

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Friday, May 10, 1985 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

head: **PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING**

AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Private Bills has had the following Bills under consideration and recommends that they be proceeded with: Bill Pr. 8, the City of Edmonton Authorities Amendment Act, 1985; Bill Pr. 13, the Society of Management Accountants of Alberta Amendment Act, 1985.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Private Bills has further had the following Bills under consideration and recommends that they be proceeded with with certain amendments: Bill Pr. 6, the Concordia Lutheran Seminary Amendment Act, 1985; Bill Pr. 11, the Calgary Municipal Heritage Properties Authority Act.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 219

**An Act to Provide for
Universal, Financially Accessible
Health Care in Alberta**

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being An Act to Provide for Universal, Financially Accessible Health Care in Alberta.

This Bill has three, clear, simple objects. First, it would abolish the collection of medical care premiums; second, the Bill would eliminate extra billing and instead establish a regime of fee negotiations; and third, it would remove the threat of the imposition of hospital user fees, and through these three actions restore universality and accessibility to medical care as it was originally envisioned in this country.

[Leave granted; Bill 219 read a first time]

Bill 42**Charter Omnibus Act**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce Bill 42, the Charter Omnibus Act.

Perhaps it is worth noting briefly that in the fall sitting last year, Bill 95 was introduced in similar terms to what Bill 42 now is. The Act would amend 62 separate sections of 48 pieces of provincial legislation. Numbers of areas of the law relative to equality are dealt with in the proposed Bill, among them freedom of conscience and religion, the largest number; the protection against incriminating testimony being used; others with respect to the right to be presumed innocent; and a number of sections with respect to equal protection and equal benefit of the law under the areas of

citizenship, sex discrimination, language literacy discrimination, and age discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, the principal change from the Bill that was before the House on the other occasion is the repeal of several sections in statutes dealing with mandatory retirement.

[Leave granted; Bill 42 read a first time]

Bill 67**Nursing Homes Act**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 67, the Nursing Homes Act. This being a money Bill, Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this is a new Act which will repeal the existing Nursing Homes Act upon its proclamation. Its purpose is to provide a mandate for the nursing home system that looks forward to the needs of those residents during the 1990s and into the next century. It will also provide the legislative framework to provide substantial upgrading and revisions to present nursing home programs and levels of care.

[Leave granted; Bill 67 read a first time]

Bill 70

**Telecommunication Statutes
Amendment Act, 1985**

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 70, Telecommunication Statutes Amendment Act, 1985.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend two Acts of the Legislature. First is the AGT-Edmonton Telephones Act. The amendments will allow both telephone companies to share toll revenue generated, based on usage, and the second provision will ensure that both telephone companies accept the obligation to provide funds to finance telephone services that are not self-supporting. The amendment to the Public Utilities Board Act will allow for the creation of the special telecommunications tribunal. The primary function of that tribunal will be to settle any future disputes between the two telephone companies.

[Leave granted; Bill 70 read a first time]

Bill 71**Chartered Accountants Act**

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I have three Bills to introduce this morning. First I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Chartered Accountants Act.

This new Act will conform to the policies on professions and occupations. It will introduce the concept of public members on the council, a practice review committee, and other provisions. It will also define the terms "audit", "review", and "statute" for use in other Alberta statutes as well as this one. I might add that it is the intent of the government to study the statutes and regulations over the next year to make sure those terms are used properly throughout the statutes of Alberta. The Bill also gives exclusive scope of practice for audit to the chartered accountants of Alberta and will share the exclusive scope of practice for review with the other accounting professions.

[Leave granted; Bill 71 read a first time]

Bill 72

Management Accountants Act

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the second Bill I request leave to introduce is the Management Accountants Act.

Again, this is a new Act which will conform to the policies. It will introduce public members on the council and a practice review committee and makes provisions for sharing the exclusive scope of practice for review as defined with the other two accounting groups.

[Leave granted; Bill 72 read a first time]

Bill 76

**Certified General Accountants
Amendment Act, 1985**

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I request leave also to introduce a Bill, being the Certified General Accountants Amendment Act, 1985.

This Bill will improve the Act introduced last fall, and passed by the Legislature, so that it will conform to the provisions in the other two Bills. It will also include the necessary amendments to allow for the sharing of the exclusive scope of practice for review with the other two groups.

[Leave granted; Bill 76 read a first time]

Bill 69

Dependent Adults Amendment Act, 1985

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Dependent Adults Amendment Act, 1985.

This Bill will clarify the tests or criteria which are to be applied by the court in deciding whether or not to appoint a guardian for a dependent adult. In addition, the Bill provides that guardianship orders will be specific to those areas of a person's life in which actual dependence is demonstrated by the evidence in reports presented to the court. The Bill will also extend from the current three years to six years the period within which a review of a guardianship order must take place. The remaining amendments address issues of clarity and consistency within the scope of the Bill.

[Leave granted; Bill 69 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Bill just introduced, Bill 69, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 49 bright, enthusiastic grade 5 students from the E. G. Wahlstrom school in Slave Lake. They are accompanied by teachers Mr. Schmidt and Miss Johnston, parents Mrs. Wallsten, Mrs. Foffenroth, Mrs. Hartmann, and Mrs. Beaudoin. They're

seated in both galleries. I ask that they stand to receive the cordial welcome of members of the Assembly.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure today in introducing 26 students from the grade 6 class in McKernan elementary school. I am very pleased that they're here today to see the proceedings of the Assembly and hope to meet with them after question period. I look forward to that. They've been in the building for a little while and, I believe, have undertaken part of their tour and will be continuing. They are accompanied today by one of their teachers, Louise Decosse. I ask that the students and teacher stand and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. WOO: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this morning to introduce to you and hon. members of the Assembly a group of 48 grade 6 students from St. Theresa elementary school. They are accompanied by their teachers, Connie Poschmann and Ray Rudanec, and two parents, Mrs. Bakor and Mrs. Mylod. They are seated in the public gallery, and I now ask that they rise and receive the traditional welcome of the Assembly.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Hon. Don Sparrow I'd like to introduce 25 grade 6 students from the J. E. LaPointe school in Beaumont. They're accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Susan Mackey. I ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Department of Tourism and Small Business

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in August 1984 the government of Alberta followed up its commitment to give the private sector the opportunity to participate in the operation and management of the Nakiska ski area on Mount Allan. They did this through the issuance of a prequalification call and a request for proposals.

Six proposals were received from prequalified proponents. These proposals were received and evaluated on the basis of several criteria outlined in the terms of reference. These included related alpine ski area experience, management and operational strategies, business organization, financial ability and resources.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to announce today that the government of Alberta has selected the Ski Kananaskis group to operate and manage the Nakiska ski area on Mount Allan. Ski Kananaskis is an Alberta-based group representing a variety of business interests in the province of Alberta. Members of the group possess extensive ski area management experience, which includes the operation and expansion of the Marmot Basin ski area in Jasper National Park from 1964 to the present. The organization has complemented its hands-on ski area expertise with excellent business and financial skills.

The Ski Kananaskis group have satisfactorily demonstrated their understanding and ability to meet the needs of recreational skiing public, the 1988 Olympic Winter Games, and the ongoing legacy and training requirements of the post-Olympic years. The Ski Kananaskis group's commitment to provide a high quality skiing experience, complemented by a vigorous marketing strategy, were important factors in their selection.

The quality of all the proposals was excellent, Mr. Speaker, and it made the selection of an operator a very difficult task. I would like to commend and thank those groups who responded to the proposal call.

Mr. Speaker, the construction of the Nakiska ski area on Mount Allan is well under way and on schedule and will meet the next Olympics objectives of pre-Olympic trials in 1987 and the Olympic events of 1988. Within the next 90 days the detailed lease will be finalized to allow the new operators to become involved as soon as possible in order to prepare for full operation of Nakiska in the 1986-87 ski season.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make one or two comments on behalf of myself and my colleague. I would like to say to the hon. minister that I'm concerned. I'm pleased to see that the members in this consortium have had experience at Marmot and some of the other areas, because I've raised this question in the Assembly many times. What are we doing, spending taxpayers' dollars, to the entrepreneur who's already got facilities in existence? I'm concerned about what is going to happen to the operators in Sunshine, Lake Louise, and Marmot, because there are only so many dollars that can go around in the skiing business. When governments are building a facility that's going to go into opposition to the private entrepreneur, I'm wondering about the free-enterprise principles of this government.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps if the hon. member wishes, he could raise those questions in the question period.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'm making a comment on the ministerial announcement, in case you missed that, sir.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Unemployment

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the first question to the Minister of Manpower. It's that Friday of the month again, and the April unemployment figures are now out. They indicate that there's been no provincial change from the March figures and a slight increase in the city of Edmonton. It appears that we may have levelled out and are at a plateau with this disturbing unemployment rate. Does the government have any projection or any estimate of what we can expect as far as the lowest unemployment rates we can look forward to during the rest of this year?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, just one point of clarification. As I read the StatsCan figures released this morning, there was a slight decline in the unemployment rate on a provincewide basis, which I must say is an improvement over what we were anticipating as a result of the normal decline caused in the primary industries by spring breakup. As far as projecting any figures for the hon. member, I will be glad to respond to them as we announce them the first Friday of each month.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to clarify. Is the minister saying that there are no long-range projections about what will happen with unemployment rates during the remainder of this year?

MR. ISLEY: What the minister is saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we're talking about a very complex set of statistics. The unemployment rate is influenced by a number of factors. If the hon. member wants to talk about employment levels, then we're talking about something which is a little more fixed. About the best you're going to do with these statistics is try to determine trends and directions. They're plagued with little blips that go up and down, because all we're doing is extrapolating from a sample.

I think there are two or three trends starting to show up, if you analyze the statistics. For four months now the construction sector has not lost employment, and in this past month has gained; that's the first four months since I've held this portfolio. The other primary industries, which is where I'm convinced the economic recovery in this province is coming from, for four months now have shown improvements, and any changes you can almost explain by climatic conditions. The manufacturing sector is starting to level out and move upward. I think we're into some positive trends.

If you want to make forecasts, I think you've got the research staff to do that as well as I. You're going to have to look back at investment decisions that have been made by the private sector, you're going to have to analyze those projects to determine the length of time from the time of an investment decision until it hits the hands-on worker, and you can start getting a fairly positive feel for employment levels. But I hasten you not to assume that just because more people are working, the unemployment rate will automatically drop, because if more people decide to come into the labour force, even within the province, and the participation rate goes up, or if the outward flow of interprovincial migration we've witnessed in this country turns back to an inward flow, those things impact your unemployment rate.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. I wonder what it is the minister's department does if we can't have anything more specific than some very vague statements about trends. My question to the minister relates to the fact that the figures nonetheless seem to show a plateau or a levelling out if we compare year by year. Does the minister have any specific projections as to when we can look forward to an actual reduction from those plateau levels that seem to be establishing themselves in the province?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member's research staff is suggesting we've had plateau levels in this province for the last number of years, I suggest they go back to the drawing board, because what I've witnessed is a significant increase in the level of unemployment that then tended to plateau and now appears to be dropping. But, again, I would offer my services outside of the House to review for the hon. member the various factors that go into determining an unemployment rate. I think he would understand why I'm not going to stand up here and project a figure we have no control over.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. My concern is that we're at a plateau now, not that we've been there for an extended time, and that apparently there's no evidence of a significant reduction. We're talking about tenths of percents. One of the things that's been promised to really do something about unemployment in this province has been the employment programs of the minister's department. My question to the minister

is: what sort of review mechanism is in place in the minister's department to evaluate the effectiveness of the department's various employment and support programs?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, internally we continually monitor all of the job creation and training programs. We recently employed a private-sector consultant to give us an external evaluation. We now have the preliminary report from that evaluation. If the hon. member is inquiring as to how many Albertans have benefitted from our employment and training programs, I would suggest to him that in the last 12 months approximately 40,000 Albertans have benefitted.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. My inquiry is whether the department's investment in employment programs is making an impact in reducing unemployment in the province. My question to the minister is whether he's instructed his officials to undertake any review of the capital projects that were proposed by the Dandelion group in Edmonton and tabled on May 2 by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, to ascertain whether any of those could begin and have an impact on unemployment rates.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. Premier stated in this House that we were prepared to continually assess capital projects and bring them on stream if there was a logical reason to do so. Consistent with that position, we as a provincial government currently have approximately \$2.7 billion of construction activity planned for the current fiscal year.

I would share with the House that although our construction sector has been the hardest hit in terms of unemployment, during the past two years approximately 20 cents out of every dollar spent in this nation on construction has been spent within this province, a province that has approximately 10 percent of the population. I think the hon. member fails to realize that there is a structural problem in that sector which has to be addressed. Once you've spent all the money maintaining a sector of your labour force at twice the nation's average, as appears to be advocated here, then what are you going to do? It seems to me it makes more sense to assist that sector to make the necessary adjustments so that we eliminate the structural problem in the labour force.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What I realize is that that list proposed tasks that need to be done, jobs that are needed in the province, and that there are people who need jobs. I look at a figure of 13.8 percent unemployment in Edmonton and ask the minister whether there has been, since that list by concerned people was tabled here, any specific assessment of the possibility of any of those projects being pursued, any reassessment within the period of time since the unemployed themselves proposed those jobs.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would point out that we are continually assessing and reassessing programs, based upon what is happening in certain sectors of the labour force. It was that type of assessment that led us to direct a very significant program at the youth of this province in November 1984, a series of programs with an emphasis on youth that we've committed half a billion dollars to over a 30-month time period, which I suggest is probably the leading response in this nation to the unemployment problem. I'm not sug-

gesting that because we've done that we've done everything possible.

I repeat: we are continually assessing the structural problems in the labour force and which special groups may need additional programs. I again remind the hon. member, as has been done before in this House, that you can't spend a dollar twice.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Speaker, it seems as if the concerns of those involved haven't been considered. My supplementary question to the minister is whether any study has been done or any attempt to look at whether or not the costs to the Treasury in this province because of unemployment are higher than by spending the money on the kinds of projects that are proposed.

MR. ISLEY: Before we start a whole round of new programs, might I suggest to the hon. member that he make sure that he and others he works with are familiar with existing programs and that there is a maximum take-up.

I repeat: it doesn't make any logical sense to throw money at a structural problem in the labour force and maintain that structural problem. It would make a lot more sense to use your money to resolve the structural problem, and you're not going to do that by spending more and more capital dollars.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As I said before, the situation as I see it is that we have capital projects that are needed, so I wonder about the minister responding that we've done all we can. My question to the minister is: in view of the fact that we nonetheless still have these very high unemployment rates and the department doesn't seem to be coming up with any new initiatives, when was the last time the minister met and talked with the Premier specifically about what can be done about situation?

MR. ISLEY: Within the last 10 days, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GURNETT: My final supplementary to the minister relates to the comment that even if we see unemployment figures going up, it's just because of more people coming into the labour force. Does the minister's department have any assessment of how many people in this province have not been identified as unemployed that may in fact be unemployed?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I could only offer that if you analyze the statistics that StatsCan released this morning, the participation rate in this province is leading the nation by far. I submit that as long as that occurs and as long as our participation rate is in the 70s, you're going to have a hard time convincing me or anyone that understands statistics that there is a serious hidden unemployment problem. If that participation rate starts to decline significantly, then you've got a possible argument. But when you're riding at 70 to 71 percent, I don't know where these people would be, unless you expect a participation rate of 80 percent, which would be 16 points above the national average.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Speaker, I submit that as long as we have high unemployment, we have a problem.

Sugar Beet Industry

MR. GURNETT: I'd like to direct my second question to the Minister of Agriculture and follow up a little bit on some questions earlier this week related to the situation for sugar beet producers in southern Alberta. Is the minister able to offer any guarantee at this point that there will be a 1985 sugar beet crop in this province?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: No, Mr. Speaker. As far as the government is concerned, we're not prepared to give that assurance. However, it would certainly be disappointing, considering the hard work the sugar beet marketing board has done to this point in their negotiations as well as the commitment made by this government and the federal government. The thought that there would be no sugar beet industry in Alberta this year is really unacceptable, considering the impact it has not only on the sugar beet growers themselves but on other commodities.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. I understand there are only days until planting has to take place. Can the minister share any communication from any of the parties involved that would give any grounds for optimism that, in fact, there may be a sugar beet crop this year?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I have some hesitancy in responding to the question because I've heard rumours but I haven't seen anything factual. I understand, though, that negotiations are still under way between the growers and B.C. Sugar, and hopefully they will come to a satisfactory resolution. I hope the decision will be made quickly, because this is the week they should be planting. So there are really hours, days at the most, to get a final resolution. At this point I think there is some room for optimism that there will be a crop this year.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate what steps he is involved with personally or what he's doing to see if the sugar beet growers could receive a new and better offer?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, we're certainly not involved in the negotiations between the growers and B.C. Sugar. That is their responsibility; we have no intention of interfering. But I've had conversations as recently as last night with the chairman of the marketing board to find out how they're moving forward. I hope to be having a meeting with him tomorrow. Of course, we'll be helpful in any way we can, short of getting involved in the negotiations. To be in on the negotiations between the factory and the growers is not a position that we in this government intend to be in.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the very quick involvement of the Department of Labour in the less than a week old beer strike in the province and the lack of involvement with sugar beets by the department, I wonder whether the minister is considering recommending that producers in that area of Alberta look at barley rather than beets for the coming year?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I have great hesitancy in recommending any crops. Personally, I believe we used to find out what the government wanted us to grow and

sometimes grew the opposite. So I have great hesitancy about recommending that. There are concerns in the soft white wheat as well as the barley industries about the normal beet acreage going into other crops and having an impact on price and stock supplies of those products. No, I won't be recommending anything.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the minister. Information came to me yesterday as well that the company has made a public statement saying the factory will stay open in 1985 based on the fact that they can get growers signed outside the association. In light of that circumstance, is the minister prepared to reconsider the policy of the \$10 payment directly to the grower who is working outside of the association?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: No, Mr. Speaker. The commitment was made to the farmers themselves. That was stated very clearly in a letter and in a follow-up letter that I filed with the Assembly. The payment is to the farmers. The producers of sugar beets must make that decision themselves.

With respect to the marketing board itself and their regulations, in conversations with Walter Boras, the chairman of the marketing board, I have suggested that we would be prepared to move in all due haste with those regulations. In fact, I suggested to him that a good course of action to help them finalize their regulations would be a meeting at the earliest opportunity — by that I mean days — between their board, the marketing council, and me. But as far as having any change with respect to the \$10 per field tonne commitment this government made, that commitment stands. It's not tied to any negotiations that may be taking place. That payment goes directly to the farmer, in the fall, after the crop is off.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I beg to differ with the minister. The matter of the \$10 per tonne is part of the negotiations, the government is involved, and it is eroding the base of the association. I think it is unfair to give it to both the grower outside of the association and the one within. Maybe it's good for political benefits for the minister from Taber-Warner ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the hon. member proceed to the question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: ... but it's not helping the association. So my question to the minister is: is the government in support of the southern Alberta beet growers association or is it not? Or is it ready to let the association go down the drain for their own political purposes?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, the \$10 a field tonne commitment that we made was made directly to the producers, the growers themselves, individually. I think it's unfortunate that it has become part of the negotiating stance in the negotiations on a contract. That \$10 doesn't belong to anybody on either side. It belongs directly to the producer himself. That producer makes the choice. It wasn't put on the table to in any way circumvent what the association is doing; not at all. The growers can make that decision, and the negotiations that are taking place between the association and B.C. Sugar should continue. But there is no way that the \$10 should be used as a football in this whole process.

I think it's unfortunate it got tied in, and it's up to the producers, the farmers themselves, to make that decision.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I respect the Minister of Agriculture's sincerity. My question is to the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications. Has he committed to persons who do not belong to the association the \$10 per tonne grant if they sign with the company? Has the minister of utilities committed that to his constituents so that they can get the grant outside of belonging to the ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member seems to still be on the same topic. Those questions should rightly still be addressed to the Minister of Agriculture. In this particular case you're asking a member, as an MLA, to answer a question, which is really not appropriate at this time.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your ruling, but when an MLA, acting as minister and influencing government policy, is destroying an association and an industry in southern Alberta, he should stand up in this House and admit it.

MR. BOGLE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member should not, for his own particular purposes, confuse the statement which was made by the Minister of Agriculture five weeks ago and was well accepted by the marketing board, the company, and all the producers, and the minister's response today, which is totally consistent with the position outlined five weeks ago.

MR. R. SPEAKER: On the point of order that's raised here, Mr. Speaker. The minister can certainly attempt to defend his position, but the question raised by people in southern Alberta is whether or not the government supports the association. I believe the minister does. What it needs to show moral support at this point in time is a change in policy, not politics with constituents. That's what's happening with the Member for Taber-Warner.

Senate Reform

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General, and it's with regard to Motion 13 on the Order Paper, as well as documents tabled yesterday by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs on destroying the powers of the Canadian Senate. My question to the House leader is with regard to the Premier's commitment to the Prime Minister. Could the House leader confirm that the Premier is committed to the support of Resolution 13 as it now stands on the Order Paper, without any amendment?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member knows that constitutional amendment in Canada involves the formula whereby Parliament and a sufficient number of provincial legislatures representing a sufficient population in order to accord with the formula would all have to proceed in the same way. They wouldn't be at liberty in some legislatures or in Parliament to pass something different from the proposed amendment, have the others pass it in this form and somebody else pass it in another form. That would not achieve an amendment. The purpose in bringing the proposal before this Assembly in the form of Motion 13 is to pass it in the form indicated.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the House leader, Mr. Speaker. This is just for confirmation on the record. Neither the letter nor the other information confirms this. Could the minister confirm that there is wholehearted support in cabinet and the caucus of the Conservative Party for the resolution on the Order Paper as it now stands? Is that the way it is presented to this Legislature?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, every once in a while the government goes so far as to present a resolution which it does indeed intend to pass in the form submitted. I should say to the hon. member that I think he will discover the views of all hon. members who are interested in the subject at the time of the debate on this motion, not by directing the questions to me at this time. I say that not out of any reservations with respect to the resolution but as to the propriety of the timing of the question and directing it to me today.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. My question is in terms of procedure more than the substance of the debate on Senate reform. Could the minister indicate why the Premier and the government chose to use the route of, first of all, publicly supporting or confirming total support for the amendment and by letter to the Prime Minister, rather than taking the position that the government would present the matter to the Legislature for public debate in the Legislature, and at that time, if confirmation of the resolution takes place, the government would indicate to the Prime Minister that the support from the Legislature is there rather than from the government? Why was the procedure used by the government, as has been outlined here in our discussion, rather than presenting the resolution, letting the Legislature decide, and then informing the Prime Minister of Canada what the Legislature of Alberta or the people of Alberta stand for, rather than just the government?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think it would occur to the hon. member that governments have the principal responsibility to propose measures to Parliament and the Legislative Assembly. It may be that the events of the last three years have persuaded the hon. member that we no longer amend our Constitution by sending supplications to Westminster, that they are indeed debated in Parliament and the legislatures. And this is the proposal with respect to the amendment.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The hon. minister has indicated to me that the matter will be discussed by the legislatures and Parliament. But what purpose does the discussion serve in this Legislature when the government, 74 to 4, knows it's going to pass? What purpose is the discussion in this Legislature under those circumstances?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I'm free, in answering procedural matters — the hon. leader is putting them to me as House leader now — to contemplate any change in the final form of the resolution. I would only point out to him that if that occurred, all the legislatures and Parliament would have to agree with that, because once an amendment is proposed under the formula, it must surely be in the same form in each of the legislatures and in Parliament, or it would be contradictory and meaningless.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the House leader. This relates Resolution 13 to Resolution 7 on the Order Paper. Could the House leader indicate, in terms of the confirmation by the Premier of support for the federal constitutional amendment, whether there were any other commitments by the Prime Minister to Albertans in terms of Senate reform, outside just the one commitment of having a measly, little meeting of first ministers to discuss the issue in a general way? Were any other commitments given to Alberta beyond that for the trade-off of emasculating the powers of the Senate of Canada?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member should anticipate that so far as that matter could be dealt with, it would be dealt with by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs in debate.

Agricultural Assistance

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Agriculture has to do with the continuing crisis in the agriculture sector. Can the minister indicate if the department has set up any type of emergency funding for farmers who have dealt with the Agricultural Development Corporation or other government lending agencies and who now do not have sufficient cash flow to put in this spring's crops? Has the minister set up or looked at a contingency fund to help these farmers in the very, very near future so they can get their crops in this year?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, that principle was established when we announced the new counselling program along with a guarantee. We suggested at that time that any farmer working on his budgeting for the year and having some difficulty working out operating capital should quickly get hold of the Agricultural Development Corporation or the Department of Agriculture to work through to make sure it was available.

Part of the guarantee that was put in place was for individuals who really had no equity left and could show a workout plan, and if that was proper, they could qualify for assistance. Even at this time, recognizing it's relatively late now and there's a number of them in the field, if there are individuals who are having difficulty and haven't as yet contacted either the Agricultural Development Corporation or the Department of Agriculture, we strongly suggest that they do so immediately. I've asked for as fast a track as possible on each one of the files to be dealt with, recognizing the limitations for individuals trying to put in their spring crop.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. What studies or monitoring is the department doing to see what is happening to the long-term future of the cattle industry in light of the fact that many small farmers and even medium-sized and large ranchers sold off a lot of their basic herds to try to get some cash flow? What are we looking at down the road, Mr. Minister? What do our studies indicate? Are we going to have a future in beef production, or is it going to die because of a sell-off?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: The sell-off of breeding stock has been very much of a concern to us all. We've had a significant number of breeding animals, cattle particularly, moved out of the country. I think that's extremely unfortunate, and part of the reason is the balkanization that's

taken place in this country that has disadvantaged us. As I said before in this House, that nonsense has to stop. Part of trying to correct that situation would be a red meat stabilization program; part of it would be the method of payment, and getting that payment into the farmers' hands; part of it is getting rid of being a dumping ground for subsidized products that are coming in from other countries, are dumped on our market, and have a negative impact on our livestock producers. Those actions must be taken. I emphasized very clearly in Ottawa that if that action wasn't taken immediately, we would look at what actions we have to take. But we can't allow any more leakage, I guess you could say, of breeding animals out of Alberta.

I feel the long-term future for the livestock industry is bright. We certainly have these short-term problems. They're causing significant problems at the moment not only for the cattle industry but for the hog industry, and I don't want any doubt in anyone's mind about our resolve to stand with our industry. I have some concern about the banks, making sure they stay with the producers, recognizing this is a short-term area we're working through. The commitment we have given to our producers that we will stand with them and protect them should be comfort to the banks, recognizing that we are working through these short-term problems. We have the resolve to stand with our producers and work through, and I hope all of those things mean we wouldn't have any more loss of our industry than we have at the moment.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the Minister of Economic Development indicate what studies his department has done or is undertaking to see what effect the downturn in the agricultural sector has on small-town Alberta? Does the minister have any studies?

MR. PLANCHE: No, not precisely that way, Mr. Speaker. The components that my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, has been discussing have been under extensive study by the two departments over a long period of time. For instance, the difference between paying the producer and paying the railway amounts to about 8 cents a pound or \$7 an animal in the hog industry and over \$30 an animal in the cattle industry. As my colleague has correctly and emphatically stated, it's something we're not going to allow to continue.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. What studies has the department of small business development had to indicate what the economic impact of the agricultural downturn has been on small-town Alberta?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Economic Development responded on behalf of both the Minister of Agriculture and me. At the request of the Department of Agriculture, we are involved in those areas, and we have the concerns and the resolve with the minister as well.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Has his department undertaken any particular investigation of whether or not a debt adjustment process would be a specific way the lending institutions could be encouraged to make sure producers stayed in business?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, we have looked at debt adjustment, but we certainly see no reason to support

it. We felt it was far better to work with our counselling program and work out a way that individuals can have a strong enterprise now and in the future. We have allowed a refinancing of arrears through the Agricultural Development Corporation. That was helpful to some of those who had an ADC account. I also understand the banks are working with individuals who can show a workout plan to restructure their finances.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I also have to say that there certainly is an impact on all of Alberta, not just small towns in rural Alberta, because everyone is involved in agriculture to some degree: one out of three people in this province is involved in some way. That was also part of the reason for our program on trade account consolidation. There was a number of small businesses that just weren't getting paid because those dollars weren't available. That was helpful not only to small-town Alberta but to all of Alberta. So we do have a concern, recognizing that the agricultural industry has an impact everywhere.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the Assembly agree to Introduction of Special Guests again?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 6 blazer scouts from the #173 Blazer Scout troop in the Parkland community of the Calgary Fish Creek constituency. They rose at dawn to make the drive from Calgary. They are accompanied today by Mr. Allan Wrubell, their blazer leader. I believe they're in the public gallery, and I wonder if I could have them stand and be welcomed by the members of the Assembly.

MR. WOO: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to hon. members a group of 64 grades 6 and 8 students from Madonna community school, which is located in the Edmonton Sherwood Park constituency. I might add that as a community school Madonna is one of the best in the province, and the staff and all those involved have certainly done a superb job on behalf of Madonna within that designation. The students are accompanied by their teachers Mary McCarger, Mary Anne Hess, and Barbara Charette. They are seated in the members' gallery, and I ask that they rise now and receive the warm welcome of the House.

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 19 students from grades 7 through 9 at the Sundre school, located in the Olds-Didsbury constituency. They've made the long trip to Edmonton this morning to visit the Legislature and see members in action. They're accompanied by their teacher Mr. Ron Fisher, parent Mrs. Weiss, and bus driver Eric Gravnau. I understand that they're seated in the members' gallery, and I'd like to ask them to stand and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Member for Stony Plain, who is absent today because of certain obligations, I feel honoured and privileged to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 56 energetic, bright-eyed grade 6 students from Brookwood elementary school in the Stony Plain constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Broda and Mr. Shapka, and parents Mrs. Rachuk, Mrs. Andersen, and Mr. Jesperson. They are seated in the public gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise on a point of order with regard to the Order Paper under Orders of the Day. It's with regard to Motion 13 and Motion 7 on the Order Paper. I would like a ruling from you, Mr. Speaker, as to whether these two motions, both dealing with Senate reform, can sit at the same time on the Order Paper: one in a very negative way and the other in a very positive way. One destroys all the powers of the Senate. The other is to put forward before Albertans and Canadians a report that supports the Triple E concept — that is, effective, elected, and equal — which is a very positive reform of the Senate of Canada, strengthening the voice of western Canada. Those resolutions, each of which has a different intent, are in conflict.

What I would like to have from you, Mr. Speaker, is a ruling with regard to that. I believe one of these resolutions should be withdrawn. If the government believes we want something positive, then we go with the resolution as presented here in Alberta. If they want something negative, then they take Resolution 13. As they've said very clearly in this House, they're prepared to support their Tory cousins in Ottawa to suppress a few Liberal Senators.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In regard to the point of order that has been raised by the hon. leader of the Representative Party, I appreciate the fact he has raised a question he would like a ruling on, but this is not the forum where that matter should be debated. So I advise the hon. member that I will notify the Speaker of the point that has been raised, and I expect that in due course he will respond in the way he sees fit.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in terms of your ruling, are you saying this isn't the forum to raise it, under Orders of the Day? Is that not the place to have done that? I understood that that's where we're at at the moment.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I regret that the hon. member misunderstood. I did not intend to convey the impression that it should not be raised here. I just wish to say that it should not be debated at the present time. There is no need for extensive elaboration on the reason for raising it. I think it was perhaps properly raised and was specific, and I'll advise the Speaker of such.

head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Hiebert in the Chair]

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

Department of the Solicitor General

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the Solicitor General like to make some opening remarks?

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I would like to address some remarks in introducing the estimates for the department for this year. Before getting into any details, I would like to pay tribute to the deputy minister of the department, who recently resigned to take the position of commissioner of corrections for the federal government in Ottawa. Until his resignation, Rheal LeBlanc was the only deputy minister the department had had. He was appointed by the then Solicitor General, now Lieutenant Governor of Alberta, and the Premier some 10 years ago. It's under his administrative management, with the assistance of some very able management personnel, that the department has developed into what it now is. In many ways I don't think the people of Alberta realize the debt they owe to the work of Rheal LeBlanc during his term as deputy minister of the Department of the Solicitor General. I certainly wish Mr. LeBlanc well in his new role. If he can do as much for the corrections system of Canada as he did for the Department of the Solicitor General, all Canadians will be well served.

At this time I'd also like to recognize the appointment of Bob King as the new Deputy Solicitor General. As members well know, Mr. King was assistant deputy minister responsible for the corrections section of the department. Again, he has been the only person in that office since the department was formed. In that role Mr. King was responsible for the many changes and developments in corrections systems within the province.

Mr. Chairman, during the past year two items have been introduced into the department which will be showing further developments during the coming fiscal year. The first one, of course, is the introduction of the Young Offenders Act in two phases; the first phase started April 1, 1984, and the other phase started at the beginning of the current fiscal year. Those two phases have introduced a new concept of young offenders legislation, a concept that young offenders should be kept completely separate from adult offenders and that they also should be regarded as having some form of responsibility for their actions and behaviour, an increasing concept of responsibility as they reach the age of 18.

The change at the beginning of the current fiscal year was to change the maximum age of young offenders from 16 to 18. In other words, the 16- and 17-year-olds who were previously treated as full adults in the justice system will now be regarded as young offenders. They will have the same rights and responsibilities as offenders between the ages of 12 and their 16th birthday.

The other item that was introduced during the past year is the new computerized system for motor vehicle and driver licence registrations. Along with that we have introduced a concept of decentralized access to the system, and there are now some 190 private issuers across the province who can give service to the smaller centres equal to what's available in the larger centres. These private issuers are hooked up by line to the computer centre. They can take the information on a vehicle and on a driver's licence and put it into the computer banks, and they can retrieve certain necessary information, although not have full access to the computer banks. The progress over the next year in that particular aspect is that next Wednesday we will be introducing in Alberta the concept of personalized licence plates, with

certain restrictions on entrepreneurial skills by those who apply.

Mr. Chairman, this coming year will see considerable changes in the corrections services of the department. As I've said, it will see the introduction of the concept of 16- and 17-year-olds being young offenders. In conjunction with that, construction has already started in Calgary on the new closed custody facility for young offenders. We anticipate that we will shortly begin construction of a facility to enable provision of similar services in the Edmonton area. Construction will also start on the remand and correction centre near the new courthouse in Medicine Hat. We are going to construct a similar facility in Red Deer for central Alberta, and we will start construction of the replacement facility for the Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Centre. Also during the coming fiscal year we will be opening and starting operation of the new Grande Cache correction centre, which is close to my own constituency.

Mr. Chairman, with those construction programs just mentioned, there is no doubt that Alberta will have the most modern correction system in North America as far as facilities are concerned, and those facilities will match the programs that are offered in this province through corrections services, both within institutions and through community corrections services.

Before leaving the corrections section of the department, I would like to mention the tremendous program we have under native counselling services for native people who are in the courts or the corrections system. The Native Counselling Services is really unique to this province. It receives some funding from the federal government and considerable funding from the provincial government and delivers a service that has obviously been very well accepted by the native people of the province. It has also had tremendous benefits for those people.

Mr. Chairman, there are not significant changes in law enforcement within the province, but I recently presented for first reading in the Assembly the new Police Act, which will allow for different forms of policing in the province. It will allow rural municipalities to have the same capability urban municipalities now have to set up their own municipal police force, if they wish, and will allow for regional policing. I think that will enable many concerns of acreage dwellers to be addressed in a more satisfactory manner than has previously been applied, but it will of course be volitional on the part of local municipal councils.

The other responsibilities of the department, in racing and overseeing the Alberta Liquor Control Board, are of relatively little significance this year. The Racing Commission allocation is decreased this year because of the decrease in pari-mutuel wagering, with a corresponding decrease in the return to the Racing Commission. Most of that money goes back to the owners and breeders.

In closing my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention that although there is an apparent increase of some considerable size in the department budget this year, if we take out the operating allowance for the new Grande Cache correction centre, the total increase in expenditures will be less than one-half of 1 percent — quite an achievement considering the type of department it is and the services it renders in different ways to so many Albertans.

Mr. Chairman, I think those are all the initial remarks I wish to make, and I'll receive any questions members may have for me.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to bring one or two matters to the minister's attention. The first is the question

of enforcement of some of the loads that farmers have. They have this problem every spring. Some of the farmers often take an overloaded truck from one field to another, and as they cross Her Majesty's road, they are stopped; they're overloaded. We know the farmer is at fault. I have great respect for the boys in blue, Mr. Minister. I think the enforcement section does a good job for us. The only plea I'm making is that they be told to use a little more discretion in some of those extenuating circumstances. You and I know that if it says 25 or 50 or 75 percent loading, the farmer is not going to haul 25 or 50 percent load, because that means he will be running back and forth across the road. That concern has been brought to my attention by the farming community.

Maybe this second problem of the movement of liquid fertilizers has been rectified. I support the philosophy that we have to protect our roads. I'd like the minister to indicate to me if that problem has been corrected, if we now have sufficient rubber under these units that the person selling the product doesn't have to re-equip his whole fleet — if that happy compromise has been reached.

The other point I want to bring to the Solicitor General's attention is: I would like to know exactly what is going to happen with the site of the present jail in Fort Saskatchewan. I know we've had discussions with the Minister of Economic Development about moving trackage. Mr. Minister, I want the record to indicate exactly where I stand on this. I have said publicly, "Move the trains but don't get rid of the right-of-way." I think that would be very short-sighted. If we preserve that right-of-way, I'd like to know what we will do with the surrounding land in conjunction with the provincial Crown property. We have the CN right-of-way, and that ties right in with the provincial property in Fort Saskatchewan.

The last point I want to make to the minister is about people who are in the business of issuing licence plates at the local level. I've had two letters brought to my attention saying, "The government has really taken away part of our livelihood." If we're trying to encourage the small entrepreneur and small businessman in small towns, I'm afraid I have to differ with what the minister is finding out about how it is helping these people. I'm finding that it is doing just the opposite. When notification comes from the government that your licence plates have expired, it's just natural that you send in the cheque and registration, and it goes up to central government and comes back through the mail. That seems to be the natural sequence of events.

The last point I want to make is a personal representation to the minister. Out of all the vehicles I have, I have checked through all that mail, and I've received only one notification that my licence must be renewed. That is for the last old clunker I bought. I haven't received anything for the other ones that I've had for some time. If that has happened with a fair number of vehicles, I'd like to know what's happening across the province. I know the minister has a little uneasiness in his mind about how computers are going to do everything for us. If the computers don't have the right information to regurgitate, they don't do the job. I'm sure there's always that shakedown period whenever you're going to a large computerized system.

When we went into the medicare system, I remember speaking to some of the people in Alberta health care who said, "If you politicians pull that caper on us again, where you say we're going into a large program and don't give us sufficient lead-time to get the hardware in place, we're not going to be very happy." They made do with relatively

short notice when the original Alberta health care system was computerized, but they said, "We don't want that lack of lead time again, because there are too many problems."

I would like to leave those few thoughts with the minister, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GURNETT: I hope I don't end up repeating any comments that were made while I wasn't here, Mr. Chairman, but there are two or three areas I would like to ask the Solicitor General some questions about and have some response from him when there is opportunity. One of them relates to a disturbance that took place at the Peace River jail about a month ago, I think. At that time the director at the Peace River correctional centre indicated that he didn't feel alcohol or drugs were involved in what happened, that it was just kind of a little acting up that arose on the moment. I understand the Solicitor General's department was going to conduct some kind of investigation of what took place that evening. I wonder whether the Solicitor General could tell us a little about what they found as they investigated that incident and whether or not any recommendations arising from what they found will be put in place there or in other institutions around the province, to make sure those kinds of things are not happening in Alberta.

Just in passing, I'd also be interested in an update on progress with relation to the jail at Grande Cache.

In February this year there was another incident where a gun and ammunition were found inside the fence at the Edmonton Institution. I wonder if the Solicitor General could tell us a little about new precautions that may have been decided on and what's happened as a follow-up to that particular incident, both inside prison grounds and nearby, outside prison areas, to maybe make sure those kinds of incidents can't happen. Basically, I'd be interested in whatever follow-up there's been as far as conclusions drawn out of that incident and particularly any action that might have been taken with regard to that incident.

I note in the estimates, Mr. Chairman, that funding for the Alberta Check Stop program won't have any change for the coming year over what it had for the past year. I wonder if the Solicitor General could indicate if that's because we're seeing a significant improvement with regard to offences in that area. What's happening in the province? Are new initiatives being considered that will deal with the situation better than the Check Stop program did? Are we making progress and seeing less need for the program in the province? Generally, I would be interested in some update and some information about what's happening in the province as far as impaired driving and those situations.

The other area I'd like the Solicitor General to make some comments about, Mr. Chairman, relates to the whole area of community crime prevention and the kind of support the department may be making toward community crime prevention. I know that some things are happening in various ways in the province, informally at least. For a long time it seemed to make good sense to move increasingly to neighbourhood policing and also citizen involvement through things like the Neighbourhood Watch or the Citizens on Patrol type of idea. I wonder whether a move back to a considerable expansion of foot patrol, particularly in the large cities in this province, as a more effective alternative to the squad car patrol system that seems to be in use has been investigated and the viability and benefits looked at in addition to the economics of it. Also, what's happening as far as the encouragement of the mini-station idea with regard to policing? Is any consideration being given to

whether or not there can be encouragement that police officers reside more or less in the same areas where they are working, to a greater degree than happens right now?

The concern, that I'm sure is shared by municipalities about any of these kinds of actions related to neighbourhood policing, is that with municipalities having the very tight budgets they do, the cost would be such that they alone couldn't move into any areas like that. I wonder whether the Solicitor General is giving any attention to the possibility of funding at the provincial level to support greater action with regard to neighbourhood policing. I'm also interested in what's happening with regard to Neighbourhood Watch type programs, which are of course based on the idea that community crime prevention can be best achieved in the community itself, whether or not there's any effort to provide significant support for these kinds of programs that would work in conjunction with neighbourhood policing to allow everybody to feel some responsibility, and whether there's any effort to get more public information to people in the province about programs like this.

When we talk about community crime prevention, the big area that seems to me to be a sensible one to pursue is the whole idea of formally establishing in the department a community crime prevention division that would be involved in giving advice and support for neighbourhood policing programs to different municipalities, to Neighbourhood Watch and Citizen on Patrol programs — these type of areas that would probably be staffed by people that had experience in both community work and crime prevention. I would appreciate the Solicitor General's comments. Certainly, that area would require a budgetary expenditure, but it's going to greatly increase the possibility of community crime prevention being successful if there's expertise and support available centrally from the department. In his reply I'd appreciate the Solicitor General taking some time to share some of his ideas and some of the information the department may be aware of relating to that whole area of community crime prevention in both the informal ways and the more formal ways.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions or comments, would the minister like to respond at this time?

DR. REID: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In answer to the questions raised by the hon. Member for Clover Bar, the first item was that of the provincial Highway Patrol, as opposed to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and difficulties with farmers' loads. The problem, of course, is the very valid concern of protecting a very, very large investment that we as taxpayers all have in the transportation system of the province. At the same time, we should not unnecessarily obstruct the flow of commerce, and farming is a highly commercial activity, as we all know. It's interesting to note that in the Highway Patrol there has recently been a very considerable increase in the number of warnings issued and a corresponding decrease in the number of prosecutions. This is related to the exact point made by the hon. Member for Clover Bar that enforcement should be an attempt at education as much as it should be a necessary concentration on trying to punish any transgressors. I think the increase in warnings and decrease in prosecutions indicates that the concern expressed by the hon. member is a similar concern to the one I have. I don't think unnecessary prosecutions really aid in getting

people to be reasonable in relation to regulations. Of course, I can't give blanket approval for people to break the regulations under the Department of Transportation, but I will take note of the matter of farm trucks crossing the highways and see what we can do to avoid any unnecessary prosecutions in those circumstances.

Perhaps the hon. member could address the question of tires on liquid fertilizers to the Minister of Transportation, as it's his department that sets those very numerous regulations that have to do with the characteristics of loads and the number of axles and the size of the truck tires. I must admit I don't have any expertise at all in that matter, but perhaps he can raise that with the Minister of Transportation.

I was interested in his questions about the site of the present Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Centre. As the hon. member and indeed most members well know, the present site includes the site of the original Fort Saskatchewan. Part of that site is under one of the current buildings. In the process of dismantling that building, considerable care will be taken to avoid any further damage to that site so it can be thoroughly investigated and explored by the anthropologists and people who do those things. In view of the designation of that site, I anticipate that it will in actual fact become a useful tourist attraction within the community of Fort Saskatchewan.

The larger item mentioned by the hon. member — I'm aware of his concern and interest in retaining at least a necessary right-of-way for the possibility of future interurban transport between the community of Fort Saskatchewan and Edmonton. It's a very valid concern, and I think it was addressed by the Minister of Transportation a few days ago during question period. The viability of moving the tracks out of the centre of the soon-to-be city of Fort Saskatchewan to the new location really depends on two items, I understand. One is the aging of the current railway bridge across the river, and the other is the availability of developable land in the downtown core. That of course is dependent to a very large degree upon the availability of the current jail site to the town. Once we vacate the present correction centre, it's certainly the intention of the Solicitor General's department to turn it over to the department of public works for demolition and then, presumably, negotiations between the town of Fort Saskatchewan — by that time it will be a city — and the government for the acquisition of that land for development.

The last significant item mentioned by the hon. member was the income of the individual private issuing offices. There has been considerable misunderstanding on the part of issuing offices, because at the same time as going to the computer system we also went to the staggered licence plate system. It's rather difficult to compare figures in the year immediately preceding the introduction of the computer system. What we have done for certain individual issuing officers is go over their figures and compare the last valid total year with the projections based on the first and second quarters of the current year. It would appear that in the majority of cases there is a similar or slight increase in income with the current system of \$2 per transaction as opposed to the previous system of 7 percent of any fees received.

The exceptions appear to be a small number of issuers who concentrated in the past on selling the licence plates for heavy-duty vehicles, trucks and such like. Some of these people have sustained a considerable loss in income because, in actual fact, the money came pretty easily on the 7 percent

basis. Because of constant changes, those fleets are now handled by a direct computer system in some cases and in others by a registration system where the department sends out a computer list to the trucking company. They make any corrections, whether it's in the size of tires on the vehicle or whatever it may be, and the billing is adjusted accordingly. That could not be done through the private issuers, for obvious reasons — the complexity of the system. That small number of issuers has indeed suffered a considerable loss. Whether any of those are in the constituency of the hon. member, I'm not sure. But it is true that a small number have suffered that loss.

For the general run of private issuers, when we actually study the situation in some detail, it appears that what I've said in the past is correct: there is an even income or a slight increase, and that's not making any allowance for potential increases in the services offered through those offices in the future. As I think the hon. member knows, we are working on putting some additional services through those district offices operated by private individuals.

Mr. Chairman, I'd now like to go to the questions asked by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

DR. BUCK: How about my licence plates?

DR. REID: I'll deal with your individual concerns individually.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview inquired about the recent disturbance at the Peace River correction centre. Mr. Chairman, I think we have to accept that in view of the nature of the approximately 2,500 people who are in correction centres, there is always going to be some attempt by at least some of them to either leave the facility ahead of schedule or the natural inclination, when they're frustrated by the fact that they are there, to respond to some of those frustrations by indulging in property damage. It has happened before during my tenure as Solicitor General, and I'm quite sure it will happen again. We always investigate these occurrences, as we investigate any unauthorized absence. If we find any defect in the system, we correct that defect, and of course we do it across the system. For obvious security reasons, we don't make public pronouncements on the findings or any changes we're implementing. The investigations remain in-house. I think the member would agree that that is the correct way to deal with things.

He mentioned the recent episode with the gun inside the Edmonton maximum institution. That's a federal facility. I do not know anything at all, neither does the department of the provincial Solicitor General, about what was found in relation to that or what measures they may have taken. I might add that in the provincial system we have very different types of facilities. They are all screened quite carefully for firearms at frequent intervals, and of course the grounds are also screened at intervals.

The hon. member asked a question about the Grande Cache correction centre. I mentioned it in my preliminary remarks while he was out of the Assembly. It is anticipated that that correction centre will open on July 1 or 2 and will be in full operation by September, with a full complement of staff and, presumably, fairly close to a full complement of inmates. It's an interesting, new concept in provincial centres. The Fort Saskatchewan centre, on which construction is going to start this year, is a similar type of facility, with a slightly different concept. The buildings do not look very much like corrections system buildings, and

the security within them is in actual fact probably greater than it is in the old-fashioned cell block.

The hon. member asked about Check Stop funding. I think he was referring to the fact that we are not greatly increasing or changing the advertising for Check Stop. Most Albertans are now well aware of the Check Stop system. In actual fact, it is operated not out of a separate budget but out of the global budgets of the RCMP and municipal police forces, part of which come from the department through police grants to municipalities: \$12 per head if a municipality has an RCMP municipal contract and \$15 per head if they have a municipal police force. The Check Stops operating on the provincial highways by provincial RCMP contract personnel are funded from funds that are allocated to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police from the province — a sum of approximately \$50 million at this time. The number of Check Stops that are operated varies from time to time during the year. There is a concentration on highways 1 and 16 during the tourism season and on weekends. Obviously, in the larger cities there's a concentration at Christmastime, as there is across the province, and again on weekends.

That's not the only attention that is paid to the problem of impaired driving in the province, Mr. Chairman. At my request, both the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the major city forces have been paying considerably more attention to the problem of impaired drivers. There's been considerable publicity in this city about the increased watchfulness of the Edmonton police department, and indeed it is shown in a somewhat dramatic increase in the number of prosecutions for impaired driving within the city. I'm aware that some members of the police department say they are not concentrating on it but in actual fact they are, and the results are beginning to show. My own concern about impaired driving goes back to my many years as a physician and coroner in the province, and I wholeheartedly approve of all the efforts that are put out by all the police departments in the province, both RCMP and municipal, to try to prevent the accidents that inevitably occur if people drink and drive, by detecting and arresting the impaired driver before any accidents occur.

I'm quite happy to take some time, Mr. Chairman, to address community crime prevention and the philosophy behind it within Alberta. As a free and democratic society, essentially a law-abiding society that believes in the rule of law, every citizen of the province and the country has a very considerable interest in crime prevention. It is always easier to cope with a situation by preventing it than dealing with it after it happens. During the time that I have been Solicitor General, I have been delighted at the very marked increase in interest in crime prevention by the general population. This is coming from many groups: Block Parent, Block Watch, Neighbourhood Watch, Victims of Violence to some extent, People Against Impaired Drivers, Mothers Against Drunk Drivers, and Students Against Drunk Drivers. All these people are very much interested in crime prevention.

There are the identification programs that are now operated by volunteer agencies and police departments: fingerprinting children and engraving, identifying, photographing, and listing valuables. These all enable us to prevent crime before it happens. They are operated to a very considerable extent by volunteer groups and are very successful. I'm not at all sure it's beneficial when governments interfere with volunteer agencies and assist considerably in funding them.

I'm looking at an example of what used to happen in this province with volunteer agencies in the cultural sector. They used to fund themselves entirely by donations and by selling memberships and subscriptions. While I certainly do not decry the efforts of the previous and current ministers of culture, when one looks at what happens when government starts to fund very considerably, as happens with that particular department, it tends to result in the volunteers saying, "We're being pushed out," and other people saying, "The government will do it." In the matter of crime prevention that would not just be unfortunate, in that it would shuffle the load over to government, but the very nature of crime prevention and individual involvement depends on the individual, not on government.

We have to have police forces, courts, and correction centres because that's a valid function of government, to do something on behalf of all of us that we cannot do individually. Certainly, I would not anticipate and would not support the concept of government taking over local crime prevention from the volunteer agencies. The very function of it has to involve individuals themselves. My department is quite prepared to assist any volunteer agency with backup information and the development of skills and programs. But I have great difficulty with the concept of the government trying to take over the function, administration, and operation of volunteer crime prevention programs. I think it would result in the death knell of them and loss of the interest we are now obtaining from the population as a whole. I very strenuously support the efforts of the individuals and those organizations.

I think I have addressed the questions that have been asked of me and have expressed some individual opinions and philosophies in addition.

MR. GURNETT: Just to follow up a little bit with the Solicitor General about the whole issue of neighbourhood or community crime prevention, Mr. Chairman. I certainly respect the comments related to the role of volunteer groups. I'm pleased to hear the comments about providing information, training support, and those kinds of areas, which are in fact an investment on the part of government in supporting volunteer organizations.

As a rural Albertan I could spend some time talking about whether or not a total lack of support for volunteer organizations is healthy in either community crime prevention or culture and certainly question whether the situation has become worse in rural Alberta, at least with the assistance that's been available. What I would really like the Solicitor General to take a few moments to pursue instead is the issue that was one part of what I talked about earlier, Mr. Chairman. That's the idea of involvement in supporting a move towards more neighbourhood- or community-based policing.

In addition to the comments related to support for volunteer crime prevention type programs, has the department been involved in any careful look at the advantages and the rationale for community-based policing on an increasing scale? I know that in small towns, where that sometimes inevitably happens because the police have to live in the small town and become part of the community life of the town, it seems to have a real impact that police are seen around the town as ordinary citizens. I'm speaking only from a very subjective point of view, from what I've seen happen, rather than on the basis of any detailed studies. I wonder if the Solicitor General could talk a little bit about

his department and its role in relation to encouraging actual policing services to be more community based.

Mr. Chairman, I'm specifically thinking in the urban context I referred to earlier, the idea of police being seen more often on the street, physically among people, rather than driving around in their highly protected vehicles. Do we know if that would be a useful thing? What intentions are there to move a little more toward that direction. If there are no intentions, why don't we think that kind of direction is useful for policing?

Thank you.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should have addressed that in some detail. As the member and other rural members and I know, the situation in small towns is completely different, because almost every individual knows who the policemen or policewomen are, and they recognize them whether or not they are in uniform. They're our neighbours, and in many cases, personal friends. The difficulty in the large city, of course, is that classic difference in the society of a large urban area, a large city, compared to a smaller community. In the smaller community people also know who the physician is, and they ask questions on the street about their health. That doesn't happen in the large city. Teachers are the same. Parents ask the teacher about how their children are doing in school when they meet the teacher in the grocery store. Again, that doesn't happen in large cities. As far as the smaller communities are concerned, I don't think there is a difficulty with the concept, and I won't address that issue at any length.

The two larger cities, of course, have municipal police departments. They have police commissions, their budget is set by the city council, and in actual fact the Solicitor General's department and the law enforcement division are only involved with those police departments at their request or at the request of the commission. The two cities are quite different in many ways, and the responsibility for policing is very validly a local concern, a matter of local autonomy. I know that there have been some experiments, I think you could call them, elsewhere in the North American continent with smaller police stations and many other concepts like that.

Currently, foot patrols do occur in the denser downtown areas of our cities. The checking of buildings — locks, doors, delivery access to warehouses, and things like that — during the night has to be done on foot. The difficulty is that in developing our two large cities, we have developed two very large urban areas in relation to population. They both have approximately 600,000 people, but if you look at the size of cities elsewhere in this world with populations of 600,000, they don't tend to be nearly as spread out as the cities of Edmonton and Calgary. It's for that reason that in the residential areas, and certainly in the single-family dwelling areas, it would be almost impossible to go on a foot patrol basis as used to be done.

The individual responses that police chiefs and police commissions jointly make to the policing requirements of those two cities, I think, are best left to the police commissions and chiefs to work out. The concern of the department is to make sure policing is adequate, and I'm quite content that in both of those large cities it is.

I'm also aware that the RCMP in many of our smaller communities now — and I'm not speaking about cities the size of Red Deer or Fort McMurray; I'm speaking about populations in the vicinity of 5,000 to 10,000 — do indeed operate foot patrols in the commercial areas at night, again

checking on locks and delivery doors and things like that. It's a concept of policing that to some extent disappeared for awhile in Britain as well. They got into cars and chased around. They have also come back to a considerable number of foot patrols, but we have to remember that they have a much more dense population than we have in this province. Just the very distances between houses and between districts in our type of communities, even the smaller ones, mean that to a large extent the car patrol is a necessity if the area is going to be covered at all. Again, I think it's best left to some local initiative, either by the officer in charge of the RCMP detachment or the local police commission and police chief

Agreed to:

1.0.1 — Minister's Office	\$187,900
1.0.2 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$149,800
1.0.3 — Finance and Administration	\$2,062,900
1.0.4 — Personnel	\$1,982,100
1.0.5 — Systems and Information Services	\$3,247,700
1.0.6 — Liquor Licensing Review Council	\$128,300
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$7,758,700
2.1 — Program Support	\$7,188,500
2.2 — Institutional Services	\$80,187,400
2.3 — Community Correctional Services	\$11,990,400
2.4 — Community Residential Centres	\$5,235,700
2.5 — Native Court Workers	\$3,003,400
Total Vote 2 — Correctional Services	\$107,605,400
3.1 — Program Support	\$1,206,900
3.2 — Financial Support for Policing	\$86,569,600
3.3 — Highway Patrol	\$4,285,700
3.4 — Federal Gun Control	\$324,700
Total Vote 3 — Law Enforcement	\$92,386,900
4.1 — Program Support	\$13,755,200
4.2 — Licence Issuing and Driver Testing	\$11,033,700
4.3 — Operator Licence Control	\$1,001,600
Total Vote 4 — Motor Vehicle Registration and Driver Licensing	\$25,790,500
Total Vote 5 — Control and Development of Horse Racing	\$3,822,600
Department Total	\$237,364,100

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I move the votes be reported.

[Motion carried]

Treasury Department

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the Provincial Treasurer like to make any comments?

MR. HYNDMAN: Actually, Mr. Chairman, there were no comments outstanding from my last occasion in speaking to the Treasury estimates.

Agreed to:

1.0.1 — Provincial Treasurer's Office	\$225,800
1.0.2 — Deputy Provincial Treasurers'	

Office	\$973,600
1.0.3 — Administrative Support	\$1,920,300
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$3,119,700
Total Vote 2 — Statistical Services	\$2,400,900
Total Vote 3 — Revenue Collection and Rebates	\$89,697,100
4.1 — Financial Management and Planning	\$32,706,700
4.2 — Employee Insurance and Compensation	\$4,423,000
Total Vote 4 — Financial Management, Planning and Central Services	\$37,129,700

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The total amount to be voted for Treasury ...

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, before we call that vote, the hon. Leader of the Opposition had indicated he had two or three questions he wanted to ask supplementary to a discussion on pensions. He's not here today; therefore, I'd be pleased to adjourn debate or approval of this final vote so he would have an opportunity to ask them perhaps at a future date.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do the members of the committee agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will the Government House Leader be calling another department?

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Chairman. The Minister of Agriculture will shortly attend upon the Assembly.

Department of Agriculture

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the Minister of Agriculture like to make any comments?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to have a good memory here. There were so many questions asked the last time I was up that I'm not sure I'm going to be able to answer them all or that everyone will remember what the questions were.

I appreciate the compliments directed toward me and the department. I suppose many ministers really think equally well of their staff. However, I'd like to say that the staff of Alberta Agriculture is unequalled in its commitment to Alberta's agricultural producers, processors, and suppliers. They certainly back up that commitment with their day-to-day performance, and I believe that rivals any other department in government.

During my previous appearance before the committee, the hon. Member for Cypress had comments dealing with the sugar beet growers, the officials in Ottawa, and the various representatives of the federal government that the hon. member had the opportunity to meet with. I'd again like to thank the Member for Cypress for representing me in Ottawa when the sugar beet growers were there to discuss their concerns with the federal government. Judging by the announcement that was made by the federal government,

that trip to Ottawa was certainly successful for them. Hopefully, we'll now get on with trying to get a resolution of that issue. It's unfortunate; it has taken a lot of energy from a lot of individuals throughout that process of trying to work toward it.

What we really need is a national sugar policy, and hopefully we'll see that take place. I was happy to have the opportunity to speak to some federal ministers this past week, telling them how important it was to get on with working on a national sugar policy and how we as a provincial government were prepared to offer them any support and assistance we could to help them in the resolution of that issue.

I thank the Member for Calgary McCall for his support. He had a number of comments on marketing and wanted a clarification of the role of research and resource development. Maybe I could deal with that first. The sector was officially formed just over two years ago to answer a need for comprehensive attention to our basic agricultural resources of land, soil, and water. Hence, from that came the words "resource development". This sector is also responsible for co-ordinating the department's research efforts and for administering Farming for the Future, the agriculture research program, among others.

However, the department's policy is to maintain research as a line function rather than a central function wherever possible. The department's experience has been that research efforts work best when they're tied to the general area where they apply. For example, the Food Processing Development Centre, which the hon. member mentioned, falls under the marketing division. The role of this centre is to provide facilities for and generally assist Alberta processors with developing processes, packaging, and marketing techniques which will open up new markets for value-added processing in this province. The Heritage Savings Trust Fund provided the capital funding for that centre, and the department provides the operating funds. Basically, this is still a new project, and funding and manpower will have to be assessed continually.

The hon. member may not be aware that one of the reasons for building the centre was to provide needed facilities; that is, a pilot-scale plant with equipment which is not usually available to smaller processors. The intention is still that processors using the facilities will provide staff with raw product, with the centre providing support as necessary. We think it will work well. Considerable interest has already been shown in the centre by Alberta processors, no matter whether they're small or large. To date we've already achieved some good results.

Offhand I can think of one, using the new saskatoon berry for preserves. This showed up on my desk a couple of months ago. I tested it for breakfast several mornings, and I can assure the committee that people will buy it. I can recall that growing up, the two fruits we always had on the farm were rhubarb and saskatoons. When the saskatoons were in season, we had saskatoon pie. We had rhubarb pie, and we even had rhubarb for breakfast. We never went hungry. There certainly were a number of those products. When I found this new saskatoon preserve, I thought it was kind of exciting that they had found a new way to use it.

The hon. Member for Wainwright asked for comments on export marketing of Alberta products. To briefly review our efforts this year, we intend to direct \$2.6 million toward assistance in the marketplace, with another \$11.9 million being spent on marketing services which help producers and

processors gain new market opportunities. I would again note our new initiative in establishing an agricultural office as part of the Alberta government office in Tokyo. This office will be supplemented with another person being contracted to work specifically with Japanese retailers to establish how Alberta processors can improve their products to meet the needs of an expanding market. Part of my mission to the Pacific Rim certainly showed evidence that we needed to have someone like that there from the department to assist our people.

The department is looking at developing new marketing opportunities for Alberta processors, especially in the Pacific Rim and the western United States, where we think some of our best prospects are. However, I think we have to look at fiscal management responsibly, and that dictates that we have to use our dollars prudently and will assist Alberta producers and processors to market in new markets where appropriate.

The hon. Member for Wainwright had several questions. His comments on GATT were well made. I agree that in the past, agriculture suffered when the federal government negotiated our final agreements. I firmly agree that agriculture must be emphasized in all trade negotiations. It's a point that our Premier has made forcefully at federal/provincial meetings. This is why I recommended that the federal/provincial ministers establish a committee on agricultural trade policy last summer. My staff chairs and acts as secretary to this committee to ensure that Canada's and especially Alberta's agriculture and food industry attains its rightful place in Canadian trade policy positions. I note that this committee met last week or the week before in Ottawa and recommended that Canada take positions in support of agriculture on issues in the GATT negotiations, the U.S. pork countervail action, beef imports in the European community, the Canadian sugar policy, U.S./Canada free trade, and new mechanisms to reduce U.S. and Canada border irritants.

On the issue of the Crow benefit, which also came up in the comments of the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, the government's position has always been very clear. We support direct payment of the benefit to farmers, and farmers really agree with that position. A survey we had conducted by Angus Reid shows that a full 70 percent of Alberta's producers favour paying a Crow benefit to producers instead of the railroads. Equally important, the survey found that farmers understand why the benefit should be paid to them, and I think that's critical. I can assure hon. members that we intend to be very active following the release of the Hall commission report of inquiry into the method of payment. We are going to work and provide any help we can to see that a satisfactory resolution of the issue is made very soon. It can't be delayed. I agree that political action on a variety of things is necessary. There has been some movement on removing the cap on the Western Grain Transportation Act, and I think that's favourable.

The hon. member raised concerns about using potable water for oil field injection, and I share his concern that aquifers are being depleted to recharge oil and gas wells. I agree that the first priority for use of this resource should be domestic, then agricultural, and then industrial. The department is prepared to support those priorities. However, I think the specific details on that are going to have to be addressed to the Minister of the Environment. I look forward to working on that issue, because I feel that our potable water supplies in this province are critical to our long-term

future. I think there are other ways of doing things, using salt water or some other method, rather than using water that goes down a hole and is gone.

If we look at the drought situation we've had in this past year, I think we recognize the seriousness of water supplies and that we have a responsibility to take care of those water supplies in a significant way. Even though the oil and gas sector provides a lot of income for us and we use some of that in agriculture, I still don't think there's an excuse for using potable water supplies. I intend to be as strong and as helpful as I can to work with other members to see a satisfactory resolution.

I appreciate that the hon. member also raised the announcement about the fertilizer price protection plan. The hon. Member for Vegreville also mentioned the subject, as did the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. We also had some discussion about preferential treatment for Alberta fertilizer manufacturers. As the committee is aware, the purpose of this plan is to ease the financial burden of this input cost for farmers, really with the ultimate goal of ensuring that farmers use fertilizer on the 1985 crop. I think it would be disastrous for farmers to cut back on that input, especially at a time when the bins are empty and a big crop is necessary for many producers. We had a deep concern that there would be some reduction in the use of fertilizer at a critical time, and I hope that program is helpful.

I have some concern about the increases in the price of fertilizer. We have to look at all the input costs. As I said before, if you look after the pennies, the dollars look after themselves. I mentioned the built-in monitoring mechanism in the Assembly before. It's only for monitoring; the government can't dictate prices, nor should we. However, we can report prices, and if they get out of line, the committee can be assured the producers are going to be informed.

The Member for Wainwright also asked if arrangements for the opening of the Prince Rupert grain terminal have been completed. I think everyone is aware now that they basically have, and everyone knows who is going. That's an exciting opportunity to have a look at a project that I think is going to be helpful to all producers in this province, particularly to northern Alberta in most ways. I'm looking forward to the opening.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview raised a second set of concerns. He spent some time complimenting the effort of the home and community design branch. I certainly thank him for his support of the branch's past efforts. However, things really do change. In a time of restraint firm priorities need to be established. As the hon. member himself has suggested, the development and marketing of food products and assisting producers with direct input costs must be high priorities. In reviewing the estimates for 1985-86, we felt that improving market opportunities for a number of producers and processors was a higher priority than home design services. I guess you could say we felt at this time that the department should be paying more attention to helping people gain income rather than spend it.

The point was made that custom home design is an important consideration for some producers, and I agree. However, I also feel the department should not duplicate services provided by the private sector. To me it makes common sense that that's one area where government should be exercising fiscal responsibility. Many of the services provided by way of custom home design are increasingly available in the private sector, and this was an important

consideration in our decision to reduce our budget in this area. As well, I think the hon. member will agree that most people who can build custom-designed homes today or carry out major remodelling can in fact afford to pay for some of those services. Still, for others we have retained one home design specialist and some funds for retraining people in the private sector as needed.

I note that the services of all our district home economists and engineering specialists also continue to be available to farm families with housing questions. Within the new engineering services we've also made a small cut in the amount of money available to our engineering skill training courses: welding, farmstead wiring, plumbing, carpentry, mechanics, hydraulics, and others. However, our ability to meet any needs for such courses will not really be affected. We have in fact monitored the need for these services and, in terms of budget, have matched a small increase in the demand for some of those courses. I suggest this is probably a reflection of the fine job my staff has done in meeting those needs.

I also accept the member's compliments on the level of resources we've directed to region 6. These numbers are developed over many months and are settled well before the end of the previous year. When I was last up, I mentioned that budgets for the regions are developed partly in response to trends. Whether or not individual increases are above or below those of other regions, they're dictated by demand for services in the particular region. They can really change from year to year, so they have to be flexible.

The hon. member also asked for my comments on farm financial services and on services offering financial advice being tied to boom-and-bust cycles. I believe the hon. Member for Norwood also had a question which partially referred to this area. First, farm financial management. I don't believe anyone should infer that because we offer financial counselling services, all farmers are bad managers. They're not. There are some bad managers. I know some, and I expect you also know some. But there are very few, in fact, compared to the many excellent producers we have in this province. No one has all the information they need, and that's why we have courses and services which supply new information and teach new skills. To my knowledge, if you're basically a bad manager, you wouldn't take advantage of most of those services anyway.

Mr. Chairman, I should also say that our expanded services are one response of many to a cost/price squeeze which clearly requires that we direct more effort to controlling costs and using resources more effectively. Even good managers can improve their skills. Within government we encourage our managers to take skill upgrading whenever possible. Again, it doesn't mean they're bad managers just because they take skill upgrading courses; it just recognizes that situations can change and we all have to change to meet them.

In this context the hon. member seemed to imply that financial management advice should be given in a way that ignores the current state of the economy. I think that would be like burying one's head in the sand. Farmers don't and can't use advice that's out of touch with reality. Reality is that a farmer is an independent businessman who bases his decisions on whatever sources of advice he chooses, and then he has to live with those decisions. The job of government is to assist where appropriate, to provide the backup for those times when very unusual events create critical circumstances. On a daily basis we provide good advice, recognizing that agriculture is very much tied to

the national and North American world economies. We must assess situations realistically, and our advice to producers must be realistic. However, the final decision rests with the producers. That's democracy, and it has to work that way.

The hon. member also asked about the method of drawing boundaries for the livestock drought assistance program we implemented last summer. The boundary for the designated drought area in Alberta was developed in consultation with the government caucus and all sheep and cattle and livestock organizations across the province. We also had some assistance from the federal government in trying to draw that line. But, you know, any time you draw a line, you make people mad. I didn't like drawing the line. If it wouldn't have been a tri-province agreement working with the federal government and there had to be a line drawn — that's something I personally had great difficulty with.

I understand that no matter where you draw it, it's not going to be easy. I had my staff drive the line, and they surveyed a number of areas and met with many delegations before that line was established. To cover small areas which had suffered from drought but were outside the boundary, we put in the feed freight assistance program last fall. I think it's a good example of efforts of concerns of producers across this province, and farmers had several methods of input. A lot of it came through the MLAs, the district agriculturists, and their representatives.

A concern was raised about consultation with producers in developing a crop insurance program. The board of directors of the Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation held extensive public meetings throughout the Peace River region in 1983 and '84, and similar meetings were held in the Lethbridge-Cardston area last January. On April 16 the crop insurance corporation also made the decision, after I had some discussion with them, that they were going to hold more public meetings in the Peace River region this June and July. I think it's important that they go right to the areas where the concerns are raised, hear from the people right there, and then make recommendations back to the full board. Then those recommendations will come to my desk, and we can look at how we can improve the program.

We shouldn't always have pride of authorship and feel that nothing can be improved. There are ways to improve it, and we should always be open to it. I encourage all the boards under my responsibility to move out and hold their meetings in different parts of the province so the people have an opportunity to come and make their representations to them. I think that's the democratic way to do it. I think it's the responsible approach. I hope some of the MLAs will attend those meetings with the crop insurance corporation when they're held in those regions. I think we can all learn. I learn something new about each one of the programs every day.

Mr. Chairman, I also observe the appropriation for the high-risk subsidy, which is primarily intended for the Peace River area, has been increased \$300,000 to \$4.2 million for the 1985 crop year.

I'd like to thank the hon. Member for St. Paul for his accolades. Many of the programs he mentioned have done much to help producers in his constituency, and I trust they'll continue to do so in the future.

The hon. member raised a question about the future possibility of a new packing plant in the north. This is one area where we have concern. I'd like to see one established. It requires careful encouragement, because narrow profit margins are involved. At present there are four things which

may provide the type of encouragement needed. The first is research, and the research necessary to establish a modern plant can now be conducted through the food development centre at Leduc. The second provision is capital. Up to 35 percent of the cost of a new plant could be provided through the Canada-Alberta Nutritive Processing Assistance Agreement, so I hope the individuals who are looking at it don't miss that opportunity.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway had a number of general comments. I'd like to thank him for his thoughts on urban appreciation of Alberta's food industry. In fact, I directly quoted the member in a speech I gave in Fort Macleod two days later at the local Rotary Club's rural appreciation night. I think his comments were very appropriate. The hon. member asked if any evaluation had been done on the Better Buy Alberta campaign. Studies have been done and show that the program has achieved enough public awareness to permit Alberta's relatively small food processing companies to compete in the market with the international giants like General Foods, General Mills, and Kraft Foods. I think programs like this make a valuable contribution to the further development of the domestic food processing industry.

However, I think the Japanese have shown us that we need more than a slogan. The Japanese people believe their products are the best and they buy them, tariffs and quotas aside. That is why many countries have difficulty breaking into a Japanese market, and that's the reason the premier of Japan actually went out, I believe, on April 20 to do some interesting PR. He made some points about shopping for products from Italy, France, and other nations to promote good foreign relations.

Mr. Chairman, a number of surveys have been done. A number of comments were raised by a number of members. I'd like to thank the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park for his firm support of the marketing programs, and I can assure him the department is putting in a solid effort to expand markets available for Alberta producers and processors. I wish to respond to his notion that Alberta cows be taught to respond to Mandarin Chinese. I consulted with some experts in this field and was assured that the traditional "moo" of Alberta cows translates well into any language.

The hon. member asked whether or not there was sufficient concern to amend provincial legislation regarding pasteurization of milk in terms of actions which can be taken by municipal government. I'm certain the hon. member is aware that this question involves several areas of jurisdiction; therefore, I'd suggest he also refer his question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition posed several questions. The first concerned Unifarm's submission to the government. The hon. member also pushed his case for an Alberta debt adjustment board, and I believe the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking partly responded to the subject. However, I appreciate the concerns the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood is trying to make in such a proposal. We've looked at many, many options in the search to ensure that financial needs of Alberta farmers are taken care of in the best possible fashion. I believe the hon. member and I could argue the point for many hours on whether or not government-initiated mechanisms for regulating how and when farmers pay off their loans would dry up credit. To this day I still hear both farmers and bankers and other credit lenders say that it took 40 years for the credit sector

to overcome the massive loss of confidence caused by creating a debt adjustment board in the 1930s.

I'm pleased at the number of comments made about the Agricultural Development Corporation guarantee program. I'd like to thank the hon. Member for Vegreville for his kind comments. I value very much the support I receive from members on behalf of the province's agricultural sector. It was a pleasure to work with him as acting chairman of the Alberta Grain Commission. He took on the task during a turbulent time in Canada's grain industry, and I appreciate very much the effort he put in to further the position of Alberta's grain producers. The hon. member had comments pertaining to seed cleaning plants, grain drying, grain cleaning, the new and old Prince Rupert grain terminals, Accent '85, the fertilizer price protection plan, my staff, and ADC's beginning farmer program. He made a number of comments; I don't believe there were any specific questions.

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking had comments in a number of areas. I'd like to thank him for his spirited support of the program run by the Agricultural Development Corporation. I agree that the agricultural industry requires credit-granting agencies separate from the Treasury Branches and the banks and other general purpose financial institutions. While these agencies do provide a considerable portion of the operating funds used by the agricultural sector, there are many specific instances where credit arrangements are better handled through mechanisms like ADC.

The hon. Member for Clover Bar had a number of comments on the agricultural sector that ranged on the side of, to repeat his words, doom and gloom. I can't in good conscience support in any way his prediction that there will not be a farmer left to speak of in five years. Earlier I mentioned the average equity level of Alberta farmers. I believe I mentioned it when I was up before estimates the last time. Even that figure is down five or six points over the several years. It's still at 83 to 84 percent, and that places us well ahead of the average equity level of American farmers and, in my opinion, in good shape to weather whatever difficulties we'll have in the future, as long as we're realistic.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there were some further remarks about farm financing. It has always perplexed me how some members can urge us to throw a bucketful of money at the industry and then, within minutes, others suggest that we curtail activities we already have in place. Some might say that's a politician's dream: to be faced with conflicting demands and try to resolve them. I tend to look at it from a practical point of view. Primarily the Agricultural Development Corporation and the Department of Agriculture have to work together to develop and do all we can, but there are limitations on how far we can go. I think we have a good, bright outlook, as long as we're realistic and recognize that it's the industry working in co-operation with government that will make us successful; it's not going off in our own directions.

Mr. Chairman, I think that answers most of the questions asked of me.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the quantity of information the minister came back with. I was quickly looking through my earlier notes to see which questions were being responded to. I appreciate the information he provided. I should say at the beginning that the small saskatoon syrup industry in this province also makes a very good product for pancakes, as another breakfast alternative.

I want to express special appreciation at the beginning for the information about the crop insurance hearings in the Peace country. I think that is the kind of situation people have been asking for, and it's good to hear it responded to. That may be a good place to begin, too, and comment about the home design branch and the information the minister provided about that.

I understand the rationale he presented for the reduction in the department, Mr. Chairman, but I still have a problem when I look at a budget of \$220 million for the department. I wonder about just how useful a savings of probably something under \$200,000 is in the overall picture when it's contrasted with the fact that the people who had used the program had very strongly indicated that it was important to them and had been financially useful to them. I think it's much like crop insurance. It's one of those cases where I would share with the minister that we need to look at not creating a perception of unresponsiveness. If people in the farm community are saying, "Here was a program that any neighbour of mine that used it found helpful and even economically beneficial, and now it's disappeared," then we're building a perception that I'm afraid can hurt the department's standing with farmers. That really was one of the two main reasons I was concerned to see such a relatively small number of dollars eliminated when it was a program that seemed to be so valuable.

The other thing I'd say in responding to the minister's comments about the home design branch is simply that although I'm sure the immediate need to not be spending money is valid, we also have to look at long-term situations. A well-designed, efficient home has savings over a family's lifetime that have to be taken into consideration and should play a role in decisions about that.

I would like to ask the minister to comment about an idea that seems to be being talked about over kitchen tables a little bit in the last few weeks. He may have heard it in his area as well. I mention it to him not necessarily because I see it as something that has a really good future but because no attention to it may create a wrong perception about the department's desire to be responsive; that is, the idea of a temporary freeze on all input costs. People are starting to say, "A little here and a little there is nice, but given the crisis kind of situation we sense ourselves in now, what the government should really be looking at is making sure that there's a real freeze." I wonder whether there's been any consideration or study of that idea, whether there's any precedent for supporting something like that — not a permanent interference in the whole area of input costs but a freeze on input costs as a crisis support step.

One area I don't think the minister responded to, Mr. Chairman, was particularly about the comments I made on research. I expressed a concern earlier about the fact that research seems to be on a year-by-year basis. Although the Farming for the Future program, for example, has a number of very good projects happening — and I certainly am pleased with a lot of the areas they have research happening in — that program really depends on funding on a yearly basis, a few million dollars each year. I wonder what attention or consideration has been given to the idea of establishing a real foundation in this province, similar to what was done with medical research, where there was a significant one-time endowment made from the heritage fund and, as a result, some stability and some long-range commitment to research established. I wonder how carefully that idea has been looked at in connection with agriculture, given the high priority it has in the economics of this province.

Also, in talking about the long-term protection of the environment and particularly of our soil resource, I wonder if the minister could take a moment to tell us a little bit about what's happening as far as Alberta Agriculture's consideration of the Environment Council of Alberta report, which made about 26 or 27 recommendations to protect the land base in this province. There could be very quick action on some of them, and some of them are longer term ones. I wonder what Alberta Agriculture is doing with that particular report.

I'd also appreciate the minister's taking a few more minutes — I know he spent a lot of time in the last week talking about sugar beets in question period. I guess the over-riding question I still have for the minister is: given the situation we have and even his recognition earlier this morning that there is, in fact, a possibility that there won't be a sugar beet crop in this province if something doesn't happen very quickly, why is he not willing to intervene? I accept his comments about leaving the producers with some integrity and that it's in their hands to make decisions. But when it is agreed by all of us that it is such a critical moment and that days or even hours, as he said this morning, could make a difference, could he tell us whether there's still a case for that? I've heard him say now that he doesn't intend to. I wonder if we could know why.

Another area I'd like to pursue with the minister is the whole area of government participation in information campaigns. In asking questions about the tension between Gainers and the Pork Producers' Marketing Board, I know the minister has responded a little on the government's not having any intention to be involved in that area. But, for example, I was rereading some of the articles from about February this winter that appeared in the Toronto press and then were carried across the country, about farmers having incomes twice the average Canadian income. People talk about those things, and people in an urban context are affected by that information when it appears in the press.

I wonder if the minister could share a bit more about why Alberta Agriculture doesn't see that it's important to be involved, not necessarily in competitive advertising but in effective methods of getting out clear information about the realities in the farm economy and the agricultural economy of this province, so that we're not left with people that don't know any better seeing advertisements and headlines, jumping to conclusions, and then being basically negative about any government action that would provide support to agriculture.

I also wonder about an idea that came up at a recent farmers' meeting I attended in Valleyview. The Minister of Transportation attended as well. There was a lot of talk that night about practical ways to provide some help to farmers. One of the things that came up was the idea of extending the fuel subsidy that's now available for farm vehicles to assist vehicles that are trucking agricultural produce. Maybe that would allow Alberta-manufactured agricultural products to be more competitive. I wonder if the minister or his department is talking at all with the Treasurer about the idea of extending that helpful program to also provide support for the trucking of agricultural products in this province.

I wonder if the minister could also take a little time to share with me a bit about the Alberta Grain Commission. I notice that the estimates for it involve an almost 26 percent increase. I'm interested in knowing a little bit more about its activities, particularly its relationship to the Canadian Wheat Board. Does it work in basically a supportive role

of the Wheat Board? Is its role primarily to be critical there? Just how do the two associate with each other?

There was one other area that I hadn't raised earlier but would be interested in the minister's comment on. Perhaps it's too early to say anything, but he may have some idea. That is, is there any picture developing yet of what may happen as far as unseeded acreage in the province this year? Is that going to increase? Also, with seeded acreage is there any indication yet whether there will be an increase this year in uncleaned seed being used? Will there be more acres seeded with unclean seed? Is there any kind of trend there? Was there more unseeded acreage last year than the year before that? Certainly, with the difficulty of input costs, if people are going to have to look at higher costs for chemicals because of increasing weed problems, we've got a new problem instead of a solution. So those are some areas.

One final point, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the fertilizer rebate. A couple of times other members have asked the minister if he was getting any clear picture in his monitoring program of what is happening as far as price increases. Now that we've had a little longer time and the question hasn't been asked for awhile, I wonder if there's any information available in that area. Also, seeing price increases and some of the other things that have happened in the wake of the fertilizer rebate program that was announced earlier this spring, are there any other concerns developing about the fertilizer industry in the province? Is there any investigation of other aspects of the fertilizer industry to see whether or not it's operating in the most supportive way to the overall agricultural community?

As I said at the outset, I appreciate all the information I received and would like to have the minister bear with me in responding to some of those areas as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to respond. The first area was the home design branch. I know the hon. member has a very great interest in that. I understand that he himself has a home design that's basically energy-efficient and that he has done a number of things with it, so I can appreciate that. I said before that if you look after the pennies, the dollars look after themselves. We had to look at where we thought we could reduce to try to help with the critical situations some farmers are in. That was one area that was reduced to some degree. The book isn't closed; the design branch is still there. If we feel there is a demand, certainly I'll look at reassessing it for the next year. Our only reason for having the Department of Agriculture in this province is to serve producers, so we want to do all we can in the best way we can.

Looking at a temporary freeze on input costs, I don't know how we would do that. Basically, we could look at the farm fuel distribution allowance as one area and the fertilizer program as another. I don't know what other areas we could be involved in. I'm certainly interested in looking at all of them, because the input costs are important. There's a lot of focus on input costs today, and the reason is that the price for what we sell is too low. I think we have to be even more aggressive in the marketplace. If we got the price up a little bit, we could stand a little more input cost. Hopefully, the effort in Japan and putting an agricultural person in the Tokyo office will increase the prices a little bit. That's where research into new types of products we can grow comes in. We're trying to look at every benefit we can for the producers.

Anything on input costs is something we have — I'm really looking critically at all areas where we can be involved. If members have areas we can look at, I'm certainly prepared to look at them. Research is one I really feel strongly about, because I think it gives an added benefit to everyone. We certainly haven't reduced our efforts in research. Some people thought we did, because we took some of the projects out of Farming for the Future and put them into the department. Farming for the Future was really designed as short-term projects that would have some immediate impact. We moved the longer term research projects that have to be going on and on over to the department budget so they could be funded from there on a longer term and not take money from Farming for the Future that could be used in other areas. So there's no real reduction; in fact, we're looking at an increase in research.

I think there should be even more. There should be a better co-ordination of research, a better dissemination of it to people. It doesn't do any good if it sits on the shelf. Research is only good if it's put to some use, so we're looking at ways we can improve getting that research transferred from the researcher to the farmer. We have a high priority on that area. We're looking at all options.

I think there are some exciting new possibilities with computers, and I'd like to see more dollars for a number of things in that scenario. I have to work harder this next year to convince some of my colleagues that maybe we should have more dollars in computers — not that it will solve all our problems, but it certainly will help.

The ECA report is being assessed at the moment. I'm pleased that the hearings were held. There are some exciting possibilities there. We'd already made some movement in the department in some of the areas by reorganizing and putting that increased emphasis on land, soil, and water, our basic resources. I think some of the options that were looked at are exciting. I'm now working with my cabinet colleagues on an assessment of how we handle that report and where we go from here. I can't be too definitive now, because I'm only one department that is involved.

On the question of why I won't get involved in intervening in sugar beets, I don't know how I would do that. You have a private company with shareholders on one side that's negotiating with farmers on the other side. I don't want to be the meat in a sandwich. I think putting the \$10 per field tonne on the table to make the negotiations meaningful and being of assistance to them in any way I can is the right role. I don't know what I would do if I got involved in it. If I thought there was some way it would be helpful, I would, but I just can't see how I could do that.

My executive assistant just gave me a note saying that the producers are now planting sugar beets. There's no estimate as yet of how many acres, but it's mostly on the farms in the Taber area. I don't know what that means. I don't know how the contracts are signed or anything. But if the sugar factory has said it's going to stay open, if beets are being planted and negotiations are taking place, reasonable people being reasonable with each other should be able to come to a satisfactory solution; at least I hope so.

On the information campaigns, I understand what the member is talking about. I don't think urban Alberta, 77 percent of the population of this province, understands agriculture. They see ads that are negative to agriculture, and I don't like it. I think it creates concerns. I'm now looking at putting together a brochure that will explain clearly to people the impact agriculture has on them in

urban Alberta. I don't know how I'm going to do it yet. It's just a thought. I think I'll get it done outside somehow; I'm not quite sure. It would be something they could slip in their pocket, that they could have in their mailbox. They would know that one out of three Albertans is in some way involved in agriculture. If we eat, we're all involved. I think we can do something in those areas. But I don't want to get involved in a campaign to counteract what somebody else is saying. That's a game I don't want to play.

Looking for a new freight on agricultural products is a concern we have, because we don't have a seaport at Banff. We have to look at the freight component as a very major one. The Minister of Economic Development and I have been working on that — mostly him; I've been helping him with it. I think we can make some progress.

On the unseeded acreage, I don't know yet. I'll be happy to find out and report that to the hon. member. I'm not sure what that is. As far as uncleaned seed being used, that really concerns me. That's why we have our seed plant program, and we encourage people to use clean seed. We have been relatively effective in doing that, but I have some concern about uncleaned seed still being used. I'll dig up that information next week and have it for the hon. member.

The fertilizer price increases have been worrisome to some degree. We had significant discounts last fall because people weren't buying fertilizer, and then they brought the price back up. I'm really concerned about that price staying at a reasonable level. I think it's high to start with, and with the increases now it looks as if they're trying to grab onto our rebate. I don't want that to happen, and that's why I have increased the monitoring. I'm going to discuss with Unifarm how they, too, can monitor and let me know if there are some problems, so we can keep on top of them and have a talk with somebody if they're getting out of control. Working with the plants, recognizing that they're world-scale plants, and looking at the whole area of fertilizer and how we can be more effective and efficient for our producers is something I have a deep interest in myself and will continue to work on.

I believe that answers most of the questions, Mr. Chairman.

Agreed to:

1.1.1 — Minister's Office	\$250,798
1.1.2 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$178,719
1.1.3 — Surface Rights Board	\$1,624,438
1.1.4 — Farmers' Advocate	\$299,000
1.1.5 — Financial Services	\$1,742,507
1.1.6 — Personnel	\$653,330
1.1.7 — Communications	\$2,763,707
1.1.8 — Director — Departmental Services	\$252,181
1.1.9 — Computer Services	\$2,852,943
1.1.10 — Library	\$344,447
Total Vote 1.1 — Central Support Services	\$10,962,070
1.2.1 — Assistant Deputy Minister — Planning and Economics	\$158,488
1.2.2 — Planning Secretariat	\$937,882
1.2.3 — Director — Economic Services	\$417,373
1.2.4 — Market Analysis	\$718,184
1.2.5 — Statistics	\$405,767
1.2.6 — Production Economics	\$515,651
1.2.7 — Farm Business Management	\$961,991

1.2.8 — Resource Economics	\$204,969
1.2.9 — Alberta Grain Commission	\$243,924
Total Vote 12 — Planning and Economic	
Services	\$4,564,229
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support	
Services	\$15,526,299
2.1 — Program Support	\$115,700
2.2 — Animal Products	\$10,211,317
2.3 — Animal Health	\$8,463,886
2.4 — Plant Products	\$13,049,568
Total Vote 2 — Production Assistance	\$31,840,471
3.1 — Program Support	\$198,005
3.2 — Marketing Services	\$11,904,312
3.3 — Market Development	\$2,624,678
Total Vote 3 — Marketing Assistance	\$14,726,995
4.1 — Program Support	\$168,352
4.2 — Advisory Services	\$12,293,806
4.3 — Home Economics and 4-H	\$6,465,639
4.4 — Rural Services	\$12,101,652
4.5 — Farm Financial Management	
Services	\$2,549,060
Total Vote 4 — Field Services	\$33,578,509
5.1 — Program Support	\$175,846
5.2 — Research	\$4,454,587
5.3 — Land Use Planning	\$3,116,070
5.4 — Soil and Water Management	\$4,686,417
Total Vote 5 — Research and Resource	
Development	\$12,432,920
Total Vote 6 — Financing of Alberta	
Grain Terminals	—
Total Vote 7 — Hail and Crop Insurance	
Assistance	\$10,262,638
Total Vote 8 — Agricultural Development	
Lending Assistance	\$101,521,000
Department Total	\$219,888,832

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

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolutions and reports as follows:

Be it 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 Solicitor General: \$7,758,700 for departmental support services, \$107,605,400 for correctional services, \$92,386,900 for law enforcement, \$25,790,500 for motor vehicle registration and driver licensing, \$3,822,600 for control and development of horse racing.

The Department of Agriculture: \$15,526,299 for departmental support services, \$31,840,471 for production assistance, \$14,726,995 for marketing assistance, \$33,578,509 for field services, \$12,432,920 for research and resource development, \$10,262,638 for hail and crop insurance assistance, \$101,521,000 for agricultural development lending assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: I have some concern about our proceedings at this time. I realize one shouldn't become too exercised about, perhaps, trifles. But it's very plain that the clock has passed 1 o'clock and that a committee does not have authority to stop the clock unless delegated by the House. I therefore respectfully suggest that an hon. member might wish to propose a motion that the clock be deemed to have been stopped at 1 o'clock.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I so move.

MR. SPEAKER: Do the members agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report by the hon. Acting Deputy Chairman of the Committee of Supply and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it's proposed that the Assembly sit Monday evening. Government business for the afternoon will be Committee of Supply for the Department of Manpower and in the evening Committee of Supply for the Department of Utilities and Telecommunications.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a motion for adjournment, the clock having been stopped?

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

MR. SPEAKER: I wish.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'll try again. I move the Assembly now adjourn until Monday at 2:30 in the afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Do the members agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 1:05 p.m., the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]

