing their offices. Through a computer system the thermostats are turned down weekends

and come on again at a given hour so that by the time the staff reports at 8 or earlier on a Monday morning, the buildings are back up to normal heat. There are similar things with the use of lighting. I can assure members that the reduction of the number of operating bulbs above us is not a part of our light energy conservation scheme. It is simply a reflection of the number of days we've been here and the fact that the lights will not be changed until we have left. So much for the maintenance operation.

I would like to touch briefly on government transportation in Vote No. 3 and remark that although that covers air and ground transportation, the only significant variation from previous years, over and beyond normal growth or expansion, is the fact that we're now serving something like 154 centres with our mail delivery courier service. It's an overnight service and means an awful lot, I think, to the government employees, and consequently the public, in all the centres we are serving. We've done that again through a combination of public sector employees and contracting out to the Loomis corporation for the delivery of mail between different communities.

If I could comment, Mr. Speaker, on the supply vote, No. 4, that's an area that has attracted a good deal of interest in previous years. As members know, we are required to do our purchasing of government supplies by the public tender process. This year we will purchase about \$380 million worth of supplies and equipment for all the departments and agencies of government. In number, the products range upwards of 20,000. I don't know the number of transactions, but they are in the thousands.

One of the chief ambitions and directions of the commodity buyers is to give all suppliers in Alberta that are interested in delivering or serving a particular market the opportunity of bidding or tendering on that given market. It is a very complex thing with the manual system we have been using and, with the expanding number of suppliers, just getting the right supplier on the right list of invitations to tender is a very complex thing.

The manual system requires the handling of the paper several times. The first time would be when the customer/client comes to the departmental buyer and says, we would like you to purchase this on our behalf. That involves writing some sort of specifications or an invitation to tender, putting it out to the appropriate potential suppliers, putting a terminal date on it when the bids would come back, then an evaluation of the bid to see if they match the specs, and which is the lower or better tender, having regard to price, the capacity to deliver the service and, in some cases, to service the contract once it is let. It is a very, very complex thing in a government as large as ours and a business sector as buoyant and as changing as the business sector is and has been in Alberta.

We've tried to get and are getting into a computerized system. We've got the software program substantially developed, so that in the latter part of the summer we hope we can tie the potential tenderers in a given product area into a list so the range of products they may be interested in tendering on will be contained in the computerized mode, and with the punch of a button we can determine who the appropriate potential bidders are in a given area. That will cut down the paper handling substantially. We'll also have evaluation in the system, not only evaluating the tenderer on a given return, but also evaluating the performance after the tender is let and the changing situation, so that we can determine whether or not a given supplier continues in a given product area.

One of the concerns or interests in the past estimates reviews was whether or not we could get tendering, bidding, or buying out to the regions. We have striven to do that, somewhat successfully, I think. The main means of doing it has been through the direct purchase order, where the several client departments of government are authorized by Executive Council in order to purchase supplies for their requirements within the regions they are serving up to a limit of \$250 per purchase. This means that we have been able to say that if the public servants in the Barrhead area, the Milk River area, or whatever section of the province are buying a product, rather than coming through to central supply of Government Services, they're able to buy it with appropriate documentation in the local area. This year we anticipate a forecast of about \$45 million worth of goods purchased through that direct purchase order in the regions of the province. To accomplish this, we have buyers in four commodity areas — 20 in number.

Mr. Chairman, coming to Vote 6, which is information and telecommunication services, that is really the hardware area, the computer section of government, which is in the Terrace Building with appropriate computers and back-up equipment to service all the demands of government. That has been a real challenge because of the sophistication of government, with the storage bank of information that is appropriate to any given program. It becomes critically important that you have all the information there at the punch of a button.

That is critically important to areas such as hospital services. It is good to see the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care here, because health care is one of the major client users of the computer section. Another area where it's critically important to have the right information available to the client at the right moment is the Solicitor General. Whenever his police officers, in whatever part of the province they may be, stop someone, it is imperative that they be able to get information on the ownership of a vehicle, the driver's licence, and so on immediately so they know what kind of individual they're dealing with.

So the growth in that area has been phenomenal. The departments have been individually responsible for the development of their software programs; that is, the means by which the delivery of the program can be handled. That is done in combination with the Government Services Department and the private sector.

Mr. Chairman, the next vote, Vote 5, is the Public Affairs Bureau. That is one of the most difficult areas of government, the communication of the various programs of government to the body politic of the province. The difficulty is in determining what information the public needs, and how best to communicate it. Of course members of the Assembly are very important delivery mechanisms for communicating the programs of various departments of government. They do that through their usual M L A communication.

On a more formalized or systematized basis, we have the Public Affairs Bureau. They do their thing in a number of ways. One is the establishment or location of public affairs officers in the various departments of government. Some of the departments probably are more effective in communicating than others. That is because of the relationship that develops between the public affairs officers, the executive director of the bureau, and the individual ministries, the senior officers and the minister. If that relationship is working well, and if there is mutual respect for the competency of the officials involved, then

the communication will be very good indeed. In other areas it may not be quite as effective as one would hope, but it is something we continually work at. We have in the order of 68 public affairs officers out with the departments at this time.

Another means of government communication is direct advertising. We do not do a great deal of that, but there are occasions when it becomes important, Mr. Chairman. We did some this past year for Executive Council. Two other initiatives undertaken by the Public Affairs Bureau this past year were the entry into Man and His World in Montreal with an exhibit, and the Canadian National Exhibition in Toronto. We thought that both those entries in the market place, if you would, in other provinces of [Canada] would explain the Alberta position in a number of areas. We touched lightly on the constitutional thing and the energy thing, not in terms of any hard sell, but the tour guides were there to explain as well they might the Alberta position in those critical areas during the past summer. I think it was a very worth-while expenditure, a very positive thing. The results were tabulated through books offered to the public in those two cities to comment on the exhibits. The comments were of a very positive nature.

One other area in the Public Affairs Bureau I would like to comment on is the RITE system, the centre we have established to permit the public to call the government of Alberta in 34 centres in the province. I think that works very effectively. I've been rather pleased with the communication the young ladies who operate the centre have with the public. Their public relations are an example for all public employees, I think. The response seems to be very good among the public. They call in with inquiries about the programs of government. We expanded that this year, because there were regions of the province beyond the RITE centre that were not able to get into the system. I believe about 14 per cent of the public were not able to use the system. We did that through the establishment of a Zenith number, whereby anyone in any region of the province can call that number and immediately will be connected to the appropriate department of government.

One other brief comment, Mr. Speaker, on government services in particular and government in general in Alberta. The other day in question period, the Member for Olds-Didsbury asked questions of the Provincial Treasurer, the acting deputy Premier that day, as to whether more government services could not be contracted out to the private sector. I really say to him — I didn't have an opportunity that day — that what we have done in terms of contracting out is a very impressive record. Perhaps the fallacy or lack of understanding from that corner might be that it still costs money whether you do it in-house as a government, through government employees, or whether you contract it out to the public. Perhaps on occasion, it might even cost more in the private sector. I think the key thing is to have a balance between the capability of delivering the service within government and of having it done by the private sector.

I'd just report in that area that one of the committees of cabinet recently did a study on how much government business was being contracted out to the private sector by various departments. We asked each of them to do an inventory, and the inventory is very impressive. Each of us listed what we are doing at this time in terms of who is getting the business, what sector it is, and the dollar volumes. I was particularly pleased by the large amount of government service business that is being contracted

out, and generally impressed by the amount of business being tendered to the private sector throughout the entire government.

Mr. Chairman, those were the general comments I wanted to make. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$164,185
1.02 — Administrative Services	\$986,340
1.03 — Financial Services	\$929,600
1.04 — Personnel	\$1,169,020
1.05 — Metric Conversion	\$261,625
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$3,510,770
Vote 2 — Building Operations and Maintenance	\$89,102,225
Vote 3 — Government Transportation	\$5,306,865
Vote 4 — Supply	\$4,601,815
Vote 5 — Public Affairs	\$8,469,175
6.1 — Information Services	\$1,103,375
6.2 — Telecommunication Services	\$26,714,750
Total Vote 6 — Information and Telecommunication Services	\$27,818,125
Department Total	\$138,808,975

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### Department of the Solicitor General

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

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few minutes to highlight some matters I think are worth noting in the estimates of the Department of the Solicitor General. First of all, there is a considerable increase in the number of positions being allocated this year. Ten of those positions are for departmental support services, and basically are needed in the finance and administration area, the personnel area, and the computer and research area. By far the largest number of positions added is 81 for correctional services.

As far as the location of those positions, 36 are in the Bow River Correctional Centre, the new centre which will be opening just about now, added to the general area of Spy Hill west of Calgary. There are seven positions in the Calgary Correctional Centre — that's Spy Hill — and seven positions in the Missionview Correctional Centre, which is the former staff houses provided on the site of the Peace River correctional centre. The balance of the new positions is spread across all the correctional facilities we're operating.

We are adding six in the law enforcement area. There will be one highway patrol officer added to Airdrie, one to Fort Saskatchewan, and one clerical position at Red Deer. Three are in the program support area for that vote. We have added no new positions in motor vehicles this year.

With regard to correctional services, we will be devel-

oping a new minimum security camp at Ghost River for 30 inmates. It will be a forestry type of camp similar to others we have operated in the past. The new facility at the Missionview Correctional Centre in Peace River will contain 22 inmates. Again, it will be similar to the Lakeside Centre at Lethbridge, and it will occupy the old staff housing at the Peace River facility.

A new forestry camp for 20 inmates will be established at Kinuso. We will probably be entering into a service contract with Native Counselling to provide the supervision for that particular forestry camp. I might say that I've been impressed with the work done by Native Counselling. I saw on cable television one night a considerable amount of time devoted to the work being done at Lac La Biche; just a tremendous amount of good work done with native peoples.

We will be establishing two new community residential centres, one in Edmonton and one in Calgary. They will be privately operated. We are, in effect, purchasing bed space for approximately 46 inmates. As far as major new projects are concerned, we're advanced on the Medicine Hat Correctional Centre, and some \$500,000 is contained in the budget of Housing and Public Works to start that process. It will probably cost in the neighborhood of \$23 million before it's completed in about 1985.

We'll be starting on a multipurpose facility for Red Deer, and \$150,000 is provided in the budget of Housing and Public Works to start the planning for that facility. We're not sure yet as to the number of inmates that should be housed there. I received letters from the RCMP operating the lockup in the city of Red Deer saying that they were very overcrowded. We'll be providing a lockup and probably a remand facility, with some beds for the short-term inmates, particularly inmates who, by judicial order, are having to serve their sentences on the weekend. We've obviously got to have some provision in the city of Red Deer to handle central Alberta. That particular facility will probably be somewhere adjacent to the court facilities. But if that is not possible or for some reason not convenient, I suppose it could be located in the general area of Red Deer.

We're starting the planning for the new Calgary Remand Centre. About \$4.7 million is provided in the Housing and Public Works budget. I think hon. members will be aware of the fact that we were going to rebuild the Calgary Remand Centre in downtown Calgary. However, the decision has now been taken that in view of the high price of land in the downtown core, it would be better to leave the Calgary Remand Centre facility as it is and provide room for additional bed space of a remand classification on the site of the Spy Hill facility west of Calgary. About \$1.89 million is also provided in the Department of Housing and Public Works for upgrading the Holy Redeemer College site to provide training facilities for correctional officers and highway patrol officers. In the budget of Housing and Public Works, \$4.2 million is provided for the replacement of the Fort Saskatchewan correctional facility. Hopefully we'll see a start made to that in a very positive way this fiscal year.

About \$10.6 million is contained in the Housing and Public Works budget for completion of work on the new facility at Lethbridge, which is replacing the existing correctional facility there. I understand that is fairly well on schedule. The Department of Housing and Public Works also has \$2.7 million for the workshops at the Peace River correctional centre.

In the law enforcement vote, there's a considerable increase as a result of the new contract for the provision

of RCMP services in the province. In addition, there is provision for some 46 new positions that the RCMP will be establishing throughout Alberta. This summer I'll be reviewing the existing policing grants which remain unchanged and only have a volume increase because of the change in population. In addition to the funds provided for in this budget, I'll be reviewing the various budgets of all the police forces of the province to see what share the province is paying and what share the local taxpayers are paying. Hopefully, we'll come up with an amendment to the policing grants that presently exist.

Members will recall that the chairman of the Racing Commission indicated that the government will be seeking additional funding for horse racing in the province. Members will notice that that is included. There's an increase of \$1.9 million. It arises from increasing the share of the pari-mutuel take from 1.25 to 2 per cent. These funds will be used as purse supplements and breeding grants distributed by the Racing Commission.

I'd like to note how much the government appreciates the work done by the staff particularly at correctional facilities and the work done by correctional officers. I'm sure all members realize they have to deal with a difficult area, and of the many, many thousands of inmates they handle, the vast majority go without incident. Every once in a while there is an incident and it has to be looked into. The senior staff are very diligent about making sure that inmate and citizen rights are maintained. Yet some rights have to be expressed for the correctional officers, who at various times have the difficult job of handling very unruly types of situations. So I as Solicitor General must express appreciation to the staff and the senior people in the department for the work they do.

I say the same thing about the highway patrol people, who are out every day, no matter what the weather, to make sure the trucking industry is obeying the rules of the highways and looking after truck weights. Naturally they have to take a certain amount of abuse, because citizens are sometimes a little irate at the work they have to do. But they do it well, and I have had very few complaints. Over the last year, I've had a watching brief on the turnover and vacancy rates. I'm impressed with the fact that the vacancy rates are very low, and the turnover rates are a lot better. I take that to be a response to the last round of negotiations. We could see some improvement in the highway patrol area. But I think the last round of negotiations resulted in a very favorable establishment of wages and salaries, particularly in the corrections area.

Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, one question relating to extra funding for police. I think the minister partially answered it. The council in Redcliff feel they have a problem, as it's a municipal police force and they have to patrol Highway 1 going through the town. They feel that a situation such as that should allow extra funding in the police budget, over and above the existing per capita grants. I wonder if the minister could comment on that.

I think that's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make one or two comments, a couple of them basically in the form of questions. First, if the minister can enlarge on how the correctional institution in St. Paul is doing, if it's serving its need to basically be — I believe the philosophy was to have native people closer to home. Can the minister enlarge on that?

Secondly, the present situation of the proposed correctional institute in the Horsehills area. I noticed, with a fair amount of interest, that when the federal penitentiary was going in there, our Tory friends sat silently by and let the federal government take all the heat, without telling us that the provincial government had aspirations about putting their own institution in that area. Now it's quite interesting to see how our Tory friends are going to react to that situation. I have stated publicly that I didn't think the federal penitentiary should go in that area. In spite of the fact that the federal government tried to convince us that they have to be close enough to a labor supply and close enough to psychologists and psychiatrists, I thought that was a bunch of nonsense. That would have been a good industry for an area 40 or 50 miles outside Edmonton. I still believe that. So, Mr. Chairman, I think the minister should have a look at moving that institution to an area 40 or so miles from the city of Edmonton. I know there are costs involved in shuffling inmates back and forth, but I think it would make an excellent industry in some of our outlying communities.

The other area I'd like to touch on is taking away the licensing outlets in the small towns. I think it's probably an area the minister should reconsider and let us know what his ultimate plans are. Another area I'd like to touch upon is that I believe policemen should be concerned with policing. I don't think we should be wasting manpower in having the Royal Canadian Mounted Police running up and down the highway, telling somebody their headlights or their tail lights are out. I am sure the boys in the little blue cars, who are now established as part of our enforcement agencies to enforce weights, purple gas, things such as this, could certainly be charged with making sure the motorists in this province are keeping their cars in safe condition.

When I've broached this subject, I've been told that what we find when we have these routine checks is interesting. We find people with suspended licences. We find stolen cars. We find people on the most-wanted list. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we'd find that out if we let the boys in blue do that same service. They can be equipped with radios. They can be plugged into the computer. They certainly can provide and get that same information, phone ahead to the RCMP, and do the apprehension.

The last point I'd like to touch on very briefly is the young offender who has a six- or eight-month suspended sentence. In many cases the offender has not really committed a severe transgression. I would really like to see us looking at these young people working out their sentences more than we are. We're really paying lip-service to that program at this time, Mr. Chairman. All of us who come from smaller communities especially know there are so many small projects these people could be doing. It would serve two purposes. Number one, it would make them appreciate the fact that it's just not a free ride. They have done a wrong to society. Bloody well get out there with your axe and cut some underbrush on the golf course. Get out there and clean the bloody snow off the streets, instead of getting taken in the Crowbar Hotel and watching TV and playing cards. That isn't much of a cotton-pickin' sentence in many instances. Plus the stigma. If a young man gets apprehended in Fort Saskatchewan and he has to trim the hedge for his local church, maybe the one he and his parents go to, there would be some stigma attached to that. There's a better chance that young man would think: say, I've really screwed up, and I'm doing something to repay society for

the fact that I've done damage to someone or caused someone some hurt. If we're going to do this type of thing, I think we should really get off our butts and get it done.

Mr. Chairman, those are the few things I would like the minister to comment on. I'll touch on a couple of other little areas as we go through the estimates.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to touch on five areas in the form of comments and questions. Looking at Vote No. 2, correctional services, I see an overall increase of 8.2 per cent. In his summary, I would ask the minister to advise us whether that 8.2 per cent is going to be adequate or whether it will probably be necessary to have some form of special warrant. Frankly, with inflation being what it is today and the pressures of more difficult times, I think it's highly unlikely we're going to have fewer people in correctional institutions, though we might all like to hope that is the case. With that in mind, that we're probably going to have more clients, shall we say, are we making sufficient funds available to properly staff our correctional centres? I raise that, Mr. Chairman, because a little over a year ago I had occasion to meet with a number of correctional officers in this province, but especially with respect to officers from the Edmonton Remand Centre. They brought a number of concerns to my attention that related all the way from working conditions in that particular institution to salary levels. I was quite surprised to learn what the salary levels were, because they certainly were not the kind that would attract people to become correctional officers.

I think the minister quite properly thanked the people in our correctional institutions in the province for the difficult job they're doing, but they're certainly not getting any great financial reward for doing it. I just cannot imagine it will be other than necessary to make a fairly generous settlement with the correctional officers this year. That being the case, is the committee not being asked to consider estimates here that in fact will be only partly correct, and that we're going to have to have a sizeable special warrant to meet the salary adjustment this fiscal year?

Mr. Chairman, I raised the question of the remand centre specifically because I look at the elements and last year the forecast for the Edmonton Remand Centre was \$9,641,000. This current year our estimates are only \$9,647,000, an increase of \$6,000, about one-tenth of one per cent. I would like the minister to explain to the committee how the Edmonton Remand Centre is going to be able to fulfil its mandate with an increase of only \$6,000 out of a total budget of \$9.6 million? It seems to me that some of the problems, especially the working conditions the correctional officers discussed with me a year ago, are going to remain at best unresolved and at worst exacerbated somewhat if all we have to allot is an addition \$6,000.

I'd urge hon. members of the committee to look at the additional sums of money. In almost every case — there's actually a drop at the Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Institution; the Belmont centre, a marginal increase; the Calgary Correctional Institution, an increase of about 4 per cent; the Calgary Remand Centre, an increase of about 2 or 3 per cent. The point I'm making, Mr. Chairman, is that if we're going to be fair to the correctional officers especially, who have no picnic, who have a tough job to undertake, it seems to me we should be looking at estimates which will not only maintain as many officers working in the system as possible but at-

tract other people to it. I just don't think that is very likely with the estimates we have before us, unless the minister is able to give us some indication of where he's going to find the money within the system.

Perhaps there's going to be a shift in the system; I don't know. But certainly you're not going to keep people with an 8 per cent wage increase across the board or with less than a 1 per cent increase, as is the case with the Edmonton Remand Centre. When he opened his remarks, the minister did not indicate whether we have any figures on the number of people who will be in the estimates, people spending time with us, as it were, over this next fiscal year. It seems to me it would be wildly optimistic to presume there will be a drop in demand.

Mr. Chairman, I want to move from the 8 per cent increase in correctional services to ask the minister specifically if in his summary remarks he could advise the committee on Vote 4, motor vehicle registration and driver licensing, and explain what the components of the 200 per cent increase in program development are. Perhaps we could have a specific outline as to why we have a little over \$5 million increase. In the explanation of that, Mr. Chairman, I note that that deals with various administrative and other costs which cannot be identified with individual subprograms. Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps for the committee to vote \$5 million, we might have a little more detail than is contained in the estimates book. I would welcome that from the minister.

I'd like to say one thing about the whole question of driver exams in the province, especially as it relates to smaller communities. I've had a number of constituents express complaints at the problem of getting an appointment for a driver examination. The appointed time has come, there's a long line-up, and the people have to go back to the central community in which they live, which is fair enough. But to what extent do we have an overtime policy — let me use the example of Worsley, which is about 120 miles from Peace River — so that when you have the people in that community and you have a line-up, they're able to deal with all the people who come on that particular day, and not have people drive 50 miles and have to go home again because the time has come, the line-up was too great, and the driver examiners go back to their central community? So is there any policy on overtime which would make a more flexible driver examination schedule in the rural areas especially?

Mr. Chairman, those basically were the major concerns brought to my attention. Just one final observation: I realize that in Vote 5 we're talking about — and I just look at the program delivery mechanism. The minister advised us that the grant is calculated on the basis of 2 per cent of the total pari-mutuel handle; that is, for horse racing in the province for the previous fiscal year. So I guess that in a sense we're just using the better's own money. But in these difficult times, when we have the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care telling us that we can't undertake an ambulance scheme because we haven't the money, and the Minister of Social Services and Community Health telling us the problems the province has with after-school funding because we're running out of money, and we have all kinds of people talking about faded rainbows, et cetera, I really wonder whether it's a wise move for us to increase what is really a luxury item.

Some members may take issue with that, and they're certainly welcome to do so. But a 78.1 per cent increase, even though it comes from a higher assessment on the pari-mutuel betting in this province, in my view is rather large at a time when we are being asked by almost

everyone to tighten our belts. Mr. Chairman, that's one of the observations I would make. I know that this money, at least a fair amount of it — about \$3.5 million, as I look at the figures — is going to be invested in developing that particular type of industry in the province; But again, when we find that the government is saying no to many, many obvious areas of concern to the average person, I really question whether that kind of increase in the Racing Commission is desirable or wise.

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to comment to the minister that I'm very pleased to observe that \$150,000 in the budget has been established through the Housing and Public Works Department for study and planning for a provincial corrections centre. I'd be particularly pleased tonight to have the minister expand to some degree on what he thinks the study might indicate when it is made at Red Deer to determine the needs of that city as far as a correctional centre is concerned.

Of late, a lot of attention has been paid to the provincial and federal correctional centres in our province. Just recently there was quite a dissertation on the situation at Bowden and its tremendous overcrowding. I don't want to bring the federal government into it, but it seems that with the downturn of the economy, we are running into a state of more and more people who tend to get into difficulties with the law. There's a need for action to be taken by our judicial system to teach them a lesson that they should try to walk the straight and narrow.

Certainly Red Deer is no exception to the rest of the country. For instance, just recently the staff sergeant at Red Deer indicated that some 3,928 prisoners were handled in Red Deer last year. The city of Red Deer has a small police station with 14 cells. With very quick arithmetic, it's plain to see that for 280 days of the year those 14 cells are completely occupied.

I'm pleased the minister was able to announce that the new facility at Calgary, Bow River, is opening up. It will probably be able to take some of the overflow from Red Deer for a period of time. I realize that these institutions cannot be built overnight, but certainly with the growth of Calgary and of Red Deer in central Alberta, the Bow River facility will very shortly be filled up, because Red Deer is rapidly growing and in fact is the third-largest market area in all of Alberta, which means people.

With the growth of central Alberta's people, we always have a proportion who are in trouble with the law and need to be held over, either for remand or for sentencing, then transported by RCMP vans to other locations around the province. This creates great inconvenience to the families of those people who would like to visit them on weekends and try to get them to take a turnaround in their lives. If they're moved hundreds of miles away, of course it is difficult for their families to help in rehabilitating them through family contacts.

Another factor to the people who are in difficulty is the cost of having their lawyers travel to other locations when appeals are requested, when sentencing is to be considered, and before sentencing. Everybody is entitled to the right of defence. Lawyers have to travel to other locations. These of course are expensive items to consider, because lawyers don't come cheap when we get involved in court actions, be they on the defence or on the prosecuting side. So I'm very pleased that the minister has seen fit to make a move in suggesting to the cabinet that some action be taken for Red Deer.

I remember the first year I was in this House, some three years ago, making an appeal, recorded in *Hansard*,

that something be done to assist in a remand centre for Red Deer. I respectfully suggest to the minister and to this Assembly that we've long gone past the situation where a remand centre only is sufficient for a city the size of Red Deer and the population of central Alberta. I won't repeat all the things I said the other night when talking to the Minister of Housing and Public Works, but it is a serious situation.

I might say for the edification of everyone that in the month, the 31 days, since the Treasurer announced that new multipurpose correctional centres for men and women in Red Deer and Medicine Hat are planned to be built, I have not not one telephone call or one letter from people objecting to a correctional centre being built in Red Deer, or approximately close at hand to Red Deer. It is too much of a motherhood issue for people to complain about.

MR. MACK: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of brief questions and a comment to the hon. Solicitor General. On Vote 3, under federal gun control, is the federal government supplying funding for that since it's their program, or has the province undertaken to fund that vote?

Another question is basically with regard to operator licensing and control. I thought the province had a very good system in place once they started issuing the plastic operator's licence, which was good for an ID and certainly well preserved in the plastic form. That appears to have been changed. They're now issuing a licence which is useless. The plastic one is not too meaningful in that it hasn't anything on it. You also have to have a paper one which is almost the size of the vehicle registration, which is certainly not as conducive as the previous one. I wonder if the minister can respond as to the rationale in the change. Why was the change necessitated? Now instead of carrying one item on your person, you have to carry two items of ID: the actual operator's licence, which is the paper document, and the plastic one. If the minister could respond to that, I would certainly be interested. It would be my view, unless there is some good reason for it, that that's a step backward rather than forward.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Solicitor General would be good enough to comment with respect to the time line on the construction of that new facility in Calgary, whether overcrowding is occurring within the Calgary Remand Centre at the moment, and what plans are under way to do some temporary relief should the occasion arise. I wonder if there has been any noticeable effect in terms of occupancy at the Calgary Remand Centre with the recent opening of the new Calgary detoxification centre, the Alpha house facility, in the east belt line area of downtown Calgary. A number of us were hopeful that the opening of that facility would be able to take off some of the so-called drunks who have been sort of filling up part of the system in the Calgary Remand Centre.

Also two other quick questions. I wonder if the minister has some understanding of what the average age is in some of these facilities, especially the Calgary Remand Centre. I wonder if he might be good enough to comment briefly about some of the education programs which I understand are in place for inmates, especially as they affect our native Indian population and the Metis people as well.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to hear the minister state that there are going to be some changes with regard to the funding formulas for policing in the municipalities. The Calgary city council, when they met with Calgary MLAs, mentioned that they were grateful that provincial government funding for the police budget was based on a per capita basis which took care of the city's growth, but they were concerned that inflationary factors were not covered by this kind of formula. I'm wondering if, in the new look the Solicitor General is going to give to that aspect, those two factors will be combined; also if there's a little more definite time line as to when some decisions will be made and — you may have mentioned this — whether that was expected to be a part or an ancillary part of his budget for 1982.

Mr. Chairman, the other thing I would like to have some information on is with regard to traffic fatalities and accidents in Alberta. I realize I probably could have done some of this, but I wonder what the comparative statistics might be between this year and last year, if the hon. gentleman has that, particularly whether or not there's been any reduction or change in accidents due to alcohol or intoxication, and whether the Solicitor General would see the necessity in perhaps increasing fines or sentences that should perhaps come automatically to those who might be convicted of drunken driving.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Chairman, I just have two questions for the hon. Solicitor General. One concerns the gun control Bill C-451 that was supposed to have been shelved. I wonder if the hon. Solicitor General could indicate whether the provincial department has been in touch with the federal counterpart to relay the concerns of many Albertans who certainly are not prepared to accept more stringent gun controls in Alberta. It certainly is a concern of many people of Alberta at this time as I travel through the province. Especially during the election in Olds-Didsbury, the question came up many times.

The other question is whether we're putting more emphasis on reimbursement to society for the crimes that have been perpetrated, where possible. Certainly I recognize there are some areas where reimbursement is not possible. But I look at the estimates here, and I wonder if creating a situation where society was paid for those crimes committed against them would not be a better way than putting them in penitentiaries, remand centres, and so forth. My question is whether or not there is a committee or group in place that might be studying that type of penal reform for the province of Alberta. If there is, I would certainly welcome the Solicitor General's comments on that.

The other one I had a comment on was Vote 5. However, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has already dealt with that. The only thing I can say is that I hope we're not gambling with our penal system as it appears to be in Vote 5, with the 78.1 per cent increase.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the minister like to answer the questions?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, I'll try to deal with the questions and comments by the members in the order they raised them. I must say that I appreciate very much the contributions all the members have made on what I feel is a very important aspect of government services to the people of this province.

First of all, with regard to the Redcliff situation expressed by the Member for Cypress, one of the problems

that I think all police forces have is the fact that they always deal with a lot of transient people, and they obviously have to deal with people from outside their own local jurisdiction. So even from large police forces I get the same sort of comments as the Redcliff police force made to the Member for Cypress. However, as I have indicated, I will be looking at funding for police services by municipalities. Hopefully, that will be done in the June-July period.

The Member for Clover Bar asked about the St. Paul institution. That has been working extremely well from a rehabilitative point of view and also from the point of view of the native people. Because of the nature of the work programs, it is designed for the young adult. The workshops there are providing a very useful type of facility for the young person, whether he be native or non-native.

With regard to the Fort Saskatchewan replacement facility, I met with the hon. member who represents the area. I had a very useful meeting. We are looking at the proposals and will take the concerns of the residents into account as best we can. As far as the possibility of locating it elsewhere, certainly the local residents who saw me suggested another location. We'll take a look at that. Whether we have to go another 50 miles out is another question. We'll face that if and when we have to make a change.

With regard to motor vehicle licences and vehicle registrations for the small communities, I think I've covered that fairly well in question period. Where we have found a demand and we can't get a satisfactory private issue, we have to turn to other offices such as village offices. I think that's helped a little in providing the service.

Policing and the fact that RCMP are being used on the highways: I think it is a valid comment that good police work requires a police presence on the highways. We're watching with a great deal of interest the experiment — I call it an experiment — in New Brunswick where the highway patrol has taken over that type of work. It seems to me that if we're going to have people doing that, we have to have forces trained to the level of the regular policemen. It means the right to carry weapons, the right to arrest.

DR. BUCK: Why?

MR. HARLE: I don't see how you can ask unarmed people to approach vehicles in isolated areas of the province. It really is a problem for such individuals. If you're going to go that far, then they have to have the qualifications of policemen. Also, I know where people have broken into local stores, for example, and are travelling on the highway with their ill-gotten gains. Obviously if a policeman has stopped that vehicle, he has an opportunity for carrying out an arrest. I think that's very important work. However, as I've said, we're watching with interest the development of the New Brunswick experience. It may well be that somewhere down the road we have to look at an alternative.

With regard to the younger offender and shorter sentences, a fair amount of detail on the fine option program and the community service order program is contained in the 1980-81 annual report of the department. I think it's working out very well. We can obviously do more in that area, but there was a tremendous increase last time. I think you'll see a similar increase when we file the annual report for this past year.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview wondered about

the correctional services. Obviously a large [part] of that program funding is contained in the wages and salaries. As I recall, there is a salary contingency part in the Treasury vote. Depending on what the settlement is, of course, it will come through a special warrant for whatever the difference is for the final settlement. As I've indicated, we did add another 81 positions in that area and, even with that addition, we're still coming up with the percentages we've indicated — I think, too, once you take into account the fact that we also required a special warrant last year to cover the additional food and other matters of maintenance for the increased number of inmates who were handled in the correction facilities.

On the department of motor vehicles, particularly with regard to driver testing, as far as overtime policy in that area is concerned, the staff have been asked to do as best they can and make sure they don't get into those types of situations where people have driven 50 miles for a test. If they'd only let the staff know, the staff have been instructed to make use of whatever overtime is necessary to clear the deck each day. Wherever I can be advised that that is not happening, we'll certainly follow it up. There are instructions not to hesitate to use overtime to clear up those people who are waiting.

With regard to horse racing, I realize that's a fairly large increase. But on the other hand, it is a large employer of people. Sure, one can argue that it's a luxury area. But when it comes down to the people who are actually employed and doing the work, that's what the breeder grants go to support. It's very much a people, job-oriented industry. I've received lots of support from the horsemen, particularly those who work in the barns, look after the horses, and provide enjoyment to the people who you might say are treating it as a luxury. It's out of their spending that these funds go. Sure, there's a lot of contribution of effort by the people who have the wherewithal to race horses. But on the other hand, they do employ a lot of people in the horse racing business.

With regard to the city of Red Deer and the member's comments on the needs of the city, I think he spelled it out with the number of people who were handled in the 14 cells that are available for Red Deer. I think that expresses the need for a facility for Red Deer. It's a bit confusing to compare it to the Bow River. Bow River is sentenced inmates. There'll be very, very few sentenced inmates involved as far as the Red Deer proposal is concerned. But you're right: the cost of travel for the citizens, and legal representatives for people who are remanded and have to go out of Red Deer, is a very good cause for saying that there is a need for that type of facility for the city.

The member for Edmonton Belmont alludes to the federal gun-control program. Those funds are borne 100 per cent by the federal government. It shows up as an expenditure on our side and, in Treasury, the receipt from the federal government for those funds.

With regard to the two pieces of paper needed, one is for the photograph and identification. Of course the other part has to be non-plastic, because it's needed for sending in information when there are convictions on the record and that sort of thing. As I understand it, they've had to go to the two parts, and all jurisdictions have done the same thing. [interjection] It may be. But how do you plasticize something you've got to write on?

With regard to the comments of the Member for Calgary Millican on the construction of the Calgary Remand Centre, we won't know for some time until we can start the planning on it. We have had tentative plans

developed for the downtown location. Now that's all wiped out; we've got to start again. Hopefully, the same time line — I'm sorry, I don't have it here with me. It'll be at least three to five years down the road.

The detox centre: we haven't carried out much of an analysis yet because of the fact that it's only been open for a relatively short period of time. But I did see comments in the Calgary press about the fact that news commentators riding with the police are taking people down to the centre. So I can assume from that that it must be working. We were hoping that it would relieve the pressure on the impaired driving side. We'll have to make an analysis once they've gotten into a regular routine — they've only been open for two or three months now — to see how it's working out. We'll be watching the developments there.

Average age: I haven't got figures, although there may be material in the annual report, because we do keep statistics on ages and educational requirements. You may find some material there. The educational programs: we're working with the Department of Education in Calgary, Edmonton, and various locations where the correction facilities are located. So far it's been working out really well. We're in effect making use of the community to provide the service, not trying to provide it ourselves. I think that's good, because it brings someone from the community into the institutions. The same with the native programs: I'm spending a great deal of effort developing things of interest to the native peoples, through their own societies and having them involved in the institutions, making sure that we try to employ native correctional officers. Native Counselling itself is doing an excellent job, particularly for the minimum security type of input.

The Member for Calgary North Hill commented on the funding for policing. That's correct. The grants at the present time are on a per capita basis, and do not take into account inflationary factors other than the growth in population, because that's part of the per capita basis. That's the purpose of the review, to see if we can come up with a change in the present formula. As I said, that'll be done in June, July, and August of this year.

I'm sorry, I don't have any statistics on traffic accidents. I think they were down at one time. But it was particularly bad last year until December, particularly in the city of Edmonton where we seem to have a lot of fatalities. I did ask the department to pull the driver's licences on all the drivers of vehicles involved in fatalities during the calendar year 1981. Out of the 760-odd drivers involved driving a vehicle where there was a fatality either to the driver or to someone else in the vehicle, 34 were suspended drivers, I think. That certainly would indicate that we can't blame the impaired or suspended driver for all our problems. Accidents are caused by all of us. We can't pass the blame to those two groups. However, where those two groups are involved, they're usually very serious.

The Member for Olds-Didsbury raised the gun control issue. I think the Bill he's talking about is a private member's Bill; it isn't a government Bill. As far as I know, the federal Solicitor General has indicated that he hasn't any inclination to go that route.

With regard to the reimbursement to members of society for crimes, again I'd refer to the annual report of the department. Through the community service order program, we provided some 1,154 community service orders in the period '80-81. It'll be up again this year over last year, which was a 21.5 per cent increase. We found that that has worked very well. We could certainly do more,

and we will. The fine option program, which provides for making sure that people can work off fines: there's been 150,000 hours of work performed in that year. It'll be up again this year, recovering some \$600,000 by getting people to work to pay off their fines. These programs are brought to the attention of not only the sentenced inmates but also those who are coming up for sentencing, so that if they know there's something they are going to wind up getting a fine for, they can start getting the thing in motion so they can take advantage of these programs.

Several studies have been done to get at this problem of the minor type of offence, where there's a fine, to try to make sure that not only does the individual have the opportunity to pay it off but through their use of the provisions of the Criminal Code, the victim is compensated. Where it gets rather dicey is the supervision of something that may involve the victim. But certainly the community service orders, whereby work is done on various community projects — the Department of the Solicitor General, through probationary services, will make available and encourage local communities to provide work projects so that people can be doing good work in a community for the benefit of the community, particularly in the area where damage has been caused to schools or whatever. No doubt we can do more. But it is well established now, and has been developed.

I think that covers the points raised by the members.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Chairman, I have one other question. It's under Vote 5 again. I wonder if the hon. Solicitor General could respond to whether the department encourages moonlighting. I make reference to the chairman of the Alberta Racing Commission. His salary doesn't show up here, but I understand it to be in the range of \$55,000 to \$60,000. Could the hon. Solicitor General indicate the amount of time required for him to fill that position?

MR. HARLE: I assume the hon. member is talking about a column that appears in various newspapers. I'm sure he rattles that off — he's been in the newspaper business for a long time, and I'm sure he can do that in his sleep.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the question is very clear: what are his duties for that \$50,000?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, he is the chairman of the Racing Commission. As I understand it, he is a very active chairman and attends all the functions he is obligated to attend.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Chairman, another question to the hon. Solicitor General. Does the Solicitor General know whether or not he is on salary with his journalism? If so, how can we condone one man holding down those two jobs in this time of high unemployment in Alberta?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, as long as he does not get into a position of conflict, I don't think we should be telling him he can't write columns in the newspaper. It seems to me it would be unfair to the individual who has spent his life in newspaper work to tell him he can't write columns.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would be interested, as I'm sure other members of the committee would, to perhaps have a little more information on the amount of time the chairman of the Racing Commission gives to the

responsibility. The minister said that he undertakes all the work required of his responsibilities. I presume that's true. That being the case, perhaps the minister could define a little more clearly for the members of the committee exactly what those responsibilities are, the amount of time required, whether we're looking at a full work week as most public employees are obliged to undertake, whether it's just a case of a meeting now and again, how many meetings of the Racing Commission are held each year, what type of preparation work is required before a meeting is held, what specific work the chairman of the commission has with respect to the financial support and incentive to the bloodstock industry — exactly what does he do in working out this program — and the kind of support services the chairman has at his disposal.

During these difficult days when everybody has to tighten their belts, members of the committee need to know whether we have a position here that is a sinecure or whether it's a working position. If it's a working position, is it a 40-, 50-, or 60-hour working position? Is it the kind of position that the minister could take to Mr. Booth and the officials of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees and say, I defend this position, because here is a chairman of the Racing Commission who is working 50 hours a week, working overtime, and putting all his efforts into it. This is the kind of thing we want to know, Mr. Chairman. What kind of work is being done?

MR. KESLER: He's obviously working twice as hard as MLAs.

MR. NOTLEY: So I think the only way to deal with this is to have a definitive response by the minister on just what type of work is being undertaken by the chairman of the Racing Commission.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, at the present time, I can't tell you how many hours the chairman spends on the business of the commission. However, I can say that any time I've had any contact at all with the races, he's been there making sure things are running properly. I would say he's devoting the majority of his time to the job of the commission. It's not just commission meetings he's handling; he's actually at the tracks when they're operating to make sure they are running properly.

I did intend to cover for the Member for Spirit River-Fairview the difference in accounting for the figures for the motor vehicle registration in Vote 4. If one looks at Vote 4.1, there is \$7.6 million in estimates. If you look over, you'll see the comparable forecast of \$2.5 million, where the comparable estimate was \$7.9 million. A year ago \$7.9 million was in the estimates in order to cover the computer system being put in place which will tie the information from the courts to the registering system for motor vehicle licences and registration, and will provide the computer service terminals to all the motor vehicle branch offices and provide the terminal capacity for the police services. Because that was slowed down and we weren't able to advance, the estimates were not all spent last year, and they are included this year. This is the year when the cost is the largest, because the processors, the terminals, the printers, the memory disks, and all the computer software capital assets are needed to put that program into eventual completion. About \$1.8 to \$1.9 million is in capital. There are some other capital items of computer testing equipment, replacement of cash regis-

ters, photocopying machines, and calculators, just normal replacement types of things, required by the department.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Solicitor General for his extremely comprehensive answer to the question I posed on program support on Vote 4. Now I would like as comprehensive and thorough an answer as to exactly what Mr. Farran does as chairman of the Racing Commission. The minister indicated that he spends a lot of time at the track — so do quite a number of people. That does not necessarily mean we have a precise explanation in this House as to what he does. How many people are employed by the Racing Commission? How many meetings of the commission are held? What type of preparation work is required by the chairman for those meetings? Dealing with the services provided by the program, we have security and regulation of horse races. Exactly what does the chairman do on that? Financial support and incentive to the bloodstock industry: to what extent does the chairman take the lead, and what does he do in terms of fulfilling that particular aspect of the program support we're voting. Are any other people engaged by the Racing Commission?

Mr. Chairman, since the minister did such an exemplary job in explaining all the other questions that have been posed, I think it would only be fair to him if we had an equally thorough explanation of the work of the chairman of the commission.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, I will certainly take those questions and respond to the hon. member by letter to cover them. I'm sorry I don't have all those details immediately at hand. I know that the commission employs staff at all the tracks to supervise the races. The chairman himself makes sure he attends the appeals when the stewards suspend the drivers and the trainers. All these have to be handled by the commission staff. In other words, it's an ongoing, day-to-day supervision of the races.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Do other members of the commission work with Mr. Farran? What kind of remuneration do they get out of this vote?

MR. HARLE: There are other members of the commission who sit, and I believe they are on a part-time basis.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. Could the hon. Solicitor General indicate the criteria for the appointment of the chairman of the Racing Commission? What qualifications are required for that appointment?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, basically the people who have been appointed have an interest in horses. Some are interested from a point of view of whether they are involved in the standard-bred or thoroughbred side. There's also just general interest in horses and horse racing. By and large, I think they've done an excellent job in supervising the tracks and making sure that the people who go down to bet are betting on an honest race.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Chairman, another question. Could the hon. Solicitor General indicate whether the chairman of the Racing Commission owns or partially owns, in partnership or whatever, a stable of horses that he competes with at the track on a regular basis?

MR. HARLE: Off the top of my head, I haven't any idea. I can certainly find out and respond to the hon. member.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Chairman, another question to the hon. Solicitor General. If he owned horses and those horses were competing in the races at the track, would he be acceptable as the chairman of the Racing Commission?

MR. HARLE: I would have to see whether any other members are involved in that way. I'm sorry, I couldn't tell you.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. I think the hon. minister indicated that the outline of the responsibilities of Mr. Farran, or the chief commissioner, would be provided to the Legislature. In terms of control of the use of drugs, et cetera, on the track, is that one of his responsibilities? Or do other persons, veterinarians, et cetera, who report to the commission, have that responsibility?

MR. HARLE: I believe it's the way you have described. A number of officials at the track receive authority from the commission, from the point of view of trainers, the blood samples that are taken, the stewards who supervise the races and make sure the horses don't become involved in collisions, and all the duties that go toward supervision of the races themselves.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Since its announcement last week, one of the needs of this government is revenue. Has the government considered changing the formula by which the revenue from the races is shared, so the government has a greater take from the races?

MR. HARLE: No, we haven't. The feeling is that the percentage taken now is about as much as the betters are prepared to allow to be taken out of their wagering for this purpose. The feeling the chairman of the Racing Commission has, that's been communicated to me, is that if they were to increase the take from the pari-mutuel, it would hurt the betting.

There has been some room, because we moved up the percentage which is going into supporting horse racing and development of breeding in the province. We've done that primarily because rather similar amounts have been allocated across Canada and the provinces that conduct major races, and we try to make sure that we're not out of line with what's happening in the other provinces.

MR. NOTLEY: The minister didn't answer the question of how often the commission meets. Do they have regular meetings, or is it just a case of periodic meetings? I'm interested in the allocation of this money for financial support as an incentive to the bloodstock industry.

There would obviously be some kind of criteria developed for the allocation of this money. How is it distributed? On what basis? What is the formula? Is that exclusively the purview of the chairman? Presumably the commission as a whole would be setting down guidelines, but to what extent is there consultation with people in the industry? Is there a specific formula so everybody gets a piece of the action? Exactly how is it being dealt with?

Also with respect to some farmers in this province who have horses they're training and racing in other parts of the country, where there's more of a developed industry

— for example, I think of one of my constituents who has several horses being trained in Washington State — is there any program in terms of assistance there? Or is this money exclusively used for people who house their horses here in the province?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, I'll supply the formula in a letter so I have it exact. But my recollection is that it's divided at the end of the year, depending on the number of first places in effect among the winners. Slightly different arrangements are made, depending on whether you're talking about the standard-breds or the thorough-breds. In other words, it has to be worked out in consultation with those in the industry and of course is a decision made by the Racing Commission itself.

MR. NOTLEY: How often does it meet?

MR. HARLE: My recollection is that it meets whenever it has to meet. As I say, these matters come up on a daily basis, as the race meets are progressing. Of course there are appeals of decisions made by the stewards in the conduct of the races. So they act as a policing body of those involved in the horse racing industry.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the minister didn't clarify the total allocation of this \$4,378,000 to various groups. Does that mean that this is allocated to private breeders by the commission? I notice some of it goes to public race tracks for improvement. Is that allocated to the various tracks in Edmonton, Calgary, Lethbridge, and Lloydminster on a per capita or a percentage basis of take? Is there a formula for that kind of thing?

MR. HARLE: There is a formula. I'm sorry, I don't have it here. Of course they have to pay for their own staffing, all those supervising the track. So a lot of wages and salaries are included in the amount, as well as the breeder grants for the improvement of horses.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple more questions on this, then I want to go back to some of the correctional institutions in a little more detail. In terms of the allocation of funds, I'm not quite sure if I understood the minister. I gather some money is made available to the major tracks. Is there any funding from the Racing Commission for race tracks in smaller centres used occasionally — for example, I think of Grande Prairie as a case in point — or is it just allocated to the major tracks? On what basis would there be an allocation from the Racing Commission?

MR. HARLE: Out of the total pari-mutuel take — it may show up, but I don't believe it's part of this budget — Department of Agriculture grants are also made to the tracks for the physical facilities. Yes, I believe it does go down to Lethbridge, Red Deer, and other locations that have smaller tracks. They receive part of that share. In other words, this accounts for only 2 per cent of the pari-mutuel take. The total amount that comes off the pari-mutuel take is about 15 per cent. The rest is divided in other ways.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, where would we get that information? It's not in the estimates here. Presumably it would be in the annual report of the Racing Commission, but would it be shown in any other place in our overall estimates?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, it's shown in the Department of Agriculture, because in effect it's part of their grants to support the facilities located in various communities.

MR. NOTLEY: The formula, then, as to the allocation to major and smaller tracks is determined first of all by the commission. The Department of Agriculture accepts the recommendations of the commission in terms of the allocation to the various tracks. Is that how it works?

MR. HARLE: I believe there's probably more detail in the annual report of the Racing Commission. Of course that is filed every year in the Legislature. I haven't got a copy here, but I think you'll see the breakdown of the percentages.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, unless other people have questions on this issue, I was going to go on to another area.

I'd like to deal for a moment with Vote No. 2. I raised this as a question, and the minister answered it in a general sense. That is the 8 per cent increase in institutional services. What surprised me, however, was the very low increase in the Edmonton Remand Centre. Just to outline for hon. members of the committee, on page 162 of the elements book, the remand centre's forecast last year was \$9,641,000. This year we're looking at \$9,647,000 or an increase of \$6,000. I find it hard to believe that there isn't going to be greater pressure on the remand centres in both Edmonton and Calgary in this next budget year than was the case in the last budget year. It seems to me that that \$6,000 increase is going to leave us somewhat short in terms of being able to handle the job in the Edmonton area.

Also, while I'm on my feet, the increase in Calgary is about — I said 4 per cent. I guess it would be 5.5 per cent, which is again somewhat less than the rate of inflation. But it seems to me that \$6,000 in Edmonton is still going to leave the centre significantly short of what is required to carry out the job. I would be interested in the minister advising the committee of the reasons for that \$6,000 increase and, in his opinion, why \$6,000 is adequate.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, I tried to respond to that. If one looks at page 333 in the estimates book, you'll see that the comparable estimates were \$41 million, whereas the actual forecast was \$46. There was a special warrant, of course, which in effect has already been built into the needs for the current year. So we've added the 81 positions we need, and very few positions are allocated for existing facilities. Most of them go into the Bow River facility. With the combination of the addition of the special warrant during the course of the year, plus the new needs, assuming no change in the wage rates, we believe that will in fact take care of the needs. As I've indicated, I believe the Treasury Department has included in their budget the possible amount to cover future settlements with AUPE. Obviously, if more is needed, there will have to be a special warrant.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I suppose that's really the question. I note the difference between the estimates and the forecast. The forecast is what actually will be spent in 1981-82, so we know that \$9,641,000 will in fact have been spent. But that is now a base on which inflation is going to be building. That's just an ugly fact of life.

There's nothing we can do about it. Using that as a base, Mr. Chairman, the minister is now telling us it will be \$9,647,000 for 1982-83. Obviously that isn't going to be the figure. We're going to have to add a special warrant. We realize that's going to be inevitable when it comes to the salary adjustment, because I'm not asking the minister to prejudge what that salary adjustment will be. But I would guess that part of the special warrant last year — and we take the remand centre as a case in point — was for other things beyond salaries. To what extent are we going to have an additional special warrant required for some of these centres beyond the salary adjustment because of built-in inflation? We're now talking about a larger base in which all the pressures of inflation are going to be present.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to be that in terms of budgeting, as much as possible, these things have to be accurate when presented to the committee. The one area I give the minister is a salary adjustment. He can't be expected to comment on that. But surely on other items, other aspects of that, we should have that information. It would seem to me if that's what we're doing, you're going to have a little larger increase than what appears to be \$6,000. In the case of Fort Saskatchewan, there's actually going to be a reduction this year of \$26,000. None of us really believes that, but that's what the estimates say.

Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make is: let's try to be as accurate as we can in terms of making the decision in this committee, before we vote the amount, so there will be minimal use of special warrants. We know there are going to be times when there's no other choice but to use a special warrant, but in the whole process of preparing a budget, surely those should be kept to the minimum requirements. As I look at it, it seems to me that we're going to be looking at more than salary adjustments as the demand for special warrants that will be on the minister's desk in the next few months.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, I think I've explained the difference. We certainly feel that because we built the amounts of the special warrant into the new figures, this will be sufficient for the correctional institutional services. Of course until last year, sometimes there has been an underexpenditure. We did have a need for a special warrant last year. They feel they've got the budgeting under pretty tight control and that the figure presented is their best estimate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, on a different subject. I don't think it's been raised yet this evening. I had a phone call today with regard to strip-searching. I wonder if the minister has rules in place with regard to that action and whether changes have been made in the last year. If I recall correctly, about a year ago we had concerns with regard to this matter. The minister said some studies and observations were going on and some changes were to be proposed. I wonder if the minister could bring us up to date as to what those changes have been.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, I assume that the Leader of the Opposition is talking about the correctional facilities, particularly the remand and detention side. Yes, those persons who have been arrested and brought to the detention centre by the police are not taken into the secure portion, provided they have indicated in some way or other that they want bail, that they can raise the bail that is set. Of the many thousands who come through

that process, usually there is no problem. However, if the individual cannot raise bail or does not wish to raise bail, of course they have to be taken into the secure part of the institution.

The policy is to carry out a strip-search of all persons entering the institution. This is done not only to protect the inmate, because of course suicide attempts are made on occasion and we never know when that's going to occur. In addition to that, there is ample evidence available to the correctional staff to indicate that people try to smuggle in drugs and weapons. In order to make every effort to keep that type of contraband out of the institution, the strip-search policy has been instituted. It's too bad, but I think we would find that internally the institution would get very rapidly out of hand if we were to relax in any way this search for contraband of this nature.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Could changes have been made during the last period of time in terms of better facilities — I believe facilities was one of the concerns a year ago — and better-trained people doing the searches? Has that type of thing occurred?

MR. HARLE: Yes, we have, Mr. Chairman. The training of the correctional staff has been improved. As I indicated in discussing the budget at the start of the debate tonight, we've budgeted funds in the Department of Housing and Public Works for some renovations at Holy Redeemer College, where we will be taking the correctional staff for in-house training. Of course they receive training in the strip-search process. I think the staff have done a pretty professional job. We're very crowded in the downtown detention centre in the city of Edmonton. We have moved the females basically out of the detention centre, except at parts of the day that are not crowded such as the morning and afternoon. But later in the afternoon, fresh arrests are taken directly to the remand centre. Eventually we hope to eliminate the downtown detention centre which has been used for so many years and have everyone dealt with at the remand centre. That will occur as soon as the tunnel is completed from the court facilities over to the remand centre.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$165,900
1.02 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$131,700
1.03 — Finance and Administration	\$1,669,000
1.04 — Personnel	\$1,083,500
1.05 — Computer and Research Services	\$1,923,050
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$4,973,150

2.1 — Program Support	\$3,707,750
2.2 — Institutional Services	\$48,927,600
2.3 — Community Correctional Services	\$8,303,500
2.4 — Community Residential Centres	\$1,520,700
2.5 — Native Courtworkers	\$1,412,600
Total Vote 2 — Correctional Services	\$63,872,150

3.1 — Program Support	\$1,106,900
3.2 — Financial Support for Policing	\$77,342,300
3.3 — Highway Motor Patrol	\$3,543,925
3.4 — Federal Gun Control	\$356,000
Total Vote 3 — Law Enforcement	\$82,349,125

4.1 — Program Support	\$7,655,100
4.2 — Licence Issuing and Accident Claims	\$21,637,300
4.3 — Operator Licence Control	\$747,500
Total Vote 4 — Motor Vehicle Registration and Driver Licensing	\$30,039,900
 Vote 5 — Control and Development of Horse Racing	 \$4,378,200
 Department Total	 \$185,612,525

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the votes be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1983, sums not exceeding the following for the departments and purposes indicated.

Department of Recreation and Parks: \$3,397,256 for departmental support services; \$57,143,080 for recreation development; \$34,907,184 for provincial parks.

Department of Government Services: \$3,510,770 for departmental support services; \$89,102,225 for building operations and maintenance; \$5,306,865 for government transportation; \$4,601,815 for supply; \$8,469,175 for public affairs; \$27,818,125 for information and telecommunication services.

Department of the Solicitor General: \$4,973,150 for departmental support services; \$63,872,150 for correctional services; \$82,349,125 for law enforcement; \$30,039,900 for motor vehicle registration and driver licensing; \$4,378,200 for control and development of horse racing.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I previously indicated that tomorrow evening Executive Council estimates will be called, and that is the case. Items 10 and 11, disaster preparedness and public service employees, will probably be held until another day, but I believe the first nine items under that heading are ready to proceed.

[At 10:12 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

