

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Wednesday, May 18, 1983 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and hon. members of this Assembly some 26 grades 5 and 6 students from Queen Street elementary school, located in the town of Spruce Grove. They are accompanied by their teacher Debbie Mitchell, teacher's aide Mrs. Ruhl, and bus driver Dorothy Gagné. They are seated in the members gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly a group of 30 Castor elementary grade 6 students. They are accompanied by their teachers Wendy Dunkle and Glen Goring, parents Mrs. Bunbury and Mr. Harder, and bus driver Walter Turnbull. They're sitting in the members gallery, and I ask that they rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, 17 students from the Alberta Vocational Centre, situated in Edmonton Centre. Accompanied by their leader Yuri Drohomirecki, they are seated in the members gallery. I ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's always an exciting time for young people when they have an opportunity to visit the Legislature and observe the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly. This afternoon 60 grade 6 students are here from Barrhead elementary school. They're accompanied by two very dedicated teachers, Mr. Don Roblin and Mrs. Maureen Tansowny. It's my pleasure to introduce them to all members of the Assembly. As I ask them to rise in the public gallery, I also ask members of the Assembly to acknowledge their presence.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Mortgage Company Guidelines**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In light of the gloomy report by the Conference Board of Canada with respect to the outlook of Alberta, I'd like to direct this question with respect to the concerns of Tower Mortgage and its operation in the province. As things stand, Mr. Speaker, it's only when mortgage firms raise money by debentures, notes, or bonds that mortgage companies come under the scrutiny of a sole government agency. Could the minister outline

what plans the department or the government has to develop specific and enforceable guidelines for mortgage company transactions in this province?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that's a question that has been raised in the House before, I think by both hon. members of the Official Opposition. I have responded in this way and will continue to do so. There are two problems here. One arises from the fact that there seems to be some confusion in the public's mind with respect to whether they are making a deposit or an investment. Unfortunately, a number of people in the public have believed they were making a deposit, when in fact it has been an investment. It comes under the scrutiny of our Securities Commission, at least in terms of the prospectus offered.

Mr. Speaker, it's my intention, hopefully by the end of this sitting, to come up with a proposal that I would air in public, either an information package that would be made available to the public so they will be aware of precisely what the undertaking is — what they're launching into, if you will — or, alternatively, some legislation that may do the job.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the minister plans for guidelines which would prevent overvaluation — that is, self-inflated valuation — of properties which are held by mortgage companies or those transacted by mortgage companies? I relate this to the situation of Tower Mortgage and Tow-Mor Properties.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, from time to time when the securities or assets of any given company are valued, they are scrutinized from the point of view of the value at a particular time. I think we're all aware of what has happened in the real estate industry, in terms of the fairly dramatic downturn in values there. I don't know whether the hon. member, in his description of an overvaluation done by the company — I think what we have seen is that those valuations that were done within the last two years, say, have changed dramatically at this point in time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Bearing that in mind, is the government prepared, at a minimum, to require independent, third-party appraisals of properties owned by mortgage companies?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think what the hon. member is suggesting is an area that, number one, would add a great deal to the cost of companies doing business in this province and, of course, would reflect on the amount of return that would be available to somebody either making a deposit or making an investment. I think the type of security that might be offered by that additional step would have to be balanced very carefully with what would happen to the eventual return on the investment.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the minister or the government be prepared to require that parent mortgage companies at least report in greater detail their non-arm's-length transactions with their subsidiary companies, so Albertans can be sure that their agreements are indeed established under market terms? This is particularly relevant with respect to mort-

gage companies and land companies that are subsidiary to the mortgage companies.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I suppose that would be one of the many elements that would have to be looked at in terms of legislation, if in fact we were to go that far. Certainly that couldn't be addressed by way of just an alert to the public that would describe exactly what kind of transaction they were entering into. But that will be among the number of issues I will be addressing.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister developing measures which will ensure that mortgage companies will comply with their debt obligations as filed in their annual prospectus? Will strict debt/equity ratios be established and enforced thereafter?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that could only be done by legislation, and of course that legislation would then take the form of a number of financial Acts that we have, in particular with respect to trust companies. If that's the route the government believes is the most appropriate, then that would happen.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In view of the difficulties of Dial, Merit, Ram, Vista, and now the serious problems of Tower Mortgage, has the government considered going beyond ministerial review and appointing either a task force or perhaps even a royal commission to examine measures the government might bring before the Legislature to protect investors in Alberta-based mortgage companies?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, this question is under discussion with my colleagues.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister advise the Assembly when this Legislature may expect to hear an announcement on measures this government proposes to give some measure of security to those people investing in Alberta mortgage companies? The minister says it's under review. Can we have some time frame as to when that review will be complete and an announcement will be made to Albertans?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to correct one thing in terms of the hon. member's terminology. He has stated "invest"; once again, invest. If we're talking about investments, the public's investing, that is a risk area. Certainly it wouldn't be my intention to get into regulating the risk area of investments in this province because, after all, people do have a right not only to make a dollar but possibly to lose a dollar in terms of those investments.

But if we're talking about what we might now wish to describe as deposit-taking institutions, Mr. Speaker, I'm hopeful that by the end of these spring sittings of the Legislature, I will have something more firm to offer the hon. member and the public.

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

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the minister is with respect to measures that could protect Albertans, be they depositors or investors, from the non-arm's-length arrangements between mortgage companies and subsidiary companies. At least two of

these firms have got into trouble because of the land companies involved; Tower is the most recent one. To what extent can investors and depositors be given some assurance that the government will monitor and control arm's-length arrangements between a parent company and its subsidiary land companies?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to undertake that particular — I suppose it would be a policy that would be enshrined in legislation. It will be decided if that is a worth-while measure, given the kinds of concerns I've already raised in terms of the cost to not only business but the people of this province, in insuring the transactions the hon. member has mentioned. That will be part of the review process.

#### Suncor Emission Controls

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment and is with respect to the air quality directive issued by the minister to Suncor on May 11. Can the minister inform the Assembly why the government waited until now to issue this directive, when there have been difficulties with the pollution control system since its installation in 1979 and the minister has indicated that the company has had difficulties meeting air emission control requirements over the last two years?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe I dealt with an earlier question from the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray. I think I responded that over the past two years Suncor has had some difficulties, basically because of the number of shut-downs which have occurred and which have resulted in emissions above the licence limits. We have been reviewing with Suncor the work they have done. They have made some improvements. We've requested further information with regard to operating practices and improvements which may be made.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Why, however, the two-year wait?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I already stated, Suncor has undertaken a considerable amount of work with regard to making improvements. The department felt we would require further information with regard to their operating practices and further improvements, and that's why the directive was issued at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Given the substantial increase from \$20.67 to \$40.55 in the price per barrel of Suncor oil from 1981 to 1982 as a consequence of the energy agreement, and the additional \$248 million Suncor made in 1982 due to the increased price, will the minister now direct the company to install in its plant the best available technology for emission control?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, the practice of the government of Alberta with regard to pollution control and the licences that are issued to companies has been to follow the practice that we would require them to have the best practicable pollution control technology installed. At the time the plant was started and operation was originally approved, I believe that requirement was met. We have been working with them over this period to

improve where there are some difficulties, and that is the practice of the province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of a 1976 study on emission control done by Suncor, which indicated that the best available technology could remove 99.5 per cent of all particulate matter and 90 per cent of sulphur dioxide emissions, and especially in view of the fact that Suncor is now receiving the world price, will the minister instruct Suncor to install a system which will cost less than \$2 a barrel but massively improve emission control in the Fort McMurray area?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe I already responded to that question. Our policy and practice has been to have the best practical technology with regard to plants. There's a difference between best practical technology and best available technology. That has been the practice of the government. I will not be in a position to direct the company to install best available technology at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Given the totally different conditions of the company — \$20.67 oil in 1981 and world price in 1982 — is the minister saying that under those radically different price circumstances, the government is not going to insist on the best available technology being installed?

MR. BRADLEY: No, Mr. Speaker. That is not the practice upon which we license companies in the province. As I already explained, it is with regard to the best practical technology at the time the company was originally given approval to construct. We are working with Suncor in terms of the operational difficulties with regard to that licence. And no, we would not be directing the company to install best available technology at this time.

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

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, could the minister inform the Assembly what progress has been made on the research program, started in 1981, into the effects that emissions from oil sands plants have had on the Fort McMurray area? Have any reports been received from the study, and will the minister be prepared to table those initial reports of the five-year program?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question under advisement.

#### **Northeast Regional Water Pipeline**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of the Environment has to do with the northeast regional water pipeline from Edmonton to Vegreville, a pipeline that may be without water. Can the minister indicate what discussion he has had with the communities involved as to the status of the treatment plant in Edmonton, to assure people along that pipeline that there will be water in the pipeline this summer?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had any discussions with the communities with regard to the question the hon. member has addressed. However, I am aware and have received communication from the town of Fort Saskatchewan in which they outlined their concerns with

regard to information they have received from the city of Edmonton that there may be periods, particularly this summer, where there will be water shortages and that they have advised downstream users — the Northeast Water Board, which has a contract with the city of Edmonton to supply water — that there may be periods where there will be rationing and advising as to the criteria for rationing. That is the present situation.

I do not have the specific information before me, but I understand that one of the city of Edmonton's water treatment plants is not able to meet its design capacity in terms of production this year, and improvements are being made to ensure that that design capacity will be met as quickly as possible.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate to the Assembly whose responsibility it was in the department to make sure sufficient treatment facilities were available before the pipeline was put in place?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Northeast Water Board has a contract with the city of Edmonton with regards to its water requirements. That contract is between the Northeast Water Board and the city of Edmonton. The design capacity of the water treatment plants in Edmonton was such that it could meet those requirements of the downstream contractors.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister saying that the Department of the Environment was involved in the initiation and carrying out of the design and construction of the pipeline without knowing if there would be sufficient water available for that pipeline?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, at the time the design of the various components was put in place, I believe the assurances were there from the city of Edmonton that they had the design capacity and that their plants could supply those downstream communities with water. They've since advised, earlier this year, that they have some problems with the specific treatment plant, which may require them to implement some rationing if there is a water shortage.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate if there have been any directives or information given to the effected communities that they may have to go back to using their original water supplies?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received the exact wording of the letter from the city of Edmonton, advising those who've contracted with them for water as to what specific measures they would take in terms of water shortage and implementing rationing. I am aware that the town of Fort Saskatchewan sent me a letter advising me what the Northeast Water Board's program would be if rationing is necessary. They would advise the downstream users that if rationing is necessary, there may be some alternatives they may wish to look at.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that some of the communities that have hooked onto the water pipeline are not able to use their old facilities, can the minister indicate if there are any contingency plans in place to provide those communities with water?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, with regard to that, the information was only received in my office within the last day or two. I requested the department to review the matter with regard to what effect it will have and whether or not there is the necessity to implement contingency plans, depending upon the nature of water restrictions of which the city of Edmonton has advised those downstream users.

DR. BUCK: Jack left you a mess.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise whether the Northeast Water Board went into the contract with the city of Edmonton because the city was concerned that they had a treatment plant standing idle which could treat water for 300,000 people? Was it on those conditions that the Northeast Water Board made that agreement?

MR. BRADLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd have to check into the specifics with regard to the relationships and contracts that were signed between the Northeast Water Board and the city of Edmonton. It is my understanding that at the time the various contracts were entered into, the city of Edmonton obviously would not have entered into such a contract if they did not believe they could supply the downstream contractors with the necessary water.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, while he's checking this, can the minister find out if the Department of the Environment went ahead and planned the pipeline without knowing if there would be sufficient treated water available?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I've tried to advise the Assembly and the hon. member, at the time the city of Edmonton, as a new water treatment plant which has the capacity to supply the necessary water ... There is a temporary problem with regard to the treatment plant, which the city of Edmonton has just advised some of their downstream users of — and which I believe would have an effect on the city too — that if there is a water shortage, there may be a need for rationing.

#### **Transportation of Handicapped Students**

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. I understand the minister's department has transferred to Alberta Education the funding responsibility for special aids for handicapped students. Is the minister in a position to advise the House as to the amount of funds transferred from his department for this program?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the transfer occurred effective April 1, 1983, and the amount was in the vicinity of some \$200,000.

MR. McPHERSON: A supplementary question. With respect to this program, is the minister aware of any difficulties or confusion on the part of school administrators on how and where they apply for funding?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, since the program was transferred to the Department of Education, in terms of any current operations I refer the question to the hon. Minister of Education.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, this is one of a number of transfers that are occurring as the result of extensive discussions involving the Department of Social Services and Community Health, the Department of Education, and the Department of Advanced Education. Since there are jurisdictional problems, both with respect to young people and adults, the agreement is that anything related to the instruction of children should be provided by the Department of Education. It was on that basis that the transfer occurred from the Department of Social Services and Community Health to the Department of Education. The aids we are describing provide assistance to the child and the teacher in the classroom. That's the basis of the agreement upon which the transfer was made.

As my colleague the hon. minister said, funding for the transfer occurred as of April 1, since that's the beginning of a new fiscal year. The administrative responsibility is actually transferred for September 1, which is the beginning of the new school year. So there are some children, and perhaps some school or health officials, who may have a difficulty at the moment in this period of transition. The only thing I can suggest is that they should properly contact the local school board or the regional office of the Department of Education. If any particular difficulties are drawn to our attention, we will certainly deal with them expeditiously.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Firstly, does the minister anticipate that this will cut down on the paperwork and people involved, in that the grants can go directly to the schools? Secondly, has any consideration been given to the grant following the student more closely, now that it will be in the Department of Education? For example, if the child changes schools, will they be able to receive the grant quickly and not go through more paperwork and wait a lot longer? Because it does cause a problem in smaller school jurisdictions, where they aren't able to move people quickly, and it causes some problems in smaller schools.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, certainly one of the things which often motivates the provincial government is the desire to deliver services more efficiently, on behalf of the student or parents, and with less red tape. That was a consideration in this decision. As the hon. member suggested, parents or health professionals will now be able to deal with a local authority; that is, the school board. The school board will in turn be dealing with only one department, rather than two. We believe it will be more efficient and effective for the student.

On the other matter: yes, the assistance will follow the child more directly than has been the case in the past.

#### **Human Rights Curriculum Review**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Education. In the ministerial statement last Thursday, the Premier said he had asked the minister

to have a special review undertaken forthwith of our curriculum, to ascertain if there are any practical changes which could be made that would better foster greater tolerance and respect for minority groups and individuals in our society.

My question is: can the minister advise exactly which group or agency has been or will be charged with undertaking this review and when they may be expected to report to the minister?

MR. KING: No decision has been made about that yet, Mr. Speaker, although a decision will be made imminently. It is obvious that the kind of review we are discussing is not the ordinary review you might expect to have done by the staff of the Department of Education. This is a review which, in its nature, will involve interested representatives of the community; the Heritage Council, to cite one example, or the Human Rights Commission. I have asked the department to make recommendations to me about the process such a review would follow, in order to involve interested community representatives. I expect to make a decision on that in the very near future.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister advise the Assembly whether the findings of this review will be tabled in the Legislature or made public in any other way?

MR. KING: It's our practice to make the results of such reviews public. Whether or not it was our practice, it is certainly what we would do in this particular case. The public has an interest, and they have a right to know.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the study overseen by the minister, will he incorporate the 1980 study commissioned by the League for Human Rights of Canadian B'nai B'rith, which I believe found that only one of 22 government-approved history and social science textbooks in Alberta high schools deals sufficiently well with the holocaust?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, we're now getting into an area about which it is difficult to respond. This province does not publish or print textbooks. We therefore attempt to find textbooks in the market that deal in the most complete way possible with the themes that are important in our curriculum. If we can't find the material available in the market, then our alternative is to prepare teachers in some way or other so that they can deal with important questions, even though those questions may not be dealt with in the textbooks.

The study the hon. member refers to found that, on balance, the material used in Alberta's classrooms was better than the material used in any other classroom in any other province in Canada, if I recall the results of the study correctly. The question is, therefore, not only how might we find better textbooks — because they might not be available in the market place — but if we can't find better textbooks, how we can better prepare teachers for dealing with the challenge.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister is correct, but they said that all of them were poor at the time. To follow through, as part of the review will the minister undertake to have textbooks which refer to the holocaust, and which are currently government approved for use at pre-highschool levels, thoroughly studied and assessed in this regard?

MR. KING: The review of existing or proposed curricular material is an ongoing process. So I think my commitment in that regard would not be significant, in light of the fact that I'd only be committing myself to the continuation of the current practice of the Department of Education. The more significant commitment that is implicit in this discussion, and which I am certainly willing to make to the House this afternoon, is that we will involve the community more broadly than at present in

helping to determine whether all cultural, religious, and racial interests are accurately and constructively reflected in not only the curricular materials but the curriculum itself.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that he is going to involve more in the process. Would the minister advise what opportunity will be made available for any interested groups and individuals to comment on the findings of the review prior to the implementation of any or all of the review's recommendations?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, it has generally been my practice that when a report is made public — as I undertook a moment ago, the outcome of this would be a report that would be made public — we allow the passage of some time and encourage public response. I expect that would be the situation here. When the process is completed, there would be a report, and the report would be made public. We would invite the public to respond to the contents of that report, including its recommendations, before I made any recommendation to my colleagues in the government as to subsequent policy or practice in the department.

MR. SPEAKER: There are three hon. ministers who wish to supplement information previously given: the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health, the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and the hon. Minister of the Environment.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I presume that means there are no other questions to be asked by members. Am I being presumptuous in asking that?

MR. SPEAKER: That's not so. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has asked to be recognized a second time.

The problem is that members are occasionally asking questions which perhaps should be asked on notice. The result is that ministers are finding themselves obliged to accept questions as notice for subsequent answering. If time is not made in the question period for those answers, then the hon. members who asked those questions are not going to get answers. As it happens today, the traffic isn't too heavy. I'm sure we'll be able to reach the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

#### **Women's Shelters**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to provide the hon. Member for Clover Bar further information with respect to his questions yesterday on women's shelters. Between April 1, 1982, and September 30, 1982, about 1,750 women and children were admitted to shelters in Alberta. At the same time, approximately 900 were not admitted to shelters. As I said yesterday, that was primarily in Edmonton and Calgary.

Since then, the situation has improved significantly. With respect to Edmonton — which I believe the hon. member was particularly concerned about — the opening of a second shelter last October certainly helped the load. Previously an average of 40 families a month could not be admitted. That has currently been reduced to between 12 and 15 families per month. This problem will be further mitigated by the opening of new approved shelters during this fiscal year: a new home in Sherwood Park, one in Calgary, one in Camrose, and one in Red Deer.

In terms of families that went to the shelters and could not be accommodated, they were then referred to the emergency aspect of social services. Through social services, they were put up in hotels or motels and were there until shelter spaces became vacant. Because there is a very quick turnaround time in terms of stay in the shelters, they were able to be accommodated fairly rapidly.

#### **Bankruptcies**

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. Member for Lethbridge West asked a question with respect to individual bankruptcies — numbers and, I believe, possible trends. I have some information for the hon. member. The statistics for the last quarter of 1982 reflect 890 individual bankruptcies. The statistic for the first quarter of 1983 is 860. So there has indeed been a slight decline.

Tied to that question, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member also raised the orderly payment of debts program. This program is governed by the federal Interest Act. When there is a court judgment under the orderly payment of debts program and it's so ordered, an automatic 5 per cent interest is paid.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Those figures the minister gave us for business bankruptcies, the 860 — would the minister confirm that this was a 52 per cent increase over the previous four months and a 29 per cent increase in the last month, and that this is much higher than the national average?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member obviously knows the answer and simply wants, for his own purposes, to get the minister to agree with him.

MR. MARTIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I got this from the federal government. We're never sure if they have the right figures, and I just wanted to confirm it.

#### **Northeast Regional Water Pipeline (continued)**

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to supplement an answer I gave to an earlier question today from the Member for Clover Bar, with regard to the water situation he brought forward. The advice the Northeast Water Board has received and is passing on to its members is that the city of Edmonton can supply water to meet average demands and to partially meet peak demands. I wouldn't want to leave the impression that there would be a water shortage for domestic consumption for the city of Edmonton or any of its downstream users. The most serious constraint of the water conservation program, which the city has been advised of and the Northeast Water Board has advised its customers of, would be a ban on the watering of lawns.

#### **Economic Conditions**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. It flows out of a question I asked on March 11 with respect to the solemn undertaking given by the hon. Premier to the people of Alberta in October 1982 that there was going to be an imminent turnaround in the Alberta economy. The hon. Premier indicated that the first bit of empirical evidence was the Conference Board quarterly forecast. In light of the most recent

Conference Board forecast, what evaluation of that forecast and of the economic outlook for this province is being made by the government of Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I refer the hon. Leader of the Opposition to page 8 of the Budget Address and, for further elaboration, to the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. What assessment is the government of Alberta now making of the most recent Conference Board report with respect to what appears to be an uncertain consumer demand in the province of Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I refer the question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, there is a quarterly report of the Conference Board out today, which points out that after the fast growth of 1981 and the downturn of 1982, the economy in Alberta has steadied out for this year and moved into a modest economic recovery on the basis of their projections for next year. Therefore it appears that there has been a delay in the Alberta economy moving into the economic downturn and a delay coming out.

There's no question that the report of the Conference Board, which is the third in the last nine months, is generally in line with what we stated in the budget, in the sense that we indicated that three events have delayed the economic recovery in the province of Alberta. Those are outlined in the budget, with regard to lowered energy demand, the OPEC lower oil price situation, and natural gas. That item is specifically mentioned in the Conference Board report today, the fact of the problems with regard to international oil prices. Although I note that Conference Board report, they specifically say with regard to Alberta:

Oil and gas production and exploration are actually projected to rise slightly this year after posting sharp declines in 1981 and 1982.

With regard to the retail sales area mentioned by the hon. Opposition Leader, I think the report indicates a significant 10 per cent rise in retail sales projected for Alberta next year.

#### **Ku Klux Klan Congress**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Solicitor General. Has the Solicitor General ascertained whether or not the recent poster campaign by sympathizers or members of the Ku Klux Klan, promoting an upcoming Aryan World Congress, is in violation of section 281(2) of the Criminal Code of Canada?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, as that matter would relate more properly to the portfolio of the Attorney General, I refer it to him.

MR. SPEAKER: I think it's probably very flattering on the part of the hon. member to assume that hon. ministers have the Criminal Code memorized. Perhaps such a question could be given on notice.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. The Solicitor General is in charge of the police force, but I will refer it to the Attorney General. I know he knows section 281(2), because we talked about it before.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the potential of charges under section 281 in respect of hate propaganda are treated the same way as charges in respect of any other matter. If there is a complaint made, it's investigated. If the investigation yields sufficient evidence for laying a charge, that would surely be done.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary to the Attorney General. To the minister's knowledge, have any complaints been received regarding the very recent campaign of the Ku Klux Klan and the posters going around the city?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge. I would regard something like that of significant importance and would be glad to check into it.

#### **National Security Service**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to either the Premier or the Attorney General. It's with respect to the introduction today in the House of Commons of legislation to establish a new civilian agency, the Canadian security intelligence service, built on the foundations of the current security system of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The legislation implements the government's decision announced in 1981, following a recommendation of the McDonald commission, to separate security intelligence from police and law enforcement activities. In view of the decision made by the government today, but based on their position as of August 1981, has the government of Alberta any response to this and any position on it?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would have to review the legislation presented to the House of Commons before being in a position to give any comment in respect of it. I'm certainly familiar with the intention to establish a security service that would report on a civilian employer basis, rather than directly within the police service as has been the case in the past. I've had some indication of the legislation being pending but have not had the opportunity to see what was presented today.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Without commenting on the legislation but rather on the principle, has the government of Alberta made any representation, either through the Attorney General or his colleague the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, on this matter between 1981 and the introduction of legislation today?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think it might be better described as conversations and discussions. Throughout this period, the federal government would have been well aware of two factors. One is that we acknowledge that the operation of the security service is a federal responsibility. The second is that so far as the operations of security personnel are carried on throughout Canada, as was indicated in the inquiries made by Mr. Justice McDonald, the activities may from time to time be of concern to provincial law enforcement agencies. Our position is that we underline that type of concern in respect of past situations and trust that the operations of the security service in a new form won't give rise to the same kind of difficulty.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, so I understand the minister's answer. Is the minister

saying that as a result of those concerns about the activities of security services, the government of Alberta basically accepted the principal recommendation of the McDonald commission and communicated that acceptance to the government of Canada, and the government of Canada is now basically acting not only in accordance with the McDonald commission report but with the support of the government of Alberta, at least?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the way it's being proceeded with at the present time is entirely suitable. In saying that, I refer to the general characteristics of having the security service based on a civilian reporting basis.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last question. The time for the question period has expired.

MR. NOTLEY: Could the Attorney General advise the Assembly whether there was any discussion by the federal government — or Mr. Kaplan in particular, in his position — with provincial attorneys general prior to the introduction of this Bill and subsequent to the McDonald report on this matter?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would have difficulty recalling if there were specific occasions on which that occurred, perhaps with one recent exception. Not long ago there was a conversation with Mr. Kaplan in which that was discussed. My difficulty in answering the hon. Leader of the Opposition is to say whether or not there had also been other such conversations since the McDonald commission came out. Conversations of that type, not being in the nature of a formal representation, tend to be tied to other occasions for meeting.

#### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Assembly agree that the hon. Member for Wainwright might revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### **head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

*(reversion)*

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, 32 grades 8 and 9 students from the Hardisty school. I'm very pleased to see them here today to have a first-hand look at this Assembly in operation. I hope the students will get answers to a number of the questions asked of me when I visited this classroom last fall. Accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Elizabeth Schmidt, Mrs. Joan Drager, and bus driver Mr. Jim Yuskiw, they are seated in the members gallery. Would they please rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

#### **head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

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

**Department of Federal and  
Intergovernmental Affairs**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the minister have some responses?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity of hopefully concluding the votes relative to the department today. It's now almost a month since April 22, when we spent an entire morning dealing with the estimates of this department. I want to briefly respond to some of the issues raised that morning. I want to thank the members who participated and indicate how pleased I was that in some major areas there appeared to be considerable unanimity between the members of the Official Opposition and members of the government, relative to the issues of property rights and Senate reform. Since then, I have provided the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood with a copy of the government's discussion paper, which was made public last fall and which, in many ways, is very close to the recommendations the hon. members of the opposition advanced during the course of their remarks.

Now I think we have to look at what is happening, and things seem to be happening rather quickly — somewhat to my surprise, I must say — in the last month. While we're all aware that the joint House of Commons/Senate committee has been announced, it has now been appointed and the members made public. The Prime Minister has indicated that a government of Canada paper relative to the position of the government of Canada on the issue of Senate reform will be made public in the near future. I remind hon. members of the committee that the subject of Senate reform was indeed mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. It would appear that once the federal government has issued what I think is to be called its green paper on the issue, we will have to study that very carefully, then consult with members of the Assembly as to the appropriate Alberta response to the joint committee. But in any event, I think it is an encouraging sign that there will be some movement toward Senate reform during the current fiscal year. We will all have to take a very careful look at what is going to be proposed. But I thank the hon. members for their participation and their thoughtful comments relative to that issue.

As I indicated as well, a resolution will be introduced in the Assembly dealing with the issue of the constitutional accord on aboriginal rights. That will be announced in the very near future. I wish to thank the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud for his remarks relative to the impact of the Macdonald commission. That will be another major development that will have to be assessed very carefully in the near future by members of this Assembly. Since the estimates were introduced on April 22, we have had an announcement by the commission chairman of the plans for discussion throughout Canada of the terms of that commission. Some preliminary meetings will be taking place in the next month or two at academic institutions in Canada. Then in the fall, opportunities will be made available for public hearings across the country in major centres, including centres in Alberta. At that time, members of the public and interested organizations can make their representations to the Macdonald commission. As I said in my opening remarks on April 22, we would have to carefully consider

the issue as to how Alberta will respond to that commission.

One specific question relative to the budget was asked by the hon. Member for Calgary Currie, as to whether it is the intention of the government to open any additional offices outside the province in this fiscal year. The answer I must give to that specific question is no. It had been suggested and thought that it might be useful to open an office in Atlantic Canada. But in view of the current fiscal situation, that proposal has been postponed. The idea has considerable merit and will be examined in future budgetary considerations, but not during this current year.

In reviewing the comments made by hon. members, I noted that there was some discussion of the Crow rate relative to the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Since then of course the issues have broken, and my colleagues the ministers of Agriculture and Economic Development have taken certain steps and announced the position of the government of Alberta on that issue. I think it is appropriate for them to continue with their primary responsibilities in that area. After all, the department is a service department to other government departments and, in this particular area, is acting very much in that capacity.

In conclusion, one issue raised by the members of the Official Opposition related to the testing of cruise missiles. I have answered those questions in the question period, I think, on at least two occasions. Of course, the Premier dealt with those as well in his estimates the other evening. However, I do want to take a moment to indicate quite clearly that this is one area where we must be very correct in our dealings with the government of Canada and its responsibilities under the Canadian Constitution. There are areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction; there are areas of exclusive federal jurisdiction. In this particular case, when it comes to the issue of national defence and international defence treaties, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the relationship Canada has with its NATO partners, that is clearly a responsibility of the government of Canada. The agreement which has been entered into between Canada and the United States does not have a place for direct provincial government responsibility.

However, I do wish to emphasize what I said in my remarks relative to a question. When it comes to the issue of property and the lives of the citizens of the province of Alberta during any testing which may ensue as a result of that umbrella agreement between Canada and the United States, the Minister of National Defence has assured our government that there will be full and complete consultation with the government of Alberta relative to the 'over-flying', if you will, of any of these unarmed missiles during testing. That consultation has not taken place yet, because of course no final agreement has been arrived at between the government of Canada and the government of the United States relative to cruise missile testing. If the disarmament discussions now under way in other parts of the world between the parties involved are successful, perhaps it may never have to happen.

I know that hon. members of the Assembly from all parties have their own views as Canadians relative to the issues that were raised. None the less, the government of Alberta maintains the position that I have outlined relative to the issue of national defence being solely the responsibility of the government of Canada, and that is quite appropriate. Other members have expressed their views during the course of the estimates, almost a month ago. Those obviously represent their personal views and



perhaps the views of their constituents, but they do not represent the views of the government of Alberta.

There was one remark made by the Leader of the Opposition that I think is important to respond to. He indicated that the government had not been afraid to trespass on areas of federal responsibility in other areas. I want to emphasize this: in any case where representation was made by the government of this province relative to trade matters, it was in two particular areas where, under the Constitution of Canada, there is a shared responsibility. I refer to agriculture, under section 95, and to the subject of energy or natural resources. All members of the Assembly are aware that in the most recent amendments to the Constitution, which are part of the Constitution that was brought to Canada just over a year ago and proclaimed in April 1982, there is increased provincial government responsibility for non-renewable natural resources, forestry resources, and electrical energy, under section 92A of the Constitution. Those are the areas where the government has indeed been vigorous in trying to ensure that the natural resources and agricultural products of Alberta that are developed for export outside the province or the country — indeed the government has a clear constitutional position in which to make representations to the federal government for inclusion in such bodies as the Wheat Board or the representations made by Canada in such forums as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

I just wanted to touch on those particular issues that were raised during the course of the estimates. Perhaps I have not adequately responded to all the matters that have been raised, because I guess we in this House will never agree on everything. But I do want to thank the members of the opposition for having agreed with the government on the issue of property rights and, in large measure as well, relative to the approach we should be taking toward reforming the Senate as part of the Canadian government. So I think there is some encouragement that this House doesn't automatically engender disagreement on every issue.

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Chairman, just a point for clarification. I'm not sure whether this would fall into the minister's department or that of the Minister of Municipal Affairs; that is, in regard to the issue of cruise missile testing. A lot of local municipalities intend to put this on their fall election ballot as a referendum. I just wonder what the point of this would be when, as clearly stated by the minister, there is no jurisdiction over defence for provinces or municipalities. Who controls the wording of these referendums, whether they're anti-cruise missile, anti-nuclear testing, or just pro-peace? Certainly in Edmonton, the mayor ruled against putting this on the fall ballot as a referendum, and this is being legally appealed.

I wonder if the minister could give some clarification as to the position on this question.

MR. HORSMAN: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, that question was raised by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood during his remarks on the opening of my estimates, and I should have responded to that. It's clearly a matter of interpretation of municipal government legislation in the province of Alberta. Questions relating to the type of referenda which might be placed before municipal electors are a matter for consideration by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. MARTIN: Before we go on, I have just one simple question for the minister. Seeing he is the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, I was curious how he is going to vote in the upcoming Conservative leadership conference.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, whether or not I can get to that particular event of some considerable interest is very conjectural at the moment. As I pointed out in my remarks in the budget debate, the 100th anniversary of the city of Medicine Hat happens to fall on the 10th day of June, which is the Friday of that particular convention. I certainly intend to be in Medicine Hat for the official event, and whether or not it's possible for me somehow to get to Ottawa to cast a vote the following day is very, very much up in the air at the moment. I may be up in the air in the middle of the night; I don't know. But in any event, I'm still up in the air as to who I might support.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$225,871
1.02 — Administrative Support	\$612,827
1.03 — Intergovernmental Affairs	\$1,814,205
1.04 — Alberta Offices	\$2,434,002
1.05 — Conferences and Missions	\$348,000
1.06 — Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline	\$6,300
Total Vote 1 — Intergovernmental Co-ordination and Research	\$5,441,205
Department Total	\$5,441,205

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the vote for the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### Department of Social Services and Community Health

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Chairman, we ran out of time on the last day, relative to a couple of questions I said I would get back to some of the hon. members on. One question related to single men's hostels, in terms of the percentage increase in budget for the year being something like 3 per cent and how that related to the significant increase in the social allowance funding to transients. In fact they are not related. There has actually been an increase in the vacancy rates in hostels across the province. In other words, there are not as many people staying at the hostels as there were a couple of years ago.

However, we're enabling social allowance recipients, the unemployed employables, to get social assistance through these particular centres. So the increase in numbers of transients is the result of classification. In actual fact, the shelters are used less than they were, and the people who are getting their assistance there can live at home, room and board, or wherever.

The other question related to family court services. The Department of Social Services and Community Health is involved in terms of family court ordered home studies. They're generally involved in custody suits. The court asks the department to do a home or family study to assist the court in making a decision. The load is certainly heavy, and the resources are stretched in that particular area. However, people in a divorce action can arrange for private reports, if they wish. Of course they'd have to pay

for it themselves.

Those are two areas I wanted to comment on. We'll attempt to answer any others that are outstanding, if hon. members would raise them.

MR. MARTIN: Just three or four points to follow up. One, I mentioned to the minister that we're getting all sorts of letters — I'm sure he is — about how the policies of the government in terms of social services are affecting people at an individual level. For the record, I want to quickly read this one letter — it's just a page, and then a specific suggestion — to see if the minister might entertain the suggestion. It's addressed to us, and I obviously can't give the person's name. It says:

I object to the new housing budget limits for social assistance recipients and I am outraged that there is no appeal committee to consider the individual needs of the people (voters). Because of the economy there are people that are on temporary or partial assistance only, not that that should make any difference. People should be allowed to choose where they live no matter who they are or if they are on assistance. I feel it is more than inhuman to force taxpayers, ex-taxpayers or potential taxpayers to sell their homes when they cannot improve the situation they and the government are in at this time. In many cases, myself included, they would never again be able to purchase a home of their own if they are now "forced" to sell them because of the budget limitations "forced" upon them. As far as I can see the only ones to benefit from the "forced" sale of their home would be real estate companies, private owners of apartment blocks and moving companies. I would rather the government put a lien against ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the hon. member would summarize the letter. Actually, reading of documents such as letters, telegrams, or newspaper articles into the record ...

MR. MARTIN: With all due respect, I said there would be one page. We're coming to the end of it, and there's a suggestion at the end.

... my property for their portion of the payments than lose my home completely. They (the government) would then be reimbursed for their support. If the economy recovers, owners would be able to repay on a loan basis depending on the income of the home owner.

They go on to plead for assistance.

I looked at the idea. There may be problems with it, but at least it's a positive suggestion. My questions to the minister: would they look at a proposal like this or have they, or would he take it under advisement? That might be a way out for the minister, in that they don't have to sell their houses. If they did get a job and their income went up, they would have to pay back the government, but they wouldn't be forced to sell their homes on the asset limits. I'd ask the minister to comment on it, take it under advisement, or whatever the case may be.

Mr. Chairman, the other question has to do with a specific question I don't believe has come up yet. Can the minister expand on the funding and program support for the turnover of the child welfare services to the Indian band at Slave Lake, if he has that information?

The other information I think the minister would like to talk about in his estimates, because it did achieve a fair amount of publicity, had to do with the Ombudsman's

report on the suicide of Grant Lee Phillips. I think the minister is aware that the Ombudsman was disturbed by this, and I'm not asking the minister to go through the whole case. The question specifically: is it still government policy to install alone in hotels for extended periods mentally disturbed foster children who don't currently have a place? If the minister is aware that that happened in that case, I would ask him to comment if it has been changed or what has happened as a result.

I recall the Member for Little Bow talking about the Klufas report. My last question is: could the minister be a little more specific about some of the recommendations — what they have done and are looking at in terms of that — or just add a little bit on that particular part?

Mr. Chairman, I think that with those questions we've basically covered the gamut of ideas. I'm sure the minister and I could go on in philosophical discussion for many hours. I doubt that's going to do much good from our perspective, other than who we talk to outside in public. Could the minister come back to speak to those questions?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, just one or two brief comments to the minister. The question I raised the other day in question period — I would like to indicate that it really comes home to you quite forcefully when someone on your staff comes to work in a beaten and battered condition, and it's not the first time it's happened. It certainly puts the caseworker in a real predicament when people who work in a government department don't really have anyplace to put these people immediately or to help them. I'm sure it must be a frustration that caseworkers run into time after time. I know that the minister cannot move that rapidly to make sure that facilities are available at all times, but the only real request I have of him is that caseworkers be empowered, with some kind of simple system, to put these people up in a motel, hotel, or anything at all to get them away from the batterer.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

I'd like to make another point to the minister. I know we are quite often criticized for trying to advertise these things, and it sometimes leads to the break-up of families. We say these things are available, so the wife runs away from the husband or vice versa. But I think more information should be disseminated to tell battered wives that they don't have to put up with that kind of abuse any longer. I'm saying to the minister that we should have a concerted effort to tell women especially that they just don't have to put up with that kind of nonsense forever. If it's something that's going on more than it should, here's what they do and here's how we'll try to help them. That's really the representation I want to make to the minister.

We've discussed this when we've talked about philosophy, but I think that the government has chosen a rather bad time to try to cut down on people who are genuinely in need. I guess the reason I've survived the three avalanches in this Assembly — the first two were not too difficult, but the last three have been avalanches — is because I know what goes on with my people. I know that people who are in genuine need are having a most difficult time trying to get by on what they are getting from the department. I know it's difficult to be a minister when budgets are being cut. But when we look at the entire budget of this province, I think we could have done a little different job of priorities. I think we've really

condemned some of these people to a lifetime on welfare. I know that in the 16 years I've been in this Assembly, Mr. Chairman, we've talked about providing incentives for people to get off welfare. But we seem to be going in the opposite direction: if you make a little bit of money, we'll take away the government's help. That certainly doesn't encourage people to get out on their own.

I guess the most difficult and prevalent cases are when the wife is left. The husband just takes off and conveniently forgets to write the alimony cheque about every other month. These women are having a dreadful time, especially when they have adolescent dependants. It's a tough struggle for them.

Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say to the minister that if he has any clout, when he gets back to budgeting for next year I think we've looked at slashing in the wrong area.

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

DR. WEBBER: Yes, Mr. Chairman — interesting points, all of them. I'll take them in the order they were asked.

With respect to the comment from the Member for Edmonton Norwood, dealing with people who have difficulty meeting their mortgage payments and alternative ways in which they can be handled, and the question of the liens: that alternative was considered. I don't remember all the pros and cons. I know it is done in some cases, and I'd be happy to provide the hon. member with information relative to that particular approach.

The hon. member referred to the Grant Lee Phillips case and the concerns of the Ombudsman. We have acted on the recommendations of the Ombudsman's report. With respect to the fact that Grant Lee Phillips was put up in a hotel in Calgary, that policy has been changed. It was a time when finding accommodation was a problem, and it was not intended as a long-term measure. However, we have now instituted a policy where it is not to occur unless the person is chaperoned in some way. The other aspects of the Ombudsman's report on that particular case spilled over into other departments. That's all I would comment, unless there are further questions.

The Klufas report on the provision of services for handicapped people in Alberta was very comprehensive, as a result of that group holding hearings across the province. There was tremendous grass-roots input to the services for the handicapped. The general conclusion of the report was that we have come a long way in provision of services for handicapped people in this province; in fact provide the best services overall of any province in the country. But that doesn't mean there aren't things we can do to further improve the system.

One of the largest concerns related to accessibility of handicapped people to information about services for the handicapped. There was a recommendation related to the establishment of community-type resource centres where handicapped people can go to get information about the types of services available to them. I think it was a very valuable report and, again, recommendations spilled over into other government departments. We are assessing all those recommendations and hope we can act on a number of them. The hon. Member for Little Bow held up a pamphlet or booklet in the House the other day, which lists services for the handicapped throughout the province. As an interim measure, those have been sent out to agencies across the province.

With regard to the fourth question from the Member for Edmonton Norwood: funding for child welfare serv-

ices. What he was getting at there just escaped me. Maybe he can ask again.

With regard to the Member for Clover Bar and the problems of abuse of women in the province, today in question period I answered some aspects of that. We are increasing the number of shelters in the province from nine to a total of 12 by the end of this year which, according to the numbers we have, should relieve to a great extent, and hopefully eliminate, any possibility of turn-aways at the door. However, turn-aways at the door are referred to emergency social services and put up in motels or hotels. So the social workers, on duty on a 24-hour basis, can make the decision to put these people up until accommodation is available. I had the pleasant opportunity of visiting Grande Prairie recently. The hon. Member for Grande Prairie took me to a number of facilities in that city, including a women's shelter. It was very interesting to see how they operate and the types of services they provide.

With regard to informing people in the province of the services available, if the hon. member has any specific suggestions on how we can improve that, I'd be happy to get that input. It's certainly a continuing difficult problem.

Mr. Chairman, the timing of social allowance changes is something that we really don't have any control over. It is the objective of the government at this particular time to have sound financial management as a priority and, at the same time, to provide quality social services. We feel that the total package we put together results in some cost savings and, at the same time, provides assistance for the tremendously increased load of social allowance recipients in the province — as I mentioned the other day, almost half a billion dollars in the budget for social allowance for this coming year.

I have tried to get feedback from a variety of sources, not only from social workers in the field, as to how the adjustments and changes have been received. I met recently with some 12 to 15 social workers in Calgary. They were very positive about the changes. They felt it was about time that we as a government were concerned about the funding we provide in this particular area. Just this morning I met with some people who are involved in providing services to the handicapped. Their biggest difficulty was understanding why we made these changes. Once that had been explained to them, they accepted it.

I don't know if anything more needs to be said about that, other than that the hon. Member for Clover Bar indicated we were going in the opposite direction relative to incentives. That's not true. We've increased the incentives for people to retain more of the money they can earn if they are on social allowance. I believe that's been increased from \$85 to \$115 per month. I hope that answers some of the questions.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, one question. I was specifically asking about your speech of May 16, about the master agreement signed by the federal government, the provincial government, and the Lesser Slave Lake regional council, and what the support services and costs were on that.

Just one other question, and then I'll let the minister relax for a while. There's been some speculation — whether right or not — about the elderly being squeezed because of some policies, the shelter allowances and all the rest. I'm sure he's heard this. Some people have speculated that they've been driven to waiting lists of nursing homes and other extended care facilities, because

these represent the only realistic alternative to the present living arrangements. Is this true? Do we have any evidence of this? If there is some evidence, what sorts of numbers are we looking at?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Chairman, I did make reference to a master agreement between the federal government, the government of Alberta, and the Lesser Slave Lake regional council, consisting of a number of bands in that area, that we had hoped would be completed this week. The agreement would be one in which we would be moving in the direction of having that council manage their child welfare services. This would be accomplished by a series of annual mini-agreements, if you want, and through a period of time, would transfer the responsibility for handling child welfare services to the native people themselves, rather than the provincial government providing those services. I mentioned that it would hopefully be completed this week. It all depends on the timing, whether the federal minister can be here to sign the agreement.

I have no information that I'm aware of, relative to any senior citizens indicating that they might have to move to a nursing home because of these changes. The changes, as they affect the elderly, primarily relate to the anomaly that occurred with pensions; not their own pensions but the social allowance supplements. That affects approximately 800 people in Alberta. Since the social workers have met with these senior citizens to establish what their needs are, I can't fathom that any of them would be forced to move into a nursing home as a result.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$327,100
1.02 — Appeal and Advisory Secretariat	\$132,950
1.03 — Deputy Minister of Social Services	\$582,350
1.04 — Deputy Minister of Health Services	\$419,120
1.05 — Associate Deputy Minister	\$1,135,700
1.06 — Assistant Deputy Minister Planning Secretariat	\$2,908,290
1.07 — Regional Service Delivery	[\$24,595,120]
1.08 — Management and Operational Audit	\$1,538,750
1.09 — Assistant Deputy Minister Operations Support	\$663,400
1.010 — Financial Services	\$6,605,200
1.011 — Personnel Services	[\$4,224,960]
1.012 — Administrative Services	\$6,358,100
1.013 — Public Communications	\$ 1,449,240
1.014 — Information Systems Services	\$6,147,440
1.015 — Legal Services	\$43,740
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$57,131,460
2.1 — Program Development and Support	\$2,668,140
2.2 — Regional Service Delivery	\$16,828,950
2.3 — Social Allowance for Aged	[\$19,696,300]
2.4 — Social Allowance for Single Parent Families	\$216,342,100
2.5 — Social Allowance for Physically Handicapped	\$68,584,600
2.6 — Social Allowance for Mentally Handicapped	\$11,849,000
2.7 — Social Allowance for Employables	\$120,186,120
2.8 — Social Allowance for Special Groups	\$16,296,710
Total Vote 2 — Social Allowance	\$472,451,920

3.1 — Program Development and Support	\$717,870
3.2 — Regional Service Delivery	\$21,171,810
3.3 — Family Services	\$45,686,760
3.4 — Contracted Residences	\$40,168,230
3.5 — Residence and Treatment in Institutions	\$24,492,050
Total Vote 3 — Child Welfare Services	\$132,236,720
4.1 — Guardianship of Dependent Adults	\$3,261,100
4.2 — Senior Citizens	\$763,600
4.3 — Family Relations Program	\$3,022,700
4.4 — Purchased Services and Agency Grants for Adults	\$3,500,000
4.5 — Residential Accommodation in Institutions and Hostels for Adults	\$4,825,200
Total Vote 4 — Specialized Social Services	\$15,372,600
5.1 — Regional Service Delivery	\$1,846,270
5.2 — Senior Citizens' Supplementary Benefits	\$70,558,200
5.3 — Allowances and Benefits	\$70,639,000
5.4 — Day Care	\$14,786,000
5.5 — Widows' Supplementary Benefits	\$10,500,000
Total Vote 5 — Benefits and Income Support	\$168,329,470
6.1 — Program Development and Support	\$399,090
6.2 — Regional Service Delivery	\$2,587,200
6.3 — Purchased Services and Agency Grants	\$17,661,120
Total Vote 6 — Vocational Rehabilitation Services	\$20,647,410
7.1 — Program Development and Support	\$1,416,100
7.2 — Regional Service Delivery	\$2,496,570
7.3 — Purchased Services and Agency Grants	\$30,531,480
7.4 — Residence and Treatment in Institutions	\$71,442,310
Total Vote 7 — Services for the Handicapped	\$105,886,460
8.1 — Program Development and Support	\$3,699,420
8.2 — Regional Service Delivery	\$13,302,620
8.3 — Purchased Services and Agency Grants	\$6,745,480
8.4 — Residence and Treatment in Institutions	\$15,709,590
Total Vote 8 — Treatment of Mental Illness	\$39,457,110
9.1 — Program Development and Support	\$3,054,500
9.2 — Communicable Disease Control	\$5,872,400
9.3 — Funding of Provincial Health Laboratory	\$8,573,400
9.4 — Rehabilitative and Special Health Services	\$27,064,700
9.5 — Vital Statistics	\$1,555,000
Total Vote 9 — General Health Services	\$46,120,000
10.1 — Program Development and Support	\$1,382,245
10.2 — Regional Service Delivery	\$1,204,525
10.3 — Community Health Services	\$3,202,030
10.4 — Funding of Community Social Services	\$24,806,200
10.5 — Funding of Local Health Services	\$81,844,200

10.6 — Day Care	\$19,289,000
Total Vote 10 — Community Social and Health Services	\$131,728,200
11.1 — Program Support	\$3,116,602
11.2 — Treatment and Rehabilitation Services	\$9,942,564
11.3 — Education and Information Services	\$4,207,482
11.4 — Direct Financial Assistance to Private Treatment Agencies	\$6,314,456
Total Vote 11 — Alcoholism and Drug Abuse — Treatment and Education	\$23,581,104
Department Total	\$1,212,942,454

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Chairman, I move that the estimates for the Department of Social Services and Community Health be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### Department of Labour

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

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I think I would just await questions, if there are any.

MR. MARTIN: We'll save a fair amount of things for the future, I would think, so I will be short at this particular time.

MR. SZWENDER: Promise?

MR. MARTIN: Yes, I promise. I have to go to a meeting, that's why.

What I would like to do is ask a couple of questions. One has to do with Bill 44. When are we going to see this? Will it be next week, Tuesday, Friday, whenever? I am not going to ask what's in it, because I'm sure we have a pretty good idea. From our perspective, knowing this would give us some time.

The other thing I meant to mention to the hon. minister, and I just have to make a point of it. In question period yesterday, the minister got quite upset and referred to the Bill of Rights. All I was saying at the time was that precisely the questions we were asking had to do with the public education program. I quote what the minister said back on April 20:

In terms of the suggestion the hon. leader makes about a publicity campaign, I'm not sure all experts would agree that that is the best way to deal with that kind of literature. In fact, it seems to me — as has been reported to me by others, their opinion — that sometimes that kind of campaigning just adds further publicity to unfortunate theories and suggestions which none of us, in keeping with the Individual's Rights Protection Act, wish to see promoted.

I thank the hon. member for changing his mind over one month. Somehow he saw the light that a public education program was needed, and he is now doing it. That's what I was referring to in question period.

The only other comment I'd make at this time is that after Bill 44, whenever it comes — unless it's a complete surprise to everybody, and if it is I will compliment the minister and we'll be flowing with kind things to say —

we are going to have some problems in labor relations in the province. I don't believe it will be serious to begin with, but it will be an ongoing friction. I suggest to the minister that it's not going to make his job easy in the next little while. I would be interested in how the minister feels he can overcome this friction that is bound to occur, especially between some of the organized groups.

I know the minister has polls that Bill 44 — I think for all the wrong reasons — is popular. In history we see these things happen. I suggested about Bill 44, and I still believe, that the way to good labor relations is through co-operation rather than taking rights away. Be that as it may, I know the government is committed to Bill 44. We will have our say about that in the Legislature. But I suggest that things are not going to be rosy for the Minister of Labour. I hope he recognizes that it is serious when you have the type of bitterness that could come out of this. I hope that at this time he and his staff are thinking of ways to get back to co-operation to bridge the gap as much as possible, so that we're not looking years and years ahead at bitter labor negotiations between government and the labor movement.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the minister would agree that this is not a desirable way to go ahead. It's not good for our democratic society; it's not good for anybody in the long run. I would ask the minister if he could make a few comments about what he sees for the ongoing labor negotiations and what he thinks he can do to bring things together again after Bill 44.

Thank you.

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

MR. YOUNG: If there are no other questions, certainly. Dealing first with Bill 44 and the question of when it may be given second reading. I'm not the House leader, but it would be my hope that the latter part of next week, depending on other House business, might enable us to get back to Bill 44.

With respect to the question of what follows Bill 44, I think the hon. member is anticipating. I hope to achieve his first, but unlikely, wish, that he will be able to express his pleasure with Bill 44. If that's the case, of course there probably won't be any other problems and I won't be faced with the hypothetical task that is the concern.

Perhaps the House would be interested in reflecting briefly upon this aspect of the situation. In labor relations and the impact of any piece of labor legislation, some regard needs to be given to the nature of the employment relationship in Alberta. While we have approximately 28 per cent of the employees of this province organized in some form of union, the fact is that in the private sector that number is 16 per cent. So 84 per cent of private-sector employees in this province do not belong to any kind of union. That means that 84 out of every 100 employees in this province have had to respond to the current economic situation in the private sector on an immediate basis as market forces have dictated. They haven't had the buffer that an agreement provides. Obviously their situations vary, depending upon the industry, the employer within the industry, and the nature of the employer's relationship with the employees.

On a broader basis, I would like to express the view that the more I work with the general question of how to have an ongoing relationship between management and unions, especially when we're talking about provincial or regional organizations, I'm coming to the view that we

have to treat almost on an industry or sector basis. Because the challenges, the kinds of organizations, the general thrust of problems, and how those ebb and flow within an industry differ. While there are some broad overall concerns that I would like to be able to deal with and have employers and employees dealing with, in this province we don't have any provision to do that.

The unions themselves are of quite different opinions on certain pretty fundamental matters, as the hon. member knows. Employers tend to be somewhat independent of mind as well. Generally speaking, they have not come together in any strong organization that speaks with one voice over many sectors. So I think we have to look at each industrial sector in taking that direction somewhat further in our preventive mediation services program. We are now trying to put in place individuals who will build a bank of information about the immediate past problems in previous rounds of bargaining, and those we think are emerging, for each industrial sector. We try to work with the parties ahead of time, when we can predict, to head off some of those difficulties of the past.

I have only four of the brochures on the preventive mediation program here. I could get more. Perhaps someone would deliver this to the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood for his information; it might be of interest. If other members would like them, I can easily get them. But I can't get them this afternoon in time to distribute to all members.

To turn to the question of the education program for the Human Rights Commission. The hon. member made reference to my response to a question in April without giving the question and the context in which the question was raised. At that time, I was trying to make the point that rather than get out and focus a program on one aspect of racism in this case, or religious discrimination, it was important for all of us to recall that discrimination against any one of us today can be the seeds for discrimination against others tomorrow, be they ones or twos or all of us. In short, if there is discrimination and lack of understanding, lack of appreciation of the cultural and religious values of one single group, one single minority — or majority, for that matter — then that in itself can become the seeds from which discrimination grows on a much larger scale. The only way to combat that effectively is to do so in the name of tolerance and understanding.

I have no problem with a program that tries to do that in terms of its objective. The challenge is to have a program which is effective in accomplishing that. In some very recent discussions I've had, we've been trying to consider different program formats. After hearing some of those discussions, I am coming to the conclusion that we have to focus on programs that are very visual or that involve different people.

It's not good enough to pick up a piece of paper which most people who have a different point of view aren't going to read through anyway. If they read the first line and disagree with it, they're not going to finish reading it because it's pretty dry stuff. But if they meet someone who has characteristics with which they're not familiar and they're given an opportunity to confront and relate to that individual as a human being, I think that goes much further than any words can express. In short, on the theory that a picture is worth a thousand words, and a moving picture is worth much more, it seems to me that that is the direction we must go in dealing with the general problem before us. But to do that effectively — as all hon. members will appreciate in looking at advertis-

ing, there's a lot of advertising done on television and radio but much of it is not very effective, in my opinion. I'm sure the agencies wouldn't agree with that. But I think that is a factor. So not only do we have to find the right medium; we have to find a very ingenious, astute, shrewd, and well-developed programmer to be able to organize that sort of thing for the commission. As I see it, that's going to be the challenge.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up on that. In question period yesterday, I didn't get the idea that they'd made a decision about times. I see June perhaps, and then I see the chairman of the commission saying it may take a couple of years before the program is under way. Could the minister update us a bit on that? Is it really two years we're talking about?

First of all, I agree with the minister that it has to be done well. A lot of pamphlets and things that are handed out actually work the other way. It's a waste of money and time. Nobody would question that what we do has to be tasteful and has to be done well to be effective. I agree with the minister on that. But in terms of the time frame, when we were asking the questions, we weren't asking specifically about just going out and doing one.

Perhaps all of us are a little shocked at what's been going on the last two or three months. I expect it caught us all by surprise. Until recently, I certainly didn't perceive that there was much anti-Semitism in the province. I expect that was true of most hon. members here. But it seems to be there. It seems to be coming out now in all sorts of strange and bizarre ways. So if we're going to work on this, perhaps there's even more immediacy than I thought. We know these things come up more in a recession too; many sociologists will tell us this. I wonder if the minister could update us. I'm a little confused by comments in the House and what I read in the papers later.

MR. YOUNG: I think I can do that. Since question period yesterday, I have been involved in one or two more meetings on this subject. I don't see a dichotomy between what the chairman of the commission said and what I have said, or what it was reported we said — perhaps I should express it that way. We see two different challenges in our discussions.

One is a longer term challenge. That is the one to which the commission chairman made reference in, I believe, a press clipping I saw today. We believe that challenge will take some time to organize, because it is focussed on the established school structure: the curriculum, teaching staff, et cetera. As the hon. member knows better than I, it takes quite a while to be satisfied as to the types of materials that should be there. Getting them into the system and having them permeate the system will be a much longer term project. I think that's where the reference to the potential of a couple of years came from.

I'm not going to suggest that we will see results by the end of June. I simply suggest that if we're dealing with the general public and what can be done in a program directed in that manner, we are looking at shorter time frames — still a lot of questions but much shorter time frames. Our discussion has focussed in terms of doing something fairly immediate. Some requests have been made to certain groups for their opinions on the longer term in the sense of the organized educational establishment, the kindergarten through grade 12 group, as distinct and separate from opinions and directions we should go in dealing with the broader, mature public.

One of the interesting questions in dealing with something relating to the broader public of today is how significant the current economic conditions are, in terms of how they stimulate the response of one person to another. In terms of job competition, are people less tolerant in those circumstances when pressed by economic debt, if you will, by uncertainty or insecurity? Do they lose some of the tolerance that otherwise would be there? If indeed that's a fact, then if we move in that direction, it tells us something about the nature of the advertising that must be undertaken. These are the kinds of questions we're looking at. It's why I make a sharp distinction between the kindergarten through grade 12 system and the general public, and why I suggest there's no dichotomy between the two statements. I think one was with reference to one system and one to the other.

Agreed to:

1.0.1 — Minister's Office	\$165,339
1.0.2 — Executive Management	\$336,229
1.0.3 — Personnel	\$283,981
1.0.4 — Finance and Administration	\$1,006,831
1.0.5 — Systems	\$335,181
1.0.6 — Communications	\$53,858
1.0.7 — Research	\$921,428
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$3,102,847
Total Vote 2 — Labor Relations	\$5,005,024
Total Vote 3 — General Safety Services	\$15,042,609
Total Vote 4 — Industrial Relations Adjudication and Regulation	\$959,995
Total Vote 5 — Individual's Rights Protection	\$1,150,969
Department Total	\$25,261,444

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I move that the estimates for the Department of Labour be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

Be it resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, sums not exceeding the following for the departments and purposes indicated:

The Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, \$5,441,205 for intergovernmental co-ordination and research.

The Department of Social Services and Community Health: \$57,131,460 for departmental support services, \$472,451,920 for social allowances, \$132,236,720 for child welfare services, \$15,372,600 for specialized social services, \$168,329,470 for benefits and income support, \$20,647,410 for vocational rehabilitation services, \$105,886,460 for services for the handicapped, \$39,457,110 for treatment for mental illness, \$46,120,000 for general health services, \$131,728,200 for community social and health services, \$23,581,104 for alcoholism and drug abuse treatment and education.

The Department of Labour: \$3,102,847 for departmental support services, \$5,005,024 for labor relations, \$15,042,609 for general safety services, \$959,995 for industrial relations adjudication and regulation, \$1,150,969 for individual's rights protection.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, in view of certain obligations of some members, I move that we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

[At 4:43 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]

