

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Tuesday, May 7, 1985 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. KOZIAK: It's my pleasure in the absence of my colleagues the Minister of Economic Development and the Minister of International Trade to introduce in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, a delegation of businessmen from China who are here exploring the possibilities of a joint ventureship in the aircraft industry. They are: Mr. Yong Gang Lu, Mr. Wenbin Xu, Mr. Bosheng Liu, Mr. Zhao Xin Suen, Mr. Jian Kin Liao, and Mr. Tian Jian Shi. They're joined by representatives of WT Aircraft International, Wladimir Talanczuk and Andriy Semotiuk.

As I indicated, they are here to explore the possibilities of joint ventureship involving Chinese and Alberta talent and capital for the production of ultralight aircraft. I would ask that all those I introduced rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file with the Legislative Assembly copies of the document Status of the Fish and Wildlife Resource in Alberta. This status report of our fish and wildlife resource is the first such report done by any government in Canada. I would like to thank the Member for Rocky Mountain House for assisting my department staff in preparing the highly regarded information. Copies have previously been made available to all members.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report of the health care insurance plan for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1984.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file with the Library of the Legislative Assembly a copy of a letter which I received yesterday from Dr. B. T. Keeler, the executive secretary of the Alberta Teachers' Association, and two attachments to that letter. One of the attachments is a statement which, at a meeting with the ATA on April 26, 1985, I had suggested to them as a statement of commonly shared principles affecting the development of certain professional matters in the province. The provincial executive council of the Alberta Teachers' Association was unable to accept that as a statement of principle, and so the second attachment is an alternative which they suggested to me.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, today I have the considerable pleasure of introducing 29 students from the grade 6 Ukrainian bilingual class in St. Martin elementary Catholic school, located in the Edmonton Parkallen constituency. If

I might, I think it's a special occasion to note that this year marks the 10th anniversary of the introduction of the Ukrainian bilingual program into Alberta schools. Alberta has recognized the cultural and linguistic diversity of Alberta residents and provides for instruction in Ukrainian, German, Hebrew, Chinese, Arabic, and other languages, in addition to English and French. In order to celebrate this event, the students here today are also going to look forward early next month on June 2 to a family picnic and concert at the Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Village. They, of course, hope that many other students from the same program would join them on that occasion.

Mr. Speaker, the students are accompanied today by teachers Mrs. Mary Dytyniak and Mr. Will Micklich, along with a number of parents: Mrs. Wasylynchuk, Mrs. Stechishin, Mrs. Stepnisky, Mrs. Rudnisky, Mrs. Pastuszenko, and Mrs. Biscoe. I would ask that all the class, the teachers, and the parents now rise in the members' gallery and receive the welcome of the members.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege this afternoon of introducing to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 57 grade 6 students from the Win Ferguson school in Fort Saskatchewan. They are accompanied by teachers Mrs. Ackerman, Mrs. Parrish, Mr. Lucas, and parents Mrs. Roemer, Mr. MacKay, and Mrs. Morrow. They are in the public gallery, and I'd like them to rise and receive the welcome of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: May I ask the members to join me in welcoming a class from the Patricia Heights school who are accompanied by parent Mrs. Chris Yewchuk and teacher Mrs. Pat Richardson. I would ask them to stand and be recognized and welcomed by the members.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the introduction of 22 enthusiastic students to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, is my distinct pleasure today. In the members' gallery are grade 6 students from the Talmud Torah school, accompanied by two teachers, Mrs. van Manen and Mrs. Shandling, and an interested parent, Mrs. Birnboim. I'd ask that they all stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly at this time.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**University of Calgary PCB Spill**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. Reports from Calgary indicate that a significant PCB spill occurred at the University of Calgary in 1984, and that PCBs were spilled directly on a worker. My question is: was any report of this accident made to a director of inspection, as is required under section 13 of the Occupational Health and Safety Act?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, if I may advise the House, as a result of the news item in the local newspapers, my officials contacted the University of Calgary. The university indicated that there was so small an amount of spillage that they felt there was no need to report it. We are now trying to contact the worker that was supposed to have been exposed to the PCBs, but as of the time that the House was sitting, I've had no report on it.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me it's not for them to decide if PCBs are spilt. My question is: after the follow-up, will the minister direct his officials to determine whether or not action should be undertaken against the University of Calgary for failure to comply with the Act?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, safety is the responsibility of both the employer and the worker. In this case neither party advised my officials. I can assure the House that when the investigation is completed, I will be in a better position to advise or even make recommendations to other departments that would appropriately be involved in it.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister taken any action to inform employees at institutions and facilities where PCBs are stored of the proper methods of transportation and handling of this substance?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, publications, pamphlets, communication by meetings and educational seminars: all efforts are used to communicate to workers and employers the proper disposal of PCBs or material that contains PCBs.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker. My reading of the Hazardous Chemicals Act leads me to believe that there is no requirement that such incidents as the one at the University of Calgary must be reported to the minister. My question is: does the government have any plan to plug this loophole by introducing amendments which would require that such spills be reported to the minister's department?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Hazardous Chemicals Advisory Committee is currently reviewing draft regulations which will look at the whole area of hazardous chemicals. Once that review has been completed, I'd be in a position to advise the House further.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. I'm asking specifically: will the minister be recommending that any spill like the University of Calgary one should be reported to his department?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated that there are some preliminary, draft regulations, which have been circulated. We'll be receiving advice on the contents of those regulations. I'd be able to advise the House further at that time.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. Apparently, this spill took place some 20 metres from the Bow River. Is the minister's department investigating whether or not section 17 of the Clean Water Act was violated in this instance?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, all the circumstances under which this spill occurred are under investigation by the department at this time to determine, in fact, what did take place and where the spill occurred. The department is investigating that. I will shortly have a report from them with regard to the results of their investigation.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. Will the minister undertake to table the results of all the

soil and water samplings done by his department at that particular U of C spill site?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, the department has taken some samples, and I will undertake to have those samples made public.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the Minister of Advanced Education. Has the minister scheduled any meeting with University of Calgary officials to determine why this incident was not reported to appropriate provincial officials immediately?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I've recently been in contact with the University of Calgary. First of all, they want to give assurance to the Legislative Assembly that every precaution is taken in the handling of PCBs, including a full-time safety officer and a very stringent set of regulations. Full reporting is, of course, required under the regulations under which the University of Calgary operates. They receive a nominal amount of PCBs through a variety of research projects which they have. They have given me assurance that they have maintained control on the handling and disposal of PCBs with the utmost care. Secondly, in terms of the discussion I had with the University of Calgary, assurance has been given to me that officials will be reviewing all elements of this unfortunate incident. They will be making a full report to the government to assure us as to the full details of their investigation and to allow us to deal with the question and provide some guidance as to how regulations can be made in the future, which would more specifically carry the responsibility where it should be.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Following from his comments that in the reply from the University of Calgary they didn't think it was worth reporting because there was only a small amount, could the minister responsible for workers' health and safety indicate who determined this and how they came to this conclusion? Was he able to assess that when he talked to University of Calgary officials?

MR. DIACHUK: Not at this time, Mr. Speaker. It was just preliminary information given to me by the regional office in Calgary, that in their communication with the University of Calgary the university had competent people there to clean up. When we finalize the report, we'll be in a better position to respond to that question.

Teaching Standards Council

MR. MARTIN: I'd like to direct the second set of questions to the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the filing today of a statement of principles back and forth. I'm curious. Could the minister indicate why he found it necessary on April 26 to send a statement of principles to the ATA that they had to respond to, I understand, before he would continue negotiations with them?

MR. KING: No, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member misunderstands.

MR. MARTIN: My question to the minister is simply this: why did he send out a statement of principles which basically declared that he's God Almighty? Other than that, why did

he find it necessary to send out this statement? That was the question.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, the government is establishing a Council on Alberta Teaching Standards. There would be some benefit for the teachers of the province if the Alberta Teachers' Association were involved in the operation of that council. The Alberta Teachers' Association, nevertheless, at its recent annual representative assembly declared itself in opposition to the principles and said that they were not going to be involved unless certain significant changes affecting the principles were made. The suggestion I made at the April 26 meeting was meant to try to find some common expression of the principles so that we could set the question of principle aside and deal with some of the elements of the Council on Alberta Teaching Standards. The Alberta Teachers' Association replied that they are unable to accept the statement of principle that I suggested to them. They have come back with a different statement of principle. That's where we are at the present time.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. As I look through his statement, a lot of it is the same as what the ATA has replied. What assessment has the minister made in regard to the ATA's statement of principles? Does he accept that there is some room for compromise with their statement that they've sent back to him?

MR. KING: Of course, Mr. Speaker, everyone will have to read the letter and the attachments themselves. But as far as I can see, there is no indication that the Alberta Teachers' Association accepts the idea of the Council on Alberta Teaching Standards. If I'm wrong, I'd be interested to hear that from the hon. member. There is no suggestion in the letter as to what it is they find objectionable in what we are doing, nor is there any suggestion about what should be done to make the unacceptable acceptable, nor is there any comment about pursuing a new teaching profession Act as an alternative. So I see nothing in the letter that indicates a change in the position of the Alberta Teachers' Association. If I'm wrong about that, I'm sure the Alberta Teachers' Association will advise me.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. They accept a lot of the principles, and you can agree on the principles. It doesn't necessarily mean that they have to accept the council. There can be some disagreement there. My point is, though, that they have accepted some of the principles. My question is: as far as the minister is concerned, is there no room for any compromise in what I read here? I point out that they were asked to reply specifically to his statement. As I understand it, they have given suggestions in the past, but on this particular point they were just to reply to this.

MR. KING: The hon. member will note that in the statement that comes to us from the Alberta Teachers' Association, this is omitted:

... need for the Minister to develop and administer comprehensive, constructive and effective policy, programs and administrative procedures that address certification, decertification and properly related matters.

I have to presume that the omission of that is deliberate on the part of provincial executive council of the Alberta Teachers' Association, and in the mind of the government that's a significant omission.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. We can go through it point by point, but it seems to me there's some compromise. My question to the minister is simply this: is it the position of the minister that there are no useful proposals at all in the submissions that have been made to him by the ATA on the proposed teaching council?

MR. KING: Perhaps the hon. member could assist me by stating one of the specific initiatives of the Alberta Teachers' Association that he's referring to.

MR. MARTIN: Let me ask a question in doing that, because I'll get cut off if I go through it. Would the minister indicate, then, that it is the position of the government that the Teachers' Association's suggestion that the ATA continue to have a role in practice reviews has merit? If the minister accepts that, why have such recommendations not been reflected in the council proposals that he's drawn up?

MR. KING: I regret that I do not follow the hon. member. I would first of all need to have him read to me something from the letter which suggests that the Alberta Teachers' Association is interested in being involved with the council under any conditions whatsoever. He is absolutely correct that it is quite possible to support the principle of what is involved here without supporting any of the detail. Perhaps he can show me where the Alberta Teachers' Association has said that they support the principles, though not the detail.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. Is it not correct that when the minister sent out the statement of principles, all he asked of the ATA at that time was for them to reply to those principles, and after they'd replied to the principles, perhaps some more negotiations could go on? At least that's their understanding.

MR. KING: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, what was the point of the exercise, then? If the minister was going to go ahead with the council and there's no room for negotiation, why bother with an exercise like this where we waste everybody's time?

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: It's been customary for the person who asks the question to ask a reasonable number of supplementaries — I agree that we're arriving at that goal — and then for other members to intervene. Perhaps we might have a further supplementary by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, followed by the hon. Member for Vegreville.

MR. MARTIN: Well, I'll point it out. It seems to have been a long, drawn out exercise. If the minister drew up these principles, asking the ATA to respond to them, and if basically the only thing they won't accept is the make-up of the council and if they won't accept that and the minister just rejects what they're saying, what was the point of the exercise to begin with?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I have already said in answer to an earlier question that I take it that the ATA rejects more than that one particular question. I take it by their

deliberate omission of this that they reject the idea of the need to

... develop and administer comprehensive, constructive and effective policy, programs and administrative procedures that address certification, decertification and properly related matters.

That was in the suggestion which I offered to them; it is omitted from the reply they gave to me. I have to presume the omission is deliberate, and there is nothing in the covering letter that suggests anything to the contrary.

MR. BATIUK: I stood up, Mr. Speaker, because nobody was moving before.

A supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister advise whether, should a new teaching profession Act come into being, there is a possibility of abolishment of the Council on Alberta Teaching Standards?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member seems to be asking a hypothetical question, but if he wants to ask about a matter of policy, perhaps it could be taken that way.

MR. KING: As a matter of policy, Mr. Speaker, and as a matter of the declared intention of the government, in the event that a new teaching profession Act is agreed to by the interested parties, then it is almost certain that the council would cease functioning and that the responsibilities of the council would be rolled up into whatever new organization had charge of the operations of the profession.

MR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary to the Minister of Education. The minister indicated in his interchange with the Leader of the Opposition his assumption as to what the ATA was saying in its response. I wonder if the minister has any plans in the immediate future to meet with ATA officials again to determine exactly what they were getting at in their response.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I don't ordinarily go looking for work. I have received a letter from the Alberta Teachers' Association. We are in the process of establishing the council. If the Alberta Teachers' Association wants to talk about these things, then I'd always be receptive to that request for talks, but I am not going to go looking for more talks. There's more than enough to keep us busy.

Senate Reform

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs with regard to a comment he made in the Legislature on May 1 on Senate reform and the commitment of the Alberta government to support the federal government's position. It was a very firm commitment, as I understand it. Could the minister indicate what effect that will have in terms of meaningful discussions on overall Senate reform, not only from the Alberta point of view but in Canada as a whole?

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest to the hon. member that he's really asking for an out-and-out opinion. Of course, the minister's opinion would be interesting, and so would the opinions of probably any other members of the House. I don't see any questions of fact involved in the question at all.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister indicate what consideration

was given in terms of the effect of Alberta's position in supporting the federal government — what effect would that have on meaningful discussion on Senate reform?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of information, in discussions earlier today with the hon. federal Minister of Justice, I'm advised that the federal proposal has now been put on notice to be made public later today and will therefore come on the Order Paper of the federal House of Commons this week. At that time the exact text will be made public, and immediately thereafter, we expect that we will table a similar motion in the Alberta Legislative Assembly for consideration and debate during the course of the spring sittings.

I might add that at the time of the tabling of the federal proposal, we are proposing to table an exchange of correspondence between the Prime Minister and the Premier of our province and between myself and the federal Minister of Justice in which it is made abundantly clear that a full-scale discussion of overall and comprehensive Senate reform will be undertaken, leading to a comprehensive constitutional conference by 1987 on the subject of the upper House in Canada.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In the comments of May 1 the minister indicated that the most recent correspondence was sent by our Premier to the Prime Minister, indicating that Alberta would join with other provinces in supporting the federal resolution. That means there is a commitment to support. In his comments at the same time and again today, the minister said, "I'm not at liberty to indicate the terms of the resolution." On what basis did the provincial government give that wholehearted support to the federal resolution before the details of it were known by the Alberta government?

MR. HORSMAN: On the basis of the commitments contained in the correspondence between the Prime Minister and the Premier of Alberta and between the Minister of Justice and myself.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate what those commitments were? Has the minister assured us in this Legislature that there will not be a jeopardizing of the full discussion of Senate reform? Is there a commitment from the federal government as to a specific scheduling of the debate on full Senate reform?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have tried to make clear that when the resolution is tabled in the Assembly, I will also table the correspondence which I referred to in the earlier answer and again today, in which, in the view of our government, there is a firm commitment by the federal government to a comprehensive review of the role of the upper House in the federal state of Canada, and that that comprehensive review will contain an opportunity for all provinces and the federal government to review the role of an upper House, the method of selection of members of the upper House, and the powers of that upper House once it is established — hopefully, in the view of our government — so that it will properly carry out one of its main functions, and that is to represent the interests of the provinces in the federal state as partners in Confederation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate whether the government has

taken a position with regard to the document Strengthening Canada: Reform of Canada's Senate that was tabled in this Legislature? In a more simple sense, is it the intention of the Conservative government of Alberta to support the Triple E concept of Senate reform?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the subject of that particular select committee report will also be debated during the course of the spring sittings, and at that time there will be ample opportunity to debate the merits of the particular proposals contained in that report. It is obvious that the report has been well researched, and it has been well received in many areas of Alberta. That, of course, will be a matter subject to debate. It will obviously be a very useful document for our government to use as we consider it in this Legislature, debate the various recommendations, and then proceed into a process of negotiations until 1987 with other provinces and the federal government relative to the role of an upper House in the federal state of Canada.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will it be the intention of the minister to bring in a resolution for debate on this specific report, or will it be done through other means on the Order Paper?

MR. HORSMAN: If the hon. member will refer to the Order Paper, he will find that such a motion is on the Order Paper now.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister or the House leader indicate at this time when it is the intent of the government to bring that forward for discussion in the House?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is proposed to bring — I want to get the timetable correct. When the federal government proposal is made public, it is our intention to then table an identical amendment based on the federal resolution, as is required under the Constitution Act. At that time we will consider whether to debate the two motions concurrently, separately, or one following after the other and which one should be debated first. It is our intention to provide ample opportunity for debate of both motions during the spring sitting, but as to the exact date for the consideration of that, we don't have that at this moment. Certainly, ample notice will be given to members of the Assembly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, this relates to my earlier question, to clarify it. Is it the intention of the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to present the federal position to the Legislature as a resolution? You've answered part of my question, about working it in with the matter of the report. Will it be the minister or another member of the Legislature who will present that amendment?

MR. HORSMAN: No, I expect the amendment will be in my name, Mr. Speaker.

Rehabilitation Society of Calgary

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to travel a little distance from home again today and ask the Minister of Social Services and Community Health another question about the Rehabilitation Society of Calgary. Yesterday the minister stated that his department had suggested that the

Rehabilitation Society of Calgary could sell some of their property to help fund the expansion they require there. Has the minister investigated whether or not the society actually owns any property which they could sell?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, one of the locations that particular organization is involved in is property owned by the city of Calgary with, to my understanding, a building on it owned by the Lions Club in Calgary. They've been there for some time. The suggestion has been made to that particular organization that possibly the city of Calgary or the Lions Club could donate that property to the organization, and they might want to consider that in terms of their 25 percent contribution to the 75/25 cost sharing on a new project.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Given that the society doesn't in fact have any real estate of their own to use toward raising their 25 percent of the costs, could the minister indicate whether he was told specifically and explicitly by the society that they were not prepared to put any money into the expansion they require, as he indicated yesterday, or whether that was just a personal conclusion he drew for himself?

DR. WEBBER: I'm having a little difficulty understanding what the hon. member is asking. If it is that I am assuming that this particular organization wants 100 percent funding from the province for their new building and, of course, the land and programming to go with it, then it's more than an assumption. We've met with this particular group for a number of years, as a matter of fact, and the proposal presented to us recently requested that the province provide 100 percent funding for this particular facility.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. My question was whether or not the society had indicated they were not prepared to put money in or whether that was a conclusion. My question is whether the minister has looked at the possibility of guaranteeing a loan for the \$1.2 million that would be the society's share under the current 75/25 funding arrangement?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, we have looked at every conceivable way to help address the needs of this particular organization. In fact, a meeting is planned for this evening between Calgary regional people and the executive of this particular organization to discuss the proposal that we would put forth to them. Certainly, we've looked at a number of options. However, one has to be fair to all the other agencies in the province that are providing services. Across this province we have some 40 groups that are providing services of a similar nature, not exactly the same, and they have been involved in raising money locally on the basis of 75/25 for capital expenditures. If we were to suddenly turn around and grant one organization 100 percent funding without any community involvement at all, you can imagine what the other 39 groups in the province would say. I think we have to be fair in this process.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, or just to re-ask the question that wasn't answered. My question is not whether the department is considering 100 percent funding but whether it's considering the possibility of guaranteeing the \$1.2 million share that would be the society's portion of the cost.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that particular proposal has been under discussion and will be under discussion this evening as well. However, I think that has some implications. We have addressed it in the past, and I'm struggling to recall all the implications of that. If I recall, it was not a viable alternative.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I don't think any organization expects an open cheque book with things like this. Certainly, when the minister talks about fairness, that's a reasonable way to approach each situation. My question to the minister is whether he can confirm that there is a maximum of \$9,000 per client space in terms of the funding for 75 percent of capital costs.

DR. WEBBER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have had in place a \$12,000 per client-space ceiling where the province will pick up \$9,000 and the local organization \$3,000. However, I wrote to the Calgary Rehab Society just before Christmas, I believe, and indicated that if, in fact, it was not possible in the marketplace to have the total costs within that \$12,000 range, we would give consideration to going beyond \$12,000, but on a 75/25 basis.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Given the amount of effort that the minister indicates the department has made to see if there is some way to fund it, I wonder whether there has been any investigation by the minister and his department as to whether or not it's feasible for the society to in fact raise the 25 percent in the circumstances they find themselves in in Calgary at this time, given the current difficulties raising money by charities.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, different organizations have different abilities to raise money locally. However, I think it would be appropriate and proper for them to make the attempt to raise money locally. I'm not convinced that that particular organization has made the proper attempts.

I recently met with another organization in Calgary. They came forth with a very interesting proposal with regard to helping 16-, 17-, and 18-year-olds in the city. If I recall, they had about three-quarters of the capital raised by going out into the community. So it's my personal view that this particular organization needs to be more involved in approaching the volunteer and community organizations in the city.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. My understanding and memory is that the society does in fact engage in fundraising activities and is doing its best. My question is whether there is any method planned or any contingency to assist the clients of the society who are turned away, assuming there are no new facilities and the current facilities don't allow for handling all the people who need them. Is there any contingency plan to find alternative programs for those people?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the particular agency we're talking about has claimed extensive waiting lists. In a recent assessment we had done, it's my memory that the waiting list totalled about 30. If no agreement comes about to the particular proposal they have, then certainly other alternatives have to be examined. One could speculate on the possibilities, one being, of course, to tender the process to other agencies locally that might be willing to provide similar services.

Motor Vehicle Registrations

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Solicitor General, and it has to do with licence plate renewals. In light of the fact that we've gone to a staggered renewal of licence plates, can the minister indicate what notification the car owner receives at this time to indicate that his licence is about to expire?

DR. REID: The system that was developed, Mr. Speaker, is to send out a renewal notice and warning together during the month preceding the month at the end of which the licence will be invalid. From conversations with the hon. member, I understand that he has some instances where these notices have not arrived. If he gives me the details, I'll be happy to look into those individual instances.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in checking with some of my constituents, it seems to be a fairly prevalent problem. Can the minister indicate what discussion he has had with the law enforcement agencies? Is there a tolerance period of a month or two? What happens when the citizen says, "Mr. Officer, I didn't get any notification; I didn't realize it had expired"? I realize that's the responsibility of the car owner, but what tolerance period is allowed by the enforcement officers?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, in the past when all the licence plates ran out at the same time, nominally March 31, usually a tolerance of one month extending to the end of April was given, during which time we notified the law enforcement people that there was a period of grace. In going over to the staggered system for automobiles and small vehicles, that tolerance has been abolished, so that the expiry date on the tab on the plate is in actual fact the expiry date. There is not a tolerance now as there used to be.

DR. BUCK: Just for the sake of the Assembly and the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate what system is in place as to who expires when? Are they alphabetical? Are they when you purchase the car? What is the system that's in place?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I think this was made amply plain when the system was introduced. We took the letters of the alphabet in sequences to make sure that every twelfth of the total list was brought up each month in sequence, so that there's an approximately even distribution of the number of renewals month by month throughout the year. It's not strictly done on an alphabetical basis, because of course there are more names that start with certain letters than with others. The attempt was made to balance it, approximately one-twelfth of the renewals each month of the year. In actual fact, that's how it did work out.

The difficulty that the hon. member is describing appears to be with sending out renewal notices. My understanding is that they are automatically sent out by the computer on which they are recorded. There seems to be some problem with the delivery of some of those renewal notices, which are sent out to the registered address of the owner. As I said, I'm quite prepared to look into the matter on an individual basis if the member has any constituents with problems.

DR. BUCK: A question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Now that we've gone to this centralized, computerized system,

can the minister indicate what effect has been noted on the local issuing agents, who at one time did all the plate renewal issuances in the province? What effect has it had on the small-business people now that we've gone to the centralized government system?

DR. REID: In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, we have not really gone to a centralized government system other than the computer systems, which are in Edmonton. The individual issuing offices, the privately operated issuing offices around the province, are now on a direct line to that system. Renewals, changes of address, or changes of vehicle can be entered at any office around the province. My understanding is that in actual fact most of the individual offices have an increased volume of business with the new system compared to what they had on the old system. There are a small number of issuing offices which had concentrated on the issuing of truck permits on the old percentage basis where, because they're no longer receiving that business due to the operation of a fleet system, a small number of operators — about seven around the province — have in actual fact had a reduction in income. Most of the individual issuing offices have had a slight increase or are about the same.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, would the minister be in a position to indicate to the Assembly or table some information to that effect? The information we're getting is exactly the opposite.

DR. REID: I don't know that I should be issuing freely to the public the financial records of the individual operators.

DR. BUCK: Why are they tearing up their Tory cards?

Conventions on Postsecondary Campuses

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. I've learned that the Institute of Canadian Bankers has, after inviting proposals for accommodation, food service, and lecture space, made arrangements to have training lectures for banking staff at the University of Calgary. I would like the minister, if he would, to advise why we would not disallow this type of activity and have these types of conventions, seminars, or lectures referred to the private sector to at least supply accommodation and food service rather than using the public facility at the university.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the member's question deals with what role the universities, whether in Calgary or other locations, take into consideration when they get involved in hosting conventions. Let me simply indicate that in my discussions with the chairmen of boards of universities across the province, all chairmen have been very conscious of this particular point, and they are caught in the touch of a conflict. The conflict is, of course, that we as legislators suggest to them that they should fully utilize the systems and the infrastructure or the buildings which they have at their disposal. They see that as part of their mandate to ensure 12-month utilization of those facilities, and wherever possible they strive to maximize the benefit to the people of Alberta in a variety of ways to ensure that those buildings are used in that fashion.

Secondly, most universities and colleges abide by one principle; that is, wherever a department or faculty wants

to engender debate or discussion on an academic area or an area of interest to the university, they should feel free to encourage participation, not just in Alberta but from across Canada, to focus in on public policy issues. As a result of that, it is important that they host these meetings, these conventions, these gatherings on the university so that there can be a fully collegial spirit and these issues can be developed and debated. The public then becomes aware, and this important debate is accessible to them.

In the case of the particular point which the member raises, I must admit that I don't have the details as to why the University of Calgary, in this case, is seen to have been pushing back private sector competition by taking over, as I understand it, some of the services normally provided by the private sector. I can only say that I'm sure the board of governors, in their autonomy, have decided that this is one case where they wanted, for a variety of reasons, to host this event, and of course they are very conscious of the impact on the private sector when they do that.

I should note as well, Mr. Speaker, that in many cases universities and colleges also commission, hire, and lease space off the campus in private sector facilities to host important events.

If the member wishes, Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to get further details for him and advise him.

MR. NELSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise, with the continued demise of hotels and other components of the hospitality industry due to bankruptcies and receiverships, why we would even allow for consideration of the use of a public facility, funded with public dollars, which could conceivably have these lectures offered within those facilities at cost or less? Why would we even consider having the university provide the space for these activities, considering the university does not have to worry about profit, capital investment, or capital debt retirement, like those in the private sector?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, those are all valid concerns which I appreciate having on the record, because I think they express the views of the government as well. Yet I've tried to put on the other side of the issue some of the constraints under which the university board of governors operates. I should say that I'm not altogether in agreement that the statement of doom and demise of the tourist industry is quite as difficult as the member indicates. In fact, I understand that, given the economic turnaround in this province and that tourism has a very major potential for expansion — and I know our minister of tourism has done an awful lot already, in terms of both current budget expenditure and policy formation, to ensure that that industry and that sector of the economy remains viable and strong. Yet I will take the word of advice as caution. I will express the views to the various boards of governors under my responsibility and will attempt to give a specific answer to the member as soon as possible.

MR. NELSON: One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Considering what the minister has indicated, and possibly the minister responsible for tourism, will we then continue to support the view that the university is a corporate body unto its own, and will we do nothing to discourage them from competing with the private sector? If that's the case, why don't we socialize our hospitality industry whom the same bankers bankrupt without conscience, who make money and thousands of dollars off them, yet they then go to the

public trough and a public facility that doesn't need to show a profit?

MR. SPEAKER: The time for the question period has run out. I think perhaps we should acknowledge that the hon. Member for Calgary McCall has made quite an argumentative proposal, which no doubt every member has heard. The hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health would like to supplement some information given to a question asked earlier in today's question period. With the indulgence of the House, perhaps we might extend to accommodate the hon. minister.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Rehabilitation Society of Calgary
(continued)

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview referred to the proposal about a guaranteed loan, I was trying to recall the rationale behind rejecting that proposal. It was as follows. They want us to put up 75 percent and, instead of their coming up with 25 percent, to guarantee a loan for that 25 percent, and then for the government in subsequent years to give grants to that association to pay that loan off. To me that's 100 percent financing. So that's the basic thing wrong with that particular proposal.

We will continue to work with them to see if we can find ways they can come up with their share of the arrangement. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the Calgary MLAs have worked very hard with this particular organization over the years in trying to assist them and, I'm sure, will continue to do so.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Assembly agree to revert briefly to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to introduce 48 energetic Canadian students seated in the members' gallery. Half of them are grade 6 students from the Stratford junior high school located in the Edmonton Glenora constituency, and the other half are from Quebec. They're participating in a student exchange under the popular open house Canada program.

Monsieur le Président, il me fait de grand plaisir d'offrir aux étudiants de la belle province un très bon accueil à notre province en ce moment.

Our students in the galleries will be travelling back to Quebec with their young friends tomorrow for a week-long visit there. They're accompanied by their teachers Elizabeth Ford, Scott Fehr, Margarite Parisé, and Rita Gagnon. I'd like to ask these young people and the teachers and parents to rise at this time and receive a warm welcome from the Alberta Legislative Assembly.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly 32 grade 6 students from the Chester Ronning school in the city of Camrose. With them today is their teacher, Mr. McClarty, parent Mrs. Ashton, and driver Mr. Aldridge. I might point out that this is the fifth or sixth year this school has visited our Assembly. They have taken parliamentary procedures in their social studies course.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, may I read a Social Studies Opinion written by one of the students:

I really liked the Social Studies unit on the democratic government. I learned the most on this topic than I've ever learned about one thing. At first it seemed so complicated, but by forming a government in our classroom and running popcorn sales and stuff on our own, you learn it really easy. I really learned a lot from studying for the big Social Studies test. I studied for a real long time and learned stuff I had forgotten about. From just being a Cabinet Minister in our classroom government, I see that being involved in Parliament is a real big responsibility and a lot of publicity. I plan to have a family, so I wouldn't want them being criticized for something I did wrong and was put in the paper or on the news. For that reason I don't think I'll ever be a politician.

I'd like to table that, Mr. Speaker.

They are sitting in the public gallery, and I ask them to rise now and be recognized by the Assembly.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce 39 young people from across the province. They're with the Forum for Young Albertans. These students represent all areas of the province. They're here for a week-long seminar studying all levels of government. I believe members will have an opportunity to meet the individual students later in the week. They are accompanied by the executive director, Linda Ciurysek, and counsellors Lorraine Turk, Brian Tittermore, and Meriel Hughes. They're seated in the public gallery, and I ask the Assembly to welcome these young people from all across the province.

head: **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

137. Mr. Martin moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a list of all grants or corporate investments approved by the small business equity corporation from its inception to March 31, 1985, itemizing for each grant or corporate investment, where known:

- (1) the name or names of the person who received a grant or corporate investment,
- (2) the nature of each business,
- (3) the amount of each grant or corporate investment,
- (4) the date that each grant or corporate investment was issued.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I ask hon. members not to accept Motion 137. I guess I can get into the detail by starting off with the fact that we do not have a small business equity corporation. It is a program in which there are some 136 private-sector corporations that are registered with us as they put together their funds.

More importantly, any program of universal or widespread application, where any person can qualify for a benefit by meeting general guidelines, is not the appropriate type of program to provide this type of detailed information in

response to a motion for a return. There are a number of programs where all a person has to do is meet a regulatory guideline and they become fully qualified to participate in the program. The interest shielding program is an example. The farm fuel distribution allowance is another one. Tax information is traditionally confidential. It's a very important principle, and it applies to this program as well. In essence, what we're doing is providing grants as well as certificates of corporate investment.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to provide general information: the number of registrations, the geographical location, the sectors the investments are made in — for example, the agricultural community, the retail/wholesale community — and the aggregate amount of funding that, in fact, is being invested both by the private sector and by us through the incentive programs we have.

Mr. Speaker, I ask hon. members not to accept Motion 137.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the minister and to the motion on the Order Paper, I am not convinced that the reasons are valid. I think we have to remember that on principle we have public moneys given to private groups that have put together a pool of equity capital. The question I raise is: if group X is receiving some 30 percent in terms of a government contribution — that's public money that goes to someone — why isn't it public on that basis, and why isn't it put in the *Gazette*?

I remember that we had this same discussion in terms of moneys made available through the Alberta Opportunity Company. The commitment of the government at that time was to list the names of the companies, as I recall. I could be corrected; I'm going by recollection at this time. We had the commitment of government to do that so that we would know the specific names of persons who received money out of the public purse. In this situation I see no difference.

The second step, where the funds go from this group of persons who put the equity together and their investments as such — maybe that's part of their own private business as to what they do with it. But the first step, where they put it together, are incorporated as such, and the government provides funds to them — why shouldn't we know their names? Why shouldn't their names be listed on the public roster? That's most difficult for me to understand.

On that basis I couldn't support the defeat of this resolution. To me it should be public. If the minister was able to answer that in some way or someone else on the front bench was able to clearly enunciate why that couldn't be public, I'd appreciate that. As I see it, listing the names of the group of persons who receive it doesn't put their business in jeopardy in any way. If they have the courage to come to government and say, "give me a percentage and be a partner," then they should have the courage to list their names on a public list. That's the trade-off. If they don't want it and want to deal just with the regular lending institutions, fine. That's the way I look at it. If there are others here who could explain that, I'd be willing to listen to the argument on the other side. But what the minister has said so far doesn't convince me at this point that we shouldn't have that public listing.

I'm just talking about a public listing. When we look at the other aspects of the resolution, the nature of each business: maybe that's questionable. The amount of each grant: there's nothing wrong with that. The date each grant was issued: I can't see that as harmful information, Mr.

Speaker. So I'd certainly appreciate it if the government would reconsider their present position.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two comments. As I understand the way the Alberta small business equity corporation works, if 20 investors invested \$5,000 apiece and formed an Alberta small business equity corporation and it's incorporated as such, then as one of those investors, I receive a cheque from the provincial government for 30 percent of that as a participant in that company, after they have met certain qualifications. I support what my colleague, the hon. Member for Little Bow, said. After I as a member of that Alberta small business equity corporation have invested our funds in ABC Company Ltd., I don't think that's the business of anyone except me as a lender and ABC Company Ltd. as a borrower. Certainly, I think that should be kept private.

But I see no reason why the people who are participants in the Alberta small business equity corporation, who receive 30 percent refunds from the taxpayers of Alberta, would not be willing to say, as we go through all the public accounts records, that those funds have been given to those Albertans who are going to take a certain risk. Mr. Speaker, the one premise we as politicians must always remember is that when we do public business, it must be done in public. I certainly have to ... [interjections] I beg your pardon, hon. member?

We are expending public funds. If I were one of those investors and for a \$10,000 investment I received 30 percent, or \$3,000, of the taxpayers' money back, I would have no problem saying: certainly, I invested, and I hope I don't lose the rest of the equity that I put into ABC Company Ltd. Mr. Minister, I certainly think that portion of it could be complied with. I think the government wants to amend the motion to say that that portion would be made public. The other stuff — I don't think it's the business of the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood or anybody else. But, Mr. Minister, the part where you receive public funds — I think you're making a grave error.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, it puzzles those of us who are not necessarily sitting in the front benches but who have an interest in the subject as to how the members can both object to and support the motion at the same time. I think the minister has already pointed out that this is not a corporation; it's a program. The grant part of it, as far as application for and receipt of a grant of public money by anyone, may well be quite acceptable. I think I heard the minister saying he would make general disclosures of those kinds of things.

But I think the members who spoke last simply underscored the objections most of us would have to it; that is, the revealing of tax information or investment plans or procedures of private corporations by SBECs themselves is simply unacceptable. I think I heard them say that, and if that's the case, why doesn't whoever wrote the motion go back and rewrite it and ask for what it is he really wants, rather than asking the minister or those of us on the other side of the House to rewrite the resolution?

It's clearly confused between the grants and the investments. I think that confusion needs to be cleared up. It needs to be perfectly clear that members on this side of the House would have a very difficult time supporting this government providing private corporations' tax filings or investment decisions to the House. I would oppose that on

principle, while I have less objection, if any, to revealing those who obtain grants from the government.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. leader conclude the debate?

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, if "corporation" or "program" was the main problem, the minister could have got hold of us and we certainly would have accepted that, as we often do with other people. It seems to me that's missing the point entirely. The point is that the government is involved in this. I've publicly said I think it's a good program. It's government money that's involved. Where do you draw the line? We've had this argument before about what I call hybrid companies — government money, but it's a private company. Surely it at least throws back the whole idea of public money being debated in the public arena. That's what we're here for. I for one thought the minister would be glad. He talked about the success of the program, and we came back and had more money. When I look through it, all we're asking for is the names of the persons who received a grant. We're not asking what they do with it. Government money was involved.

We look at the nature of each business. The minister talks about the success of the equity program. He has talked about diversification. If we see the types of areas it is going into, we can make up our own minds about whether it's diversifying the economy. The amount of each grant or corporate investment and the date that each grant or corporate investment was issued: I see nothing sinister about those. The fact remains that government money is involved. Surely we should debate that in this House and know the information.

If people do not want to deal with the government, if they want to deal just with private institutions, that's an entirely different matter; it's none of our business. But when we're asked here for government money to be involved, surely that is our business. I don't understand what is so sinister about this. I don't understand what there is to hide. I thought it was fairly straightforward, that we'd get the minister responding gladly. Mr. Speaker, I for one am very surprised that a legitimate answer — if "corporation" is the problem, we would gladly change to "program". But that doesn't seem to be the major problem, because I'm sure the minister would have come back to us and said to change the word "corporation" to "program", and we would have quickly accepted that.

Mr. Speaker, I just don't understand this reluctance to give us this type of information. I really worry about the trends. We heard it with other companies, that there's government money involved but somehow it's a private corporation; therefore, we have no rights here. That is really getting away from the whole idea of accountability and who controls the purse strings when we're dealing with public money. Whenever public money is involved, it's our job in this Legislature to assess if it's being spent wisely or not. I am extremely disappointed. I know the numbers can vote us down, but I'm extremely disappointed that we can't get this type of information.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Could I ask the minister a question? In terms of the small business equity program as such, will this information not become public through the public accounts at a later date? If so on that basis, could the minister indicate why the information could not be presented to the Assembly at this point?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure it would individually become a part of public accounts. In a lump sum, yes. I guess it is similar, in essence, to public funds that go into legal aid. There's a lump sum that's specifically identified as being used for legal aid, but it doesn't determine who got it. The same thing applies to health care. A lump sum is provided in public accounts, but it doesn't identify individually who, in fact, gets it.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Gurnett	Martin	Speaker, R.
Against the motion:		
Adair	Harle	Osterman
Alexander	Hiebert	Pahl
Alger	Hyland	Paproski
Anderson	Hyndman	Payne
Batiuk	Johnston	Pengelly
Bogle	Jonson	Purdy
Bradley	King	Reid
Campbell	Koper	Shrake
Carter	Kowalski	Stevens
Chambers	Koziak	Stiles
Clark	LeMessurier	Stromberg
Cook	Lysons	Szwender
Crawford	McPherson	Thompson
Cripps	Miller	Trynchy
Diachuk	Moore, M.	Webber
Drobot	Moore, R.	Weiss
Embury	Musgrove	Woo
Fyfe	Nelson	Young
Gogo	Oman	Zip
Totals:	Ayes — 3	Noes — 57

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

212. Moved by Mr. Musgrove:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to continue to encourage the use of municipal wastewater for irrigation on suitable agricultural land.

MR. MUSGROVE: It's certainly my pleasure to bring to you Motion 212. Mr. Speaker, the practice of applying sewage effluent and sludge to land is not new. In Europe in the second half of the 19th century land application of raw sewage was a common way of reducing the waste loading in many rivers. In more recent times land application of sewage effluent and sludge has again received attention as a means of avoiding discharge into streams and rivers and also taking advantage of the nutrients in the wastewater for agricultural advantage.

Mr. Speaker, it would not be acceptable today to use raw sewage for irrigation on agricultural land. However, sewage that has been through primary treatment could be acceptable and benefit the farmer, because it has high volumes of phosphates, nitrates, and ammonia, which farmers otherwise have to apply in the form of artificial fertilizer.

Mr. Speaker, the hamlet in which I live has a population of something over 100 people, and it has a sewage lagoon that holds approximately 10 acre-feet of sewage. As well as being used for the hamlet, it is also a dumping station for two provincial parks, one being Dinosaur Provincial Park. The outlet for the lagoon is into Little Sandhill Creek. It is dumped twice a year — it's supposed to be during the high-water season — and the sewage goes back through Dinosaur Provincial Park into the Red Deer River. The lagoon is surrounded by native grassland. Would it not be a better way to go to the landowner who owns the land around the lagoon and encourage him to buy a small sprinkler irrigation system and use the effluent for irrigation? It would irrigate approximately 10 acres and it would increase the agricultural production on that land about tenfold.

In the town of Brooks, which is in the middle of my constituency, they built a new sewage lagoon in the 1970s. The design and location of the lagoon was such that the effluent could be used to irrigate the surrounding farmland. Several years have passed since that lagoon went into operation, but no irrigation has taken place to this date. They say it will happen in the future. The present situation is that the sewage is overflowing into Onetree Creek, which finally runs into the Red Deer River.

Mr. Speaker, there are several municipalities that do use effluent for irrigation. Taber has its own effluent irrigation system, all of which belongs to the town. They irrigate about 360 acres, and they gain some revenue from the sale of alfalfa hay that they grow on their half section. Claresholm has a deal with a local farmer where he uses the sewage in a centre pivot system for irrigation. Medicine Hat sewage was used for flood irrigation for many years during the irrigation season only; the rest of the year it was dropped into the river. Mr. Speaker, I saw some of those crops that were raised on the land that was irrigated out of the Medicine Hat sewage system. They were exceptionally good crops without any addition of fertilizer. The crops were a mixture of alfalfa and brome hay, and walking through them, they came up to your shirt pockets.

"Suitable agricultural land" is part of the motion. Mr. Speaker, some land is not fit for irrigation because it brings salt to the surface. Some is not acceptable for this type of irrigation because it drains directly into another waterway. As far as salts are concerned, sprinkler irrigation doesn't bring salts to the surface as does flood irrigation. Also, the ammonia in the effluent might tend to dissolve some of the alkali. It's like putting a base on an acid, and ammonia is just the opposite of the salt in alkali.

Mr. Speaker, using primary-treated effluent for irrigation would not negate the need to dispose of the sludge, which is primarily taken out. It is presently spread on farmland by many municipalities, and that still could be part of the program. The sludge would still be left at the end of the primary treatment.

Mr. Speaker, several studies have been done on the concept of using the city of Calgary's sewage for irrigation. I was at the official opening of the phosphate removal part of the Bonnybrook sewage plant in Calgary. As I recall, there was a substantial expense to the city, and at that time there was no nitrate removal. At the ceremony it was asked if the city had considered using the effluent for sprinkler irrigation so as not to need to take out phosphates and nitrates. The firm that had done the engineering for the Bonnybrook project stated that it would cost a horrendous sum. They quoted figures on buying land, buying irrigation equipment, and water transfer that ran into billions of dollars.

When asked what they felt the revenue from the agricultural products would be, they stated that they didn't believe you could sell agricultural products produced under effluent irrigation. We know that's not true. It's used in other places, and there's great success in raising agricultural products and no problem with sales of certain ones.

A lot of money can be spent on phosphate and nitrate removal or full tertiary treatment, but a rough ballpark figure could be a capital cost of approximately \$150 million for the city of Calgary with an annual operating cost of approximately \$25 million. The city's 1983 discharge flow was approximately 306 acre-feet per day. Providing adequate storage facilities were provided, this would irrigate approximately 115,000 acres. Storage for seven months' supply is a question. It would take a storage facility to store approximately 77,000 acre-feet of effluent. Looking at a reservoir of comparable size, it would be the Crawling Valley reservoir north of Bassano, which holds 105,000 acre-feet and cost \$5 million in construction costs and \$2 million in engineering costs in 1983.

However, according to a study done by the University of Calgary, there are some alternatives. As these are only alternatives and not necessarily strong suggestions, they should be considered as such. They studied the strategy of using Eagle Lake east of Strathmore and Deadhorse Lake at Hussar as possible storage ponds. Eagle Lake is now used by the town of Strathmore as an effluent outlet, and Deadhorse Lake has been dry for some years. There are other probable storage places that could be used without a lot of capital output.

The effluent could be pumped into a high point east of Calgary and allowed to free-flow from there. It would probably need a pipe about five to seven feet in diameter for free flow from one storage reservoir to another. It could also free-flow via an open irrigation canal, which would be considerably cheaper than piping it. The cost of energy for pumping the water would run from \$2 million to \$4 million a year, considerably below the cost of operating some of the plants they have nowadays.

I would not recommend that this type of irrigation be integrated with another irrigation system for the simple reason that all irrigation districts supply domestic water to municipal and rural residents in their areas. It would have to be a unique kind of irrigation district that operated completely on its own and distinct from any other irrigation district.

If someone were to ask me the first place I would recommend for establishing such an irrigation district, I would say somewhere in the Special Areas, in the Hanna-Oyen area, for two reasons. One is that in that area irrigation would be a must most years, so the water has to be used. The second is that it is a long way from a river system, and it would avoid any possibility of the water leaching into another river system. That area is probably 50 miles or so from a river, and it's quite dry. People would be using the irrigation water rather than — in a wet summer they would not bother to irrigate.

The argument has been brought out about what happens to the people using water from the Bow River down from Calgary, because a certain amount of what is now the flow in the river would be diverted into the city and would not come back into the river. But according to a study I read, only 10 percent of the low flow of the Bow River is diverted through the Calgary municipal water system. That's not a staggering amount. What happens to the fish if the water flow in the river is reduced? The study also shows that by

taking out the nutrients from the river that cause algae, et cetera, and allowing a clear flow of water, the fish would be better off, because they would be getting more oxygen. Some reports I've read say some of the fish kills in the Bow River many miles below the city of Calgary are not necessarily because of the low flow of the water but because algae and other nutrients in the water have removed some of the oxygen.

Another benefit of not having the sewage in the river is that it takes away the algae-causing nutrients that cause weed growth in existing irrigation systems. The irrigation system that I am part of spends millions of dollars a year cleaning out weeds caused by algae that come into the irrigation canals through the river system. It is recognized that this irrigation system would have algae problems and weed growth in the canals. But that would be a problem unique to that system and related only to that system.

Studies of the benefits of irrigation have been done by the Irrigation Projects people. Sixty percent of the benefits of the irrigation system goes to the rest of Alberta, about 20 percent goes to the rest of the people in Canada, and 14 percent goes to the farmers and the irrigation district itself. Considering that effluent irrigation is a benefit in that it contains the phosphates and nitrates that are otherwise applied in the form of artificial fertilizer; considering the fact that in a lot of cases approximately 30 percent of a farmer's input costs are the fertilizer he applies to his land; considering that farmers pay water rates in the neighbourhood of \$10 an acre, which in this case would be 115,000 acres, which would bring in revenue to the city of Calgary of something just over \$1 million a year — keeping all those factors in mind, Mr. Speaker, I believe we should encourage all municipalities to use wastewater for sprinkler irrigation so as to enhance agricultural productivity and also keep the effluent out of our waterways.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure this afternoon to take part in the discussion of Motion 212, relating to the use of municipal wastewater for irrigation purposes. A few years ago, before I was elected to this Legislature, when I was on the town council in Bow Island, I remember that we had a small project with wastewater. The person who rented the land where the town lagoon was pumped that water onto some barley. There was some question then, because it was early in this system of using wastewater. There was some discussion about whether what he was doing could be done and what effect it would have. Nevertheless, he carried on with it. That was probably in 1972 or '73. He carried on with it for at least a couple of years, and then it was dropped after that. But he raised some pretty good barley crops on that land without any fertilizer, as the Member for Bow Valley said.

Mr. Speaker, some projects in Alberta are using wastewater. Before I talk about some of them, I should say first that when I was in Israel in 1980 and looked at irrigation systems there, of all the systems we looked at, there was only one kibbutz that used their wastewater for irrigation purposes. At that time I thought it was strange that in a country that was so short of water, there was only one system that used wastewater for irrigation. They were sprinkling it on cotton, I believe. Nevertheless, we saw some of the better systems in Israel. Through all of those systems, all we saw was the one that used wastewater for irrigation.

Mr. Speaker, in bringing the motion forward, I believe the Member for Bow Valley said that the amount of wastewater in Calgary needing storage was about 77,000 acre-feet for seven months. The total number of acres of land able to be watered would be approximately 115,000 acres. To put that in perspective, that would be approximately the size of the Lethbridge Northern Irrigation District. That district has a total of 116,745 acres for irrigation, which is a large amount of water. We're only talking about the stuff in Calgary for the purposes of irrigation. We have all the other cities and towns in Alberta where water could be available for irrigation purposes. They could provide quite a bit more area under irrigation.

The member also alluded to what would happen if this water was taken out of the river and not returned, whether there would be enough water for the usage downstream from Calgary. Studies seem to say that the effect on the water wouldn't be that great. But if that was pure water with all that removed, I wonder, when the member got the water out of his dugout on his farm at Patricia and mixed it with his rye, if the rye would even taste as good as it does now or if it would give it a bit of a different taste, being as they were drinking purer pure water. I'm sure others will talk about how the removal of all this water from the river will affect the pollution in the river and the removal of the weeds that grow in the river because of the nutrients that are created. I'm sure it might help clean that up as well.

Mr. Speaker, in Taber they've been involved in sprinkling from their sewage system maybe longer than most places. They initially put the project in approximately 10 years ago. In an article in 1980, the then mayor of Taber was quoted as saying that they netted approximately \$20,000 off the hay crop produced on that land. So I'd think any municipality that could net that much off a crop produced from raw sewage water would be happy if they could even just cover the operational amounts on their systems. I know they've recently changed their system in Taber from a side row to a pivot system. I think they went to three or four pivots — I'm not sure which — to cover and use up the water from the town sewage. There are also other systems around.

My colleagues are trying to make me hurry up here, so I'm losing my place and it's taking more time to get done anyway. I guess I should quote from the results of the study *Impact of Ten Years of Municipal Wastewater Irrigation on Soils and Groundwater at Taber*. One of the paragraphs is one we should look at. It says:

Ten years of crop irrigation with municipal effluent from the Town of Taber has resulted in minor deterioration in soil and groundwater quality, but has greatly increased the agricultural productivity of the area and has greatly reduced the discharge of effluent to the Oldman River.

Mr. Speaker, I think that shows well that there is a great benefit from the use of this water and that we should encourage municipalities to consider using it wherever possible.

Thank you.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to participate in this debate on Motion 212 this afternoon and congratulate the Member for Bow Valley for bringing this most important issue to the floor. Speaking both as a member of this Assembly and as a farmer, I fully support this motion to

encourage the use of municipal wastewater for irrigation on suitable agricultural lands.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that with careful monitoring of this kind of action, there are a number of substantial benefits that can be achieved from wastewater applications. Disposing of our wastewater in this way means that we can productively utilize our waste products and at the same time provide for an alternative means of waste treatment and disposal. Land application for the treatment of municipal wastewaters is an excellent means of increasing the productivity of our farmlands through the addition of moisture and nutrients. For farmers this means, of course, increased crop production and soil conditioning and a reduction in fertilizer costs.

The key word in the motion is "suitable" agricultural land. There are lands in my area that would benefit extremely from this type of moisture application through a pipeline system and pumps, and at the same time a lot of strain would be taken off Pekisko, Stimson, and Willow creeks, which are presently strenuously used for irrigation projects.

One good example of a municipal wastewater project, a very popular one with the farmers, I've been told — and I'm going to deviate a little bit — is the sewage sludge application program operated by the city of Calgary. Under this program sewage sludge from the Shepard lagoons in southeast Calgary is applied to surrounding farmlands using city-owned sludge injectors, which are very humongous and expensive chunks of equipment, Mr. Speaker. Calgary sludge is applied to these lands at no cost to the farmers. From what I understand, this program is pretty popular with the farmers down there. For example, I was told that disposing of one year's worth of sludge from the city of Calgary by means of land application would require 4,500 acres of farmland. Last year alone, the city of Calgary was offered a total of 20,000 acres of land by local farmers for this purpose.

For openers, Mr. Speaker, think of the savings to the farmers in the proximity of any large city where you can make a deal to have it applied to your land. If the value of this style of fertilizer is all that it's cracked up to be, it seems to me that the farmers who are taking the benefit of this application should soon show considerably higher profits than they are used to. This is primarily due to the fact that they have reduced their fertilizer bill on that particular acreage to literally no cost.

My son Stephen is one of the farmers who will be participating in Calgary's sludge application program this year. In July the city will be injecting sludge into 100 acres of his land, and in late August or September Stephen plans to put in winter wheat or fall rye on this piece of land. The procedure is very simple, Mr. Speaker. You simply get your land in shape, plant some clover, and after it gets growing well, dig it under. Then the Calgary people come out and plow in their sludge. It's a magnificent system. When the fall rye goes in, you have to stand out of the way while it grows. My son Stephen tells me this program is pretty attractive to farmers because there are no costs involved for the purchase and application of the sludge, and the farmland will remain fertile for at least a couple of years.

Mr. Speaker, I think that with proper monitoring of this kind of program, we may find that using municipal wastewater for application on agricultural lands will prove to be a very useful, low-cost, and beneficial way of disposing of our wastewater. Once again, congratulations to the Member for Bow Valley.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's a great motion and heartily recommend that the Assembly pass it.

MR. DROBOT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the question now be put.

MR. SPEAKER: We have a motion to deal with. Does the Assembly wish to adopt the motion moved by the hon. Member for St. Paul?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: On the main motion, would the members in favour please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

[Motion carried]

209. Moved by Mr. Gurnett:

- Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to
 - (a) implement a farm fertilizer distribution allowance program similar in form and administration to the farm fuel distribution allowance program and designed to rebate to Alberta farmers, through their local dealers, the equivalent of the provincial royalty levied on the natural gas feedstock used to manufacture fertilizer manufactured and sold in Alberta, and
 - (b) press the federal government to implement a similar dealer-level rebate program for the purpose of rebating to farmers the value of federal taxes paid on natural gas feedstocks used to manufacture fertilizer manufactured and sold in Canada.

[Adjourned debate March 21: Mr. Stromberg]

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment briefly on Motion 209, introduced in the Legislature on March 21 by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. All members of the Assembly have been and are concerned with the input costs of agriculture. As the member and other members rightly pointed out, fertilizer is one of the chief components of those input costs. The Member for Bow Valley rightly pointed out that the agriculture caucus has been seriously considering initiatives which would help out with farm input costs, fertilizer included. The member also shared some concern along with the Member for Cardston that the effectiveness of the program, i.e. the benefits, would flow through to agriculture.

I know members have raised concerns on this particular issue in the House, and many of us are still questioning recent increases in fertilizer prices which have, for all practical purposes, eaten up the benefits. I know the Member for Cypress has written and asked some very specific questions of the companies regarding their recent increases.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be specific about the motion. In (a) the motion reads:

- implement a farm fertilizer distribution allowance program similar in form and administration to the farm fuel distribution allowance program and designed to rebate to Alberta farmers, through their local dealers, the equivalent of the provincial royalty levied on the natural gas feedstock used to manufacture fertilizer manufactured and sold in Alberta.

On April 1 the Minister of Agriculture read a ministerial statement, and I'd like to refer to two sentences from that statement. The first one says:

The two-year farm fertilizer price protection plan will be retroactive to August 1, 1984, and will end July 31, 1986. Fertilizer purchased between those two dates will be eligible for grant payments. The total estimated cost of the program is \$47 million . . . I would note that payments under this program will exceed the royalties received by the province on the natural gas used in fertilizer [manufacture].

The motion suggests that that be done, and it has.

One other area of the motion is that the payment will be made directly to the farmer or will be made in the same vein as the farm fuel distribution allowance. In this case, the minister has initiated the payment directly to the farmer. Therefore, the fertilizer can be purchased anywhere. Hopefully, this will ensure that some of the concerns about where the benefit goes are alleviated and that the benefit will in fact go to agriculture.

The second part of the motion wants us to press the federal government to implement a similar dealer-level rebate program for the purpose of rebating to farmers the value of federal taxes . . .

In that same ministerial statement the minister said:

I would also like to note that for some time we have discussed a joint effort of this type with the federal government, but we have received little positive response. Therefore, at this time I have again requested the federal government to match our effort to help Alberta farmers meet and overcome the so-called cost/price squeeze.

Mr. Speaker, in the energy agreement tabled in the House on March 28, I'd just like to note that a lot of the taxes the member is talking about and, I'm sure, had in mind when he introduced the motion — the natural gas and gas liquids tax, the natural gas export tax, the incremental oil revenue tax, the Canadian ownership special charge, and the oil export tax and petroleum charge — have been eliminated under the agreement, so those taxes will no longer flow through to Alberta farmers. The PGR tax will be phased out over three years.

Since the government has implemented the concerns raised in Motion 209 and we have two years to assess the benefits of that program, I know we'll be continuing to press the federal government to assist Alberta farmers in the cost/price squeeze. I move that we adjourn the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a motion for adjournment. Do the members agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is carried.

213. Moved by Mr. Stiles:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to introduce legislation enabling an individual to recover the cost of defending himself in proceedings commenced against him before any court, administrative tribunal, or quasi-judicial body by a board, commission, or agency of government or by any Crown corporation, in cases where the decision is in favour of the individual.

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, I don't often rise in my place on private members' days. Unfortunately, I have some other

responsibilities that quite often take me out of the House on these days, and I regret that I haven't the opportunity to speak as often as I would like to.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I think the motion I have placed on the Order Paper and am going to speak to this afternoon deserves a little explanation as to how it happened that I felt compelled to make this motion. The story concerns a businessman who was contacted one day by a young lady who advised him she was looking for employment and wanted to know if there was any employment available at his particular business. He advised her on the telephone that there wasn't any opening available at that time, but on the other hand he was always prepared to speak to a prospective employee in the possibility that at some future date he might be able to improve the quality of his staff. On that basis, the lady attended his place of business for an interview. During the course of that interview it became apparent to this employer that he didn't believe the person applying was particularly suited to the work she was applying for, in terms of her experience and training and to some extent in terms of her manner and the fact that she would be in contact with other employees and it would be necessary for there to be some compatibility and no discord among the employees. He felt that this particular person wouldn't lend herself too well to that arrangement.

In any case, during the course of the conversation he mentioned to her that they had had female employees in the past and that with this kind of employment, involving extremely vigorous physical work, it appeared that the female employees didn't last too long. Accordingly, they had some reluctance to consider females for this particular type of work. That was about the substance of the comment he made. This person wanted to know who in his employment had made that sort of assumption and statement. Following that, she had an opportunity to talk to the foreman who had made the comment in discussing the matter with the employer, tore a strip off him in the process, and made herself not particularly welcome around the place.

They thought no more of it until a few days later, when they received word from the Human Rights Commission to the effect that the young lady had lodged a complaint that she'd been denied employment by reason of her sex. There was further telephone contact from the Human Rights Commission civil servant in charge of investigating the matter. The facts were placed before this individual, but that wasn't satisfactory. He persisted and suggested there should be an investigation. At that point in time, the employer in question sought the advice of his lawyer. The lawyer was retained to communicate with the Human Rights Commission and point out that there were female employees at this place of business, that there wasn't a job opportunity available at that time in any case, and that the whole thing was really a frivolous complaint.

To be honest, I'm not sure whether this thing is still going on or not; I haven't heard any more about it. The employer was very concerned that because of the persistence of the person from the Human Rights Commission, he had been put to the expense of retaining a lawyer to respond to this complaint even though the complaint really had no substance. Under those circumstances, he was exposed to costs that he felt he shouldn't have to incur in the course of operating his business and accommodating someone who was looking for a job interview. Then he found that he was faced with the power of the provincial government and one of its agencies and forced to defend himself in a matter that he shouldn't have had to spend more than two minutes on the telephone to deal with.

That was the impetus, if you will, that prompted me to place this motion on the Order Paper. It's a kind of long-winded motion, but it's difficult to phrase something of that sort any less completely and still cover the ground.

What costs are we talking about? Obviously, in this day and age of governments introducing legislation to protect the rights of individuals, to see that people are properly paid or housed or properly treated in the course of being served or employed, we naturally have the downside; that is to say, individuals who find themselves the subject of a complaint have to deal with it. It is certainly not my intention that we look at all the costs involved: the time away from business or employment or some other inconvenience the employer or individual may be put to. What I have in mind in this motion, Mr. Speaker, are the costs a person has to shell out of his pocket: the cost of retaining legal counsel or other assistance to deal with the kinds of complaints and charges that are sometimes brought by boards and agencies.

The number of boards, commissions, and agencies we now have in our legislation is substantial, and it's one of those things that comes up from time to time when we're dealing with the public. I'm looking at the Inventory of Agencies, Boards and Commissions produced by this government in 1982. It's about half an inch thick. I haven't counted, but there are a tremendous number of boards, agencies, and commissions — some of them quasi-judicial. Some of them have powers of compelled attendance. They can compel witnesses to attend, bring the power of the law to bear on persons complained against and, in some cases, have substantial, fairly sweeping powers. Others are less powerful. In fact, many of them don't have any powers of this kind, but there are those which do.

I'll list a few that have these kinds of powers to some degree. The Labour Relations Board, the Securities Commission, the Gaming Commission, and the Farm Implement Board come to mind. The Consumer and Corporate Affairs department has powers among its various agencies to deal with the public in various ways and compel them to do things. I mentioned the Human Rights Commission earlier. The Energy Resources Conservation Board can conduct hearings and compel witnesses. The Workers' Compensation Board, the Insurance Appeal Board, the Mortgage Brokers Appeal Board, and Surface Rights are others. All of these various boards — most of them are boards; one or two are commissions — have various powers to compel and require persons to answer complaints or charges or make submissions.

In most cases the purpose of these boards and commissions is to protect the public or individuals in some way. We've gradually slipped away from the idea of the individual being responsible to take care of himself; the principle of caveat emptor has been abandoned in many instances. We now have areas where we're told what our rights are. Instead of assuming we have rights automatically and it's the position of government to protect them, we're now being told what the rights are and what we're entitled to. That encourages people to bring forward their complaints. It gives them a vehicle they can ride. Where we previously felt the protection of the public was covered by criminal law, we now have various acts of quasi-criminal law which can move in and confront the individual who has been complained about with the necessity to answer the complaint and defend himself.

Some of these agencies and commissions now have the power to award costs, and I'll mention only a couple of them. The one that comes to mind most easily is the Energy

Resources Conservation Board. When that board conducts hearings, the various intervenors can apply to the board to have their costs picked up by the board, and in most cases that is what happens. So when groups of individuals who are contesting the application of an oil company or another resource company to develop or extract a resource find that they're before that board and have incurred substantial costs making their presentations, the board has the power to reimburse them. If an individual is faced with the possibility of expropriation of his property and a hearing is called for in the proceedings and the individual appears before it and incurs costs, again the power is there for the hearing officer to relieve him of that expense and grant the costs.

The problem has not very often come to light. In researching this particular area, we find that the extent of the problem is not easily defined. Very few individuals have ever complained that they've incurred these costs, although I'm quite sure, as in the case I mentioned, it happens more frequently today than ever and perhaps a lot more frequently than we realize.

Another aspect of this particular motion that hasn't been addressed and is difficult to answer from researching it is: what are the implications for government and for Albertans? In dealing with the extent of the problem, the individuals affected often view the matter in which they find themselves caught up as a matter of law. They tend to respect the law. They don't think there's a possibility of challenge. Often their costs aren't extensive, so they tend to be happy that the brief brush with a government agency is over. They're content to complain and grumble to their neighbour and forget about it.

I believe it would be in the interest of members to think about the extent to which we have these kinds of laws in our province today and the extent to which government agencies are enforcing them, the manner in which they're doing so, and the extent to which that is creating a feeling of general dissatisfaction with the amount of government interference in our daily lives. That's something that has been raised in the past, and I'm sure we'll hear about it again. It's something members should think about: to what extent are we creating an ogre, a spectre of overbearing government? Is it necessary, or should we be seriously thinking about taking steps to make sure these agencies and boards are in some way more accountable than they are today? Particularly, perhaps some of the individuals who are enforcing these laws need to be made more accountable. We should think about this idea of allowing the costs being at least one way of doing that.

In terms of the implications for government, it's often the case that groups bring a concern to government and suggest there be legislation to address that concern. What happens is that government acts. A number of these boards and commissions I mentioned have arisen from legislation that has been designed to protect people from one thing or another, hopefully to be a bit of a big brother. Sometimes we forget what the implications of those statutes might be. The one that comes to my mind immediately is the Charter of Rights and some of the problems we're now facing and some of the ramifications of that statute that perhaps weren't considered when it was introduced and passed.

One of the questions we have to raise is: how do we administer something of this kind? How do we deal with it? Part of the purpose, of course, is to introduce an element of discipline within the boards and agencies so they aren't too vigorously pursuing their role, and to perhaps introduce a little caution in how they deal with these matters so they

aren't needlessly imposing the burden of government on individuals who are affected.

We require to know at what point repayment of costs should be considered. Is it when there is an initial complaint and the person is perhaps notified by telephone? Does he incur the costs from that moment forward, or do we wait and deal with the costs if there is an investigation or inquiry or if the person is required to appear and make representations? The more difficult questions are: who will decide the costs, and who will decide whether there is to be an award of costs? Within the common law we have the prerogative writs of certiorari and mandamus, which allow an individual to go to the courts and require in the case of certiorari that a government agency stop doing something it's doing that you don't want it to do, or mandamus, to cause it to do something it's supposed to do and is reluctant to do.

In cases of these writs and applications, the court is often faced with a question of natural justice, whether the person has been given proper notice or an opportunity to be heard or whether the law has been properly interpreted, that sort of thing. Once it's before the court, the matter of costs can be addressed. But in many cases these matters don't get before a court, and the matter of costs isn't addressed. In the case of the Energy Resources Conservation Board or in expropriation hearings, the actual hearing authority can award costs, and I think that's appropriate.

There are practical considerations in this regard. I think the board or agency must be charged with the responsibility to award the costs. We don't want a further proliferation of commissions and agencies to decide these kinds of matters. On practical grounds I think it's something the agency should decide. My feeling is that, given that role, the agency will be considerate of the individuals being dealt with, and the element of discipline will be introduced by that means. On the other hand, we don't want to refer all these matters to the courts, neither do the courts want to hear them all. So that isn't the solution. I think the agency or board concerned must be given that responsibility. In the end, of course, if the legislation is there and the agency doesn't act, the ultimate recourse is to the courts.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, I believe there are cases in which people are being required to incur costs because of legislation we have, in all good conscience, put in place. Those individuals who are faced with that problem should have some opportunity to recover those costs, or there should be some possibility that the costs can be reimbursed to them. That is the intent of the motion. I ask members to support it.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, my thanks to the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury for presenting the motion on what I believe is a very common concern and very timely, as it relates to the constituency of Lac La Biche-McMurray. The hon. member read the motion and I won't reread it, but he indicated that it's very complex. I would like to emphasize the key points in the motion: "to recover the cost of defending himself . . . in cases where the decision is in favour of the individual." As the MLA for the constituency, I've had many briefs presented from northern communities, and representing many of the remote communities, I feel it is very timely. In particular, groups from the Metis association and various native organizations have advocated a similar idea. I believe a government study or consideration of a situation such as this is warranted. More recently, on

questioning the hon. Attorney General during his estimates, he indicated he would consider such a proposal.

As governments have been called upon to do more for citizens, administrative tribunals, boards, commissions, and so forth have grown in number and impact. Government has expanded its role from that of providing certain minimal services — roads, schools, courts — to a degree of involvement in the economy, to assuring fairness in business and employment practices, to assisting individuals in dealing with others and with corporations, and to providing more protection of rights and properties, a concern we all share. Such expansion has by and large been beneficial to maintaining the peace, order, and good government demanded by our society. However, as we expand, we have also found that it's impossible for Legislatures to make all the necessary regulatory decisions. I look to my hon. colleague on the right; I'm sure he would agree with that. I don't know if he's on the right, but to my right.

It is impossible for Legislatures to oversee the administration of the laws they create. It is impossible to deal with all disputes through the court system. The burdens placed on Legislatures and the courts led to the creation of various administrative and quasi-judicial bodies. To supplement these arms of government we have the Public Utilities Board, which was empowered to regulate public gas utilities to ensure safe and adequate service to Albertans at just and reasonable rates, the Surface Rights Board to assist individuals in the negotiation of fair surface leases and compensation for surface use, and the Human Rights Commission to enforce the Individual's Rights Protection Act: just some examples of groups and boards that have been put in place to assist the citizens of the province of Alberta.

There are numerous other such bodies, and the range of activities they are involved in — such as taxation, planning, and labour relations — impact on the day-to-day lives of all Albertans. There are good reasons for the existence of these bodies. Accessibility: ideally every citizen has the ability to approach a board or commission. Simplicity: proceedings are less complex than the courts. Of course, that would reduce the need for lawyers and the attendant costs. I'm sure some might question that. Efficiency: less time is required to deal with administrative matters or disputes. Of course, specialization is possible through the use of the expertise on these bodies.

In order to meet these goals, Mr. Speaker, certain powers are given to the boards, commissions, and agencies of government. They have the power to investigate, call witnesses, and make decisions and have those decisions enforced; the power to take legal action against an individual, either through their own proceedings or through courts. These powers have led to problems. In general, the proceedings of these bodies have become more complex and more difficult for the average Albertan to understand — and one of the aims and goals was that that would not be. More knowledge is required to argue effectively before them, and as a result there is more involvement of the legal profession, once again causing some concern.

The role in decision-making is larger, yet they are not elected. In many cases appeals of their decisions are not provided for. Of course, that leads to questions of accountability. The costs of legal advice for individuals can be quite high. Legal aid is available only for certain types of actions in the courts and to those in financial need. If a person is not guilty of any infraction or offence, he may have spent hundreds of dollars to prove this, which may

be more severe than the penalty if he or she had been guilty. I'm sure we're all familiar with many individuals who took the simple approach on receiving either a traffic infraction or a minor infraction and thought it was much easier to pay the fine and not proceed to court and have to either call witnesses or plead their defence. I'm very pleased to advise the Assembly that I am one of those individuals who took the alternative in one case and was successful. I'm pleased I took that stand. I wish more individuals would.

Fairness to all persons in remote areas is very difficult, because appearing before a court or a body to defend oneself may involve travelling long distances, lost income, time off work, and additional nonlegal expenses. Mr. Speaker, I recently indicated to the Assembly an example that happened in the community of Chipewyan Lake, which is accessible only by air. An individual was arrested on a minor infraction, brought into the city of Fort McMurray, proceeded to the court, and found that the court case would be remanded to another day. Four or five days later this individual still had to stay in town to appear before the court and found that there was not only additional cost but in the meantime he had lost his job because he was not able to return to the community. So a great deal of undue hardship and inconvenience was caused not only to that individual but to his family and the people who were looking to him for leadership and advice. It's a very difficult situation, one that I think should be addressed. The individual in this particular case was innocent. He then had to arrange for a charter to fly back to the community and, not having those resources available immediately, was not able to do so. This is just one example. There are many in remote parts of northern Alberta.

I'd like to point out some of the existing methods of recovering costs. Random: awarding of costs is not always provided for in enabling legislation. Within courts, costs that can't be rewarded are limited and, secondly, not necessarily effective. If an appeal for costs is made to the Ombudsman, he can only make recommendations for their payment. Those recommendations are not binding. Third, they're costly in themselves. If an individual goes through the courts to recover costs, he or she may also incur additional expenses. The idea of implementing a system for people to recover costs when actions against them are dismissed is worthy of examination. It would help to return to some of the original goals of establishing boards and commissions and agencies to help the individuals. I believe it would establish two main objectives: simplicity and accessibility. It would also ensure real fairness in such proceedings — fairness in the final results and not just in the strict legal sense. It would require government bodies to take care to be responsible in launching actions, to make sure they're within their mandate, to keep within the powers given them in pursuing the actions, and to ensure that the actions are valid and substantiated. These bodies have been created to assist the citizens of Alberta, to give them good government. They are funded by all Albertans. In return, Albertans should not suffer any unnecessary financial loss as a result of proceedings against them.

Mr. Speaker, it might be an interesting avenue for the private sector to explore. We have various insurance programs under health care. We have private insurance for automobiles. Perhaps there could be 'legicare'. It might be interesting, though, if one were to take a new bride and say, "Part of the conditions are that we must take out insurance to protect us against a divorce proceeding." I

could see some ramifications in that. But I'm thinking about such simplistic ones as reasonable care under other court actions as they may appear. It's something to think about and consider.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to support Motion 213, presented by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury today. Thank you.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Olds-Didsbury has introduced a motion that I suspect will be quite controversial as the debate goes on. To my mind, it will take men and women of the learned trade to actually decipher the pros and cons of this motion, for the simple reason that while there is a strong element of common sense attached to the wording, there is also a factor of intellectual ability that I am grieved to say I do not have. I am completely out of my element when it comes to making decisions on such things as the Individual's Rights Protection Act, the Human Rights Commission, the Employment Standards Act, and the Alberta rules of court, with particular reference to costs. In that respect I don't feel too bad, inasmuch as there are several of my learned friends in this Legislature who, I'm sure, are quite capable of arriving at a clear and comprehensive decision in due course.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I would once again like to touch on certain irritations that develop from time to time in the Highwood constituency. Having worked fairly closely and amicably with the council of the municipal district of Foothills No. 31, I have discovered much to my chagrin that the decisions of this dedicated body of men and women are often reversed through the ability of the applicant for a given endeavour to appeal the decision of the council. From what I understand, the appeal board is situated in Edmonton and, to my mind, often knows very little about the logistics of a local decision by a group some 250 miles away. What I'm trying to say is that surely a municipal level of government has every bit as much ability to make a decision that stays within the parameters of their bylaws as another body of men and women far removed from the problem at hand.

Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost faith in our judicial system and most certainly agree with our privilege to appeal a decision we think is unfair, but I can't help but wonder every once in a while if our local government shouldn't be allowed to make final decisions on matters that concern them and their area rather than having a separate appeal board make their decisions for them.

Mr. Speaker, that is the only point I wanted to dwell on under this motion.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to talk to Motion 213, which is presently before us. This is a subject that has become near and dear to my heart due to some circumstances I've been involved in with some citizens for a number of years. Hopefully it has ultimately been resolved. At the same time, the fear these citizens went through during a period of discussion and harassment by government at one level or another is reason for my participating today. I would like to discuss how big governments, be they municipal, provincial, or federal, can continue to bleed people of their own resources and their own tax dollars.

To use an example, I will briefly take members through a factual scenario that occurred in Calgary. It's interesting that through the years the province has set up many quasi-judicial boards, committees, commissions, and a pile of

other nonpolitical, arm's length organizations to deal with many of our citizens' concerns, complaints, needs, and so on. Included in these is the Alberta Assessment Appeal Board, which is really a quasi-judicial body dealing with the land assessment concerns of citizens of municipalities. We also have Acts passed to hopefully protect our citizens, many of whom are financially defenceless against big government's actions; for example, a senior citizen and an unemployed person who fight for their rights and have little if any money to fight large corporations, be they government or otherwise, and in particular the municipality of Calgary at the time and ultimately the government of Alberta. Through the quasi-judicial system that is set up, a citizen can take his concern, complaint, or otherwise and deal with that in a personal manner. Amazingly, even though they have to deal with this in a personal manner, many times without a lawyer or some assistance, they are fighting against a bank of government authorities — lawyers, bureaucrats, and whatever — and the case is really banked against them. Should that citizen win that case, in all or in part, generally speaking you feel somewhat secure that the system has given him justice. If he doesn't win the case, he certainly feels a little disappointed that justice may not have been done, but at the same time he should be given good reason for the decision and in most cases is. A government, particularly a municipality, can and may take our citizens to court and further pursue a particular issue. Of course, this creates a very costly circumstance for a citizen. Remember, when a citizen is unemployed or is even a senior citizen who has very little resources available to him, that creates a very extreme hardship and a situation where he really cannot afford to protect himself.

It's interesting that governments, or corporations for that matter, have banks of lawyers, bureaucrats, and so on to develop their position. They also have access to private lawyers to fight their cases for them. The poor little citizen out there has to have legal advice, but can he afford banks of lawyers? Can he afford a bunch of researchers and so on? No. Boy, this senior citizen has paid his taxes for many years; he's paid and paid and paid. Now we're going to use some of his money to beat up on him and then tell him he's got to pay some more to protect himself. So what does he do? He either tries to get legal aid or uses up all his savings, if he has any, and gets into a worse situation. There are very few, if any, options for him unless he wants to roll over and lay dead. Well, some people don't just roll over and lay dead that easily, and I say: good on them.

Another scenario is that if the municipality requests some permissive legislation to assist taxpayers in their costs, it's sometimes asked for on deaf ears. So big bad governments leave our citizen out to dry, and then we ask why people get mad at us.

Another scenario is because of a complaint that may not be legitimate, even though it's given under oath, by affidavit or otherwise. A judge can give an *ex parte* order to facilitate the removal of children from a home. Even though statements offered in an affidavit may be false and that *ex parte* order given to remove children from the care of their mother, who may be on welfare or may be a single parent trying to make ends meet, how does she fight back? She needs a very good lawyer to give legal advice. How can she afford that? She really can't. So she gets a lawyer on the hook and owes him a pile of money and can't repay him. It becomes really difficult.

Once the case is heard in a court of law and the information to support the removal of those children by an

ex parte order is found to be incorrect, a judge could order costs against an individual but does not often do it. So the innocent victim of someone's spite is stuck with a legal bill they can't afford. The only positive side is that they get their children back, and even though they're happy in that respect, they've still got a legal cost. The result is that through the legal system, with *ex parte* order in particular, we tend to allow our judges and maybe even our bureaucrats too much rope and too much ability to deal with certain issues in a manner that may not be proper. Sometimes they become overzealous, overprotective, and even overaggressive. In many cases we allow these situations to happen without getting both sides of an issue and act too quickly in damaging some innocent victim.

Mr. Speaker, in many cases governments have the only ball game in town. Because we have the only ball game in town, we have to become more responsible and responsive when dealing with the many situations that occur in our community. We must provide legislative compensation of those costs incurred as a result of appearing before a court or otherwise. There is an argument, of course, that people would suggest: "Because you're found innocent, why should we give you costs? There had to be some reason for us to determine initially that we had a case against you." That may be so. But believe it or not, that person is innocent until shown guilty by a court of law or until such time as they suggest that maybe they're not innocent. Even so, we have to deem those people innocent. Once they have been determined so, with the kind of pressure and the circumstance we put these people through, be it the legal matter of a criminal offence or the two instances I've shown here — a land compensation situation and taxes or the removal of children from a family — those people become victims of a system or victims due to spiteful conditions that relate to some of the bureaucrats that develop them. I can assure you that in one particular case it is a spiteful situation. There are many examples out there in the community that deal with people and issues that may not always come to our attention, but those that do certainly become horror shows.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Olds-Didsbury should be congratulated for bringing this issue to the Legislature for discussion, because I think we all need to take a second look. Maybe in taking that second look and creating legislation that will protect some of these people who cannot financially look after themselves, in particular where they are found innocent of a particular circumstance or where they can show reason why they can win their battle, if that be the case, it may make people who are bringing these charges and these cases forward a little more responsible to provide a little more evidence to show good reason why those people should be there and, as such, may lessen the cases brought forward and also lessen some of the hardship and the circumstances created by these situations. I support this very, very enthusiastically and again commend the member for bringing it forward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to speak in support of the motion of the Member for Olds-Didsbury. I have some very strong feelings about some of the situations that are created. I realize that some people get caught in a situation where they have to defend themselves because of some provincial or municipal law or quasi-judicial body and the cost of defence comes out of their pocket. One of the things I feel very strongly about is the case of appeals

of these types of situations by the Crown. I could name quite a number of situations where a person was charged with an offence and found innocent and then the Crown appealed it. In that type of situation, the government supposedly has the best legal counsel that can be hired and also has financial resources at their disposal to the point where they can go on to infinity.

I can give you one example of a situation that happened in my constituency in 1983. It concerned a gravel trucker loading gravel at a pit [for] a government contractor, hauling it some 16 miles, and weighing it where it was dumped. This trucker found the highway traffic patrol waiting for him at the scales. When he was weighed, he was found to have an overloaded axle and was charged. His defence was that he had no way of knowing whether he was overloaded until he got to the scales and was therefore not guilty. However, the charge was laid, and the fine was to be \$800 because of the weight. He went to court and won the case. I don't know the reason, but the highway traffic patrol decided to appeal it. At that point his lawyer advised him to pay the fine because the cost of legal counsel to go through with the appeal was going to be \$1,000. Besides, if they won that one, they might appeal it again. I know of a couple of cases where that's happened.

I feel that we as a government got a bad image out of that case, first for the simple reason that we have our own legal counsel, supposedly as good as you can get, and secondly because the cost of that legal counsel comes out of the taxpayers' money, not out of any individual's pocket, whereas in this case this person was going to have to put up his defence money out of his own pocket for the second time. It appeared unfair. Even if a person is responsible for the first part in court, if it's appealed by the province, I feel the appeal defence should be paid for by the province.

I feel very strongly about this motion, Mr. Speaker, and I think we should support it.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to compliment the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury for bringing a very well-intentioned but flawed motion to the Assembly. I'd like to speak on a philosophic base and then test the motion, which has very good intentions, against practicalities. I see that I only have some six or seven minutes in which to deal with this debate, and I'll be brief and to the point.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to start off with a quotation from Aristotle. He asked some fundamental questions about the role of the state and man's obligations to it, and the state's obligations to man. It was his view that the state was created to serve man, that man organized families and then villages, that villages then organized states and they were subordinate to the will of man. If you'll bear with me, I've got two sentences from Aristotle:

Every state is a community of some kind, and every community is established with a view to some good ...

But, if all communities aim at some good, the state or political community, which is the highest of all, and which embraces all the rest, aims at good in a [higher] degree than any other ...

The state, in Aristotle's view, was the highest expression of the ideals of man.

Mr. Speaker, he went on to say that "a state exists for the sake of a good life" for the individuals who are part of that state. What I'm trying to say is this: when we benefit from the state, when we benefit from the order it creates and the prosperity it can bring us, I think we as citizens have an obligation to participate as equals and as

members of that body politic, and it imposes some obligations on us. It means that we're going to receive some benefits from the community but that we also have to expect to meet some social obligations when we fall into conflict with the community, when we have some disagreement with the community or it has some disagreement with us.

Taken to logical absurdity, this motion reads that the costs for the defendant should be recovered in any proceedings, in any court; it could be traffic court. If he brings in the best lawyer in the city of Edmonton to fight a parking ticket, we would pay that bill. An administrative tribunal could be anything from a development appeal board meeting at city council to Keegstra. There are any number of appeal boards or tribunals that we set up. Surely we as citizens have an obligation to participate freely in that. A quasi-judicial board, commission, or agency could mean anything from appealing before the Energy Resources Conservation Board or the PUB or any number of agencies. What the hon. gentleman is suggesting, if he gets his way, is that perhaps with the help of some very expensive talent, he may get free on a technicality and he would have all those costs paid for him by the state.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to conclude with a couple of observations by John Stuart Mill. He said in his essay on liberty:

Though society is not founded on a contract, and though no good purpose is answered by inventing a contract in order to deduce social obligations from it, every one who receives the protection of society owes a return for the benefit, and the fact of living in society renders it indispensable that each should be bound to observe a certain line of conduct towards the rest.

He was arguing in his essay on liberty that we have some social obligations as citizens, that we derive a benefit from the state, and that we have some social contract to freely participate in it.

Mr. Speaker, there may be some horror stories, and perhaps it's reasonable to have some sort of system where in cases that are grossly unfair — a citizen has been dragged through tribunals or cases — that should be considered. But in the ordinary conduct of the community, that should not be the case.

Mr. Speaker, I see the hour is fast drawing nigh. I urge hon. members not to support this motion. It's well intentioned but simplistic, and doesn't recognize the basic social obligations of individuals to the community. I move that we adjourn the debate. I'd like to continue the discussion later.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is proposed that when members assemble this evening, they do so in Committee of Supply. The Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs will be first for consideration this evening, and should there be time, Hospitals and Medical Care might return for further consideration, as might Energy and Natural Resources.

I move that the Assembly stand adjourned until such time as the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Do the members agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

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

head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the committee please come to order.

Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. minister wish to make some comments?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd make a few opening remarks relative to the functions and activities of the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs which we can foresee in the coming year that will be of interest to members and on which the estimates of the department are based. As hon. members are aware, it is the smallest department of government in terms of expenditure and number of employees, but it fulfills a very important role in that we have the responsibility of co-ordinating and working with the other provinces in Canada, the federal government, and with governments outside the country in an appropriate way.

The first instance upcoming will be the Western Premiers' Conference, which will take place next week in Grande Prairie, at which the premiers of the four western provinces will gather. This is Alberta's turn to host the conference, the first of which was hosted by our Premier in Lloydminster, followed by Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, and now Grande Prairie. On that conference agenda will be a number of items which will be a matter of discussion later in the Assembly. Following that a ministerial meeting will follow the unsuccessful meeting with respect to aboriginal constitutional matters which adjourned earlier last month. That was originally scheduled for late May, but I have since learned that it may not take place now until the first week in June, although that has not been absolutely finalized. It will be a matter of some significance.

The next conference for which the department is now organizing our participation will be the annual Premiers' Conference to be held August 20 to 23 in St. John's, Newfoundland. Then something of great significance, and I made reference to this in the budget debate: the annual Conference of First Ministers, which Alberta has been working toward for many years and is now part of the accord signed in Regina on February 15. That annual Conference of First Ministers has now been set for November 27 and 28 and will take place in Halifax. My department will be actively involved in preparing Alberta's positions relative to the various topics that will take place at that annual Conference of First Ministers.

With respect to the federal/provincial issues before us, reference was made earlier today, and as I've indicated on other occasions, the subject of Senate reform will of course be before us in this Assembly and will be debated on at

least two occasions: with reference to the select committee report now before members of the Assembly and with respect to the federal proposal for amendments to the current Senate. I think that not a great deal need be said about that during the course of these estimates except that part of the responsibility I as minister of this department have will be to participate with other provincial and federal ministers in a continuing committee of ministers, assuming that the resolution is passed in the federal Parliament and enough provinces to proceed with the constitutional amendment. A continuing committee of ministers should start its work very soon so that various participants can put forward their views with respect to how an upper House should be properly structured within a federal state such as Canada, with particular emphasis on the importance of ensuring the representation of the provinces as partners in Confederation.

The next federal/provincial issue which will be coming at us very soon, and hon. members should be aware of this, will relate to the subject of where Quebec will fit into the Canadian federation. We know that the current government in Quebec, led by the Hon. Rene Lévesque and his party, is soon to announce what their terms will be relative to signing the Constitution, which they refused to do in 1981 at the time of the constitutional conference. We will be very active and interested in that whole issue. I touched on that in my remarks in estimates last year and again in my discussion during the budget debate this year.

Likewise, I should alert hon. members to the fact that the established programs financing agreement will expire in 1987, and that means discussions will have to begin this summer. Of course, hon. members are well aware that the constitutional responsibility for education, health care financing, and social services rests with the provinces, yet through a process of financing agreements, whether agreed upon or unilaterally imposed, we have a relationship and a role to play with the federal government in those vital areas of our responsibilities to the people of Alberta.

With respect to economic issues, the economic regional development agreements are the responsibility of the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. We have, as you know, signed a comprehensive, umbrella agreement earlier this year, and under that now subagreements are being negotiated, the first of which was the forestry agreement signed by the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, which provided matching grant funding by the federal and provincial governments with respect to our forests. Other subagreements are under way. We are very close, I believe, to completing a tourism subagreement, memorandums of understanding have been signed relative to science and technology, and others are under consideration.

Internationally, I think I should comment on the significance of activities taking place in the world. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades: the next round of multinational trade negotiations have been the subject of considerable discussion in the past week. Members will be aware that the Bonn meeting did not result in an accord that will set a date for those negotiations to take place. Our government, of course, has pressed our federal government to urge an early start, and the inclusion in particular of agricultural products is part of that next round of negotiations under the GATT. I think it's fair to say that the failure to set a date at the economic summit in Bonn has to be regarded as a disappointment from the western Canadian perspective, particularly from the agricultural perspective. For those of us who have direct involve-

ment and concern with agriculture, as every member must have in the province such as Alberta, we hope our federal government will continue to press very hard for a new round to prevent a rising ground swell of protectionism in the developed world in particular.

I think it's important to note the provincial role in international matters. Of course, we have our foreign offices. They are responsible for dealing in international matters and providing help to our government, the people of Alberta, and the private sector with respect to trade and intelligence with regard to what our competition is doing in other parts of the world. I should point out as well that we are increasing our activities with regard to contact with the northern tier states of the United States so that we can try to avoid any misunderstandings between Canadian provinces and states such as Montana. I was very pleased with the recent passage of the resolution in the Assembly sponsored by our colleague the Member for Cypress relative to our relationship with Montana. I look forward to following through on trying to further develop that relationship.

Of course, we have our twinning relationships with Hokkaido in Japan, Kangwon province in Korea, and Heilongjiang province in the People's Republic of China. Those relationships are developing in a multitude of ways to the benefit of not only Alberta's economic well-being, which is hopefully a prime consideration, but in other ways as well: recreation, culture, understanding, and as we saw today in the Assembly, people prepared to come here and talk about joint venturing by the government of China and Alberta companies, something that, quite frankly, would have been unheard even five years ago. I'm quite pleased to see that type of development take place, and I think our twinning relationships have played a major role in that respect.

If I may, I would like to officially welcome the translation bureau of the government of Alberta to the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Members will see in the estimates of my department for the first time that branch of government, which we think is located more appropriately here than in Public Works. This department of government will now be providing the translation services through the translation bureau. I must add that that workload is substantially increasing.

Of course, we have four agents general now. I should point out that it has been the recent decision of the government to appoint a new Agent General with responsibilities for Hong Kong, China, the ASEAN countries, Australia, and New Zealand. That person is Jack Kennedy, a Calgarian — I mean an Edmontonian; my goodness, I must be very careful — who is looking forward with a great deal of anticipation to taking up his new responsibilities in Hong Kong to replace the retiring Agent General there, our former colleague in this Assembly Fred Peacock.

I think it would be appropriate if I just said a few words about Fred Peacock in this Assembly as he concludes his work for the people of Alberta in the Pacific Rim. He really is one of Alberta's great dynamos when it comes to espousing and encouraging entrepreneurial skills and activities not only here in Alberta but, since he's been working during the past few years for the people of Alberta, in Hong Kong. He has demonstrated his dynamism, interest, and enthusiasm for this province and Canada throughout the Pacific Rim. He's made a lot of friends for Alberta and Canada in his activities. I understand that despite the fact that he might be eligible to receive his senior citizen's allowances, whatever they might be, he has absolutely no

intention of taking them and retiring but, indeed, intends to carry on an active and full entrepreneurial business life when he concludes his services for Albertans. I wish him well and his charming and delightful wife, Ursula. I wish them great success in their future activities and thank them most sincerely on behalf of Albertans for their service for our province and country in the Pacific Rim.

I should also advise members of the committee that we have made a decision to promote our Director General in Tokyo, Ivan Bumstead, to a position of Agent General for Japan and Korea. Members will be aware that Ivan has been in Tokyo for some years and has deep roots there and a great deal of knowledge that he can bring to his position. Of course, he will be doing a great deal for us in his position as Agent General, which means we now have four agents general. In addition to the three I've mentioned, the retiring and the new for Hong Kong and Ivan Bumstead, Jim Seymour continues to work very effectively for us in our New York office, particularly in our relationships with the governments of Canada and the United States of America, in making sure that Alberta is well aware of what is taking place with respect to legislative activity both on the part of the administration and the Congress in the U.S. It's vital to us to be well informed and well aware.

Of course, our Agent General's office in London is the premier post, in the sense of its longevity and size. That office continues to serve us well not just in the United Kingdom but western Europe. Jim McKibben is our Agent General. He continues to provide us with a great deal of information and advice, particularly on energy matters, and keeps us abreast of the oil pricing situation in the world.

Mr. Chairman, that's a brief summary of some of the activities that are undertaken by this department of government. Before I conclude, I must indicate that in my responsibilities I have much more activity now with the new government in dealing with a number of ministers who are most enthusiastic about dealing back, if I can put it that way, with the government of Alberta. With respect to international relations I have met, corresponded, and talked with the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, Minister of State for External Affairs. As a result of my responsibilities for the economic regional development agreement, I have met with and relate to the Hon. Sinclair Stevens. With respect to matters relating to the Department of National Defence, I've met with and have been in close contact with the previous minister, Mr. Coates, who, as you know, resigned from his position, and now with the Hon. Erik Nielsen. Interestingly enough, I have as well the responsibility of dealing in matters of national parks, as far as Alberta is concerned. Mme Blais-Grenier and I have had meetings and discussions relative to national parks, and we look forward to perhaps resolving some of those outstanding difficulties between the people who live in the national parks and who are Albertans and the federal government, who are the absentee landlord with respect to the townsites of Banff and Jasper in particular. Of course, the Hon. John Crosbie, the Minister of Justice, with respect to constitutional issues, and those I touched upon earlier in my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, that's a very broad outline of the activities under way within the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I would be pleased to answer any questions members may wish to pose.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Chairman, I want to pose two or three fairly brief questions to the minister about some matters

and then take a few more minutes to comment a little more extensively, on behalf of my children and many others, about a larger matter.

I would be interested in the minister's detailing a little more about the overseas missions of the Alberta government: the houses in London, Tokyo, Hong Kong, and in the various locations in the United States, New York, Los Angeles, and whatnot — just a little more detail about what happens and the particular things these offices do. I know they were referred to briefly in the minister's opening comments, but on occasion I certainly hear comments made that indicate that to at least some people in this province there's a perception that in a certain way those places serve as another alternative to the Senate. It would be reassuring to have information about the kinds of things that are done through those offices, perhaps in a little more detail than we had earlier, to indicate that they are, in fact, a valuable investment on the part of the province.

I'd be particularly interested in the minister's comments about his involvement in areas where the Alberta government is actively trying to work to see that the Canadian government does something in areas that relate to the agricultural crisis. At the end of last week many of us saw an editorial in the *Edmonton Journal* that indicated that the long-term crisis in relation to agricultural production is maybe one of the two most serious things facing this country and the world as a whole right now. Certainly, we've heard the Minister of Agriculture talk about a number of areas in which he's been making some kind of contact with the federal government: particularly the efforts to have a red meat stabilization program developed, also in connection with the capital gains tax removal, and the matter we talked about this afternoon in the Assembly related to encouraging the federal government to do at least as much as the provincial government with regard to reducing the cost of fertilizer by eliminating the taxes on natural gas.

There are many other areas like this, Mr. Chairman. I'd be interested in knowing the kind of role the minister plays in that and how he's able to support or extend the efforts of the Minister of Agriculture to see that the federal government acts with real strength to do something to support what's happening with agriculture. I'm particularly interested in that at this time, of course, because we understand that in about two weeks we'll be finding out about the budget that will be presented by the federal government. These and several others related to agriculture are all matters where we hope that the budget will reflect decisions made to support farmers in this province. It would be good to hear a little comment on that.

I'm also interested in whether or not the minister, in working with the Minister of International Trade, has initiated any kind of action to assist in the whole area of Alberta's international trade, where we're always interested in extending things, by attempting to take advantage of the current empty space that's been left because of the United States' embargo against Nicaragua. Are we looking at possibilities to make some real movement and extend our trade relationships with that particular country to our benefit and theirs because of the damage that's going to be suffered by them as they lose a major part of the trade they've had in the past?

Those are three specific areas. The other area that I'd like to take a few minutes to talk about, Mr. Chairman — and there are some specific matters as part of it that I'd like the minister to comment on — relates to the nuclear threat that exists in the world today. In that same editorial

I referred to in the *Journal*, the second major threat that was talked about, the other area that potentially holds the greatest danger for all of us in the near- and the long-term future, is certainly what's happening as far as the situation with nuclear arms in the world. I apologize, in a sense, for intruding that kind of reality into our meeting here tonight. I know to some members maybe that's something that is far away and on a scale different from the deliberations we're involved in here. But I'm concerned because a great deal of the world is in a very different and a much more dangerous state than we're aware of on a day-by-day basis as we function here.

I know some days ago, when we were looking at the estimates for the Minister of International Trade, I made reference to the relatively small amount of money that this province commits to international assistance and was reassured that we commit \$7 million and no other province in this country does as much. But I can't help making a comparison with the \$10 billion budget to serve the province of Alberta and see that \$7 million as still very modest.

When we think about the reality of where many, many people in this world live, Mr. Chairman — I've briefly mentioned a couple of times the country where my family made our home for a number of years. That was a country where over 90 percent of the people couldn't even read and write, where the average life expectancy of a citizen was less than 40 years, and where the great majority of people ate nothing in those entire 40 years except bread. They never had the chance to eat anything beyond that. Those kinds of things can't be easily dismissed, Mr. Chairman. As I indicated, we should perhaps be more concerned about those kinds of things when we meet here and be looking for possibilities to do more in those areas.

I'm also concerned that we may not be using the potential influence that a government as well respected and as powerful as the Alberta government is could be using to provide more support and encouragement in the whole area of what is happening with nuclear arms in the world. I won't go into a lot of detail in talking about the particular issue tonight because I know that all of us have been aware of the statistics and some of the horror stories related to it. As we think about it for a few minutes, let me just point out that if a 1 megaton nuclear weapon exploded over Edmonton by mistake or by a deliberate choice due to things that happened in the world, we'd be dealing with an unbelievable situation. We've got to remember that there are many, many thousands of weapons in the world with that capacity or greater.

But if just that 1 megaton weapon were exploded over Edmonton, for whatever reasons, we'd be looking at 80 percent of the doctors being either killed or incapacitated in that explosion and a situation where they would be dealing with casualties on a 1 to 1,500 or more basis. Even after an initial destruction of a great amount of the population of the city and its surrounding areas, we'd be looking at them without any facilities or medications to speak of, with millions and millions of units of blood needed almost immediately. That's just looking at one location. As I say, there are thousands of weapons of this strength and even far greater strength available in the world right now that could be used. If one weapon like that were exploded two and a half kilometres in the atmosphere above a city, it would totally flatten everything within a seven-kilometre radius on the ground, and as a result, of course, destroy any life that was there. The concern is the fact that there are probably around 20,000 megatons of nuclear arms in

the world, and I'm talking about 1. The potential is there for 20,000 times that.

I have a particular concern about the issue of cruise missiles, Mr. Chairman, because the intention is to . . . [interjections] Yes, in their tests they don't fly very far away from where I live and farm. But the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but I have difficulty seeing how the comments at the present time relate to vote 1, which is the only vote for this department.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Chairman, in addition to the fact that I've been assured by other members here on a number of previous occasions that there is a certain amount of liberty in our discussion here, I suggest that they relate because the minister is responsible for intergovernmental affairs, and as I indicated at the outset . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. member, though, that those kinds of representations would more properly be made to Members of Parliament or people in the House of Commons in Ottawa. Actually, they are dealing with issues that are not relative to what we have under discussion tonight.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that they're relevant in the sense that right now we see the issue of governments at every level and even citizen groups all over this country actively trying to make an impact with the federal government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the hon. member would wish to put a resolution on the Order Paper so that issue could be debated at some future time. But in general, this evening we have other things before us that have to be considered.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Chairman, maybe I can just move fairly quickly, then, and indicate some specific questions that the minister could perhaps respond to that I think relate to areas that he could certainly see as part of his responsibility. I'm concerned, for example, about some remarks that were attributed to the minister this February, when he talked about the people who are involved in actively working to do something about what's happening with nuclear weapons in the world. At least as the remarks were attributed, he indicated that these people had been led astray and hoodwinked by people on the extremes of the political scene. I'd be interested in his comments about that.

My experience is that there are hundreds of thousands of people in this country and in the world that are concerned with these issues; for example, I think even of the Physicians for Social Responsibility, which has many active members in this province and 11,000 or more physicians active in it, of organizations that involve generals, admirals, and people of that walk of life, and in general, of the fact that Gallup poll testing in this country has said that the majority of citizens are opposed to cruise testing taking place in the country. I'd be interested in the minister's comments in view of that, whether he could confirm his attributed comments and whether, in fact, he feels the majority of people are not really supportive of an end to the nuclear threat and are being hoodwinked, as the comment said.

Just this week in Manitoba the Premier introduced a resolution to make the province a nuclear-weapons-free zone and said that if that resolution is passed, of course, the

province will be making a statement that the people there will not participate in any way in the arms race. I would be happy to see any province, regardless of what party was in power there, bring in a resolution like that. I wonder whether the minister is considering a resolution like that, introducing something similar in this province that could be looked at. I'm also concerned about what might be happening as far as discussion in this province with regard to taking advantage of some of the perceived economic spin-offs of the space weapons research the president in the United States talks so much about. We know that right now there is almost \$1.5 billion spent every day on developing and building nuclear weapons, which is a spectacular amount of money. I wonder whether the minister is able to assure us that Alberta will not look for possibilities to become involved or to encourage Alberta firms or educational institutions to be involved in participating in research or activities that will allow that major American initiative to go ahead and be extended; also, as the minister is looking at this whole serious issue, whether or not he is giving any attention to determining whether there is a role Alberta could play in encouraging what's already happening in this province and this country related to militarism, to shift over instead to more peaceful kinds of employment for those people and more peaceful uses of those facilities than the kinds of things they're now being put to and whether we're actively trying to find alternatives that will allow economic prosperity in this province without it being through the support of military development and extension.

Those are some specific matters. I certainly appreciate the opportunity to at least indicate to the minister the concerns that a large number of Albertans hold about these things, and I look forward to his comments.

MR. SZWENDER: All six of them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we call on the next member wishing to comment, the score at the end of the first period is Oilers 2, Hawks 1.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to participate briefly in the discussion of the estimates of this particular department and would, first of all, like to say how much I personally appreciate the work done by the minister and his department. I've had an opportunity to work with that department and with this particular minister, perhaps to a greater extent than many of the other departments and possibly to a greater extent than some other members, and believe that the calibre of individual in that department is excellent. The co-operative nature of the people there is unparalleled and, indeed, the contribution made by the department toward assuring Alberta's place in this country in Confederation, as well as its relationships throughout the world, is quite accomplished.

I believe these expenditures are well intended and, indeed, an excellent investment for the province of Alberta, and in particular, would like to note the topic of the offices in other parts of the world and in Ottawa. I have had some experience with one or two of those offices and can assure the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, at least, that there is very productive work carried on in that respect. I don't believe Alberta could be in a position to assure that we respond properly to all national and, at times, larger issues with the efficiency, knowledge, and information, as we indeed do, without the great assistance of those offices, as was evidenced by the London office during the consti-

tutional discussions. The excellent work which our Agent General, Mr. McKibben, carried out there of making the British Houses of Commons and Lords aware of our position in the constitutional discussions. It may well have been the case that had not those kinds of representations taken place, the then federal government could have put forth a package which would have been unacceptable in the extreme to this province and, I believe, to the majority of Canadians. Indeed, one could go through a series of examples on those offices.

My first question to the minister would be with respect to offices. I've asked this one before, would again ask, and I suppose, advocate since I don't see it mentioned in this year's estimates, for an office in the Atlantic provinces. It's been discussed on a number of occasions, and I believe clearly that such an office would assist us in relationships with those provinces on the far eastern end of our country who we have a great deal in common with and with respect to constitutional, economic, and other discussions have an increasing need to stay in contact with and further develop the very close relationships that we now have. In travelling through those Atlantic provinces and meeting with legislators on all sides of all Houses on two occasions, with the constitutional and Senate committees, I do indeed believe we could benefit from having an office there and personally would like to see it, if not in these estimates, in the following year's estimates.

I note, as well, with respect to offices, the white paper strategy for 1985-1990 mentioned the possibility of expanding these offices in the world, in terms of encouraging trade with other countries and promoting Alberta products in particular, as well as fulfilling some other functions. Perhaps the minister could give us an update on whether there is now serious consideration of, in fact, implementing that particular part of the white paper.

My comments, Mr. Chairman, have been primarily made. I would very much like to reiterate how much I appreciate the excellent work of the minister's department and the minister himself in the recent work of the Senate committee; the co-operation from the minister's office, the assistance but lack of interference in any way, being in strict accord with parliamentary rules and tradition, was very much appreciated and couldn't have been better. I'd like to pay particular attention to Mr. Garry Pocock from the department who worked with the Senate committee over the first stage of its report, and indeed, the person who followed him, Mr. Rob Reynolds, who assisted us a great deal.

So with those words of thanks, those few comments, and the question to the minister, I would indeed vote in favour of these estimates.

MR. THOMPSON: I'll even be more brief than the previous speaker. I would be interested in having the minister give us his assessment of the negotiations that are continuing between the federal and provincial governments and the native people as to aboriginal rights as outlined in the Constitution.

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to make a few comments to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. First off, I wonder if the hon. minister could confirm some facts. The one I had was that less than 40 percent of all Progressive Conservatives in Alberta own cruise missiles and that over 50 percent have declared that they won't use them unless antagonized.

I wish to say two points to the minister. The first is that any of the communist countries that are exporting

revolution seem to have lots of money to buy arms but not food. Don't encourage the federal government, at least on my behalf, to give them aid or any other benefits. The main point I stood up to speak on was that I appreciate the efforts you have made in keeping good relations with our other municipalities. I would like to see you seriously consider one point. Some of our major cities, namely Calgary, have made some efforts on their own to promote their city as well as this province in other areas, such as Hong Kong and China. I hope our minister will do everything he can to assist them.

In fact, the mayor of Calgary has done a good job abroad, and I've often wondered if we should consider little grants sometime to encourage or assist them to go abroad and make contact with Mr. Pocock in Hong Kong and some of our people in California. I've been to a lot of functions recently in the Chinatown area in Calgary, and I've seen these trade delegations there. They were in with the city delegation, and as a provincial representative, I was quite pleased to be at the function. It appears that they do a good job. As well, our own Minister of Economic Development has done an excellent job abroad.

That was basically the point I wanted to make. I hope that we work hand in hand with our other governments in Alberta and encourage them to go abroad, because they can do quite a good job. In the Chinatown area in Calgary the merchants, the business, the importers, and the travel agents have had some excellent relations in Hong Kong and in mainland China itself. I hope that we encourage them, as well as the fine efforts that you and your department are doing.

Thank you.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Chairman, just a few brief comments reflecting on a trip I had the opportunity to take last fall to the United Kingdom. I want to express to the minister and his staff at Alberta House in London my very sincere appreciation for their consideration and the great deal of work they went to to make contacts for myself in the field of education and areas that I was particularly interested in visiting.

I want to assure the Member for Spirit River-Fairview that if he thinks that appointments to positions such as director general of Alberta House are like the Senate, we must be getting our full money out of senators in this country, because Mr. McKibben and his staff work extremely hard and perform a very important function in the promotion of the knowledge and the contacts that are essential for relationships between Alberta and other countries within the European Common Market. In fact, in my visits to some of the postsecondary institutions in the United Kingdom there is, in my opinion, a great lack of understanding of the involvement and the relationships of Canada as a country. In my assessment, most of the international news services cover news from North America from the perspective of the United States. Unless there was some significant disaster or some incident whereby some Canadian might insult the Queen or step in front of her or something that's important to people in Great Britain, then there is simply no coverage of Canada.

I would make a suggestion to the minister that he consider the expansion of the office — I speak of the one in London; I'm sure the same may be appropriate in the other Alberta offices — an expansion of at least one person that would visit educational institutions to talk about Canada, about Alberta, and what we have to offer. I found there

was a great dearth of understanding or knowledge of our country. I think that the work being carried out by the people in those offices is extremely important. It's effective, but I don't think they could spread themselves so thinly as to visit the educational institutions and communicate with the staff and students. These are the people who will graduate in future years and enter the business force. I think it's important that we have some additional information or method of communicating our responsibilities, our role, and our place in the world economy. It's important for our province now, and I think it will be even more important in future years. Just that brief suggestion, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to compliment the minister on the important work that he is doing within his portfolio and the staff that assist him within the department. We appreciate the efforts the minister has made to a very great extent. He works very hard at it and is very effective in his portfolio.

Thank you.

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Chairman, I didn't know I was that high on the list, but I'll make my comments at this time as I prepared them. I'd like to begin by complimenting the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs for the terrific job he's done, the amount of travelling he's put in, and the work he's done on behalf of Alberta in conjunction and co-operation with the federal government. I'm sure he's finding his job much more pleasurable and easy after September 4, 1984, dealing with people who look upon this province as a friendly ally and as a part of Canada, compared to the previous regime that dictated policies to this part of the country.

I'd like to make a few comments that the minister, in his responsibilities, could pass on to his federal counterparts. One, regarding the famine relief aid to Ethiopia: certainly, the famine there has caused a lot of grief among people in western nations with regard to the terrible starvation and drought the people there have undergone. I believe that the hearts and, of course, the generosity of people in the western world have been extended to those people in the sense of a humanitarian brotherhood, in alleviating as much suffering as possible. Certainly, here in Alberta there were many various types of fund-raising projects by school groups and various charities. Society as a whole pitched in and sent their dollars of goodwill to ensure that Albertans participated in assisting relief to Ethiopia.

Mr. Chairman, the kinds of reports we often hear about the government situation in Ethiopia leaves one to wonder: are those dollars actually reaching their targets? Reports are that 50 percent of the GNP of the Ethiopian communist government goes to armaments in fighting neighbours or suppressing so-called insurgents in some type of civil war within that country. It often makes me wonder, is the Ethiopian government using their own people as political hostages? Are they actually imposing political famine on those people to generate assistance from countries such as Canada that are in a position to help? I'm just hoping that the minister can assure Albertans that, indeed, the dollars they designate for assistance to those people, whether in Ethiopia, specifically, or any other area which has very questionable and often, in many cases, illegitimate governments that have seized power through force, whether those dollars are reaching the people they were intended for, rather than for the purposes of their governments. I hope the minister can elaborate specifically on what guarantees Albertans have that their dollars are reaching the assistance they were designated for.

As we're meeting here this evening, Mr. Chairman, the hour approaches midnight. Of course, May 8, 1945, was an historic moment for the free world in that it was the end of World War II. Tomorrow we will be celebrating the 40th anniversary of the defeat of a totalitarian regime in Nazi Germany. That is an historic moment for all western nations that participated in that struggle to achieve the democracy and the high standard of living that we've been able to enjoy. As members of a democracy that suffered and contributed so much in order to ensure that freedom, I think that we should not lose sight of the cost we've put in for that democratic freedom. Quite often I get very, very nervous about some of the trends that a handful of people are perpetrating in our country, purporting to represent the majority of Canadians with these so-called peace movements. I don't think there's anyone in this Assembly or anyone in this country who would put forward a position that they do not support peace, yet many of these peace movements are blatantly anti-American. I hope that with the new federal government, friendly to the United States and to Alberta, the message is conveyed that we as Canadians are not represented by those groups of people who put up tents — and two or three of them camped for nothing for two years in front of our Parliament buildings and supposedly represent all Albertans — or passing some silly plebiscite that this is a nuclear-free zone, so that when we, indeed, are all zapped to kingdom come, the Russians — I'm saying Russians, but of course, it could be any of our supposed Red enemies — will very conveniently overlook nuclear-free zones, because a plebiscite was passed and we will certainly not be victimized by any kind of aggression.

I'm trying to point out to the minister, Mr. Chairman, that the United States should know that we are their allies as a nation and as a province. I believe the great majority of people support our position in NATO, that peace comes through strength, and that if we have to participate in cruise missile testing or lend our landscape or environment or permission as part of that agreement, we're doing exactly what is expected of us in furthering the freedom we fought for so long ago — 40 years may not be that long ago — and that we will continue to do whatever is necessary to ensure that the sacrifice other Canadians put forward is not forgotten so very quickly by the pacifists who put forward the image of peace but really are dupes of regimes and propaganda that would have other motives in their protestations. I hope the message is conveyed to the federal government that the great majority of Albertans support our role in NATO.

Another thing annoyed me very recently, Mr. Chairman, and I hope the minister will also convey this to our friends in the United States, particularly Ambassador Robinson, who I found to be an incredibly able and admirable man. We were most pleased to be able to meet him. Here in Canada we do not like some things. I'm referring specifically to the circus sent here from Spokane or Seattle. A bunch of people came here from the United States who thought they had a better idea of what Albertans' needs are and sent a few boxes of food. More cameras followed them than actual aid. Maybe the minister could mention to the U.S. authorities or to the border authorities that we're not really in need of that much assistance, that Albertans are quite capable of taking care of their own, that in fact the assistance they were supposedly sending was totally unnecessary, as was indicated by the various parties involved, and that we don't really appreciate being made a spectacle of by people who are turning this into nothing more than

a media event. Hopefully, in the future the border, which is obviously open — we have the largest undefended border in the world. We share much in common with our neighbours, but there are those who would try to discredit us. So in the future maybe we could be a little bit more stringent in who we allow into this country for those kinds of reasons.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make two very quick comments just for the record. Two concerns I have are related to the estimates directly. One is related to administrative support, where there's a 17.6 percent increase, which disturbs me greatly. The other one is in the area of conferences and missions, where there's an increase of 43.9 percent to three-quarters of a million dollars. I'd like additional information from the minister as to how he developed those budgets, why they're necessary, and how we can control the costs in those particular areas. It just seems rather disturbing, unless of course, there are good reasons. I would certainly like some additional information relative to those.

Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions or comments?

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just ask one. Perhaps a month ago I brought up a question in the House about the behaviour of the customs and immigration department at the Edmonton International Airport — or immigrations and customs department or a consortium thereof, however the combination happens to work — that process we have to go through being one that seems unnecessarily punitive. At the time I asked the question it was directed to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business who reflected it to the Minister of Economic Development. I think the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs was away at the time. Perhaps the question belongs back in his bailiwick.

I might just ask him if he could investigate what it is that the searchers at the Edmonton International Airport are looking for. I've had a great deal of mail and a number of phone calls on this issue since I brought it up, the latest one being this afternoon, in which citizens of Edmonton who just returned from an offshore visit had their bags completely disassembled. The wife had her cosmetics kit opened, and the customs official straightened out a paper clip and stirred around in a jar of face cream, presumably looking for some solid object. It would seem to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps these people are looking for drugs or some kind of contraband.

I wonder if in response to this issue, which is a sore point with Edmontonians and Albertans in general, the minister might ask the proper party. We've been castigated for not addressing our questions to immigration, to customs, or to the right one in either particular issue, or to the Transport department or whoever runs the show. I'm less concerned about who runs the show than I am about the issue. I guess the issue is what this department seems to suspect incoming people of at the Edmonton International Airport. Is this, in fact, a centre where drugs are brought into the country? Is there some kind of contraband that comes in here? If there's a root cause, then perhaps we have some other issue to address our attention to. If there is not, then I would like to get an answer to my earlier

question: could we begin to behave in a somewhat more civilized fashion to the people that come here?

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I might raise one more issue that has caused some distress in the country. I remember raising it in this minister's estimates two years ago, but I don't recall a reply; I may be wrong. It has to do with the problem of the 'Francization' of all areas of Canada; that is, essentially, the bilingualism issue. A couple of years ago I brought up that the former federal Minister of State was rather fanatical in his pursuit of the idea that hopefully one day he would succeed in making Canada a totally French country. The last budget of that particular government had a budget extending \$125 million over five years for funding organizations in all provinces to pursue the cause of the advancement of the French language in all provinces in Canada. It was an annoyance then; it seemed like an unnecessarily disruptive process to Confederation. While it has taken on a somewhat lower profile in the last year or so, I am not aware that that budget, the issue, and those challenges in courts have in fact diminished or gone away. I would appreciate if the minister could advise whether such funds are still there for those kinds of purposes.

On the same issue, and while it may lie specifically in the portfolio of the Solicitor General, like others I have felt that the process of requiring fluently bilingual French RCMP officers in Alberta, for example, is entirely unnecessary, if not downright dangerous. Quite frankly, I think the issue is under control at the present moment, but it occasionally shows signs of becoming an agitation which, in my view, is highly unnecessary for this part of the world. If it doesn't specifically fall exclusively to the Solicitor General, I think the minister might address the problem of his federal counterparts telling us why we need RCMP officers in the province of Alberta who speak French.

Having said that, I think I'll leave the other issues that I spoke of last year for a different forum, but I would appreciate any reflections the minister might care to give us on the matters raised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. minister wish to respond?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, during the course of the remarks of my colleagues in the committee this evening, I have had a number of representations, which I will certainly pass on to the appropriate federal ministers. The department is named Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, but that does not mean it assumes responsibility for all federal government actions or activities within Alberta, be it the issue of customs and immigration or others. As I say, it is a broad-ranging department, and obviously, I do have contacts with specific ministers, as I indicated in my opening remarks.

If I could, I think I'd like to try to tackle the subject of national defence and the role my department plays in that area. Alberta is a province in Canada; clearly, the responsibility for national defence under the Constitution of Canada rests with the federal government. At the same time, and in particular with reference to such things as national defence establishments in Alberta and the subject of cruise missiles testing over Alberta property, it has been the responsibility of the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to relate directly to the federal government. In doing so, we regard our responsibility as that of making sure that the property, lives, health, and safety of Albertans are properly protected and that we are guaranteed by both the federal government and other allies

in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or NORAD, which is the air defence wing established in Canada and the United States, that we are properly protected. In other words, we make representation to the federal government with respect to those issues.

Nobody in this Legislative Assembly, nobody in Canada that I have ever met, advocates the use of nuclear arms. At the same time, we as a country are part of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and other defence alliances to protect Canada and North America against unfriendly acts by foreign powers. We have indicated to the federal government that we support their policies with respect to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and others. I have been quoted, as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has said, that some Albertans have been hoodwinked and led astray by political extremists. I repeat that I believe that to be the case. If people come in front of this Legislature Building, march, make accusations, write letters to me, to the Premier, to the editor, or to whomever, or make representations that in some way the government of Alberta is involved with national defence issues or is supportive of the use of nuclear armaments other than as part of our defence and deterrent system, then indeed they are misleading other Albertans, and I believe it is unfortunate to have that occur. I will say that that is the context in which I made my remarks on that particular subject.

This government does not believe in war. This government believes that the Canadian government does not believe in war or hostile acts, nor do we believe we should be participating in those except to defend the territorial integrity of this country and our allies, as we have agreed to do. That is quite clearly the position we have taken and the position that has been taken by the Premier on the occasions on which he has addressed that issue. But the subject of national defence is quite clearly a federal government responsibility.

Nonetheless, within Alberta there are national defence establishments, and I have had to deal with ministers of National Defence with such matters as the Sarcée Reserve, the training base that was located there, and the proposal to locate it elsewhere in the province. Likewise, I can indicate that over the years my department has had a close working relationship with the Department of National Defence with respect to the Suffield military block and the activities that take place there, in particular because Alberta Energy Company has the natural gas rights and works closely with the military, both the Canadian Armed Forces and the British army training unit there, in order to assure a co-operative use of that particular defence establishment. At Wainwright as well, there's a very large military establishment. I might add that those military activities are carried out for defensive, training purposes in this province, and we, as Albertans, do not object to that activity taking place within this province as long as the lives, health, and the safety of Albertans, are protected and maintained by the federal government and their military partners or allies as they carry out their training activities.

With respect, I might add the economic impact of the training of British army units in Alberta over the last several years, which has been carried out with remarkable co-operation. To the city of Medicine Hat, which is of particular interest to me, it has been a matter of considerable economic impact and provides considerable employment for the people of that community, and I'm sure the same would apply to other communities where these military bases are located. But in any event, I just wanted to underline that these are

all carried out by the federal government, pursuant to carefully understood military alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I think that deals with our position with respect to the subject of national defence. With regard to defence research, of course, that has been carried on in Alberta for decades both in the private sector and on military bases located in Alberta. It has not been the policy of our government to advocate to the federal government that they disengage in those activities, nor do I believe it to be appropriate for us to do so, and I don't intend to do so on this occasion.

Now if I could turn to other matters and answer some of the specific questions posed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, who has asked for more details as to the activities of the various offices which we maintain as a government. I think I'll try to do it this way, Mr. Chairman. Each foreign office has a slightly different function, or in fact, dramatically different functions. There are two offices in Los Angeles and in Houston in the United States which are manned by an officer from the Department of Economic Development. In those cases, those are trade-related or industry-related offices dealing directly with that particular department, and the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs provides support services by way of a secretary in each case. Obviously, the Houston office is related to the oil and gas industry. The office in Los Angeles is more diversified because it handles such things as tourism inquiries, participation in investment seminars, some activities related to postsecondary education with regard to Canadian studies activities and, furthermore, since California is the largest single buyer of Alberta natural gas, has a very major role to play in contacts with our purchasers. That's the Los Angeles office summed up very quickly.

As I indicated, New York has a great deal to do with watching the Washington scene and advising of activities that are taking place in Congress and the administration there. In addition, in May last year the New York office held one of the most successful investment seminars this government has ever put on. It attracted people from the top echelons of business and investment to advise the people in that vital financial community of the investment opportunities and the economic climate that exist in Alberta. That's one example of the work done there. They are finding that more and more inquiries with respect to tourism find their way to the door. With interest growing with respect to the '88 Winter Olympics, there's quite a good deal of activity there as well. I just returned from a visit to New York. After I spoke to the Financial Post conference in Toronto on free trade with the United States, I visited our New York office. As a result of their arrangements, I was able to make contact with a number of people who are involved in investment banking and in the communications area so that we could let them know more about Alberta. In fact, I had a very interesting, lengthy lunch with the managing editor and members of the editorial board of the *New York Times* so that they could be aware of activities taking place in Alberta. That's the type of activity that goes on in New York.

With respect to specific trade areas, natural gas pricing and deregulation are very important issues. The question of trade irritants: the problems we're facing now with respect to countervail in the hog industry, for example, are being monitored by our New York office. We only have two employees who are Albertans. There is locally hired secretarial staff. Our one officer spends a good deal of time in Washington in contact with people both in the admin-

istration and Congress. In my discussion of this subject in the estimates last year I believe I mentioned the participation that we had in a co-operative way with other provinces with respect to the countervail action with regard to our forest products. We've also taken an active interest in trucking problems. Those are the types of activities that are carried out in the New York office. I thought that would be useful.

If I could just carry on and be more specific with respect to London, in the London office we have representatives from various departments of government. The Agent General is directly employed by the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, but there are officers from Economic Development, Tourism and Small Business, and Manpower. Those officers have specific responsibilities not only with respect to the United Kingdom but, as I mentioned, with respect to western Europe. It's a very busy place, as hon. members who have visited will know. There are cultural activities by Albertans taking place in the London office. The same thing is true with respect to New York. I might add that when I was in New York earlier this year, we hosted a reception for Angela Cheng, who was making her debut at the Lincoln center. At the Alberta agent's residence we entertained around several dozen people — it was very crowded — from New York entertainment and I think perhaps I'd better say from places like the Juilliard School of music and so on. This is the type of thing that goes on. It's a very diversified activity.

Of course, with trade we've done everything from promoting the sale of Canadian beef in Harrods in London to working closely with the Canadian Embassy and Canadian industry with respect to the export of coal, the promotion of oil sands, consideration in Japan, the subject of liquified natural gas. In particular with Hong Kong we've had activities relating to the development of the petrochemical industry in China, and of course, the subject of entrepreneurial immigration is at the present time a matter of very real concern in both the Hong Kong and London offices.

Those are some ideas. I hope that that gives a little clearer picture as to what those offices do.

With respect to what we do with the Canadian government, that was a very good question. I'm glad the hon. member asked it, because a very real oversight on my part in my opening remarks was I forgot to mention the role of the office we maintain in Ottawa. That office is staffed by our representative, Tom Wood. In his activities he is in constant touch with our Members of Parliament from Alberta, with members of the Cabinet, with members of government caucus from other parts of Canada, and with members of the opposition parties to make them aware of Alberta concerns with regard to agriculture. What are we now doing, for example, with the subject of red meat? Our Ottawa office has arranged for the fact, that today and yesterday, the ministers of Agriculture, Economic Development, and Housing, as chairman of a special committee of cabinet on red meat issues, are meeting there with federal cabinet ministers, federal Members of Parliament relative to that particular issue. That's been arranged through our Ottawa office and, of course, other matters such as the energy agreement just concluded was very importantly dealt with by Mr. Wood.

With respect to some other specific questions I'm afraid that on the subject of international trade in Nicaragua, I'm not in a position to answer that — that should be referred to my colleague the Minister of International Trade — except to say that I was rather disturbed to hear that one of the offshoots of that particular embargo might be that Nicaragua

was looking to Canada as a place to sell the beef which they normally sold to the United States. Quite frankly, I hope that is not an offshoot of that particular development, because at the present time I think we're already suffering from too many beef imports from other nations. I'll leave that to my colleague the hon. Minister of International Trade to comment upon.

I want to turn, if I may, to a specific question that was raised by the Member for Calgary Currie. I thank him for his complimentary remarks about the various officials within the department who have assisted him and members of his Senate committee in the course of their deliberations. As he indicated quite clearly, their role was to provide service and not to direct their activities.

There's nothing in the budget for new offices, but it should be pointed out that we have increased our activities with the Atlantic provinces very substantially in the last few years. I have visited each of the Atlantic provinces and met with ministers responsible for intergovernmental affairs. I point out as well that the last Premiers' Conference was held in Charlottetown in August last year, and the next Premiers' Conference will be held in St. John's, Newfoundland, which will provide us with a much better contact with those governments on an elected official to elected official basis. Likewise, during the course of the very considerable number of conferences which have come about as a result of the new government's promised co-operation and consultation, we have come into close contact with members of the governments of the Atlantic provinces. I think that's a very healthy development. In fact, we received support in Regina, in particular, from the Atlantic provinces for our free trade proposals. That was very helpful to us in those discussions. Of course, our Premier deserves a great deal of credit for his personal knowledge and understanding of those various ministers.

With respect to whether or not we're ready to move on expansion of offices as proposed in the white paper, that of course, is still under consideration. No answer can be given. There obviously is nothing in this year's budget for that expansion, but consideration will certainly be given to that as we develop recommendations out of the white paper. In the summaries I have seen of representations made to the committee, which travelled throughout the province, there was general support by those people who commented on the foreign offices for expansion or upgrading of activities. I have noted that, and we'll be discussing that as we develop further.

A specific question raised by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican was with regard to whether or not this department is prepared to assist municipalities, particularly I would think, those who are promoting such things as twinning relationships. I can advise members of the Assembly that in the grants there is a modest amount of \$20,000 set aside for that very purpose. So municipal governments who are going to such places as Daqing in Heilongjiang will be assisted by our department, not only in terms of us providing advice and assistance in advance but with dollars. It's a modest amount, but it is a start. Those funds will be available to municipal governments who are interested in twinning relationships in our sister provinces.

I noted the comments by the hon. Member for St. Albert with respect to postsecondary institutions in the United Kingdom. I can also briefly comment that in my departmental budget this year \$100,000 is set aside for Canadian studies, not just in the United Kingdom but wherever Canadian studies are to be found. A great deal of that funding has

in fact gone to the United Kingdom, to the Foundation for Canadian Studies there. They have a network through which they try to make those modest amounts go as far as possible. We have also been stepping up our funding for various Canadian studies programs in the United States. During the past year I have spoken at such places as the University of California at Berkeley, Johns Hopkins University, the international study centre in Washington, the Canadian Studies Center at Duke University, just last week at the Canadian study centre at Northwestern University at Evanston, Illinois, as well as such places as the Canadian institute for international affairs in New York City, to try to get the Alberta, western message across as best we can. So that is a little bit that we can do with respect to trying to improve the understanding in other countries with respect to Canada and western Canada in particular.

I want to comment, if I could, on the comments made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont who said that I've been doing a lot of travelling and it's easier dealing with the new government than with the last. That's quite true. Since September 4 there's been a great deal more activity by way of consultation and discussion. We've been asking for it for years; now we're getting it. I can assure the hon. members that the travel associated with it is much more extensive, and as hon. members know, travel is broadening in more ways than one. That's why I'm jogging again and going on a diet. In any event, it is true that we have a great deal more co-operation and consultation with the federal government.

I don't know whether I've covered all the questions or not with some of my general remarks. I think one question was raised by the hon. Member for Cardston who asked me to comment on the negotiations that are continuing between the federal and provincial governments and the native peoples as to aboriginal rights as outlined in the Constitution. As I indicated in my opening remarks, the First Ministers' Conference held in Ottawa did not succeed in arriving at a constitutional amendment. Alberta's position has been made clear by our Premier at that time and subsequently that we are not prepared as a government to agree to entrenching in the Constitution undefined rights to self-government and that we must work at this process in a different way.

We will, of course, be communicating that again at the next ministerial meeting which will take place — as I indicated, it was supposed to be by the end of May but perhaps will not be held now until the beginning of June. At the same time we are not going to stand still. Activities are under way with regard to the Metis people of Alberta, in particular, by my colleague the Minister responsible for Native Affairs. It's a difficult issue, and hon. members are aware of the position our government has taken. We will work toward improving the lot of our native peoples, but we think that will be done best outside the realm of a constitutional amendment. We have a commitment to deal with that.

There were some specific questions. I believe the hon. Member for Calgary McCall asked about the subject of conferences and missions and an explanation as to the fairly substantial increase we had in that particular area. I can advise him that with respect to conferences and missions, we have had a readjustment, but in fact, the grant of \$200,000 to the Asia-Pacific Foundation in this fiscal year has changed that amount very considerably. That is where that is being reflected. As hon. members are aware, the Asia-Pacific Foundation has been established by an Act of

Parliament, it is being supported by the federal government and several provinces, and we have committed \$1 million over five years, and a \$200,000 grant for this current fiscal year is included there, which has resulted in the substantial increase in that particular area.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud made a number of representations which I think I will pass on to my colleagues who have responsibility in those areas. He mentioned a story with respect to customs and immigration at the Edmonton airport. Those are unfortunate situations. When they are reported, we try to pass them on. I have had correspondence and meetings with the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark on the subject. As a matter of fact, I received a letter from him today in which he indicated his concern as well. Whether or not excessive zeal is applied here in Edmonton, I don't know. I could relate a horror story of my own, coming back from San Diego with my wife and three small children, having all the sand tipped out of sea shells my children had collected and all my bags unpacked, and then being forced to repack them. I don't know why. At the time I was the Minister of Manpower, dealing directly on almost a daily basis with the then minister of immigration, Lloyd Axworthy. Whether or not that was the reason we were singled out, I don't know, but I always suspected that might be the case. I say that in jest, of course. Nonetheless, those things do occur, and they are unpleasant. I assume that there are, of course, reasons for inspecting on a periodic basis various people who are coming in, but I will certainly pass on our concerns there once again.

With respect to bilingualism funding by the Secretary of State, I think that's an interesting point, as well as bilingualism for RCMP officers. Those are really matters that relate to responsibilities of other members of our government in their direct dealings with the federal government, but the representations have been noted.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont isn't here, but he made reference to the border between Canada and the United States and whether or not in that we should be making representations as to who should come in and so on. I think I have to take a little issue with him on that. As long as they're not proposing to come into Canada and carry out activities which are destructive, criminal, or otherwise, I don't think we should be barring well-meaning people from coming into Canada or asking the federal government to deal in a negative way with people who come here in a well-meaning way. Whether they are right or wrong, in a free society such as ours and the United States', I think people should be free to move across the border between Canada and United States. I don't want to be unduly harsh with the hon. member, but I think it would be a mistake for us to try to make representations which would close our borders to people who are presumably here out of the goodness of their hearts, for whatever reason.

Mr. Chairman, I think I've said enough. If I've missed some of the questions that have been raised, I'd be happy to come back to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The chairman of the committee has received a message asking if the members of this committee know the score. The latest score I have is 3-2 for the Oilers.

MR. GURNETT: I appreciated much of the information the minister supplied, and it was very useful and thoughtful. I want to just follow up. One question he didn't respond

to was whether or not this government is considering the possibility of introducing a resolution regarding a nuclear freeze for this province. I'd just like to make a couple of comments related to that, giving him an opportunity to respond to that.

As other hon. members and the minister talked about this whole issue of the nuclear problem, there was a lot of reference made to national defence and, in one case at least, I think the word "pacifism" was used. In case there's any misunderstanding from when I posed my questions earlier, I just want to emphasize that I recognize, and I think we all do, that there are going to continue to be conflicts between nations in the world just as there are between individuals. That's not going to disappear. My comments and questions for the minister were not directed to indicating that there should be an end to all national defence or all use of weapons in the world. For example, I think Canada and all of us should be very proud of the Canadian Forces' role in a peacekeeping way with the United Nations over the years. I think we should all be proud that our country and the leaders of it have chosen not to involve this country in the actual production of nuclear weapons. Those are good things.

But, specifically, my questions to the minister related to the whole issue of nuclear weapons, because those are a particularly new stage in this kind of violence in the world that is different and, in scale, far beyond anything we've ever dealt with. I think it needs to be approached differently, and it's very important not to be indifferent or casual about this matter or to dismiss it lightly, because of the gravity of the problem. When you look at a world with 50,000 nuclear weapons, it's really just a question of how many times the United States or the Soviet Union can blow all of us up. So I was pleased that in his comments the minister recognized that the Legislature is a legitimate forum for this very important issue to be addressed by the people of Alberta.

I would be particularly interested in whether or not there is consideration being given to the introduction of a resolution similar to the one being introduced in Manitoba, similar to one that's been passed in many, scores of municipalities from villages to large cities in this country over the years. I think we must act strongly in this area. Certainly, an influential province like Alberta is making a clear statement to the federal government on this issue when they act on this.

In closing on this issue, because the minister referred to the fact that he didn't know of anyone who wanted war and would promote this, I would just mention that there is an area of concern amongst many of us about the fact that the United States' government, despite a number of opportunities to do so, has never agreed that they would not engage in a first-strike nuclear war. Obviously, that doesn't mean that they would engage, but it is a concern that they've never ruled out that option and, in fact, have developed the MX missile system which seems to have no other purpose than that.

In any case, without pursuing that further, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate the minister taking a moment to respond or share some of his thoughts about the possibility of a nuclear freeze resolution being introduced in this province.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, the government has not given consideration to a resolution of that nature being introduced in this Assembly. I think the federal government has made it clear that it does not approve of nuclear

armaments being used in time of war or as first-strike weapons. I can't stand here and delineate directly all the positions the federal government has taken with respect to this matter, but quite frankly, it would strike me that a motion by the Manitoba government that it is a nuclear-free zone would have very little effect if, in fact, the unthinkable occurred and a nuclear war did break out. All the resolutions in the world will not stop that.

If a bomb is coming or a missile is coming, a resolution isn't going to stop it. The only thing that can stop it, I think, is what is going on now in the world, and Canada has played an active role in trying to promote the major powers sitting down together and trying to work out disarmament agreements. To try to establish a mood of trust and understanding between nations is important. I think that can be done best by our federal government, and at this time I wouldn't propose to introduce a resolution similar to that in Manitoba in this Legislature.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$236,663
1.02 — Administrative Support	\$784,988
1.03 — Intergovernmental Affairs	\$1,900,825
1.04 — Alberta Offices	\$2,475,030
1.05 — Conferences and Missions	\$773,500
1.06 — Translation Bureau	\$175,800
Total Vote 1 — Intergovernmental Coordination and Research	\$6,346,806
Department Total	\$6,346,806

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, there is a capital figure too, a tiny one. Is that to be included in this vote?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which figure was that?

MR. HORSMAN: On vote 1, operating was \$6,328,806 and capital \$18,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That amount is included in the total amount to be voted.

MR. HORSMAN: I'm sorry. I didn't hear that. It was \$6,346,806?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HORSMAN: I move that the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

Department of Hospitals and Medical Care

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe the hon. minister was responding to some questions. Is that right?

MR. RUSSELL: Hon. members will recall that we'd considered this for two full days, and I think I've responded to all the questions except two, which I'm prepared to answer tonight, and then perhaps we could call the votes.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview brought up the matter of the Holy Cross hospital in Calgary and asked what the arrangements were there with respect to obstetrics and family practice. The obstetrics department is being moved and expanded into the new Rockyview hospital in generally the same southwest area of the city. The one at

the Holy Cross will no longer be necessary, and so there will not be an obstetrics department there. The board is still considering the location of the new family practice unit, whether it will be at the existing Holy Cross site or the new Rockyview site.

The hon. Member for St. Albert had asked about the relationship between the children's pavilion and the renovations that had been announced for the Royal Alexandra hospital. There's a fairly significant children's pavilion, as it's called there, and it's getting approximately \$9.5 million for expansion and renovation. It will give it its own emergency and admitting, expand the number of beds, and bring in a number of other diagnostic and counselling services. So we'll end up with a completely self-contained children's pavilion there of somewhere between 120 and 135 beds. That's been given approval by the Treasury Board.

The hon. member also asked questions about the current shortage of auxiliary beds in the Edmonton area. It is quite severe. That's why we're doing our best with respect to the significant capital investments we're making to try to address that problem. We're going to make a major impact by way of the agreement we have reached with the board of the Edmonton General hospital. We will be adding another 270 auxiliary beds to the existing Youville pavilion, which specializes in geriatric care. So that will make a pretty magnificent auxiliary care centre for those persons who are waiting for so long, many of them in active care beds in the Edmonton region.

I believe that responds to the last of the issues that were brought up the last time this vote was called, Mr. Chairman.

Agreed to:

1.0.1 — Minister's Office	\$284,601
1.0.2 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$882,073
1.0.3 — Professional Services	\$827,391
1.0.4 — Personnel Services	\$647,602
1.0.5 — Hospital Services	\$6,047,901
1.0.6 — Health Care Insurance Plan Administration	\$21,954,306
1.0.7 — Finance and Administrative Services	\$8,498,895
1.0.8 — Policy Development	\$1,203,254
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$40,346,023

2 — Health Care Insurance

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the hon. minister, I notice that for vote 2 we have a slightly different format. I wonder if the minister would like to comment on that.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, there's really no comment required other than perhaps a slight explanatory note. The votes are shown by way of expenditure and revenue, and then the basic budgetary requirement is the vote called. For example, in 2.0.1 the budgetary requirement is \$299,559,000, but the revenues are those received by way of either health care premiums or direct cash transfers from the federal government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So in each case we're voting the budgetary requirement.

MR. RUSSELL: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

Agreed to:

2.0.1 — Basic Health Services	\$299,559,000
2.0.2 — Blue Cross Nongroup Benefits	\$77,376,000
2.0.3 — Extended Health Benefits	\$26,067,000
2.0.4 — Out-of-Province Hospital Costs	\$23,159,000
Total Vote 2 — Health Care Insurance	\$426,161,000

3.1 — Program Support	\$168,852,976
3.2 — Major Medical Referral and Research Centres	\$227,143,290
3.3 — Major Urban Medical and Referral Centres	\$396,386,900
3.4 — Other Referral Centres	\$137,363,060
3.5 — Specialized Health Care	\$174,171,649
3.6 — Community-Based Hospital Facilities (Over 40 Beds)	\$149,207,055
3.7 — Rural Community-Based Hospital Facilities (40 Beds and Under)	\$98,507,157
Total Vote 3 — Financial Assistance for Active Care	\$1,351,632,087

4.1 — Program Support	\$10,922,244
4.2 — Long-Term Chronic Care	\$173,588,105
4.3 — Specialized Long-Term Chronic Care	\$2,215,415
Total Vote 4 — Financial Assistance for Long-Term Chronic Care	\$186,725,764

5.1 — Program Support	\$3,923,084
5.2 — District Nursing Homes	\$35,459,821
5.3 — Private Nursing Homes	\$48,887,974
5.4 — Voluntary Nursing Homes	\$20,578,080
Total Vote 5 — Financial Assistance for Supervised Personal Care	\$108,848,959

6.1 — Program Support	\$23,639,000
6.2 — Major Medical Referral and Research Centres	\$226,000
6.3 — Major Urban Medical and Referral Centres	\$76,781,000
6.4 — Other Referral Centres	\$40,241,000
6.5 — Specialized Health Care	\$10,009,000
6.6 — Community-Based Hospital Facilities (Over 40 Beds)	\$44,506,000
6.7 — Rural Community-Based Hospital Facilities (40 Beds and Under)	\$19,507,000
6.8 — Long-term Chronic Care	\$9,730,000
6.9 — Supervised Personal Care	\$216,000
Total Vote 6 — Financial Assistance for	

Capital Construction	\$224,855,000
----------------------	---------------

Department Total	\$2,338,568,833
------------------	-----------------

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

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1986, sums not exceeding the following for the departments and purposes indicated:

The Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, \$6,346,806 for intergovernmental co-ordination and research.

The Department of Hospitals and Medical Care: \$40,346,023 for departmental support services, \$426,161,000 for health care insurance, \$1,351,632,087 for financial assist-

ance for active care, \$186,725,764 for financial assistance for long-term chronic care, \$108,848,959 for financial assistance for supervised personal care, \$224,855,000 for financial assistance for capital construction.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 10:02 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]