

Title: Monday, March 22, 1999 Subcom. B: Justice and Attorney General

Date: 99/03/22

8:06 p.m.

[Mr. Tannas in the Chair]

Subcommittee B - Justice and Attorney General

Tannas, Don, Chairman
 Laing, Bonnie, Deputy Chairman
 Barrett, Pam
 Blakeman, Laurie
 Calahasen, Pearl
 Dickson, Gary
 Doerksen, Victor
 Forsyth, Heather

Fritz, Yvonne
 Graham, Marlene
 Hancock, Dave
 Havelock, Jon
 Jonson, Halvar
 Kryczka, Karen
 Leibovici, Karen

McClellan, Shirley
 Melchin, Greg
 Olsen, Sue
 Paszkowski, Walter
 Sloan, Linda
 Soetaert, Colleen
 Tarchuk, Janis

THE CHAIRMAN: The subcommittee has under consideration the estimates of the Department of Justice. To begin I guess we'll ask the hon. Minister of Justice and Attorney General to make his opening comments, and then we'll have questions.

MR. HAVELOCK: Yes. Mr. Chairman and committee members, I can tell you in a heartfelt way that it's certainly a pleasure to be here to present the ministry's estimates and business plan for the period 1999-2000 to 2001-2002. With me today sitting off to my right is our new deputy minister and Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Paul Bourque, who's just standing; we have Doug Ray also, assistant deputy minister, civil law - you all know Doug - Dan Mercer, executive director, corporate services division; Shawkat Sabur, director of financial services, way down at the end; and Randy Petruk, director of corporate support services.

I might as well get right into it. On the fourth page of our business plan we have provided an overview of the environment in which the department routinely operates, and obviously this brings with it a number of challenges. As we have outlined in the business plan, "the Ministry is charged with administering justice in Alberta." We "must respond to changes in . . . legislation," much of which is generated at the federal level. Gun control and changes to the Young Offenders Act are two recent examples.

In addition, the ministry "acts as a facilitator by working with individuals, governments, other organizations, and communities throughout the province" to prevent, detect, investigate, and prosecute crime. The Department of Justice represents the public interests through the prosecution and punishment of wrongdoers.

Accessibility to the services provided by Alberta Justice continues as a basic challenge to ensure that Albertans "are able to access every required Ministerial service." In addition, these services and "programs must not only exemplify excellence in the level of service delivery;" they must also be cost-effective.

Most importantly, Mr. Chairman, based upon what we know about public perception we must continue "to provide greater clarity regarding how the justice system operates so that citizens understand and support" the work of the department.

As you know, 14 months ago I announced that a forum would be held to build consensus on actions for improving public confidence and community participation in the justice system. That forum, the summit on justice, was held from January 27 through 29 of this year at the University of Calgary. A total of 151 delegates attended. I believe, if I'm not mistaken, we had three or four members of the opposition attend that. Eighty-three of the 151 delegates were randomly selected from across the province, and we did ask a substantial amount of these Albertans through their participation in the summit.

We provided them with a total of seven objectives to pursue, and three objectives in particular are important with respect to my presentation today. Number one, we asked the delegates to determine ways to make the most effective and efficient use of our justice system and community resources. Number two, we asked them to identify issues, challenges, needs, innovations, and opportunities, and finally, number three, we asked them to identify and establish priorities for change and future direction.

We were originally rewarded by the summit, Mr. Chairman. The delegates provided us with a total of 519 individual recommendations on the following themes: improve public knowledge, education, and awareness; simplify the justice system; increase sensitivity and cultural awareness; enhance community partnerships; increase the role of victims and offenders; clarify accountability; act on previous studies and reports on justice; and, finally and not surprisingly, increase funding. While I am not here today to ask you for significantly more money based on these themes, I believe the budget before you will be able to support many of the recommendations we plan to implement from the summit.

Mr. Chairman, this business plan may be best considered a work in progress. I have not as yet received the justice summit final report, and I do not know exactly what all the recommendations are or which ones government will eventually approve. However, it is likely that some of the adopted recommendations will have budget implications. Nevertheless, I am committed to make representation for more funding only when we can demonstrate a need and a clear business case for reinvestment. In that regard, as members will note, we have included some additional funding where appropriate according to the needs as we have identified them at this time.

From a broad financial perspective the ministry's 1999-2000 gross operating expense estimates are \$369.2 million. This represents a net increase of \$20.5 million, or a 5.9 percent increase from the comparable 1998-99 estimates. However, if you take into account supplementary funding for judicial compensation approved by Treasury Board this fiscal year, the increase from the comparable '98-99 forecast is only \$14.2 million, or a 4 percent increase, which is consistent with the goals established for all departments in government.

In terms of capital investment this is relatively unchanged at \$2.8 million in '99-2000. In addition, the ministry's '99-2000 estimates also include a further amount of \$28.89 million for statutory requirements, and of this amount, \$27.75 million relates to funding required for motor vehicle accident claims.

This year, as was the case last year, we have structured our business plan so that our strategies are directly linked to each of our goals. Rather than reviewing the complete plan, I will review some important additions to last year's plan. The first goal reflects our experience with the summit themes.

Achieving success according to such themes will require that we "create an active partnership with other Government Ministries, the community and stakeholders" to advance our goals. Under this new

goal we have five strategies: one, work through the justice summit "to increase public confidence in the administration of justice"; two, "implement the Children's Services Business Plan"; three, "work in partnership with First Nations and Metis people to address" their "justice needs and concerns"; four, "support the People and Prosperity Initiative" arising from the growth summit; and, five, "work with stakeholders to improve the service delivery" of our programs.

Each of these strategies has a number of associated initiatives, Mr. Chairman. Our remaining goals are the same as last year. However, we have added some new strategies while we continue to pursue existing ones. For example, under the goal of facilitating "the rehabilitation of offenders and helping victims," we will continue to focus the resources of Alberta Justice on serious and violent crime.

Our business plan lists several other initiatives. The work with federal Justice regarding the development and implementation of the proposals passed under the federal government's new youth justice strategy is particularly significant. As all of you know by now, we have many concerns about this new legislation. From a financial perspective it is not clear at this stage what additional costs we will have to incur. Suffice it to say that we are already paying a disproportionate share of the associated costs, and I am continuing to pressure the federal government to return to the original 50-50 formula it committed to in 1984. Right now, for your information, I believe the sharing is 59 percent province and 41 percent federal government, although it remains to be seen how the new youth justice strategy will impact the cost sharing.

We have added another strategy to our third goal of facilitating "the rehabilitation of offenders and helping victims." This new strategy will involve monitoring and evaluating the services to crime victims provided by the Victims of Crime Act. We also intend to collaborate with other ministries to monitor the implementation of the Protection against Family Violence Act.

We've also added two new strategies to our fourth goal of providing Albertans access to civil and criminal justice. These include enhancing "opportunities for Albertans to obtain appropriate dispute resolution mechanisms" and improving "access for Albertans to the court process."

With respect to our performance, progress on our first goal will now be measured by public satisfaction with the justice system. Clearly, if we succeed in working effectively with stakeholders, our level of public approval will increase. And by way of a little free advertising our satisfaction rate went from 52 percent to 61 percent this past year.

We have now developed a performance measure relating to "victim satisfaction . . . with services provided." As I've already mentioned, since our ministry is sponsoring the Victims of Crime Act, we felt the level of approval of our programs from the victims' point of view should be a key measure.

8:16

With regard to our fifth goal, ensuring "access to justice services for persons in need," we are recommending to now use the dollar amounts collected on an average maintenance enforcement file as a measure, although I will admit this one is not as satisfactory as I'd like it to be. This is in addition to the existing performance measure: "Client satisfaction with the services of the Maintenance Enforcement Program," and as noted in the plan, we are also working on additional monetary performance measures. This one I think is the most legitimate one, and that is including the amounts collected as a proportion of that which the program is entitled to collect.

A final major change to this year's business plan is found in the last section called Corporate Strategies. We are all aware that in

order for our programs to be effective, we must have the necessary infrastructure to deliver them. The key to doing this, we believe, is not necessarily having more resources plugged in to our administration but rather to have more skilled staff and more effective technology. In addition we feel it is critically important to collaborate with others outside our ministry wherever it is cost-effective and reasonable to do so. Accordingly our corporate strategies have been introduced this year so that we can begin a process of renewal and reinvestment in a way that benefits all our programs and hence all Albertans.

Mr. Chairman and committee members, these are the goals, strategies, initiatives, and budget implications that I wish to review with you this evening. I'm now prepared to take questions as soon as I get a pad of paper.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

I'll call on the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. DICKSON: Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. Good evening, Mr. Minister, and welcome, Mr. Bourque.

Let me start off - actually this feels a little nostalgic - with some of the questions that I remember we didn't get the responses we were hoping for last year, Mr. Minister. It seems to me that last time we had a format where you were particularly forthcoming, and rather than just throwing a whole bunch of questions at you, you actually engaged in trying to respond to some of them at the time, and I'd like to encourage you to do that this evening, if you're willing.

MR. HAVELOCK: Hon. member, if the committee is prepared to indulge me in that, if you don't hit me with 20 minutes worth of questions and expect 20 minutes worth of answers, then I think it can work quite well if there's some to and fro and give and take, et cetera, although I understand that the process is that once you ask a question or two, then it goes to the government members.

MR. DICKSON: Well, with respect, my view is that I have 20 minutes, and if I choose to encourage you to respond within that 20 minutes, then . . .

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, is that appropriate, Mr. Chairman? It may not be in keeping with the standard procedure in the House, in light of your earlier ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the subcommittee is agreeable to the process of, say, the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo asking a series of questions and you responding during a given period of time, then the chairman is perfectly happy with that. If it's not agreeable, then we have to go with the rules of the House. It's to facilitate the subcommittee. The subcommittee having heard the proposal by the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo and the hon. minister - or do you want to hear again what the proposal is? [interjections] Okay. Calgary-Buffalo do you want to just briefly say what it is, and if they're happy with that, I'm sure happy to chair that.

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, Mr. Chairman, could I also suggest then - because I know that I won't have every answer to every question that you ask - that you consider whether or not I could have perhaps my deputy minister up here because I know that they're quite helpful in facilitating me getting information. It's up to you, Mr. Chairman. That's what I've been advised before.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, let's have them put together. Since this is not in fact the floor, where Chamber rules would be there, if we're

really wanting to facilitate - hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo would you just briefly put the proposal including the minister's caveat here, and if that's agreeable with the committee then . . .

MR. DICKSON: All I'm suggesting is really to do what I remember you did last year, which is that you had your deputy beside you. We asked two or three questions. When you'd flag that you wanted to try responding to them, you responded. We went on with another two or three questions, and we got some very useful information using that process.

MR. HAVELOCK: Hon. member, I fully support that.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a question. The hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

MRS. FORSYTH: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify something with Mr. Dickson. Is it the 20 minutes that you're allocated? Do you want that timing? Because it's 20 minutes and then 20 minutes. So you're talking about your 20-minute time line.

MR. DICKSON: I'm prepared to share my 20 minutes with the Minister of Justice.

MRS. FORSYTH: Fine.

MR. HAVELOCK: That's what being a lawyer is all about.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ready for the question? All in support of that, please raise your arm. Those opposed, please raise your arm. If my eyesight is not failing, it looks like we have unanimous consent.

Hon. deputy minister, if you'd come and . . . [interjection]

Okay. I'll guess we'll start the timer off with this setting. The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. DICKSON: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Let me start with one of my pet issues from last year. You remember my proposal. We have one of the most electronically sophisticated courts of appeal in the country. I had suggested last time that we ought to be looking at having a video record of trials that would be available so that the panel on the Court of Appeal would have access not only to a written transcript but would also have access to a video record of viva voce evidence being given in the course of a trial. You will recall that this is a suggestion that had been made to me actually by a couple of the most senior civil litigators in the city of Calgary. You said it was something that you would look at.

I'm back a year later to ask, Mr. Minister, if you've given any more thought to that, if you've considered why we would not be able to do that. It seems to me that when the technology exists and particularly, as I say, when our Court of Appeal is as sophisticated as it is in terms of dealing with electronic information and computer technology, it makes sense that we would apply that technology in an area where it's particularly important. It certainly wouldn't hurt, presumably, the quality of appellate dispositions.

Now, moving on to some questions on the civil side. Would you tell us, Mr. Minister, the top three initiatives that your department has undertaken in the last year in terms of public legal education. I think of Justice Sopinka and others who have talked repeatedly about the enormous impediment that legal fees pose litigants in this country. It seems to me that if ever there were a time that the provincial government and your department ought to be providing leadership in terms of an enlightened public legal education program, this would be the time and you would be the minister. So I'm interested in knowing what we're going to do.

My experience since I've been a member of the bar, since 1972, is that this is an area that's been largely orphaned by government. It's been done by the Alberta Law Foundation. It's been done by nonprofit agencies. It's been done modestly by the Canadian Bar Association. I think it's time, Mr. Minister, that we see leadership coming from the top justice fellow, and that's you. So I'm interested in what your proposal is there.

We talked with your predecessor, when I used to be Justice critic, on the notion of the multidoor courthouse. Mr. Minister, I look through the business plan and I see hints of a proposal to provide an array of remedies, but I don't see it. When I go to 611-4th Street S.W. in Calgary, that courthouse and the processes available to me as a litigant don't look a lot different now than they did in 1971. There have been models - and I've referred you to them before - in the state of Georgia, in Washington, D.C., and in other places. They've gone a long distance down that road. Mr. Minister, I don't know why we don't see ADR brought right into the courthouses in this province and made readily available.

When we look at goal 4 and you talk about dispute resolution mechanisms - and I'm looking at your business plan - other than the piece of legislation we dealt with I think last year dealing with Crown disputes, I'm not seeing a lot of evidence in terms of alternate dispute resolution mechanisms being advanced, promoted, supported by your ministry.

I see things that are happening in spite of or independent of your ministry. I'm trying to get a sense of where your ministry is driving some of these initiatives that people seem to acknowledge are really important.

8:26

MR. HAVELOCK: Do you want me to answer some now?

MR. DICKSON: You bet.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister.

MR. HAVELOCK: Thank you. I do recall the discussion relating to the video record of trials. To be honest with you, at this stage we don't have sufficient funds in the budget to pursue that. However, speaking generally we are looking at, for example in Calgary, trying to consolidate courthouses in one location. There is a proposal being examined internally. Perhaps at that stage it would be appropriate to take a look at that not just with respect to the Court of Appeal but take a look at how it can be effectively used for the other levels of court.

The top three initiatives in public legal education. I'll give you some off the top of my head. One, the maintenance enforcement area, and due to the work by the Member for Calgary-Lougheed we are trying to develop some brochures and some materials for people who are involved in that particular area of the law so they can either take themselves through the system and reduce their costs or, alternately, take a lot of the steps unto themselves and not have to retain the services of a lawyer. We're trying to simplify that, and that's a big area. In fact, maintenance enforcement is the one area where as a minister - I think I've mentioned this before - I receive more correspondence from MLAs than any other area. So that's a big push for us, and we hope that will be successful. In that regard we've also established some offices in the province relating to the federal support guidelines. I think we have a one-stop-shopping concept where people can pick up that type of information with respect to that area.

I hate to harp on it, but I know that we need to educate the population generally with respect to how the system works. That

was one of the key features of the justice summit which was just concluded. It generated a lot of coverage. I think we produced some great materials and distributed those on a widespread basis, so hopefully that has helped. I'm advised our Public Trustee has some very good public legal education initiatives in place. I don't have the detail with me, but I'd be happy to get that to you. The Alberta Law Foundation we also provide with a grant, and they are also involved and have a responsibility with respect to public legal education.

Crime prevention week. A very successful initiative that we undertake every year. We're looking at actually expanding that to an initiative that runs 365 days a year. So we're trying to enhance some knowledge in that area.

Multidoor courthouse, mediation, ADR. Yes, we're looking at expanding mediation. We had a very successful program in place in Edmonton. We've expanded that to Calgary. I think it's a 70 percent success rate. I recently asked the department to take a look at how we can expand that and try to drive litigants through that process. In Ontario, if I'm not mistaken, they've put in a formal process where the litigants pay \$100 or \$50, something along those lines, and they're required to go to mediation before they appear before the courts. That has resulted in a lot of settlements. It's very successful, so we're looking at that idea.

ADR itself. To be honest with you, I'd like to see us doing more in that area too. We are working on some committees with the legal community, with the judiciary. Unfortunately, it just takes a lot of time to try and get some things done. Again in that regard I can provide you with some more specific detail from the department at the conclusion of this meeting.

MR. DICKSON: Thanks very much, Mr. Minister. I appreciate those responses. Just following up, because this whole process is about quantification, let me ask you to identify, if you will, what the goals are that you'd like your ministry to be measured against a year hence in terms of public legal education and promotion of ADR. What I'm looking for here - you've given me some sense of what's going on currently. You've acknowledged you'd like to do more. I think Albertans would like to know, Mr. Minister, what your targets are for 1999-2000 so that when we line up behind the microphones a year from now, we can evaluate whether you've achieved your goals or exceeded them and where we send the congratulations. I think it would be helpful if you could quantify those things, Mr. Minister, for us tonight.

MR. HAVELOCK: Do you want me to respond now?

MR. DICKSON: Yes, please.

MR. HAVELOCK: All right. I'm taking a quick flip through the business plan, but I don't believe I have any specific goal measurement which relates to ADR itself. We will look at the public satisfaction generally. I think that would be a measure of whether or not we've improved the system generally.

Accessibility and time to trial. We do have that on the criminal side, and that's something we're trying to maintain at a certain number of weeks. Actually you raise an interesting point, and I think what we can do is take that into account. Perhaps we should look at developing a measurement with respect to ADR and/or mediation. Perhaps it can be, on the mediation side, how many cases go to mediation, what amount are resolved before it takes the next step. On the ADR side formally, I don't think we've advanced that enough at this stage of the game to come up with a measurement. It's still being worked on. But I think we could take a look at that on

the mediation side. I think that's a legitimate suggestion, and I know the department will do that in light of the answer I just gave.

THE CHAIRMAN: Hon. member.

MR. DICKSON: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, we've made one modest step in terms of expanding the jurisdiction of the civil side of Provincial Court up to \$7,500. When is that going to be moved to \$10,000? There continue to be a lot of marginal civil actions that frankly belong in the Provincial Court. The adjustment, the ceiling that went up to \$7,500 is certainly better than where it was before, but I say respectfully, Mr. Minister, that it seems like a very timid step. I'm anxious to have the ceiling moved to \$10,000, and I'm hopeful you'll indicate when we'll move to that.

The other item. You raise it yourself, Mr. Minister, when you talk about time to trial. I haven't sort of gone through *Hansard* from one or two years ago, but I'm sure we've had this conversation about the civil side. Why is it not at least as important to know, from the time a certificate of readiness has been executed by plaintiff's council and defendant's council, the length of time from that point until the matter is heard and judicially determined? Why don't we track that? It's been awhile since I've been doing any civil litigation, but my colleagues and people who practise in the civil side tell me that notwithstanding all the great initiatives the courts have initiated - and I'm thinking of pretrial conferences, case conferences, a host of things the courts have initiated - there are still backlogs in terms of getting civil trial time. So my question I guess firstly is: why aren't we using that as a performance measurement?

There's a whole body of activity that goes on in the civil side. I think sometimes the criminal side attracts a disproportionate amount of attention because it's not private litigation, but the reality, I think, is that it's far more important to most Albertans. Whether it's a wrongful dismissal action or contract litigation or specific performance action, those people want that trial date. So why wouldn't we be measuring that? If you think it's significant to measure time to trial in the criminal side, why aren't we working on the civil side?

My suggestion would be that if you take it from time of certificate of readiness, that gets you past all of the potential party-induced delays in terms of scheduling discoveries and production and all that kind of stuff. So I'm interested in what you'd do there, Mr. Minister.

The other thing is with respect to public awareness, and you raised it, sir, when you talked about the justice summit. I think we talked a year ago, and I asked you then and I ask you now: what role do you, as the senior law person in the province, plan on playing over the next year in terms of giving Albertans more accurate information about the nature and extent of crime?

I think we both acknowledge that when people are fearful, they tend to be more punitive and they tend to be hostile to conditional release programs. All of those things build in enormous cost problems for you as a minister and for your government. So I'm interested in knowing just what your specific plans are, once again coming back to something that becomes quantifiable and measurable. If you can share with us, Mr. Minister, the goals you have in terms of giving people more accurate information about the criminal justice system so that we have a way of measuring that a year hence.

8:36

I'll say, with respect, that I find that the measurements you're using now in your justice business plan are not particularly helpful. The public perception of safety - and I think we went through this before when Professor Dube at the University of Toronto went through his survey, that's been replicated a host of times since.

What we know is that people typically feel their own home is safe. It's a question of how they feel about their bigger community. That's the issue. Most everybody feels safe in their own yard and their own house. The question is: do they feel safe going into downtown Edmonton or downtown Peace River or wherever? That's the sort of issue that I think we're moving towards or that we'd like to. Perhaps you might indicate why we're still using these very crude measurements of public satisfaction, because I think we can do a lot better. You've got lots of bright people in your department, and there are far more sophisticated tools that can be adapted to measure Albertans' level of satisfaction.

MR. HAVELOCK: Do you want me to answer those?

MR. DICKSON: Yeah. You bet.

MR. HAVELOCK: Okay. The civil claims issue. As you know, in October '97 the limit was raised from \$4,000 to \$7,500, and it's been in place, therefore, about 18 months now. An evaluation report, which will assess what impact raising this limit has had on our existing resources and court lead times, is near completion. It will be reviewed, and we'll be able to determine whether or not the initiative had any significant impact. If it did, I would think in the very near future we could look at raising the limit to \$10,000. In fact, if it's found to be working, I see no reason why we couldn't raise the limit even more, because of course, as you know, due to the costs of going through the courts, \$10,000 is still a pretty small lawsuit. We may want to look at increasing it even beyond that. If the assessment indicates it's worked well, then I think by 2000 we'll probably be boosting the jurisdiction and then maybe even do it again shortly thereafter.

Time to trial on the civil side. I am advised that actually on the QB side we have the fastest time to trial in the country. Nevertheless, your suggestion in measuring it from certificate of readiness I think we'll take into account. You've raised some issues regarding the performance measures generally. In fact what I'd like to suggest is that if you'd like us to take a look at some specific measures that you have in mind, put them down, and we will take a look at them. I'm not married to these measures. If there are more effective ways to indicate our success in achieving our goals, I'd be happy to take a look at them.

Giving Albertans more accurate information about the nature of crime. You're familiar with the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. They have very good information. We publish that regularly. It's an organization that's highly thought of and independent.

By the way, am I allowed to use first names in this committee or not?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. HAVELOCK: No? Okay. Fine.

Member for Calgary-Buffalo, as you know - or maybe you don't know - we publish a lot of things in Justice, and we're trying to get the accurate information out. But typically what happens in this department is that very often it's not the good news that's reported; it's the sensationalized cases that wind up in the paper or some statements or whatever. One of our biggest challenges is trying to get our message across, and that's one of the things, again, that was identified through the justice summit. We are looking at some partnering initiatives also. The new deputy raised that with me some time ago, where we're trying to work with the private sector so we can get this information out more accurately to Albertans generally.

So, again, to summarize, you've raised some performance measure issues, and I'd encourage you or anyone on this committee to send us any concepts you may like us to take a look at with respect to our performance measures.

THE CHAIRMAN: Calgary-Buffalo, you have 40 seconds left.

MR. DICKSON: Thank you. What's the cost in terms of new judges if you raise the ceiling \$10,000 for the civil side of provincial court? How much will that cost? There is a cost component.

MR. HAVELOCK: I don't believe we know that at this stage of the game. That's part of the overall assessment. But if I recall correctly, when we raised it from \$4,000 to \$7,500 - and correct me if I'm wrong - I think we added one in Calgary, one in Edmonton. I think that's all we added, hon. member, with respect to that increase. I can't tell you off the top of my head what we would have to add at this stage. We'd still have to do the evaluation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Just to remind people, we are in fact in a subcommittee of the committee. It's not the designated supply subcommittee, which has quite different rules and is much more open. We're kind of going by consensus, and the fact is we're not in the Chamber.

Since we don't have the convention of standing, the next person that may wish to speak on my list is Edmonton-Ellerslie. If anybody does wish to ask some questions and that kind of thing, please send me along a note. Right now I haven't got any indication that somebody on the other . . . [interjection] Okay. Then the hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek, and we'll come back to Edmonton-Ellerslie. Yes, Edmonton-Riverview is on. If anybody else is interested in asking questions, please let me know.

Calgary-Fish Creek.

MRS. FORSYTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Minister. I'd like to start off on the government lottery funds estimates in regard to the total cost of carrying out the ministry programs. One of the things that I'm noticing is the policing, which is \$103.1 million.

MR. HAVELOCK: What page are you on?

MRS. FORSYTH: Page 297. At the top, the third paragraph, the first bullet, under policing. My understanding is that policing is determined by a ratio. I'd like to know how that ratio is determined. My understanding of that is there is so much population and there are so many police officers.

The other thing I'd like to ask is on page 299, Mr. Minister. You talk about "the amount collected by the Maintenance Enforcement Program on court orders as a proportion of the amount [it] is legally entitled to collect." You indicate in your budget that "this indicator is currently not available, however, system enhancements are being considered in order to ensure this measure is available in the future." I'd like to ask you when that is going to be done.

My next question is on the "number of eligible persons receiving legal aid services." Of course, you indicate that "volume measures the demand for legal aid." I notice that there's a substantial increase from 1996 figures to 1997 figures of 7,647 recipients of legal aid compared to the previous figure, '95-96, of just over 1,000. What's that attributed to? That is another question I have.

MR. HAVELOCK: Why don't I answer those, and then you can come up with some more. How's that?

The \$103.1 million. Quite frankly, I don't know that the department is involved in any ratio that's done with respect to policing. We have the general agreement with the RCMP on a provincial level - what is that? - about \$81 million, and we don't become in any way involved with the RCMP in the allocation of their manpower. That's an operational decision which they make. I believe another amount of money is for the aboriginal policing, which would be included in there. I don't have that figure off the top of my head, but to assure you, when we're funding policing services, we aren't doing it on the basis of a ratio. Now, perhaps the Calgary or Edmonton city police or whatever may well try and do it on the basis of a ratio based on their own budget, but we don't do that provincially.

8:46

MRS. FORSYTH: You don't determine the ratio?

MR. HAVELOCK: No.

On page 299: "This indicator is currently not available." Well, I can assure you that it will be available for next year's business plan, and I'd like that to be available in the very near future. So perhaps when this is put into the business plan, we'll have some initial results that we'll be able to advise the committee of.

The legal aid side. I guess it may well be that some of the certificates that were issued were for lesser amounts, less complex cases. I can certainly get you some more information on why the number of people receiving legal aid services increased. Now, we didn't increase the budget. If I'm not mistaken, they actually changed their guidelines with respect to the qualifications for people being able to qualify for legal aid. Did that come into effect this past year, or is it coming into effect shortly? It's coming into effect right now, so that's not the reason why that changed. Again, I can get you some specifics on why the increased number and still based on the same budget.

THE CHAIRMAN: Calgary-Fish Creek.

MRS. FORSYTH: Yes. Thanks. I note that under program 8, correctional services, on page 292 of the estimates there is a modest increase in the funding for purchased community services contracts. I'd like to know where these increases are targeted.

MR. HAVELOCK: Sorry. Which line item are you at?

MRS. FORSYTH: Program 8 on page 292. It's near the bottom.

MR. HAVELOCK: Which line? Line 8.4 or what?

MRS. FORSYTH: Line 8.4.

MR. HAVELOCK: Okay.

MRS. FORSYTH: I'm back to goal 1 in your book, number 2: "Retain responsibility for the administration of criminal justice programs for young offenders while supporting the children's initiative." I'd like an explanation on that, if I could, please. I'm not understanding what you're trying to say.

One of the things that I find very interesting when I'm driving up to Edmonton every week is your work program with your offenders on Deerfoot Trail. It seems to me they're out there every Sunday. I'd like you to explain that to me. I think it's a good program. Do they do other things? I've just seen them on Deerfoot. Occasionally I've seen them on highway 2. Are those adult offenders? Are you doing the same thing for young offenders? That is another thing I'd like to know.

I'd like an update on your youth justice committees. I was involved in that way back, with one of the first or second ones, other than the aboriginal ones, that were first initiated up north. I'd like to know if you have any success rates on the youth justice committees. I know that you've really got quite a few going right now.

MR. HAVELOCK: That's three. How about if I try and answer those for now?

MRS. FORSYTH: Okay.

MR. HAVELOCK: Your question relating to 8.4. The decrease results mainly from the reallocation of contract services resources within the subprogram itself. Then you were looking at 8.4 generally?

MRS. FORSYTH: Yes. Page 292.

MR. HAVELOCK: Okay. Well, it's not a substantial decrease at all. I think it's - what? - about \$13,000. There was some reallocation, and obviously we were able to reallocate and do the job a little more effectively than we were before.

Goal 1, number 2: control over young offender programs and working with the minister without portfolio in charge of the children's initiative. What we determined quite some time ago was that we felt it appropriate for the Department of Justice to maintain responsibility for those programs relating directly to young offenders: incarceration and programs within the system, the work camps, et cetera. What we've tried to do, nevertheless, is transfer some programs to the children's initiative, those that we felt they could actually work with. I think there was the Métis mentoring program, if I'm not mistaken. That was one of the ones that was transferred. What else was transferred? The court worker program is in the process of being transferred. We've tried to evaluate those which we can effectively transfer without undermining our primary responsibility for young offender programs, and we'll continue to do that. We support very strongly the children's initiative.

As I've indicated before, unfortunately by the time young people reach us, it's often too late. The system generally has failed to address their problem. What we try and do when we have those young people is provide them with a caring and nurturing environment. In fact for a lot of them, when they're with us and incarcerated, it's really the only structure they've had for quite some time.

One of the difficulties we have, then, is that when they leave our facilities, they're going back to what they were doing before. We have a program which we initiated with Community Services just last year. One is an art program. Another one is a sports-related program. We've tried to move young people into there and give them some structure after they've left the system. It's been very successful. We evaluated it. We're happy with the results, but we need to continue to do more of that. Again, it's a question of budget. [interjection] It's just been mentioned to me that we're also working with Junior Achievement. I can get you some more information on that.

Work programs. Yes, I've passed the workers on the road quite often, and typically I'll beep. Sometimes you get a response, and sometimes you don't. I won't describe to you what the response is sometimes. It's been very effective for us. We have been able to provide assistance to a number of communities throughout the province. If you look at a \$5 an hour rate, I think it was in excess of 1.5 million hours, or was it \$1.5 million that we provided work? Five million dollars' worth of services. We continue to encourage that.

On the youth side we don't do as much because when we have these young people, we're trying to have them attend school within our facilities, although if appropriate we do get them involved in some community activities.

The youth justice committees. We have in excess of, I think, 70 in the province right now. We do not have any way right now of measuring how successful those are. Again I think you're raising a good issue. Perhaps the department should look at the types of cases that are being referred to those committees and the success rate, and try to track some of those young people who have been through that process to determine whether or not they're showing up again in the system. So that's something we'll certainly take into consideration.

THE CHAIRMAN: Calgary-Fish Creek.

MRS. FORSYTH: Yes, please. I'm still in The Right Balance on page 228, if I may, Mr. Minister, the fourth point, on the top, in regard to "work with Health to reduce risk taking behaviours which impact wellness in adolescents." I'd like you to elaborate on that.

MR. HAVELOCK: I'm sorry; which page?

MRS. FORSYTH: Page 228.

MR. HAVELOCK: It's in the business plan; right?

MRS. FORSYTH: At the top of page 228, number 4. It's in regards to your strategy: "work with Health to reduce risk taking behaviours which impact wellness in adolescents." I'd like you to expand on that, please.

Number 5 is something dear to my heart, and that's the phase 2 implementation committee of the children involved in prostitution. I'd like to first of all thank your representative that has been involved in this. As you're aware, it's been a very successful six or seven weeks so far. One of the things in the original task force was the idea of getting these kids to court quicker and also screening. I'm wondering where we are on that.

The next one is on page 229, number 4(2), in regards to evaluating the Calgary Young Offender Centre mentoring program initiative with the business community.

I'd like to know if you're still as successful as you have been in the past in regards to Shunda Creek, the work camp program. I've been up there to visit, and I know it's a very successful program.

8:56

MR. HAVELOCK: Okay. Your initiative number 4: you've asked if officials from Alberta Justice and Alberta Health have begun discussions leading to joint initiatives addressing the health needs of youth in custody. The particular focus will be on "reducing risk taking behaviours and promoting wellness," for example, HIV/AIDS awareness, smoking reduction, nutrition, and injury prevention.

I think you asked about number 5. You, of course, were very much involved in that. The goal of the task force, as you know, is to identify strategies to address the involvement of juveniles in prostitution-related activities. The phase 2 implementation committee was established in January of '97 to ensure action on the recommendations contained in the task force report. As you know, the act was proclaimed on February 1, 1999. Initial indications from certain law enforcement officers, and our department officials, is that it's very successful. It is having an impact. In fact, I would not be surprised if other jurisdictions across the country actually passed legislation similar to that.

MRS. FORSYTH: Could I ask further to that one, Mr. Minister, in regards to the idea of getting these kids into court quicker and a screening process for them when they're facing their pimp?

MR. HAVELOCK: The screening process so they can get into court a little faster. On that I'd have to get back to you. I don't have any information on that one at this stage.

I think you also asked about the mentoring program. Let me just see if I have some information I can give you. This was, as you know, established in '97, and the community nonprofit society's board of directors works closely with the administration of the Calgary Young Offender Centre to identify and obtain private-sector expertise. The program is volunteer driven. We have centre directors in Edmonton, Lethbridge, and Grande Prairie. They'll attempt to identify capable volunteer champions interested in assisting them in the development of volunteer community partnerships benefiting young offenders.

I think that basically sums it up. We are looking, as I indicated earlier, at some initiatives to implement the Junior Achievement programs in young offender facilities. That's what's happening in that area.

Your other question: you asked about Shunda Creek. I haven't been there since I visited some time ago. My understanding is that the program continues to be very successful. They're having around an 85 to 90 percent success rate with young people. They're not turning up in the system for offending again, so it's working very well at this stage.

MRS. FORSYTH: I just want to go back to the mentoring program and the initiative with the business community. When I did the review of the young offenders, one of the things the kids continually talked about is the ability to get some sort of employment and work, being as simple as filling out a résumé and working with the community on some sort of job program. The business knows that these are young offenders but are willing to work with them so they can get some sort of experience. I'm wondering if that's what that is, or if you've worked on that yet.

MR. HAVELOCK: Yeah. That's part of it. Certainly if we aren't doing some of the things you suggest, then we can have those implemented. It is all about trying to give these young people some experience and some expertise and the ability to go out, hopefully once they leave our facilities, so they can find meaningful employment.

MRS. FORSYTH: Okay. On page 232 in Karen's book. The first question is about the protection against family violence. Your goal is the spring of 1999. I'm wondering if you're still on target for that.

MR. HAVELOCK: We are. In fact, we're looking at June.

MRS. FORSYTH: Page 234, 3(3), in regard to the MLA review committee on maintenance enforcement. You talked about legislative change with respect to the consolidation of family law by the spring of 2001.

MR. HAVELOCK: Yes.

MRS. FORSYTH: Can you elaborate on that?

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, we're trying to consolidate the family law statutes into one statute. It is a huge task, which is one of the reasons why we had to delay it until 2001, but certainly the legal

community and the judiciary are very supportive of it, and we're working on it as we speak. We anticipate having it ready by that date. That's the commitment.

MRS. FORSYTH: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Just so everyone knows, I have next Edmonton-Ellerslie, then Calgary-West, then Edmonton-Riverview, then Calgary-Cross, then Calgary-Buffalo.
So, Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, and all of your staff for attending this evening. The first questions I have are on CAPS. I looked through the business plan with great interest and couldn't find any reference to them there. I'm wondering why that is, and why we don't see any measurable targets for CAPS.

MR. HAVELOCK: Okay. What sort of measurable target would you have for CAPS?

MS CARLSON: Well, I think you could take a look at a lot of things: level of experience, any kind of performance targets you might have, employment equity targets.

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, what I could advise you is that one of the issues, as you know, with respect to CAPS that we've been wrestling with is that of sexual harassment. I think I've indicated in the House before that we have a four-point program in place with respect to trying to deal with that. We're looking at education programs. Of course, we discipline members, we feel appropriately, once they step out of line. We try and hire the best people we possibly can for CAPS. We do provide them with adequate training and education. I don't think we would develop a performance measure specifically for CAPS. Generally, it works quite well, but again we recognize that we have some specific problems in the area just outlined, and we're trying to address those. It's really, hon. member, a question of education, and that's what we're stressing with the members of CAPS at this time.

MS CARLSON: Right. So what about work harassment issues, issues other than sexual harassment there within the staffing? Could you address that for a moment?

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, we would approach work harassment much the same as sexual harassment. Again, it's simply a matter of education, but it's not limited to CAPS. Our policy is that with respect to sexual harassment, work harassment, it's zero tolerance in the Department of Justice, and I think it's zero tolerance in the government as a whole. Again, we encourage and want individuals to come forward if they feel they've been subjected to sexual or workplace harassment, and we review it internally. If it's necessary, we will advise the police if something has occurred which we feel is unacceptable. We try and work with the employees. But, of course, disciplinary measures are taken where appropriate. It can result in termination, suspension, transfer, referring them to counseling if necessary.

I guess I can't point to any specific measure in that area. We just try and impress upon all of our employees that it's unacceptable and will be dealt with severely.

MS CARLSON: My next question isn't meant to move this into a confrontational situation, but with respect, Mr. Minister, if there is no whistle-blower protection, how do you expect people to come

forward and not feel that they are in some jeopardy in terms of their employment?

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, quite frankly, if they feel they have a legitimate complaint, the complaint is investigated, and I can assure you that we take the inquiry very seriously. We treat it seriously. I know the Department of Justice and the staff in the department have a very high standard, a very high level of integrity, and I don't think any employee should be at all concerned about coming forward with respect to an issue that has occurred.

Now, whistle-blower I view as being slightly different than what you've outlined regarding workplace harassment and sexual harassment. That's a very personal event that has occurred. If someone feels that a department, for example, is wasting money or a program is not being applied properly, then you would look at whistle-blower. I don't think whistle-blower really has reasonable application to an area where you personally have been subjected to that type of behaviour. All I can do is give assurances to all of our staff that their inquiries will be treated confidentially.

Of course, we need to examine what's happened. We need to investigate what has happened. If it's determined that inappropriate action has taken place, then we will take action back based on what I outlined earlier. We have a number of options available to us. So I would hope that all employees would be encouraged to come forward.

It's interesting. That issue was raised in the House where it was suggested a videotape of myself giving answers in the House was being used to actually try and discourage people from coming forward. Well, I investigated that. Our manager of public security taped me giving a response. I wasn't aware of this. He did this personally. He had a very informal meeting over lunch, where I think 12 employees and managers turned up. They weren't required to. He showed them the tape, and basically the message was: look; this is our department policy on sexual harassment, zero tolerance. That was the point he was trying to make. Our managers are encouraged to advise our employees: if this is happening to you, you come forward; it's unacceptable.

9:06

MS CARLSON: Good thinking.

You talked about the four-point program for sexual harassment. Do you have a similar program for work harassment?

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, we can certainly look at that. I don't know if we have one that's specifically aimed at work harassment, but we'll get you further detail on that.

MS CARLSON: Okay; sure. Perhaps you could undertake to also provide how much of your budget is spent currently on either sexual harassment or work harassment issues.

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, I'm going to guess off the top of my head. We do not have a specific budget allocated to that. Generally the department provides materials, education, counseling, et cetera, under an umbrella budget. If we have any investigations, I'm also advised that it's simply part of the overall cost of the department. If we do break it out specifically, I will provide you with the information, but I don't believe we do.

MS CARLSON: Okay; sure. That's fine.

Can you tell me what level of experience the CAPS officers have and how much that has changed over the past five years? My understanding is that there's been quite a high turnover.

MR. HAVELOCK: I don't have that information with me. I will get that for you. I am advised that we've increased our entry level requirements. We'll get you the package.

MS CARLSON: Okay. Fairly extensive information, then, also on the turnover rate and how much it costs to train a specific officer?

MR. HAVELOCK: Sure. We can get you that, if available.

MS CARLSON: Okay. As available, whatever's available is fine. Don't go to any additional effort just on this.

MR. HAVELOCK: We won't invent anything.

MS CARLSON: No, that wasn't my point.
What efforts are now being made to recruit women in CAPS?

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, our department policy is that anyone who comes forward and is qualified for the position will be given due consideration. Whether we are out there specifically recruiting women with respect to CAPS, again, I'll have to determine whether or not we are. I don't have an answer to that. The policy is generally that all job positions are available for anyone to apply. We simply try and select the best person available.

MS CARLSON: Good.

Could you add to the information that you're going to provide to us how many people are on wage and how many are on contract with CAPS?

MR. HAVELOCK: We can.

MS CARLSON: I'd like to turn now to maintenance enforcement, a popular topic tonight. Mr. Minister, I have before me figures on what was spent in the '91-92 year and then those figures adjusted for both inflation and population in maintenance enforcement. I see in program 3.5 that from '91-92 to the budgeted '99-2000 year, where it used to cost us \$1, it now costs us \$1.22 to provide that service. So that's a 22 percent increase in costs after adjusting for both inflation and population increases. In the six years I've been here, it's still the number one issue in my constituency in terms of custodial parents not getting the money. A 22 percent increase is significant. I'm wondering why we've seen a significant increase in spending there, yet we seem to have the same or less of a satisfaction rate in terms of custodial parents receiving their funds.

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, I don't have that specific information. We can certainly look at it. One, I would assume that salary costs are a factor when you've taken out the inflation. We have hired more individuals to be involved on the collection side. We've just put in \$1.5 million to implement some of the recommendations that the Member for Calgary-Lougheed's committee came forward with. We can come up with some specifics and try and give you an answer to that.

MS CARLSON: Okay. Just to put this into context. Before you adjust for either population or inflation, where you spent \$1 in '91-92, you now spend \$1.60.

MR. HAVELOCK: Now \$1.60? I thought you said \$1.22.

MS CARLSON: That's before adjusting it for population and inflation. So we're talking real dollars. It's still a significant increase.

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, again, does the inflation number - I would assume that excludes salary costs. You're looking at an eight-year period, so salary costs will have gone up across government. We can certainly try and give you that.

MS CARLSON: For the most part, not more than what inflation adjustments have been.

MR. HAVELOCK: We'll see if we can get you the number.

MS CARLSON: Okay; that's good.

And if you could tell me if maintenance enforcement is currently fully staffed.

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, we have a certain number of positions allocated, but there is turnover. With the changes that are being brought forward as a result of the committee's work, we feel that we'll be able to enhance the services not only to the debtor but to the creditor and also hopefully boost our collections.

One of the things we are looking at specifically is the creation of a special unit to try and go after those difficult cases to recover funds. Will it ever be fully staffed? Will we ever have enough staff to collect on every file? No. But based on the budget they have available to them, I think they do a pretty good job of trying to secure moneys. We do collect more money through that. As you can recall probably, before this came into effect, we had a number of single moms and dads who had custody receiving government assistance. Since this program has come into place, we've more than recovered those costs. So it is an efficient program for government.

But fully staffed? I mean, we have a certain number of FTEs allocated to it, and we try and keep it up to that level.

MS CARLSON: Efficiency is in the eye of the beholder, Mr. Minister. Recovering your costs wouldn't be what we would be considering to be efficient operation of maintenance enforcement.

Fully staffed doesn't mean enough staff to adequately meet all the needs. Where I was going with that question is: do you see it as crucial to the operation of maintenance enforcement to ensure that all your full-time equivalent positions are filled to the best of your ability at all times? Has that been the situation for the past 12 months? Do you expect it to be for the next 12 months?

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, absolutely. We expect to have those positions filled. We also are trying to implement some training programs. There have been a lot of changes made over the last year. We brought a new director on I think approximately a year ago. We're bringing forward some legislative changes again based on the committee's work. The report came out - what? - about six months ago, eight months ago.

MS GRAHAM: The end of May.

MR. HAVELOCK: Okay; the end of May. We responded within months to that. We're trying to make some significant change to the program.

Certainly the number of FTEs that we have allocated there, we always try and keep them filled to the best of our ability. We need to also recognize that it is a relatively stressful job trying to track debtors and trying to ensure that they are making their payments. It's not an easy task, and we do have turnover in that area. We'd like to reduce the turnover, but I don't think we'll ever eliminate it because of the nature of the job.

MS CARLSON: Okay. The legislation that recently came out in maintenance enforcement, while I don't think it goes quite far enough, certainly I support it. I anticipated seeing some companion legislation on access coming out. Where is that?

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, you'll just have to hang tight. I can't tell you at this stage, but we are looking at the access issue. Stay tuned.

MS CARLSON: Soon? This session?

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, we're looking at this session. I know that the opposition will ensure its speedy passage through the House.

MS CARLSON: As long as it's well drafted, no problems there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hurry up, but do it right.

MS CARLSON: Hurry up, but do it right. That's right. Hurry up, for sure. It's a long-time, serious, significant issue I think in this province.

The next question is on vote 8.4.2, native court workers. Once again when I see this figure adjusted for both inflation and population, we've seen a significant reduction in the dollars spent, and I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, if you'd comment on that. Compared to '91-92, we are only spending .46 of a dollar now. Has there been some sort of dramatic change in that program that we should be aware of?

9:16

MR. HAVELOCK: There hasn't been any dramatic change. Responsibility for this was recently transferred to Family and Social Services, if I'm not mistaken, but with respect to your question, we can get you some additional information.

I will mention - and I hope this is the correct program. I believe the federal government provides some funding for this to us. Is that right? [interjection] For the criminal side; right. Each year it's quite a big argument with the federal government because they typically want to cut the funding for this area, and we've managed to maintain it.

MRS. SLOAN: No.

MR. HAVELOCK: Yes, absolutely. It is, hon. member. Yes. We wind up arguing with the federal government on cutting this program.

MS CARLSON: I'd have to say, then, that you haven't done a very good job in this last year. If I look at my figures in '91-92 we had \$1; in '92-93, 97 cents on the dollar; in '93-94, 85 cents on the dollar; in '94-95, 87 cents on the dollar - whoever the minister was then, he obviously did a good job - in '95-96, 79 cents on the dollar; in '97-98, 72 cents on the dollar; in '98-99, 73 cents on the dollar; and then in '99-2000, 46 cents on the dollar. So that's a dramatic drop.

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, I don't want to be confrontational either, but I think you're assuming that you need to spend more money to maintain the effectiveness of a program, and I disagree.

MS CARLSON: No, that wasn't my point. My question was: why the dramatic change? And you blamed it on the feds.

MR. HAVELOCK: I didn't blame it on the feds. I indicated that

we're still delivering the program effectively, and I also indicated that every year it's an argument with the federal government with respect to cutting funding. They have not yet done that, but we struggle to ensure that the funding is maintained. We're quite happy with the operation of the program. In fact, if we're able to maintain a program for a number of years despite inflation and it's still effective, I think that indicates we're doing a good job.

MS CARLSON: Okay. Fair enough. Thank you.

My next question I think comes under court services, and it's more information that I need on the judicial selection panel. Mr. Minister, you gave us some information about it in the House the other day: five people on the panel and two alternates, as I understand it. Can you tell me how those people got on that panel?

MR. HAVELOCK: Yes. I solicited a number of people, my colleagues, individuals that I know personally, and certainly anyone who wished to send in some names, because it was well known that we were looking at establishing the panel. I will also indicate that neither of the opposition critics for both parties sent in any names for any consideration. I would certainly have looked at those names. We looked at the names that were put forward, and we evaluated them on the basis of expertise and made that decision. We made the decision on the basis of who we felt could do the job the best. Bottom line. What we're trying to do through that process is to the greatest extent possible limit political influence.

I would hope that you aren't suggesting that simply because an individual is a man or a woman, they can't be objective when they're looking at an issue. That's not what determines selecting someone for a committee, at least for me. When I look at someone, it's not whether they're a man or a woman. It's whether they can do the job.

MS CARLSON: Right.

Could you expand on your comment well-known process? There is advertising, some sort of an open manner in which letters went out to people; I don't know. So if you could tell me what that open process was, I'd appreciate it.

MR. HAVELOCK: I didn't say that at all. I already explained to you the basis upon which I solicited names. I asked my colleagues for names. If you had any interest in it, certainly you could have submitted some. We didn't go ahead and advertise on a widespread basis. I spoke with some members in the legal community. They were advised that we were looking at appointing some lawyers. We did a lot of internal soliciting ourselves. I didn't go out and place ads in papers suggesting people apply. I would have thought it was a high-profile enough issue that anyone who had any interest could have certainly approached us.

MS CARLSON: So well-known process to you is defined by word of mouth essentially?

MR. HAVELOCK: No. I said that it was, I think, a high-profile enough issue that anyone who was interested certainly could have contacted our department and expressed an interest in serving, including the opposition.

MS CARLSON: Right. So, Mr. Minister, in your opinion, then, the only people who could fill this job adequately who were women were women who could fill it as alternates, not members on the committee.

MR. HAVELOCK: No. What I did, again, was evaluate the abilities

and the background of all the people involved in this and hopefully made the right decision with respect to who could serve on it. I can assure you also that it's very likely that the alternates will be required. I believe the quorum is five, if I'm not mistaken, and I know that it will not be possible for every member at all times to serve on that committee.

Now, what I have done is that I spoke to members of the committee to see if it was a concern for them, and we're still soliciting feedback from them. For me it was really a nonissue. I wanted people to have some confidence in the process. I'll evaluate it and determine whether or not we need to make some changes. I'm more than open to doing that, but again, I don't want to send the message that for any committee that I appoint as Justice minister, I'm simply going to make a decision that it has to have this number of people on it who are male or female. For me, again, the decision is: who can do the job?

MS CARLSON: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. The next speaker is Calgary-West, followed by Edmonton-Riverview.

MS KRYCZKA: Yes. Page 286 of the estimates shows a budget increase of \$11,155,000 for the court services program. What has caused this increase?

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, the increase is comprised of the following. As you may recall, we had an issue before the courts regarding judicial independence and salaries. It was the Wickman decision, which came out about a year and a half ago. As a result of that decision, we established a commission to take a look at judicial salaries generally. The commission came back with a recommendation pertaining to increases. The government made a recommendation as to what it felt was fair and implemented that. The judiciary challenged that. The courts basically overturned a cabinet decision, and that necessitated an increase in the budget. Basically, the increase is due to judges' salaries and benefits going up over \$6.8 million.

Justices of the peace salaries and benefits. Again, that was because we've had to restructure the justice of the peace system based on the Wickman decision and ensure that there was some degree of judicial independence. That's close to half a million dollars. A presiding justice of the peace and support staff, a little over \$800,000; legal and other salaries and benefits, \$740,000.

We're looking at the Tsuu T'ina First Nation court, something that you were personally involved in. We have allocated \$215,000 for that initiative. Court support staff is \$708,000, and we are looking at the Join project capital and amortization. That's a computer project, if I'm not mistaken. That's computer systems, and that's \$1.3 million.

As I've outlined, however, the majority of the increase was due to the Wickman decision and the court finding that government's recommendation with respect to judicial salaries was not appropriate. That resulted in the increase in the budget. This was something I also had to bring forward through supplementary estimates, I think a couple of weeks ago.

MS KRYCZKA: Good.

Going over to my next question, under goal 2, page 230. It's the fourth point in the ministry business plans. Under goal 2 in the business plan it says that the ministry will "liaise with Federal Justice regarding the development and implementation of the proposals that are passed under the federal government's new youth

justice strategy." What is Alberta's position on this matter, and has the budget been adjusted to accommodate changes to the youth justice legislation?

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, we did liaise as much as we possibly could with the federal government over the past couple of years, and we tried to make our position clear. They listened to us on some issues and not on others. As you know, the federal minister tabled the revised act a few weeks ago, and we will continue to lobby to make some of the changes that we feel are important. We have not made any change in our budget because at this stage we don't fully understand what the implications are, nor has the federal government seen fit, at least to date, to provide us with the detail as to how our budget will be impacted. There has been some public discussion and comment by the federal minister that Alberta may well see an increase in its funding because of the low incarceration rate we have with respect to young offenders - I think we're the third lowest in the country - and she felt that we were being penalized despite the fact that we were utilizing alternative measures such as youth justice committees to ensure that young people did not wind up in our prisons, but that remains to be seen. We don't know what the financial impact is at this stage.

9:26

MS KRYCZKA: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Finished?

MS KRYCZKA: Next.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. The next speaker is Edmonton-Riverview, followed by Calgary-Cross, followed by Calgary-Buffalo, followed by Calgary-Lougheed, followed by Lesser Slave Lake. In between there, we have Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MRS. SLOAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister and members of the public service, I would like to follow just for a few moments on the line of questioning that Edmonton-Ellerslie concluded on. I'd like to ask the minister what his definition of equality is as it applies to the operations of the Justice department and, specifically, if his process for the selection committee that was just referenced is to serve as a baseline or precedent for how selections will be made on other classifications within the department.

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, I guess the process for selection was, again, who we felt would do the best job. I've indicated previously that anyone who's applying for any job with Justice - I hope we'll make the decision on the basis of who is the best qualified. I think I've answered that. That to me is the essence of equality. If you're suggesting an affirmative action program or whatever, I don't think Albertans generally support that. I feel that Albertans want to ensure that the best possible person available is hired for the particular job. That's what I've done with respect to that committee.

I can also indicate that we've got a lot of committees through Justice. I had the Member for Calgary-West head up the Tsuu T'ina court review. I know that you did not raise a concern with respect that she was the sole member of the committee and a female at that. I think she did an excellent job. I had the Member for Calgary-Lougheed head up the maintenance enforcement. We worked closely with the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek, who was involved in the juvenile prostitution issue on the justice summit. I think we had a split of three males, two females. On the prisoner voting

committee I think I had two males, one female. Whenever I'm selecting committees, I try and ensure that we have good representation. But, again, for me the issue isn't whether you're a man or a woman. The issue is: can you do the job?

MRS. SLOAN: So then, Mr. Minister, how would you explain the inequity that exists with respect to the appointment of Provincial Court judges in this province based on gender?

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, there's quite a simple explanation.

MRS. SLOAN: Are you implying by your statements that there are no female lawyers in this province that are qualified and aptly prepared to serve in that capacity?

MR. HAVELOCK: No, you're implying that.

MRS. SLOAN: No. I'm just interpreting your statement.

MR. HAVELOCK: What I'm saying is that one of the reasons why there is a difference, quite frankly, is that you have to look at it historically. Until a few years ago the profession was generally dominated by males. Until quite recently - in fact, I understand that in the last few years for law school registrations females now exceed males, if I'm not mistaken. So I think over time you'll see that situation changing.

But if you're suggesting, again - and this is what I find offensive. The Law Society, members of the legal community generally, and Albertans expect, especially with respect to the appointment of the judiciary, that you take the best person. They do not want an affirmative action program in place with respect to filling judicial positions. I'm not suggesting in any way that there aren't a number of qualified females or males out there, but basically we try and make the decision on the basis of who best can fill the position.

I will also indicate, however, that the committee headed up by the Member for Calgary-Lougheed came forward with some recommendations regarding gender, regarding demographics, and those are being reconsidered by the new committee. We've also asked Judicial Council to consider that.

So I would fully expect that when they're sending names forward to myself and to government for consideration, you will likely see more females on the list. But I will tell you right now that I am not going to make the decision nor will government make the decision on the basis of whether you're male or female. It will be based on whether or not you're the best person for the job.

MRS. SLOAN: Thank you.

I'm wondering if the minister could state on the record whether or not there are any visible minorities represented in that selection panel.

MR. HAVELOCK: I'm happy to tell you for the record because we announced it publicly. I believe we have Chester Cunningham, who represents the aboriginal community on that. I will point out that, unfortunately, the aboriginal community is disproportionately represented in our prison population. I think they make up 3 to 4 percent of our population generally and about 35 percent of those that are presently incarcerated. So, yes, he's on that committee. Again, I will also point out that one of the criteria established by the Member for Calgary-Lougheed's committee was to look at that very issue.

The other thing that we've reserved to the minister of the day, whether it's myself or someone else, is the ability to ask the

committee, when they're looking at names, to consider some specific characteristics or qualifications. If, for example, there's a vacancy that arises in northern Alberta, where there is a large aboriginal population, and we feel that it would be appropriate for the committee to consider whether or not there are any qualified aboriginal candidates out there to fill that position, we can ask them to do that. The same if we want someone who's bilingual, for example. So we've tried to put enough flexibility in the system to try and reflect some special circumstances. But, again, I think we need to be careful. While we're trying to enhance the involvement of women and of minorities in the system, the bottom line should be - and the Law Society has argued this for years - take the politics out of it and ensure that the best possible person is appointed to the bench on the basis of merit.

MRS. SLOAN: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

You spoke in your preliminary remarks about the difficulty the department has with respect to educating the public about justice: the processes, et cetera. When I think of the three top issues that signify justice in the public's mind in the last year - the Vriend decision, the utilization by this government of the notwithstanding clause, and the Jason Dix case - I see no reference to any of those encompassed within the business plan of the ministry.

Specifically with respect to the Vriend decision I would like to know at what cost that challenge was undertaken on behalf of the taxpayers. What was the number of hours utilized by Justice employees in preparation for that and the actual expenditure of dollars in relation to that as well? It would seem to me also that it would have perhaps been prudent to have done some type of department postmortem on that particular case. There was an obvious, enormous expense incurred, and perhaps it might serve as a useful document for future ministers and departmental staff when they are contemplating challenging an issue of that nature to the Supreme Court.

Similarly with the notwithstanding clause: again, no reference within the department's report. It's like it didn't happen. How did it occur that that in fact went forward, found itself in legislation before the Assembly, and then a quick retreat had to be orchestrated by the Premier in that regard? Any additional clarifications that the minister could provide with respect to, again, an analysis of how that occurred within the department would be useful.

Similarly with Jason Dix and the obstruction of justice in many respects that occurred at both macro and micro levels within that particular case. What has the department done to date, and what are they planning to do in the future to ensure that that type of incident does not occur again?

That brings me to another issue that has been a bit of a pet peeve of mine since assuming the portfolio of Family and Social Services in 1997. That is the fact that the medical examiner in this province does not publish an annual report. In fact, the last annual report that is published is 1995, and my recollection of the rationale that is behind that reality is the fact that they have not been afforded the funding to do an annual report on a fiscal-year basis. So the reality is that if I were to look for the documentation of deaths of children in this province, I would not be able to go to the library and look for the medical examiner's report. I'm speaking specifically of children's deaths that occurred while in the care of or while known to Family and Social Services. Further, I cannot find those in any form within the department of social services business plan because they choose not to document the incidence of death. Further, if I come to the Department of Justice, I see no reference at all to the operation of that office aside from the budget allocation that they receive on an annual basis. I'm not sure what the justification for that is. That

reality has existed now for four years. I believe I raised it last year during the budget estimates, so it's not something that's been unknown to this government.

9:36

MR. HAVELOCK: Do you want me to answer some questions now or wait?

MRS. SLOAN: Well, certainly feel free. If you would like to provide some response, that would be fine.

MR. HAVELOCK: Okay. Let me start with the medical examiner first. They are part of the department and typically don't publish an annual report. If you have any specific information that you want, then we'll try and get you that information plus fatality . . .

MRS. SLOAN: Well, it was a practice to publish an annual report until 1995.

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, I guess they stopped the practice. Quite frankly, I don't see any need, because if you want any specific information from the department, we're quite prepared to give it to you; no problem. Why go to the expense of publishing an annual report that's not necessary? Fatality inquiry reports also are all public. If you have any specific concerns in that area, we'll try and get you the information. From my perspective, I don't see why there was any need to publish the annual report, but if you have some specific concerns or questions, then absolutely put them down, and we'll try to get you the information.

Let me get back to the Vriend decision. I've been asked this before by the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo and other members of the opposition. I will not disclose the costs of any cases that are taken before the courts on behalf of government. It's subject to solicitor/client privilege, and I will not breach that.

When you talk about the Vriend decision generally, this government had a particular policy with respect to that issue. We felt that not having it mentioned in the legislation was not in any way discriminatory. The Supreme Court held differently, and our caucus considered it and decided to go with the Supreme Court decision. So that's the end of that one.

The Dix case. One, you did mention obstruction of justice. I hope you're not alleging any criminal wrongdoing on the part of any member of this department or police forces. That's essentially what I think you did, so you may want to rephrase that statement in the future to ensure that you aren't alleging that, or if you are going to continue to say it, I'd suggest you say it in the House and not outside the House.

I take offence at the suggestion. That case was evaluated by a very senior Crown prosecutor. He felt he had sufficient evidence to go forward. Some things happened during the court process. We then turned the case over to I think three or four senior Crowns to take a look at it, and they determined that we no longer met the threshold to proceed, that there was no longer a likelihood of conviction. Therefore, we pulled back on it. As a result of that, we did develop some informant testimony guidelines, which are presently circulating throughout the legal community: with the police, with lawyers, and with the judiciary. We hope to have some responses back by the end of the month, and we can go forward with a guideline that members of the police force and Crowns can use in the future to try to avoid that situation.

Regarding the notwithstanding clause, as I've said I think time and again, there was no intention to try and remove rights from people. Our intention was simply to try and facilitate settlement. Interest-

ingly, after that legislation was withdrawn, we did settle a large number of cases. So I'm more than happy to admit again, as I did some time ago: probably a good idea; wrong vehicle. No question it was the wrong vehicle. We reviewed that issue with department staff. I can remember that as we went through the process, we looked at that very closely. We received legal advice from two independent firms with respect to that issue. Hey, we made a boo-boo; we won't do it again.

In fact, I find it rather remarkable that when we came out with our decision with respect to taking the notwithstanding clause to the general public prior to trying to use it, we now see the opposition suggesting that that's inappropriate. Well, I can tell you that I wish that process had been in place a year ago, because it's very likely that Bill 26 never would have seen the light of day because of that. I think it's always a good move to basically solicit the views of Albertans, because I think Albertans generally come up with the right answer on issues. So I'm encouraged that we've taken that step recently. Again, had it been in place about a year, a year and a half ago, Bill 26 would not have happened.

MRS. SLOAN: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I think the concern, just to verify the opposition's position on the matter, is that human rights in this province should not be based on a public opinion poll or referendum result.

My final questions are really offered more as my analysis of the business plan and a lack of identification or really any existence of any understanding within the department surrounding the social basis for many of the problems that your department deals with. I find it interesting that there is no offering of any statistics or analysis with respect to the percentage of the young offender caseload that is known to or in the custody of child welfare. There is no provision of any statistics surrounding the number of cases that are linked or related to unemployment, to poverty, or to occupational class within the province.

There is no analysis of the regional variance of crime. I would suspect, Mr. Minister, that there are certain communities and regions in this province that suffer from a higher rate of crime than do others. That is not provided. Further, there is not offered - unless I have missed it, and if that's the case, I'm sure it will be pointed out to me - the percentage of justice cases that are related to the aboriginal population or the visible minority groups.

Just on a related note, there has been continual reference made to gang activity in the province. I'm not referring to work gangs or work crews but rather gang-related violence and criminal activity, which is becoming more of a factor within our school system, and I don't see that identified as a performance measure or goal or strategy. I'm wondering why that is.

The final area of questions relate to the corporate strategies of the department. There is an acknowledgment that a succession plan is needed for the department, and I think that's a commendable acknowledgment. I would request details of what that succession plan will entail and how it will be implemented.

Further, there is mentioned within the corporate strategies of a long-term leadership program, a mentoring program, the implementation of the department learning committee recommendations, initiatives for retention, employee recognition, and a department wellness program, all of which are made really with just brief references. There are no details provided.

In hand with that, there is no indication within the performance measures what the turnover rate within the various classifications in Justice are and what specifically these initiatives will do to try and address those things.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie did indicate and did

question the minister with respect to sexual harassment and workplace harassment, and the minister attempted to allege that whistle-blowing protection would not have done anything to mitigate those occurrences within his department. It would seem to me that if such legislation were in place, the responsibility to report, I would say with respect, sir, would not fall solely to the victim of that harassment but rather would be something that any employee witnessing or observing such harassment taking place would feel protected in bringing forward to the powers that be. That protection is not afforded, because we do not have that legislation in existence in the province.

Thank you for the opportunity to ask those questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister.

MR. HAVELOCK: Thank you. I'll be very brief. The succession planning, the leadership mentoring, the other issues that you raised: we can certainly get you some detail on that, and we would be happy to provide that.

You've asked some specifics regarding the lack of identification of the understanding of the social basis the department deals with: statistics known as to regional variance of crime, percentage of justice cases related to aboriginal population and visible minority groups, et cetera. If we keep some of those statistics, we can certainly get those for you. Just because they don't appear in the business plan, though, I don't think you should assume that the department or our officials are not well aware of those issues.

We need to keep in mind, as I mentioned earlier, that unfortunately we don't deal with the root causes of crime initially. That falls within some of the other departments: Health, Social Services, Education. We work closely with those departments in trying to support some of the initiatives that they bring forward.

I think where we play a more realistic role is once unfortunately these individuals come into our system. What can we do for them when they're in the system and after they've left the system? That's where I think we can have our biggest impact. Again, don't interpret those remarks as meaning that we don't work closely with other departments. We are concerned about the root causes of crime, but our budget is not focused in those areas.

You mentioned the human rights not being based on a public opinion poll. I think there's been some misinterpretation of what the government did the other day. Just because we're going to go to the general population with respect to an issue that may come up, you're assuming that human rights issues may well be the ones that are referred to the general population. There could be a number of other areas where the notwithstanding clause may be considered by a government. But, again, I see it as another level of protection to ensure that minorities are not faced with a problem.

9:46

Again, I have a lot of confidence in - I know that the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo referred to it as the tyranny of the majority. Well, quite frankly, I think Albertans would find that offensive. I think that Albertans, for the most part, are very tolerant, very understanding, very caring, and if the government has an issue which they wish to refer to them, I think the moral compass will always determine that they make the right decisions, so I'm not at all concerned in that regard.

Whistle-blower protection. Well, we can I guess argue forever as to whether or not the legislation would be effective in protecting someone. All I can say publicly and for the record is that if any employee has been subjected to work harassment or sexual harassment within the workplace, I certainly encourage them to come

forward, and I encourage any employee who is aware of this happening to one of their colleagues to come forward. We will handle it in a sensitive manner and in a professional manner and ensure as best we can that it doesn't happen again.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Minister.

The next person is the hon. Member for Calgary-Cross.

MRS. FRITZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Many of my questions have already been asked this evening, but I'm going to just move to a couple of questions in the budget book on page 291, public security. We haven't asked questions on that page, and I have just a couple there.

I'm interested in the additional \$616,000 that is added to the crime prevention program and whether or not the moneys are going to be for administration or materials or whatever. It's such a worthwhile program. I was pleased to see an increase there, actually, but I'm interested in what it would be for.

Also, looking at this part of the budget, I'm interested in the provincial policing program, because it's had an increase of \$3.023 million. I wondered why it's had that increase, how those funds are going to be allocated. It went up from \$82.224 million, Mr. Minister.

MR. HAVELOCK: Right.

MRS. FRITZ: Also on that page under public security, I wondered how the federal gun control is going to be administered, noticing that it went to zero. So I thought I'd ask that question.

MR. HAVELOCK: So are the feds.

MRS. FRITZ: Also, further on that page, I of course would like to know a bit about the First Nations policing. My questions there have to do with how many First Nations policing departments we have now. I'm also interested in how they're funded. I'm more interested in the funding actually than the number - and if you don't have the number this evening, that's fine - and whether or not we fully fund them. What's the cost split between the federal government and the provincial government?

Also, I know you mentioned the Tsuu T'ina court system earlier in your remarks, and I just wondered when you anticipate that court system would be up and running.

I just have one further question. I'm also interested in what the reasons are for the \$3.5 million overall increase in this area. I think I've identified some of them, but if there are any that I haven't . . .

Thank you.

MR. HAVELOCK: Crime prevention first. It's interesting. Up until this budget year the crime prevention dollars that were allocated to the community really were quite minimal, and in our three-year business plan we're going to see some significant increases in that area. It results from the reallocation of resources and consolidation of the crime prevention programs into the division.

The breakdown is as follows. There's \$200,000 for the expansion of the aboriginal crime prevention program; \$200,000 to establish a provincial grant fund to support community initiatives, because the community has indicated - and I think quite rightly so - that we provide very little direct support with respect to crime prevention. There is \$75,000 now allocated for the expansion of model programs in the province, for handicapped persons for example, \$60,000 for public education and awareness, \$40,000 for a staff co-ordinator, and \$25,000 for resource materials. So I guess out of the \$600,000

the staff co-ordinator would make up \$40,000 of that, but as the dollars increase through the budget for that, I don't anticipate there'll be any significant administrative increase.

You asked about program 7.2.2, the provincial policing. The increase of \$3 million: there's been \$2.5 million allocated for the implementation of the organized crime strategy, and there's about a million dollars additional for the RCMP pay increases. There's been a reallocation of resources in the subprogram for policing programs, which is why it's not working out to exactly a \$3.5 million increase.

You asked about federal gun control and how that's going to be administered. Well, we ask ourselves that question every day based on the complaints that are coming forward from the gun community. As you're aware, we basically withdrew from administering this program. We turned over the operational aspects - what? A couple of months ago?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Six months ago.

MR. HAVELOCK: Was it six months ago? So the federal government is entirely responsible for administering it. We basically stayed out of it. As you know, we still have the challenge before the Supreme Court of Canada, where we're arguing that this is a provincial jurisdiction, and hopefully the courts will view that as being accurate.

First Nations policing. I believe we have 11 First Nations police forces at this time. I can get you some specifics on that, and I also believe the funding is 48 percent provincial and 52 percent federal.

Now, this has been an area of some concern for us. We have some of the forces working very well, very efficiently. We have others where we are experiencing some difficulties, and that was what the review was all about that was conducted by the Member for Athabasca-Wabasca. We have found that we need to enhance the training aspect of the program. There may well be some questions raised as to some of the police forces regionalizing so they can be a little more efficient, because there will be some economies of scale which they can achieve. There's a challenge in developing a program where we actually have a high retention rate with aboriginal police force officers. We'd like to see that enhanced.

Tsuu T'ina. When will it be up and running? I know we're looking at a temporary facility to use in the short term there, but really the bigger issue is that to ensure that it's permanent, we'll need a commitment from the federal government regarding the construction of a Provincial Court facility. We do not provide those types of facilities at the provincial level, but we have made the commitment to provide the aboriginal justice. We will also work with the community to ensure that we have aboriginal prosecutors and aboriginal staff in place. It will take some time, though, because we need to develop some expertise in the area, but we are committed to ensuring that it operates as quickly as possible. It has a good concept in it, the peacemaker concept, which the federal government has committed to funding. The bottom line is that we need to develop a system that's more responsive to the cultural needs of the aboriginal community, because our system isn't working effectively. That's the whole concept behind trying this. It's the only concept of its kind I think in the country, and hopefully it will work effectively.

You asked a sixth question?

MRS. FRITZ: I did: if I'd missed any in here about the reasons for the increase of the \$3.5 million overall.

MR. HAVELOCK: Well, I can give you a brief rundown: the organized crime, \$2.5 million; the RCMP, \$1 million; crime prevention programs, \$600,000. Those are the major increases. As you note, the transfer of the gun control program with the federal government reduced total program operating estimates by \$425,000, because that was a little bit of a moneymaker for us, although not a significant one.

9:56

MRS. FRITZ: Thank you.

Do we have any more time then, Mr. Chairman? Can I ask a further question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have more time? Yes, you do.

MRS. FRITZ: How much more time do we have?

THE CHAIRMAN: You have 11 minutes and 39 seconds and decreasing on your time, and the committee is in charge of its own time. Hon. Member for Calgary-Cross, do you have further questions?

MRS. FRITZ: I do, Mr. Chairman. Just on page 290, as well, of the budget, and it has to do with the medical examiner's office. I noticed that it's Calgary, Edmonton, and then the head office, and my question has more to do with the rest of the province.

MR. HAVELOCK: Yes. What we do there is we privately retain doctors to provide medical examiner services throughout the province. Now, this is more of a public service. I can advise you that the doctors are not making a lot of money off this. But the system works very well. We recently put through some increases for doctors at the local level; did we not? I think we did. We can get you some further information on changes we made in that area. Right now only those that are retained directly by government are presently located in Calgary and Edmonton.

MRS. FRITZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to move that the committee rise and report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-Cross has moved that the subcommittee do now rise and report. All those in support of that motion, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: The ayes have it. We'll go down and meet with our fellow members in the Chamber.

[The subcommittee adjourned at 9:59 p.m.]

