

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Thursday, April 22, 1982 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 28****Alberta Opportunity Fund  
Amendment Act, 1982**

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 28, the Alberta Opportunity Fund Amendment Act, 1982. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

The principles of Bill 28 are: one, to authorize the company to increase total borrowings of the Alberta Opportunity Company from \$150 million to \$300 million; two, to increase the limits the company can approve, except by approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, from \$750,000 to \$1 million; and to ensure continuity of the pension plan for employees of the company. It will also provide the Alberta Opportunity Company with the ability to create more than one loans committee, to facilitate speeding up the process of approving loans.

[Leave granted; Bill 28 read a first time]

**Bill 206****An Act to Amend the Stray Animals Act**

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 206, An Act to Amend the Stray Animals Act.

The purpose of the Act is to clarify the legal responsibility of one farmer's livestock to another.

[Leave granted; Bill 206 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file a quarterly report, for the last quarter of 1981, dealing with progress at the Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre. I also table the annual report of the Health Care Insurance Plan for the year ended March 31, 1981, as required by statute.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report for Pacific Western Airlines.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to introduce to you, and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly, a group of 73 grade 6 students from Lorelei elementary school in the Castle Downs area

of Edmonton Calder. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Rimney, Mr. Parker, and Mr. Luard, and by student teacher Miss Meske. I believe they are all seated in the members gallery, and I'd like to ask them to rise and receive the traditional welcome of the House.

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, 35 grade 6 students from Red Deer who attend a brand new school, Pine Community elementary. They are the first class from that school to attend this Legislature. Accompanied by their instructors Mr. Atkinson and Mrs. Zak, and by parents Mr. Phelps, Mrs. Marke, Mrs. Dunham, and Mrs. Wilsher, they are seated in the public gallery. I ask that they now rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the House.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to introduce 30 young citizens from grade 6 in the Sherwood school in the Edmonton Glenora constituency. Accompanied by Mr. McDonald and Mrs. Rybock, they're in the public gallery. I ask that they rise at this time and be accorded the normal welcome of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Western Canada Lottery**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Culture. It follows the questions I asked the other day, with regard to the Western Canada Lottery, Alberta division. Could the minister indicate whether she is able to table one of the contracts between the distributors and Western Canada Lottery, Alberta division, in which the Minister of Culture is involved?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I haven't been able to reach the chairman of the Alberta division. As soon as I get his permission, I'll do so.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate the term of the current contract? What was the starting date, and what is the terminating date of the present contract?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: If the hon. member of the opposition is referring to the three-month period, it was April 1 to the end of June.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer to page 639 in *Hansard* of Monday, when I raised this question. With regard to how the distributorships would be handled after June 30, the hon. member indicated that that would be a matter of caucus discussion and government policy.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to refer to the contract signed by the various distributors. I'd like to quickly refresh the minister's mind on page 2, Section G:

The Division has advised the Distributor that it is prepared to grant a license to the Distributor to distribute the Express, Provincial and Super Loto tickets within the territory in this license on an interim basis only, until June 30, 1982; at which time it is the intention of the Division to change the distribution system to provide that the distribution of tickets will be managed and conducted by one licensed distributor designated by the Division to be

responsible for the entire Province of Alberta, who will distribute tickets through the services of salaried employees.

My question is: why did the hon. minister have these distributors sign that kind of contract, if it is the intention of the minister to review the matter and continue private entrepreneurship in Alberta, or the opportunity for some 13 private distributors at the present time?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, we issued a new licence. The hon. member asked me how long they were going to continue in the present manner as they have in the past. It will be for a three-month period. We are now meeting with the distributors, and we'll be listening to them.

The contract we have with the Alberta division says that at any time, the minister may dissolve the licence with the Alberta division. If the caucus decides they are not happy or would not like to accept the change, and that they'd like to consider it in another manner, we will be deciding that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Why did the hon. minister insert this section in the contract, if it was not to blackmail or tell these distributors that they ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. leader has had considerable latitude with his question, but to come out with a veiled accusation of blackmail — and not too heavily veiled, either — goes just a little bit beyond the pale. I respectfully ask the hon. leader if he would just deal with that expression somewhat further, so it needn't cause us any further concern.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Why did the hon. minister, on behalf of the government of Alberta, require the distributors to sign a contract ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm concerned about the implication of blackmail. I don't think we should leave that hanging out there, before we go on with the question period.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order with regard to the word "blackmail". Before the distributors could receive this new 90-day contract from the lottery, and from the government of Alberta as well, they were required to consent to having their distributorships terminated as of June 30, 1982. If that's not blackmail, what is?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. With great respect, the hon. leader is compounding the difficulty. He's trying to persuade me to join in his finding of blackmail. I can't do that. We simply don't accuse each other of blackmail in this House, howsoever strongly we may feel about something. I would respectfully ask that the hon. leader deal with that question further, so we need not be concerned about it, also so it won't establish an undesirable precedent.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if that isn't an acceptable word, then I would like to use the word "coerced" into signing the contract. If that's acceptable, I would like to proceed with my questions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: As long as we take the word "blackmail" as having been withdrawn, I think "coerce" is acceptable. It indicates an application of pressure, strong persuasion, or more than that, but at least it's not a criminal offence.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the hon. minister is: why were the 13 distributors coerced into signing a contract which indicated their termination as of June 30, 1982? They didn't accept that policy, but it was the only way they could obtain another 90-day contract with the government and, in turn, specifically with the lottery.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, the contract is not with the government of Alberta; it is between the Alberta division and the distributors. We do not hire the distributors. It is completely up to the division. If the hon. member would like clarification, perhaps he could ask the chairman of the Alberta division.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Then why did the minister stand in her place on Monday this week and very clearly say that the policy after June 30 will be determined by the Conservative caucus — the Lougheed caucus of this government — if the government is not responsible? There is an inconsistency somewhere, and that should be clarified by the hon. minister. Why did the minister say one thing on Monday and now not take her responsibility on Thursday? [interjections]

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, we wanted to give the distributors the opportunity of speaking to the caucus committee on lotteries. Therefore we gave them the extension for the three-month period, so we could have the opportunity of listening to both sides: the Alberta division plus the distributors. I think that was being extremely fair, because they made a very good point of saying they were not happy with the proposed contract. So we are listening to them, and next week we will set up a meeting with the distributors to let them say why the method of distribution should stay the same as it is now.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Why is the caucus hearing the matter if they have no influence on the final decision? Is the minister denying that the government totally severs itself from this specific contract and the Alberta division of the Western Canada Lottery system?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, we do issue a contract with the Alberta division, and that has been done. We have said that we will review it during these first three months, and I did state earlier that a contract can be terminated at the request of the minister.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Once the contract has been distributed, could the hon. minister indicate if the Alberta division is accountable to the hon. minister's department?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: They are responsible to my department and to the Western Canada Lottery Foundation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The hon. minister has admitted responsibility for the contract, and the Alberta . . .

MRS. LeMESSURIER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I said that the contract is between the Alberta division and the distributors. It is not with the Minister of Culture.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, can the hon. minister indicate if, under her portfolio, she is responsible for the Western Canada Lottery, Alberta division, and if the ministry establishes the ground rules by which that division operates in Alberta?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Yes, we do have a contract with the Alberta division, giving them the authority to run the distribution of the tickets for the province of Alberta. It's up to the Alberta division to sell and distribute the tickets in a manner they see fit. We have had some requests from distributors that they do not accept this new method and, as I said earlier, that is one of the reasons we will listen to their point of view.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is it the minister's intention to intervene on behalf of these private entrepreneurs in this province, or is the minister more prone to a position whereby salaried employees and one distributor in the province is adequate at the present time?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I said that we were going to listen to both sides. I can't stand in my place and say one thing . . . The caucus committee has not heard the distributors yet, and I think they should be given the opportunity of listening to them.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. If the hon. minister has no position with regard to the future of distributors in this province, why did the minister make a recommendation, in terms of contract and other material, to the cabinet of this province?

MR. SPEAKER: Are we going to get into cabinet discussions and recommendations that ministers . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: Why did she make a policy recommendation?

MR. SPEAKER: If it involves a cabinet matter, then it's outside the scope of the question period. That's well known, from hundreds of years of parliamentary history. But if it relates to something else, then perhaps the question would be in order.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, it's exactly the same way until the end of June. Nothing whatsoever has changed in the manner of distribution.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

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

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, is the minister prepared to bring this matter before the Legislature, before a final decision is made by the government of Alberta?

MR. McCRAE: Private members. [interjections]

MRS. LeMESSURIER: If the Leader of the Opposition would like to put a motion on the Order Paper, by all means.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, that's the way the people of Alberta are treated. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

#### Housing Assistance

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to look at another area in this province, with regard to the housing industry. My question is to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. In recent studies, I understand there is a 15 per cent drop in housing starts in Alberta, which is greater than the national . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let's get to the question. This preamble is quite undisguised debate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, these ministers don't come alive until you kind of tug their chains a little.

DR. McCRIMMON: If you've got a question, ask it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: To the hon. minister: is the government planning any kind of low-interest loan program, a fixed term for mortgages for people in Alberta, so they can possibly enjoy their own private houses in Alberta?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, it's really too bad that the Leader of the Opposition wasn't here the other evening, when I went through my budget. I spent several hours answering in depth . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister talks about answering questions. The generalizations we heard the other night don't satisfy Albertans.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm not sure there's a point of order here. In fairness, I think the minister should be given an opportunity to answer, before we start debating whether his answers in committee were adequate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I just had the urge to say something.

MR. SPEAKER: It's not an isolated instance.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going into a debate on whether the questions, more than the answers, are generalizations.

I spent considerable time reviewing the budget last Thursday night; I believe roughly a couple of hours. It's unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition couldn't be present. I went over many aspects of the budget, including the housing budget. That night I had the facts and figures with me. Unfortunately today I naturally didn't carry that package back.

But we were looking at something like \$1.5 billion directly into housing. I might say that in this year's budget, the total investment of the heritage fund will be over \$5 billion: 40 per cent of the heritage fund invested in housing. There are many different programs which are extremely well received by the people of this province.

The family home purchase program provides 6,000 homes with heavy subsidies for low- to middle-income people. The core housing incentive program is having a very high take-up, 50 per cent of the units with controlled rentals, which is helping many low-income people and our senior citizens find low-cost accommodation. I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker.

Since I had two hours to do my budget the other night, Mr. Speaker, I don't think you'd give me the same time today. But I'm amazed at the questions from the Leader of the Opposition, with regard to what we're doing for housing. That's a ridiculous question. [interjections]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister should ask a few people who are losing their homes because they can't pay their mortgages. What is the hon. minister doing about those people who can't meet their mortgage payments at present and are losing their homes? Has the minister made any recommendation to the Premier, so mortgage rates could be part of the economic resurgence program of this government, here in Alberta? [interjections]

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I think we're all aware of the unfortunate budget presented by the federal government last fall. However, one aspect of that budget that they did concede was that the problem of high interest rates in this country was their policy and, therefore, their responsibility.

The federal government introduced a program whereby people with homes experiencing difficulty with regard to mortgage repayments — in other words, gross debt/service ratio exceeding 30 per cent — could apply for a grant or deferment of payment, if you like, depending on the equity they'd built up on their property. That was their responsibility, and they accepted it. Anyone who has that kind of difficulty should apply to the federal government, through Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation or their Member of Parliament. [interjections]

I would say, though, that the indication of foreclosure rate we have through the Home Mortgage Corporation is that foreclosures are even lower this year than last year.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification. Could the hon. minister indicate the position of government at this time, and his position, with regard to his own programs? Will the programs of the Department of Housing and Public Works be as announced and in a holding position for the people of Alberta, during the remaining part of the fiscal year 1982-83?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I don't follow that question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. minister is very clear. Is the minister going to do any more with regard to mortgage rates this year ...

MR. NOTLEY: Before an election.

MR. R. SPEAKER: ... before the election, or is the minister in a holding pattern, like we've seen in the last year?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, our budget — in which, I regret again, the Leader of the Opposition wasn't here to participate last week — provides for the construction or financing of some 24,000 units this year by the government of this province. That's unmatched by any other jurisdiction anywhere.

MR. R. SPEAKER: We're talking about mortgage rates.

MR. CHAMBERS: I just answered the question about mortgage rates. [interjections] I said that the federal government is the body responsible for the high interest rate policy that exists in this country. They've accepted their responsibility with regard to mortgage rates, and they should.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The hon. minister indicated that if you have trouble with your mortgage, go to the federal government. Some months ago, the federal government announced a program for Canadians, whereby if anyone in a difficult situation was about to lose their home because they couldn't meet their mortgage payments, the federal government would look at those situations. Has the hon. minister been involved in any such program in the province of Alberta? Is the minister aware of any request for that program to protect people from losing their homes?

MR. NOTLEY: Is he helping Cosgrove look?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, again I say quite clearly that I consider that to be the responsibility of the federal government, because high interest rates is their policy. They've accepted that. Anybody who has difficulty with their mortgage payments and whose gross debt/service [ratio] exceeds 30 per cent ...

MR. NOTLEY: Pass the buck.

MR. CHAMBERS: ... may apply to the federal government for assistance. That's their responsibility, they've accepted it, and that's where people should apply.

MR. NOTLEY: Tell the people in Calder that, my friend.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary of the hon. leader in this debate, followed by a question by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, then the hon. Member for Vegreville.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister said that this is an area of responsibility for the federal government. In his capacity as minister responsible for housing, has the hon. minister made any recent — like in the last two or three weeks — representation to Ottawa, saying: look, there are some problems in western Canada; there are some problems in Alberta; what are you going to do about it? In some way relative to mortgage rates, has the minister attempted to influence the new budget that may be brought down by the federal government?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, those are hypothetical questions. [interjections] I've met in the past with ...

MR. R. SPEAKER: It was not a hypothetical question. I said: has the minister met with somebody in the last three weeks? I know it's hypothetical that he would ever be meeting. It's too nice in Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: It's hypothetical that he would do anything.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Has the minister met with anybody from the federal government on the matter?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I've been sitting in here for the last two weeks, so I haven't met with anybody from the federal government in the last two weeks. But I have previously met and conversed with the federal minister of housing, and he's well aware of my views. I say that the question the Leader of the Opposition asked was hypothetical. I'm not sure that there's going to be a new federal budget.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In question period, it's been indicated that helping Alberta home-owners, through the heritage trust fund, is a system of subsidies. Is the heritage trust fund the money of the people of Alberta or not? [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I think that question has answered itself.

MR. KESLER: If it is, then it isn't a subsidy. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the fact that the population of Alberta is 8 per cent of that in Canada, could the minister advise whether housing starts in Alberta are also comparable to the 8 per cent in Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, it seems we're doing some research in question period, and there is a very slight suspicion that there might be an ulterior motive.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister confirm whether the subsidy aspect of the loans comes from the trust fund or general revenues?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the subsidies come from general revenues. The capital comes from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. [interjection]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, of the proposed 24,000 housing starts, can the Minister of Housing and Public Works indicate what percentage the government will be involved in? Will it be 20 [per cent] of the 24,000 or all the 24,000? Is the private sector still playing a role in the housebuilding situation in this province?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, that's a good question, which I should clarify. We're projecting — and again it's only a projection; all it can be at this time — something in the order of 35,000 housing starts for this year. The 24,000 referred to are starts that are directly constructed or financed by the province of Alberta.

I think all of us would like to see greater involvement by the private sector. I hope the private sector will get back in in a much more major way this year. Of course, a big part of the difficulty has been the very high interest rate policy of the federal government.

### Long-term Care for Disabled

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care is a follow-up to the question I asked about the placement in a nursing home, for a long time, of young people with many aged people. Has the minister had an opportunity to get together the statistics to indicate to the Assembly how prevalent is the problem of having people spread throughout the province in convalescent homes? Can the minister give us that information at this time?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I don't have it all yet. I did write each nursing home in the province and every board that was responsible for the administration of those homes, asking them for a fairly detailed census breakdown of their residents and what special programs they had in place for younger people. I don't have all the replies in as yet. We've also had responses from the two boards responsible for running the Calgary children's hospital and the Fanning centre in Calgary. Some residents of the Fanning centre are attending school at the Alberta children's hospital school. Those boards are now in the process of getting together and trying to work out some mutual improvements for the lives of those particular residents.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to indicate if any short-term, interim care will be provided for these people, before we look at some centralized facilities?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to leave the impression that these younger persons aren't getting good care in the meantime; they are. What we're concerned about, and what the Health Facilities Review Committee report dealt with, is the fact that they're getting that care in an environment which is predominantly oriented towards older people, in many cases geriatric patients. The question is: can we rearrange the facilities and have another look at them, in order to make their environment more attractive? They are receiving good levels of care in the interim.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I didn't mean to infer to the minister that they were not getting adequate care; it's just that throughout the province they were in senior citizens' homes.

Is the minister in a position at this time to indicate if the study as to the use of active treatment beds for chronic care has been tabulated?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, we have some figures on that, by individual hospitals. We're going to have a better indication of the long-range picture when the two metropolitan hospital planning councils finish their bed-needs study for the year 2000. Certainly the evidence presented so far indicates a need for more auxiliary beds in the near future.

### Suncor Plant — Working Conditions

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. This afternoon, is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether the investigation concerning the PCB spill on December 2,

conducted by both the company and the department, is going to be made public? When will it be made public?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview for providing me with a memo dated April 22 and delivered to my office this afternoon. I'm able to assure him that the investigation he refers to has been investigated. My officials advise me that the transformers which have PCBs in them are properly identified and that all precautions, properly set out by the occupational health and safety division, are being taken at any time. But I haven't had an opportunity to share with my officials the further concerns he raised in the memo dated today, and will be looking into them later.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to tell the Assembly whether the investigation that took place subsequent to the spill on December 2 dealt only with that spill, or whether officials of the department evaluated the other spills which have occurred over a nine-year period?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not able to advise the Assembly at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. As a result of his discussion with officials of the department who investigated the spill of December 2, is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly as to the reasons that although spills have occurred over a period of nine years, warnings were only posted subsequent to the spill of December 2?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, that was part of the second answer I gave. Because I've just received the concerns from the hon. member, I haven't been able to review them with my officials. When I do, I will be able to respond more fully.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In discussions with officials, can the minister advise the Assembly whether he has given instructions that, in terms of evaluating the situation, there will be monitoring of leakage and atmospheric concentrations of PCBs? In the course of his discussions with officials, did he specifically instruct them to ascertain why the door to the adjacent lunch-room is continually left open, even after the spill of December 2?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, that is a continuation of the submission the hon. member made. In time, I will be able to respond more fully.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will the hon. minister undertake to have this sample of fluid, which was drawn from the transformer, analysed to determine the concentration of PCBs and the toxicity? I should just point out to the minister: don't drop it, and don't drink it.

Mr. Speaker, while he's considering the question of analysing that jar, perhaps I could ask the hon. minister whether the government is prepared to consider at this time — be very careful when you take it, Mr. Minister; I don't want you to drop it — a full inquiry on safety conditions at Suncor, pursuant to Section 29 of the Occupational Health and Safety Act?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, in my first response to the hon. member, I indicated that all safety precautions and procedures are in place. Some of the innuendoes the hon. member has raised here verbally were also in this document that he mailed to me. In all fairness to the members of this Assembly and to him, I've asked that I be given time to review it. But I do say that an example such as this is possibly a precedent that you would have to consider, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that even I don't know if I should have handled it.

Nevertheless, I know that there is a proper approach. Workers, unions, and representatives of workers in this province know the availability of the occupational health and safety people. This can be tested without having to be brought into this Assembly. It's never been refused, Mr. Speaker. My officials are co-operating and have indicated to me that Suncor, which has been accused, is a responsible employer with good safety programs in place at that plant.

MR. SPEAKER: Referring to the hon. minister's concern about the traffic in dangerous materials in the Assembly, I was assuming that this would not be a precedent and that if members wish to have analyses done of very mysterious subjects, they might arrange that outside the question period.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I assure the minister that this won't be a precedent. On the point of order, I should say that if workers can work in close proximity with this fluid, I'm sure the minister will want to have it examined as quickly as possible.

My supplementary question to the minister is with respect to the overall issue of an inquiry pursuant to Section 29. Can the minister be a little more definite in terms of a timetable? At this stage, how long does the department intend to review the information before a decision is made? Can the minister give an undertaking that a decision will be made prior to the close of the spring session of the Legislature?

MR. DIACHUK: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't give that indication of a decision to be made prior to the closing of the spring session.

#### **Oil Sands Development**

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, it's a beautiful day for playing hooky from anywhere. Consequently, I'll have to direct my question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In this Assembly, today, will the Provincial Treasurer guarantee that the government of Alberta will not take an equity position in the Alsands project?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that matter has been ventilated a number of times, in discussions in this Assembly with the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. His statements, and those of the Premier recently, still stand.

MR. KESLER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the government currently considering offering loan money to the Alsands consortium at interest rates lower than those available in current markets?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, that's the same question asked and answered a number of times. The same answers prevail.

MR. KESLER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I disagree with the answer. However, we'll ask another question. Will the Provincial Treasurer undertake to offer no better deal on interest rates to Alsands than is offered to the average Albertan?

MR. HYNDMAN: I'm not sure who the offerors are in the case the hon. member is suggesting. Is he talking about the treasury branch?

MR. KESLER: I'm talking about any available funds to the public. I'll restate the question: will the hon. Provincial Treasurer undertake to offer no better deal on interest rates to Alsands than is offered to the average Albertan? That includes anyone involved in that project.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, this Assembly, by various statutes, has made a number of differences with respect to financing over the years, bearing in mind the individual situations. For example, beginning farmers have money available to them at 6 per cent. I think that's one example of a program we should continue. So each situation, each case, as this Assembly has handled over the years, will be dealt with individually, bearing in mind the public interest of Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, would the Provincial Treasurer advise the Assembly whether there will be no shielding of any money lent to Alsands, beyond the shielding that an existing businessman in Edmonton or Calgary might be able to obtain by applying to the Alberta Opportunity Company; in short, that the level of assistance to Alsands would be no greater than the level of assistance to an existing businessman in Edmonton or Calgary?

MR. KESLER: Absolutely.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, as we've said before, and as members know, discussions are ongoing with the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and officials from Ottawa. I can simply restate that if, as, and when there are announcements or statements to be made with respect to the situation vis-a-vis Alsands, they will be made known.

MR. KESLER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It may sound repetitious, but I think we need an answer, as the answers have been repetitious as well. Would the hon. Provincial Treasurer undertake to guarantee this Assembly that the government of Alberta will not use any of the money Albertans have saved in the heritage trust fund, either to purchase equity in or provide financing for the Alsands project?

MR. HYNDMAN: Again, Mr. Speaker, the parameters for investment of the heritage trust fund have been set by this Assembly, through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act. We will scrupulously follow that.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture could assure the House that flogging of a horse like this is not cruelty to animals, and governed by provincial statute? [interjections]

DR. BUCK: You got elected for that, Rollie?

MR. KESLER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. member forgot to add: flogging of a "dead" horse.

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps while we're at it, we should also talk about riding a horse. [interjections]

MR. KESLER: A supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

MR. NOTLEY: Can you ride, Rollie?

MR. KESLER: As we've been unable to receive an answer from the hon. Provincial Treasurer, we'll have to infer somewhat in the question. What justification is he prepared to give for risking Albertans' money in a project that the private sector finds uneconomical? Does the hon. Provincial Treasurer feel that the government is better able to read the conditions of the oil industry than the oil industry itself?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the question is either hypothetical or premature, or both. If, as, and when there is any arrangement of any kind, then the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources will announce it. If announcements are made, the government will of course stand by any position it takes.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the House leader or the Provincial Treasurer, with regard to the current negotiations between our Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and the national Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Could the minister indicate whether those negotiations relative to Alsands and the other topics raised yesterday in question period, are one-day negotiations, two days? Will they go into the weekend, over into next week? Could the minister or House leader indicate the time frame with regard to current negotiations? From the negotiations, could there be any indication that the negotiations are attempting to reach some type of agreement, specifically with Alsands, because that's the question at hand?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, at this time, I don't have any definitive information as to the status of those negotiations. We'll have to see how matters develop, up to the end of the month.

#### Metrication

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Attorney General. Could the Attorney General indicate if the policy of the Land Titles Office is to issue all land titles in hectares?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member lapses into such language, I'm not sure I know exactly what it means. Maybe he and I share that disability.

I have answered in the House before that the policy of the Land Titles Office, as I recall it, is for subdivided parcels to be described in whatever manner a subdivided parcel should be described, usually by lot, block number, and the like. The policy in regard to hectares and acres applies to parcels 10 acres and larger. In those cases, both matters of description are used.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Attorney General received any reports from municipalities that are not accepting the transfer of land titles in hectares?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, none have come to my attention. It may be that if some confusion over the policy exists, municipalities would directly approach the department, in the sense of the inspector of land titles or officials. I'd be glad to ask that question of them and provide the hon. member with the information.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A further supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate the position of the department with regard to metrication, as far as the cattle industry is concerned? In the near future, are we going to convert to the metric system in the cattle industry?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the livestock industry, on its own behalf, has made application to hold any transfer of a change to the metric system as it pertains to their industry. One would have to wait and see what type of success they have.

MR. KESLER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister take steps to ensure that there is consistency in dealing with the agricultural product, in particular with the livestock product, and that as it is on the hoof, that system of measurement is used through the entire market?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, early in the 70s, application was made to retain the acre as a land measurement within agriculture. We have certainly had some support from our producer groups to keep the original standard measurement. Recognizing that there are some requirements within the federal law, at present we have been able to ask for extensions that have kept us with a measurement with which we have been used to operating.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that questions 127 and 128 and motions for returns 120 and 121 stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

## head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

209. Moved by Mr. Stromberg:

Be it resolved that the Assembly recommend to the government of Alberta that representation be made, urging the federal government to remove the requirement that weights and measures be shown *only* in metric but permit also the imperial standard, primarily in the areas of retail commercial scales and agricultural chemicals, with a phased-in changeover that relates to obsolescence and normal replacement practice as outlined in the white paper on metric conversion in Canada, tabled in the House of Commons on January 16, 1970.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, the intent of my motion is to slow down complete metric conversion, primarily in the areas of retail commercial scales and agricultural chemicals. It proposes that the Alberta government make strong representation to the federal government that weights and measures not be shown only in metric. The major argument utilized in this motion is that metric conversion in Canada, as was to occur with the phased-in changeover that relates to obsolescence and normal replacement practice, has been totally ignored — and I mean totally ignored — by the federal government.

There are many arguments in favor of slowing down complete domestic metric conversion, arguments which support this motion. Why must Canadians suffer metric marking only on domestic goods, when the major reason for metrication was to expand international trade potential? Surely to goodness Canada could operate similarly to the United States of America: products traded internationally are metric, and domestic products still use the imperial standard. At the very least, Mr. Speaker, both standards could be used until our people either become more comfortable with the metric system or until children, who are now educated in the system, age and become predominant in our society.

Mr. Speaker, the time frame for complete domestic conversion to metric could certainly be lengthened, with little negative effect. In fact, a complete shift to metric may be received more favorably later by the generations being educated in the international system units now. The conversion of agricultural chemicals to metric only, as well as the compulsory phased-in conversion of retail weight scales, have generated considerable controversy and heat, in the western provinces in particular and especially in Calgary.

Many Canadians have clearly reached a saturation point in their tolerance of any further metrication. This growing dissatisfaction and being darn well fed up is evident in a recent anti-metric petition tabled in the House of Commons a few weeks ago. This petition was 36 inches wide, 3.5 miles long, weighed 247 pounds, and asked the federal government to make metric conversion voluntary. Mr. Speaker, it was signed by an estimated 135,327 people.

In western Canada, there was a time when if a farmer suffered a disaster such as drought, flood, or losing his crops to hail, he shook his fist at the heavens and damned the CPR. This year he will be cursing metrication for his ruined fields, because the application of agricultural chemicals requires complicated calculations involving dilution ratios, chemicals to area of land, wind speed, and so on. As one farmer pointed out in a letter to the Editor of the *Edmonton Journal*, all it takes is one mistake in his computation in a change to metric, and a crop can be ruined.

It apparently does not matter to the Ottawa moguls that our weed sprayers are calibrated to use ounces, pints, or quarts, according to the chemical used. This so-called white paper presented by Ottawa advocated a phased-in changeover regarding agricultural chemicals, but since 1981 instructions for the application of farm-related chemicals has been in metric only. There was not an adjustment period wherein both the imperial and metric standards were used on the labels of agricultural chemicals.

These will be trying times this spring, when the agricultural industry tries to comprehend metrics in spraying their fields. Mr. Speaker, may I try to explain to you what is going to be involved in spraying my own fields? I have here what is probably about a 4.5 gallon can. They



used to come out in 5 gallon cans, and now it's so many litres. It's a herbicide called Torch. By the way, this pail cost me \$168. I would like to read to you. I can't figure it out; maybe you can, Mr. Speaker. I doubt if even a lawyer could figure this out. I sat up half the night reading this over, but I will just go into what the directions call for: directions for TORCH alone; directions for TORCH plus 2,4-D or MCPA, tank-mix; directions for TORCH and HOE-GRASS, tank-mix; TORCH plus AVENGE 200-C, tank-mix; and down at the bottom, TORCH and ROUNDUP. Now if this pail costs \$175, think what a pail of Avenger is going to cost. It's going to cost another \$200.

So I'm supposed to go out with this, this spring. The instructions for application say: select best tank mix for weed population presented. Well, they don't have to tell me that. I know what a weed is:

... 2,4-D, for Russian Thistle, and apply following all cautions and limitations of 2,4-D or MCPA labels. Do not apply tank mixture ...

And so forth and so on.

Now it gets a little interesting. It says,

Apply in 100 litres of water per hectare.

And it reads,

TORCH (1 pail treats 160 hectares ...

I don't know how many acres that is. I suppose my kids can figure it out for me. But it goes on and indicates,

... 125 litres per hectare) plus [2,4-D or] MCPA amine or ester at 275 to 425 grams ... per hectare.

Mr. Speaker, our system of lands in western Canada is laid out on a section and quarter basis. It's a half mile run to the end of the quarter. When we're spraying fields, we time ourselves so we will be applying at a rate of 10 gallons to as high as 20 gallons of water to the acre. We have different lengths of booms for our sprayers. Some are 60 feet and some are as high as 100. With the sprayer I have, it usually takes me about 7.25 minutes to run the full half mile and come back. If I'm travelling 5.5 miles per hour, I know I'm applying 20 gallons of water per acre. That's spreading it out pretty thin.

When I was using imperial measurement, depending on crop conditions, weather conditions, and the advanced stage of weed growth, I would use anywhere from five ounces to as high as 10 ounces of chemical. Five ounces of chemical — that would make a pretty good drink — is about the same size as this glass. That's spread out fairly thinly on an acre of land. But going through this, just one mistake, and you've burned your crop. We certainly saw that throughout Alberta last year. Field after field had been burned yellow, a tremendous financial loss.

If I eat my cornflakes in the morning, and French is looking me in the face, all I have to do is turn that package around and look at the English or the cartoons. If I buy a can of peas and French is on one side, I turn it around to see what it says on the other side. Surely we could ask that on the other side of agricultural chemicals it be in imperial; you would have your choice.

Mr. Speaker, over the years I've tabled a few things in the Legislature, from coal, to horseshoes, to brush. I'd like to table this with you, and perhaps you can tell me how to spray my crops.

[Mr. Stromberg tabled a herbicide container]

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to take part in debate on Motion 209, proposed by my hon. colleague from Camrose. I suppose you could call his speech a "canned" one. However, rising in my place, I can assure

you that I express the concerns of many of my constituents.

The 1873 Canada Weights and Measures Act permits legal use of imperial and metric systems. In 1970, metric conversion in Canada was proposed in the federal government's white paper. This conversion was to occur with a phased-in change-over related to obsolescence and normal replacement practice, a proposal which has been ignored by the federal government. At that time, in the early '70s, Canada's status as a trading nation was presented as justification for switching to the metric system. However, it must be remembered that the authors of the white paper did not advocate mandatory conversion. The paper states quite clearly that no legislative action is contemplated, which would make mandatory a general use of metric in place of inch/pound units. It was said and thought that the slow, voluntary change to metric would help Canada by opening new trading markets in metric regions. However, I think it can be argued that this did not happen.

The regulations which have made metric conversion mandatory in various sectors, were made through orders in council, pursuant to Section 10(1)(1) of the Weights and Measures Act, and were not debated. These orders in council stipulated when different sectors had to be converted to metric.

Mr. Speaker, the conversion of agricultural chemicals to metric only has caused farmers much frustration and concern. There are grave dangers in using grams per hectare or litres per hectare when using dangerous and toxic chemicals. They must be handled with supreme care and in precise amounts. As the hon. Member for Camrose has mentioned, one mistake in the complicated calculation to metric, and a crop and a year's livelihood are lost, especially when weed sprayers are calibrated to use ounces, pints, and quarts. The compulsory phased-in conversion of retail weigh scales has caused much controversy across the country, all at great cost and confusion to retailers and consumers. Many Canadians have clearly had enough of metrication. This is evidenced by the 3.5 mile long, 247 pound petition presented to the Speaker in the House of Commons not too long ago.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that the market trend to the metric system outside North America, and the increasing importance of Canada as a trading and manufacturing country, made it urgently necessary to consider the matter of conversion to metric. However, matters are further complicated because the United States, which is Canada's main export market, has not made a decision to convert. This fact should lead to a reconsideration in Canada.

Metric disciples insist on complete conversion in areas that have nothing to do with international trade. It appears that the federal government and the metric commission forgot about people when they launched this metric conversion program. Degrees Celsius, kilometres, and hectares have nothing to do with international trade. Why must Canadians suffer metric markings only, on domestic goods, when the major reason for metrication was to expand international trade? What is traded internationally could be in metric; domestic products could use the imperial measure. I am told that this is the practice in England also. Or at least, both standards could be used.

The federal government originally proposed voluntary conversion to the metric system with this phased-in change-over, which was supposed to be related to obsolescence and normal replacement practice. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely abhorrent that the federal government now

makes retailers use and bear the cost of converting existing scales to metric weight measurement, a conversion that does not relate to obsolescence and to normal replacement practice; a conversion that is costly to retailers and consumers and does not relate to world trade; a system that was supposed to be voluntary; a system that imposes fines on those who do not conform.

Mr. Speaker, let us tie our metric conversion to the United States, our major trading partner. If they go metric, perhaps we'll have to, because it's said that 70 to 75 per cent of our trade is with the United States. Let us use only the imperial system in sectors that have no connection with world trade, and let us at least use a dual system, even if metric is needed for world trade. Let us, as members of this Assembly, support Motion 209.

Thank you.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the motion concerning metrication, proposed by the hon. Member for Camrose. I'm pleased to see the initiative of the hon. member in bringing forth this needed proposal, especially in these times of economic recession. As mentioned, it's creating many hardships for many people in our province and across the country. I think many are being affected by it, especially in the agricultural industry in western Canada, as demonstrated by the illustration, that probably won't set a precedent.

Mr. Speaker, the extreme costs borne by this program to change this system have been mentioned in many reports in the last months, costs of something like \$4.5 billion to \$5 billion to Canadians. At a time when we're being told to be more efficient, we have government policy that is in fact encouraging inefficiency.

Not only are we seeing the effects in the raising of grain, as mentioned, but as more and more demands are placed upon individuals to convert to the metric system, we see many mistakes occurring in dealing with agriculture, auction marts, and in the purchasing and selling of cattle. I see a definite problem arising as this metric system becomes more ingrained. Many people will not be able to cope with it. For instance, many people dealing in the purchase of cattle, go to an auction mart and try to convert instantly from pounds to metric. I see auctioneers having to convert their method of sales. Overall, it is very, very costly to Albertans. I think the estimated costs of \$4.5 billion to \$5 billion are very underestimated as to the total effect we're going to see at this time.

I think it's been mentioned very adequately that it was presented as an order in council by the federal government, a federal government that we seem to have allowed greater latitude in making decisions for us as time has gone on. In granting that greater latitude, we see more and more infringements upon our rights. Through this order in council, we can be fined up to \$5,000 or spend two years in jail if we don't adhere to those regulations. I think the seriousness of it was brought up last week in the Calgary courts. A shop owner in a specific business who was advertising in both units — not advertising in one unit, but in both — is being charged. That will certainly set a precedent. It seems to me that's a long way from being voluntary, as was intended by the original order in council.

We've heard much discussion about the United States, the major trading partner for Canada, converting to metric. However, there are strong indications that not only are they backing off, they are going to totally shelve metric conversion. The president of the United States metrication board resigned. Since his resignation, the board has

been allowed to stagnate, and staff have not been replaced. It gives the appearance that they recognize the folly of the metric system, especially in these times of economic trials.

It's also been brought up in previous discussion in this Assembly that many other countries are re-evaluating the necessity of converting to metric. Some of those countries are Great Britain — there is some discrepancy as to how valid metrication is there — Japan, and Australia. Many of the free-world countries are taking a second look, and I think we in Alberta have to be very concerned about that. Certainly they are, and always have been, the greatest trading partners we've had. We have to value that trade, and be prepared to deal with them in the units of measure they adhere to.

I think another thing that should be brought out is the system that's being used. The *Système International* being implemented is, for all purposes, not even the universal metric unit. I think that should make us somewhat concerned. If we're converting to something that isn't an international system, it gives us another point to re-evaluate our position.

I'd like to reiterate the seriousness of it, as we now have the situation in the courts in this province. Because of that situation, I think the motion presented today is very timely. It will bring the seriousness of it to the attention of the people of the province, and to the attention of the federal government, and the fact that this province is prepared to take a stand. It hurts a little to say it, but it pleases me a great deal to see that happening. I think it's a much needed policy. Again, I'd like to say that I commend the hon. member and the government for the initiative they've shown in bringing forth this metric proposal at this time.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this debate this afternoon. I too would like to congratulate the hon. Member for Camrose for bringing forward this very timely and important motion to the Assembly.

I think it should be pointed out at the start of my participation today that weights and measures is an area of exclusive federal jurisdiction, and not an area of jurisdiction of this provincial Legislature. The substance of the motion before us today asks the government to make representation to the federal government to permit the use of imperial standards of measurement as well as metric, primarily in the areas of retail and commercial scales, and agricultural chemicals, and that the metric conversion should proceed according to phased-in change-overs that relate to obsolescence and normal replacement, as outlined in the federal white paper on metric conversion tabled in the House of Commons on January 16, 1970.

Before getting into the substance of my remarks, I would like to comment on a point made by the Member for Olds-Didsbury, with regard to how the federal government has proceeded in the implementation of metric and metric conversion. It should be pointed out that this implementation has not taken place only by order in council. First, a joint resolution before the House of Commons and the Senate in 1975 established a program of guideline dates for metric conversion in Canada. It received widespread support in the House of Commons. So a joint resolution was debated in the House of Commons, prior to a schedule for guideline dates being set forward.

Further, a statute law amendment Act, which related to

a number of actions in which the metric or standard international system would be implemented in various other Acts of the House of Commons, was proposed in 1976, debated in the House of Commons in 1977, and subsequently passed. It's true that that legislation permitted, by order in council, the implementation and the standard of measurement to be used.

Another comment on remarks by the Member for Olds-Didsbury with regard to what other jurisdictions are doing. I understand Japan has had a conversion program under way, and it is essentially complete in all areas. So from the information I have, Japan has in fact converted to metric, and Japan is a major trading partner of our country. As pointed out by other members, England is committed to a change-over to metric conversion as a result of joining the European Economic Community. In essence, England does trade in metric with the European Economic Community. Domestically, it has slowed down its conversion process because of public opposition.

The United States has a very interesting approach to metric. They are not proceeding as quickly as indicated earlier. Their national metric council has not proceeded, and appointments have not been made to that council. They are in a slowdown position. The U.S. has had an *ad hoc* approach to metric. It should be pointed out that in the area of wines and spirits, metric is now being used. The soft drink industry is converting, and metric conversion in the United States auto industry is almost 95 per cent complete. Another area one should look at is that they are selling gasoline in litres in 16 states, and the United States education system is now proceeding with regard to metric measures. As well, I understand that approximately 60 per cent of the top 500 U.S. corporations now do business in metric.

I would now like to turn to remarks I want to make. They may perhaps be a repetition of those other members have made, but they certainly reflect the feelings of the people I represent in the constituency of Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. When we as a country were looking towards conversion to metric, I think our major concern was with regard to international trade and having access to international markets, and an understanding that the majority of the world trade language of measurement was in fact metric. We also have to recognize that our largest trading partner is the United States of America, and anything we do mustn't jeopardize our position in the American market place.

Those sectors of our economy which compete internationally should be using metric, where metric is the language of measurement. We should not jeopardize our international trade opportunities and competitiveness by ignoring the realities of international trade. If some international buyer wishes to buy coal in metric tonnes, we should not insist on selling it in imperial tons. If someone wishes to buy our grain in metric tonnes, we should not insist on selling only in imperial bushels. I understand that is what is done; we sell our coal and grain in metric tonnes, not imperial tons or bushels.

The United States is our largest trading partner. If they are still using imperial linear measurements and weights, we should not proceed to convert to metric items which we trade with the U.S. market place, until the United States does. That only makes clear sense. We should not outpace the United States in terms of metric conversion. We should proceed at the same rate in order to accomplish the same goals they have, mainly because they are our largest international trading partner. We do not want to be out of sync with them.

With regard to domestic usage, there is another aspect. Do the benefits of selling in metric internationally, require us to sell exclusively in metric domestically? I say no. What happened to the principle of phased-in obsolescence and normal replacement, as outlined in the federal white paper? I believe it has been ignored and abandoned. There is not voluntary conversion according to obsolescence and normal replacement, but arbitrary and compulsory conversion as it relates to the use of weights and measures.

This motion requests that not only metric but also the imperial standard be permitted to be used in the areas of retail commercial scales primarily, and in the usage of agricultural chemicals. I think this is an excellent motion. The vast majority of our citizenry has been educated only in the use of the imperial standard: pounds, gallons, and feet. The imposition of metric, without corresponding imperial measurement, effectively makes a majority of our citizenry illiterate, from the viewpoint of the language of measurement. This motion addresses this issue.

If we move towards metric, people whose understanding is only in imperial measurements are not accommodated. They must not feel that they have been legislated into illiteracy. A massive re-education process must be initiated, which I believe is impossible. Citizens educated in imperial can be educated in metric, but are we really prepared to undertake such a massive re-education process? I think not. Metric has been introduced in our schools. As students in our education system grow older, the conversion to metric will be effected. It should be a long, gradual process. It is not something that can happen arbitrarily overnight, by setting a certain date for every citizen to think in metric.

I support the use of both metric and imperial as long as is necessary to accommodate those of us who are unilingually imperial, until the era arrives in a generation or two in the future when our society has become effectively metric, not through compulsion but through a gradual process effected by education, obsolescence, and normal replacement.

A number of our members, in particular the hon. Member for Camrose, have alluded to the area of agricultural chemicals. I think he's made an excellent representation. My representation on this matter isn't as informed as his, but a number of my constituents have brought this matter to my attention, particularly with regard to the application of chemicals and fertilizers, and the problems it has created.

As I understand it, the applicators which the majority of our farmers use are calibrated in imperial. They are used to thinking in imperial standards, as the hon. Member for Camrose so eloquently described. As he outlined, chemicals and fertilizers will be packaged in metric, and the instructions for application are going to be in metric. Conversion is complicated. Again, the hon. Member for Camrose outlined that effectively.

If you aren't careful, errors can result. Over-application of fertilizer results in burnt crops. Too strong an application of a pesticide or chemical can be hazardous, both to humans and animals. Too little fertilizer results in reduced yields. Too little pesticide or chemical will not eradicate the disease or pestilence for which it was applied. I think the hon. Member for Camrose eloquently outlined that.

Is there really a benefit to our domestic agricultural community from metrication? I say no. The use of metric and imperial, as proposed in the motion, will allow our farm community to continue to function effectively in the

language of measurement with which they are presently familiar, which is imperial, and allow them to phase into metric over time, as they become familiar with it and as they replace imperial applicators with metric applicators.

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury alluded to the question of charges relating to advertising in imperial. In our society, I think most of us feel that it is not desirable that someone should be charged because they are advertising something for sale in imperial measurements. This brings us to the question of Bill 101 in Quebec, where citizens aren't able to advertise in the English language in their storefronts. I think that as Canadians, most of us do not find that to be proper, although it is a law passed by the legislature of Quebec.

Are we being told we can only communicate in the language of metric, and the language of imperial measurement is forbidden by law? Surely, this is an infringement on a person's right to communicate in whatever language he chooses. Are the words "pound", "yard", and "gallons" not to be allowed in advertising, or eradicated from usage in the English language? If the public understands what the retailer is selling, surely it should be the individual's right to read the advertisement. If the advertisement is not libellous, obscene, or offensive, it should be allowed. Let the consumer decide whether he or she wishes to purchase whatever goods or service are advertised, in whatever language of measurement.

In conclusion, I support the motion put forward by the hon. Member for Camrose. I think it's an excellent motion. All members of the Assembly should support this motion with regard to the provincial government making representation to the federal government to allow imperial measurement to be permitted alongside metric measurement, primarily in the areas of retail/commercial scales and agricultural chemicals; if metric is going to proceed, that it be on the basis of the guidelines and proposals in the white paper, which said it should be phased in, recognizing obsolescence and normal replacement.

I support the use of metric, though. It should be used in international trade, where opportunities warrant, to ensure and maintain our international competitiveness. Secondly, I believe that domestic phase-in in weights and measures should only be done in concert with the United States, and according to the principles outlined in the white paper: obsolescence and normal replacement. I believe quite strongly that both imperial and metric measurements should be permitted in weights and measures in the areas of commercial retail scales, packaging, and agricultural chemicals, until such time as that is the only effective language in use in our educational system.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks with regard to this resolution. First of all, I think we all recognize that the metric system in Canada was developed by some federal bureaucrat, endorsed by a socialist Liberal government, and then, following that, endorsed by the Lougheed government in Alberta by legislation that came into this Assembly ...

MR. BRADLEY: And you voted for it too, Ray.

MR. R. SPEAKER: ... that supported the change of highway signs and of the use of metric. [interjections] They have it in legislation; it's there. This government brought it in and imposed it on Albertans. At that time, there were no speeches like I've heard today — not one. They were sitting back saying, we as a Lougheed govern-

ment will accept what that Ottawa government gives us; it's fine; it's now Canadian policy, and as good citizens we'll just condescend, lean back, and take it. That's where Albertans are today. We have it today because the Lougheed government got so involved with their own present circumstances that ...

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. R. SPEAKER: This hon. member isn't in order. I don't know what he'd ever have to contribute.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member would ...

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. leader just resume his seat for a moment until we see what this point of order is about.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's out of order.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to ask if the hon. member would consider a question. I would like him to ask: what the position of the provincial government of Alberta had been on the ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It would seem to me that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has been induced to yield the floor under the guise of a point of order. Had it not been put that way, I couldn't have asked him to resume his seat. The request for permission to ask a question is not a point of order. The hon. leader may or may not yield the floor for that purpose; that's entirely up to him.

MR. McCRAE: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I didn't intend to mislead you or the hon. member. I simply wondered if he would consider a question. The question I wanted him to ask me was: what was the position of the Alberta government in 1976-77, when a law was introduced in the Chamber and supported by all members? Of course, the position in that statute was one of facilitation only, to assist the private sector in adjusting to metrication in accordance with federal ...

MR. R. SPEAKER: On a point of order. It's my turn to speak, and I had the floor. I know the hon. member has the urge to speak and defend his faults and the faults of the Lougheed government, Mr. Speaker, but in your ruling I wish you wouldn't allow him to speak on my time.

MR. SPEAKER: It's not up to me to recognize a member to ask a question of a member who has the floor. That's entirely up to the member who has the floor. I think the hon. leader has perhaps misunderstood what I said. I would not have asked the hon. leader to yield the floor had I not been told that what was coming up was a point of order. I didn't know it was a question. The hon. leader has the floor with no questions, no doubts, or anything.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that very much.

I was right at a point where I wanted to remind this Lougheed government about some other things, about the great Conservative who carried that large document into the federal House, the hon. Gordon Taylor. One of the greatest Conservatives in Canada today says the metr-

ic system is terrible, the worst thing in the world. If we recall, it was that Conservative member, who now represents this Lougheed government in Ottawa, who sat in this Assembly and helped this government translate miles per hour into kilometres per hour, and approved the legislation in this House. [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, that is about as deceptive as this resolution before us. It's the very same thing. All of a sudden this group, by their polls and from their Premier, realizes that metric is on the minds of the voters of Alberta. They have now awakened after 11 years in government and said, man, we're going to fight with a resolution to Ottawa. I don't know of any member in this government — and I don't think the hon. Member for Lethbridge East, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, will even take it to Ottawa. Most likely he will be embarrassed about taking it. As normal, the hon. Member for Lethbridge East won't even take it to Ottawa. [interjections]

Here we have the Lougheed government — the hon. Premier of this province has his backbenchers doing his work for him again. We've got to go and tell the folks we're really fighting for them. Here we are, trying to say to the voters that we're going to fight against metric now. But look at the record. The record proves the point: 11 years and not one action against the metric system. Not one in those 11 years, except endorsing it by legislation in this Assembly, and bringing Bills in this Assembly that endorse the metric system; the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Housing and Public Works endorsing the metric system. Today in question period, the Attorney General endorsed the metric system by saying we could have metric in terms of land titles. It is in the law, and we condescend and give in to the federal government. We just lie back and take it from them. That is what it's all about, Mr. Speaker.

So this government, now trying to fight against political forces, brings in a resolution again to deceive or mislead the people of Alberta, or in some attempt not to tell them as it actually is. That's what we've got: a resolution to that effect. [interjections]

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is the word "deceive" ...

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that yes, this resolution should be before us today.

MR. SPEAKER: Another label has been tossed at me under a point of order. We'll have to see what's behind it.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'm asking your indulgence to find out if the words "deceive" or "deceit" are parliamentary. The hon. leader has ... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: It depends on how it's used. I think the hon. member is talking about an idea or a motion. He's not saying any member has been guilty of deception.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's very accurate and correct. [interjections] I'm talking about a Lougheed government, and his presentation to the people of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, even though saying those things, it is right even at the last hour to bring this resolution before this Legislature on behalf of the people of Alberta. I certainly commend the hon. Member for Camrose for doing that. I think it's timely and a must, whether for

political reasons or real reasons behind the matter.

I want to put this on record so that if the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs presents the *Hansard* of today to the federal government, I can give an example to whomever in the federal government might read it, of representation that I think really indicates the foolishness of the metric system in Canada at the present time; the foolishness that comes about when the metric system is used in the retail commercial business or in retail commercial sales.

I gave this example in my throne debate earlier in this session. There's a business called Mallory and Carnegie in the little town of Kirkcaldy in my constituency. That business has been there for over 80 years, owned by the same family. I remember meeting Grandpa Mallory, an excited Albertan, on his 90th birthday. He was going out in the back yard to plant a tree. He said, we need some more trees in this province. He had his pants rolled up, and out he went at 90 years of age, dug a hole, and we planted the tree together. I remember that exciting time.

The fact of the matter is that Don Mallory now owns the store, and has delivered services to that community for many years. How does he deliver? How did they deliver it over all these years? The groceries were in imperial measures — pounds, whatever. The scale has that system on it. The one gas pump out front, which has been there for years and years, sells gas in gallons. His customers in that local community have always bought in pounds, ounces, et cetera. The gasoline has always been bought in gallons. Everybody's happy: a happy seller, a happy, satisfied consumer. The law now says to him, change the scale and the gas pump to metric. He's had the estimate done, and this is what it will cost him: \$2,000 to change those two scales and the gas pump. He said to me in my pre-session meeting: who pays the \$2,000; because the federal government wants me to do it, are they going to pay for it? He said, I didn't ask for that in my business; my customers do not ask for it. The answer is that he has to pay it. Who does he take it out of? His customers who, as it is at the moment, are pressed to pay their regular grocery bills and gas bills.

That example can be translated through every small town in Alberta, through every business in the large urban centres of Alberta. The situation is totally unfair, illogical, and irresponsible by any government at this time in history; specifically irresponsible when we have such an economic turnaround that causes this kind of situation. It's unfair. I can only recommend that this government, through its ministers and through its Premier, make this a major presentation to the federal government. Because if we can stop it now, we can still save the imposition on many businesses across this province, and certainly stop it in other provinces in western Canada.

That's the unfairness, Mr. Speaker. That is the most bureaucratic, socialist approach to government I have ever known. It's got to stop. That kind of thing must stop, because it's unnecessary. We talk about international trade. Anybody who deals in international trade has computers that can translate these systems back and forth by pressing a few buttons. They don't need us all to be in metric to serve their purposes. There's no way that is necessary, because they do it every day when they deal with countries throughout the world. They will continue to do that. So anybody who sold the federal government that it was necessary for us all to be metric so we could have better opportunity in international trade, is foolish and unthinking at this point in time.

Mr. Speaker, we must go back to basics. Our responsi-

bility in this Legislature, where hopefully all of us sitting in this House right now believe in the free market system, is that we must allow the consumer and the seller to determine those kinds of transactions, and not intervene so that we cause artificial situations that cause increased costs to our consumers and vendors of goods in the market place. That's basic to what we should do. If the federal Liberal government in Ottawa had that tenet as one of its objectives, we wouldn't be in the position we are today. If the Lougheed Conservative government had remembered that tenet, maybe even if the Social Credit Party over the last few years had remembered that tenet and spoken up, and even if the MP I referred to earlier had recalled that tenet as he sat in this Legislature and in the House of Commons, we wouldn't be in the situation we're in today. But we are. I think it's up to us as legislators, the government which must go to Ottawa on our behalf, to fight and scream and kick as hard as we can to stop what is being imposed on us, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, as I rise today to participate in support of Motion 209 from the hon. Member for Camrose, I'd like to deal first with some of the comments made by the hon. Member for Little Bow, the Leader of the Opposition, and review *Hansard* of October 22, 1976. I noted the members who spoke on that motion. The Member for Edmonton Calder, now Minister of Housing and Public Works, carried the Bill through. The others who spoke on it were Mr. Zander of Drayton Valley, Mr. Cookson of Lacombe, Mr. Taylor of Drumheller — I should say, in review of most of their comments, that all issued cautions relating to the Bill — Mr. Clark from Olds-Didsbury, Mr. Young from Edmonton Jasper Place, Mr. Horsman from Medicine Hat-Redcliff, Dr. Horner and, closing debate on second reading, Mr. Chambers.

I'll go through that list again, Mr. Speaker, but I don't believe I saw there the name of the hon. Member for Little Bow, speaking against that Bill on second reading. I must confess that I don't have the copies of third reading, if indeed there was debate on third reading. So we can't use that word he was using, because it would refer to one member. I suggest that maybe he is guilty of the same thing he is accusing the rest of us of, as members of the Legislature.

AN HON. MEMBER: Surely not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame.

MR. HYLAND: I'd like to quote from the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's Medicine Hat.

MR. HYLAND: Then it was Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

I have yet to hear explained to me, and I'd certainly be willing to be convinced, that this in fact was entered into with the full knowledge of the elected representatives of the Members of Parliament of this country.

He goes on to question where indeed metric really started, whether it was from a committee of certain departments, from a conference, or whatever. A little later he replies to some comments made by the previous speaker:

It seems to me the approach taken by the Member for Edmonton Jasper Place this morning is somewhat along the line that if something unpleasant is

going to happen to you, you might as well relax and enjoy it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, does that sound like people who were in total support of the Bill? Cautions were expressed. The hon. member who spoke before me was not on that list. I must confess that neither was I. Maybe in some ways I'm as guilty as he is; we must share the guilt.

We've heard other members talk about the problems related to spray in the agricultural industry, to the purchase of livestock at live weight, and all the problems that come about when you're applying chemicals, dealing with litres and hectares, and trying to convert that to acres, the way our land is measured. The majority of members who spoke before me issued cautions related to that. I think that portion has been well covered. This year we will probably see more burned fields, as the hon. Member for Camrose suggested, because maybe some of the old cans farmers kept around from the year before will now be rusted, and they won't be able to read the paint on them, or new kinds of sprays will come out with all the instructions in metric. I did note that when the cans got smaller, for some strange reason the price didn't drop. The price remained about the same. There really wasn't a saving to the farmer.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what percentage of our chemicals are made in the United States. But as some members have suggested, with the U.S. still being on imperial measurement, and anything being exported into Canada having to be metric, I wonder how much extra cost that has put on some of our chemicals, when we have to have different sized cans and different printing. Even the printing isn't the same, let alone the size. That has to cost us extra. The reverse: what happens when chemical companies in Canada produce agricultural chemicals to go into the States? Their competitive edge must be injured when they have to double all their packaging.

We've heard about the problem in Calgary with the person being charged for advertising in both metric and imperial. The Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest related that to the similarities with Bill 101 in Quebec, and people there not being able to advertise in English. Here, we're not able to advertise in imperial measurement. Maybe we should approach that the way the federal government has approached Bill 101. Maybe instead of the federal government taking the provincial government to court, we should take the federal government to court and see if indeed we can only advertise in one language, and can't use imperial words. Indeed, that is a language.

Last fall, I found out one of the many advantages of living in southern Alberta. I went down to Great Falls for a weekend and was able to buy a measuring tape in feet and inches, with no metric on it. I have trouble enough cutting two pieces of plywood to match up. It's about twice as bad when it's in metric, and I don't know what I'm doing. I'm sure a lot of people are in the same position.

There are a lot of people in this country with houses that were obviously built before metrication. What's going to happen to all these houses if we're appearing to depart from the voluntary metrication, as in the white paper, to a mandatory one? What happens when you go to fix your house up, and a sheet of gyproc is half an inch short on the edges? You lose one-third of the sheet to match the studs. As other members related, those kinds of costs haven't even been tabulated yet. I'm sure we're really going to feel those costs as time goes on.

Mr. Speaker, I believe nobody has talked today about

mechanics working on vehicles — the grassroots. In my understanding, because they're not self-employed, mechanics cannot deduct the cost of their tools against their income tax. They are employed on a wage. So they have to buy a complete set of tools. A good set of tools can run anywhere up to \$3,000 or \$4,000. They have no direct benefit.

It's just another example like the Member for Little Bow used, of the person in his area who is having to pay the direct cost of conversion of his scales and gas pump, except that unless the person who employs him pays him more money, the mechanic is in the same situation as the farmer. He doesn't have total control over his end income. He is in a squeeze where he has to pay out this money with no direct benefit. Sure, you can talk about big companies can buy the tools, et cetera; that's fine. But the majority of these people are employed by somebody else and have to supply tools themselves. It's just a cost to them.

Today we have heard all members say, why not have a dual system? Why can't we advertise in both imperial and metric when we're relating to measurements? What's wrong with that? To me that appears to be simple. It doesn't create a problem. As children are educated, through time and through natural attrition they'll understand the metric system properly. I don't know if it was during his speech or during our conversation, but the Member for Camrose related how, if he has a problem when he looks at something metric, he asks his young daughter; she can tell him the change right away. It's starting to happen. I think we should look at that.

I feel that people all over Canada grudgingly accepted the change from miles to kilometres; they accepted the change in the road signs. Now they're starting to react to the changes in measurement where they have to deal with it every day in stores, where they're not sure exactly what they're buying according to the old system, so they're wondering about the change in the value they're getting for their dollar at a time when there is a cost/price squeeze on the dollar.

On average, I think people have been accepting metrication, and they're just full of it. It's not a voluntary thing anymore. It's something that's been forced upon them. I think people are willing to change but are not willing to be changed, especially the people in western Canada. I think that's the key phrase: they don't want to be changed. If it's voluntary and they can see an advantage, they'll change. But anytime anybody starts forcing something, there's a reaction. That's what we're getting now, that reaction to being changed.

Maybe we need to be metric on the international scale. It's a simple matter with the heritage trust fund grain hopper cars this Assembly agreed to purchase. I think they hold 3,300 bushels of wheat; I don't know what that works out to in tonnes. But when any farmer I know goes to the elevator and figures out his yield, he doesn't figure it out in tonnes; he figures it out for himself in bushels. Even though his truck hauls so many tonnes, he still wants to know how many bushels he had on it. At least in that respect, it is a more precise measurement that you can visualize. Yet that was accepted. But I don't really see why we couldn't still have the old system — the calculations in the export markets can be made quickly — especially with our major trading partner, the U.S., not going totally and quickly into metric.

I think we should indeed look at this motion and reconsider our hurry toward compulsory total metrication. In our urge to agree with metrication and adopt it as

a voluntary working language — even the government of Alberta has made some steps related to it. Some of them, such as provincial buildings being designed and tendered in metric, were made at the wish of the industry. Alberta Housing and various other groups work in metric. Sure, the average person building a house today would be looking at metric. But I don't see why we couldn't have both, so we could indeed understand the sizes.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, seeing as you're starting to get ready to cut me off, I would just like to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I wouldn't be as rude as that. I was just going to ask the hon. member if he might conclude.

MR. HYLAND: I would just like to conclude with part of the conclusion of a debate in the House of Commons that I read in my research. I forget which member made it. But part of it was three numbers, 36-24-36, supposedly that of a perfect figure; 90-60-90, apparently relates to the same thing. I suppose one could live with that. Maybe the only good thing coming out of metrication is that certain members of this Legislature will have their weight listed in only three numbers.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

#### head: PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (Second Reading)

##### Bill 219 Alberta Scientific Research Foundation Act

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise and move second reading of Bill 219.

Bill 219 is basically enabling legislation to create a scientific research foundation. The legislation is not detailed and has purposely been left so. It creates a research foundation, and it would be funded by this Legislature at some later time. It can also receive gifts in kind from industry or the private sector. Briefly leading the members through it, Mr. Speaker, it's designed to be an arm's length foundation, with some representation provided by the cabinet. The cabinet would appoint some distinguished personnel to head this foundation dealing in science policy. There would be a representative from industry, from the Alberta Research Council, and from the universities of Alberta and Calgary.

Mr. Speaker, in a sense the model is the Heritage Foundation for Medical Research, that the Premier of the province proposed to the Legislature in 1979. Basically the legislation suggests we should try to complement that very laudable initiative in medical research by also trying to focus our energy in a variety of other areas, which will probably have a pay-off in jobs at some point in the future.

In part, the government's program has been to diversify the economy and try to get the province of Alberta off the hewers of wood and drawers of water syndrome Canada's been plagued with as well. We've heard the line that quite often jobs are going down the pipeline. It's a fact that until this government came into office, we didn't have very much upgrading of our natural resources. Oil was funnelled out, with no upgrading, to eastern Canada or the United States. By and large, our agricultural products were sent out in a raw state as well. This

government came into office in 1971 on the platform that it would diversify the economy and provide a future for Albertans. Bill 219 can be thought of as part and parcel of that initiative.

Over the last month, Mr. Speaker, I've been speaking to a number of people in the university communities and the private sector. Some suggestions for improvement have been made. Maybe I could enter them now. I realize they couldn't be effected until we reach committee stage on this Bill, which I hope we can do this fall, after second reading is given, it's passed, and we go on to implementing it. I say that with my tongue somewhat in my cheek. The suggestions made, and I think they are reasonable, are that we specify that engineering is part of this package. It is suggested, in the reference to applied science, that engineering be part of this program, but it isn't explicit. It's been suggested that the title be amended to the Alberta Scientific and Engineering Research Foundation. That's very reasonable.

Secondly, we might consider creating a board of scientific advisers below the foundation board. Like the Heritage Foundation for Medical Research, those people would be selected from distinguished scholars worldwide. They would make recommendations to the board on funding specific projects. Thirdly, we provide a system of incentives that would be given to researchers. Specifically, researchers would be given a share in the patent rights of any new products or technology developed through this. It might be a way to encourage researchers working on a project to be a little more innovative and hard working. Certainly that's the private-sector or free-enterprise approach this government would like to adopt in everything it does. I think doing that is worth while in this area of endeavor as well.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, let me ask why we would need this sort of initiative. We're doing pretty well in Alberta, aren't we? That's what I hear. The answer is probably yes, we do have a reasonably good track record. We have about 10 per cent of all the research done in Canada being done here in Alberta, which is about average. We're not great, and we're not bad. We have some fine people in the Alberta Research Council. Mr. Musgreave, a member from the Assembly, is chairman of that Research Council. They are doing a fine job in traditional areas of activity in this province, energy and coal. It's fair to say that the Alberta Research Council has a very fine reputation. Earlier I mentioned the Heritage Foundation for Medical Research. It is just gearing up now. They're attracting some fine scholars to Alberta, both on a permanent basis and visiting scholars. They're providing a lot of initiative in this area of activity, and hopefully it will pay off. Advances in medical science will be of benefit to Albertans and will be attracting high-technology industry to spin off the developments that take place in the long run.

AOSTRA too deserves special mention. It's doing a pretty good job in areas related to energy development. Of course, we have Farming for the Future. Last week, I introduced for second reading a Bill for second reading that deals with trying to boost agricultural research as a key area, just targeting in on that one spot.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that as a province we account for about 10 per cent of all the research done in this country. But Canada has some major problems. To say we're doing an average job in Canada is not very laudatory at all. We have basically been a country of hewers of wood and drawers of water. When I was with the Hon. Bill Diachuk and his select committee on

workers' compensation, we visited a number of countries, including Germany. At that time, with a number of members of the Assembly here, we had a chance to go through the Bayer chemical plant in Cologne, Germany. In one research facility, that one company has more PhDs and researchers than the University of Alberta.

We asked, why do you have so many people on staff? The answer is very simple. They told us that in a very competitive world market place, the only way Germany could stay ahead of the Japanese, Brazilians, and others in production was to create new products that hadn't been developed yet. They could market lightweight, high-impact plastics that no one else had. They had no competition. That is the way Germany, in part of their industrial strategy, is keeping ahead of the competition. In the Bayer chemical plant, they spend fully 8 per cent of sales, not profits, on research and development of new pharmaceuticals, plastics, and chemicals, so they can be ahead of the competition.

I submit that Canada is exporting resource products and allowing others to exploit them, in part because we're not taking advantage of the opportunities we have and doing the research to develop new and innovative products we could market worldwide. Alberta has perhaps a twofold disadvantage, because we are a colony of a colony. If Canada has that role in the world market place, then certainly this province has that role in Canada. We export our raw products to be processed largely in central Canada, or in the world market place. We fulfil that role for a country that is fulfilling that role for others. If we're going to break out of that mold, we have to be bold. This government has repeatedly been told to be bold.

Mr. Speaker, I think most people would agree that research and development has a role in industrial strategy. Research is thought of not as an expenditure but as an investment. That's exactly what it is. It's an investment in the future. Canada has some long-range problems ahead, and Alberta has a share of those problems. We have very severe manpower shortages at the graduate research level, the level of trying to develop expertise at PhD level. A lot of our PhDs in the sciences are retiring or are of retirement age. The people who went through our universities 30 or 40 years ago are now reaching a stage in their careers where they would like to take a break, and there's nobody coming up behind them. That's going to really affect this province, because in some key areas this is a particular problem.

In key areas for this particular economy, we should be concerned about forestry. In forestry, Canada is going to experience a rapid downturn in the number of people available to do the research; for example, on poplar development. If that's important in northern Alberta — and a lot of my colleagues in northern Alberta have been talking about the opportunities for aspen products — we're not going to have the staff available to take advantage of that natural resource. That's true in petrochemicals and in a variety of research areas. We're not even keeping pace with the miserable job we're doing as a country, let alone recognizing a basic structural problem in our economy and trying to solve it.

A scientific research and engineering foundation, as proposed in Bill 219, can go some way. It's not a be all and end all; it's not a panacea. But it can go some way in addressing this problem. It can go some way in trying to help Alberta become a high-tech centre — I think the Premier used the phrase "brain centre". The Premier has an excellent track record, in that area, in medical re-



search. This foundation would try to broaden that perspective into other areas as well. Areas we could contemplate activity in, for example, would be electronics or pharmaceuticals. At the University of Alberta, Chemobiomed is a good example of a small company that has developed some products which are in demand worldwide and providing jobs in Alberta. We should be doing more of that. Computing science would be another good area; cold-weather engineering is an area of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, a person could ask, aren't we doing enough in Alberta? We are spending about \$300 million a year in the private sector, industry, and at the university level, and that sounds like a lot of money. But if we're going to keep up with the industrial countries like Germany, Japan, France, the EEC countries, or the United States, we're not investing enough in the future.

What I'm really trying to do with the proposal before us, Bill 219, is just ask, shouldn't we be considering the opportunities we have? Shouldn't we be bold? Shouldn't we be doing more in trying to act out that ideal we have of having a diversified economy that is high tech, can ship out light products to a world market and not have to ship out bulky heavy products, natural resource products, which is basically exporting jobs? I think everybody in this Assembly has talked about that to their constituents.

If we move today in this area, Mr. Speaker, we won't be seeing developments in this regard for perhaps five or 10 years. You have to have that kind of long-range approach to creating jobs. By moving in 1982, we might start to see some benefits at the close of this decade. But our failure to do so is going to mean that the situation is going to get much worse, as those retiring researchers leave the system and we're in a much worse position than we are today — and today we're not in a very good position at all.

Alberta really needs a science policy. It's key to the industrial development strategy for this province. We should be trying to develop a science strategy that also emphasizes development: that develops ideas, concepts, and products right here in Alberta, so we're not shipping ideas to Toronto to be developed in the Connaught labs, if we're developing pharmaceuticals; so we're not sending technology and ideas to Germany or Japan. So, Mr. Speaker, we have to do both things. We have to invest in research and in developing the ideas that come out of that.

The Canadian Federation of Independent Business has gone on record as supporting this kind of move. It's reported in the Science Council of Canada report, *Forging the Links*, that small business needs the Canadian government, the Alberta government, to make major investments in this area. I think there is a developing consensus in Canada. In a document entitled *Agenda for Action*, the Canadian Manufacturers Association said that Canada has to "come to grips". We don't have the economic advantages other countries have, and we have to take steps to develop an industrial strategy that emphasizes research and development, innovation, and create new products to market in the world market place.

Mr. Speaker, I'll just briefly quote a report of the Federation of Independent Business:

There is only one way out for Western nations like Canada; [that is to rely] on impressive new technological innovation.

The way out they're referring to is economic decline. If you look at Canada's GNP and our standard of living, they have declined dramatically since the 1970s. As you compare our standard of living to the United States,

Germany, or Japan, we're not keeping pace. Even Italy outranks us, and we used to laugh at Italy a few years ago. We have to face the fact that in the federation's view, Canada is a "second-rate industrial nation". We have to make that transition, that investment.

Mr. Speaker, we have a leadership role in Alberta. We've referred to that role in a number of areas: in the constitution, in energy. We recognize we have some special problems in industrial development in this province. Alberta should be bold, and we should move in this kind of direction.

I'd like to close with a few observations. Our Premier has moved dramatically in this regard with the Heritage Foundation for Medical Research. I think it should act as a precedent for moving just as boldly in an area that will benefit us in industrial development. We have to assemble a critical mass, and it's much like a nuclear reaction. Innovation requires people from a variety of disciplines, interacting with one another and recreating or recombining information and knowledge in new and exciting ways. In order to do that, we can't focus narrowly on one area like medical research, because medical research requires a competent base in chemistry, biology, physics, engineering, computer science. You have to have all those things in place as building blocks before you can move in an area like medical research, or having moved in that area, to take advantage of the new ideas and new technology. You have to have the computing science background in order to take full advantage and back up industry as it moves to develop those jobs and market a new product.

Mr. Speaker, we have to assemble a critical mass. Not only are we not assembling that critical mass in Canada, we're falling back. As people retire in the next few years, we're finding it difficult to replace them. PhDs going through universities, even in Alberta, are declining in real numbers. We're not producing as many PhDs in this province or this country as we used to. We need people who are going to provide that critical mass in engineering, chemistry, or physics, to provide the technology that will provide jobs for this province.

We are doing a pretty good job, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think we should be negative. The Alberta Research Council is doing a fine job. The Alberta universities are doing a pretty fair job in research, although there I suggest we have to emphasize excellence. AOSTRA has a good reputation. The private sector is moving in a variety of areas, largely energy-related. We have a fine reputation in agriculture, especially with Farming for the Future. We have a good base. But if we are bold and imaginative, we can capitalize on that base that is being put in place. In perhaps 10 or 15 years, Albertans will say that this government moved dramatically and decisively to diversify the Alberta economy in the mid-80s. We are doing that now in a variety of areas. I only suggest that we should be a little bolder.

Incidentally, this idea of the creation of a foundation is not new. It does have the support of a variety of people from the private sector and the universities. I have a lot of correspondence relating to that, and I think hon. members of the Assembly have received some as well. The time to be bold is now. That's how I'd like to conclude my remarks.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words about Bill 219, the Alberta Scientific Research Foundation Act, proposed by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry. As he said, this is not a new idea. It has been around for some time. As chairman of the cabinet science

policy committee on research, I would like to tell my colleagues about some of the other proposals that I have had the experience of reviewing in the last couple of years.

One was called the very long based array telescope system, which I think wanted roughly \$25 million, and we were to put up the capital funds. There was a request for a \$25 million solar foundation, to be built in southern Alberta. There was a request that we fund the *Science Forum* magazine, which is published in Quebec and was in danger of collapsing because of lack of funds; it has since collapsed. There was a request by the science and engineering department of the University of Alberta for a technological foundation that would generate roughly \$200,000 to \$300,000 per year, that was to be used by researchers. Now in the mill in the university milieu is a biological foundation, which will come to about \$100 million.

This very proposal that the hon. member suggested is right now being developed for consideration by our science policy committee, and eventually cabinet and the caucus, by the responsible departments of the University of Calgary and the University of Alberta. These are all very good, and some have a return that will be sooner rather than later. But they are still under review, and I would like to point out some of the difficulties we have in addressing ourselves to science and the development of research in Alberta, particularly in the private sector.

First of all, the science policy the hon. member suggests we should have has been very well developed in the province of Quebec. They issued a white paper, held forums, and studied it throughout the province. In the usual sort of French attitude, they've come up with a very formal system, but an interesting system in that they have developed a scientific advisory council representing the entire province. Obviously they are concerned about it, because the Deputy Premier is responsible for it. But they also link culture with science. The objectives are co-ordinated, funded, and allocated in specific areas.

Last fall I had the pleasure of chairing a day-long meeting the day that Quebec decided not to join in our constitution. I had a meeting with the Deputy Premier of Quebec. He was on a tour of western Canada, to see how other provinces have handled the matter of science and the development of a science policy. While they have a formal plan, an advisory council, and all this input, his concern was that at the cabinet level they have no method of bringing the various departments together. So they didn't have a science policy committee, as we have developed in the past years.

Similarly, Ontario doesn't have a science policy as such. But one of planks of the Ontario Conservative government in the last election was the BIL program, which was the formation of a biological institute which will see the spending of several million dollars over the next few years in a biological program being developed with Labatt's brewery. Remaining provinces have similar attempts to co-ordinate research and development. In the western premiers' conference this month, which was postponed, part of the meeting was to concern itself with research and development in the western provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Bill's objectives are very good; there's no question of their merit. As expressed by the member, serious concerns have been expressed by such people as the president and chairman of Northern Telecom and the president of the National Research Council of Canada. The Conference Board in Canada issued a recent report on research and development, and where we

are going in Canada. As the hon. member suggested, these organizations view it from the world scene. They view our part in that and the future opportunities. Fortunately for Canada, the attitude of our federal government is changing in a significant way. The new Minister for Science and Technology, Mr. Roberts, has been fortunate enough to get more money.

One of the things under consideration, which will interest the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, is the development of a research laboratory in Alberta. I assume it will be in northern Alberta, and that could be anywhere north of Calgary. The purpose of this laboratory will be to establish and study northern climatic problems, particularly relating to development in the Arctic. This is part of the long-range plan of the National Research Council to try to get involved in more difficult problems throughout Canada. They have a similar institution that's just about finished in the province of Newfoundland, and they are completing one in Montreal, Quebec.

The science policy committee, of which I am chairman, is working on a proposed paper that would in effect become a basis for a science policy. It's difficult to develop an overall umbrella concept. Several jurisdictions are very jealous of their domain. All you need to do is talk to the University of Calgary and suggest that the University of Edmonton is coming up with a proposal that's not unique to the University of Calgary, and you'll know exactly what I mean. They want to protect their money. I suggest to the hon. member that many members of our Executive Council have struggled with this problem of developing a research and science policy for the province, and we are still working on it.

In the recent approval of the estimates for the Alberta Research Council, one of the new approaches we are making this year is the formation of a science secretariat. We will have one very senior civil servant on this, with the ability to draw people from industry and from other departments who will advise the president of the Research Council, who is our consultant on the science policy committee, on such proposals as have previously come forward.

As the hon. member said, the government's program has been good. I think it's been excellent. When you consider the things we have done in this province in the name of research and development, compared to what has been achieved in the rest of Canada, and the very great difficulties anybody has with spending money — when you say to somebody, well there's no rate of return for two years, four years, maybe 10, or maybe 20. A lot of people don't realize that the Clark process of separating the tar sands, used by the Syncrude and Suncor projects, was developed by Professor Clark at the Alberta Research Council in the early '30s. It has taken all those years to bring it to fruition, where it can become economical. The Alberta Research Council is one of the oldest institutions in Canada; it was formed over 60 years ago. To date, we have spent over \$100 million in AOSTRA, which is responsible for the separation of oil from oil sands.

The hon. member mentioned Farming for the Future. We also have federal and provincial experimental farms in our province. He mentioned the medical research foundation, which sees proceeds of \$300 million at work. A food processing plant is under way in southern Alberta. We also have the Vegreville Environmental Centre. We have a long-range plan in the Alberta Research Council, which anticipates our staff moving from 500 to

1,000 people in the next five years. We will soon be letting our contracts for the site work of the Alberta Research Council in southern Edmonton. The land and buildings will cost almost \$100 million by the time it's built and equipped. We've spent, and are spending right now, millions in renovating the University of Alberta campus building for the Alberta Research Council. We have under consideration a new office building at Clover Bar. We have coal processing work at Nisku and Devon, under the energy resources research fund, which was signed in 1974 by our province and the federal government.

I would like to mention what's happening in the private sector in Alberta. Petro-Canada has built a new research centre in Calgary. Shell Canada has one in Calgary. Bell-Northern is building a major research centre in Edmonton. Arctel Canada is building a solar regional laboratory in Calgary. Nova corporation is building one in Calgary. Biologicals Ltd., a Toronto company, has recently signed a joint agreement with the Alberta Research Council to create a biotechnology enterprise at the Research Council laboratories on the University of Alberta campus in Edmonton.

A plan is under way to establish a major laser engineering centre at the University of Alberta, with major focus on fusion research. The University of Alberta is also setting up its own microelectronic centre, under the centres of excellence program. The university is undergoing a major re-equipment program in electron microscopy. The University of Alberta isotope dating centre is also re-equipping, to make it one of the best centres of its kind in the world for geological and biological dating studies.

I know what the hon. member said about people retiring. But this should make him appreciative of what's actually happening in Alberta: at the University of Calgary, enrolment this year is up 11 per cent, with most of the increase coming from enrolment in the sciences. I'm happy to say that over a quarter of the present class of engineering students are women. I think most of my colleagues will appreciate that women do have half the brains in the community. The quicker we get more women involved in science and technology, the better it will be for all of us. Many people, particularly in eastern countries such as Russia, are using and have used women for a long time in the fields of science and development.

Mr. Speaker, in addition I would like to mention briefly the long-range plans of the Alberta Research Council. We have four main thrusts: the expansion of research in oil sands and heavy oil sands, a major expansion of research in coal, the further development of service to industry, and the seeking of new ways to work with industry in Alberta economic development. We are focusing a substantial effort in frontier sciences likely to be of long-term economic benefits, such as biotechnology. For any of this to be effective, the important thing is that we need the necessary financing, production, marketing, and other functions. I would just like to mention that one of the difficulties we have is, first of all, keeping the plans moving ahead for our facilities; secondly, obtaining enough facilities; and, thirdly, I think there has to be more guidance by government when huge amounts of public expenditures, such as I mentioned briefly, are involved.

I think we should consider a science council of Alberta, similar to what's been established in Quebec, where we would get input from all sectors, and I think this could be in the form of an advisory role. I would like to point out that, in my view, the government has taken a very posi-

tive step. I would like to take some credit for this as a member of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund standing committee of the Legislature. Our Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower introduced a \$100 million scholarship program, which has seen a significant increase in enrolment as a result of scholarships that are directed towards encouraging our young people to stay in universities or to go to universities and become equipped, particularly in the fields of science.

I feel and I know that our Minister of Economic Development has a venture capital company under consideration. This in itself is another way we can take some of the efforts of our research and development and put them into the market place. People who do the basic research unfortunately don't necessarily by nature worry about where the money comes from or whether it's going to be economical. So we need some system of evaluation and some ways of making sure that when these developments go from the laboratory into the pilot plants and then finally into the market place, they're going to provide an economic return.

I'd like to mention too that there are other projects. This is one of them. It's very challenging, but it's expensive. We are certainly encouraging new worlds of science. There will be other matters we'll consider. I think it's good to have the opportunity to debate this Bill today. I obviously can't support it. I think we are in the process of achieving many of the objectives of the hon. member. What I would like to suggest is that we need more discussion of where we are going and how we're going to get there. We have many institutions in place. The medical foundation, with a \$300 million fund, is a very new institution when you compare its life of one or two years versus the 60-odd years of the Alberta Research Council. I think we should give these institutions an opportunity to develop.

I appreciate what's happening in our universities, the new crop of young people who are coming forward. We know the general attitude of our society, at both federal and provincial levels. We are becoming conscious of the difficulties we're facing when we look at our competitive position with Japan, Germany, and some of these other well-developed countries. I think we're aware of the fact that we cannot continue to just export resources alone, if we're going to maintain our standard of living. Yes, our standard of living has dropped compared to, say, 15 or 20 years ago. Obviously it's at our peril that we ignore what the hon. member has mentioned. But I feel we should try to emphasize and adjudicate what we are doing, and encourage those institutions we presently have in existence to fulfil their mandate before we launch another venture.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to stand and make some remarks on Bill 219. First of all, I'd like to say that I'm beginning to understand more all the time some of the difficulties this government has in dealing with the problems, as I hear the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight indicate to the Assembly that PetroCan is a private-sector contributor. I find that difficult to accept.

As I look at Bill 219, item number 3(1): "The Foundation shall be managed by a Board of 9 members of whom ..." It then carries on with the delegation of authority in the board. It kind of reminds me of Alberta's position in Confederation, where we have no representation and feel somewhat alienated. I find the Bill interesting in that there are three major universities in the province of Alberta, in Edmonton, Calgary, and Lethbridge. Howev-

er, the hon. member who has presented the Bill feels that it's important to have two appointed from the University of Alberta, one from the University of Calgary, and the University of Lethbridge, in southern Alberta, seems to have missed being recognized in that role. If it's a Bill that pertains to a research foundation for all Alberta, certainly the entire province should have had initial representation on that board.

I concur with the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight in the number of foundations, organizations, or councils that are already in place to do research. I concur with him that there isn't a need at this time for Bill 219. I think we're in a time of economic suppression or recession, and the government at this time has the responsibility to show restraint in developing new programs, especially where there's an overlap. As I look at the Executive Council report on the estimates, it says part of the Alberta Research Council's function is to:

...research activities in new fields or subject areas that are considered to offer long-term opportunities for Alberta.

It appears to me that those suggestions in Bill 219 could be incorporated in that area, saving more bureaucratic establishment in Alberta at this time of unneeded spending.

I also have difficulty accepting a situation where we have more government spending and encouragement of more government spending when I feel there are ways that perhaps we could better get the private sector involved. There certainly must be some policies or programs that could be implemented so that, by leaving tax dollars in their pockets, we could encourage the oil companies, the petrochemical industry, the textile industries, the medical profession, dental, veterinarian — whatever they might be — to get involved in research and do their own research. Oftentimes, through the research of these private companies, we have totally unrelated scientific discoveries being made.

As I go down through the list, I have another problem in number 5, where we deal with intellectual property: "to acquire, hold and alienate real, personal and intellectual property ...". It seems to me that that could become a very legal interpretation. I think we've seen evidence of that particular situation even in the oil industry in the last two or three years, where information individuals have had through research has been made available to other companies. Because of that information being made available to other companies, we've had long drawn-out court cases that have run into virtually thousands and thousands of dollars. I find that that's probably an area where we could run into some difficulty.

Another area that I find some difficulty with in is that "the Foundation shall not be operated for the purpose of profit or gain." If we don't have some incentive, and if we're not out there to be productive, I think we're involved in a futile exercise. When you take away that initiative, whether the research produced is a valuable commodity or not, I think we have to be looking down the road. Hopefully the foundation could support itself. It could only support itself if they have in mind that they are going to create a situation where they would have profit or gain. It doesn't matter to me whether it's the private sector or a government organization, or a government body or a private body: if they're not involved in it so they have financial rewards, if they're having a cash input, perhaps they're losing sight of the object of a business.

As mentioned, I think these areas of research — and

it's been proven. I like to use the example of the United States where, through a responsible, free-enterprise system — leaving tax dollars in the private sector instead of confiscating the wealth and funnelling it through government bureaucratic departments — in 200 hundred years that country made the most — significant scientific progress of any time on the earth. I think we have to recognize that. They did it because of the freedom that individuals and individual companies had. I think we have to relate back to that. We have to give individuals and individual companies that incentive again, so that we can progress and that our standard of living once again reaches the potential we've fallen behind in.

Basically those are my comments. Anything the private sector can do, we should allow them to, through different means and methods. As mentioned, we have the Research Council in place. We have other research organizations that are doing an adequate job, especially at this time. I don't think we need to burden society with additional costs. For that reason, I find it very, very hard to accept and support Bill 219.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member be prepared to answer a question?

MR. KESLER: I'm not the man who wrote the Bill.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I just wondered if you were aware of the many billions of dollars the U.S. government has put into research in the military areas. I don't think you can direct that to private enterprise. From that have come many of the products you're talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly we should be using the ordinary parliamentary form of address.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that that's happened in the last, say, 25 or 30 years. But the bulk of the scientific advancement that took place prior to that time was done by private funding and the private sector.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry asked me if I'd be interested in participating in today's debate on his Bill. I indicated that I would be prepared to participate — albeit briefly, as I look at my watch — because of my considerable interest in the subject of research and development, particularly in Alberta. However, my interest in the specific notion of a research foundation is subject to a certain ambivalence, which is to say that I could probably argue the concept both ways.

Before elaborating on that ambivalence, though, I want to make the point that legislators oftentimes have demonstrated that emotional distance between them and the research function frequently leads to a seriously diminished political or legislative vision. To make the point, I'd like to offer two examples. The first is from the U.S. congressional record of 1875, wherein a speaker is reported to have said:

The dangers of gasoline powered vehicles are obvious. Stores of gasoline in the hands of people interested primarily in profit would constitute a fire and explosive hazard of the first rank. Horseless carriages propelled by gasoline engines might attain speeds of 14 or even 20 miles per hour. The development of this new power may displace the use of horses, which would wreck our agriculture. The discovery with which we are dealing involves forces of a

nature too dangerous to fit into any of our usual concepts.

If another illustration is needed to make the point, the Undersecretary of State in the United States government said in 1934:

Scientific investigation into the possibilities of jet propulsion has given no indication that this method can be a serious competitor to the propellor. We do not consider we should be justified in spending any time or money on it.

It would be my hope that by means of this debate and other techniques and procedures, we as legislators could become closer to the research function, remain current on it, and be less capable of this kind of visionary inadequacy illustrated in these two examples I've brought forward today.

One concern I have with the Bill is that its proposed objective appears to be far too imprecise — 'loosey-goosey', if I could use that phrase in debate — and too generalized to win much support for itself inside or outside the Assembly. Perhaps if the Bill itself had as much meat on its bones as the background material the hon. member provided for me, my reservations might be diminished.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to suggest that the Bill is somewhat weakened by its silence on such crucial matters as research area priorities and the foundation's relationship with other organizations, such as the Alberta Research Council, which are already performing the funding of research in our province. In this regard, I'd like to suggest to the Member for Edmonton Glengarry one possible modification to the foundation concept; that is, rather than incorporate a generalized basic and applied science framework, perhaps the member's proposed foundation would get more support in the Assembly if it could have a more focused attack, perhaps research that could be directed or limited to areas where adequate research is not presently being done.

A second concern I have is that I must admit to a certain personal scepticism or at least resistance to the foundation concept. I'm not certain which is the greater problem in Alberta, or indeed in Canada: generating insufficient new knowledge or simply applying the monumental amount of scientific knowledge available to us right now. Despite these two or three concerns, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of positive observations if I could.

My interest in research and development derives in part from my ever-increasing recognition of the need for economic diversification in the province, and that research and high tech is one of the most promising routes to that kind of diversification. Hon. members will recall that the Premier, during second reading debate of his medical research foundation Bill, indicated that one of the government's prime objectives in the area of economic diversification was making Alberta a brain centre for Alberta, an interesting phrase that was used in the comments of the Member for Glengarry earlier today. To the extent that this Bill before us could meaningfully contribute to making Alberta the nation's brain centre, in my view the Bill has some merit.

My support for research and development in general, and for this Bill, derives also from what I regard as our obligation to future citizens of this province. Our generation has benefited from the investments in scientific research made by earlier generations; our ancestors, if you like. So also should future generations benefit from our generation's investments in scientific research.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to raise one other reservation about the Bill. I know it's a reservation that many businessmen in my constituency of Calgary Fish Creek would have; that is, the creation of yet another government institutional solution to a problem. The real problem is the virtual absence of high-risk capital for firms to use in basic and applied research. It seems to me that a system of risk reduction is necessary to increase the flow of funds into this area of the private sector. For example, the corporate income tax policies of the province could provide an excellent opportunity to accomplish this. As well, incentives could be made available to all Alberta-based corporations conducting scientific research and development, either in the form of tax-free grants or perhaps as a credit against income tax payable.

During my research while preparing for today's debate, Mr. Speaker, I came across two encouraging statistics that I'd like to get into *Hansard* before I run out of clock. First, R and D expenditures in Alberta on a per capita basis were approximately 20 per cent greater than the national per capita expenditure average in the 1979-80 fiscal year. I'd like to applaud the government for its expenditure commitment to R and D. A second encouraging statistic is that the Alberta government was primarily a funder of R and D activity in the province, not a performer. In fact, Alberta performed a mere 8 per cent of the total dollar value of R and D activities in the '79-80 fiscal year. By way of comparison, other provincial governments in Canada performed nearly half the total dollar value of expenditures they funded.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a P.S. in the final moment. I sense in Alberta a need for improved communication between our scientists and our research facilities, and the owners; that is to say, the taxpayers of the province. I think it's safe to say that there's a wide chasm right now, a very serious misunderstanding that exists between the scientific community and the owners, the taxpayers. I suggest that that scepticism, that misunderstanding, undermines the scientific effort in government as well as in the universities and the private sector.

I think that could be remedied with such things as institutional open houses, closer and more effective links with the mass media and, if I could suggest for members of the mass media, an even greater emphasis on their part in demystifying the R and D activity going on in this province. With these kinds of initiatives by the scientific community and the media, I think public interest in R and D in the province would increase. As the Bill of the Member for Edmonton Glengarry has generated additional interest and debate in the Legislature today, hopefully it too has made a modest contribution to increased public interest in R and D in Alberta. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the time, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this evening the Assembly will be in Committee of Supply, dealing with the estimates of the Social Services and Community Health Department. It's not likely that any other estimates would be called tonight. If that changes, I will try to let hon. members — at least the Leader of the Opposition —

know prior to 8 o'clock.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

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

#### head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

#### Department of Social Services and Community Health

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, at the end of last evening's discussions, we were on regionalization and just got started on the concept of regionalization. As I understand it, we have six regional directors in place at this time. Along with that, in process there is the transfer of some 300 staff from the central office. It wasn't clear to me last evening if that staff would go under the six regional offices, and the functions performed by the six regional offices was not clear to me. We didn't go into the actual functions in terms of how the regional co-ordinators relate to other programs, such as the health units, day care, home care, and hospitalization in the area. How does the co-ordinator relate to some of the municipal programs, as well as the programs directly under the responsibility of the minister? That's not clear to me at this time. I don't recall having an earlier discussion in the Legislature in terms of that kind of detail. I wonder if the minister could summarize that and, secondly, point out where we are at the present time. What kinds of things will possibly happen in this current fiscal year to firm up the decentralization or the regionalization? What seems to be the goal for the next four or five years?

As the minister knows — and we've had two or three discussions with regard to this — it was always my attitude that we should try to create as much opportunity for decision-making and autonomy at the local level. One of the plans I was moving towards prior to 1971 was the idea of having what I called regional health and social development boards, because that related to the department. I thought they would take a format similar to local municipal councils or local school boards, where eventually those people looking after those services could be locally elected officials, locally elected people who would have not only the opportunity of taxing through the local level but also the opportunity of having both conditional and unconditional grants provided to them to meet the local health and social services requirements at that point in time. I wonder if the minister has looked at any kind of concept like that as well in this longer term projection of what is happening at the present time.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I apologize for rising in my place again, but last day in committee I neglected to bring up one other concern I had, and that was the Rehoboth establishment in Stony Plain. I'm sure the minister is very familiar with that.

The organization had a number of pieces of correspondence between various people in the minister's office and, I imagine, the minister's office itself, looking for funding this year. Just a little bit of history on the organization. They're fully funded by private industry, through either church organizations or other organizations within the community. I think that because of the economic times we're in and so on, they're starting to feel a real pinch and are looking to the government for some assistance and for an expansion of the operation they now carry on in the community. What they have is a group home, with facilities to look after a number of mentally and physically handicapped individuals. I visited the home a number of times in the past number of years, and I find that they're supplying to the community of Edmonton and area a facility that is really needed. I guess why I'm on my feet this evening is to determine from the minister if we can see any funding in the future for this organization that is doing an excellent job in the community.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Chairman, on Wednesday morning we met with one of the regional directors for one part of the province. I had to leave that discussion before we had the total impact of what he was going to tell us as far as NADC was concerned. I wonder if the minister might explain a little bit further.

In the questioning from the Leader of the Opposition, he mentioned 300 people being transferred. My concerns are: are these 300 people going to be over and above the people who are here, are we still going to replace some people, or are we going to end up at the same level? My main concern is that we're not hiring a bunch more people to handle this thing regionally. And further, what decisions will be made at the regional level? Will they have anything to do with funding at the regional level?

Those two questions bother me a little bit, and I'd like some clarification on them.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, last night I think the minister answered the question I had on the parent counselling unit by indicating that it was going to education and would still be available to the kindergartens and preschool groups. If that's right, he needn't go into it again.

I guess I have to say that I'm pleased with the decentralization of the department, and the resident social workers have certainly improved the situation in Drayton Valley. When we finish moving the office out to Drayton Valley, I don't think I will have any more complaints. [interjection] No, I'm talking about complaints from constituents. I used to get them constantly.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, with the movement out to Drayton Valley, they are accessible, people can see them, and the problems seem to be resolved in a reasonable manner, quickly and efficiently.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would be good enough to refresh the memories of those in the Assembly as to the time line and expectations with regard to the new facility at Fort Macleod and the one at Bow Island, and also the plans with respect to the Baker site in Calgary.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to respond to the questions and comments of the hon. Member for Little Bow in conjunction with the hon. Member for Grande Prairie, because both hon. members were on the same basic point.

Members will recall that when the Speech from the Throne was read on April 2, 1981, there was a reference to decentralization of decision-making within the Department of Social Services and Community Health. This has really been one of my goals in government, being someone who comes from a community approximately 400 miles from Edmonton. In fact if we check, I think we'd find that my home community is farther from the capital than any other member's in this Assembly. The feeling I have, both as a resident of that community and as a former member of its town council, is that the closer we can bring services to people, the more efficient and effective those services will be. We are now in the process of bringing services closer to people. But equally important is bringing the decision-making to the people, because it's one thing to open an office and add another level of staff to serve the public, and it's quite another to transfer from your central office authority the actual decision-making ability.

We decided to move in a very practical and organized kind of way, not by moving the entire structure of the department to a decentralized mode overnight — that would have caused undue hardship to the clients we serve; there would have been mass confusion within the more than 9,000 employees in the department, and it would have caused untold hardship for others — but rather to go about this in a step-by-step process. The first step was to organize the six regions, to decide where the boundaries of the various regions should be, to come to some very basic decisions. For instance, should there be a division serving southwest as well as southeastern Alberta? Or should all of southern Alberta be in one division? A number of issues had to be looked at. In the end, we decided that six regions could adequately serve the province.

We set about looking at where the district offices were in the province at that time, where new offices were planned to be opened, and where regional centres should be located, always trying to keep in mind the concept of a wheel, so that the regional centre would be in the centre and it would have, going out from that centre, spokes to the various district offices.

We then set about working with the department through a Sage failure avoidance system by interviewing in excess of 400 members of the department and, I believe, 120 to 130 people from outside the department, to find out all the things that might go wrong. That process stretched over a seven- to eight-month period of time. We gave people in the department an opportunity to respond, people ranging from the minister, the deputy ministers, right on down through the district offices to a number of secretaries, clerk stenos, and receptionists at the front desk. All of them had input to the process so we could identify the kinds of problems that people saw with the present system and that they thought might take away from the success of true regionalization.

We went through two major meetings with members of the department. One was last year on April 3, and the second was January 28 and 29 of this year. The most senior people from the department came together to discuss, in a very open way, the process to be followed. In fact I think it's fair to say that until January 28 and 29 there were some in the department who weren't convinced

we meant business, who weren't convinced we meant to decentralize decision-making. It's one thing to establish that office; it's quite another to get across the idea that you're going to transfer some of the decision-making authority.

Through this process, I was very concerned that we not bring in another overlay of public service. Eighteen new positions have been created. In excess of 300 positions will be transferred from Edmonton. They will be from the programming, finance, and personnel areas of the department, so that when we reach our full objective, we will have six units within the department with their own financial and personnel components and with a degree of programming responsibility. We intend to keep the two programming wings of the department, social services on one hand and health services on the other, here in Edmonton as part of the monitoring body to ensure that we don't have six different interpretations of provincial policy, but in fact have one provincial policy being interpreted the same way in all the regions.

In order to ensure good cross-fertilization of ideas, the six regional directors went through a long process, an orientation period, before they actually assumed their responsibilities. I couldn't be prouder of the group of men and women we've got. We have three people who worked their way through the department and are now part of our regional director system. We have three from outside the department, one who has had experience in government and in the public education system, the other two from outside government. Collectively as a force, they're a very astute group of men and women. At the end of that process, all six regional directors assumed their responsibilities in the field on February 1 of this year.

If you go into any of the regional offices at the present time, you will find a skeleton staff. Very few of the 300 positions have been transferred to this point in time. That's ongoing now. We're identifying positions, giving individuals the opportunity to move. In some cases people do not wish to move, either because of their family commitments here in Edmonton or for other reasons. We're trying as best we can to accommodate their wishes and needs and, at the same time, achieve our goals and objectives.

The hon. member mentioned a process which would see a complete return of the functioning to the local level, whether that be through the municipal councils in place now or through some other body. The hon. member and I share a very unique privilege, along with two other hon. members in this Assembly, in that we happen to represent the only remaining part of the province that distributes social assistance for that initial period of time. That's done in the Barons-Eureka-Warner health and social services area. It's a unique experience. It goes back to the days when the province provided 80 or 90 per cent of the funding, and the municipalities topped that up and then provided their own service. That's the sort of thing which is ongoing in terms of our study and evaluation. I'm committed to ensuring that we complete this process step by step in an orderly way. Rather than doing it fast, I want to ensure that we do it right. We're trying as best we can to get input from a variety of sources to ensure that each step of the way — and we find that sometimes circumstances are different.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview asked the question yesterday about housing in McLennan, a unique challenge that we face in that community. That's not going to stop us from locating the centre in McLennan or getting 50 to 60 people located in that community. It may

present some problems for us in achieving our goal, but we are going to achieve the goal and we'll do it in an orderly way.

The hon. Member for Stony Plain asked a question about the Rehoboth society and the excellent work it is doing. I'd be less than candid if I didn't share with the hon. member that we're having some difficulty at this time finding the funding for the group home proposal. We are meeting with the six regional directors within the next two weeks. In fact I might have mentioned earlier that, along with the associate deputy minister of the department, I meet with the regional directors once a month to spend one and a half to two hours going over some of the important issues in the various regions.

We will be meeting during the next two weeks. One of the major items on our agenda is not only the Rehoboth proposal but the proposal in Vegreville that was raised by the hon. member yesterday, and several proposals from across the province. I want to assure the hon. member that if there's any way to find the funding to support a group of volunteers who are providing the kind of service being provided by Rehoboth, we'll be doing it. That will receive much greater priority from our department than a government-operated program that's still on the drawing boards. We want to assist those who are trying to help themselves first.

With regard to Drayton Valley, the hon. member has commented on the benefits and value in having a district office in her community. A lot of credit has to go to the hon. member for parking on my doorstep and being persistent to get an office to serve that part of the county of Parkland. We opened what we call the first suboffice in the province. The reality of the situation is that we're very close to having a full-time independent office in the community. That's only in part a response to the hon. member and more a response to the needs of the area and the legitimate concerns that have come from a variety of sources.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Calgary Millican asked about the Baker plan replacement. Hon. members will recall that, we currently have a 200-bed institution in Calgary, the old Baker sanatorium, which provides the same kinds of services for Calgary and southern Alberta that the Eric Cormack Centre provides here in Edmonton, primarily serving multihandicapped, medically fragile individuals. The proposal that came to my desk called for two 50-bed facilities in Calgary and a number of group homes in Calgary and across southern Alberta. Before accepting that and passing it on to the government caucus, I asked the department to do a detailed analysis of where the individuals currently in the centre were from. We found that there were enough youngsters from southeast and southwestern Alberta to demonstrate that we could, with some assistance by transferring a few individuals from Michener Centre, open two smaller facilities, one in southwest and one in southeastern Alberta, and have a smaller centre in Calgary itself. So the current plans are for a 60-bed replacement in the city of Calgary and two 30-bed facilities in Bow Island and Fort Macleod.

It's my understanding that the Fort Macleod proposal is very close to going to tender. Construction should be under way later this calendar year. I believe the Bow Island proposal is two to three months behind the Fort Macleod proposal in its planning, and the Calgary proposal is even behind that. We are still looking for the finalization of the site in Calgary. It appears that we may be back on the old Baker site, in response to requests by a

number of parents who currently have their children in that facility.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The minister missed — I'm sure not intentionally — a couple of areas I'd like to expand on. One was with regard to co-ordination with other agencies within the community that deliver health and social services. I have some notes with regard to the Sage investigation that went on. I wonder if the minister could indicate some of the potential problem areas the minister is looking at at this time.

MR. BOGLE: To the hon. member, Mr. Chairman. I overlooked the hon. member's question on the health units, family and community support service relationships, and other community-based agencies. There's a very special relationship between our department and the locally autonomous programs operated by our health units and by our municipalities through family and community support service programs. The interaction between the regional directors and their staff members and these bodies is one of co-ordination consultation. In no way would a regional director be trying to interface with a medical officer of health or an administrator of a health unit or a municipality on their particular programs. It's a co-ordination link only, because those bodies — the 27 health units, the 60 family and community support service groups — are both represented by provincial organizations, and I meet with them on the average twice a year. So I'd be extremely distraught if I heard any examples of our regional directors or their staffs in any way trying to bring those autonomous bodies under our umbrella as a department.

One of the recurring concerns in the Sage analysis, which was across the department — it showed up at the district office level in social services, in mental health, in the rehab services, the services for the handicapped area, finance, personnel, and the health services division — was that in some way the evaluation process wasn't working as it was originally intended, that people in the department were not being rated as they should be, and that favoritism was being practiced. I'm certain that in some cases it was a perceived feeling and without foundation. But for whatever reason, it was there.

That was an issue which my deputy ministers and I took head on at the January 28 and 29 meetings. I assured the staff members present at the meeting that we would be following a process — and directives have gone out from our director of personnel, endorsed by the policy management committee of our department, to ensure that there's a clear understanding that people will be rated in their jobs according to performance in that capacity, not on some other artificial means. As well, each deputy minister, before rating those who work directly for the deputy minister, will want to see how those below have rated their officials. To use an example, before the deputy minister of social services in the department rates the assistant deputy minister of rehabilitation services, the deputy minister will want to see how the assistant deputy minister rated the eight to 10 people who work directly for him. Before I rate the deputy ministers, I will want to see how they in turn have rated those who work for them: the deputies and the executive directors. That's one of the areas.

Another that quickly comes to mind was a concern that came out of the Lesser Slave Lake area, I believe — a concern that we weren't providing our officials with the right kinds of vehicles, that we were putting in requests



for normal cars or station wagons. When you're riding over the rough road from, say Slave Lake to Wabasca, you need a four-wheel drive. That's the kind of issue we can address if we know what the problem is. The difficulty before was that that kind of message was never coming through. So we're trying to use the results of the Sage analysis to see where there were inequities in the department, where there were perceived or real problems, and address them head on and get people feeling they're part of this whole team.

We've got a conference coming up in Brighton, England, in August of this year. That's a conference that traditionally the minister and several senior officials would go to. That's not what we're doing this year. By the co-operation of our district staff, and on a peer evaluation, our staff will be selecting one person from each of the regions selected to go to that conference. So we'll be sending six social workers to Brighton, England, for the conference. When they come back, they'll spend some time going around to the various district offices within their regions and reporting on what they learned and the ideas that might be of help to us here. So we're trying to get a teamwork approach within the department, primarily so there's a listening and a responsive reaction from the top to the bottom and from the bottom back to the top.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, one of the historic concerns regional offices had was the ability to provide cash to persons in immediate need, and this wasn't always possible for the regional offices because of the Financial Administration Act. I don't think it's possible even yet. I don't know if the amendment to that Act has gone through or not. Would the regionalization and the decentralization of the decision-making make that possible because the accountants are regional and have some accountability on an immediate basis? Or are we still faced with that same problem? Is the voucher system in effect yet and used? What role will it play?

MR. BOGLE: In certain limited areas, the district administrators at the present time have the ability to provide cash for an emergency situation. They are limited. I would be misleading the member if I let him believe that's something either our assistant deputy minister of finance or his counterparts in Treasury like, because it can very easily lead to mismanagement. But the ability is there on a limited basis. Vouchers are still used to a degree in dealing with foster parents. That's not something I'm satisfied with. We're working on it.

I can't indicate if we see the end of the tunnel yet. So there's no misunderstanding, even with the regionalization system there will still be a very important coordinating role that the central office, under finance, will play. But what it does mean is that when the budgets are being prepared for the regions, for the various communities within those regions, there'll be considerably more input at the local level, and discretion as to the whole funding approach. My understanding is that the only way we could get around that is if there were in fact a total break. If you're back to a system where the local level provides a service, and you're on either a contract or a grant arrangement to that body or organization, as long as you're part of government the Financial Administration Act does place a lot of safeguards.

The hon. member is aware of the Auditor General's report and the fact that we get stung from time to time. It happened a year ago with Wapiti Lodge in Grande Prairie, where some of our arrangements weren't as tight,

from a financial control point of view, as the Auditor General thought they should be. He was right. Yet on the other hand, it impedes our ability to be more flexible and provide some of the innovative kinds of services we might want in different areas.

So the short answer to the question is yes, we have the ability. But I wouldn't want to mislead the member, in that it is a small ability.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, with regard to the decentralization. I know there will be a regionalization or a decentralization of the accounting procedures. There'll be some professionals there. How would the minister parallel this to, say, the regionalization concept of the Department of Education, where a group of consultants go, in turn, to schools, upon request of the principals or teachers, to give them added help in certain areas? I observe some of the expenditures here; for example, single mothers and some of the very basic problems they face in our society. Will there be specialists in areas such as how they cope with some of the day-to-day things, or how they cope with the emotional strains they undergo as individuals who have to carry a load that in one way or another they carried on with a partner prior to that? Will we have specialists like that in the regional offices, who can go in as a team or an individual and help, say, the regional office at Lethbridge or in other areas in that larger region that is represented?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, the difficulty with that comparison is that whereas Education is providing a consultative service to a group of autonomous school boards delivering the service for Education, in most cases we are providing the service directly as a department. A better comparison would be with either Education or Agriculture. I guess I'm a little biased, but I think that we're going through a greater degree of regionalization. I don't think any other department that provides direct services like we do will be going to extensive decentralization of its decision-making.

The short answer to the member's question is that a lot of the expertise is already there at the district office level in terms of assisting. We have been working with groups like the American humane society to try to assist in upgrading our social workers with new skills. If it's that kind of input the hon. member is asking about, we're currently contracting with that organization; we're doing a bit of it in-house, but mainly on a contractual basis.

We certainly know there has to be a lot of interaction between the different professional groups, because we're in such an ever-changing world. There's nothing more distressing than to hear a case of someone who didn't get the right information from a professional. If the professional doesn't have the most up-to-date information on the available services and help which can be obtained, then the client is going to be the loser in the long run. So we're trying to achieve that.

The difficulty with that comparison is that Education has a role so different from ours. There is clearly going to continue to be a strong role for the two programming divisions of the department, and we hope our own programming officials are spending time out in the regions. To give a good example, if the programming people in rehabilitation services are meeting with the people from the district offices and the regional offices who are delivering those services — and it may be Lethbridge where they're meeting this month for a two-day meeting, where they're pooling their resources and ideas. They may get

together again in a two-month period, and then the meeting might take place in Lloydminster. So there's an opportunity to get around to the different parts of the province, see the strengths, see some of the challenges faced by the department in those areas.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, in our discussion up to this point, we have talked about autonomy or authority coming from the central office out to this regional level of government. At the same time, does the minister see some withdrawal of authority from the regional office or the local office at the present time? For example, I think a lot of authority was given to the director in charge of the office at Lethbridge or Medicine Hat. Are we going to usurp some of their power back into this middle level of organization? Is there some guard against that? Because human nature often wants to create more work and say, look, before you do something in Lethbridge or Medicine Hat, you've got to check back with me. Are some safeguards built into the program so that doesn't happen? Admitted or not, these people at the regional office who are co-ordinating will have better access to the minister, the deputy minister, and the people in Edmonton than, say, the local district office. All of a sudden there could be a power grab going on. Are some safeguards built into the system to prevent that? Does the minister feel at this time that the division of authority is clear enough to prevent that?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, we tried to address major issues through the task force on decentralization and get a policy framework around an area first, before talking about moving people or authority. One of the things we tried to do to safeguard against that occurring was to look at the various functions, not at the district office level but at the regional manager level, because we've always had regional managers for the three divisions of the department: mental health, rehab services, and social services. The regional directors felt very strongly that they would like to move away from the concept of regional managers to area managers. Using our part of the province as an example, in future there will be an area manager responsible for the Lethbridge area and a second area manager responsible for the Medicine Hat area, both reporting to the regional director. They'll be bringing together the resources of the three different district offices in the communities of Lethbridge and Medicine Hat.

Mr. Chairman, I think the proof is in the pudding. Yesterday I needed to speak with the regional director for central Alberta about an urgent matter. I didn't find her in her office in Innisfail; I found her in Wainwright, where she was spending a day and a half visiting with the district office staff, sitting down with the social workers and other support staff in the office, and meeting them one on one on their turf. All regional directors have been doing that in the various parts of their regions, so they are known. They're not just a name and a title; there's a face that goes with it.

I remember when the hon. Member for Bow Valley and I went to open a day care centre in Brooks. We stopped in unannounced at the district office. That startled our staff somewhat; they weren't expecting a visit. The regional director for southern Alberta advised me a couple of weeks after that, when she was back, that it wasn't really fair to bring the local MLA and the minister without some advanced warning. But they were appreciative to see both of us, and I hope we have a chance to go back some time.

MR. MACK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I will attempt to be brief. My comments and questions relate primarily to the positives and negatives of regionalization. I'm sure regionalization is desirable in terms of being able to deliver the services to both the communities and the people in need. Is there a form insofar as the minister's office is concerned where divisionalization ensures a degree of autonomy within the delivery system? Unless that degree of autonomy is there, I think the system would break down to some degree in terms of being able to make decisions. My question then to the minister is: are you employing a similar audit system to audit not only the finances which are being handled but the quality of service, similar, for example, to an active treatment centre, which in order to be able to reach accreditation standards, employs within the delivery system an audit system which utilizes, where possible, the users or the community? Or will a community advisory committee be in place in a larger regional district which could also be an advisory committee to the regional staff as well as, when necessary, the minister or his deputy? I'm raising this as a question because I think that quite often a system breaks down because there aren't the checks and balances from the ministerial office to ensure that the quality is never jeopardized for, let's say, expediency.

Having raised this point, Mr. Chairman, I would certainly applaud the minister for the many initiatives — some of them very bold — that have been taken over the past number of months to show sensitivity to the needs of people. A budget of \$1 billion plus indicates the massive amount of work done to deliver that kind of service, and the large number of people required to deliver it. I applaud that. I think that with it, there's growth. There's also opposition to changing the old ways and adopting new, innovative systems. On Monday morning I personally will be visiting an after-school care in the city. It's not in my constituency, but I've been invited to visit it because it is an innovative program, apparently working very well. It's certainly going to be a comparative model, a test if you will, as opposed perhaps to the conventional ones operating through the municipal governments. I applaud that. I think these are the kinds of initiatives required for us to be able to ascertain, in a very clear tone, whether these are working well and whether we should expand them.

Further, I would ask if the minister might respond, particularly in the area of after-school care, whether there's a real effort in co-ordinating his efforts with the Minister of Education to utilize the very costly buildings we have, our schools that have vacant space, in the after-school care programs. At least the major capital investment is already in place. All we have to do is renovate them so they would supply the required accommodation for that type of program, and hopefully would utilize the citizens in the community, wherever that school may be located, to actually become part of the delivery of that after-school care program, rather than leaving it more in the area of the cadillac type of service that has proven to work well. But I think the system could be delivered within the parameters articulated by the minister's department, perhaps equally as effectively, with no quality jeopardized in delivering the service.

I would also like to request that the minister touch briefly on the area of preventive care. Preventive care would also perhaps interface with the Minister of Education, particularly in the area where you have two parents in a home and suddenly there's a break and the family is left with one parent. I wonder if there's any addressing of

preventive care during the initial months of the trauma school age children, particularly, will experience? Perhaps a smaller class load for that particular teacher. Again there may be regions — I'm thinking of the large urban centres experiencing perhaps a much greater degree of family breakdown. Is any consideration being given to providing more teacher time per class that may have two or three families where they did enjoy the father and mother in the home and then, all of a sudden, there's just one? In many instances, they become the recipients of some social assistance when the family breakdown occurs. I wonder if that is also transferred to the other ministry, and if there's an interface whereby additional preventive social service can be given to those children in that type of setting? If the educational system had any strength in their request for a smaller class size, I believe this would be a very strong argument in support of their position, certainly not like the one where a 20-20 class size should be across the board. I do believe that perhaps in some areas of the school system where these situations occur, preventive social services might play a major role in that area.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, just to finalize this discussion on regionalization, I really want to be clear on the functions of the regional office. Let's take a social allowance application and a child welfare case, for example. Through the social worker, the district office normally deals with the welfare case as such. If it's a child welfare case, they too can deal with the case as such, let's say, right in Lethbridge. If they need back-up, they come through the central office for certain kinds of forms, legal measures, and so on. Where does the regional office fit into that kind of format? When you're dealing with the actual client, what type of co-ordination is required between Medicine Hat and Lethbridge? Is it because, if the case moves to Medicine Hat, that regional office is then able to do something to co-ordinate the move or keep check on whether they have welfare in Lethbridge and not welfare down in Medicine Hat, or welfare in Medicine Hat. Is that the kind of thing? That functional responsibility is not exactly clear to me, Mr. Chairman, so that it's different from, say, the district office. I don't know where the difference really stands at this point.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a comment and then ask the minister a question. It's with regard to the local appeal committees in the province looking at extraordinary situations as far as social allowance is concerned. I'm sure one of the best ombudsmen I have in my area is this committee. They do an excellent job, and they certainly save a lot of work. I'm sure they do that for all the members in the Legislature. I discovered that one area they weren't able to deal with was where foster children or foster parents are concerned. I wonder if the minister was looking at setting up an appeal committee or letting the appeal committees we have at the present time deal with such cases as foster children?

While I'm on my feet, I would just like to say to the minister that I had a situation in my constituency that we couldn't solve. I really didn't know where to go. I dealt with the situation for several months, and finally I had to come to the minister to appeal the situation. I'd be remiss on behalf of the foster children, the parents, and myself if I didn't thank the minister for the work he did to solve the problem. He got those children back into the home where they rightfully belong. This happened several

months ago, and everything is working very well. The parents told me to thank the minister, so now I am thanking him for the work he did. I certainly appreciated it very much myself. But I would like to see if we could have these situations solved by the local committees. I think it would be a lot easier to deal with as far as our foster children and foster parents are concerned.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, in responding first to the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont, the question really was: who's keeping an eye on what's going on? I'd say that there are a variety of people. Some of them include the central office of the department and the district personnel within the department, reporting through their regional directors; the clients we serve; certainly MLAs, a good example being the hon. Member for Bow Valley, who just spoke; the 38 appeal and advisory committees from across the province. They hear cases. They are restricted in what they can make a decision on, but there are no restrictions in terms of what they can advise on. They give advice to me, the department, and the government on a variety of fields.

We are moving in a significant way — and it's on page 303 of our estimates. In the middle of the page, under management audit, you'll note there's a very significant increase of 55.2 per cent in the budget. That is so the management audit team — and we've recently recruited a permanent director of management audit, who comes to us from the private sector — will be able to look at good management practices, in addition to financial aspects. That will assist both the department and agencies we serve outside the department. Today, one of the agencies we serve requested that I send our auditors in to assist them. We'll be very pleased to do that and share the information with them on a confidential basis.

I'd be remiss if I didn't point out one other very important group of men and women from across this province who work with us: the Social Care Facilities Review Committee. The committee visited 193 facilities in 1980, 427 in 1981, and 92 up to April 20 of this year, for a total of 712. Those range all the way from AADAC facilities, adult care, after-school care, child care institutions, child welfare resources, day care centres, family day-homes, foster homes, group homes with 4 beds or over, hostels, services for the handicapped institutions, vocational rehabilitation centres, women's shelters, special visitations as a result of complaints, out-of-province visits, special meetings, and conferences. So it's been a very active committee in being a lightning rod to assist in finding areas of concern across the province.

With regard to the hon. member's questions on after-school care, I had a meeting today with three members of the Edmonton after-school care organization and explained very fully that this is not an integral part of the city's family and community support service. I said, I'm not sure you really want to become part of a provincial program again, because if we do we'll have provincial standards that will be applicable from north to south. One of the first areas we would have to address would be the staff/child ratio. At present we have a staff/child ratio of 1:8 in the city of Edmonton. As far as I'm aware, that's the lowest in Canada. Even socialist Saskatchewan would blush at those figures. They have 1:10. Most provinces are at 1:15. We all know that about 70 percent of the costs in after-school care are associated with child/staff ratios. So there are some concerns in those areas. That's one of the things.

The city wants the dollars; in this case, \$10 per capita

or nearly \$5.3 million for the city of Edmonton. Part of the responsibility that goes along with those dollars is to decide where the priorities are, how to balance the needs of senior citizens — Meals on Wheels and homemaker services programs, senior citizens drop-in centres — with those of family and community counselling activities and youth programs, including after-school care. But after-school care is only one of a number of very important preventive social programs that the city council, as other municipalities across this province, will have to address.

The hon. Member for Little Bow asked for further clarification on the regional office interface with the district office. If we can have the kind of exchange we're having now, I think this is probably one of the best examples of democracy in action. I'm trying to explain and understand how a system is intended to work, because I wouldn't have known the hon. member's concerns in this area had they not been raised tonight. In no way should a client be served from a regional office. In other words, for the people of Alberta who are, and were, being served from our district offices before we moved on decentralization, there should be no change at all. A client cannot walk into the office in Coaldale or McLennan to receive a direct service. They must go through a district office. So the regional offices are co-ordinating centres, nerve centres to co-ordinate the activities of all the district offices within the region. But in no way will any service be given to a client from a regional office.

In order to provide that function, it was felt that in addition to the regional directors, the area managers, a communications officer, and the support staff, we needed some financial and personnel staff to round out that component. But those offices should not affect a client who moves from Lethbridge to Medicine Hat. We're bringing in a computerized system. It's reflected in our budget in many areas where there are variances. The computerized system will tie all the district offices together with the regional centres and Edmonton. So we'll be able to follow and monitor the activities more closely. But clearly the district offices should continue to function as they have.

A key advantage should be that if there's a problem the district manager can't solve, if a client falls between the cracks in the programs, rather than trying to work through the maze and get an answer from Edmonton, they're now working with the regional centre. If it's something the regional director can't deal with on the spot, it will be dealt with in short order because the regional director will be reporting directly to the associate deputy minister of the department. That should make the flow of decision-making faster. It should speed up the process so the client we're all here to serve can be served in the best possible way.

The hon. Member for Bow Valley raised some important concerns about the local appeal committees. I appreciate his comments, and I agree with him completely. I give full credit to the former government of this province for initiating the concept of appeal committees. I think it's a marvelous system. As an example, rather than putting MLAs on the spot in trying to decide and play Solomon, we've brought together a team of Albertans from all walks of life through 38 committees across this province. Some are from the business community; some are homemakers. If at all possible, we'd like to bring in people who were once on social assistance. They sit and listen to the department's point of view. They listen to the reasons the social workers made the decision they made. Then they listen to the client, and they make a decision.

In those areas where they cannot override the department, they have the authority and the ability to appeal directly to my office for change.

We saw that about two and a half years ago. The appeal committees from Peace River and Lethbridge said that our AISH — assured income for the severely handicapped — policies were wrong. They said those should be available to treaty Indians. We took it to social planning. We made a \$1.5 million decision to extend the program to treaty Indians. That was a result of the recommendations of the appeal committees.

The hon. member touched upon a really exciting concept: to involve the foster care area, in some way, with appeal committees. As the hon. member will recall, this is one of the specific terms of reference given to the Cavanagh Board of Review. Last summer I was in the process of putting together a team of Albertans — some from the department, some from the lay private sector — to travel to Scotland to look at an innovative process adopted there. In essence, community committees help the government in the placement by reviewing child welfare and foster care activities. We decided it was inappropriate to send the committee at that time, because the Cavanagh Board of Review was working on the same subject matter. I'm anxious to receive the report by Mr. Justice Cavanagh. I sincerely hope there is some reference to an appeal advisory committee role for child welfare and foster care that would be similar to what we've established in the area of social care and the assured income for the severely handicapped. Because it's a good model, and it's working well.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to be overly persistent about this regionalization program, but it is new and is moving across the province right now. I can understand the financial audit mechanism that's going in so that, in a sense, each area has its regional budget. The hon. member from Edmonton mentioned the social audit that will be a regional office responsibility. In turn, would that mean that some kind of comparative thing will be happening between one region and another, so the minister or deputy minister and officials can audit what is happening generally across the province so you can see certain trends? Let's say that in one area of the province there are more successes in terms of preventing family breakdown. Then you say, maybe they're doing something there that could be used in other areas. Is that part of the concept? Is there a mechanism in the central office that's going to do this overall observation and auditing from a macro level?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, one of the key aspects will be to get the minister, deputy minister, and senior staff out from Edmonton to the various regions of the province. Last fall we spent some time in Grande Prairie, and once the House rises I intend to get on the road again with senior officials. I think we're targeted to go to central Alberta next. We want to spend some time as a senior team. In Grande Prairie I saw a couple of municipal and health unit officials approach our assistant deputy minister of finance, who's in the gallery tonight, and say: so you're Don Strang; it's good to see you. People had been communicating for some time via telephone, letter, or memo, but it was a time to see them. The important thing is that we as a team of senior officials and the minister were seeing people on their own turf,

and that's very important. With decentralization of decision-making, the one thing we have to guard against is having six fragmented programs going in their own directions. We have to have one provincial policy.

The way we will be able to monitor and ensure that if something is working well in the Calgary region — if they've found something that really clicks, we want to learn from that and use the same experience in Edmonton and in other areas. We can best do that in a system of keeping our people moving about the province and sharing ideas. The first time we gathered our people, on April 3, 1981, I was astounded to find some senior members of the department meeting other senior members for the first time. I'm talking about people of middle-management level — Senior Officer II classification and up — meeting people for the first time. Why? Because the department's organization had been so vertical that people in the health services division in Lethbridge did not meet people in rehab services or social services in Calgary or the other regions. By getting the senior people together like that, we were getting a cross-fertilization of ideas. That's a concept we're trying to build on to strengthen the whole delivery system.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, will the various regional offices have funds by which they can implement programs or funds provided by the central budget that will allow for a concept to be tried in one manner in one region, another manner in another region, and another region may be a control area? Is that part of the plan in effect at the present time as well?

MR. BOGLE: That's under consideration, Mr. Chairman, but it is not in the 1982-83 budget. This Thursday at a retreat, work is beginning with preliminary discussions on the 1983-84 budget with senior members of the management team. The regional directors are involved in that process, and we will be looking at that and a number of other areas which would allow some innovation and flexibility.

Agreed to:

1.1.1 — Minister's Office	\$256,700
1.1.2 — Executive Management	\$2,359,180
1.1.3 — Departmental Financial Services	\$6,999,650
1.1.4 — Research and Planning	\$5,268,460
1.1.5 — Senior Citizens' Bureau	\$648,110
1.1.6 — Personnel and Staff Development	\$6,429,200
1.1.7 — Public Communications	\$1,399,110
1.1.8 — Departmental Administrative Services	\$6,479,850
1.1.9 — Management Audit	\$1,069,820
Total 1.1 — Central Support Services	\$30,910,080
1.2.1 — Social Service District Offices	\$48,647,600
1.2.2 — Family Maintenance and Court Services	\$625,120
1.2.3 — Administration of District Offices	\$1,459,720
Total 1.2 — Regional Delivery of Social Services	\$50,732,440
1.3.1 — Public Guardian's Office	\$3,238,640
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$84,881,160
2.1 — Program Support	\$3,264,310
2.2 — Social Allowance for Aged	\$17,354,000

2.3 — Social Allowance for Single-parent Families	\$146,904,000
2.4 — Social Allowance for Physically Handicapped	\$43,065,000
2.5 — Social Allowance for Mentally Handicapped	\$9,266,000
2.6 — Social Allowance for Employables	\$44,472,140
2.7 — Social Allowance for Special Groups	\$6,889,000

#### Total Vote 2 — Social Allowance

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, before we move away from that vote, could the minister indicate what he sees happening generally with regard to the numbers in 1982-83, and what possible cushion is built in? We have an economic downturn, and that usually puts a lot pressure on budgets such as this. Secondly, in terms of the employables, is the department still actively pursuing job opportunities for employable persons? What seems to be the success rate at this point in time? In the first year of the program, I recall we were able to reduce expenditure on a list of employables by about \$1 million. Is that figure higher now? What is really happening?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, in 1981-82 we had an average case load of 31,366. In 1982-83 we are projecting an increase to some 32,882, which would be an increase of about 4.8 per cent. We project that the biggest single area of increase will be in the employables category because of the downturn in the economy. That's reflected in the percentage increase in the budget. The largest single area, which has been of great concern to our government, relates to single-parent families. In that case, we anticipate a slight increase from the current numbers, to about 14,400. It will still remain the largest. In both cases, we're trying very hard to help single mothers. We have a retraining program up to a maximum of two years at a college or technical school. With the employables program, we're still endeavoring to help them find jobs. We have programs like the employment skills, and we're also very rigidly following our policy and practice of providing assistance for employables through our hostels and other such facilities for two weeks. At the end of two weeks, if the individual does not have a job, cannot demonstrate to the director that he's gotten into that kind of position, then he must move on and provide for himself.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I note that in vocational rehabilitation services there's an 8.5 per cent increase over last year's forecast. This is on page 315 of the estimates. Manpower development and training assistance funding dropped by 5.1 per cent. Is there a change in the direction of the programs in terms of that, or have those funds been transferred to some other area?

MR. BOGLE: I'll be pleased to discuss it in detail when we get there, but I believe that was the transfer of the Opportunity Corp., which went from our department to Advanced Education and Manpower and saw the transfer of positions and responsibilities.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 2 — Social Allowance	\$271,214,450
---------------------------------	---------------

3.1 — Program Support	\$3,511,090
3.2 — Community and Family Services	\$38,067,260
3.3 — Contracted Residences	\$38,294,380
3.4 — Residence and Treatment in Institutions	\$22,395,310
Total Vote 3 — Child Welfare Services	\$102,268,040

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. On April 1, 1983, the Young Offenders Act under the federal government is going to change the age from 16 to 18, which would divide juveniles from adult criminals. I wonder if the minister has observed what effect that may have. It may have some effect with regard to child welfare services of the department. Could the minister comment on that?

MR. BOGLE: I think we're talking about legislation which is still before the House of Commons and is in the proposal stage. The Attorney General, the Solicitor General, and I have written and expressed our concerns to the federal Solicitor General. There will be a tremendous impact upon the province of Alberta, regardless of which department is involved, if the Bill goes through in its presently worded stage. We are working with the federal government through the ends I've mentioned. We are also working on an interdepartmental committee basis through the departments most affected. We'll continue to look at the options available to the province. But very clearly, there would be a dramatic impact upon our budgeted services if the uniform age goes through as proposed by the Solicitor General.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, do I gather from the minister that the position of the government of Alberta is to maintain the age differential at 16. I forget what it is. It's 16 for girls, I believe. [interjection] It's the other way around. Is that the position of the government of Alberta?

MR. BOGLE: I have not discussed this matter personally with my counterparts. I know that officials have discussed it, and there is a recommendation coming to us. Although my colleague the Attorney General may wish to, I would hesitate to respond definitively at this time, because the policy discussions have not yet taken place between the ministers directly involved, and then assuming we've agreed, we'd have to go to Cabinet and caucus with a recommendation.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few words in that respect, because I think the situation can be stated very simply. For many years in Canada, or in Alberta in any event, because the law under the Juvenile Delinquents Act enabled that there could be different ages in different provinces, the cutoff age for male offenders between juvenile court, as it is still called, and the regular court system was 16. We feel very strongly that that's the correct age. That's where it belongs, and that's what we've expressed to the federal government.

I think the important part to note at this time is that that legislation is not expected to come fully into force for about another year. Even if passed, there will be a proclamation period. During that time we hope to persuade the federal government to permit the continuation of the present situation, which allows the province to select that age, if that's the best judgment of the provincial government. So that simply states it. We would like to see the present situation maintained in that respect; there's no question. We've said to the federal Solicitor

General that many other aspects of the legislation are really quite good, but that one has worried us.

Agreed to:

4.1 — Purchased Services and Agency Grants for Adults	\$3,333,200
4.2 — Residential Accommodation in Institutions and Hostels for Adults	\$4,527,700
Total Vote 4 — Specialized Social Services	\$7,860,900
5.1 — Senior Citizens' Supplementary Benefits	\$70,749,000
5.2 — Pensions and Allowances	\$66,687,000
5.3 — Day Care	\$15,222,000
Total Vote 5 — Benefits and Income Support	\$152,658,000

6.1 — Program Support	\$422,280
6.2 — Regional Delivery Services	\$2,866,870
6.3 — Agency Grants and Purchased Services	\$16,743,910
Total Vote 6 — Vocational Rehabilitation Services	\$20,033,060

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to give some clarification to the point raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition a few moments ago on Vote 6. I want to be clear. The hon. member may have been looking at capital when he raised his concern. Is that the specific issue on page 315? Because there is a drop in the capital proposals for the year, and that's not related to the Opportunity Corp I referred to. That would have been corrected in the conciliation between the departments. We had a very major capital injection last year for sheltered workshops, and although the program will continue, it will not continue at the same level, because we had a catch up, if you like, last year with new centres across the province. That represents the primary reason for the drop in the amount of new dollars available for capital.

Agreed to:

7.1 — Program Support	\$1,107,840
-----------------------	-------------

## 72 — Community Development and Referral

MR. BORSTAD: I want to make a few comments on this vote, because I believe it takes in the retarded workshops. [interjections] Well, I'll speak on this one if I missed it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may want to speak before the departmental total vote is called.

MR. BORSTAD: Okay.

Agreed to:

7.2 — Community Development and Referral	\$4,547,950
7.3 — Agency Grants and Purchased Services	\$29,624,140
7.4 — Residence and Treatment in Institutions	\$66,150,480
Total Vote 7 — Services for the Handicapped	\$101,430,410

MR. R. SPEAKER: Just a quick question. Could the minister make a comment with regard to the task force

on the disabled and what is happening. What is the date of their report? How are the hearings going? I understand there were going to be some 20 or more communities visited or hearings held. One concern raised was with regard to the one-page brief, which isn't all that important one way or the other.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. member was not in his place yesterday when I spoke to this. I'll be pleased to repeat briefly what I said. I had the opportunity to meet with the committee members last Friday in my office for about an hour and a half, and was pleased to learn from the chairman and members of the committee that they have received briefs and oral presentations from in excess of 160 groups and individuals. The rationale behind the chairman's request that briefs be kept to a page was that committee members would all be able to read the briefs; they wouldn't have to rely on their secretarial help to do that for them. Their work is moving along very well. A committee of the group visited one other province and were about to visit a second.

It was my understanding from our discussions that they may well be asking for an extension of their time. They're finding that the amount of input they've received from groups and individuals, the material that's been gathered from the department and from agencies, and the material they're receiving from other departments is extremely beneficial. They want to ensure that they do the job right. I assured the group that if they request some additional weeks or months, favorable consideration would be given to that.

Agreed to:

8.1 — Program Support	\$2,360,260
8.2 — Regional Diagnosis and Treatment	\$14,269,250
8.3 — Purchased Services and Agency Grants	\$7,430,230
8.4 — Residence and Treatment in Institutions	\$65,772,870
Total Vote 8 — Treatment of Mental Illness	\$89,832,610
9.1 — Program Support	\$8,544,700
9.2 — Communicable Disease Control	\$5,698,100
9.3 — Special Health Services	\$205,700
9.4 — Rehabilitative Health Services	\$24,282,600
9.5 — Vital Statistics	\$1,387,900
Total Vote 9 — General Health Services	\$40,119,000

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

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister a few questions. His department has commissioned an environmental health study in the Twin Butte area. There have been alleged health effects in that area attributed to two gas plants operating in the area. Some concerns have been expressed by local citizens resident in the Twin Butte area with regard to this study. I wonder if the minister might be able to explain the nature of the study his department is undertaking, give an overview of the components of it and what the department expects to achieve through the conduct of this study.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, over the past 20 years there have been a variety of studies on the area south of Pincher Creek, commonly referred to as Twin Butte, where there are two sour gas plants. A number of the

studies pointed to the need for a more in-depth study. We asked the Canadian Public Health Association to submit a proposal to the government for consideration. It was my understanding that in the terms of reference it was clear that we wanted something more than a statistical analysis review. But for one reason or another, that wasn't part of what came back as the total proposal. Although many of the recommendations by the CPHA were adopted, it was the decision of the department, which I endorsed, that the proposal that they do the study, and that it be based on a statistical analysis review with a probability factor, would not give the kinds of conclusive answers we're looking for.

Therefore we put together a three-phase approach to the matter. The first phase is co-ordination by the department of all existing studies, the various works done to date. The second phase will be certain health related statistics gathered with the assistance and co-operation of the Chinook health unit, the medical officer of health, Dr. Corriveau, and officials who work within that body. The third phase is an environmental health study which was commissioned by the department and is being done by Dr. Snider from the University of Alberta.

Dr. Snider's study will use a hair-tissue analysis as its basis. I'm advised that the advantage of such a study is that through hair-tissue samples one can determine the level of certain metals in the body. Because we know how fast hair grows over a given period of time, we can look back over a number of months as to the results of either emissions from the plants or other side effects on the individual participants. In order to achieve the results, we are looking at, in addition to 100 people in the Twin Butte area, two control communities, one in another foothills community with the same atmospheric conditions and a third in a plains community that doesn't have the same conditions. In both cases, the control communities will be outside sour gas plant areas.

Hopefully, by the end of the study we will have some tangible evidence to give to the various participants, so they can see how they are affected by either the atmosphere or other factors. Clearly another study which would have stated, for example, that there's a one in 1,000, a one in 500, or even a one in 50 chance that some of the health-related problems may be a result of some of the toxic substances being emitted from the plants was not the kind of study we thought would give evidence and results to the people of the area.

MR. BRADLEY: As a follow-up question, there has been a request for an independent study, outside government rather than something done in-house. With the various aspects taking place with these studies, some components are being conducted in-house. Does the minister consider the environmental health study, which is being done by Dr. Snider, to be an independent study?

Secondly, there has been a suggestion that this is just a sociological study. That's a criticism of the proposal that has been put forward by some residents in the Twin Butte area.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, very clearly in response to the latter part of the question first, it is a health environment study. It is not a sociological study. The testing will be done in a laboratory in California. Very clearly, of the three elements of the thrust we have approved as a department, one is in-house, and that is the evaluation of previous studies. The health unit is an autonomous body, and the work being done by the medical officer of health

and his staff is not being co-ordinated or directed by the department. It is with their co-operation and assistance. The third is most definitely independent, in terms of the nature of the work being done. The results of the three studies will be forwarded to the Provincial Board of Health. They in turn will make whatever recommendations they feel appropriate to the provincial government.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, another concern which has been expressed is why we are not taking blood tests, why this approach of a hair-tissue analysis over the taking of blood tests or other samples.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, once the hair-tissue analysis tests are concluded and individuals have the results, if any individual feels there is a need for further substantiation, either in blood testing or urine testing, then consideration may be given that once the existing testing has been completed.

MR. BRADLEY: One further question to the minister with regard to this study. Have there been any opportunities for local citizens in the study area to have input into some aspects or make requests that certain things be looked into?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. It was late February — I believe the 24th — when I along with the deputy minister of health services and the MLA for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest had the opportunity to meet with some residents in the community. At that time, I offered to the residents that if they felt there was an element that needed to be retested in a particular area, and a concern was raised that the air-monitoring wasn't done at the right location — it was done on a hill and it should have been done down on a low spot. I indicated that if some of the residents had a specific request that could be accommodated by the moving of a trailer or by some other process, I would appreciate input coming through the Member of the Legislative Assembly for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest so we could consider the same.

MR. BRADLEY: Could the minister advise as to when he expects this study to be started, and how long it will take to complete the study?

MR. BOGLE: Two of the three steps in the review and study have already started: the gathering of information by the department and the collection of information by the health unit. It's my understanding that Dr. Snider will begin his detailed work, although he's been in the community on a number of occasions. The actual testing will begin in the first week of May this year. I anticipate that his work will take three to four months to conclude.

MR. BRADLEY: I'd like to indicate to the minister that although there are some citizens in the Twin Butte area who have expressed concerns with the direction this study has been taking, because they're directly affected and have been perhaps suspicious of the activities of government, the council of the Municipal District of Pincher Creek certainly supports the proposed study and is requesting citizens to be co-operative in its conduct.

One final question with regard to the results of the individual sampling of individuals, and correlating information with regard to what health effects the individual is experiencing: will that be available to individuals? Is this study being conducted on a voluntary basis? Will it be

compulsory that citizens participate in it, or will it be voluntary?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, the study will be voluntary. Any individual who does not wish to participate certainly is under no obligation to do so. We've also indicated that once the initial sample of 100 people has been selected, if someone has been missed and would like to participate, we'll make the opportunity available for them to do that. One of the reasons Dr. Snider can do his work in a three-month period of time — whereas if you were using a blood and urine sample as an example, you would probably need up to a year — is that with either blood or urine you are testing on any given day, you are looking at the results of a period of 24 to 36 hours, whereas with the hair-tissue analysis, by measuring back and recognizing the rate at which hair grows, you are able to go back a number of months. So they're able to determine with a hair sample today what the conditions were two, four, or eight months ago. Therefore it's felt that we can achieve the same basic results with that process.

MR. BRADLEY: I don't believe the minister answered the question of whether the results will be available to the individuals.

MR. BOGLE: Pardon me. Most definitely, the information will be shared on a confidential basis with each individual. The information will be shared on a general basis, obviously without names, in the basic results of the study. But each individual who participates in the study will get results from Dr. Snider as to the testing of their hair samples.

Agreed to:

10.1 — Community Social Services	\$25,030,500
10.2 — Community Health Services	\$79,420,500
10.3 — Day Care	\$30,724,200
Total Vote 10 — Community Social and Health Services	\$135,175,200

Total Vote 12 — Designation, Regulation and Licensure of Professions and Occupations	\$450,050
--	-----------

Department Total \$1,027,197,598

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the vote be approved.

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Appleby 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 department and purposes indicated. Department of Social Services and Community Health: \$84,881,160 for departmental support services,



\$271,214,450 for social allowance, \$102,268,040 for child welfare services, \$7,860,900 for specialized social services, \$152,658,000 for benefits and income support, \$20,033,060 for vocational rehabilitation services, \$101,430,410 for services for the handicapped, \$89,832,610 for treatment of mental illness, \$40,119,000 for general health services, \$135,175,200 for community social and health services, \$21,274,718 for alcoholism and drug abuse — treatment and education, and \$450,050 for designation, regulation and licensure of professions and occupations.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier to hon. members that we would be doing second readings of bills tomorrow. It's not our intention to call Bill No. 32. Subject to that, I believe all the others are available for second reading.

[At 9:41 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]

