

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Monday, May 7, 1990 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 90/05/07

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **Prayers**

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

At the beginning of this week we ask You, Father, to renew and strengthen in us the awareness of our duty and privilege as members of this Legislature.

We ask You also in Your divine providence to bless and protect the Assembly and the province we are elected to serve. Amen.

head: **Introduction of Bills**

**Bill 284**

**Code of Ethics and Conduct Act**

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to introduce Bill 284, the Code of Ethics and Conduct Act.

This Bill would define real and apparent conflicts of interest and govern business inside the Assembly, outside it, and when no longer in office. Section 24 would amend the Alberta Energy Company Act so members would be prohibited from voting if shareholders. A conflict of interest commissioner would be established as an officer of the Legislature similar to the Auditor General, Ombudsman, and Chief Electoral Officer. Finally, Mr. Speaker, penalties for violating the Act include fines of up to \$10,000 and disqualification from the Assembly or public office for up to seven years.

[Leave granted; Bill 284 read a first time]

head: **Introduction of Special Guests**

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you notice the red shirts in the gallery today, and the shirts are the uniforms of a very fine youth organization. These are the Junior Forest Wardens, who are today represented by the Bauer family. I'm sure you also notice that Bertie Beaver is also in the gallery, and he's a symbol of the Alberta Forest Service. The Bauer family is a Junior Forest Warden family, and Mrs. Bauer is a representative of more than 700 volunteers who support the Junior Forest Warden program, a program which will celebrate its 30th anniversary here in Alberta and its 60th anniversary in Canada. There are 118 Junior Forest Warden clubs operating in 85 different communities in the province in total. There are some 3,500 Junior Forest Wardens, age 6 to 18, who are involved in learning, understanding, and appreciation of the forest environment. This week, National Forest Week, the Junior Forest Wardens have left on every member's desk a practical gift to remind you of the excellent program of forestry week. Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Bauer family and Bertie Beaver to rise and receive the warm welcome and appreciation of the members.

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly a number of students from the New Norway school: 24 members escorted by their teacher Darryl Nielsen and by parents Mr. Dale Enarson, Mrs. Wendy Sonnenberg, and Mrs. Louise Crandall. I'd ask that they all stand in the members' gallery and receive the traditional welcome from the Assembly.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you and the other members of the Assembly this afternoon some 48 young students from Weinlos elementary school in the constituency of Edmonton-Mill Woods. They're accompanied today by their teachers Mr. Glen Sharpies and Mr. Bob Foo, as well as parents Mrs. Rolls and Mrs. Harris. I'd ask them to now stand and receive the warm welcome of the members of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Calder.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly a group of social workers from local 6. They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **Oral Question Period**

**Social Workers' Strike**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour, and it flows from Friday in question period. I quote from *Hansard*. The Minister of Labour said:

The International Labour Organisation says . . . if there is no strike legislation, then you must have compulsory arbitration as a process to balance. We have that, and [it] is a fair process.

And it does work, Mr. Speaker. Let me say this does work.

Well, I found that interesting. I've now got in front of me the ILO report, and it's not quite the same as the minister said. Surprise, surprise. Section 48(2) they're talking about specifically, Mr. Speaker.

The committee hopes that provisions such as these which have undermined the union's confidence in the arbitration system – which are meant to compensate the employees concerned for the lack of the right to strike – will be reconsidered in consultation with the parties and appropriate amendments made with a view to enabling arbitrators to examine all matters in dispute.

My question to the Minister of Labour: why did the minister so deliberately distort the ILO's position last Friday?

MS McCOY: Well, Mr. Speaker, as we're talking about the labour legislation in Alberta, we have to keep in mind the reasons behind it. There are balances. Always when you have two parties at the table, there is a third party at the table, and that is the public. One always has to maintain the public interest. In that regard, when the government is at the table as manager with its employees, we have looked at maintaining the services to the public where they can get them nowhere else. In this instance they can go nowhere else for the help they need. In that regard we have said, therefore, that we will maintain the services as essential services, but we will put in collective bargaining procedures.

Interestingly enough, I recently went back to the debates in this Legislature when in fact the Bill that we're talking about now as law was debated. That was one of the main points that was made then. It's a question of balancing the public interest as a whole with the interests of a few very important people, in this instance the social workers, 80 percent of whom are employed in this province.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that across Canada, in the 10 provinces, five provinces have no-strike legislation, five provinces have legislation that permits their civil servants to go on strike. Two of the provinces that do allow their civil servants to go on strike are B.C. and Saskatchewan. In comparing the lot of social workers in B.C. and Saskatchewan to that of Alberta, we find that in fact the salaries are more or less on par, and, in fact, although you can take averages in places in here, by and large the caseloads are about the same as well. So I would say that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. We're going to have some more questions, obviously.

The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the minister conveniently skirted around. She said on Friday very clearly that the ILO had said that these were fair and just laws. I quoted it to her. They didn't say that. What they said: if you're not going to have the right to strike, then you have to have the right to fair arbitration. We do not. I want to ask that minister: dealing with caseloads and organization of work, how can she say it's fair when they don't even have the right to negotiate their working conditions?

MS McCOY: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, in comparing as to whether our legislation works or doesn't work with the process that we have, I think to compare our situation with B.C. and Saskatchewan is a fair comparison because they have a different process than we do. In fact, the results here are comparable to the results in the other two provinces. So we do have a fair process, and we do have one that works. That supports my statement on Friday.

I might also point out, Mr. Speaker, that it was us who put the caseloads on the negotiating table. We said right from day one that that is a key issue in the discussions. What turned out later to be a dispute – we put a mechanism to resolve that situation on the table from day one. It wasn't until a few days before the social workers illegally walked off the job that they in fact put a counterproposal on the table. I want to put out that they did put a counterproposal on, a task force which would resolve these caseload measures. We said: "Terrific. Great. Now, because there's some differences of opinion as to how this mechanism would work, let's get down to fine details and come to an agreement as to how that mechanism would work." At that point they said, "No, we're walking off." We then said, "Let's get a mediator in here, because we want to settle the caseload issues." They said, "We don't want any mediation." We have from the beginning wanted to negotiate with the social workers that very key issue called caseloads. So far they have not done so.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, they have to have a proposal before there's mediation. It doesn't make any sense.

In terms of the board – you've had how many studies? You have a warehouse full of studies about caseloads, Mr. Speaker. To this minister: is it not the case that what the union wanted

was that it would have some clout and that they would have time and that they would follow some of the recommendations, and the government didn't want to give them any power? They're just going to have another study. Isn't that the truth, Ms Minister?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, there were two proposals on the table: one that we had put there from day one, one that the social workers put there on the last day. Never in negotiations when you open up – very rarely do you open up with the same proposal. There were questions of details that had not been debated, but they walked off. They walked off their jobs. They walked away from the table. They refused mediation. We never had a chance to come to some of those details, to get some form of mechanism that would resolve the question. But from the beginning we have said: "We want to have a negotiation regarding the caseloads. The social workers must be part of the solution to that question." We're still saying that to this day. We're still at the table hoping they will come back.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

### Public Service Contract Negotiations

MR. MARTIN: Yes. I'd like to direct my second question to the same minister, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, they have to be part of the solutions – that's why they want to negotiate it – and part of the arbitration process. That's my point, Mr. Speaker. It's going to get worse. It looks like it's going to get worse, because if the province's nurses and social workers aren't enough proof that Alberta's labour laws for public service are regressive and wrong and not working, then maybe the brewing trouble with the province's corrections workers will prove to be the straw that breaks this government's back.

Local 3 of the Union of Provincial Employees has been trying since January to negotiate a new contract with the government. The major issue in this case is pensions, but the problem is the very same again, Mr. Speaker. These ridiculous labour laws are stacked in the government's favour, so now we're going to have possibly more provincial employees resorting to walking off the job as early as this week. These are the labour laws you're talking about working? My question to the minister: now that it seems possible that we could be adding local 3 to the list that already has social workers on it, is the Minister of Labour still going to go on with this charade and stick to her line that there's nothing wrong with this government's labour laws?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, how can we negotiate with subsidiary 3, the correctional workers, when the president of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees arbitrarily suspended negotiations on all 11 subsidiaries in addition to subsidiary 6, which is the social workers? How could we have progressed any further in that in the last few days?

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, – and I'm very pleased to hear that she has done that – the president today wrote a letter, which we received, to the Public Service Commissioner suggesting that in fact she remove that artificial suspension for both subsidiary 3 and subsidiary 10. We have responded to her in writing and said that we welcome that, and we have also suggested, in fact, that we immediately return to bargaining for subsidiary 1, which is administrative and support services, and subsidiary 8, educational services, and would in fact hope that she come back to the table immediately for the other seven subsidiaries.

MR. MARTIN: Again the minister misses the total point. There's none so blind as those who will not see, Mr. Speaker, because you're dealing with precisely the same problem again. Under Section 48(2), under the arbitration that the minister says is fair, they can't deal with the organization of work, like the social workers dealing with caseloads, and under there it says "(d) pensions". They can't even negotiate. Will the minister now admit that that's the problem, that you can't have serious negotiations if the government doesn't have to even negotiate these issues?

MS McCOY: There is no law – let me say this again. There is no law in Alberta that says you cannot negotiate these matters, and in fact we are negotiating, or attempting to negotiate, a mechanism for caseloads with the social workers. We want them to be part of the solution. As to the other negotiations, how can we negotiate if the president of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees arbitrarily suspends all across the board for all the employees who are not involved in this illegal walkout?

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, when the minister stands up . . . I have it right in front of me. Section 48(2) says clearly, "the organization of work, the assignment of duties and the determination of the number of employees of an employer . . . pensions": almost everything. They can't go to an arbitration board with that. What it really says is that the government can do whatever they want in negotiations. Now, if you have one side with all the clout, how do you think you're ever going to get people to the bargaining table?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I think the opposition leader has confused negotiation with arbitration.

### **Social Workers' Strike** (continued)

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the minister responsible for social services.

MR. SPEAKER: Family and Social Services.

MR. DECORE: The Minister of Labour has quite correctly identified the key issue in this strike as the issue of casework overload. The minister of social services has even agreed on a number of occasions that there is overload. The government and the social workers went through a five-year process, a joint consultative process, a committee looking at this issue of casework overload. But over five years – in fact, over two decades – nothing has been done to alleviate that problem of casework overload. Now, my first question to the minister is this: given that this is the key issue and given the likelihood of great difficulty ensuing when the courts again revisit this matter today and given the fact that the minister of social services agreed to consider using a special resource person in the dean of the Faculty of Social Work from the University of Calgary, would the minister confirm today that he would agree to set aside the need for a strike, call upon this special resource person, that the ministry has used, call on him to resolve this issue of casework overload and end the strike today?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, no one individual is going to be able to resolve the caseload situation. But I do want to correct some of the comments made by the leader of the Liberal Party.

He began by saying that nothing is being done about caseload, and nothing could be further from the truth. We have taken a number of steps in recent years to address caseload, and I want to again outline some of those initiatives for the benefit of this Assembly, because I want them to be very clear. When it relates to income security, if you go back, in the past six years our caseload has increased by 28,970, which is about a 52 percent increase. At the same time, our staffing has increased from 716 full-time equivalents to 1,132 full-time equivalents for a 58 percent increase. So our staff is growing at a faster rate than our caseload.

But further to that, Mr. Speaker, on the income security side we've also implemented a differential use of staff. Initially it was piloted in a number of our offices, and it's now being phased in to all of our offices. We haven't been able to do it as quickly as we'd like, but again we've taken substantive steps in implementing these new initiatives combined with new automation. I've had a chance to speak to front-line workers who have been a part of this. They tell me that it's made a vast difference in their offices and that the process is working.

I'd also want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in '86-87 average cases per staff, 119.9; in '89-90 average cases per staff is down to 90.7. On the child welfare side, again a number of initiatives. My department tells me they're very close to presenting a caseload model for my approval and for implementation. It's regrettable that we've had these interruptions, but I want to point out again the initiatives there and the steps that we have taken. Caseload is down: May of '89, 9,900; February of '90, 8,900; a 10 percent decrease in terms of child welfare caseload and face-to-face investigations.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Perhaps we can hear more.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, I've just been handed a note indicating that the courts have imposed a 45-day no-picketing injunction. My question to the minister is this. It seems to me that there is a serious lack of faith on the part of the social workers, the government workers, in not believing that this casework overload is going to be solved. Now, it's my understanding, Mr. Minister, that a special internal investigation was held, agreeing and seeing that there was this casework overload and setting certain capping limits. The question is: will the minister agree to impose those capping limits that have been set by an internal investigation so as to at least show good faith to the other side on this issue now?

MR. OLDRING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to re-emphasize that we are anxious to see this issue resolved. But again I have to challenge his preamble. I didn't quite have the opportunity of finalizing my comment as it relates to the child welfare side, and I'd want to point out that our average in Alberta today provincewide is between 29 and 30 cases per worker. Now, we recognize that in the city of Edmonton it's 40, so obviously there are some inequities in the system, and we need to address that. We know that in the Calgary region it's just under 25. We know that in terms of our provincial average it compares well with other provinces, with Ontario and B.C. also around 30. We also know that the Child Welfare League of America – a very well respected organization by professionals – recommends a caseload of between 25 to 35, so we're within their standards on a provincewide basis.

But yes, there are some inequities within the system. Yes, we want to resolve it. Yes, we've put forward one recommendation on the negotiating table. If social workers will come back to work and if social workers will come back to the negotiating table, I am confident these issues will be addressed. They'll continue to be addressed in a very meaningful way, we will continue to make progress, and it can be resolved in the interests of Albertans and in the interests of the workers themselves.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, an injunction has been granted. We've got the other side saying that they refuse to go to work. This is going to be a very, very strained period for the next hours and days. The provincial legislation this House has passed says that there shall be established a special association to look after social workers. That legislation says that they shall determine the code of ethics and work standards for themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: Question, please.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, the representatives from that association just said last week that they cannot live to those standards, so the law is being breached. The social worker law is being breached.

MR. SPEAKER: What's the question, hon. member? This is the third.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, how can the minister condone the breaching of laws on one side and then say, "Well, you're going to have to go to jail or you're going to be fined" on the other? How can it work both ways?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much, hon. member.

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, the minister and this government do not condone the breaking of any laws, and that's why, again, we are so anxious in the interest of those social workers themselves. I know that feelings are running high; I know that emotions are running high. I know that at this time approximately 50 percent of our caseworkers are out and about 50 percent are in, and I know that when we see 100 percent in again, that 100 percent are going to have to be able to get along with each other. So we're anxious in their interest to see this thing resolved. We're anxious to see services returned to those Albertans that rely on them on a day-to-day basis, again thinking of children in our care and seniors and handicapped and others. We're anxious to get on with meaningful dialogue, and it can't happen until social workers go back to work and come back to the negotiating table. I'm confident that if they will, we'll do our part to make sure there are meaningful and fair negotiations at those tables and these issues are addressed in a meaningful and fair way.

MR. SPEAKER: Cardston, followed by Edmonton-Avonmore.

#### **Highways Cleanup Program**

MR. ADY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister of transportation. The department of transportation has had a program in place since 1976 that has involved the 4-H clubs across this province in clearing refuse along the roadsides of our primary highways. This program has had many positive

aspects to it that all of us are aware of; however, we have now experienced two tragic fatal accidents to our young 4-H members while they're carrying out this service and responsibility. The last of these fatalities took place in my constituency and involved a young eight-year-old boy, Spencer Gregson, who resided in the town of Raymond. Could the minister advise what measures he is prepared to take to avoid any further such tragedies as this program is carried out?

MR. ADAIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a very good position, to suggest that we had a loss of a young lad on the 4-H and JFW cleanup campaign of this past Saturday. Young Spencer Gregson, an eight-year-old, was killed in the area just south of Lethbridge. As a result of that death, I have asked the department for the police reports, and I have also indicated to my deputy minister in the department that we will be doing a complete review of all aspects of the program, from the safety aspects to the volunteers who so capably have done a good job along with the parents. A year ago, for example, there were 11,000 young people out on the highway, 4,600 adults working with them. It's a tragedy when something like this occurs. I certainly want to express our condolences to the Gregson family for the loss of their young son.

MR. ADY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Although quite likely the program is almost completed for this year, has the minister considered putting the program on hold until he can come in with a re-evaluation so that we can have a better handle on avoiding such tragedies?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that there are any areas in the province that did not participate on Saturday, but I've instructed the deputy minister that if there are any areas, they be put on hold, that they not proceed from this point on.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Avonmore.

#### **Child Welfare Caseloads**

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are to the Minister of Family and Social Services. We have witnessed a decade of concern about the quality of care for children provided by the department of social services. Cavanagh reviewed child abuse in foster homes, and Thomlison and Porter reviewed cases of foster children who committed suicide, linking their deaths with the failure of the department to provide consistent care and emotional security due to high caseloads. How long will it take this minister to accept his responsibility to protect the children of this province by lowering caseloads?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, I've already commented on the efforts that we are making to reduce caseloads, but again I want to emphasize that it's a complex issue. It's not a simple matter of just continuing to add personnel, and certainly if that's appropriate, we'll do that in some instances. But I can only reiterate what I've said already, and that is that we are committed to reducing those caseloads, that we have made considerable progress since those particular reports have come out and will continue to make progress. But we need to do it not alone, Mr. Speaker; this isn't an issue that government can take on alone. I want to say how encouraged I am in the short time I've been in this particular portfolio to see the way Albertans – community agencies, families, churches, and others – are also

pitching in to respond to these needs. This kind of co-operative effort that I've talked about on many occasions, this kind of joint initiative, is what it's going to take to address this societal problem in a meaningful way. I'll again emphasize that we're going to continue to do our share, that we want to continue to work in partnership with Albertans but also in partnership with caseworkers themselves.

MS M. LAING: Well, Mr. Speaker, the primary responsibility for children in care lies with the minister, and many of the recommendations of the Thomlison and Porter reports with respect to foster children have not been met. Foster children, as we have heard today, are still being shuffled around, and high caseloads mean that social workers still don't have the time to provide the kind of care these children need, require, and deserve. It's clear the system, not social workers – this government, not social workers – is failing children. How does the minister possibly expect Albertans to believe that he will solve the problem of high caseloads now when it has not been solved for over a decade?

MR. OLDRING: Again, Mr. Speaker, I've talked about the progress we're making. I can only reiterate that our commitment has been substantive, that our budget as it relates to this particular area has grown substantively in the last few years and was up again this year. But again I reiterate that we aren't going to do it alone. I'm quite prepared to accept my responsibility, and this government accepts its responsibility. We're going to continue to be leaders, and we're going to continue to make sure we're taking the appropriate steps.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I outlined some of the factual numbers for the benefit of the members earlier in this Assembly. We have made considerable progress in reducing caseloads. We recognize that there's more progress to be made. We recognize there are inequities across the province, and we want to address that. But again, we're not going to do it alone; we need social workers' input on this. We need them to be a part of the solution. We need them at the negotiating table. We need to be able to continue to work with community agencies through programs like FCSS, a very unique program, again something this government has shown leadership on, something that is bringing into the partnership millions of volunteer hours across this province. Again, I'm convinced that Albertans, as is always the case when they see a need, when they identify a need, when they identify a demand – we get together, we pitch in, and we address it.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Edmonton-Whitemud, followed by Lesser Slave Lake.

### **Wild Rose Foundation Japan Trip**

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Because of the lack of accountability of lottery funds to this House and the rather tight-lipped approach by foundation agency and department officials falling under the jurisdiction of the minister responsible for lotteries, this member is forced to ask these questions in this particular manner. The information I have received indicates that the budgeting process for the delegation now in Japan, which includes a member of this House, was rather complex, to use the exact terminology. To the minister responsible for lottery funds. Will the minister indicate to this House: were the dollars for this expenditure earmarked

specifically in the budget of the Wild Rose Foundation, or did the minister channel fresh dollars through the foundation to cover those costs?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, there are some 20 foundations in the province of Alberta which receive global funding for the lottery operations. One of those foundations in our province is the Wild Rose Foundation. The Wild Rose Foundation receives \$5 million a year and has for the last number of years, as an example. The Alberta Sport Council receives \$9.1 million.

Mr. Speaker, in 1989, in negotiations and discussions between the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs department of our government and our sister province in Japan, the province of Hokkaido, officials from the governor's office in Hokkaido indicated that over the next several years there was one point of interest Hokkaido wanted to learn more about, as they had heard about the outstanding volunteer movement we have in our province. They indicated that they would be conveying a letter of invitation to the government of Alberta, and in February-March of this year I received a personal invitation from the office of the governor of the state of Hokkaido asking me to lead a delegation to Hokkaido and talk about the volunteer movement in our province. I'd also mention that in his letter he'd heard about the Wild Rose Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I asked the MLA for Red Deer, who is the chairman of the Premier's Council in Support of Alberta Families, to lead such a mission, and he is accompanied by Mr. Stan Fisher, the executive director of the Wild Rose Foundation. The Wild Rose Foundation gave me three nominees from throughout the province of Alberta: Mrs. Martha Parker, who's the director of the Calgary volunteer centre; Mr. Vern Colley, who's a detective with the Edmonton city police and is well known for his extensive volunteer work with youth organizations; and also accompanying the group is Colleen Kelly, a lady from Red Deer who has had extensive years of volunteer work. The allocation for expenses for this mission will be borne by the Wild Rose Foundation as part of a \$5 million annual allocation they get. There is no special adjustment being made.

As part of a reciprocal agreement, because 1990 is the 10th anniversary of the twinning of Alberta and Hokkaido, in the fall of 1990 the state of Hokkaido will be sending a group back to Alberta. Mr. Speaker, this is part of the positive international relations of the province of Alberta.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the minister responsible for lotteries: would the minister indicate whether the decision to fund the delegation was made independently by the board of the foundation, or was there some direction given by the minister's office that, in fact, a commitment for these dollars should be made to cover these costs?

MR. KOWALSKI: That's a strange question, Mr. Speaker. The board of directors of the Wild Rose Foundation is responsible to the minister responsible for the Wild Rose Foundation, and the minister responsible for the Wild Rose Foundation just happens to be myself. I have periodic meetings with all people I am responsible for, and in the most recent meetings with the Wild Rose Foundation, the foundation indicated to me that it wanted to accept this invitation that was extended to me. I endorsed them to do it, asked them for the volunteers, and the question of payment was never a question that would ever go outside the mandate of the Wild Rose Foundation. The foundation has a chairman, has a number of public appointees

throughout the province. All budgeting aspects of the foundation are reviewed by Alberta's Auditor General, and in fact the most recent publication of public accounts has a complete review of it by the Auditor General. It's one of the outstanding organizations we have in our province. The Wild Rose Foundation has not only gained national attention; it's gained attention in North America, and I'm pleased to report that the rest of the world now understands the importance of the volunteer movement in our province. I'm just delighted that our . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. Thank you.  
Lesser Slave Lake, followed by Edmonton-Jasper Place.

### Forest Management

MS CALAHASEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife. Seeing that this is National Forest Week – and it was really nice to see Bertie Beaver and the Junior Forest Wardens up there – I cannot help but stress the importance . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: It made me feel good too.

MS CALAHASEN: Some of us did have a childhood.

I cannot help but stress the importance forestry projects are playing in diversifying our economy, particularly in northern Alberta. As most of my colleagues can attest, unemployment and welfare are unacceptably high, Mr. Speaker, and economic development is one way to be able to reduce caseloads. We must ensure that all projects are decided so that these economic disparities are used in decision-making. What initiatives is this government providing to ensure proper planning and allocation of our forests is occurring?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, that is a very important question when you consider that what we're looking at is that diversification really means stability and security for a long term not only for communities and those jobs and the security that brings but for the forest resource itself. So tied in with that, of course, it's very important to look at forest management planning and the public process, which I'll be announcing soon, as well as the research component that will have to be enhanced and improved, as well as working with the companies even closer to make sure the standards of reforestation are the highest anywhere in the world and will protect our forests for the long-term future.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Lesser Slave Lake.

MS CALAHASEN: Thank you. Some of my communities are very interested in silviculture, as the minister knows. With the new free-to-grow standard – which I think you've just sort of looked at in terms of reforestation – having been brought into effect May 1, a standard which is supposed to address reforestation in a number of ways . . . However, there's very little information about this particular initiative in the public eye. Would the minister elaborate how the standard will address reforestation needs either in the seedling capability or in the facility capabilities for the future?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, what "free to grow" really means is just that: it's free to grow; it's free from the competi-

tion around it. In the reforestation they do, all forest companies will have to meet this new standard, which is a tough standard. There are some companies that don't like having to meet that very high standard that put us at the forefront, frankly, of reforestation practices in the world.

But with that comes the need for more improved genetics, more seedling capacity. So we're expanding the tree nursery at Smoky Lake, and we're also looking at a container facility somewhere in northwestern Alberta to make sure the free-to-grow standard, the genetic quality of the seed, and the standards each company meets protect that forest for the long-term future.

### Environmental Laws Enforcement

MR. McINNIS: The Minister of the Environment indicated recently that his department had issued more than 2,000 letters of permission for the nonroutine discharge of liquid effluents over the past two years. The existence of these letters of permission make the environmental laws and standards in Alberta virtually meaningless. It's like having a permit to ignore the speed limit or ignore drunk driving laws. I wonder if the minister would indicate what gives his government the moral authority to issue letters which allow big companies and others to treat the law as if it doesn't exist while it throws the book at social workers who stand up for the poor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of the Environment.

MR. KLEIN: Is the question to the minister responsible for social workers or me?

MR. FOX: You.

MR. MARTIN: He said "the Minister of the Environment."

MR. FOX: You're the one that lets them pollute. You're the one that lets them break the law.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, if I indicated 2,000 letters had gone out, I think that needs to be clarified somewhat. There are 2,000 outlets, if you will, in the province that over a period of time could have received letters of permission. These could be small municipal sewerage systems; they could be large sewerage treatment systems, such as the city of Edmonton. It could be any industrial outlet.

One of the problems in answering the hon. member's question is that it would result in an administrative nightmare to go back and trace all these letters, to write all the companies, and to find out for what . . . In some cases the situations were more profound than other situations. It would have been an administrative nightmare, Mr. Speaker, to get that information.

I advise the hon. member that if he had a specific instance or a specific case, let me know and we will do our best to get him the answer.

MR. McINNIS: I believe this minister is becoming an administrative nightmare. He doesn't know how many letters have been issued over the last two years? The minister did take a strong stance in saying that the public has no right to have access to that information. I wonder if the minister can now understand why people feel violated when the government allows

these nonroutine discharges and won't even inform them of it after the fact. Does he understand the feeling in that regard?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, you know, as usual the hon. member is being totally unreasonable and somewhat outrageous. From time to time things occur in this society that require a variance. For instance, in the city of Edmonton, because of a combined system that allows storm sewerage to mix with sanitary sewerage, we are required to give the city of Edmonton a letter of permission to, unfortunately, dump into the North Saskatchewan River so all this crud and crap won't back up and create a great inconvenience for the people of this city, including the hon. member's basement.

MR. SPEAKER: Ordinarily the Chair would have ruled one of those words out of order, but since it was descriptive of what actually goes into the river, I let it pass.

Calgary-McKnight, followed by Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

### English as a Second Language Funding

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An increasing number of students from Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Europe are arriving in Alberta schools on a daily basis throughout the school year, especially in the two major cities, although this is certainly a rural phenomena as well. These students are sometimes illiterate in their own language and desperately need five to eight years of English as a Second Language training if they are to succeed and compete in our province. Yet the Department of Education's policy is to provide funding only for those who are registered on September 30 and then only for three years. At a recent MLA/trustee meeting in Calgary, a trustee from Three Hills made an impassioned and convincing plea for a change to the ESL funding, a suggestion I've made before as well. My question is to the Minister of Education. Will the minister implement immediately a policy of two funding dates per school year for ESL so that all students in the program get funding?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct. The school boards receive \$639 extra for each and every English as a Second Language student that's enrolled in the school system as of September 30 of any given year. That's \$639 each year for three consecutive years. That's over and above the base funding the provincial government provides to all school boards across the province. I believe that goes quite a distance to meeting the needs of those young people, but I am certainly open to hearing from school boards about the two dates per year on which funding might be provided.

MRS. GAGNON: That is a very hopeful answer, Mr. Speaker. I know many school boards will be pleased to hear that the minister is open to that. Will the minister also consider increasing the grant from a maximum of three years per student to five years per student?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I'm not entirely convinced that the responsibility lies solely in the school system. There are other agencies within the community that must take on this responsibility as new families with young children move into our communities across the province. I think it's something that all agencies, including other government departments, must take a

careful look at, and it's something I will be recommending to my colleagues in Treasury Board as a program that is definitely needing review, not just for students in the school system but for all Albertans, all new Canadians, who are wanting or needing English as a Second Language as a program.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, I want to supplement that, if I may, sir. I would like it to be known – because I think it's very important that the hon. member raised it – that we in career development are also assisting with some \$6 million-plus within the overall program. I appreciate the representation that's been made, and I'll work with my colleague as well to see that those programs are in place.

### Oldman River Dam

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. The 25,000-member organization of the Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists, and Geophysicists of Alberta is responsible for the regulation and control of the practice of engineering, geology, and geophysics in the province of Alberta. In advertisements in daily newspapers across the province, they've expressed concern with proposals to shut down the construction of the Oldman River dam, which is currently 70 percent complete, because of their concern for safety and well-being of the public and the environment. They have stated that

prolonged use of temporary facilities is an unsafe substitute for long term river management, and does not conform to sound engineering practice.

And APEGGA states that

in the interest of public safety and protection of the environment, this Association strongly recommends that construction of the [Oldman River] dam and spillways should proceed to completion without delay.

My question to the minister is: has he had the opportunity to review this advertisement and respond to it?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, this advertisement, as I understand, was placed in daily newspapers in the province of Alberta over this past weekend. I'm certainly aware of the advertisement; I read it this morning. I haven't responded to it. Perhaps I might do that now publicly.

Over the past year or year and a half there have been numerous groups in the province of Alberta who have basically indicated to me that they wanted to know from me if it was important to take out paid advertisements pointing out their message of support for the Oldman River dam. APEGGA was not one of those groups that ever talked to me about this. I guess it's the result of the frustration of those people who are proponents of and supportive of the Oldman River dam. They would view the almost one-sided coverage that exists with respect to this project, and their own frustration would take them now to a point where they would want to pay for a message to be placed in a newspaper in support of the Oldman River dam. The coverage in the last year or year and a half has been totally one-sided in favour of those who are opposed to this very important project, and I'm just delighted that the Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists of Alberta point out that "in the interest of public safety and the protection of the environment" we should all work toward a conclusion of the Oldman River dam.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary. Sticking to the business of an advertisement is one thing. We're not discussing the dam because it's sub judice.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the minister was to ask him if he has received any other expressions of support from public organizations or bodies in Alberta with regards to continued completion of the Oldman River dam.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, in the last number of months I've received numerous letters, petitions on behalf of elected councils, organizations such as the Alberta association of municipalities, the irrigation association, totaling well over 400,000 citizens in this province. Numerous councils, the city of Lethbridge, and virtually every municipality south of Calgary have passed a resolution and motion in their own municipal council calling for the continued construction of the Oldman River dam and expressing their complete support, in the interests of protecting and enhancing the environment, that we conclude this project.

head: **Orders of the Day**

head: **Committee of Supply**

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

[applause]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Chair is happy, as is the entire committee, to see the return of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona. Nice to see you, our good friend.

head: **Main Estimates 1990-91**

#### **Solicitor General**

MR. CHAIRMAN: The estimates are to be found at page 301 of the main book with the elements at page 133 in the supplemental book.

The hon. Solicitor General.

MR. FOWLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm particularly pleased to see the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona come in and join us today. I hope I'm as pleased at the end of the day as I am now, but it's so good to see him here.

I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to review the initiatives planned for the 1990-91 fiscal year for each of the votes in the Department of the Solicitor General. However, first of all, I think it important to note that the department will be achieving its objectives this year with sound financial management in order to ensure that the resources of the taxpayers are prudently and efficiently allocated in a manner reflecting the priorities of this government.

Vote 1, Departmental Support Services, includes funding for my office, the deputy minister's office, and the various support services such as personnel, finance, corporate services, and computer services. The increase from the previous fiscal year is 14 percent, which reflects my commitment to the control of expenditures in non-service delivery areas.

Vote 2, Correctional Services, includes a request for \$115,911,100, which represents a 3.1 percent increase over the 1989-90 figure. This moderate increase will allow my depart-

ment to continue to be a leader in Canada with respect to delivery of correctional services. Over the past five years the government has completed a program of upgrading and replacement of correctional, remand, and young offender centres. The program has ensured that the province will have a series of humane, secure facilities which provide for superior public safety, offender programs, and positive working conditions for staff. The final element in this program of facility upgrading and replacement will commence this year with the construction of a new remand facility in Calgary. This facility will take the burden off the existing remand centre in downtown Calgary. In particular it will provide for enhanced accommodation for female remanded prisoners and prisoners from the Calgary area with mental health problems. I am confident that with the addition of the new facility and the retrofitting of the existing Calgary Remand Centre, needs of the Calgary area with respect to the detention of remanded prisoners will be well served. I appreciate the support provided by the Calgary caucus members respecting this important initiative.

Mr. Chairman, my department is boldly moving forward to address the situation with respect to the numbers of native people within our adult and young offenders. The department is working closely with native reserves and native agencies to ensure that there is more direct involvement by native people and native communities in the planning and delivery of correctional services for native offenders.

This past year the Blood tribe, through the Kainai Community Corrections Society, assumed responsibility for the delivery of community correctional services to its members. During the current fiscal year the society will begin operation of a community correctional centre on the reserve. Discussions are also under way with the Peigan nation and the Yellowhead Tribal Council, as well as with other native bands and organizations, with respect to the increased involvement of the native community in the delivery of correctional services to their people. I'm also pleased to advise that my department is moving ahead with the development of an adolescent substance abuse treatment program for young offenders at the site of the existing St. Paul Correctional Centre. This facility will provide much-needed programs for youth primarily of native origin who suffer from alcohol or drug abuse. It is my intention to have the facility operated by Poundmaker's Lodge, a highly reputable native organization which has considerable experience in the delivery of residential substance abuse treatment programs. Planning for the new program is well advanced and should be operational by September 1990. Initiatives of this nature, along with the work currently being done by the task force on the treatment of natives by the criminal justice system, will hopefully in time help lead to significant reductions in the numbers of native people in custody.

I remain concerned at the number of young offenders in custody and, in particular, at the number of young offenders remanded into custody. Our statistics show that a high number of young offenders remanded into custody are often not sentenced to periods of custody. This indicates that a number of these young offenders are being remanded into custody not because of the seriousness of their offence but due to the fact that a suitable placement for them in the community cannot be found. My department will be piloting an intervention program where departmental staff will be working directly with police to attempt to place young people in suitable homes at the time of arrest. I am hopeful that this program, if successful, can be expanded throughout the province and will contribute to

reducing the number of young offenders that are being remanded into custody.

Vote 3, Law Enforcement. This vote consists primarily of municipal police assistance grants in the amounts of \$31.7 million and \$72.6 million required to fund the provincial policing by the RCMP, pursuant to the policing agreement with the federal government. I am pleased to announce that the RCMP provincial policing budget has been increased by 12 percent for the 1990-91 fiscal year. This increase reflects the government's commitment to ensuring that the policing needs of rural Alberta are fully met. Police grants for municipalities have been increased by 3 percent for 1991.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to announce that legislation will be presented during this session of the Legislature to establish a victim service assistance program in Alberta. This legislation will provide for a mechanism for collecting federal fine surcharge moneys. These funds will be used to support a variety of programs and services for victims which can be delivered by policing services and nongovernment organizations. I am committed to ensuring the availability of service to many Albertans who are victims of crime.

I am also committed to addressing a problem of increasing concern to this government and the people of Alberta, the issue of family violence. My department will be taking a lead role in developing a series of initiatives to support police services. The police are usually the first and often the only agency called upon to intervene in family violence incidents. Therefore, it is imperative that they are able to respond effectively and humanely to these cases. Family violence has historically been viewed as a social problem and a family problem. In fact, Mr. Chairman, it is a criminal act and subject to criminal justice intervention. Any individual who assaults his or her spouse or their children is no less a criminal than an individual who assaults a stranger on the street. A victim of family violence is entitled to protection from ongoing harm or abuse. It is within this context that I will be introducing initiatives to enforce the charging policy outlined by the Attorney General, enhanced police training and education, public awareness, crime prevention, and services to victims.

Improvements with respect to policing in native communities will continue to be a priority during the new fiscal year. My attention will be focused on improving the relationship between the RCMP and native communities as well as in establishing an increased presence of native people in the delivery of police services in native communities. I also intend to place continuing efforts on crime prevention programs in native communities.

Vote 4, Motor Vehicle Registration and Driver Licensing. This vote includes the funding required to provide driver licensing services to Alberta's estimated 1.8 million drivers and 2.2 million vehicles. Also included in this vote is funding for the Driver Control Board, which monitors and manages problem drivers and funding for the administration of the Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Fund. Motor vehicle registration and driver licensing services are delivered through a network of 11 government operated licence issuing offices, 102 driver testing centres, and 163 independently operated licence issuing offices throughout the province. Of the more than four million transactions that resulted from providing services to Alberta motorists in fiscal '89-90, over 1.2 million were provided by independently operated licence issuing offices.

I am pleased to advise that the traffic fines collection program is now fully operational. This program has replaced the old system of issuing a warrant for the nonpayment of fines and has

essentially resulted in the decriminalization of the collection of unpaid fines in our province. Failure to pay outstanding traffic fines will now result in vehicle and driver licensing services being refused until such time as the fines have been paid.

Mr. Chairman, the delivery of motor vehicle registration and driver licensing services in the most efficient and cost-effective manner possible will continue to be an important priority during the '90-91 fiscal year. Emphasis will continue to be placed on the provisions of vehicle registration renewal services by mail. To further improve the efficiency of motor vehicle licence issuing offices, the staggered renewal system has been restructured to more evenly distribute the workload throughout the year. In addition, a voluntary two-year vehicle registration renewal option has been introduced, which not only provides a convenience to owners of private passenger vehicles but also assists in reducing annual workloads within the motor vehicle division.

A year ago a new registration system known as the single application vehicle registration for proportionally registered commercial vehicles was introduced in Alberta as well as throughout the rest of the country. This has greatly simplified the registration process for commercial vehicles operating in more than one jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, there is still an unacceptably high level of motor vehicle accidents on Alberta's highways resulting from driver error. Consequently, I wish to reaffirm my department's commitment to maximizing the safety of our streets and highways through meaningful law enforcement and educational and problem-driver rehabilitation programs. Statistics indicate that the number of drivers aged 55 and over will double in the next decade. To meet the needs of this segment of the driving population, new and innovative educational programs will be required to ensure that mature drivers are given every opportunity to maintain their mobility and independence. Earlier this year I announced jointly with the president of the Alberta Motor Association the first phase of providing programs for mature drivers, which is an educational program delivered by the Alberta Motor Association at no charge to all drivers 55 years of age and over. Remedial rehabilitative programs are an integral part of allowing previously unsafe drivers back on the road. In addition to assessment, counseling, and driver training programs currently in place, my department is reviewing the feasibility of introducing mandatory driver improvement programs for problem drivers as a condition of retaining or again obtaining the privilege to drive.

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely pleased with the impaired driving initiatives that have been implemented during the past year, and I plan to ensure that the fight against impaired driving continues to be a very high priority. Alberta has recently confirmed its leadership role in this area by hosting an International Congress on Drinking and Driving, which was held in Edmonton March 28 to 30 of this year, and there were in fact over 400 delegates from as far away as Europe and Australia that were registered. Mr. Chairman, while the estimates indicate that the impaired driving budget has been reduced in '90-91, I want to again assure members that these reductions have been in the area of nonrecurring grants and advertising and will in fact have no impact on the impaired driving programs already established. In fact, approximately \$500,000 of the impaired driving budget for '89-90 was committed to one-time nonrecurring expenditures. Consequently, even with the reductions in the '90-91 budget, there will be additional funds available for existing and new programs.

Enforcement initiatives such as the year-round Check Stop program will continue to operate. Grants to municipalities will be provided for the purchase of hand held breath/alcohol analyzers, which will greatly increase the number of breath/alcohol tests conducted by police officers in this province. A spirit of co-operation between government, police, and the community in the battle against impaired driving will continue. The severity and extent of impaired driving commands this joint effort, because removing the impaired driver from our roadway is everybody's responsibility.

The provincewide designated driver program recently launched has been positively received and accepted by the citizens of Alberta. Efforts will be made to increase the visibility and use of the program by individuals attending private house parties, social functions, and licensed establishments across the province. The program will continue to expand through the co-operative efforts of the private sector, the Alberta Liquor Control Board, and my department.

Impaired driving in native communities continues to be a serious issue that demands concentrated attention. My department is currently working with the native community to design program initiatives that meet the special needs.

Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to advise you that Alberta is the first province in Canada to have an ignition interlock program. Alcohol-sensing devices will be linked to a vehicle's ignition system and will require a breath sample before the vehicle can be started. When used as a condition of licence reinstatement for convicted impaired drivers, it will assist in making Alberta's highways safer for all citizens. Another noteworthy aspect of this program is that the impaired driver is responsible for all costs associated with the installation and maintenance of the interlock system. This program commenced on a pilot basis in Edmonton on April 2, 1990. The first participants will be required by the Driver Control Board to operate vehicles equipped with ignition interlock devices or remain suspended, even though they have satisfied all licensing requirements. During the summer the program will expand to Calgary, and by early fall conditional reinstatement will be considered for second- and third-time offenders. At the end of the first year of operation it is anticipated that as many as 400 drivers will be involved in the program.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the public is starting to see results from our impaired driving initiatives. The number of persons charged with impaired driving in this province is steadily declining. In 1984 the number charged was 24,907, and in 1988 the number charged was 18,102. This is encouraging, as enforcement activities have in fact increased in this area. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman and all members, that the attack on impaired driving will continue until the fatalities and injuries that result from this serious problem are reduced significantly.

Mr. Chairman, this past year government centre security and Legislature security were integrated into the protection services branch. With improved staff training and upgrading of government centre's security systems, I want to assure all members that it is my intention to ensure that adequate security measures are in place to protect the members of this Assembly, their staff, the media, and members of the public. I understand the need to establish a balance between ease of access and appropriate modern security measures in order to deal with the unfortunate developments that are now being witnessed in our country, and I hope the aforementioned will be well served by the security measures which will be implemented.

Vote 5, the Alberta Racing Commission, the sport of kings. One other area of responsibility that the Solicitor General has is the interesting and exciting area of horse racing. Almost 6,000 Albertans are licensed to work in the horse racing industry in Alberta. This does not include employment on stud farms, in production of feed, offtrack veterinary services, truckers, tack shops, equine supplies, and so on. The Alberta Department of Agriculture has calculated that horses constitute a \$1.2 billion industry in the province; race horses must contribute at least half that figure. Members of the Assembly may be interested to know that every major meet requires a minimum of 1,200 horses: At the smaller meets in rural Alberta an estimated further 500 thoroughbreds, 400 racing quarter horses, 250 Arabians, and 100 racing Appaloosas would take part.

One of the main reasons for the growing success in the horse racing field is that Alberta levies a special tax of 5 percent on the total pari-mutuel handled. These revenues, after paying the commission's overhead, are rebated to the industry as purse supplements for winning Alberta breeds as incentives to breeders.

This year the Alberta Racing Commission has embarked on an imaginative program to spread its market beyond the two major tracks, four middle-sized tracks, and 12 minor tracks. It began in January to televise live races to other points in the province. The plan is still in early stages, but televising harness racing from Calgary into Edmonton during January, February, and March was a success. Races are also being exported by modern telecommunications to Regina and Saskatoon. Plans are now firm for Lethbridge to receive races from Calgary. Edmonton Northlands is working on plans to broadcast into the Northwest Territories, Grande Prairie, Peace River, and Fort McMurray. Calgary has plans for Banff, Brooks, Red Deer, and Medicine Hat. This industry, Mr. Chairman, makes no charges on taxpayers at large, generates its own revenues, and makes a big contribution to the diversification of our provincial economy.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate that during the past year in which I have been Solicitor General, I have found the issues and problems that I have addressed to be most challenging. I would like to thank all members on both sides of the House for the co-operation and support that I have been provided in assisting me to carry out my responsibilities.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, may I take this opportunity of thanking hon. members in the Assembly on all sides of the House for their good wishes while I've been laid up, all of them sincere I think, and only one of which was ambiguous. This said, "I'd pray for you if I thought it would do any good." But since it came from a very good friend of mine, I believe it referred more to the opinions of the sender than of the subject matter.

Mr. Chairman, this department is not one of the larger ones in terms of expenditure in the government; in fact the estimates total \$272 million. The last public accounts for the year 1988 to '89 showed an income from various sources of \$150 million. Assuming that the same sort of numbers will still apply, that only is a shortfall that the public picks up of \$122 million or so. On top of that, as we know, there have been increases in the fees payable by the public in connection with motor vehicles. I think those increases are more than reasonable. In fact, most of them I really believe could be doubled without undue imposition on the public. One of my colleagues just told me that he was down in Arizona recently, and it cost \$800 to license an '87 Corvette there. It gives you some idea of how we're giving the users of

motor vehicles in Canada generally – because I realize that we have to keep in some kind of step with the other provinces. But I think it's high time we made the users of motor vehicles pay their way in the community for the impact that they have, not only on pollution but on people's lives, and the fact that we revolve around that motor vehicle. So \$50 to license it, when the minimum you have to pay probably for insurance is \$500 per annum, is a real bargain. Yet that increase alone will bring in \$25 million extra, and I can see that there might be some room there.

As for the Solicitor General himself, if I can say so with respect, Mr. Chairman, he is an ornament to this government and a diligent and excellent minister. I really have no complaints to make about the figures in the estimates. I believe they are reasonable and have been well explained by the minister.

It's not to say that I don't have things to say about the department, because I'll take the opportunity, as we all may, to deal with the activities of the department as they now exist. Perhaps I'll go to what I see as the one area which is grossly neglected by this government in the motor vehicles area, and it is for political reasons, I have no doubt. By and large, this department does not deal with matters with a political slant. That's why one can be collegial about this, I suppose, and the things that are done in connection with the various departments can receive praise, because they do not represent any political point of view.

However, the area I allude to is the insuring of motor vehicles. The non New Democrat governments have it as their idea that there are just always efficiencies to be had which, whatever the case, overbear the perceived inefficiencies of the government doing anything. While I have to agree that the profit motive is a great motivator to efficiency, in some cases there are such inbuilt efficiencies to be had from a monopoly system – that is inevitable – that it cannot be overborne. I mean, it just cannot be said that because a government does it, the institution is blighted. Otherwise, we would have to say Alberta Government Telephones is a blighted institution, and it just isn't. Yet it's inefficient by and large to have a telephone system that is a series of interconnected private companies, and so with automobile insurance.

The Solicitor General, in his departmental report for the year ended March 31, 1989, speaks of the computer system in place for motor vehicle information, the MOVE system, and boasts of it as being excellent, and I'm sure it is. It's had teething troubles, but I notice in the last couple of years from the Auditor General's report that they seem to be out of the way – and I'm glad of that – and other people are copying our system. But all the information necessary to the granting of that basic set of insurance – again there's no choice there; it's a minimum mandated – is in the system already, and just with a bit of software that makes the extra programming, you can spit out simply what the owner of the particular vehicle has to pay that year when he or she renews his licence to get himself insured on that basic package. The administration costs just come down so much that no private insurance, however efficient, can compete.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

That has been found to be the case even in British Columbia, where you have a government completely polarized to the previous New Democrat government there, that still carries on with the Insurance Company of British Columbia, insuring

automobiles with the licence, simply because it can't be touched by private enterprise. I must say in British Columbia they're trying to give it a bad name by actually jacking up the premiums so that it is cheaper in some classes of vehicle to get insurance in Alberta than in British Columbia. But what's happening there is that the profits, then, are colossal in the company. Of course, it comes back to the public anyway, so that points up another advantage of public insurance.

But I'm indebted to a Mr. Bruce Gajerski from the University of Alberta who has brought me up to date on premiums between the two systems, and I'll just give hon. members a brief glimpse of the sort of differences. The last year of which we have complete figures – he was writing in January of this year – is for 1987. A 1987 Ford Taurus LX – whether that means 60 or just LX, I don't know – for the basic package of liability of a million, collision \$100 deductible, comprehensive \$50 deductible, a fairly standard package: \$1,400 in Toronto; \$594 in Winnipeg; which has provincial insurance; \$553 in Regina, which has provincial insurance; \$918 in Calgary, which doesn't of course; and \$841 in Vancouver. We note in Vancouver that the accident rate seems to be about 25 percent higher than the rest of Canada, for reasons I can't understand.

But, at any rate, across the board it's that. I mean, when you get into the single male 16 to 18 with three years accident-free even, the differences are astronomic. But there's a certain reason there, namely in the state systems they won't discriminate on the basis of sex or age but only on experience, and the premiums are between a half and two-thirds, in general. In 1987 all three publicly funded provincial insurance companies lost money on a point of fact, but they raised the premiums the next year to cover that, and adding in the deficit, it still made the premiums less than two-thirds of what they are here.

So I have renewed my call annually for this. It's part of our particular policy, of course, but that's not the reason I primarily do it. The reason I primarily do it is because it's the best; it's the most efficient. I ask the Solicitor General to set aside the Conservative ideas or prejudices on this and have some inquiries made, just make an inquiry afoot, try to leave the political ideas out of it if possible for a while and just see how it would work. Because it doesn't mean that the insurance agents are out of much business either. They're out of the most troublesome part of the business, which is the basic cover. They can still sell the extra insurance that people might want to have above the basic package, and that's where they make their money, in point of fact. As it is, it's competitive out there on the basic cover. They don't make much money there; they make their better premiums on the extra cover.

And why is this? Well, it's the efficiency, on the one hand, of having the system all in place undoubtedly. As the Insurance Bureau of Canada argues all the time and the Fraser Institute, there are hidden subsidies. But what does that matter? What is a hidden subsidy if it's going to count against this argument? The hidden subsidy is only something which subsidizes the system, which wouldn't be there but for that particular system you have in place. The hidden subsidy they're talking about is the fact there is the MOVES computer that has all the information in it. For a private institution to replicate that of course would cost money. But it's there already, and we should make use of it. That's my argument, Mr. Chairman.

The second fact, of course, is that if you make a loss, the public has to pay, if you make a profit, the public gets it back again. Since most people depend on motor vehicles in this society, it's not crucial that you make a loss or a profit in any

particular year so long as you have a policy that will pay for itself in the short run or medium run. So I say use it, and make an inquiry about this.

The next thing I want to cover, in case if I leave it late I run out of time, is a topical matter, and that is in the case of Mr. McClelland at the Grande Cache prison last year. The facts come from the department themselves, I believe – the Solicitor General can correct me if I'm wrong on this – that he was injected with a tranquilizer by a nurse at the institution against his will because he was misbehaving. He may have been quite seriously misbehaving. I'm not denying there wasn't cause to do something about his behaviour. I say nothing of that, but only of the methods used to control it. The Solicitor General is a lawyer, too, and he'll know that that's obviously a trespass of the person. It can only be justified in the case of an accident or something like that where the person is unconscious, or under the provisions of the Mental Health Act where there's been a finding that by reason of a disease of the mind the person is a danger to himself or others; an order can be made and treatment administered against the will of the patient. But not in the case in question.

I have little doubt that everything was done in good faith, but I ask the Solicitor General two things. First, is this a practice in place at any prison or number of prisons? The second thing is concerning the facts themselves. It is alleged that the department will not apologize to Mr. McClelland in case they may be sued for admitting error. Well, with respect, I don't know whether that's true or not. But if it is true, Mr. Chairman, then it is not a proper way for the department and its managers to conduct themselves, because if an error has been made, it should be acknowledged and the consequences borne by the government. If, in fact, the situation was such that restraint was necessary and the action was taken in good faith, sure, it's still a trespass of the person but the damages might not be all that great. In any event, it's better that the principle of honesty be followed than that there be a cover-up in the name of saving the taxpayers some sum of money. Surely the prison authorities know that if a prisoner is out of hand, he or she may be restrained by all means that are reasonably necessary to attain restraint, whether it's by shackles or a straitjacket, but not by invasion of the body.

I notice that nothing has been said for the past couple of years concerning difficulties with the link with CPIC, the Canadian police information centre. That was a cause of problem. Mostly it was that while the police network, which I think is largely run by the mounted police, was very grateful to get any information it could, it was very chary about letting information out, so that for quite a long while there people could have their licences suspended by the court in other provinces and we wouldn't know about it here. I take it that there is a minimum of or no difficulty now in exchanging information between provinces with the CPIC about court suspensions and records that the police need, particularly in regulation of motor vehicles.

I'm glad to see that for the first time the Solicitor General's department reports are as up to date as we may reasonably expect, namely the one for March 31, 1989, and ending then, is in place. That does allow us to read the latest report and know it's not entirely ancient history, as used to be the case. Perhaps I can be so bold as to suggest this: that the Solicitor General could ask that they be couched in less opaque language. They're full of euphemisms and circumlocutions, particularly when it comes to nasty words like prison or prisoners or serving prisoners and so on. I noticed a number of circumlocutions for

imprisonment: custodial disposition, incarceration. Jail or prisons: those words don't occur there. They're called centres or correctional centres, or even just facilities. And criminals are persons who engage in criminal behaviour. Well, all criminals are persons who engage or have engaged in criminal behaviour, but of course not all persons who engage in criminal behaviour are known to be criminals. And so on. It may sound picky, but it would be wonderful if ordinary language was used, even in government reports. The Consumer and Corporate Affairs department is making a good start on this in legislation and regulations and the administration of insurance policies and the like. Let's see it spread.

Mr. Chairman, the Solicitor General spoke at some length about the impaired driving initiatives that the department has taken, and we on this side of the House applaud them all. They're excellent. We can't even say that some of them are long overdue, because they are ahead of the game in most jurisdictions. The department has fallen short of deciding, as far as I can see, that a licence should be, ipso facto, suspended once a person was charged with impaired driving or driving with a blood alcohol level over the limit. I can see the reasons for this: a) because there's an outcry from people who think that the rights of the individual have somehow been jeopardized, and b) because the Driver Control Board has the power, anyway, to move to suspend licences in bad cases. But I'm not so sure that that is a convincing argument. I realize there is far from unanimity on this subject, both amongst the group I move in and . . . I count myself to be civil libertarian, and some of them think this is something that invades the presumption of innocence. Well, it invades the presumption of innocence no more than imprisonment on remand invades the presumption of innocence, for exactly the same reasons.

It seems to me not unreasonable that it should be the case that a person who is charged with impaired driving – let's say we up the threshold a bit to .10 instead of .08 – might at least have their licence suspended unless the court allows it back again in the same way, Mr. Chairman, that a person who has committed a serious crime will be held in custody unless he's able to make bail and secure what is now called judicial interim release. So here to the same person – it doesn't have to be before the Driver Control Board; it can simply be to the bail magistrate or whatever they're called now, but anyway, to the Provincial Court – an application can be made exactly analogous to applying for bail, and the onus will then be on the prosecutor to show cause why the person should not get his or her vehicle back. But it seems to me that that's a much less cumbersome process than the man or woman getting his or her licence back. And then in the bad cases, with the Driver Control Board saying: "Hey, we're going to yank your licence here. You've been in this plight before; you're driving, so it is alleged, while drunk, and this is too much," everyone knows that the biggest penalty is the loss of the motor vehicle. So this will be an encouragement to those people in the cases where they would, in fact, lose their motor vehicle, if they know they're going to be for it anyway, to speed up the trials and get the thing over with quickly so their period of suspension can start running more quickly. That's been the effect in other jurisdictions. This is not an outré; this is not an unusual suggestion. It is the case, without any right of getting the car back, as far as I know, in some European jurisdictions, and was recommended in 1984 by the Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving in the United States.

Those are some things I'd like to hear from the Solicitor General on. Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before recognizing the Member for Calgary-Buffalo, is the committee agreed that Calgary-Buffalo and Westlock-Sturgeon divide their time? Is that acceptable?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed. [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We won't worry about interpretations.

Calgary-Buffalo, please.

MR. CHUMIR: I'm going to start so that I get some time. Otherwise it would be very unfair.

I'm pleased to stand on these estimates. I'd also . . .

MR. TAYLOR: I'm sorry, that's it.

MR. CHUMIR: Westlock-Sturgeon says my time is up. Thank you.

I'd like to take this opportunity to express what I'm sure are the sentiments of the whole House in welcoming the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, whom I'm fond of referring to as Rumpole, back to this House. I'd like to use the term that he used earlier in his comments: that he is, indeed, an ornament to this House. His performances are distinguished by elegant, witty, and imaginative presentations of sensible and balanced views. I would like to say that some of his speeches – I think back particularly with respect to his speech on second reading of the Interprovincial Lottery Act in 1988, which will, I'm sure, be read years hence, I know, by myself for its wit, literacy, and passion for justice and democracy. So we look forward to hearing many, many more of those speeches in this House.

Now, with that, any words of praise I might have for the Solicitor General will of necessity pale by comparison, but only by comparison, because I . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, hon. member. There is a rule about . . . Thank you. Please proceed.

MR. CHUMIR: My comments will pale only by comparison because I believe the minister is a strong minister. He reminds me of that immovable middle guard of the Edmonton Eskimos of some years ago, Frankie Morris; I know he's not always right, but I think he's well-intentioned. But I do have some areas where I believe he could improve his performance substantially by taking my advice, which I will now proceed to give.

I have one question with respect to vote 1. The numbers, Mr. Chairman, relating to the cut in the Staff Training College are down 29.7 percent, and I would appreciate if we could, either today or in due course, get an explanation of that drop. But also, moving on to vote 2, I'd like to commend the minister for finally making a decision to build the new Calgary Remand Centre which has long been needed.

Insofar as the treatment of those who are within our correctional system is concerned, last year I raised some issues relating to complaints that I've been receiving from inmates and from organizations such as the John Howard Society and the Elizabeth Fry Society with respect to poor quality and cutbacks in some areas, particularly education programs but also in areas of health and recreation. Last year the minister indicated that we do have the same programs as the federal institutions and that these are, in fact, more than adequate to deal with the situation.

I would like to comment on this adequacy, because I think that's probably quite incorrect both in terms of the provincial government and the federal government. I refer to a intensive study of the Correctional Services of Canada regarding mental health problems suffered by penitentiary inmates. It was reported in the *John Howard Society of Alberta Reporter* of December 1989, and I believe it was the first study ever to do this: it systematically diagnosed inmates across Canada for mental disabilities, and the findings were indeed horrendous. Based on comprehensive interviews of more than 1,600 inmates of the total prison population of approximately 12,500, the study found that there are more than 500 schizophrenics in the penitentiary system, that 300 suffer from a severe loss of intellectual ability arising from organic brain damage, 72 percent are alcohol users, 52 percent abuse drugs, more than 15 percent have a major dysfunction characterized by a serious depression lasting at least two years, 27 percent have phobic disorders, 25 percent have psychosocial disorders, and there's a high estimated prevalence of agoraphobia and sociophobia.

I'm wondering if that unhappy catalogue – whether the minister has any studies or whether he's directed his department to conduct its own review into the number of Alberta inmates who are suffering from mental illness. I think it's generally taken that a very, very large percentage of inmates fall into that category. I'm wondering whether or not the minister would give us some comment about the nature of the resources that are dedicated to dealing with mental problems within the system. We're hearing a tremendous number of complaints with respect to the inadequacy of these. Perhaps the minister might also provide the House, either today or when he's able to pull these together, with the number of psychiatrists, psychologists, and mental health counselors currently employed by the department.

I've also heard concerns, Mr. Chairman, which I expressed last year, with respect to this federal transfer program whereby federal prisoners are moved into the provincial system, that they're not getting the full package and that the province is, in fact, making money in not providing adequate servicing. I'm wondering whether or not the minister would care to comment on that, and if he has not satisfied himself on that matter, whether perhaps he might wish to review the economic aspects of that arrangement in order to ensure that federal prisoners within the provincial system are getting a fair deal.

I also commented last year and would like to reiterate my concern about the numbers of prisoners within our provincial institutions for failure to pay fines. Last year's statistics indicate that at any given time there's an average of 57 individuals, men and women, in our institutions for unpaid fines. This is 1.8 percent of the total populace. It sounds small in percentage terms, but when we consider that there's somewhat of a revolving door – they'd be there on a perhaps relatively medium- to short-term basis – this in fact involves imprisonment for inability to pay. It is, in a sense, imprisonment for poverty, and there was a Charter of Rights case in the maritimes within the last several years which indicated that such incarceration does contravene the Charter of Rights. I would suggest to the minister that I think it's something that merits review.

A concern has been expressed by those who are involved in assessing the prison situation for women about the need for a halfway house. I know that the Elizabeth Fry Society has been lobbying the provincial government for 10 years for a female offenders' halfway house in Edmonton. Currently there is not one in all of western Canada. There is some perception that this is because the women are victims of a numbers game: not being

as numerous as the men, they tend not to get a reasonable proportion of the program dollars, and this is the reason why there is not one in all of western Canada. This apparently has particular consequences for Alberta women serving federal sentences in Ontario's Kingston penitentiary for women, the only federal women's penitentiary in Canada, as we know. If a woman wants to come back to Alberta to do her day parole, her only option is to go into a provincial minimum security institution and take the appropriate route from there. That does not seem to be adequate in relation to programming that is available for men. So I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, why it is that the department which provides for 146 beds in halfway houses for men in Edmonton alone refuses to provide a single halfway house facility for women inmates serving day parole. I wonder, perhaps, whether the minister might consider reviewing that and remedying that.

Moving on to the young offenders issue. I would like to also compliment the minister on the pilot program with respect to putting young offenders in suitable homes. I think that's a good program, and I hope it will prove to be effective and we'll find some new avenues for dealing with these problems. I've heard some concerns relating to the Calgary Young Offender Centre being overcrowded and the need to move inmates, young offenders who are inappropriate for that facility, to Strathmore, and there have been some escapes. I'm wondering if we might have some comment about that. I'm also wondering why the funding for the Strathmore facility is down 11.1 percent. Presumably that's related to the opening of the new facility in Calgary, but I'd appreciate a comment on that.

I've heard a never ending litany of concerns with respect to the shortage of psychological programming, psychiatrists, and drug programming for young offenders in our institutions, and I'd like to urge the minister once again to review and deal with those matters. There was a reference in his earlier comments to a new facility being set up near St. Paul, but that appears to be primarily for the native populace. It sounds like a good initiative, but the native populace is far from the only group which needs these. Most workers in the young offenders system tell me that about 90 percent or perhaps even more young offenders who have difficulties with the system are involved with drugs and alcohol, many of them of a very, very serious nature, and I think we would be doing our community a great service in the long haul by addressing this matter at that early stage.

I also have some questions with respect to the young offender and the provincial guardianship system and related matters, Mr. Chairman. We have several written questions that I would like to reiterate here, and perhaps the minister might move them up in the scale of timing. One relates to what are the standards for the visiting of children under guardianship who are being detained in a young offender centre. Apparently there are some problems and concerns with respect to that issue, and we'd appreciate it if the minister could give some clarification. If he'd like to discuss that directly – I saw a puzzled look – perhaps that would be an appropriate way of dealing with it. Secondly, what are the standards for representation of children under guardianship in court by the Department of Family and Social Services? At what occasion and what circumstances is that type of representation given? How many children, Mr. Chairman, with child welfare status were in the young offender program as of the years ended March 31, 1987, '88, '89, and now 1990?

[Mr. Moore in the Chair]

I've also had some questions raised, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the youth orientation unit run by the Mennonite Central Committee up in northern Alberta, which is losing its funding. It has been suggested that amongst other reasons why it and, I believe, four or five other similar facilities are being chopped is that the facility is court driven and that the courts over the past few years have been designating more young offenders as requiring placement in an urban secure facility environment. I'm wondering whether the minister can perhaps provide details as to how many young offenders have been sentenced to a secure facility and how many have been placed in open-custody environments for the last five reporting years. Has the government approached and discussed with the Attorney General's department as to why the courts are running against the philosophy of the Solicitor General's young offender division, which is committed, I understand, to community-based programs for young offenders?

There's a recent issue in the news with respect to the Ombudsman's report relating to the involuntary administration of drugs to an inmate. I'm wondering whether the minister might be in a position to indicate to the House whether he accepts the policy directive of the Ombudsman that it is improper to administer drugs to inmates against their will unless they are dangerous to themselves or others or otherwise suffer from mental illness, and if he does so accept, whether he'll proceed to enforce that.

Moving on to vote 3, Law Enforcement, I have some concerns with respect to what appears to be difficulties in having prosecutors in the Attorney General's department appear before the native justice task force to give evidence. We have the rather cryptic memorandum from the department to prosecutors that there is to be one group presentation on behalf of the Attorney General's department. The way I read it is that they're being told that no individual prosecutors are going to speak even if on their own instance. I think this is very shortsighted. Prosecutors are amongst those who are most knowledgeable with respect to the way the system operates, and we note that it was a prosecutor on his own aegis that sprung the difficulties relating to the Gingras affair, which has certainly served the public interest by being disclosed. I'm wondering whether the minister has talked to the Attorney General in that regard, and if not, will he do so and perhaps give us some assurance that we will get the benefit of the most competent people in this province, many of whom are prosecutors, coming before that task force.

High-speed chase policy concerns me, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to see that a task force has been set in motion, but the nature of the task force, its composition and procedures, are such as to deal with it as if high-speed chases were merely a policing issue as opposed to an important matter of public safety on the highways. I for the life of me can't understand why the minister wouldn't include on that committee general members of the public so we could get an outside and fresh perspective, some objectivity rather than having people who are and have been within the policing or the administration of the justice system for some significant period of time. You'd get a better product.

At a 1981 committee set up by the city of Calgary Police Commission of which I was a member, most were citizen members, and I believe it's generally acknowledged – and you can check this with the Calgary police service – that we came up with an excellent report with no problems for policing, no problems with respect to information being released in a harmful

manner. That report became the basis for what I believe is one of the better police chase policies in the whole country.

Similarly, I'm concerned as to why the deliberations are not to be made public. Why are they behind closed doors? Why this secrecy? That really harkens back to an era which should be long gone.

How are we doing timewise, Mr. Chairman? Ten minutes? Good. I've got. . . Eleven? Now it's 10. It was 11 before I inquired. Let me know when we're down to five, would you please, Mr. Chairman?

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is that all you're allowing the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon? You're only allowing him five minutes?

MR. CHUMIR: That's all he wanted.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. CHUMIR: I think he was very kind. I had to have a very firm discussion with him, and after the discussion he decided that five minutes was all that he wanted.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

So far as impaired driving is concerned, I'm quite pleased to see strong initiatives being taken by the minister. I'm a long-standing advocate of tougher measures in this area. I'm concerned about two areas though. One, and I've raised this in the Legislature many times, it seems to me that short of seizing the car, the licence suspension is the primary sanction – the primary sanction. The difficulty is that once it's suspended, the chances of somebody getting caught are very remote. Through research that I've read and committees that I've been on, I think it's generally accepted that many, many drivers take to the roads even after their licences have been suspended. It has been my perception that the penalties for first conviction are very light indeed in relation to the gravity of the offence. They're usually a relatively small fine. There's a stronger penalty of jailing for a second offence, but it's very rare that that would happen. B.C. has implemented a mandatory seven-day jail sentence, which really means a weekend in jail, and I know it kind of clogs up our perhaps overcrowded facilities. Surely there must be a way that we could impose some form of sanction – even put them in a school gymnasium from 8 a.m. till 10 p.m. for three days on a weekend and call it jail. But I think we should get a little tougher there.

I've also been concerned about the designated driver program, the absence of government involvement in that. I inquired four years ago, when the government was pushing that, whether the government had designated programs. We called department after department and found that there were no programs for functions where government employees were meeting at Christmas or otherwise. I think the government should be providing that type of leadership; it's fairly easy. How can you ask the private sector to get on to that type of thing when the government isn't doing it?

The Sikh/turban issue is an area in which I'm very disappointed with the response of the government and the minister. This relates to the right of Sikhs with turbans to serve in the RCMP. The government has totally sidestepped the issue by alleging, totally erroneously, that it's a federal issue. A federal issue when we have a contract with the RCMP? A federal issue

when we have a Sikh population that's heavily affected? A federal issue that we shouldn't deal with or won't touch when we hold forth loudly on the Tiananmen Square massacre? I think the minister and the government would be very well advised to read the speech by the commissioner of the RCMP, Inkster, in which he expressed very elegantly how disturbed he was that otherwise reasonable and intelligent people in this country seemed to be unwilling to accommodate themselves to some modest changes that are absolutely inevitable if we're going to have groups of different backgrounds in this country.

Finally, in terms of motor vehicle licensing and driver licensing, I've been hearing stories about a significant decline in service in this area, Mr. Chairman. I received a call several months ago about up to one-month delays in Calgary in order to get a driver's licence testing. Apparently, this stands in distinction to that for driving schools, which don't have a wait. There seems to be a bit of discrimination. I know there's an administrative explanation re how driving schools book, but it doesn't seem to me to serve the ordinary person particularly well, particularly in an era when the fee for road costs is going up from \$10 to \$20. Similarly in motor vehicle registration; I've been hearing complaints in Calgary recently about lengthy lineups for obtaining licences. I know the minister is trying to encourage mail-in, and I think that is excellent, and the two-year licensing and so on. But, on the other hand, fees are going up from \$41 to \$50 for autos and \$21 to \$30 for motor vehicles and off-road vehicles, and at the same time there was word that six staff had been laid off in this area in Calgary as of March 31. Now, that is what I was advised, and I would be very interested. . . . The minister's eyebrows said, "It's news to me." But, in any event, I want to say that when I refer to the licensing, I'm not so much criticizing the magnitude of the fee as I am the fact that there's an apparent decline in service at the same time as fees are going up.

I now see five minutes left. I cede the floor to my friend from Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you. I'll try to move reasonably quickly and dispense with the compliments. I think the minister's head will be getting quite big by now anyhow, so I'll try to bring him down to earth.

The first is a rather individual item. There's a manager for the Legal liquor store, a Mr. Bruce. I've talked to the minister some and to other people. I think the case is now moving through the Human Rights Commission. He's a gentleman that's slowly losing his eyesight, but the doctors say that it's sufficient that he can work for the Liquor Control Board, yet they're forcing him to take retirement. I think for somebody who's worked 30 to 35 years for an organization, particularly a government organization, surely you can find a place to keep him on a few more years until official retirement rather than shove him out the door. I would like the minister to. . . . I know he's said he's going to investigate it a couple of times, but I haven't heard anything. I think it's quite out of place, and it's certainly not in the spirit of generosity that I've always encountered with the minister, to tell someone – admittedly, it's legally right – that okay, your eyesight isn't doing so well, so therefore you get out. But the point here is that I think Mr. Bruce deserves a better and fairer treatment than that. I know another job in the organization can be found. I know sometimes

he's maybe been a little difficult, but I think all of us would be a little difficult if after 30 years we were told we had to retire although we felt that we still physically could do the job.

I want to maybe ask the minister, going on to the next one, whether the minister is considering opening up a little bit more in private enterprise in the small towns for wine and beer stores, which now seem to be only handled in the big cities in private-enterprise establishments. Possibly some of the smaller towns might be interested, provided there are adults and so on and all the rest of the conditions. But it seems to be a convenience now that's limited to the cities.

Native policing and the courts. I was wondering if the minister has thought at all about having courts on the reserves, or possibly he's waiting until this study is finished. It's been recommended a number of times in previous studies on native justice that local courts on the reserves would help in native justice.

I'm disappointed that the funds to Check Stop have been cut by 41 percent, from what I can see in vote 3, from \$540,000 to \$320,000. As my colleague once mentioned – and it was something that impressed me quite a bit – a few years ago when he was on a similar committee on drinking and driving: it wasn't really the penalty that allowed you to discipline or to deter people from drunken driving; it was the certainty of being caught. I've noticed that a number of other times in other areas. The certainty of being caught is the most important way of getting a drinking driver, yet we're cutting by 40 percent one of the more effective ways of picking up drinking drivers.

Grants to the Racing Commission. That has always bothered me a bit, when we have schools that aren't being funded. We have different areas where there's human benefit, whether it's in the health schemes or in education, where we have some of our children not being able to access either health or education care, and yet the Racing Commission can find \$6.4 million to improve horse racing. Now, I used to be in horse racing many years ago, and I'll agree that a lot of money put into horse racing raises the quality of racehorses, but I'm not so sure it employs more. If you put less money into horse racing, what you get is the people going out and betting on hayburners rather than the real good ones. In other words, the urge to bet is always there. Even if the horses only had three legs, they would go to the racetrack and bet on which one with three legs over the other ones. So the idea of pouring millions into horse racing – either that, or horse racing will collapse – I'm not too sure of the logic. And in times of rough budget problems, I'm not so sure that the minister shouldn't look at that a little bit. Why should that be going on . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, hon. member. Your time has been taken.

The Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I'd like to say that I agree with the somewhat laudatory comments that have been made by our opposition colleagues today regarding the Solicitor General. I think it's safe to say that in the city of Calgary his reputation is one of a strong, honest, fair, but appropriately tough, Solicitor General.

But lest the Solicitor General enjoy too smooth a ride today, I would like to point out to him that there is an irritant under the saddle. It has to do with the motor vehicles licensing offices in the city of Calgary, particularly the one in south Calgary which serves the constituents of Calgary-Fish Creek. On an

average of one or two times a week I receive letters and phone calls asking me to appeal to the Solicitor General to see if a way can be found to reduce what has become an extremely frustrating experience. For the benefit of the non-Calgary members in the Assembly today, I would like them to be aware that the lineups in the motor vehicles offices in Calgary can take in excess of two hours. Lest you feel that that might be an exaggeration, on two occasions in the last three weeks I have stood in those lineups, once on behalf of myself and once on behalf of my son, who is, indeed, a constituent.

In fairness to the Solicitor General, I have exchanged correspondence with him pointing out in writing these concerns and frustrations and have received from him a statement or a plan of his intentions to remedy the situation. I realize the easy path of least resistance, knee-jerk responses, is: well, let's get some more people and some more computer terminals. That obviously in our current fiscal environment just isn't an appropriate way out. But I do believe on the basis of information I've received from the Solicitor General and from some other sources that there can be some procedural actions taken and some policy changes made so that that irritant under the saddle sometime within the current fiscal year might be reduced if not eliminated. I would hope that the Solicitor General, before the hour has gone today, might be able to share with the members of the Assembly what some of those procedural and policy intentions are.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The members for Calgary-Mountain View and Edmonton-Avonmore. Which order are you . . . The Member for Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I would look forward with interest to the proposed Bill that the minister is going to bring forward in regard to victims of crime and the surcharge on fines that will go to victims of crime and possibly to nongovernment agencies to help them aid victims of crime. I'm also quite interested in the initiatives to deal with violence in the family and look forward to hearing more about those programs. Certainly I think it's very important that charging automatically occur whenever possible. The research indicates that that is the one most effective deterrent for continued reoffending. So I look forward to that as well as the police training and the other initiatives the minister has mentioned.

The main area of concern for me today is women in corrections. I would like to draw the problem of women in corrections to the attention of the Solicitor General, because they make up such a small proportion of the people being dealt with through the corrections, the criminal justice system, and because their crimes tend to be nonviolent crimes, crimes against property that often come out of the unique circumstances women face in this society, and the fact that as members involved in the criminal justice system, their needs are often lost in a system whose philosophy and methods have been designed to meet the needs of men involved in criminal activity.

The majority of women in fact are, as I have mentioned, in nonviolent crimes. A huge problem is the crime of shoplifting. It costs society. It often indicates women's relatively lower economic status. I would ask the minister, then, what kinds of initiatives he has for funding shoplifting prevention programs, possibly even kind of a shoplifters anonymous program which a woman who could understand this to be a problem could voluntarily attend. It would seem to me that it would be very

cost-effective even in terms of dealing with women who have been charged, but it also may help save society the great amounts of money that are lost through shoplifting and are often undetected and unrecovered. I would also note that many women are excellent candidates for treatment; I've heard of programs with a 90 percent success rate. Certainly in my own work with women who have been in trouble with the law, it seems that if their real needs are heard and met and their real concerns are addressed, then they do in fact change quite rapidly.

Another concern that I have is that a great majority of women who are in trouble with the law have experienced abuse in their homes of origin, in the home. This is something to be dealt with, that we need to have programs for women who are incarcerated or are on probation that deal with the violence against them and the kinds of feelings that come out of that. Again I would say that this is a unique need of women inasmuch as they are the primary targets of sexual and physical violence, particularly sexual violence in the home, and again a cost-effective and effective program.

Another area of concern is women who are incarcerated and have children and their need to mother their children. Certainly the separation of a mother from her child has serious implications for the bonding between the mother and child and the long-term development of the child. It's something that the Elizabeth Fry societies have addressed in their task force, I believe. So the issue of access or mothers even having their infants with them in a correctional facility.

I think maybe I will quit there, inasmuch as it's getting late, but I guess I would just stress as strongly as I can that the needs of women who are involved in criminal activity are very different from the needs of men. They're often women who are poor, so we need fines options programs. It's no longer acceptable to incarcerate people because they cannot pay a fine. Their criminal activity is often to deal with their economic status; a primary example, of course, is prostitution. Their violent activity is often to protect themselves or their children when they are involved with violent crimes, so it's a case of self-defence. So we need a corrections system that addresses their needs and, of course, their role, as many of them are mothers and have children. How do we allow the mother/child bond to continue so that the damage that can be done by separation does not occur?

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to take a few minutes talking primarily about vote 3.1.5, Native Criminal Justice Task Force, and hopefully allow enough time for the minister to provide us with some closing comments here this afternoon.

As the minister is well aware, Mr. Chairman – I don't know whether it's well known to the other members of the Assembly or not – native offenders in Alberta as of 1987 still made up close to 30 percent, 28 and a half percent, of all admissions to provincial correctional centres, although they account for only 6 percent of the general population. I was initially pleased to see that the Alberta government and the federal government had jointly initiated a task force to review this tragedy, this very difficult situation. But having had a chance to review the mandate given to this task force, I've got some very serious concerns which I want to raise this afternoon.

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

First of all, the task force that has been established – and I raise it with the Solicitor General because of the two provincial government departments, the Attorney General and the Solicitor General, the Solicitor General is the one that's taking the initiative, taking the lead as being responsible for the conduct of this task force. What concerns me are a number of things, Mr. Chairman. First of all, it's simply a task force. This committee that's been set up is a fact-finding committee, not appointed by order in council and, amazing to me, not structured under the Public Inquiries Act, either federal Acts or provincial legislation. This group has no powers of subpoena, and it cannot command the production of documents or witnesses. It would seem to me that if the Solicitor General were serious about this inquiry, he would have given them some kind of mandate or powers that would have allowed them some independence. But, no, they were hamstrung from the beginning.

There's no commitment, Mr. Chairman, that this report, when it's finalized, will be made public. The mandate is very specific. It states that a report is going to be prepared for three persons. Those three persons are the Solicitor General of Canada, the Solicitor General of Alberta, and the Attorney General of Alberta. I would like the Solicitor General this afternoon, if he would, to make a commitment to the members of the Assembly that when that report is presented to him, he will table it and provide it to the members of the Assembly and all members of the public so that it becomes a public document.

Mr. Chairman, there was a further restriction placed on this committee, and that was that they would only be able to hear from organizations, and only representatives of organizations that have submitted briefs will be allowed to come forward and present oral submissions. Now, this may have been intended to ensure that people coming forward would have some credibility and have some sort of formal organization behind them, and to that extent it would be understandable, but to have made it a sole requirement that anybody appearing before this task force has to represent an organization unfairly limits participation from some of the people that we would most want to hear from. Also, requiring that they write a brief before they're allowed to present adds a further hoop or obstacle, particularly for native people to appear.

I believe that much of great value can be learned from people whose skills are not in writing or whose natural language or mother language is not English. So to expect or to ask somebody to write a brief and submit it before they can even appear before this task force I think is just unrealistic and unacceptable. I mean, we only have to go back to the Berger commission in the mid-'70s, which established the precedent that by taking hearings into isolated communities, people who don't speak English, who aren't accustomed to writing briefs, can come forward and have something of great value and worth to present to a commission or a task force. So this is an area that I hope the Solicitor General will go back and redo to ensure that individuals can step forward.

This has just been highlighted recently in this House, Mr. Chairman, where a Crown prosecutor read in a local newspaper that people involved in legal aid, native counseling, police, trial lawyers, prosecutors, probation officers, people involved in the Court of Queen's Bench and penitentiaries, et cetera, were being requested to step forward to make submissions to this task force. He then did the proper thing by writing to his superior, and he said: "Look, some of us might be interested. How do we

appear? Here it is in the paper. How do we go about appearing before this committee? Given that the people appearing would have to do so on behalf of their departments, will you please explain to me what the proper procedure is." At which point they received a letter in return from the director of general prosecutions that said that inasmuch as anybody appearing before this task force is doing so on behalf of the department and therefore anything they might say would be interpreted as representing the department, only the Assistant Deputy Attorney General will be able to determine what, if any, departmental representations are going to be made.

Here we have people who are key to understanding how the entire system works being told that they aren't able to appear because of the limitations of this mandate of the task force. It's preposterous; it's ludicrous to set up an inquiry to try and find out how the system could be made to better work for native people and then the very key people who could give us some ideas on how to improve this system are being told by their own department that they're not allowed to show up, to appear. The same mandate would apply to probation officers, court workers, other people that fall under the mandate of the Solicitor General. How are we to ensure that individuals who work within the system are allowed the opportunity to present and step forward so that this task force can benefit from the experiences and advice of individuals who are working within this system without being hamstrung or gagged by the mandate given the task force that they can only appear if they're representing their department? This is just designed, Mr. Chairman, from the outset to ensure that we don't get to the bottom of it, that we don't find out what the people in the system can tell us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, everybody who has ever studied the criminal justice system, particularly as it affects native people, will tell you that the socioeconomic conditions that people live in have some bearing on the conflict they come into with the law, yet here we have a task force that's expected to pretend that these conditions don't exist, that they have no bearing on people coming into conflict with the law. Because there's no mandate given this task force to examine these matters, Mr. Chairman, nor are they being asked or told or required to examine how a clash of cultures, how a loss of traditional livelihoods over the past century may have also contributed to what the dominant society labels as criminal behaviour among the native communities of our province. It's absolutely ridiculous, beyond my understanding, how such a task force could be set up without being required or given a mandate to explore those issues.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this task force has been given only a limited mandate. It's only been given limited powers. It's been given limited resources. I was quite surprised to hear from the Solicitor General in recent correspondence. I called the task force to find out what kinds of resources are being provided to outside intervenors in order that they may be able to step forward and do research before they step forward to prepare submissions to the task force. I was told that only some limited amounts of funding would be provided to bands in the province. Well, now I see that somewhere in the order of \$388,000 is being provided in the form of intervenor funding to some organizations in the province, and I commend the Solicitor General for doing that.

But I would also ask, you know: where is the research that's being provided to the task force itself? After all, Mr. Chairman, the last time we did this in Alberta was Mr. Justice Kirby some 14 or 15 years ago. His inquiry – and it was an inquiry – spanned the course, if my memory serves me correctly, of

something like three years, and he published somewhere in the order of four different volumes, again if memory serves me correctly, as his examination of this issue. Now, it's fine for us to go back and take a look and read those documents, and it's nice to take a study off the shelf after 15 years, but let's do it right this time and not just set up a task force to read past documents but determine independently and provide advice to the task force as to how we can begin to implement and make change. That's what interests me. So I would say to the Solicitor General that if the mandate he's given this task force were seen as simply a good first step, preparing the groundwork, as a forerunner for a major inquiry to follow, I wouldn't be particularly concerned. But because the opportunities to examine problems such as this and to make changes come so very rarely, I would ask him to do it right. Let's not just keep it at a cursory, superficial level, but let's give the task force the mandate and the resources they need to solve the problem.

Now, let's also, Mr. Chairman, with this task force focus on finding solutions, not reidentifying problems and reinventing the wheel. For example, the Marshall inquiry was a royal commission that examined the gross injustice, the travesty of a miscarriage of justice regarding Donald Marshall Jr. in Nova Scotia. But what this royal commission did was identify 82 recommendations for improving the criminal justice system in the province of Nova Scotia. Now, I know that Alberta is not Nova Scotia. The problems we have here are different, the context is different, but can we surely not learn from what has happened in Nova Scotia and say to this task force, "How many of these 82 recommendations are applicable to our province and our situation and our people?" Then we're starting to focus on solutions, not simply traveling the province hearing about problems all over again. That would certainly focus the task force in actually looking at solving the problem.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these recommendations or suggestions that I'm making this afternoon cannot be dealt with unless the ministers responsible go back to the drawing board and redraft the mandate that's been given to Mr. Justice Cawsey and his committee members. So I'd like to ask the Solicitor General if he would give an undertaking to ensure that the kinds of limitations that I've identified in the mandate given to the task force are going to be redrafted, they're going to be reconsidered, and this task force is going to be given the powers and the mandate they require to do the job right. That would satisfy me that this minister and this government are interested in this task force's being more than simply a public relations event or a public relations exercise. If they give it the mandate, the power, the profile, the resources to do the job right, it would signal to me and to the public of Alberta that they're serious about solving a problem. But given the limitations they've put on this task force, one is left with the only conclusion they can reach, that being that they're not serious. They're simply going through the motions in the hope – I don't know what the hope is. But they're going through the motions, and at the end of the day whether we've got the changes or the recommendations for change is one thing, but if there's not the political will to do it right in the first place, there's unlikely to be the political will to implement the recommendations at the end of the line. So I'd ask the Solicitor General to give an undertaking that those changes are going to be made in this mandate of this task force.

I'd like to ask him one other question. The minister stated in the initial press conference when this task force was announced that they were going to spend a million dollars to get to the root of this problem, yet when I look at the vote for this year, I see

only \$805,000. That's about 20 percent short of the commitment that he made. I think the resources are inadequate to start with, but even here now we see in the budget estimates a figure even less than that that was announced earlier. Could the Solicitor General reconcile for us his earlier statement of a million dollars for this task force and a figure of \$805,000 appearing in the budget estimates?

With those comments I hope I've allowed the minister enough time to respond to the concerns raised this afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. With the committee's permission, the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon has indicated that he's got another three minutes that he would like to contribute.

MR. TAYLOR: Sorry. If I could just ask for another two minutes, I only have two questions to add for the minister, which he could answer later if he quite wished. One was: has any investigation gone on in car insurance and insuring the driver rather than the car? In a modern-day society where farmers and individuals own one, two, three, or four vehicles, they have to pay insurance, PL/PD, on each vehicle, which makes no sense because they can only drive one vehicle at a time. Why doesn't the insurance just follow the driver's licence rather than the vehicle? Secondly, has the minister investigated the no-fault insurance system in Ontario?

Thank you very much. How's that for speed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much.

The hon. Solicitor General.

MR. FOWLER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Of course, it's impossible for me to answer in any type of adequate detail at all all of the questions that have been posed by members of the opposition as well as our own member. To try and do so in order not to respond in a written form at a later date I think would be almost a dereliction of duty on my part.

The Member for Edmonton-Strathcona is concerned about the McClelland incident at the Grande Cache prison. Mr. Chairman, that involves an injection alleged to have been done without the consent of the prisoner. I would advise the House that this matter is still under discussion between the Ombudsman and my department, and it may in fact be inappropriate to respond in any detail. I do want to say, however, that I am aware of the law of our country and that medications in most instances cannot be given to a person without their consent. I'm very concerned about this very incident. An apology has not been demanded by the Ombudsman at this time and may or may not be given at a future date.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona also brought up the CPIC, which is the Canadian police information exchange, and I am informed that arrangements have been made which have considerably reduced the long delays that are evident in this matter.

I was interested in the hon. member's comments on the possibility of immediate roadside suspension for impaired driving and his proposal that possibly, without having regard to the .08 within the Criminal Code, administratively a higher reading could result in an immediate roadside suspension. I thank him for that suggestion, and I will in fact be looking into it.

The Member for Calgary-Buffalo has a concern about how our mental inmates are kept, and I would advise him that the Edmonton and Calgary remand centres as well as the Calgary,

Fort Saskatchewan, and Grande Cache correctional centres have units that are located in those centres for treatment of these people. If there are those who suffer from mental health problems, they are segregated from the general population, assessed and treated by staff psychologists as well as contracted psychiatrists, and if necessary they're taken to either the Calgary General hospital or the Alberta Hospital.

The failure to pay fines in Alberta – of course, I don't have those numbers. But I do know that whenever anybody's brought in to our institute for failure to pay the fine, they do have the fine-option program put before them, and they have the ability to deal with that.

With respect to women in prison, I thank the members on the other side for their suggestions in respect to these matters. I will be discussing with my own department the fact that we apparently do not have a halfway house for women in this province, and we will be looking into that. The Member for Edmonton-Avonmore has made a number of valuable points in respect to the treatment of women offenders in this province, and I will take those under study, as a matter of fact.

Calgary-Buffalo referred to the youth orientation unit run by the Mennonite group. We are closing out our contract with that group this year. Now, I am familiar with the long history of Mennonites' involvement with youth in this province, and it was a particular disappointment to me to have to take this action in respect to this particular youth orientation unit. However, because of the Young Offenders Act, because of the obligation or the necessity for us to educate young offenders by law and the changing ages of this, it was seriously underutilized and could, in fact, not be considered an economical unit for us to continue with at all. I want to thank the Mennonites for their long assistance over a period of time and their outstanding efforts in this regard.

The high-speed chases were raised. The commission members, I would advise the Member for Calgary-Buffalo, are in fact members of the general public. I want to assure him that there is no secrecy in this group, and if they wish to hold open or public hearings, that's entirely up to the group itself.

It was suggested that impaired driving on first offences are light, and with that I agree. However, I know the hon. member knows that the extent to which any department of government, Attorney General or Solicitor General, can bring pressure or suggestions to the provincial court, or any court for that matter, is extremely limited and would be totally inappropriate for us to engage in.

AN HON. MEMBER: Then change the law, Dick.

MR. FOWLER: I'd like to do that, but that's the Criminal Code of Canada. We can deal with it administratively; I know that.

The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon has raised the matter in respect to an employee who extremely unfortunately, through a loss of eyesight which worsened over a period of time, finally reached the stage where the job function of manager of a particular store could not be continued. We have attempted to and continue to, in fact, reach a departure agreement with that manager with as much compassion as we can. It seems now that there may, *in fact*, be a change for the better in the man's eyesight. I sincerely hope that is the case, and if we can get that reported to us through the proper medical people, we will in fact be looking at it.

Courts on reserves have been tried in Alberta, Mr. Chairman, not with complete success, but I am certain that it is one of the things the new task force will be looking at.

The hayburners that the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon suggested may be out there, I think I'd bet on most of them. However, I would say that the Alberta Racing Commission is in fact bringing about what we hope, and we do not believe to be unrealistic: almost another Kentucky in Alberta in the racehorse industry. We have, in fact, indications of that from throughout North America, that Alberta is looked at as a wonderful place to be involved in the racing field.

I am painfully aware of the motor vehicles division lineups that are occurring in the province these days. There are a number of reasons for that. There's an inordinate number of people that had their licences come up in April. There is also the fact that there was an increase in fees on May 1 which everybody wanted to beat. Finally, we had a computer bug that added to our problem, all of which indicated to us that we should have been more on top of it than what we were, and I assure the House that this is being addressed to a great degree.

Mr. Chairman, I would gladly, and will be doing so in fact, respond to the rest of these questions, all of them.

But Calgary-Mountain View I know has a great concern about the native justice task force. I would only say that those terms of reference were in fact drawn up with the Indian Association of Alberta and with the Metis Association of Alberta, and Mr. Justice Cawsey did not indicate to us any difficulty at the time. In respect to the specific matter of prosecutors giving testimony, I'm advised by the Attorney General that at the prosecutors' conference coming up within the next six or seven days, they will be advised that without qualification they can in fact take part to any degree they wish as individuals.

I thank the members from the government and the members opposite for their input and sincerely thank them for their very kind and generous comments with which they commenced their remarks.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to table four copies of Alberta Corrections: Progressive Correctional Environments, which is a full outline of the correctional facilities in the province of Alberta.

Thank you very much.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee now rise, report progress, and request leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions of the Department of the Solicitor General, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.  
Does the Assembly concur?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.  
Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, just by way of advice to the members with respect to the business of the Assembly this evening, by agreement among the House leaders it's been determined that the members will sit in Committee of Supply for the purpose of hearing the estimates of the Department of Tourism. I would therefore move that when the members assemble at 8 p.m., they do so in Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.  
Those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Motion carries.  
Thank you.

[The House recessed at 5:25 p.m.]