

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Friday, May 25, 1984 10:00 a.m.

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before we get into the Routine, I'd like to seek unanimous consent of the House to now move a motion that, for the duration of this session of the Legislative Assembly, Standing Order 58(1) shall not apply.

The reason for the request for unanimous consent is quite clear. As per the rules, today is the 25th day and closure on the budgetary estimates would normally be applied at 12:45. Unfortunately we have 62 percent — 61.9 percent, to be exact — of the estimates yet to be approved by the Committee of Supply. By the device of unanimous consent, this Assembly can agree to suspend the rules. Unless we suspend the rules, Mr. Speaker, at 12:45 this afternoon we will be put in the position where the Legislature will have no choice but to vote on the appropriations.

I say to members of the House that suspending the rules by unanimous consent will allow for proper and continued discussion of the Committee of Supply on vital departments, ranging from the Attorney General's department to Hospitals and Medical Care. I needn't enumerate the departments, Mr. Speaker. I think hon. members are well aware of the departments for which Committee of Supply has not as yet been able to finalize a report.

So that is the purpose for requesting unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker. After listening to the very eloquent statement of the Minister of Education last night, discussing how important he felt his estimates were, I feel confident that this morning we will receive the unanimous consent of all members in the Assembly to suspend this particular rule and allow full and proper debate of the supply estimates.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Speaking to the point of order that has been raised at this time ...

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition was not speaking to a point of order, as the hon. Member for Little Bow just now represented. I suggest that in light of the fact of what has been done — that is, a motion seeking unanimous consent has been made without notice — that is not a matter that all hon. members can enter into debate upon. I seek Your Honour's ruling in that respect.

I suggest that it's appropriate, perhaps even in the course of my making the point of order on the point just raised, for me to respond, not at length but perhaps in the length and spirit of the hon. leader's remarks, in order that at least some other observations might appear on the record.

I do not intend to see unanimous consent given, Mr. Speaker. I will not consent to setting aside the *Standing Orders*. The hon. Leader of the Opposition used the word "closure" in respect of what occurs 15 minutes before the normal adjournment time today. That is wrong. What we are doing is operating under our *Standing Orders* based on allocated time for main estimates, which is the same length of time provided for in the House of Commons Parliament of Canada and an entirely rea-

sonable number of days for estimates that have been in the hands of hon. members since March 27.

There are other points of a similar nature, Mr. Speaker, including the way in which I have tried from time to time to accommodate the timetable of the members of the opposition in respect of consideration of estimates. But I think I said that no one should go on too long in these circumstances, because we're really debating something which is not debatable.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order raised by the House leader in terms of notice of motion — and the point of order is whether or not there should have been notice of this motion. The matter and the concern was raised last evening in this Legislature by a member of the government cabinet, the Minister of Education, about the importance of the Department of Education estimates, some \$1.2 billion, indicating that those estimates should receive priority of discussion in this Assembly.

On that notice given by the minister and the concern of the minister last night, we on this side of the House have said that if that is a sincere statement, then at our earliest convenience, which is now, the motion must be raised. I guess we didn't have time to give notice. So that was the basis upon which ... [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. It would appear we're debating a point of order which has risen as a result of a request for unanimous consent. I regret that at the time the hon. leader of the independents rose, I had no notion why he rose to his feet. Of course, then the Government House Leader came in with a point of order.

We have to deal with the request by the Leader of the Opposition that this Assembly give unanimous consent to suspend rule 58. That is the request. I'll put that question to the Assembly. Would all those who are in favour of suspension of the rule, as suggested by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The request is not allowed.

[Some hon. members rose]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. This is not a motion before the House; this is simply a request for unanimous consent. If such a request is not approved, there is no division.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. The hon. member misrepresented my comments of last night — unintentionally I am sure, but it is a misrepresentation nevertheless. I did not say that the estimates of the Department of Education should have priority. I made the point that by their use of time, the members attached a priority to the estimates of different departments and that the members were attaching a greater priority to the select committee than to the Department of Education. I conceded that it was their right to attach that greater priority to the select committee than to Education if they chose.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, some of us are concerned, and have raised that concern, about our *Standing Orders* and

what they mean. Last night I raised Standing Order 62(2), which says: "Speeches in committees of the whole Assembly must be strictly relevant to the item ..."

MR. R. SPEAKER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Could you tell me why the hon. member ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is speaking to a point of order.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I'm raising a point of order, on Standing Order 62(2), which arises from the question raised by the Leader of the Opposition. There is a concern here about estimates. We all recognize it is important. We recognize that wide-ranging debate must take place. But I'd like to point out that our standing order raises the issue of strict relevance. I raised it last night, and we were quoted *Beauchesne*. In the matter of relevance, in which he also includes repetition, *Beauchesne* concedes that ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It would appear we are entering into debate on the matter of *Standing Orders*, and at this particular time that is not an issue before the Assembly. That could probably be raised at an appropriate time on some other occasion.

MR. ALEXANDER: Could I just be clear, Mr. Speaker? I was not intending to debate the standing order, only to point out that the *Standing Orders* exist to limit the discussion which takes place in Committee of Supply and that ample ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe the hon. member has made his point. Perhaps we could continue with the next order.

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, a good friend of the province of Alberta and me personally, Sir Peter Gadsden. Many of you will remember Sir Peter when he visited the province of Alberta in 1980 as our special guest for the 75th Anniversary celebrations. At that time, Sir Peter was Lord Mayor of the city of London. As an Albertan born in Mannville, Alberta, it was Sir Peter's first opportunity to return to his birthplace, a very special homecoming for both the community of Mannville and Sir Peter himself.

Sir Peter is a knight of the Grand Cross of the Order of the British Empire and currently an alderman of the city of London. He is founder-master of the Engineers' Company and master of the Guild of the Freedom of the City of London, of which I was recently honoured to become a member.

Sir Peter is accompanied today by two members of the Department of Tourism and Small Business: Mr. Ted Sample, director of business travel division; and Miss Maureen MacKay, manager, U.S. meetings and incentive travel. I ask Sir Peter and the staff members to rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, the Private Bills Committee has had under consideration the following Bills and recommends to the Assembly that they be proceeded with, with certain amendments: Bill Pr. 5, the Alberta Savings & Trust Company Act, and Bill Pr. 8, the George Harold Sibbeston Adoption Act. I request the concurrence of the Assembly in this recommendation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree to concur in the recommendation?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 45 Medical Care Statutes Amendment Act, 1984

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 45, the Medical Care Statutes Amendment Act, 1984.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend three Acts dealing with health care, to make certain that Albertans receive the health care coverage and services required under the new Canada Health Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 45 read a first time]

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce two groups. I will introduce one and recognize them, and then invite the second group.

I had a fistfight with the Minister responsible for Native Affairs about the first one this morning. He claims them as relatives, and I claim some of them as constituents. I won. We have Mrs. Rose Pahl, her daughter MaryRose Pahl, her sister Mrs. Ivy Taylor, and her brother Sid Hardinges and his wife Winnifred Rose. The Hardinges and Mrs. Taylor arrived from their home in England last night, and their month-long visit to Canada will include functions in the Hanna area. I would like to have them stand and be greeted by the House. It appears you have a fellow countryman in the Speakers gallery with whom you might like to visit.

On the north side of the constituency, from the Coronation school, 56 grade 5 students — and I have a fairly lengthy list of parents, teachers, and drivers. I'll name them quickly: Miss Donna Tupper, Mr. Lang, Mr. Elliott, Mrs. Osestsy, Mrs. Taylor, Mrs. Hollinger, Mrs. Tkack, Mrs. Carl, Mrs. Watson, Mr. Colby, Mrs. Heidecker, Mrs. Thornton, and Mrs. Vigen. Would you please stand and be greeted by the House.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark, the Hon. Gerard Amerongen, I'm pleased to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, 30 bright, active, talkative, and energetic grade 6 students attending Aldergrove elementary school, situated in the constituency of Edmonton Meadowlark. They are seated in the public gallery, accompanied by their teacher Sandra Omelchuk. I ask them to please rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Native Affairs

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the Legislative Assembly on April 3, 1984, the Alberta government has been reviewing its policy regarding Indian land claims settlements.

I can now indicate to the House that the Alberta government will be prepared to include subsurface mineral rights within future land claims settlements made together with the federal government and Indian bands in the province of Alberta.

Associated with this policy, the Alberta government will, as is provided for under the terms of the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement of 1930, continue to reserve the authority to collect up to 50 percent of any royalty revenues generated from the development of subsurface minerals.

This policy will ensure that the few outstanding Indian land claims in Alberta will provide the potential for an additional natural resource revenue base to Indian bands, while at the same time, and consistent with the 1930 Natural Resources Transfer Agreement, reserving the authority to provide all Albertans with a portion of any revenues that may be generated from development of a resource that belongs to all Albertans.

Through the announcement of this policy, Mr. Speaker, it is this government's intention to remove any real or perceived obstacles to resolving the few outstanding Indian treaty entitlement land claims in Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm a little at a loss in terms of responding, because I don't have a copy of the ministerial announcement. But in just very quickly responding to what I heard the minister advise the Assembly today, I would like to say I am pleased that we are apparently moving toward the concept of including subsurface mineral rights. That is a step in the right direction.

However, one is going to have to look at the small print very carefully. I note that the minister indicated that 50 percent of the royalties would still be collected by the government of Alberta, even where mineral rights have presumably been transferred to Indian bands. Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether or not that is really fulfilling the spirit of an approach to settling aboriginal land claims which would be fully generous.

Again, I have to issue the caveat, because I do not have the ministerial statement in front of me. But at least we are taking one small step in the right direction. I'll have to look at the government policy in a more detailed way before being able to respond any further.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Securities Commission Investigations

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on this day that we are going to finish discussion of the budget, I'd like to direct my first question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and get an update on oral questions on which notice was taken over the last several months.

On May 14 the minister took as notice several questions with respect to Bond Street International Securities Ltd. The yet unanswered questions are: did the Alberta Securities Commission receive a warning from the Vancouver Stock Exchange which prompted the RCMP investigation, did the Alberta Securities Commission conduct its own investigation of Bond Street, and was a cease-trading order ever issued against the company by the Securities Commission? The minister took those as notice on May 14. Is she able to report?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am able to provide additional information for the hon. member. If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, I might add a little more than just the "yes", "no", "yes" if I just answered the questions directly. I think it would be best for the House to have a bit of background.

In late 1977 the commission was informed by the RCMP that a concern existed. There was only a concern raised, if you will, with no particulars. Over a year later, the concern was

translated into a number of theories. Immediately after that, the RCMP laid charges against Bond Street. Mr. Speaker, those charges were laid as a result of wiretap information the RCMP had. Of course the Securities Commission does not have the authority to, nor did they have the information as a result of the wiretap.

That information relating to the wiretap subsequently became available in April 1980. With a court case going on, it was some year later before — I guess the proper way to phrase this is that the commission wanted to preserve the limitation period, so it put in a notice of hearing. With the RCMP case in abeyance for some time, in June 1982 — and this was of course under the old Securities Act — three individuals, not Bond Street itself but three principals of the organization, were subsequently the subject of a hearing and issuance of a ruling by the commission. Bond Street itself was not the subject of a hearing, because it had voluntarily ceased business.

The hon. member asked if the information first coming to the commission was as a result of a contact by the British Columbia commission or the organization that handles those affairs there. This was not the case. As I related, the information first came to the commission by way of a concern. The rest of the answer, hopefully, answers the hon. member's questions.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, as we take up these questions on notice. As I look at *Hansard* of May 1, the minister indicated that with respect to another security company collapse, she would find out if any review had been carried out on the actions of the Securities Commission and the Superintendent of Real Estate concerning the collapse of Battleford Mortgage. Could the minister advise if that information is now forthcoming?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the archives were searched with regard to the Battleford case. Interestingly enough, back in the 1960s there was a legislative change that some have perceived to have affected the case that might have been in progress. I might add that this is certainly a point of conjecture. There is no agreement that legislation at the time may or may not have affected the Battleford case.

MR. NOTLEY: However, Mr. Speaker, my question on May 1 was, had there been any review of the actions of the Securities Commission and the Superintendent of Real Estate? Is the minister in a position to advise whether there was any review? On May 1 the minister indicated she'd see whether or not that information could be obtained.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, there is no further information.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. On April 18 the minister advised that she would undertake to inform the House whether or not the government's team of people working on the five-year Abacus Cities investigation included any lawyers from the Attorney General's department. How is that undertaking progressing?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the team of lawyers included lawyers from not only the Attorney General's department but the Securities Commission.

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you.

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. With the aid of having finally received the preliminary report on Abacus, is the hon. minister ready to respond to my question of May

2 on whether the minister was satisfied that the Securities Commission had done its job properly in regulating the activities of Abacus Cities? What is the minister's assessment, now that she has before her a review of those activities?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that review is not complete. The Securities Commission has provided me with a preliminary report with respect to the review done of the original Baines report, if you will, by the team of lawyers. The report is not complete, because there are three particular transactions the commission is looking at. They have not yet concluded whether there should be any action taken, and I am awaiting the results of that information.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has related to his questions raised on May 2, I believe. While it may not be necessary for me to quote chapter and verse of the Act, the hon. member did raise section 32 of the Securities Act. By making a comment prior to raising his question, unfortunately he has maybe misinformed the House — if I could use that term, because I don't think he had any intention of misleading the House. The misinformation is that somehow the perception is that the Securities Commission should have been issuing an interim report or some kind of report. If the hon. member will read the section, it quite clearly says that if the commission believes they have to take any action, a report will come to the minister. I hope the hon. member will read the legislation more carefully in future.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I'm glad she's so fully informed on the Act today. She wasn't before. However, that probably falls under the question of what is a matter of opinion over fact.

I will ask the hon. minister another question with respect to Abacus Cities. As I look at *Hansard* here, on April 16 the minister said she would check the obligations assumed by her predecessor to make public the results of the Securities Commission investigation of Abacus if no charges were to be laid. Has the minister had an opportunity to check out the obligation made to the Assembly on April 7, 1981, and can she now advise the Assembly if the government will stand by that position?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, indeed I have read the April 1981 *Hansard*, and it is not my opinion that any obligation was undertaken by the former Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

Since it has been raised that possibly I'm not aware of the provisions of the Act, I will just add that I am not concerned with provisions of the Act that don't exist.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister telling the House that she is not prepared to make public the results of the Securities Commission investigation into Abacus?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have never commented on that question, nor have I been asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I will certainly comment upon it when I have the full report in front of me.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister now has an opportunity to deal directly, as the minister in charge of this department, with respect to that question. In the interest of providing maximum information to the people of Alberta on a very extensive investigation costing a lot of money, will it be the intention of the government to make that report public should charges not be laid?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that question. When I have received a full report, I will respond to it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. When will the full report be received?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the commission has been sitting the last several days in Calgary. I believe they intend to communicate with me today in terms of the length of time they believe is still required.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

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

MR. NOTLEY: The minister seems to have a little better knowledge of the legislation today than she did before, having had some opportunity to chat with the commission. Given the widespread public interest in Abacus Cities, has she been given any indication whatsoever as to when she will have the report? Has she given a target date to the commission, or has the commission given any estimate as to when this will be completed?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that the commission will contact me today and provide me with that information.

MR. NOTLEY: We hope it won't be another five years.

Environmental Prosecutions

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, could I direct my second question to the hon. Attorney General. It concerns reports emanating from the environmental law conference that the Attorney General addressed yesterday, but reports of a previous session of that conference, as to the government's policy on fish and wildlife officers laying charges against individuals but having to check with the Attorney General's department or the government as to whether or not significant — and I underline the word, because I think the report indicated that the stress was on the word "significant" — environmental prosecutions proceed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there have been some recent adjustments in some of the practices of the Attorney General's department with respect to environmental prosecutions. A review of how those prosecutions were being handled was undertaken during the summer of 1983. The conclusion was reached that given the technical difficulty and the complexity of prosecutions of that type, quite frankly we should try to do a little better job on them. We had some difficulty with a major prosecution last year. Some of our observations were based on the difficulties that arose there, truly from the very technical nature of evidence and the difficulties in presenting a case where defences which are not too familiar to many people can be raised.

The circumstances prior to that time were that employees of other departments would consult with local agents in various parts of the province where they happened to be, in order to check out whether or not there would be sufficient evidence in a particular case to lay a charge. The change we made was based in part on recommendations from a variety of sources that we develop a special unit for prosecutions within the

Department of the Environment, a special unit including, obviously, lawyers who were expert in that particular field.

We adjusted that recommendation and put two lawyers from the Attorney General's department — one in Calgary and one in Edmonton, both of whom are senior Crown agents — in charge of co-ordinating prosecutions with respect to environmental matters; others are involved. Their duties are primarily to give the assessment in important cases, and as early on as possible, as to the prospects of a successful prosecution, in order that the type of evidence and the identities of witnesses, including, obviously, the officers who do certain types of sample taking and other checking of environmental matters — to involve, more as a team and more with a co-ordinated approach, that type of system.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, the point is that officers now consult with the two senior agents I've mentioned. In that sense, before charges are laid they seek the approval of those lawyers.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The question, however, relates to significant environmental prosecutions. Is the minister saying that all concerns fish and wildlife officers come upon must go through this process? My understanding of the concern at the conference was that possible infractions by individuals would still be dealt with at the district level but that if we were dealing with what one might term significant prosecutions — i.e. company prosecutions — we would have to go through this process the minister defined.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's any distinction between whether it involves an individual or a company. The distinction is the size of the operation and the extent of the problem with respect to pollution or some other violation of an environmental or fish and wildlife statute or regulation. There is certainly no policy that discriminates between individuals and companies.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. What role does the Attorney General himself play in this? He's indicated that he has two prosecutors, one in Edmonton and one in Calgary, who review this information. At what point does it reach the Attorney General's desk?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that can vary, again depending on the complexity and importance of the case. In the last number of months, starting just over a year ago, there was the Suncor prosecution. I can tell the hon. leader that that specifically came to my desk when it looked like it was in a bit of trouble. Prior to that time, the arrangements that normally obtain within the department were simply being followed. The Crown counsel involved had carried the matter to that point without any consultation with me, so it was well advanced by the time that came to my attention.

I mention one other matter because there could always be some questioning about it, there having been questions in the Assembly earlier in the session; that is, in one like the decision not to proceed in the Luscar case. That also spread over several months. Mr. Speaker, I know I referred to this in the course of speaking to my estimates earlier. But something like that really only comes to my attention, and specifically in that case, by way of a carbon copy of a memorandum showing what decision had been taken at the official level. That would point out to me that if for some reason I thought the decision was wrong, I would have the opportunity to raise it at that time. But that was not the case, and I don't think I spent more than a minute on the Luscar case at that point. As I said, it was a

matter that had been worked out between senior officials in two departments.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Attorney General hadn't. But as I look at the correspondence, his colleagues did.

However, could I ask the Attorney General what general policy he has given to these two people who review possible prosecutions? For example, is prosecution based on sufficient evidence to warrant prosecution, and then having a good chance of conviction? Is it danger to human health or repeated violations? Have any general guidelines with respect to whether or not the government proceeds with what you might call significant prosecutions been given to these people?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that's an important question, and I'm glad to be able to review the policy. The situation is that for what are primarily regulatory types of offences under statutes — that the courts refer to as regulatory, as distinct from criminal law matters — the policy of any department, and in this case the policy of the Department of the Environment, is of course very important to the way in which the matter is handled by solicitors or Crown counsel acting on behalf of the Attorney General.

To try to sum up the type of process, it wouldn't be right to say that in all cases where a case could be made out, a prosecution would automatically follow. That does not happen. In criminal cases that would be the normal situation of course. Only rarely in criminal cases do we find the situation where a full and complete case can be presented. Then for some reason — into which we needn't digress, because they are indeed rare — in criminal cases a decision might be taken not to proceed even if there were a complete case.

Totally different guidelines apply to statutory offences under matters which, although they create offences within federal or provincial statutes, the courts have held are primarily matters of civil or administrative law, as the Supreme Court of Canada has remarked. In those cases, the policy of the department then does become important to the advice we give. If the Department of the Environment believes their objective, which is regulation and the creation and maintenance of certain standards, can be achieved without a prosecution, then there is not the automatic approach to laying of charges and proceeding with the prosecution. If, for example, a polluter will change practices — perhaps undertake reconstruction of certain parts of a plant or the like — those things are taken into account, and it's not considered perhaps fulfilling the objective of the department to proceed in prosecution in all such cases, although it could happen. It could happen in cases where a polluter might be particularly difficult in the sense of repetition or in the sense of the extent to which pollution has occurred or if there's been some deception in their reporting systems or monitoring — something like that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question. The minister indicated he'd looked at the Suncor file — I gather before that matter went any further. Again stemming from reports at the conference that several prosecutions were proposed, several recommendations from Fish and Wildlife, and that at least one of these had been rejected and three were pending, could the minister perhaps update the Assembly on how many prosecution recommendations from Fish and Wildlife or Environment officials he has rejected in the last year, and whether these reports attributed to one of the participants are accurate?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't be a matter of my accepting or rejecting anything with respect to prosecutions.

What is meant by the reference to one having been rejected and three being carried on to some extent is simply that that appears to me to be the advice the fish and wildlife officer received from one of the Crown agents he approached. I shouldn't think it would surprise anyone if out of four cases brought to an experienced senior Crown counsel, he would look at them and say to the person bringing them: you have a good case here and here and here, but I'm not so sure you can make this one fly. That's the sort of conversation that would take place.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a supplementary question to the Minister of the Environment. There is a conference in Edmonton right now, discussing alternatives of prosecution or negotiation with polluters. Could the minister brief the House on the record of the Alberta department to date in getting compliance with environmental regulations?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, we've had an excellent record in the province of Alberta following the course of our enforcement policy, which is in several forms: negotiation, and we also look at prosecution when necessary. The compliance to date with our regulations has been in the order of 95-plus percent. I note that at the conference the hon. member alluded to, the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, which follows a course of prosecution, has stated that their record of compliance is somewhere in the 85 percent area. In Ontario, which also follows a prosecutorial approach, the record of compliance is 78 percent. So through our process of negotiation, we have been able to achieve 95-plus percent compliance.

Youth Emergency Shelters

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health is with regard to the services to some of the unemployed youths, particularly in the age group 15 to 19 years, where the unemployment rate of those who want employment is over 26 percent. I wonder if the minister could indicate whether consideration is being given to support for the Youth Emergency Shelter in Edmonton, which is serving a lot of those youths in their time of unemployment.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the Youth Emergency Shelter is providing an excellent service to young people who are unemployed and having some difficulties. We have been in correspondence with the centre and have had personal discussions with the director, and we have reached an agreement in terms of some help from the Department of Social Services and Community Health for young people going into that particular facility. I don't have the details at my fingertips.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate whether that support will be immediate or in the months of July, August, and September? What time line is established at the moment?

DR. WEBBER: If I recall correctly, Mr. Speaker, it was immediate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the hon. minister indicate whether that type of support will be made available to youth shelters in other centres in the province; for example, Calgary, Lethbridge, and Grande Prairie?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I think the proper approach to examining these situations is to take each circumstance into account. As the hon. member knows, we have gone through the decentralization process in the department, whereby each region is responsible for the services that are offered in that region. This particular case involved the Edmonton region and the youth centre.

I hope that if agencies out there wish to have discussions in co-operation with the department in the regions, they will discuss these matters with the regional director as well as the MLA in the area.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In the discussions with the Youth Emergency Shelter personnel, could the minister indicate whether the services of the department, through the employment placement program, were offered to the shelter as well?

DR. WEBBER: It has been some weeks since I had that conversation, Mr. Speaker. I don't recall that particular aspect.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As so often happens on a Friday morning, we have a number of special guests, particularly classes of students, who arrived late and will have to leave shortly. Would the Assembly agree that we might suspend the question period while the introductions are made?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

(reversion)

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This forenoon we have 40 students who have come in from their junior high in New Serepta. With them are Laurel Madro and Ellen Parker, their teachers. I might point out to the Minister of Education that New Serepta school is a community school and a very successful community school. They are seated in the public gallery, and I ask that they now stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this morning to introduce to all members of the Assembly two different groups of grade 6 students from two different schools located in the Barrhead constituency.

The first group, 70 grade 6 students, is seated in the members gallery, and they're from the Onoway elementary school. They're led by teachers Mr. Jim Fegyvermeki, Mrs. Mary-Lee Thome, and Mrs. Bonnie Livesey. They're also accompanied by a community leader, Mr. Milton Breitreuz, who doubled as a bus driver this morning.

The second group we have here today is from the little community of Rich Valley. The 20 grade 6 students are led by their teacher, Mrs. Behringer. They are seated in the public gallery. Also in the group is parent Mrs. Mildred Burton and bus driver Muzzy Gingras.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that both Rich Valley and Onoway have some significance to the Legislative Assembly. Rich Valley is the birthplace of the Member for Stony Plain, and Onoway is the community that had to endure Mr. Purdy as he completed his secondary system of education.

I'm really delighted to have all these young people here. I ask them to rise in both galleries, and I know they would be extremely pleased if all members of the Assembly accorded them the normal recognition.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, it's indeed a privilege to introduce to you and to the Assembly 42 grades 5 to 8 students from Alder Flats school in my constituency. They are accompanied by teachers Mr. Jerry Geiger and Mrs. Rose Marie Sackela, parents Mrs. Kathy Duffy and Mrs. Jeanine Parker, and bus driver Linda Moody. I ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege today to introduce to you a personal friend and distinguished gentleman from Falls Church, Virginia. Mr. Kent Hotaling attended the leadership prayer breakfast this morning. He is a resource person for prayer breakfasts emanating from Washington, D.C. and across the United States, and is also well known to such groups in Canada. I would like Mr. Hotaling to stand and receive the welcome of the House, please.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

(continued)

Alberta Wildlife Park

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Recreation and Parks. It has to do with his statement yesterday in this House that

the government provided no funds to that wildlife park through the Department of Recreation and Parks. . . . The funds were provided through the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, which uses lottery funds for distribution. So it's not public funds nor government funds.

It goes on to say that the government did not provide any funds to the Alberta Wildlife Park through Recreation and Parks, and the final quote:

it's not taxpayers' money; it's funds from lotteries.

Mr. Speaker, the annual report for the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation for the year ended March 31, 1983, lists a grant of \$83,250 to the foundation from the province of Alberta, Department of Recreation and Parks. My question is, could the minister clear up the apparent discrepancy between the remarks he made yesterday and the information contained in the foundation's 1983 annual report?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I'd be very pleased to do that. As a matter of fact, what I suggested in my answers yesterday is correct, except that I should have continued and mentioned that funds from lotteries are public funds, I guess, except that they are not public funds in terms of taxation by government.

Before I get to the grant, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out — and I didn't yesterday — that a number of donations are made to the foundation by the people of Alberta. Some of these donations are designated to projects and, in this case, a number of the donations made to the foundation were designated for the Alberta Wildlife Park.

In regard to the question about the \$83,000, Mr. Speaker, that's correct. It's a grant from the Department of Recreation and Parks for the administration of the recreation and parks offices so that no funds that come from the people of Alberta through lotteries or donations to that association are used for administration. Each dollar that flows from lotteries or donations or whatever gets back to the people of Alberta. Therefore the funds we give each year — and that's a yearly grant — are used for the administration of the association.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, so we can clear that up. There is some money from the government

of Alberta going to this foundation. My question is: can the minister advise whether or not the foundation — I take it that it is, but just to clarify this — is still receiving grants from the Department of Recreation and Parks for administration or other matters?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, again, the grant for administration goes yearly, and those funds are used to run the offices so that all funds that are donated by Albertans or through lotteries go back to Albertans. I want to stress as earnestly as I can that no funds that flow from the government of Alberta are used in donations. They go for the administration of the offices of the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation.

Now that I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I might also point out that the annual report I tabled in the House shows very specifically the three grants that flowed to the Alberta Wildlife Park from the foundation, the reasons for them, and what the funds were used for. That's public knowledge.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. At the same time yesterday, in answering a question with regard to the factual content of the response to [Motion for a Return] 148, the hon. minister said:

The answers I provided to the question were those provided to me by the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation . . . I wouldn't have any idea whether it's factual or not . . .

So there is no misunderstanding, is the minister saying that he tabled information in this Assembly without first satisfying himself as to the factual nature of the information tabled?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, when I was referring to "factual", I was referring to the number of dollars and cents. I know the grants were made, and that's factual. It was just the context of what number of dollars flowed that I wasn't sure of, and I'm still not. It's public knowledge in here, and the information was provided. It's just as easy for the hon. member to read as for me.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. The minister said very clearly that he didn't have an idea of whether it's factual or not. It's his responsibility to know that.

My question is, can the hon. minister identify what steps he intends to take in the future to ensure that all information which comes through him to this Assembly is in fact the truth?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, the information I provided is the truth, and I have a copy of it. Yesterday I didn't have that copy in front of me. The figures we provided are factual, because I have the same copy as I tabled in the House.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister, to follow up on yesterday. Is the minister saying that the statements attributed to Mr. Jerram are incorrect?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I can't comment on that. I'm saying that the dollars that were provided from the foundation are factual. The hon. member can put anything he wants on that.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the minister also said that

the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation is not part of government. What they do in their day-to-day operations is outside the purview of the minister or the government.

Given that the foundation was established by the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation Act, which established it specifically as an agent of the Crown in right of Alberta, which means it can be the responsibility of no one and nothing other than the government of Alberta, can the minister perhaps elaborate on this rather innovative interpretation of the doctrine of ministerial responsibility?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not involved in day-to-day operations, and that's what I said yesterday. I'll remain outside of that jurisdiction as long as the foundation is in operation.

Ambulance Services

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. About 10 years ago, the Legislature passed a resolution, sponsored by me, directing the government to look at a study on the provision of ambulance service in the province. Is the minister in a position at this time to indicate what steps have been taken to fulfill the direction of this Legislature on providing provincial ambulance service?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the member wasn't in the House on the several previous occasions when I referred to ambulance services in Alberta. A fair amount of work was done. Proposals were drawn up with respect to providing capital and operating support for the three kinds of ambulance services that exist in the province. At that time regulations were changed, expanding the scope of interhospital transfer that would be paid under hospitals benefits, and of course there have been the well-known training programs for ambulance personnel. But we've made it very clear that at this time the government doesn't want to expand its activities into the ambulance field. That will be responded to by municipalities, where the responsibility now exists, depending on the desires of the residents of those municipalities.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister — and now is your chance, Szwender. The Alberta Ambulance Operators Association presented a brief to the hospital caucus over a year ago, and there has been no response. Can the minister indicate when this association will receive a response from this government or from the minister's office?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I've communicated on many occasions with the executive and the president of the Ambulance Operators Association on a number of issues. In my view there is certainly no misunderstanding on their part of where this government stands with respect to the matter of ambulance services.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly when there will be some move in the direction of providing minimum standards for the operation of ambulance services and personnel or a uniform standard right across the province?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that's a very specific issue which is currently under consideration. I think the member is referring to the matter of whether or not the four or five pieces of legislation in three different departments should be amalgamated into a standard set of minimum ambulance requirements and whether or not that should be gathered together in one piece of legislation. It's a fair proposition, which the operators asso-

ciation has put to us, and we're presently looking at alternative solutions to it.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary. Did the hon. minister indicate that the province takes some lead role in the training of these people?

MR. RUSSELL: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't quite understand that question. Was the hon. member asking if I had indicated to the association that we do that?

MRS. CRIPPS: The minister said that the program of training we undertake is quite well known. Did the hon. minister mean that the province takes a lead role and funds it in any way?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the programs that have been in effect for several years, both on a portable basis and within a fixed located institution. Those programs have been running for some years.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister had his department assess the relative cost and quality of health care in building small hospitals in the province as compared to setting up a provincial ambulance scheme?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I believe those two issues are quite separate. On the one hand, it's certainly the province's well-known policy to provide and support to the best of its ability a good hospital system throughout all regions of the province. Of course that work, with respect to establishing and maintaining good hospitals in communities of all sizes throughout Alberta, is well under way.

I believe the question the hon. member is getting at is, should those hospitals be abandoned, an ambulance service put in their place, and a more centralized or regionalized hospital system developed? That is a policy we're not supporting. The ambulance service remains the responsibility of the local municipalities, and the citizens contribute financially to the level of service they want.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. I'm aware that the department is not supporting it. My question is, has there been an assessment by the department to ascertain the relative quality of health care and the cost of building hospitals compared to setting up a provincial ambulance scheme? I want to know if there is an assessment by his department.

MR. RUSSELL: I'm not quite sure how that might be done, Mr. Speaker. There certainly is a monitoring of hospital transfer costs as they now exist. When I said I'm not sure how that could be done, I suppose you could have one big hospital in the province and bring everybody there. That would be the ridiculous example on one end of the scale. Or you could have a system of a hospital in every community of every size throughout the province. I'm not sure what yardstick we would use to measure. But the program as it now exists with respect to interhospital transfer — the purpose and cost of those trips are well known.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

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

**Supplementary Estimates of
Expenditure 1983-84**

Agreed to:

Advanced Education

Total Vote 3 — Financial Assistance
to Students \$29,096,000

Agriculture

Total Vote 1 — Departmental
Support Services \$100,000

Attorney General

Total Vote 7 — Crimes Compensation \$360,000

Culture

Total Vote 2 — Cultural Development \$150,000
Total Vote 3 — Historical Resources
Development \$150,000

Economic Development

Total Vote 1 — Economic Development and
International Trade \$174,000
Total Vote 2 — Financing — Economic
Development Projects \$1,000,000

Education

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support
Services \$2,021,500

Energy and Natural Resources

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support
Services [\$24,961,296]
Total Vote 3 — Minerals Management \$134,054,000

4 — Forest Resources Management

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, can the minister responsible indicate if this vote is about what we look forward to for this year? Can he indicate what the fire hazard will be and if they'll be needing additional resources this year?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, the minister is not present, but we will get him back in. Perhaps we could continue with the other votes and deal with that question when the minister returns.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We'll come back to Energy and Natural Resources for the final vote, Vote 4.

Executive Council

10 — Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Response

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know from the Acting Government House Leader if we're going to have ministers here to answer these things or if we're just going to rattle them off. I think it's the responsibility of the government and the ministers, when we're going through these supplementary estimates, to have somebody to answer for them. I see the Minister of Advanced Education got in after we got through with the thing, but that was too late.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, if there are any particular votes that members would like to specify now, we could certainly ensure that the ministers are present.

Mr. Zaozirny, our hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, is now here. Perhaps we could deal with that. If the hon. Member for Clover Bar wishes to have the Minister of Transportation here for his supplementary estimates, we shall get him in immediately. Is that what you wish to do?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that we'll revert to Energy and Natural Resources? There was a question asked by the Member for Clover Bar regarding Vote 4, forest resources management. I'd ask the Member for Clover Bar to ask his question now.

Energy and Natural Resources

4 — Forest Resources Management

DR. BUCK: The question I posed is: can the minister give some indication of the amount of special warrant that was required last year, and was it a typical high risk, high fire year? Does this one look better? Are there any predictions comparing, say, the last three years and the projections for this year?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Chairman, it is an important question, because in fact the overall forest fire situation in the last fiscal year was a much improved situation from the standpoint of minimizing expenditures. That's attributable of course to the climatic circumstances, where the forest fire situation was relatively moderate in comparison to preceding years. I think it's important as well to recognize the significant advances that have occurred in the last year or so with respect to major improvements in our forest fire suppression program. For example, these include the presuppression techniques now being embarked upon and what's referred to as the 'rappeltak' approach, with a helicopter crew moving to a localized site on very short notice and being able to extinguish a fire before it becomes a major fire and one that is far more expensive to deal with.

Mr. Chairman, I can advise the committee that the expenditure situation last year was a much lower overall aggregate expenditure than the preceding year in particular. In terms of the upcoming year, of course that remains to be seen. But the good amount of moisture we've received in the last few weeks is of course very beneficial in a number of areas, including forest fire suppression.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, is the minister saying that the moisture conditions are relatively good in the north at this time?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: What I'm saying is that I don't know if I could go quite that far, Mr. Chairman. The situation in the province overall is much improved from a matter of a few weeks ago, at which time there was a great deal of concern. Because of the concern of an extreme fire hazard that existed only a few weeks ago, we embarked earlier than normal upon a dispatching of our fire prevention and forest fire protection crews. The situation today is much improved from that. If we have a reasonable amount of moisture, our hope is that the overall situation in the 1984 summer forest fire season will be comparable to the preceding year.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, can the minister indicate what breakdown he has as to how much of the fire fighting is done by the private sector and how much is done by government planes, equipment, et cetera? Is he in a position to indicate if there is any breakdown or any figure he can make available to us?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't be able to provide any specific percentages at this point in time, but I certainly can offer the comment that there is a very deliberate effort to ensure that we maximize our private-sector involvement. In terms of aircraft utilization, for example, there is a leasing situation that occurs involving the private-sector operations. Certainly in terms of the manpower requirements, the individuals involved in our forest fire prevention and protection come into government work on a contractual basis as circumstances require over the season.

So I think it's fair to say that in the aggregate, there's a very high component of private-sector involvement, in terms of both manpower and equipment utilization.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, is the minister in a position to indicate if the new Dash 8 the government has bought, or is buying, is going to be used for fire fighting? Or is this going to be the same as the original Queen Air, where the government didn't come clean and admit that the thing was to fly cabinet ministers and the odd MLA around the province? Is this Dash 8 going to be strictly for fighting fires, and how much is it going to cost us?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Chairman, I think a question of that nature would fall more appropriately under the responsibilities of my colleague the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services rather than myself.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, the question is, is it going to be used for fighting fires? The information I was given was that this new machine was supposed to be purchased for fighting forest fires and that we could also use it flying ministers around the province. That's what I want to know. Did we buy the airplane for fighting fires, or is it to fly cabinet ministers around? That's in the minister's department.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: In fact, the aircraft in question is being purchased by Public Works rather than the department for which I am responsible. I really wouldn't comment any further on it at this time. I'm sure there'll be ample opportunity for queries.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, can I find out who has bought the airplane? Is the minister telling us he is sure it is not for fighting fires that it was not bought in this appropriation?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: My hesitancy is simply because I can't say with absolute precision that it is being utilized for forest fire purposes, but that's certainly not suggesting that that isn't the case. I really would have to take that question on notice, and I'd be happy to respond on another occasion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you agreed on Vote 4?

MR. MARTIN: No. I want one question to upgrade my education. I know the minister always likes to do that. "To expand the timber salvage incentive program during 1983-84": could the minister explain precisely what that is and how long it will be in? Is it for just one more year? Give us an idea about it.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Chairman, that of course relates to the '83-84 fiscal year. The timber salvage incentive program has now been wrapped up. There is not a requisition in the current estimates for the timber salvage operation. That operation was involved with two principal aspects: the pine bark beetle difficulty, that was experienced primarily in southwestern Alberta, and a salvage of fire damaged timber as well. It

was a highly successful program that went a long way to removing both pine bark beetle damaged timber and fire damaged timber in the province, and of course provided an important economic stimulus at the same time.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up. This is basically a type of program that's used when needed, primarily dealing with disasters. If something happened in the future, that's the only time we'd bring it back.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, on the question of recovering timber. Is there a fairly extensive amount of timber recovered after fires? Is most of it still marketable and sawable, or is it just to clean the area up and allow a new forest to regenerate? How extensive is the operation?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: It's principally the latter. It depends very much on the extent of the fire damage. When there is a minimal amount of fire damage, some of that timber can be used for those purposes. As well, it enables a good measure of regeneration and reforestation, which are so fundamental to the ongoing health and viability of our forest industry.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that Vote 4, forest resources management, under Energy and Natural Resources, be held until further information is obtained?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I'll put the question.

DR. BUCK: If the minister will find out what they're doing with the Dash 8, I'll be happy.

Agreed to:

Energy and Natural Resources

Total Vote 4 — Forest Resources

Management	\$41,117,300
------------	--------------

Executive Council

10 — Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Response

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, can the minister responsible for Disaster Services, the Minister of Transportation, indicate how the program went to help the people who were flooded, like in Sherwood Park, the county of Strathcona, and some of those areas? I'm sure the minister received requests from a lot of other areas. I know those people around the Lamont area weren't compensated and felt they should have had some compensation. What were the parameters and rules, and on what basis did the department make its decisions as to who got some support and who didn't?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I provided all members of the Legislature with a copy of the disaster assistance policy, and that has a certain number of exclusions and limitations in it with regard to when and how we pay disaster assistance. The only major change made during the past year was — there was a \$200 deductible, if you like; \$200 of the losses, after the exclusions and limitations, had to be paid by the individual. We changed that to \$1,000 during the course of last spring. The reason for that change was that there were a great many claims in the area of \$600, \$700, \$800, for flooded basements and so on. It was my opinion that the idea of disaster

assistance was to provide people with an opportunity to recover from a financial disaster that they might not by themselves be able to recover from, and that certainly didn't involve an \$800 or \$1,000 cost of a flooded basement. That's not very much different from taking the engine out of your car or something. We thought it would be better to direct the resources to the larger losses, and that was the reason for that change. The result was that we didn't pay out nearly as many claims for flooded basements as we had in previous years or as we might have if we'd kept the same policy.

The other major area of concern was exclusions with regard to agricultural crops, mostly with respect to hay land. That's an extremely difficult one for us to deal with, in that we're dealing with some floodplains on existing rivers that have been known to flood for years, and people are using a lot of that land for hay and pasture. Depending on the severity of the flood, it oftentimes produces a better hay crop than no flood at all, depending again on the rainfall. We never know what happens when the event occurs. But generally speaking, all crops that are insurable by the Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation are not eligible for disaster assistance. We encourage people to get crop insurance.

With respect to hay, uncut hay land has been excluded as being eligible for disaster assistance with respect to the value of the hay. What we have done with regard to flooding problems on agricultural land is assisted people with rehabilitation of the land. If there's excessive silting, channelling, and that sort of thing, we come in and do an assessment and say, we won't pay you any crop damage but we will assist you in rehabilitating the land so you can get a crop next year and the year after. A lot of judgment has to go into even that area. I've had people write in, requesting assistance in claims of \$10,000 or \$15,000 an acre. They said, the river deposited eight inches of silt on my land, and it cost that much money to get a truck and a loader in here to haul it off. We obviously can't pay that kind of thing. We look at it on the basis of what it costs to work it into the existing soil and rehabilitate the land that way. Then we look at the total value of the land too. We're not going to pay more than what the land is actually worth.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know what I could say beyond that. I know the hon. member has drawn to my attention one case in particular where people felt they weren't fairly treated. What I do as a matter of procedure is ask the disaster committee, comprised of government representatives from various departments, to go back and have another look at it. I review our policy semiannually with the staff of Disaster Services and other provincial government departments, namely Agriculture, Environment, Treasury, and Municipal Affairs. It keeps changing, and I think it has to change to sort of fit the events. If there are some areas in which we can change the policy, I'd be only too pleased to receive any comments members might have about how we change it to better fit the disasters that occur. If members haven't got an updated policy manual, I'd be prepared to provide one. I think the only major change from the one members might have is the \$1,000 deductible matter.

Beyond that, Mr. Chairman, I could try to answer some further specific questions on the matter, but that's the general philosophy.

DR. BUCK: To the minister, Mr. Chairman. Using Sherwood Park and parts of the county of Strathcona as examples, in the situation where there's going to have to be extensive upgrading of storm sewers, what discussion has the minister had with his colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs to assist some of these municipalities and areas? Has there been any liaison between different ministries to see if there can be some assist-

ance provided through Municipal Affairs or the Department of the Environment?

MR. M. MOORE: There are various grants available. Municipal Affairs grants are unconditional, so the municipality is free to use them for whatever purpose they wish. I remember having discussions in that regard a couple of years ago with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the municipalities involved. Insofar as Environment is concerned, as the hon. member knows, there are certain grants available for trunk sewage lines and so on. The county of Strathcona has been making use of those.

But the internal upgrading of the sewage systems in both the hamlet of Sherwood Park and the Mill Woods area of the city of Edmonton are responsibilities of the municipal governments in those areas. I'm hopeful that they will take some action to improve the situation, because as long as it stays like it is, they're going to continue to have sewer backup, mainly. I understand that some of the insurance companies who had been providing sewer backup are now concerned about the losses they've incurred because the system is like it is. So it's a matter of the city of Edmonton, in the case of Mill Woods, and the county of Strathcona, in the case of Sherwood Park, taking some action. I think the county and city councils believe it is their responsibility.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up on a couple of points. I say to the minister, I agree. Certainly Mill Woods and the county of Strathcona are perhaps the two most vivid examples where it seems there's something wrong with the storm sewers. Something is going to have to be done or it's going to cost a lot of money in the future. Just to follow up, though — having formerly been an employee in the county of Strathcona, I know they are strapped for money, and I know the city of Edmonton says they're strapped for money. If it's a massive project, they may not be able to afford to update these sewers. Have they had any discussion with the Minister of Transportation about perhaps a one-time special grant that the provincial government could help them out with? It might save us all money in the future. Would the minister look upon that favourably? I'm not asking him to make a commitment here, but is that the type of thing the minister would be prepared to look at?

MR. M. MOORE: I've had no requests from or discussions with either municipality relative to upgrading those sewage systems, in terms of assisting from a perspective of Disaster Services and my responsibilities there. The Minister of the Environment or the Minister of Municipal Affairs may have. If I received them as minister responsible for Disaster Services, I would be inclined to direct the request for financial assistance for upgrading to the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications, because that's the department where the grants are being provided for water and sewage systems, and to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

Disaster Services is not in the business of providing funds to prevent disasters or to do river channelling or sewage upgrading, but rather to come in when a disaster occurs and then point out to whoever is responsible — and we've done that in the case of both Mill Woods and Sherwood Park — that there need to be some improvements. We've done it in other areas, for example in the city of Grande Prairie. When their water plant flooded on the second occasion we said, you need to do something to raise it up so we're not faced with the same situation again. Then we allow the other departments who are properly

administering assistance in that regard to come in and do what they can.

MR. MARTIN: That's fair enough. It's a reasonable answer under the circumstances. I suppose it should be pursued with other departments.

Just to follow up, though, I know the minister has put out guidelines. Could he indicate how many are considered — what is a disaster you will compensate people for? I expect that they get a lot of requests which are turned down. Can you give us a rough idea, say in this budget year we're talking about, of how many might have been turned down and how many accepted — even a rough percentage just to see what is considered a disaster by the department?

MR. M. MOORE: With respect to direct representations to my office, probably 80 percent of the requests that came forward were eventually granted disaster assistance in some amount. But I know there is a significant number of individual requests to staff of the department in various locations, where people call or drop in or something, and say, can I have some assistance? The duty officer looks at the situation and says it doesn't fit. Without checking, I have no way of knowing how many of those there would be. I think the question relates to how we get involved in providing disaster assistance to an area like — there are some of them here — Minburn, Strathcona, Vegreville, et cetera.

First of all, with regard to flood, the flooding that takes place must be because of overflowing waters — not sewage backup, not simply rain that has run in the basement windows, but a creek, stream, ravine, or something overflowing to the extent that it creates damage. The damage must be widespread and excessive. We look at that on the basis of whatever information we get from the Department of the Environment. Is it an unusual storm? They respond to us by saying yes, it's a one-in-25-year or one-in-50-year occurrence. We look at it on the basis of, is the event something people wouldn't ordinarily have anticipated and prepared themselves for — I think that's about the most general statement I can make — and then say, is it insurable? If it's an unanticipated event of widespread magnitude and not insurable, it generally qualifies. There are some exceptions with respect to recreational property and a variety of things which are considered luxury items, that we don't cover.

Then there are some exceptions to the general rule. Even though the event may not fit the criteria, if it's judged by the office of the minister responsible for Disaster Services to be of such significance that the livelihood of the individual is at stake, there's provision in the policy that we can provide disaster assistance at any rate. I'll give you one event in the last year when we did that. It has to do with tornadoes. You can insure against tornadoes, but how many people in this room know today that their insurance policy says they're covered against a tornado? How many people go to the insurance agent and say, am I covered against a tornado? The answer is, all those who've been hit by a tornado do that but hardly anyone else. So while you can get insurance for a tornado, I've found that very few people do have it. When a tornado hits, it literally destroys everything — house, barn, you name it. There's nothing left. We had several last year, and I made a decision outside the normal criteria that those events were of such magnitude that the individual's livelihood was going to be destroyed. In one case it took a complete farmyard — house, barn, milk parlour. Everything was gone, because it just flattened it. So we made a payment there. There is the ability to do that when the guidelines don't fit.

While there is a lot of responsibility attached to my office in that regard, if we're going to have an appropriate disaster response vehicle I think we need to have that flexibility, and I have to use the kind of judgment that is fair and reasonable in all cases. Mr. Chairman, a lot goes into it in terms of committee review by various government officials and so on, but I'd like to think that in every case we try to be as fair as possible.

MR. MARTIN: I appreciate that explanation. It makes it clearer in my mind. I wasn't asking specifically. If somebody gets a broken window, I know there are certain types of people who would rush to try to get compensated for it. I think you answered it, that where there was some storm, perhaps a county or town organized and asked Disaster Services. I take it by the answer that roughly 80 percent of those are accepted.

The only other question I have in this area — when we look at it, there was \$2,640,000 spent in the previous year. In the minister's experience, is that roughly about average or is that above average? Is that the type of figure that is fairly consistent as we go through, say, a 10-year period?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, we budget \$50,000 in this vote so we can pay small claims. The rest is provided by special warrant, because we don't anticipate any disasters. Over the years I believe the experience has been a slight bit higher than the \$2,640,000. I considered last year pretty reasonable in terms of the problems we had. There was no spring flooding. All the flooding that occurred here was a result of extremely heavy rains, mostly in July.

In some years we had river backup flooding, and we've cured a lot of problems there. In some towns, like Peace River, we've been able to do diking. We are more adept at knowing ahead of time when the flood is going to occur, channelling the ice out, and doing things like that in Fort McMurray, say, and Peace River. So I think we've been able to learn over the years to prevent some of that springtime flood. The rain situation is a little different, although there again, a place like Grande Prairie now has approval from the Department of Utilities and Telecommunications to build a new water plant, that will be up on top. A pretty excessive cost to that city, plus disaster assistance a year ago, will be avoided because we've done things to assist.

I think it's fair to say that the efforts that have been made by municipal governments, by individuals, and others — for example, creek clearing by the Department of the Environment is going on in some of the areas that were flooded in 1983. We are now looking at how we can rechannel some creeks to avoid some land flooding that occurred in that year. While I don't expect this will go down very much over the years, we're hopeful that some of the same occurrences won't keep coming back. A good example is the Battle River, where a dam is being constructed, and hopefully we'll avoid the extent of flooding that occurred in previous years.

MR. MARTIN: Just flowing from the minister's statements, Mr. Chairman, does representation from people often come to Disaster Services? Is it fairly common that they would come to this particular department and say they think there's a potential for a disaster — i.e., maybe there are problems with CN in the middle of Edmonton, with the computer system going wrong and the potential is there for a disaster — and ask the department to check it out? Does any of that happen — preventative services, if you like, of Disaster Services?

MR. M. MOORE: I have no knowledge of it being very widespread that individuals would come and say that, but muni-

cipalities certainly do. We have an ongoing dialogue with municipalities, and every municipality has a municipal disaster program in place. To give you an example, in the city of Medicine Hat, only a few weeks prior to the major derailment there earlier this year, Disaster Services in conjunction with the city did a dry run, if you like, on exactly that event possibly occurring. Everyone knew there was a possibility that some day a train would get away, and because of the slope into the city it could cause a great deal of damage. In fact, for officials in the disaster assistance department I'm responsible for, it was the last training exercise they did before the disaster. They were a little concerned about having put out the rain gauge and it stopped raining. They said, maybe we'd better quit doing these dry runs. Nevertheless, it was an important thing to have done, because when the disaster did occur, my advice is that the city officials, the RCMP, and everyone else, having just gone through the training exercise, were so familiar with it that there wasn't anything better that could have been done in trying to deal with the disaster.

The thing we don't deal with in a significant way, I suppose, is how to prevent them, although we're working continually with the railroads, for example, on dangerous goods and things like that, to make sure they're placarded and marked. But there is a big responsibility on railways, which we don't have any control over, to prevent the disaster from occurring.

I think almost every municipality, in their disaster assistance operations, sits down around the table and thinks about things that could happen and then tries to deal with them in their plan. Our staff obviously are there discussing them. Every municipality in Alberta has a disaster assistance committee, appointed by the municipal council, whose responsibility it is to try to think of and plan for any eventual disaster.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up on that, Mr. Chairman. So the department really does act as a preventative. I take it that they will go out on call. If a community feels they have a potential problem, they could call on Disaster Services to go and see if they do have a problem, as was done in Medicine Hat. Unfortunately, they didn't have time to do something about it. But there is that preventative nature in the department, working very closely with the councils.

MR. M. MOORE: What actually happens is that if an individual is concerned, he would call city hall, town office, or county office, and be put in touch with the chairman of the municipality's disaster committee, who would then meet with his committee and the individual. We have officers in each region of the province, and if it was then deemed that they needed some technical expertise, advice, or assistance from Disaster Services, they'd call on our man. In all likelihood, he would call on some other department. He may say, this is an area where we'd like some advice or assistance from the ERCB, the Department of the Environment, the Department of Labour, or the fire inspector's office. We then call on every resource available within government.

We may even call on the private sector. For instance, in the hon. Member for Clover Bar's constituency, there is an organization of industrial people who are involved in making sure — and they have regular meetings, planning with respect to whether or not some disasters occur with regard to the industry they're involved in. In addition, there are a number of other groups outside government. For example, even Canadian National and CP have well-trained experts in terms of the events that might occur with respect to their trains, dangerous goods, and so on. The federal government has a number of assistance

programs available through various departments. So that's sort of generally how we operate.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, on the ultimate preventative measure — that is, nuclear attack — what is the situation as far as the minister's department? That is a preventative thing, and I am sure there are things in place. Can the minister bring us up to date on that state of readiness?

MR. M. MOORE: We have an updated plan. I have to say we don't place as high a priority on planning in that area as we do for some other disasters, such as sour gas releases, pipeline blowouts, or things that in my opinion are much more likely to occur. But we do have an updated plan in the event of nuclear attack. We work very closely with the federal government there.

As far as Alberta is concerned, the situation is that fallout shelters have been identified by identifying the buildings presently in existence, in our major cities in particular, that would be effective to some extent in shielding people from the effects of nuclear fallout. Those are identified in co-operation with the federal government and their team of experts.

As the hon. member knows, we have a plan with respect to how government operations would be carried out in the event of nuclear attack. First of all, in the event of an outbreak of war it really involves a takeover, if you like, of operations by federal authorities, with provincial and municipal authorities centred at locations around the province to assist in the operations of government during such an event.

We have a number of other things that are probably not even well known to the general public. Throughout the province we have a number of hospitals that can be set up, in any location whatever, to assist. We'll even use those in peacetime, and have used them in the event of a fire or something at a hospital. We can very quickly set up a field hospital and things like that. So while those aren't related just to nuclear attack, you might use them in that event.

If members don't have it, I'd be pleased to provide as well a copy of the updated manual that we and all municipalities have with respect to the possibility of an outbreak of war.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I don't think the general population seems to be at all informed as to where these designated fallout shelters are. At least I don't think anybody seems to understand that there are designated areas. Maybe it's just my knowledge that's lacking, but I don't know how extensive that information is. Maybe it should be more extensively disseminated.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is quite correct. Although we do have a pamphlet that outlines what to do, the major emphasis in an event like that would be, first of all to tell people to listen to any radio station. The information about exactly what they will do will be broadcast by radio. I haven't placed any priority whatever on trying to inform people of something of that nature ahead of time, because I think it will mostly go in one ear and out the other. I also believe that it's probably an unnecessary alarm if we start. There are many other things we could better spend our time doing in terms of informing people about what they should do in the event of a disaster. It's much more likely that we would have a train derailment in Fort Saskatchewan that would have some poisonous gas in it, a pipeline blowout, a sour gas well, or something like that. So we've concentrated more on what to do in those areas.

For anything that has to do with a major disaster that people aren't informed about, the information is there and a system

is set up to immediately begin informing them by radio. That's the system generally recognized throughout North America. Hopefully that will be the preparedness that's required.

DR. BUCK: On the question of sirens, it seems that any time they have a shakedown the things don't seem to work too well. How often do we check these things? How often do we test the sirens that indicate that there could be a potential attack, and what are the results?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I can't answer that question. I don't believe we normally test the sirens on the basis of actually using them so the public can hear them, but I do know that any that are in place for use in that manner are checked periodically to ensure that they're in working order. It's debatable whether or not we should have a dry run. Fire drills in schools are one thing, but something of that nature might be beyond what the normal population would expect us to do.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, we should find out if they work. If any kind of preventative service is going to be any good, I think people should be aware of what it means. You have to have dry runs, but number one you have to find out if the cotton-picking siren works. That's pretty fundamental and basic. I think the minister would be wise to check with his department to find out what monitoring is going on because, as I say, the few times we've tried ours, the results have not been too encouraging. You'd certainly not want to place your life on whether the siren's going to work or not. I think you've got a fighting chance with the radio, but the sirens certainly don't impress me.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I'll undertake to see if there's a way we can find out if they're working without blowing them. The hon. member wouldn't appreciate it very much if we had one at the corner of the golf course he's building and blew it when he's putting on the 18th green for a par.

MR. MARTIN: To follow up, I was reminded when we got into what happens in case of nuclear war. Maybe the hon. minister can update us. I believe it's part of Disaster Services. There was an article about a place in Penhold for government leaders. I don't know whether it's true or not; I'm just alluding to it. If there is a place in Penhold, and government leaders or some people will be shipped there and that will be where government is undertaken, can the minister update us on that process? Is this true?

MR. M. MOORE: As I understand it, this particular plan has been in place since the Second World War. It's a Canada-wide plan where federal, provincial, and municipal government leaders would be located in the event of war. The major base in Alberta is at Penhold. I don't know the people who might be sent to that particular location, but the plan is that perhaps federal, provincial, and municipal leaders would be there. There are a number of other centres around Alberta where various government ministers, deputy heads, and so on would be located to assist in the event that a nuclear or any kind of war were under way.

Those locations have been well known for any length of time, and it's not something we do just in Alberta. It's done in co-operation with Canadian National Defence and at their direction. I've never seen the thing myself. I'd like to go down there sometime, and maybe take the hon. member with me, to

see whether or not there's enough food in there to survive for a couple of weeks.

MR. MARTIN: I was just going to bring up my question on that. I take it that it is a fallout shelter. Can the minister indicate how many people would be in there? Does the Member for Clover Bar, as a leader of society, have a chance of getting into the fallout?

MR. M. MOORE: I can't indicate how many people would be going there. As far as the hon. Member for Clover Bar is concerned, I don't even know whether he would be going. I can say that the people chosen to lead in the event of nuclear war would be those who take their responsibilities most seriously, so I don't know whether or not the member would be there.

Agreed to:

Executive Council

Total Vote 10 — Disaster Preparedness

and Emergency Response

\$2,640,150

11 — Public Service Employee Relations

MR. MARTIN: I don't know if the minister . . .

MR. HORSMAN: The hon. Attorney General is absent at the moment, but he will be returning shortly. Oh, here he is now.

MR. MARTIN: My question has to do with Executive Council, Vote 11, public service employee relations: payment of fees to legal counsel, members of the board, and chairmen of arbitration boards. I believe that's where we are. I notice that there's some \$77,000 in that year. I'm curious if there is some estimation flowing from this about what we might be looking at in the near future, specifically this year. Because of the new fiscal authority of the Treasurer, do they expect we're going to have to pay much more, that there'll be more cases going to arbitration? I wonder if there is an update or if they think this figure will be relatively the same for, say, next year.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, based in part upon the experience of the very fact that we did need additional funds last year, certainly the best estimate we could make about the requirements in this year is the one that's in the estimates of Executive Council, which was voted on earlier in the sittings.

I should maybe just add that that particular amount was required, as I recall, because the board was sitting a little more often than had been anticipated from the preceding year. It may be something my colleague the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration has a better recollection of than I have. My memory also is that the number of arbitration boards in the principal bargaining unit was larger than previously. When arbitrators and chairmen of arbitration boards are paid at the expense of the Public Service Employee Relations Board, through their appropriation, they are difficult to control in the sense that they don't work according to a schedule that we provide or publish in any way or that the board provides or publishes. They charge what they consider to be the going rate that is available as professional fees. In that sense there can be some uncertainty, particularly if numbers of days of additional sittings are required. I cannot break the \$77,000 down for the hon. member, but I think I have responded to the sense of his question.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up. I appreciate that we have passed this already, and it should have perhaps been raised

there, but I notice there is actually a cut — it's not significant — of 1.9 percent in Vote 11. Again I'm sort of curious about this fee. From what I hear and gather, I think this is going to be a fairly rough year in terms of negotiations with AUPE. I believe a couple of divisions have applied for arbitration fairly quickly. Flowing from Public Accounts, I know they've now been told to go back and negotiate. That's why I was sort of curious why we would not actually see an increase in these types of services to the government this year. I know it's difficult off the top of one's head, but it seems to me that we might be coming back next year with a more significant amount, knowing what I do about the climate right now in terms of negotiations. I don't know which minister would want to comment on that.

MR. CRAWFORD: I'd like to comment a little bit further because of what the hon. member has just said. I think the view was that there probably wouldn't need to be quite the same amount of work in this upcoming year as perhaps was required and which called upon the need for a special warrant in the recently passed fiscal year. Those estimates are of course made many months ahead of the beginning of the fiscal year and not necessarily in step, one might say, with the progress of bargaining that would be known at that time. It's not a matter of considerable concern that when done that way an estimate would be out a little bit and might require a special warrant; I don't think that's a special concern.

Of course I realize the hon. member is really asking me what we anticipate in regard to the board's workload in the year which is coming up. My answer to that is that when the estimate was arrived at, it was thought it would perhaps not be unusual. There may indeed be other features in the upcoming year that will increase the workload of the board; that's quite possible.

Agreed to:

Executive Council

Total Vote 11 — Public Service
Employee Relations

\$2,717,150

Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs

1 — Intergovernmental Co-ordination and Research

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I see the minister is here, and I know he likes to go into his department; he's very proud of it. My questions are in a couple of areas.

First of all, I notice that the funds required for the Premier's mission to Japan, China, and Hong Kong are a special requisition after the fact. In terms of planning, it would seem to me that trips we're told are important for trade and other reasons, for our economy, would be planned ahead and would be part of the budget, but I gather they're not. I'm asking the lead time when we go into these sorts of major missions, if you like. It seems to me the appropriate place — they should be planned ahead. I'm sort of curious why they're not. Do these things just come up with a month's lead time? What is the procedure there?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, the amount requested by way of special warrant was the balance of the total expense, which of course was the subject of Motion for a Return 200, and totalled \$239,000.55. Hon. members have the full details of that total expense. There was some money in the budget for visitations, but unfortunately there wasn't enough. That's why it was necessary to ask for the amount in the special warrant, which totalled \$149,000 of the \$239,000.

Just by way of explanation, invitations from foreign governments to the head of our government are not always predictable. In other words, when the budget for 1983-84 was prepared, the invitations had not all been received from the foreign governments that were involved with the Premier's trip, and therefore it was not possible to budget exactly. In this year's current budget, there is an amount included as well for foreign visitations, but until we actually receive the invitations, which may be into the fiscal year, we can't budget exactly. That's why that amount was requested, and that of course is the balance required for the total cost, which, as I said, was already supplied in detail in Motion for a Return 200. That's the reason we can't always budget with exactitude.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, can the minister just give us the information on the funds for the first part of the vote, where we are talking about all these other different grants? It's not that large an amount of money, but just to give the committee some indication of what they're for;

MR. HORSMAN: The grants for the Americas Society was \$10,000 in American funds, the Association for Canadian Studies in the United States was about \$5,000, and the 49th Parallel Institute, at Bozeman, Montana, was \$15,000 in American funds. That totals more than the \$23,700, because there was money in the grant element. Those requests for funding during this last fiscal year, which this special warrant covers, came in subsequent to the commencement of the fiscal year, and therefore were not budgeted for as they were new requests which we deemed to be worthy during the course of the year.

DR. BUCK: Are these like scholarships? Are there people studying? What do these things accomplish?

MR. HORSMAN: The Association for Canadian Studies in the United States, for example, promotes the study of Canada through a number of universities in the United States of America. As a matter of fact, the chairman of that particular association is coming to Alberta in July of this year. That association requires operating funds, and they operate on the basis of donations from various governments and from the private sector.

The 49th Parallel Institute, at Bozeman, Montana, is something relatively new. That particular institution promotes studies in Canada and published the most comprehensive book on Alberta/Montana relationships that I've ever seen. The funds for that publication came at least in part from the grant that was made by our government. It's an excellent publication. If the hon. member would like a copy, I'd be happy to provide him with one.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. On relationships with our neighbours to the south, in his responsibilities as the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs is the minister ... I notice that the hon. Member for Cypress, Mr. Hyland, made a recommendation that there be more liaison between the western United States and Alberta. Are any active steps being taken? I don't know if some of these things would be along that line. But is some attempt being made to be better neighbours with the people we sell our natural gas to and get many of our tourists from, the western part of the United States?

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. But technically of course what we're dealing with is money that has been spent. I'm certainly happy to explain that, because that's the purpose of dealing with supplementary estimates. Within the estimates of the department for the current fiscal year, there are funds

which have already been voted, because my department has been voted.

To deal with those areas of how to improve relationships with the U.S. border states — of course we only have one border state, Montana — the western governors, the mid-western governors, the association of American state legislators and so on . . . If I recall, during the course of my estimates I made particular reference to the fact that I as minister had been invited to visit and that I had already encouraged an exchange of views between legislators, and the fact that the hon. Member for Cypress was responsible for the initiation of an exchange between the agriculture committee here in Alberta and agriculturally concerned legislators from Montana. That visit did take place. I understand my department will be paying a good deal of the costs of that particular visit. That's the type of thing that will happen.

Agreed to:

Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs

Total Vote 1 — Intergovernmental
Co-ordination and Research \$172,700

Hospitals and Medical Care

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care be back? Can we move to another vote and then come back to this one?

MR. KING: The Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care will be back in the Assembly in just a moment. We could go to another vote. He will be here immediately.

Agreed to:

Housing

Total Vote 2 — Policy Development and
Financial Assistance for Housing \$52,400,000

4 — Housing for Albertans

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I guess the Minister of Housing is not here. In light of the fact that we've written down \$52 million in bad debts, I want to know from someone if this is just the tip of the iceberg. Are we going to have to keep doing this? I would like to know from the Acting Minister of Housing if this is going to be an ongoing program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we can come back to that.

Agreed to:

Labour

Total Vote 5 — Individual's Rights
Protection \$505,000

Manpower

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support
Services \$400,000
Total Vote 2 — Manpower Development
and Training Assistance \$5,500,000
Total Vote 3 — Special Employment
Programs \$13,700,000

Public Works, Supply and Services

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services isn't here, but maybe the Minister of Recreation and Parks can give us a little more of a rundown. I know the minister explained this in his estimates when we were talking about somebody making sure we don't have cost overruns on some of the other Olympic facilities like we had with the Saddledome. I know the minister has indicated that

that is not going to happen, but it did happen with the Saddledome. As a taxpayer I don't know who was responsible for that large cost overrun, but I certainly want to say at this time to the minister of recreation and the people who are going to be responsible for the expenditure of public funds that I hope we don't have these kinds of cost overruns.

Of course we well know what happened in Montreal with the Olympic Stadium; the people of Canada will be paying and paying and paying. The last time I looked, two weeks ago, the crane was still standing. I don't know if that's being contracted for or not. We're not sure if that's holding up the pilasters that were supposed to suspend the dome over the big hole in the top of the stadium. Canadian taxpayers and Alberta taxpayers don't need too many of those fiascos. I think the situation we had here in Edmonton with the completion of the Coliseum and the Commonwealth Stadium are good examples that there is a way we can prevent the taxpayers' money being wasted. I want to go on record as saying to the committee that it's the responsibility of this government to make sure we don't have these kinds of financial fiascos.

In the absence of the minister, maybe the minister of recreation can reassure me one more time that this is not going to happen with the Winter Olympics in '88. Who knows; we may not even have any Olympics in '88, because we're playing such political football. It shouldn't have come as such a great shock to the United States that the Russians pulled out with two months' notice. If anybody knows anything about politics between the Russians and the Americans, it shouldn't have come as such a great shock.

I want the Minister of Recreation and Parks to reassure me once more that there's somebody riding shotgun over the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars, that we don't have these gigantic cost overruns, I think the day is not too far off, even if the Olympics survive, when we're maybe going to rotate them between four cities that already have the facilities in place, because the taxpayer is just not going to keep spending funds for new Olympic facilities. I think it's just about time the International community woke up to the fact that maybe these Olympics are getting too expensive. The '88 Winter Olympics in Alberta may be the last we have. We might not even have that one.

I just want some reassurance from the minister that somebody is going to be riding shotgun. Can the minister reassure me of that? Otherwise we're going to have to get the other minister back in here.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I will reassure the hon. member as far as I can. I can only go back to the games we've had in the past few years under the Department of Recreation and Parks. As a matter of fact, the last three this year — the Universiade games, the Western Canada Games, and the Alberta Games — all ended up with a slight surplus. The concern the member raises, that public funds are spent wisely and within reason, is certainly a concern we all have. As far as I can assure the hon. member, I'll do that. I'll talk to my colleague the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, who will be handling the projects, that the hon. member raised the concern.

Agreed to:

Public Works, Supply and Services

Total Vote 9 — Financial Assistance to

the Calgary Olympic Coliseum

\$5,500,000

Social Services and Community Health

9 — General Health Service

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, maybe the minister can indicate how well this program is going, how extensive it is, and if we will be requiring more funds in the future. When I try to help the odd constituent who requires this assistance, it always seems to be quite a struggle to get assistance for these people. Maybe the minister can update us on how the program is going and what he sees for the future of this program.

DR. WEBBER: I'd be happy to respond, Mr. Chairman. The program underwent a very thorough review in the last year and a half, maybe even longer, when consultation took place with 30-odd groups and agencies. We took their recommendations and reviewed them, and on April 1 of this year issued — the press release we issued which described the changes was somewhat earlier; the changes we made were generally to begin on April 1 this year.

It's really too early to report any kind of assessment on how things are going. We are trying to very closely monitor the effect of the changes, and if there are adjustments that need to be made along the way, we'll make them.

In terms of better control of the budget in terms of the administration, we think we have it with the changes we've made. As the hon. member can see from other parts of the estimates, there is about a 50.5 percent increase, if I recall, in funding in the budget for the coming year, the '84-85 budget year, over last year's estimates. However, we see the \$10 million special warrant that was required because of the increased demands that have occurred in the past year.

I don't hear reports of difficulties for senior citizens and handicapped people in getting the services that are on the list. The one change we made was that of the role of the prescriber, which is generally being handled by the health units. The senior citizen would require a prescription from the doctor, and before going to the supplier would have the health unit nurse or someone from the health unit assess the needs of the individual. In the past, the difficulty in this respect has been that often the prescription is taken by the senior citizen or the handicapped person to a supplier. In some instances the supplier has been providing whatever they want to the senior citizen or handicapped person, and we've been paying for it. We hope this process will help us keep costs under control, and yet provide the services that are necessary for these people.

In dealing with his constituents in the course of the next few months, if the hon. member comes across situations he'd like to bring to our attention, we'd be happy to try to follow up on them or listen to any recommendations of further changes we might need to make.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up on the aids to daily living, as the minister is aware we supported his announcement, similar to the Saskatchewan program. I think it made good economic sense to use secondhand materials and facilities where appropriate. Could the minister just upgrade us on how that seems to be going at this point, and does he see that being a significant saving in the future? I'm trying to remember when it was brought in. Maybe it's not even in yet, but maybe he can upgrade us.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Chairman, that was the question the hon. member asked. I just finished giving an update on the program, so I think you'll be able to see from *Hansard* what was said.

In terms of the Saskatchewan program, when we were dealing with the estimates of my department some comments were made with reference to that particular program, what great things are happening with that program in Saskatchewan and the way it's being administered. Of course that implies that the way we're operating is not as good as what's happening in Saskatchewan, where the government is involved in the administration of it. If the hon. member, or whoever raised that, would check closely, I think they would find that the significant difference between the two programs is that ours in Alberta provides a much wider variety of benefits to senior citizens and handicapped people. Their program provides a more restricted list of benefits. In almost all cases, the list of benefits there is restricted to one or two particular brand names. In Alberta it is much wider open than that. We think the administrative approach we have here is the better approach.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. I won't dare stick up for a Conservative government in Saskatchewan. I say to the minister that there seems to be some speculation in the papers recently that the two Conservative governments are fighting about who is doing what to whom.

My question to the minister is: since this announcement, what reaction has he had from organized handicapped groups? Have they accepted the new guidelines, and are they happy with them? Do things seem to be flowing along fairly well?

DR. WEBBER: In recent months I don't recall any particular handicapped group writing to indicate their general objections to the program. In fact before the changes were made, there was consultation with a number of organizations and groups, including handicapped groups.

I think they generally accept the approach we're taking in that we needed to make some changes in the program, so let's make them and proceed and monitor the situation. Once again I'll say that if there are concerns about how the program is operating, if any of these organizations want to indicate any concerns to us, we'd be happy to look at those concerns and see whether any adjustments are necessary.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up, Mr. Chairman. I haven't heard any complaints at all. For the minister's information, I wasn't raising that there were complaints. I just wondered if, in his discussions, there were any. It seems not. I wasn't trying to insinuate there were problems.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, just one small point to the minister. Is this the program where, say, a physically disabled person has an aide or someone helping them? Is this part of that program?

The matter I want to bring to the minister's attention is that I want to know what screening goes on with people who are supplied to help these physically disabled people. The one instance that was brought to my attention is that when they checked the thing, the person who was helping this physically disabled young man had a fairly bad criminal record. I want to know what screening the department does of the people who help these physically disabled people, and how close that screening system is.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Chairman, the aids in this program are mechanical aids. I think the program the hon. member is referring to is the home care program, which is offered through the health units. I guess it varies from one part of the province to another as to how the health units administer that program. They may get organizations such as a volunteer organization.

Victorian Order of Nurses, or they may get private-sector organizations to provide the services for them. The full responsibility for the provision of the services lies with the local health unit.

Again I can't recall any concerns coming to my attention in terms of the calibre of the people that have been contracted to provide the services.

Agreed to:

Social Services and Community Health

Total Vote 9 — General Health Services \$10,375,310

10 — Community Social and Health Services

MR. MARTIN: I just want some follow-up. It's a fairly important area. I notice that we had more expenditure, and it gives the reasons there. In the budget we haven't passed, is this trend — part of the questions we've been raising in the past, more in a philosophical sense, I guess. But the minister will agree — we see it here in black and white — that we have had a trend to more usage of day care. I wonder if this trend is not going to accelerate, say, in the next year or two or three and, going back to the budget, if we have not again underutilized the budget and may need to come back again. I'd like the minister's comments on that.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member has indicated, the budget for day care services in the province is an important area. There are three different kinds of grants or assistance that go out in the day care program. First of all, there's an operating grant to the day care centre. Then there's a subsidy that follows the child to a day care centre. The subsidy goes directly to the day care centre, but if the child moves to another day care centre, that subsidy follows him. So there are those two kinds, and then there's an administrative grant.

The trend in the last year has been for a significant increase in the number of day care centres that have opened up across the province, primarily in the major metropolitan centres. There has also been a significant increase in the number of children going into day care centres in the last year. However, the vacancy rate for day care centres has been fairly high, around 25 to 30 percent overall. That has recently come down to around 20 percent. Those are some of the trends.

One of the concerns I have is that the subsidy for infants in the zero to 18 months age group is very high. I think it's about \$257 a month. Comparing that with \$130 for the 19 months to wherever, it seems to be more profitable for the day care centres to have that very young child in their care. So the increase in the number of young people in that age group in day care centres has been very significant.

We had an objective to try to have more of these children in day homes, possibly connected with the day care centres. But there's really been no incentive for a day care centre to establish day homes, because it's more profitable for them to keep these youngsters in their own home. We're struggling as to how to address that particular issue at this time. Because of the rate structures, the marketplace isn't working the way it should. There's the greater incentive to get the very young into the day care centres.

Those are just a few comments about the day care program. With the rising number of day care centres and the rising number of children that have gone into day care centres, we have had the special warrant. We'll work in the coming year to stay within the budget we have, but I cannot assure members at this time that a special warrant may not be necessary later in the year.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, if I can make a suggestion to the minister and get some comment from him. If we had some liaison and provided some encouragement to the private sector to go into a day care program in conjunction with industry, there are a lot of advantages to going that route. First of all, the fact that the mother is not separated from the child the whole day; if it's right in the same building where she works, she can go and visit the child at coffee break or lunchtime. In light of the fact that the Member for Edmonton Norwood feels this figure may go up, maybe we should be providing some incentive programs to the private sector, to industry, to get involved, as they have done in Sweden, and I'm sure there are programs in other jurisdictions.

So I'd like to know what the department is doing to encourage the private sector to get involved in this program.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Chairman, in terms of involvement of the private sector in day care, I don't think there's a province in the country that has the private sector more involved than here in Alberta. The opportunities are there for any private-sector organization to establish a day care centre, whether it be associated with a workplace or not. The operating subsidies and the subsidy that follows the child are all the same whether it be a private day care centre or a nonprofit day care centre. We've got a tremendous number of private-sector operations going in this province. I don't think we should be telling them where to locate. I think it's up to these private operators to determine that.

DR. BUCK: That's not the point, Mr. Chairman. The point is, what is the department doing to encourage — let's use as an example Sherritt Gordon employing all those people in Fort Saskatchewan. There are working mothers there. Why should there not be a day care centre in that plant? That's the point. Good gravy, Mr. Minister, that's not new news. That's been around for a long, long time, and I just want to know what you're doing to encourage that.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Chairman, I'm slightly surprised that the free-enterprise member from his constituency would be suggesting that we get involved in indicating where these day care centres should be located. If the Sherritt Gordon plant or people or a private-sector group out there, maybe some of the employees, would like to establish a day care centre nearby, we're not going to tell them they can't do it. Why should we be involved?

DR. BUCK: I'm not being critical. I'm just asking what encouragement, what liaison there has been. Maybe we could be saving several million dollars. Instead of a private operator having to have that facility in a town, then encourage directly or indirectly, because of the social benefits, the benefits to the child and the mother — there are a lot of advantages in that mother being able to see that child, rather than dropping the youngster off and picking him up at the end of the day. This program has been operating in many jurisdictions, and I'd like to know what the department is doing to encourage it.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the comments the hon. member makes about the close location in terms of the opportunity during the day for some contact between a mother and the child. The encouragement is there in the form of subsidies. If the hon. member is suggesting that we should be looking at some other kinds of subsidies — if there are proposals or ideas, I'd be glad to entertain them. However, I think the number of subsidies we have at the present time is

more than adequate to encourage this type of thing. I'm not sure of the degree to which it is occurring across the province. I agree with the hon. member's concept in terms of the desirability of people who are working having the day care centre close by.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up, Mr. Chairman, and come at it in a different way. I think we all agree that would be a nice concept to look at. I believe there are some examples in the province. I'm thinking of the nurses at the Royal Alex, I believe, who run something like the concept the hon. Member for Clover Bar is talking about. There may be other examples the minister is aware of.

I guess I'd just ask the minister: is his department monitoring those situations, and how does it seem to be working? That would come more from what the hon. Member for Clover Bar is talking about — not necessarily subsidies, but leadership, talking to different companies or whatever about the concept. That would be part of what he's talking about, with some examples of what's happening already that his department could be talking to other people about. Could he tell us how those seem to be working, or at least what his department's assessment is?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Chairman, we do have the very important Social Care Facilities Review Committee, chaired by Dr. Carter. They have been visiting a large number of day care centres across the province for the last number of years, and particularly in the first few months of this year. That committee has done an excellent job in visiting day care centres and giving us reports in terms of their assessment of what has been going on. Inside the department, we also have people who visit day care centres to see whether standards are maintained, and we get feedback through the system that way. We also have the day care advisory committee, consisting of the public at large. They've been very good at giving us their impressions and views of how day care centres are operating, and they make recommendations to me on any necessary changes that they see.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up. I appreciate that that's being done. What we're talking about is perhaps not new; it's tried in other countries. But the extension of the workplace concept that the Member for Clover Bar was talking about is a rather new idea. My question specifically is: because this is a relatively new concept in Alberta, what is the minister's assessment of how well those projects — at least one that I'm aware of, but there may be more — are working?

DR. WEBBER: I can only assume they're doing fine, because I haven't heard any complaints.

MR. MARTIN: Fair enough. From the minister's comments, I have just one other area I want to talk about. I believe you said the vacancy rate in day care centres was up to about 25 to 30 percent and is now around 20 percent. I wasn't aware the vacancy rate was that high. One of the reasons the minister gave, I take it, is that there was a fair amount of building in the last year. Is that the only reason? What reasons does his department give for the high vacancy rates? Does it perhaps have to do with the economy with more people now unemployed? Are there a number of reasons? What's the assessment there?

DR. WEBBER: I can't really give a complete assessment of that, because I'm not sure. In spite of the fact that there's a

high vacancy rate, I do know that there have been a number of new operations come into existence over the past year, which have opened a lot of spaces for children to go into. They've been able to attract significant numbers of children, very young children, as I indicated a few minutes ago, in the zero to 18 months age group. There seems to be considerable effort on the part of a lot of day care centres to try to bring those children into their facilities. Once they get them there, in most cases they've got them for quite a time period, right up until they're five years of age or so. So there's the advantage of having a client over a long period of time and of the higher benefits in that early age group. Trying to tie these increased numbers to the economy is a very difficult thing. I don't think I could do that here today in the time we have left.

MR. MARTIN: Just one quick question. In the department's assessment, does it have to do somewhat with the economy, that we have perhaps less than two people working and these sorts of things? Has that been part of that area? Just a quick assessment.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Chairman, if we had time I think we could make arguments as to why there maybe should be fewer children in day cares rather than more, and we could also find some reasons as to why there are more coming in, if you want to tie the arguments to the general economic situation. But the fact is that the numbers have been increasing.

MR. MARTIN: Just one final comment on this area we're trying to deal with. If we have a vacancy rate of 20 percent because we've overbuilt or whatever, and we are concerned about finances in this Assembly — we hear it all the time — that is serious in terms of the money. That's what I was trying to determine, to see if something could be done to get the vacancy rate down, because that would ultimately save money.

DR. WEBBER: Even though a day care centre may have a 20 percent vacancy rate, we don't pay funds for the empty spaces. The money goes for the spaces that are filled. Of course I suppose the day care operation would be more profitable if they could get more children in there, but that's what they're trying to do in many instances.

Agreed to:

Social Services and Community Health

Total Vote 10 — Community Social and

Health Services

\$1,000,000

Tourism and Small Business

2 — Development of Tourism and Small Business

MR. MARTIN: One quick question flowing from our discussions. Will the minister update us on this? And I hope he won't stand up. Is this for animal feed? Have we got that confusion sorted out now, that this is actually for animal feed and not something else at this point?

MR. ADAIR: There was no confusion to start with. It was for animal feed and for the maintenance of the animals for that period till the end of March of this year, I believe. That, and veterinary costs that were attached to that within the feed supplies, is exactly what it was for.

Agreed to:

Tourism and Small Business

Total Vote 2 — Development of Tourism

and Small Business \$300,000

3 — Financial Assistance to Alberta
Business via Alberta Opportunity Company

MR. MARTIN: Just one quick question, if I can get it in here. Could the minister just update why there seems to be an increase of a fair amount of money, over \$5 million, from the previous year?

MR. ADAIR: Yes, I'd be quite happy to do that. What was starting to occur was the fact that with some direction by government to assisting small business in the province, we were creating a bit of a problem for the Alberta Opportunity Company. When we had the problems with interest rates some time ago, one of the things we asked them to look at was the security of term and that they ensure they were providing funds to the small business community . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. minister, but I have to draw to the attention of members the provisions of standing orders 58 and 59. Standing Order 58(1) provides that the main estimates be considered on not more than 25 sitting days. Standing Order 59(2) requires me to put a single question proposing the approval of all the matters not yet voted upon, which shall be decided without debate or amendment, and the committee is thereupon required to forthwith rise and report.

Having regard to the fact that this is the 25th day during which estimates have been considered and the time is 15 minutes before the normal adjournment hour, I now put the question to you. Is it agreed that all resolutions on the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, and all resolutions on the supplementary estimates for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1984, not yet voted upon, be agreed to and reported?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to Standing Order 59(2), the Committee of Supply shall now rise and report.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the provision of Standing Order 59(2), the Committee of Supply reports the following:

Resolved that funds not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1984, for the departments and purposes indicated, and this is for the supplementary estimates: \$686,975, support to the Legislative Assembly; \$29,096,000, financial assistance to students, Department of Advanced Education; \$100,000, departmental support services, Department of Agriculture; \$360,000, crimes compensation, Department of the Attorney General; \$150,000 for cultural development, \$150,000 for historical resources development, Department of Culture; \$174,000 for economic development and international trade, \$1,000,000 for financing — economic development projects, Department of Economic Development; \$2,021,500 for departmental support services, Department of Education; \$24,961,296, for departmental support services, \$134,054,000 for minerals management, \$41,117,300 for forest resources management, Department of Energy and Natural Resources; \$2,640,150 for disaster preparedness and emergency response, \$77,000 for public service employee relations, Executive Council; \$172,700 for intergovernmental co-ordination and research, Department of Federal

and Intergovernmental Affairs; \$218,000 for departmental support services, \$10,953,000 for health care insurance, \$19,867,000 for financial assistance for active care, \$6,676,000 for financial assistance for long-term chronic care, Department of Hospitals and Medical Care; \$52,400,000 for policy development and financial assistance for housing, \$52,441,003.48 for housing for Albertans, Department of Housing; \$505,000 for individual's rights protection, Department of Labour; \$400,000 for departmental support services, \$5,500,000 for manpower development and training assistance, \$13,700,000 for special employment programs, Department of Manpower; \$5,500,000 for financial assistance to the Calgary Olympic Coliseum, Department of Public Works, Supply and Services; \$10,375,310 for general health services, \$1,000,000 for community social and health services, Social Services and Community Health; \$300,000 for development of tourism and small business, \$5,050,000 for financial assistance to Alberta business via Alberta Opportunity Company, Department of Tourism and Small Business.

Resolved that sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, for the departments and purposes indicated:

Legislative Assembly: \$11,895,588 for support to the Legislative Assembly; \$9,354,515 for the office of the Auditor General; \$863,158 for the office of the Ombudsman; \$952,981 for the office of the Chief Electoral Officer.

Attorney General: \$8,083,730 for departmental support services; \$56,559,980 for court services; \$23,909,980 for legal services; \$11,168,000 for support for legal aid; \$20,526,835 for protection and administration of property rights; \$3,648,010 for fatality inquiries; \$1,027,950 for crimes compensation; \$3,443,188 for public utilities regulation; \$430,280 for gaming control and licensing.

Education: \$20,981,551 for departmental support services; \$1,107,139,000 for financial assistance to schools; \$29,994,138 for education program development and delivery.

Energy and Natural Resources: \$40,304,775 for departmental support services; \$11,936,903 for resource evaluation and planning; \$12,164,370 for minerals management; \$77,270,325 for forest resources management; \$19,422,408 for public lands management; \$26,740,981 for fish and wildlife conservation; \$1,257,101 for oil sands equity management; \$467,145 for foreign ownership of land administration; \$10,097,368 for surveying and mapping services; \$8,242,491 for petroleum incentives; \$3,466,000 for oil sands research fund management; \$6,505,600 for petroleum marketing and market research.

Hospitals and Medical Care: \$37,109,758 for departmental support services; \$432,068,000 for health care insurance; \$1,271,566,146 for financial assistance for active care; \$171,609,638 for financial assistance for long-term chronic care; \$102,485,289 for financial assistance for supervised personal care; \$268,541,000 for financial assistance for capital construction.

Municipal Affairs: \$7,111,560 for departmental support services; \$214,340,731 for financial support for municipal programs; \$110,176,836 for Alberta property tax reduction plan — rebates to individuals; \$10,851,362 for support to community planning services; \$26,160,994 for administrative and technical support to municipalities; \$1,840,297 for regulatory boards.

Social Services and Community Health: \$60,803,080 for departmental support services; \$436,464,890 for social allowance; \$138,969,101 for child welfare services; \$16,074,900 for specialized social services; \$166,173,550 for benefits and income support; \$18,922,110 for vocational rehabilitation serv-

ices; \$114,664,740 for services for the handicapped; \$43,664,320 for treatment of mental illness; \$54,748,100 for general health services; \$146,311,000 for community social and health services; \$25,769,190 for alcoholism and drug abuse — treatment and education.

Tourism and Small Business: \$1,372,410 for departmental support services; \$14,592,128 for development of tourism and small business; \$11,945,070 for financial assistance to Alberta business; \$8,846,475 for Alberta heritage fund small business and farm interest shielding program.

Treasury: \$3,090,000 for departmental support services; \$2,393,900 for statistical services; \$90,402,400 for revenue collection and rebates; \$37,132,900 for financial management, planning, and central services.

Salary Contingency: \$1,000,000.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the report, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Assembly to give unanimous consent to revert to Introduction of Bills in order that the Provincial Treasurer might introduce the Appropriation Act.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**
(*reversion*)

Bill 44
Appropriation Act, 1984

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 44, the Appropriation Act, 1984. 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.

[Leave granted; Bill 44 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Assembly will consider second reading of Bills on the Order Paper. I don't think there are any Bills that hon. members of the opposition have particularly asked be held. The one introduced today would not be called immediately, but all other Bills on the Order Paper would be considered available for second reading. It's intended that the Assembly sit on Monday evening.

Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 1 o'clock.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader. Are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 12:57 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 4, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]

