

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Title: **Wednesday, November 2, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 219****The Prescription Drugs Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 219, being The Prescription Drugs Act. The principle and purpose behind Bill No. 219 are to set in place a pharmacare program for the province of Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 219 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in tabling the annual report of The Crimes Compensation Board.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the McKinsey & Co. *Financial Post* reports on the problems and challenges in health care in Canada.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, in response to a question from the hon. Leader of the Opposition on October 20, I wish to file some comments that deal with administrative changes at the forensic unit, Alberta Hospital, Edmonton.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. KOZIAK: Monsieur le President, je suis tres heureux de vous presenter, et par votre intermediaire de presenter aux membres de cette Assemblée, 20 etudiants animes de la troisieme annee qui nous viennent de l'Ecole Saint Thomas d'Aquin — in the constituency of Edmonton Strathcona. They are accompanied by the principal M. Normandeau, their teacher Mme. Amyotte, and several of their parents. Mr. Speaker, they are in the grade 3 bilingual class at St. Thomas. They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, 60 grade 5 students from St. Philip School in the constituency of Edmonton Belmont. They are seated in the members gallery. They are accompanied by their teachers Miss Crump and Mrs. Radostits. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

**Planning Act**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It really flows from the amendments we've had to The Planning Act. What steps have been taken to get the amendments into the hands of both the urban and rural municipal associations in the province, and also into the hands of the cities of Edmonton and Calgary?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the amendments were circulated as soon as we had them completed. I understand efforts were made to have as wide a distribution as possible of the amendments.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, did the Department of Municipal Affairs take on the responsibility of getting the amendments into the hands of the two municipal associations I outlined, also to the cities of Edmonton and Calgary?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I can't definitely state what process was involved, but I have had reaction from the cities of Calgary and Edmonton. Presumably they have received those amendments.

**AOC Loan**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. The question is a result of the Alberta Opportunity Company loan to the Canyon Ski Lodge in Red Deer. I understand the Opportunity Company foreclosed on the ski lodge in May and sold off the assets in August. Would the minister advise the House whether the AOC was able to receive its full investment when it sold the lodge?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I can't say exactly, but that information is available to me. I can acquire it for the hon. member if he wishes.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister advise the House if the moneys received from the sale of the lodge assets went to the Alberta Opportunity Company, or were some of the moneys distributed among the creditors or shareholders of the Canyon Ski Lodge in Red Deer?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, that's also something I would have to check. I'm sure there are priorities with regard to any funds accruing from a sale after a receivership.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Does the minister know if the Alberta Opportunity Company arranged for a professional appraisal of the property's value before a decision was made to sell it?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition doesn't totally understand the workings of the Opportunity Company. As I've said many times in the House, my involvement with the Opportunity Company is a rather passive one, and the Opportunity Company reports through me to the Leg-

islature. I simply provide application forms and information relative to the Opportunity Company, and only in a situation where a loan exceeds the maximum amount allowable to be dealt with by the board do I have some role to play in taking that application further.

The intricacies of a particular transaction normally don't come to my attention. However, I am apprized when there is a foreclosure, a receivership, things of this nature. But the intimate detail I am not normally apprized of.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Having regard to the fact that the loan was \$650,000 — which I believe is over the \$500,000 limit, so the minister and the government would have been consulted there — was the minister advised of the decision by the Alberta Opportunity Company to foreclose on this loan when the AOC took that action?

MR. DOWLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was apprized that a receiver would be appointed in that case. You should know that I was also aware the Opportunity Company made every effort to make sure the operation continued in a proper fashion and served the community of Red Deer. That is still their role. They are attempting to do that in appointing a receiver and having the assets sold.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the minister. Was the minister advised by the Alberta Opportunity Company that after — I think it's fair to say — extensive advertising for a very short period of time, three months, only one bid was received by the company doing away with the lodge?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check on that matter as well. I do know, and the hon. leader obviously knows as well, that the board of directors of the Opportunity Company is composed of 10 members of the private sector. They receive the advice of the officials of the Opportunity Company during the course of the operation of the board. The Opportunity Company board sits probably twice per month, and makes the decisions in all cases. I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition understands the workings of that organization.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I think I do. That's why I ask the next question of the minister. Could the minister explain why the facility in Red Deer was rushed to sale in only three months, when the only bid received was very low? Is the minister not aware that for property of this nature, a marketing time from six months to a year is often required to acquire the right buyer? [interjections]

MR. DOWLING: I can respond to that. I don't particularly appreciate the editorializing of the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CLARK: I noticed that.

MR. DOWLING: Some of the things he says are not correct, Mr. Speaker. Therefore I suggest that the question doesn't deserve answering.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then to the minister. Would the minister be prepared to check the record and bring back information to the House tomorrow or the next day? [interjections]

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the legal and legitimate questions of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, of course.

#### **Holiday Store Hours**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism. I'd like to know if the minister has received any written representations from representatives of privately owned grocery stores regarding Bill 228, related to the regulation of holiday store hours.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, as I recall, I have had a submission from an organization representing some number of private firms. I can't recall whether individual store operators have directed any letters to me. I'm sure some have been received by members of our caucus and our cabinet.

#### **Vocational Training Allowances**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It flows from comments he made on Monday with respect to questions concerning the Alberta Vocational Centre, but alluding to a slightly different topic. My question to the hon. minister is: where do things now officially stand with respect to the adult vocational training allowances?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, the matter is under review by the department and by me.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to outline to the Assembly the nature of the review — who is doing it, the time frame — in view of the fact that this has been a matter of concern now for some months?

DR. HOHOL: The nature of the review centres, in particular, about the appropriate level of an allowance. I have given consideration to certain factors in the cost of living and the time since the allowance was last increased, which I believe was a period of two years. It's matters like those we're looking at, making some comparisons with the allowances Canada Manpower pays. We're the only province in the business of assisting, as a last resort, with additional money students who have used the full complement of Canada Manpower money.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise the House whether or not there will be any increase for students who have already started? Will there be a retroactive increase? In terms of the assessment, what is the specific situation as it relates to students now beginning the fall term?

DR. HOHOL: We're trying to conclude our review of the matter. If it is concluded during this term, the term in which the students are presently enrolled, and it appears that we should move forward, we would look at the possibility of assigning those benefits to them. It wouldn't be a matter so much of retroactivity as assigning them a benefit during the term in which they are in school. Should that happen to be in the next term, the assignment would be for students during that term.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister outline to the Assembly the policy obstacles that have stood in the way of a decision to date, and can he be more specific as to the target date in view of the fact that there is considerable concern among these students?

DR. HOHOL: Of course the target date is as soon as possible, and we're working on it. The major obstacle would be a policy shift in the sense that if we improve or increase our allowances, we would go above and beyond those of the federal government. It's a major policy shift. Across the nation, in the 10 provinces, Canada Manpower now has a vocational allowance. Alberta alone has taken the position, and properly so, that there should be additional allowances.

If we improve ours, or go above those of the federal government, the federal government will then be the last resort of assistance in the area of allowances for vocational students. At the present time, the province is the last resort for allowances, in view of the fact that there is a federal allowance system for the 10 provinces. So there is a specific shift in policy to be considered. It's not an obstacle; it's a matter of consideration to make certain that what we do is fair, reasonable, and proper.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Will the minister assure the House that "as soon as possible" means before Christmas?

DR. HOHOL: Yes. I'm quite certain that's a commitment not that difficult to make. We're working on it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary on this topic.

MR. NOTLEY: A final supplementary question to the minister. In view of the claims of a number of students that the very high drop-out rate — in some semesters, I believe, as high as 30 per cent — is due to the vocational allowance question, have any studies been commissioned by the department, and is the minister in a position to advise us what the results of those studies are?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I just have to set aside . . . Because it wouldn't be reasonable, and I'm sure the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview would not intend to leave a figure like 30 per cent of the students dropping out because of the allowance. That is simply not the case. I'm sure he doesn't intend to leave that impression.

These students are coming into the vocational centres as a last chance — a last chance for a second, third, or fourth time. Often [they are] people who are mature in years, who've been on any number of jobs, who know the facts of life, and who have to come back — very often to learn how to learn, how to become effective again, through very basic education in advanced years. It's a difficult challenge. The schools are doing an excellent job. Those who drop out do so with the full knowledge of counselling, of expert help, and the full knowledge of what the labor force holds for them without additional training. Often they come back.

I simply want the record straight. There is a turnover or drop-out of 30 per cent at any point in time. But of these 30 per cent, many come back. They do not leave the school because of the allowance, because many would be there with or without the allowance. So let's keep the record straight on that matter, Mr. Speaker.

#### Provincial Judges

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General. This concerns the recommendations of the Kirby commission on the administration of justice we debated here a year and a half ago. Are there a significant number of provincial judges yet to be appointed in Alberta to comply with the recommendations of the Kirby commission?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I can fully answer that question right now. I know we are still a few short, but as to how many I'm not quite clear. I can check on that figure and reply in the House later.

DR. BUCK: It's getting harder to find PCs.

MR. FOSTER: Pardon me?

DR. BUCK: PCs are getting a little harder to find.

MR. FOSTER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if we want to debate the matter of the political affiliation of the members of the provincial court in the question period, I'd be quite happy to discuss that matter. If you want to put a motion on the Order Paper, I'd be more than . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: We don't really want to do that.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I noted that a card-carrying Liberal was recently appointed in the province. Could the minister indicate approximately the number who have been appointed in the past year?

MR. FOSTER: The number of card-carrying Liberals, Mr. Speaker?

DR. WARRACK: The total in Alberta is a hundred.

MR. FOSTER: Again I'd have to check, but I think we have made about 10 additional appointments to the provincial court. And I really would like to discuss the political affiliation question, if the opposition puts it on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

#### **Accident Research**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Transportation and Deputy Premier. In view of the fact that Alberta Transportation has an accident investigation analysis team, and that there is a federally funded accident research team at the University of Calgary called CARS, Calgary Accident Research Study, could the minister indicate the nature of any liaison that may exist between Alberta Transportation and the federal government with regard to accident investigation?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, there is substantial liaison between the team at the University of Calgary and the people in my department. There has been ongoing analysis of this particular area. Indeed, in the monthly reports I receive relative to motor vehicle accidents in this province, there are some very alarming statistics relative to the high percentage of, first of all, single-vehicle accidents and, secondly, accidents related to motorcycles.

#### **Student Employment Program**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Could the minister indicate whether consideration has been given to making provisions in the budget for STEP for the coming year, rather than funding it through a special warrant, which has been done in the past two or three years?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, it's really a detail I'd have to look into. We're preparing the estimates as a department. As the hon. member appreciates, the department estimates aren't necessarily the government estimates that the hon. members see in March on the floor of the House.

DR. BUCK: Don't be too prepared, Bert.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has any consideration been given to reinstituting the small business student opportunity element which has been discontinued the last two years?

DR. HOHOL: Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

#### **Fort McMurray Administration**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and is with regard to the town of Fort McMurray. I wonder if the minister has been notified of the decision of the board of administrators of the town of Fort McMurray as to its new chairman and new mayor?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, of course if the hon. member were to check the legislation, the responsibility for appointing the mayor is the minister's.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. When does the minister intend to ratify the decision of the board?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the ratification process will be done in the normal routine, when the ratifications for all new town chairmen are considered. It should be anon.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Does the minister intend to change the legislation so that a mayor could be elected by the town as such?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think I covered that this spring. I was asked the same question, and I indicated that as long Fort McMurray is in a state of rapid growth and the people are attempting to accommodate that growth as best they could, I could see no reason for interrupting the processes, either taking the town from its new town status to city status, or providing any change in the electoral process.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the minister aware of the overwhelming support from the town for this change in legislation? Will that overwhelming support — I think it's about 82 per cent of the citizens — influence his decision?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I necessarily agree with the hon. member's presentation that it's overwhelming. That of course is debatable.

DR. BUCK: Eighty-two per cent is fairly overwhelming.

MR. JOHNSTON: I have received presentations from both sides. But I think the weight of majority is to maintain a similar kind of stability in the system, and that's what we'll maintain through 1977-78.

#### **Technicians — Oil Industry**

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Advanced Education. A short explanation, if I may: the oil and gas companies in Calgary are running into serious difficulties with exploration development programs because of a very serious shortage of qualified technical personnel to do the work. Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister: what steps is the provincial government or his department taking to hold consultation with these companies in order to develop education programs that will assist to increase the supply of technical personnel for the oil and gas industry in the city of Calgary?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I'd comment in two ways. First, to use the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology as an example, every trade and every technology has a citizen council made up of trade union people, management people, citizens at large, and people from the institution. They work together to look at trends in manpower in each particular trade and technology, and advise the president and the institution on what may be in store for the occupations in the years to come. The institutions attempt to make proper adjustments.

The second comment is that there's some risk in making immediate adjustments to short-term short-

ages. I'm not saying that is the circumstance in the gas and oil situation at the present time, but it is important to note that effective adjustments are better made on the medium and the longer term.

#### **Coal Gasification**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism, in charge of the Research Council of Alberta. Will there be another project in Alberta this year on coal gasification?

MR. DOWLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, an extended coal gasification project is being undertaken. It involves a number of things: one is to actually investigate the way the coal is burned underground and whether there are some problems in underground burning of that kind. Interestingly again, the project is being undertaken and financed in a major way by private-sector companies.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary. Will the project be carried on at the same site as last year, or will a new site be chosen?

MR. DOWLING: Yes, a great part of it will be undertaken in the Forestburg area again this year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary. Will the project reach the stage this year where some of the gases can be collected?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, what they normally do in the early experimental stage of the gasification process is burn the gas, and by chromatographic examination of what is being burned, tell the percentage of each of the compounds in the gas that is expelled as a result. I know of no indication at this time that they intend to collect the gas. It will still be a burning process.

#### **Impaired Drivers**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Attorney General. I'd like to know if the minister is considering legislative changes to crack down on drinking drivers who are becoming involved more and more in serious accidents.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not considering any specific legislation with respect to drinking drivers at this time. It may be, however, that others of my colleagues have a greater interest than I have in that subject, from a legislative point of view.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the hon. Solicitor General indicate if his department is considering any legislative changes to crack down on the drinking driver?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, our present laws are pretty tough. We have made a slight change in policy, in that before we restore a licence to a driver who has been suspended for impaired driving, he must now undergo alcoholism treatment under AADAC.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General and to the Solicitor General: in light of the fact that the Minister of Transportation has announced a maximum fine of \$1,000 for defacing road signs, I would like to know if the Attorney General is considering increasing the current minimum fine of \$75 for driving without due care and attention.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to check the record. I think what the hon. member is referring to is the voluntary penalty for careless driving. If that's accurate, I would point out that the police officer has the option of providing the accused individual with the opportunity of paying it voluntarily, in which case they pay the specified penalty; or of directing the accused to actually appear in court before a judge, in which case the judge would consider all the circumstances and could assess virtually any fine at all. It would not be limited by that specific dollar figure.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. Solicitor General. Sometimes after a heavy drinker has had his licence suspended two or three times, he realizes he just can't go on doing that type of thing, and he reforms and goes many months without drinking. The course at AADAC is also very helpful. Is any consideration being given to a short reduction of the suspension, where the authorities are convinced that the man has now given up drinking for good?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member didn't have any particular person in mind when he was . . . [laughter]

DR. BUCK: How is your bicycle?

MR. FARRAN: No, there is absolutely no discretion in the law for the minister to issue what has been called a restricted licence to go to work, and that sort of thing. It's very common that I receive pleas for compassion or mercy, but I have no power to adjust a mandatory suspension. It starts at six months for the first offence, one year for the second, and three years for the third. Very often I get a plea that a fellow has been on the wagon for a couple of years, and couldn't he get his licence back; he still has one year of suspension to serve.

I'm afraid I would recommend against any change in the law to give the minister such discretion, because more than 90 per cent of our population can claim a special hardship when they're deprived of their vehicle. They need it to go to work, to feed their livestock, to keep them off welfare; they can all make the same case for a need for a vehicle.

MR. TAYLOR: A further supplementary. I might say I agree that the minister should not be put in that position. But I think the object of keeping safe drivers on the road and making drivers safe might be enhanced if a judge or a board could hear the case after the three-year suspension was more than half used up, for instance, and where there was definite evidence that the man had given up drinking entirely. I'm wondering if the minister would at least consider that. I think it might enhance the law and rehabilitate some of these people, get them back to work and looking after their families much faster.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the compassion, but as I read the general opinion of the public, they're for tougher rather than more lenient penalties. The Kirby Board of Review recommended impounding cars, so that even the wife or the son couldn't drive the suspended driver to work. There are people who advocate mandatory jail sentences, as they have in some parts of Europe. I doubt if majority opinion at the present time would be in favor of any leniency. We'd certainly look at it.

MR. KUSHNER: Supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Speaker, can the minister inform this Assembly if very many have had their licences suspended and, in fact, have been caught driving without a licence?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the definition of "many" is. It's certainly a significant number.

#### **Rural and Native Housing**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change the pace a bit and direct this question to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. It concerns the rural and native housing program. Could the minister advise the Assembly whether there is an unwritten policy that the rural and native housing expenditures will be north of Highway 16?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any such policy.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the minister, the department, or any official of the government obtained statistics on the number of units projected this year and the breakdown between native and non-native applications?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, the nature of the information the member is asking for may better be placed on the Order Paper. However, we have been targeting for some 400 units in total by the end of this year, or perhaps even exceeding that figure.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise whether it is the policy of the government, with respect to the rural and native housing program, that housing units would be constructed as a consequence of the recommendations of the local advisory committees, which I believe are established as a precondition of the program, or whether in fact houses are built on spec on the assumption they can be sold afterwards?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, there's a fairly wide divergence with respect to the delivery process. In a number of instances existing housing is bought — and this is permitted under the federal/provincial policy — and then assigned, so in cases like that the housing already exists, rather than going through the housing committee process. In most instances the housing committees play a very important part in terms of the selection process, the designation of whose application is acceptable under the program.

Perhaps if the hon. member wishes, I could provide more written information, as I indicated.

#### **Research Council Employees**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Business Development and Tourism in his capacity of chairman of the Research Council of Alberta. My question really deals with the chairman of the Research Council. Is Dr. Wiggins, who has been chairman of the council for some time, still chairman?

MR. DOWLING: No, Mr. Speaker. I don't mind informing the hon. Leader of the Opposition in the House that when I became responsible for this department as minister, I had some discussions with Dr. Wiggins asking him, since he was close to retirement, what his views were with regard to carrying on, or what he wanted to do. He suggested he had an opportunity to go with an organization called AOSTRA. I asked him to stay on for a period of time until I knew exactly what was going on in the Research Council. He did that, and very recently moved from the Research Council to AOSTRA. During a time of advertising for a replacement for Dr. Wiggins — which, I must add, will be very difficult — we have set up an interim or temporary administrative structure and a gentleman temporarily in charge of the research program.

DR. BUCK: Just pick one up like Miniely does, Bob.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Did Dr. Wiggins leave the Research Council for reasons of health, or any reason other than that he was getting close to retirement and had this opportunity with AOSTRA?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, having in mind the answer I gave just a moment ago, Dr. Wiggins wanted to leave to take a lesser role on the advice of his medical adviser. As I said, I asked him to stay on. Perhaps I was ill-advised to do that. He is in ill health, but he left of his own volition. It was by mutual consent, and there was no pressure to have him leave. On the contrary, there was pressure to have him stay as long as he wished to stay.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last question to the minister. Has the minister had recent discussions with, I suppose it would be fair to say, the acting administrator or the acting senior person of the Research Council with regard to the outside activities of certain staff members on the council?

MR. DOWLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact I had discussions — not on that particular subject — with the new acting administrative director Dr. Hitchon yesterday, and at times prior to that with regard to the operation of the Research Council, to be assured in my own mind that he understands what I consider to be the role of the chairman and of the Research Council itself, as well as the role of the council staff.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Would the minister be in a position to provide to the members of the Assembly any guidelines that he has given to the

acting chairman of the Research Council of Alberta with regard to the outside activities of employees of the Research Council?

MR. DOWLING: Well, very briefly, Mr. Speaker. It may be something that would require a lengthy answer. I would say for certain that the Research Council staff are required to react to what I consider to be government policy in a broad sense. At all times they are to have the best interests of the Research Council and the people of Alberta in mind in anything they undertake. That practice has been followed generally in all instances.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might rephrase the question to the minister. Would the minister be prepared to table with the Assembly any code of conduct with regard to outside activities of employees of the research staff? If the minister would sooner, I could put it on a motion for a return, but would the minister be prepared to table that information?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer has just tabled a document dealing with code of conduct for senior officials of government, and that obviously applies to senior officials of the Research Council.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. The question doesn't deal just with senior positions in the Research Council but researchers at the council. My question is: would the minister be prepared to table in the Assembly the guidelines of conduct, guidelines of outside involvement, or any other kinds of guidelines dealing with outside involvement that the minister has given the Research Council?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, we have had or were required by statute to have two meetings of the Research Council annually. We have exceeded that number each year that I have been responsible as chairman for the Research Council. In the course of the discussions with the members of the council, we have come to some conclusions which I suppose could be guidelines for activities of the council staff. Those obviously have been and will continue to be transmitted to all staff of the Research Council from time to time.

MR. CLARK: Then will you table it?

MR. DOWLING: We have no formal document, Mr. Speaker. We have discussions at each of our meetings with regard to the transactions that take place in the Research Council.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism, for clarification. The minister says there is no formal document. Has there been any codification, any inventory? Or is this just something that occurs every time there is a meeting? Has there been any inventory of policy at all with respect to outside activities?

MR. DOWLING: Not in a formal sense, Mr. Speaker. As I say, we have a continuing series of meetings. I

think this year we have had something in the order of four. I have no doubt there will be another one prior to the end of the year.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: On Monday, when the point of privilege was raised by the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works, I expressed the hope that I might be able to deal with it today. That has not come to pass. I trust the Assembly will extend me the patience of allowing it to be dealt with tomorrow.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the estimates of the heritage savings trust fund.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

## head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS** (Committee of Supply)

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

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

### ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVINGS TRUST FUND CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION 1978-79 ESTIMATES OF PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

#### **Farming for the Future**

#### **Agriculture**

##### **1. Farming for the Future Program**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you have any opening remarks?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, very few. There's not a great deal to add to my statement of a couple of weeks ago with respect to agricultural research, except to say that by the end of this calendar year, I hope, it would be my intention to have the committee in place and the structural organization which is necessary in order to assess projects that might be put forward to us and to allocate funds. Quite naturally, Mr. Chairman, the actual dollars from this program would not be available until the beginning of the next fiscal year. But in the meantime it will be our intention to proceed with the work of structuring the committee, being sure we are ready to go on April 1, 1978.

MR. NOTLEY: I'd like to raise just a couple of points. As I read the ministerial announcement the other day, there was no doubt in my mind when I read it the first time that this was in addition to existing

research. The only thing I'd like to have clarified is: in terms of this program, is there any possibility that research programs in place today will be shifted over during the next five years? Or in fact are we talking about \$10 million of totally new programming over the period of five years, as opposed to any presently funded programming?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, that's an important question, not only from the point of view of the provincial government's spending on research under the Department of Agriculture. In that regard I would say it's our fullest intention to ensure that we have a contribution at least equal to what we have today in terms of the department's annual budget in research, which I indicated in my ministerial statement is fairly extensive in a variety of ways, when you consider things like the Brooks horticulture research centre, some of our livestock testing centres, and so on. That funding will not diminish. In fact the \$2 million per year over five years will be in addition to that amount.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I think it's important that it be on the record that other research institutions, or institutions with a research capability, which may be requesting funds and assistance through this new fund will also be required to show that in fact it isn't a replacement for funds they've taken and used elsewhere. In other words, it will be my intention — for example, in terms of agriculture research going on at the University of Alberta — to ensure that any application of funds from this project that might go to the university for research they are doing isn't simply replacing some funds they've shifted to another area. The same would occur with respect to our federal research centres and other similar areas.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the minister's statement, and I would just like to say I certainly intend to support this proposal.

I really have, I suppose, two additional questions. One, does the government envisage any additional research facilities as a result of the farming for the future program, or will that be done in existing facilities?

The second question really flows from the total itself: \$10 million over five years. In determining this amount, what formal discussions took place with people in the agricultural research field? It raises the question of how much we should in fact be allocating, and how much it is possible to allocate. Members of the committee are not experts in the field. We don't know how far and how quickly you could go. You might spend \$10 million. That may be the limit of what we can do over five years, or it might be \$100 million. What I'm getting at is: to what extent were there formal discussions with people in the agricultural research field in drawing up the perimeters of this program, or to what extent was it strictly an internal budgetary process of the investment committee?

MR. MOORE: Once again, two questions: the first one with respect to the funds involved here and whether any of those funds might be expended on facilities. The answer, at least generally, is no. It's not intended that these funds would be expended for the development of buildings, a specific research centre, or anything of that nature. However, it is quite natur-

al that, in assisting a specific research project that may last from one to five years, some of the funds could be involved in purchase of equipment and so on; in other words, the kind of thing that's not of a lasting nature, but that scientists and others need to work with. It's not envisioned that we would get into building buildings and assisting in that area.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, in developing this program we recognized two needs in Alberta. One was for an increase in the number of research facilities. There is room for improvement in both our federal and university-funded research institutions, for additional buildings and structures which by themselves don't do any good as far as agricultural research programs are concerned, but are a necessary part of it.

The second consideration was that of providing funds to pay for research scientists, their equipment, and their work in existing areas. One that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview would be familiar with is the Beaverlodge Research Centre. It's my view, having had some knowledge of that centre for many years, that much more could be done there without building any buildings. We will be in contact with the federal government to consider what kind of things. I've already been in contact with the research centre director to ask him what kind of things he thinks could be done without additional building.

The second question was: how did we arrive at the figure, and what input was there to that? We've had discussions over at least the last year and a half with the various bodies involved in research relative to the area I just referred to — what additional help they need on certain programs, and what new programs they see as being of lasting benefit to us. In that area we've had consultation with all the federal research people, with some of the private sector, quite naturally with our own universities, with the university in Saskatoon, and with some as far away even as Ontario, in terms of livestock diseases and so on. There was no input by those people we talked to, in terms of the total figures we're talking about here. In other words, we gathered it together by talking to people about the kind of needs they've seen and the kinds of dollars and costs that were involved.

In terms of arriving at a figure of \$2 million each year and a total of \$10 million over five years, I think that will go a long way to satisfying the legitimate research requests that come to us. Quite frankly, the figure was arrived at after extensive discussions between myself and members of my department and, following that, discussions with our cabinet.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I want to say this is the type of program that is going to be helpful for agricultural industry. I think it'll help the economy of agriculture because it's going to be depressed and we need some research in this particular area. I have two questions for the minister. He did partly answer one; that is, if they'll be blending their programs with the federal programs in existence. He also indicated they will be expanding the program at Brooks. The other question, Mr. Chairman, is: how will farm organizations have input to drafting programs implemented under this fund?

MR. MOORE: First of all I should make myself clear on the Brooks horticulture research centre. I did not



say we would be expanding the research there from this fund. I said we would expect to maintain the operations at Brooks by way of the funding presently being provided. Just so there's no mistake, Mr. Chairman, in that regard.

The matter of input from farm organizations is going to come directly from the committee which I will be chairing. It would be my hope that I have some active, practising farmers on the research committee — I don't know how many yet. While they may not necessarily be drawn from existing farm organizations in Alberta, they will certainly be individuals who have a good, firm background and knowledge of livestock or grains or whatever area we consider. As a matter of fact, it is my thinking at the present time, subject to some input from members of the Legislature, that it would probably be better to draw individuals to sit on a committee from a background in a certain area of agricultural production. In other words, I think we would want to have someone on the committee who has had a great deal of experience and knowledge in the beef cattle industry and the livestock area, someone in the grains and forage area, and that kind of thing, rather than a specific representative of an individual farm organization.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the minister on such a far-reaching and extensive program of research for the agricultural industry, which is one of our prime industries here in Alberta. I can realize the importance of programs and research to increase our production. I was wondering if you were anticipating that the development and the search for markets for specialized products throughout the world will be part of the research program, and whether or not we will be carrying out research on what we might be able to sell that we're not presently selling.

MR. CLARK: Export Agency, . . .

MR. MILLER: Yes, Mr. Clark.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member mentioned two aspects that could relate in some way to what we might be doing under this program. The first one would be in terms of world markets — some work within Alberta with respect to processing our products so they fit world markets. But the actual marketing thrust that's being carried out by our department would continue to be funded by the department.

In the second area — that of developing, as I understood it, new products for world markets — that will certainly be a part of the criteria that go into the selection of research projects. If in fact it's determined that, in addition to supplying our Alberta and Canadian markets, a research project has the advantage of being a potential export product, then quite naturally the priorities would be more significant than might otherwise be the case.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Minister, I've become just a little suspicious of a rather blank cheque arrangement, as we did in some areas last year as far as the heritage fund was concerned. My question to you, Mr. Minister, is: despite the fact you don't know how many you're going to have on the committee, the size of the committee, who is going to make up the membership,

and whether you are going to have representatives from farm organizations or whether individuals will be appointed, can you at least give us some indication of your initial priorities? You've talked in terms of grains, livestock, and forage. Can we assume, Mr. Minister, that those are the priorities, and that when we come back next year those are the areas where we will have seen the major allocation of funds?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I think all I can do is restate what I did two weeks ago in announcing the program; that is, the emphasis will be on those areas I spoke about: grains, forage, and livestock.

It's early for me to suggest that next year when we come back — I suppose it would be a year and a half from now really, before we get into the area of considering what we have done over a 12-month period — that all the emphasis will be in that area. The reason is that, while I and my department staff have tried to develop considerable knowledge in this area, I want to get the input from a committee of knowledgeable people. Some are drawn from professional people, university ranks, and so on. But very definitely, Mr. Chairman, those are the criteria on which the program is based, with particular emphasis, I say again, on northern Alberta. By that I mean generally north of the Calgary area, where I think we've spent too many years living on borrowed varieties of grains and forage, and we need to see some improvements. That will be the emphasis.

I'd just say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that I'm old-fashioned enough to believe it wasn't appropriate for me to completely structure the committee, name the people, outline 100 per cent their terms of reference, and everything, without first having brought the matter to the Legislature and got approval for the funding.

MR. CLARK: I can appreciate the minister's desire to have all sorts of flexibility. But we've just had a recent experience in the committee where we found out that we approved \$7.5 million last year, thought we were buying something, and found out we really have done nothing in the course of the year. Mr. Minister, I would say to you very candidly that next year, when the heritage savings trust fund committee meets to assess the year's operation, we'll look to your remarks today as some sort of gauge as to how well you've done. That's really the gauge the members of the committee have.

I appreciate you saying with a very nice smile on your face how you don't want to have anybody on the committee and you don't really know what you're going to do and you want to talk to everybody and all those kinds of things. But, Mr. Minister, I rather assumed you would have talked to people more than outside your department before you brought the broad general proposal to us.

I can appreciate, Mr. Minister, that you don't want to tie yourself down to specifics. Fair ball. But I ask you to appreciate too the fact that we're really giving you a \$2 million blank cheque here and that we'd like to have some indication of criteria to gauge how well you've handled that blank cheque in the year or year and a half's time when your accountability comes to that committee.

Could I just make one other comment, Mr. Chairman? I've heard for three years how the province is

going to get together with the federal government and do some things as far as Beaverlodge is concerned. In fact, I guess I first raised the matter with your predecessor, and he was going to have discussions with the federal government. He tells me he did — good for you. I would like to know, perhaps not this afternoon but certainly sometime, what kind of progress you're making. Because my assessment of the kind of impact we've had on the federal government in getting a bit more funds at Beaverlodge, in the forage area that the minister has talked about and in various varieties of grain, hasn't been that great.

Excluding a certain venture at Beaverlodge which I have some interest in, I think the idea of trying to bend the arm of the federal government and become jointly involved in some projects there, foragewise and varietywise, has a great deal to commend it. I think basically they've done some good work there. They've really had some serious financial cutbacks in a couple of years, as the minister knows. Once again, we look forward in a year and a half's time to see how successful you've been in working on an agreement there. I think it's a good direction to work. In a year and a half's time we'll look forward to seeing how well you've done in that area.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, with regard the first comments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I'm well prepared to come back to the committee, at whatever time, with an explanation of what we've done with the funds. I think that's the appropriate thing to do, and I'm fully prepared to do it. However, I don't want to leave the House with the impression that because we've allocated \$2 million for the next fiscal year, it's all going to be spent. I could come back a year from now and say, we've only expended \$500,000, because I didn't have brought forward to me the kinds of proposals we thought we should be funding. So that's the other thing that could happen. I can assure you — the Provincial Treasurer is not around right at the moment — that it likely won't be in excess of \$2 million, but it could well be below.

With respect to Beaverlodge: it's like every other research centre in western Canada that's operated by the federal government; the funding has not continued to keep pace with inflation. In fact, in most research stations in the west today they're doing less than they did five years ago. I don't know how else you try to convince people of your concern and priorities other than doing what I'm suggesting now. What we're saying is that we do have a heritage savings trust fund which is designed to provide benefits in the future, and we're prepared to enter an area that for many, many years has traditionally been considered a federal area in terms of responsibility. I say "traditionally considered". It isn't necessarily a federal area when it comes to the matter of the British North America Act, but it's always been expected by most provinces that the federal government would undertake agricultural research. What we're saying to them is that we're prepared, in view of the concerns expressed over the last few years, to put our money where our mouth is, so to say, and to help in that regard.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to commend the government for bringing this \$2 million as a start to improve farming for the future. When we look at the

world food supply today and realize what's going on, I think this is probably the number one project and should be one of the top projects in this province. By the use of irrigation we were able to increase our production manifold, and this was done over a period of years through experimentation and so on. I believe there's still a very fertile field for the processing of agricultural products in this province. I'm not at all sure we can't develop a real, top-notch vegetable and fruit section in parts of Alberta. It requires some encouragement, patience, and research. This may be the process of doing that. I don't know just how closely the hon. minister is going to be confined to the words used in this particular section, but I would hope these could be interpreted quite widely.

On the other hand I think a very important section of both farming and ranching, which is mentioned here, is the fact that I don't think the farmers and ranchers have received their fair share of the national income at any time in the history of Canada. There must be some reason for that. If our farmers are going to produce, there's going to have to be profit on the farm. If our ranchers are going to continue to produce, there's going to have to be profit on the ranch too. I think this is a pretty important item — to look into that particular aspect.

One of the other things I'm concerned about in farming for the future certainly includes the production and processing of grains and livestock, but also the marketing and delivery system. I hope the fact that those two words aren't particularly mentioned here won't prevent the minister from following through in some marketing and delivery system. For instance, if you look at the 1920 elevator and the 1977 elevator, there's very little difference. The farmers have increased their production; they use modern machinery, larger machinery, more expensive machinery; they've carried out research and are getting bigger crops. But the delivery system remains almost the same. If we're going to give farmers a better price, one way to do it is to cut down on the overhead of delivery and marketing, which is a very important aspect of farming today.

I'm hoping the minister will be able to interpret this section widely to include anything that's going to make farming for the future a better industry, with greater production and greater efficiency. It certainly involves many aspects besides the actual research, production, and processing, important as those aspects are.

So I want to commend the government for bringing this estimate forward. I think it's one of the items in the Alberta heritage savings trust fund program that will probably be more far-reaching than many others, because it's actually producing food, and without food we can't keep people alive.

MR. R. SPEAKER: There seems to be some concern with regard to reporting back to the Legislature. I wonder if the minister could take on an informal commitment to report back in the Throne debate in the spring session, with regard to the progress relative to this program. That's a fairly flexible debate, and I think that would be a good time to do it — as to the committee, as to the types of projects that are being raised. Possibly that would be one medium through which we could discuss the program.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a couple of points. First of all, while I agree with the points the Member for Drumheller has raised — and I think those points are all valid, and if we're going to talk about farming for the future it is appropriate that research be considered there — I would just say that if we learned anything from our rather gruelling experience in the heritage committee, it is that if we are going to go beyond the scope of the appropriation it would be useful that in fact that be said as clearly as possible in the House. So while I concur in the points the Member for Drumheller has made, it seems to me that if the minister is thinking about expanding beyond the bounds of what I guess one might classify as applied research, into socio-economic research, I would hope the minister would outline that clearly today. It might even be necessary . . . [interjections]

Yes, well I'm not suggesting that's going to happen. I don't think we've got to . . . Well, I won't get into that.

But I think the point is well made that if we're going to go beyond the scope of what is in this proposal, the request to do that should be made in the Legislature. If that is the government's intention, frankly I would be prepared to see an amendment to the appropriation to allow that kind of latitude.

I agree with the Member for Drumheller. It's a valid point. You look at our grain delivery system. You've got an elevator system that hasn't changed since 1910 or 1915. We're talking about farming for the future, and certainly if the provincial government is going to be in a position to assess federal moves as they occur, there will no doubt have to be research. I would assume the minister would be able to fund that kind of background study or studies from other appropriations of government and would not be using the farming for the future appropriation. But if it's necessary to do that, it seems to me we should be talking about it here.

MR. MOORE: With regard to the several points that have been made. Certainly I would agree with the hon. Member for Drumheller with respect to the need for improving our market and delivery system. On the other hand, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview is quite correct. This fund was not designed with the purpose in mind of actually getting involved in improving our marketing and delivery system.

Insofar as studies relating to marketing and delivery systems are concerned, a lot of them have been done. There is a pile of paper. What's really lacking is some action by the federal government, in terms of implementing recommendations on the Hall commission report. That would be a pretty good start.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is correct in saying that's a separate issue. I wouldn't anticipate any of these funds being involved in that area, unless we got into a situation where it appeared there was some research — not development or anything — needed with respect to a particular kind of delivery system that would be of good assistance to farmers. We're not talking about a major program there.

With regard to the spring sitting of the Legislature, Mr. Chairman, during debate I'd be fully prepared to bring members up-to-date on what has transpired from this point until then. I would not expect, in the

spring session, that we would have approved any projects yet. We might have, depending on when the matter would be raised. But certainly then I would be in a good position to indicate who the members of the committee are, how it's functioning, some idea of what kind of representations have been made to the committee, and that kind of thing.

Agreed to:

Farming for the Future Program

\$2,000,000

### **Preservation of Historic Sites**

#### **Housing and Public Works**

##### **1. Government House South**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you have any opening remarks?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to indicate to the Assembly that every member has received a copy of the brochure. I think it was distributed yesterday. I would like to bring to the attention of the members the first paragraph of the purpose, which states:

The citizens of Southern Alberta have over the years wished a closer accessibility to the Provincial Government. Government House South will serve as a focal point for the Provincial Government in Southern Alberta.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Pat him on the back.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in support of this project. For a number of years a feeling has been very prevalent among Calgarians that they have continually received the short end of the stick as far as provincial government spending is concerned. I frequently have calls, both from members of my own constituency and numerous Calgary citizens, making various comparisons to indicate that more provincial dollars are being spent in Edmonton than in Calgary. While I see no early indication that the Legislature Building is going to be moved to Calgary, I'm sure many Calgary residents will view the restoration of the old Court House at least as a step in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of pleasure to speak, both for myself and members of my constituency, on the restoration of the old Court House in Calgary, which will be known in the future as Alberta House South.

I have many fond personal memories of this old building, the old Court House, as I spent many an hour on the witness stand in that building in cases presided over by such notable Albertans as the late Mr. Justice Boyd McBride and former Chief Justice Campbell McLaurin and, during those many, many hours on the witness stand, subjected to intensive cross-examination by other well-known Albertans such as Mr. Justice Milvain when he was on the other end of the fence, Edward McCormick, Q.C., Milton Harradance, Q.C., and Neil Maclean, Q.C.

Another note of nostalgia is that the old Court House is one of the few remaining examples of classic sandstone architecture in the city of Calgary, one of the last examples of this marvellous form of architec-

ture in the capital of southern Alberta. At one time, as you probably know, Calgary was known as the Sandstone City, with most of the downtown buildings being made of local sandstone, most of the schools being constructed of the same material, and the artisans being brought out from the British Isles at that time.

I feel it is most fitting to take this step to preserve a very important part of southern Alberta history and heritage in the preservation of this building. Indeed I would suggest that in our almost mad pursuit of progress at times we have already destroyed too many of the historic buildings of our cities. In Calgary the old Herald Building, later known as the Greyhound Building, one of the most beautiful buildings we ever had, lined with marble and mahogany, with a collection of gargoyles that was the envy of most of the cities of this country . . . The old Capital Theatre fell under the demolition ball, without them even removing the stage or curtains. While we hear criticisms of this project on the grounds that funds from the heritage savings trust fund could be much better assigned to more practical and utilitarian projects, I humbly submit, Mr. Chairman, that this government has responded to its duties in this area and that the report of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund capital projects division gives ample evidence of this commitment. Of course it also indicates there's a great deal more to come.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we owe it to the future residents of this province to preserve for them our history, our heritage, and this very important part of our culture. I'm convinced that future generations will thank us for foresight in making this preservation. Anyone who has enjoyed the breathtaking beauty of structures such as St. Paul's Cathedral, Westminster Abbey, and the Houses of Parliament will give thanks for the foresight of leaders of that era. Mr. Chairman, maybe Sir Christopher Wren was considered an impractical visionary by many of his contemporaries. But the world is a better place because of him and his foresight.

MR. SCHMID: Right on.

MR. LITTLE: However, Mr. Chairman, Government House South will fulfil a much more practical and useful purpose than being merely a preservation of this most important part of our history and culture. Government House South will provide a ready and easy accessibility for the people of southern Alberta to make contact with the provincial government. This historic site will provide a permanent office for the Lieutenant-Governor and will allow him to meet and receive citizens and delegations who might otherwise find travelling to the northern city some hindrance.

We also look forward to easier access to the Premier, members of the cabinet, and MLAs from both sides of the House for the citizens of southern Alberta. Government House South will also be used as a conference centre in much the same way as Government House in Edmonton. Lastly, an office will be provided for the Ombudsman who, hopefully, will extend the contact of his services to many, many more citizens of this province — which I consider a most important service to the citizens of southern Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, I am most happy to have this useful facility available to the citizens of southern Alberta.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to add my remarks. I'm afraid I won't be quite as rhapsodic as the Member for Calgary McCall, but I would like to make my small contribution. In Calgary and other parts of the province we've had some criticism of this expenditure. Many people have said we should be spending this money on hospitals, recreation facilities, parks, and things of that nature. However, I feel it's important that we emphasize the democratic institution under which we live. If this means building or restoring buildings, or emphasizing the symbols within which we work, then I say, so be it. I think it's important to the citizens of Calgary that they have a focal point for this very important purpose.

To those of you who don't live in the city, I think it might be interesting to point out some neighbors of this particular building. On the one side we have Knox United Church. As we all know, the heritage of the United Church in Canada goes back many years before it was even a united church. We have IBM, which has a lot of influence in our modern way of life. We have Eaton's, which is an old traditional family name in Canadian history. And we have Imperial Oil, or Exxon as some people would like to call it, looking down on the square. I've mentioned just some neighbors. There are others. I believe the Energy Resources Conservation Board is to the west, and some smaller oil company buildings are to the northwest.

I think it's significant that this particular sandstone architecture is being preserved. I don't share some people's enthusiasm for retention of old buildings. If they're significant from an architectural point of view, or of a particular material, I think they should be preserved. But I don't think we should get too carried away. After all, one of the reasons we're not building any more sandstone buildings is that the sandstone doesn't stand up very well in that particular climate. What a lot of people fail to realize is that the pioneers built what they could with what they had at hand. If they'd had marble from Manitoba, or even from Italy, I think they would have preferred to use that.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's important in our troubled times that we have a symbol like this building will become in our community. There's a lot of ferment in the land right now. There's a lot of talk of changing the position of the provinces vis-a-vis the federal government, of the provinces having more power. I think it's important that citizens of Calgary and surrounding areas who will visit this centre have an opportunity to see, in effect, where their government is, in place in their community.

I think that any way we can better involve people — as the hon. member said, through the Ombudsman's office, or through being able to visit various cabinet ministers or MLAs — is worthy of the expenditure. To those who criticize us I say, I think it's an expenditure that will be well worth it. I'd like to see more of this because, as I mentioned earlier, when you look and see these buildings around it, Government House South represents the will of the people in the province of Alberta. This building obviously is the epitome of it. I think we've got to emphasize to the people of our province that the church doesn't run the commu-

nity, IBM doesn't run the community, Exxon doesn't run the community; it's us up here, their elected representatives. I would certainly urge all members of the House to support anything we can do to strengthen that.

MR. PLANCHE: I'd just like to make a brief remark on Government House South. I think it's a very worthwhile and appropriate thing to do for Calgary and southern Alberta. One of the comments I've had that I think bears mentioning to the House is that if we're going to have a building that's respected and enjoyed by the citizens, I think we might well look at public access to the one in Edmonton. I would hope the Sundays-only tours now allowed might be expanded to any day that's suitable and non-conflicting, and that it might be staffed accordingly to accommodate the people at large, so they have the feeling that it is their building. I'd like that feeling to be extended to Calgary: that it isn't a building that belongs to the government and the people can come in every once in a while by appointment, but that it is accessible, taking into account the problems of vandalism and conflicting meetings and one thing and another.

Thank you very much.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, we've had some very nice platitudes with respect to Government House South. Basically I support the project. But I think a number of questions need to be asked, and need to be answered by the minister. On behalf of my constituents and others who have put forward questions with regard to this particular announcement, I think it would be helpful if the minister made some clarifications at this time. Such questions are asked as: in this inflationary time, when everyone else is asked to restrain their expenditures and program planning, how can the government set aside that responsibility with the announcement of a \$3 million project such as Government House South? I think the citizens are not criticizing from the point of view of saying it is not necessary. They simply don't know how the government arrived at that kind of expenditure at this time — and the necessity of this program. I think the minister needs to provide information as to how the different components were made up to come to an estimated figure of \$3 million. What needs to be done to the basic structure of the building; that is, where are the costly aspects of the preservation and development? I hope the minister would give us a pretty detailed outline, to the extent possible at this early stage, as to how the whole budget was determined.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, the first thing I'd like to say is that in my first year in to this Assembly I had my name chosen out of the hat, with respect to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and had an opportunity to visit Newfoundland. I was rather interested that in Newfoundland, which was such a young province, there were really two areas of government: one in St. John's and one in Corner Brook. It was recognized that government, in coming close to the people, had to serve them in such a way that there were no physical barriers between the government and the people.

In Alberta I guess 50 per cent or more of the people live south of Red Deer. There's nothing to suggest

they shouldn't have a much closer association with government in southern Alberta, because the people in Edmonton and northern Alberta do enjoy a very close association with government here in Edmonton.

DR. BUCK: Sure sure have trouble in B.C.

MR. YURKO: Well, they can make their own decisions. This is Alberta, not British Columbia.

DR. BUCK: You should have one in the north, one in the south, one in . . .

MR. YURKO: I do want to suggest that the very pertinent question was: in these inflationary times should government involve itself in this type of expenditure? I think the Member for Edmonton Norwood should recognize that what's being allocated here is heritage savings trust funds. The idea behind capital projects of the heritage savings trust fund is that money is being used for projects that wouldn't be done with a normal budget. These are projects that go beyond the normal thing government would tend to do with its normal budget. This ideally fits that type of project. Indeed it's not only necessary but ideally fits the criteria of the capital works section of the heritage savings trust fund.

With respect to the actual estimates, Mr. Chairman, I don't have them at my fingers. But I can say that in Public Works we have some of the best engineers in the province. They generally put together reasonable estimates. There are some major renovations or changes in the building. For example, there is some parking downstairs and some of the major beams have to be changed. There's a balcony being arranged off the main conference room and the dining room, I believe, on the south side of the building. The building itself is fairly old, as the Minister of Culture knows, and restoration requirements in this regard are fairly extensive.

Except by answering the question generally, Mr. Chairman, if the member wishes to have a detailed estimate I can certainly produce this any time she wishes. But I do just want to suggest that qualified engineers put these estimates together, and indeed that's how the estimate was arrived at.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood recognizes very well the importance of preserving and developing this building, but I'm not so sure that citizens who are removed from very close communication and contact in the province of Alberta were apprized of information to be able to make that same valuable assessment. My question to the minister was simply to put on record, for those who read *Hansard*, to have the opportunity to understand the project.

So I certainly hope the minister takes it as that kind of input, and perhaps will avail himself of any other opportunity that may be afforded him, when the project is approved and in progress, to convey to the citizens of this province just what is happening, its importance, and how the decision has come about. You may be sure the Member for Edmonton Norwood is very well aware of that.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer just a few comments with regard to this project of the heritage savings trust fund. I think it's most fitting that we have set aside a division of capital projects entitled "Preservation of Historic Sites". I believe there are a number of historical resources across the province. The only opportunity we're going to have to preserve some of these historical resources is through use of the capital projects division of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. As the first allocation in this project division, I think it is most appropriate that the reconstruction and preservation of the old Court House in Calgary is being done. I think it will provide a very needed focus of government in southern Alberta. Constituents from the constituency I represent find the distance to Edmonton to come and see how their government operates is quite onerous. Provision of these services in a centre in southern Alberta is certainly needed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, might I just ask the minister one or two questions? Has the minister done any projections on what the operating costs of Government House South will be? That's the first question I'd like to ask, then I have one or two comments to make.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, the operating costs will be under the budget of the Minister of Government Services, and these will obviously be included in the estimates of the Minister of Government Services for the coming year. Until such time as he has addressed himself to these costs in detail, I don't know if he's prepared to offer any guidance in that regard at this time.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, I assume it would be the normal cost of maintenance which, of course, includes janitor service, the cost of utilities, grants in lieu of taxes and, I also assume, any other kind of service and so on and so forth, normally required for the maintenance and preservation of this kind of building, of which we have many throughout the province of Alberta.

DR. BUCK: To me that's not good enough. Surely, Mr. Chairman, when the government's embarking on a major restorative project such as this, it's just not good enough to say, we will have a look at it. One of the problems when you have too much money, Mr. Chairman, is that you go ahead and do these things *ad hoc*. Surely when we're building and restoring a building for \$4 million plus, we should have some idea how we're going to operate it and how much it's going to cost to run the thing.

Mr. Chairman, I'm just not quite as enthused about the expenditure of the money as the government members are. To me, this government is becoming famous for building monuments unto itself. It reminds me so much of the Nixon government, when it's going to be Government House South, like White House West or whatever you want to call it.

MR. NOTLEY: The western White House.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, this government has lost any direction of where its priorities should lie. What we should be concentrating on are people services,

and the government is losing direction in that matter. We're forgetting the \$35 million to \$40 million we're going to spend on the Capital City Park project, and I'm sure that's going to be just the first phase. The park in Calgary — millions and millions of dollars.

We're closing hospital beds. On an open-line show this morning the Premier said, I can't really believe we're closing hospital beds and operating rooms for certain months of the year because there isn't enough money. He says, if that is a problem, would the person phoning in be kind enough to drop a letter to my office, and I certainly will check it. Well, I don't know where the Premier's been. He should be talking to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care to find out what's happening.

MR. MINIELY: We have the highest number of hospital beds of any province in Canada.

DR. BUCK: Yes, and you're probably the worst minister ever administering the thing. I'll tell you that, too.

MR. HORSMAN: Order.

DR. BUCK: Who's the chairman over there? Come on, Horsman. If you want to get to the front bench, get in the debate. Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Keep to the debate please.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, we need to have some priorities established. In listening to that talk program this morning, Mr. Chairman, the people phoning in want to know why these things are happening, when we're spending lavishly on projects such as this, which will be nothing more than monuments unto themselves.

Mr. Chairman, we talk about freezes, we talk about worrying about hospital costs, and then we cut the budget for home care and day care. That's unbelievable. That just proves there's a lack of direction and priorities with this government.

The hon. member from Calgary, Mr. Musgreave — whatever constituency that is, Mr. Chairman — said the democratic process must function. Well let's make the thing function right here where it should be functioning. It's not going to function; that's not going to be an extension of the Legislature. Sure that is going to be a government house where the MLAs will be able to meet, where the Lieutenant-Governor can go, where the Premier can go. It's only right that the Premier have a \$4.5 million edifice he can meet in. I mean, that's only right when you've got \$3.5 billion. But ask the people what they want, and they'll say, we would sooner have that \$4 million spent elsewhere.

MR. NOTLEY: The Game Farm.

DR. BUCK: Yes, even the Game Farm, when we're talking about heritage trust funds. Yes, even the Game Farm would take priority in my mind over a monument unto the PC government. How about learning disabilities? How about 32 children in one classroom? Where are the priorities?

Let's have a look at some of the major recreational complexes in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary. Now, before the hon. government members jump all

over me, Mr. Chairman, I think that when we invested \$11 million in the Commonwealth Stadium, which can be used only in the summer under present conditions, why were there not some more adequate negotiations to cover the two stadia in Edmonton and Calgary so the taxpayer's dollar can make those things function year round?

Now I know the hon. government members will say, that's inconsistent; you're saying, don't spend money but do spend money. I am saying that when you have a facility like the Commonwealth Stadium sitting covered by snow six months of the year, I think the thing should be covered so we can use it 12 months of the year. Then it's not just a football stadium; it is a multi-use facility that can be used year round.

DR. PAPROSKI: The city didn't want it.

DR. BUCK: The city didn't want it. I want that down in *Hansard*. The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway said the city didn't want it covered.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The city of Edmonton indicated that it was too costly. We in this Assembly, many members on the government side of the House, indicated quite definitively that we wanted a covered stadium.

DR. BUCK: Well that shows you how much influence the backbenchers have got in that government, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NOTLEY: It shows how much influence they have in Edmonton.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, how about the facilities for young offenders who are in our correctional institutes? We sell the facility down at Bowden and don't have any facility to replace it. Now that's foresight. We take these young people and we throw them into institutions with hardened criminals. What do they do? They come out as hardened criminals. Let's have a look at the priorities.

The one thing I do agree with, as my hon. colleague the Member for . . . Where are you from, Mr. Little? It's so tough remembering those 69 constituencies, Mr. Chairman. I apologize to the hon. member.

But we should be restoring some of these facilities too. So the minister says, well restore them. What happened to the old mill across the river? The wreck-er came in on a weekend.

MR. NOTLEY: Oh, shame, shame.

DR. BUCK: He was in such a big hurry to tear it down before anybody could find out it was going down. If we're so concerned about restoring things that have historical significance, what happened to that one?

MR. NOTLEY: Where was the minister then?

DR. BUCK: You know the minister is only there, Mr. Chairman, when they can make a big announcement. It's going to be a big deal, 4 million bucks plus. Well I think there are other priorities the people of this province would like to see that money spent on.

MR. NOTLEY: Agreed. Well put.

DR. BUCK: I support the hon. Member for Calgary Glenmore — how about that, Mr. Planche, I remembered the constituency.

MR. PLANCHE: That'll be a first.

DR. BUCK: The hon. member says these government facilities should be more accessible. We have this beautiful monument under the PCs, the restored Government House, by appointment. When we were there on a legislative committee, if it had not been for the *Hansard* people there having a little convention, there would have been practically nobody in the building for the three or four days we used the facility. If it belongs to the people of Alberta, why can't they go there just about any time they want to go there? So, hon. Member for Calgary Glenmore, I support you.

MR. NOTLEY: [Inaudible] open it up to the people.

DR. BUCK: Maybe we can get the Minister of Government Services to make a public building open to the public — you know, not just the king's throne room.

One thing about it, at least I did notice that in some of those rooms in Government House they had some Socred colors. They had a little blue and a little green in one of them, so at least we got a little in there. They didn't tell us that was for the opposition, but I presume it can be.

But the point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that this government has lost direction as far as priorities go. What people expect of their government is to have priorities and to provide people services, not huge monuments unto themselves.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. Member for Clover Bar, I can only indicate to him that it has been shown where a building is restored, especially under the present government program, for the preservation of energy, there is without any question going to be a greater cost-saving factor in operating and maintaining the building under the restoration than it would be now, first of all of course because of the new equipment and new facilities being put up.

Maybe I should just say that this is not a first in the province of Alberta. For instance an outstanding job has been done by the Royal Bank of Canada on one of the sandstone buildings in the city of Calgary. They gutted the entire inside, preserved the outside walls, and it's now one of the fine historic preservations of a building in the city of Calgary.

I am quite sure, Mr. Chairman, everyone would agree that unless we take pride in our past and, with this pride in our past, plan and project to the future and preserve for our future generations the work of our pioneers, we will not be able to have any pride of passing on to our children what our pioneers have created in this province. As Minister of Culture responsible for preservation of our history, I hope that this is just the first of many buildings of historical significance to the entire province — not just Calgary — to be preserved in this manner through the heritage trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, there definitely are people projects. For instance the hon. member has mentioned that home and day care programs were cut. This, of course, we all know is not so. Also I should maybe just mention about the old mill in Strathcona. An engineering report does exist — and anyone who is interested in that can have a copy of it — which states that it is not possible to restore this mill because of certain defects in the walls and roofing, where it would be dangerous, for instance, to restore the roofing of this particular building.

May I just use this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to explain also that any building which may be of historic significance to maybe a city, a hamlet, a village, or a town is not necessarily a provincial historic site. Therefore to ask the province to declare any kind of structure — and for that matter yesterday, the Driedmeat Hill situation for instance — of provincial historic significance would be very difficult, because it may not be of significance to the people of Alberta in general, but only to the people of the particular area. But I'm quite sure everyone would agree that the old Court House in Calgary is a building of that significance. I can also assure the hon. member that in preserving this building it would not be a monument to this government but rather to the government that had the foresight a long time ago to build this Court House in the manner in which it was built.

Of course the same goes for Government House. Government House is not listed as a monument to this government. It is listed at the time when it was built, in 1910 to 1915 and, of course, was used by the Lieutenant-Governor until the former Social Credit government turned off the lights for the last Lieutenant-Governor who was able to live there. Maybe to maintain the building took some time — of course it was not accessible to the public, even though it was Government House, the Lieutenant-Governor's house, because the last government found it in their wisdom to turn it over to other uses. Now it is available to the public on Sundays, if at all possible. Since it is being used also as a utility for meetings, be they of a provincial or interprovincial nature, I can only state that whenever possible it is available for public visits, and this will be continued as much as possible.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat that as far as I'm concerned the cost of maintenance and operation of the old Court House, once it is renovated, will most likely be much less than it would be if we would not do so, since many of the facilities which are there now would not be able to preserve as much of our energy. We would not be able to have the building either heated or cooled, as necessary, with the same cost factor as it is.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make some comments as well with regard to the preservation of our historic sites. I hadn't really planned on participating, but after listening to some members, particularly the hon. Member for Clover Bar, I feel somewhat prompted to make some response.

First of all, I don't think anybody in Alberta questions in principle the preservation of the historic sites. I think all of us in this House are agreed on that. It happens to be a coincidence that we're talking about Calgary, Alberta. It happens to be a coincidence, I guess, that we're talking about a role of establishing

Government House South in recognition that 55 per cent of the population of this province lives between the two cities and, inasmuch as this Assembly is composed of 16 members from Calgary and 17 members from Edmonton, under redistribution, surely it's only reasonable that the government should take the initiative in providing some measure of contact with the people of southern Alberta in the form of a meeting place, access, an office for the Lieutenant-Governor, who represents all Albertans, and the Ombudsman, who should also represent all Albertans. I think it's an economy measure whereby they have coupled both together. On the one hand, they've got the historic site and, on the other hand, they have managed to establish government closer to the people.

I have some difficulty with some of the remarks of the hon. Member for Clover Bar. Whether or not he does his homework, I don't know. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, we stood in this Assembly and debated The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act. Within that act we specifically legislated that 20 per cent of that, the capital projects division, was to be used for social and economic benefit for all Albertans. What better opportunity than preservation of historic sites?

The Member for Clover Bar keeps talking about day care, hospitals, a hostel out his way for young offenders. Where was the member when we debated? Why didn't he make amendments to that section that the capital projects division was going to look after day care centres? I'm sure that if the minister of Government Services found a day care centre of historic significance and got representation from the member for Clover Bar, he'd give consideration to doing that. But where was the member when we were debating that? I don't know where he was.

I've seen some tremendous examples of inflation. But at one minute after 4 we started on an appropriation of \$3 million, and in eight minutes the Member for Clover Bar had it to \$4 million. By the time he sat down, another four minutes, he had it to \$4.5 million. Thank heavens he didn't speak for 30 minutes. We'd have been up to \$30 million or \$40 million.

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Member for Clover Bar wants to stand in his place and say the policy of the Social Credit Party of Alberta is to oppose Government House South, then let him say so. Let him not by insinuation speak for the leader of his party, who's not in the House. I don't think he's being fair to his party or to anybody else.

DR. BUCK: [Inaudible] . . . of your party is never here either, John.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, if he's rising on a point of order I'll sit down and hear him out. Otherwise I'd appreciate it if he would sit down and hear me out. I get a little upset when members stand up in the House and talk without due regard for matters that have been debated here *ad infinitum*. Surely we have spent enough time on the concept of the heritage savings trust fund. Surely we have spent enough time on the capital projects division, and that's the one we're talking about. I don't think the members of this House particularly want to hear about red herrings of hospitals and day care, which are very important. We're dealing with preservation of historic sites on one hand and an expenditure of \$3 million on the



other. I for one would appreciate it if the member would stay on the subject. I support the expenditure of \$3 million; I'm sure it's an asset to the people of Alberta and particularly to those of southern Alberta.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NOTLEY: I hadn't intended to enter this discussion but the remarks of the hon. Member for Lethbridge West have prompted me to enter.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I think after listening to the impassioned plea from the hon. Member for Lethbridge West — "we shouldn't be talking about hospitals or anything, because after all this is the capital works division of the heritage trust fund" — quite frankly, if one reviews the work of the heritage committee, we find that under the heritage section we have some auxiliary beds which are not one hundred per cent connected with the cancer centre, which we will get to in a few moments, but are in fact part of a larger project. So let's not be too critical about bringing in hospitals here, because in actual fact there are certain programs that would normally be financed otherwise that are already in the heritage budget.

Mr. Chairman, I really rose to make two points. I was a little concerned when I heard the Member for Calgary McKnight talk about Government House South as an important symbol of our system of democratic parliamentary government — if I understood and heard him correctly. Government House South is going to be a building somewhat similar to Government House North which is not really the symbol of the Legislature; it is the symbol of the administration, if anything. But I think rather more important than what it's a symbol of is to underscore the point — and I think it needs to be made — that in my judgment symbols aren't really as important as the practice of democratic government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY: I think what disturbs a lot of people in this province is that we see a government that is increasingly insular in its attitude, looking inward, not willing to listen to the public, bulling ahead regardless of what public opinion thinks, and I think that's the concern quite frankly. We can have all the symbols we like. We can decide to build a symbol for the hon. Solicitor General — fine, fair ball — but that's not going to solve the more important question that people are asking: do we have an effective, viable, democratic attitude within the government of Alberta? Mr. Chairman, building government houses south, southeast, southwest, northeast, northwest, or wherever we want to build them, is not going to allay those concerns.

I want to say something else about preserving historic sites because this is one area where I do agree with the Member for Lethbridge West. I don't think there is any member of this House who is not fully in favor of moving to preserve historic sites. Quite frankly, I would have been happier if I had seen in the heritage fund a program which was designed to preserve heritage sites in the largest sense. Because you know, we are talking about preserving a building. But the function of that building is going to be totally changed. The function of Government House has been totally changed; it's very beautifully decorated,

no question about that. But even the decor has changed because it's a conference centre — something totally different than it was.

It seems to me that if we're talking about historic sites, one of our major concerns should be an historic site program that is intent on restoring those sites to their original, so that we have the building, or whatever the site is, reconstructed or refurbished and we see the building the way the pioneers had it. It seems to me that's very important, and I commend and fully support some of the projects that have taken place in this province.

I think it is a sign of maturity when we recognize the importance of preserving historic sites but making sure that the restoration work is consistent with what the site was in the first place. When one goes to Cape Breton Island, for example, and sees the tremendous work that's being done on Louisbourg, one cannot help but wonder. I think that's just a fantastic thing to do. They have not only restored the building exactly as it was, but the young men and women who are there are dressed in the garb of the day. They are not dressed in nice, spanking-clean clothes — it wasn't that way in those days. They've done enough work to know that the clothes were wrinkled, tattered, and sometimes unclean. What you get in going to Louisbourg is, in my judgment, a very accurate reflection of life in that fort during the time it existed.

And so I think, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I'd be much happier if the Minister of Culture had come in here proposing an estimate from the heritage trust fund for an expanded program of historic site development which would be based on many of the sites — I think of Buckingham House, for example, in Elk Point; I think what could be done at Dunvegan. We have got to underscore the importance of preserving some of these places, but preserving them as they were.

It's a rather sad comment maybe on the general rush and hurry and bustle of the '50s that when the coal branch closed down we had seven or eight little communities where 7,000 or 8,000 people lived and worked and died, but we don't have one of those communities existing as it was. In the United States they make all sorts of money out of these ghost towns. In British Columbia, Barkerville is an example of a restoration which brings people from all over. What the federal government's doing in Dawson City in the Yukon is, in my judgment, a fantastic program and . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Fort Steele.

MR. NOTLEY: Well, Fort Steele . . . What I'm saying to the members of the House Mr. Minister of Public Works, I would say to you that had the Minister of Culture come in and we had before us a number of proposals of historic sites that are going to be funded from the heritage trust fund, I would have no difficulty in saying, "aye, ever ready, aye", and "great stuff, go ahead". But when I see that we're going to have the project as outlined I want to make it crystal-clear; the opposition members ought to use that project. One of the important things we have to do with Government House North is make sure there's more public input, and I think we all have a responsibility on this side to ensure that.

But, Mr. Chairman, that argument misses the more

fundamental question of the need to recapture our history, and I think that is where you are lacking imagination in this appropriation. You've got \$3 million for the renovation of one building but are lacking imagination. I would say, and I suspect the hon. Minister of Culture agrees with me, that you're going to have a better selling job on some of the backbenchers, so that next year we will have an historic sites program which goes much further in achieving the objectives that seem to me to be important if we are to pay proper homage to our history and the work of our pioneers.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chairman, just for the information of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, we had the good fortune of hiring the person responsible for the restoration of Fort Louisbourg; namely, Dr. John Lunn, who is doing an excellent job of preparing for the restoration, hopefully, of places like Buckingham House, Dunvegan, and so on and so forth. I say again, we have been fortunate to get this gentleman on our staff.

DR. BUCK: How well are the logs rotting at Fort Assiniboine, Horst?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, in listening to the debate this afternoon as a member who's not from Calgary or Edmonton but from rural Alberta, I'm prompted to stand up and express my viewpoint of the development of Government House South as preservation of an historic sandstone building very much of the same era as the building this government is sitting in today. I like to believe that we're pretty proud of this particular building as a government institution. I have great feeling for the fact that we have very few buildings of this nature in Alberta. I would believe it's part of the function of government when we develop the restoration of Government House to the use it's been put today in Edmonton. In restoring Government House South I believe we are taking one more opportunity to restore a type of construction unique for its time, something we do not have too much of, and as far as I'm concerned it is certainly being put to the proper use. I do not agree with the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview when he says it should be restored to its original form. I'd hate to believe we would spend \$4 million on a courthouse in Calgary, leave it vacant for people to walk through, and that be its only function. I think it will have a much more useful role if it's restored and put to use as a government facility.

Some members in debating this afternoon have suggested it's a plum for Calgary. I don't consider it a plum for Calgary. As far as I'm concerned it's all part of Alberta. I'm certainly not a Calgarian or one from the south, but I believe that, when we take a building of this nature and restore it before it gets beyond the point of being restored, this is the function and the time to do it. I think the money being used today is being well spent. I think the priorities are right. I think hon. members who are critical of the fact that we are taking some part of our government from Edmonton to Calgary will remember that when they built the Jubilee Auditoriums, they felt that when one-third of the people of this province lived in Calgary and one-third in Edmonton, it was only justifiable if we built a Jubilee Auditorium in Edmonton

that there should also be one in Calgary.

Thank you.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman I thought the minister would have some comments to make in regard to things that have been said, but I'd like to . . .

DR. BUCK: They're going to call the next one 'House Yurko'.

MR. R. SPEAKER: House Yurko. Yes, I'm sure that's true.

The concept of preserving historic sites is supported by everyone in this Assembly and certainly by me. We look at two things here, though. First, we've had a specific example or item set before us: Government House South. That's the thing we are making our judgment on. As members of the Legislature — and this criticism can be directed at every one of the appropriations — we are approving announcements of the government and the ministers after the fact. The Premier and the minister made this announcement across the province and now they're coming and asking us to approve the funds for this type of capital expenditure. That's the weakness in this whole heritage trust savings fund concept. The Legislature approves it after the fact and has little time for input in the decision-making. The ministers arrogantly bring these ideas forth, hopefully with the approval of the Premier, and the backbenchers get up one after another from Calgary and outlying districts.

The hon. Member for Wainwright made a great speech, one of the finest in all the years he has been here, but wait till they read that back home. He's approving something he didn't even have anything to say about in the initial stages; didn't have anything to say about where it fits into the priority system, and he approved the priority it had. If we had it listed one to ten with a few other things, I wonder where it would fit in a priority system.

Mr. Chairman, that is the weakness in this whole thing, and I want to say about this Government House South project: it may have some benefits, but it only symbolizes the arrogance of this government. It is going to be restored with \$4 million — we've talked about \$3 million here. I don't know how you can rip a building to pieces inside and out and restore it to its original intent. If you're spending that kind of money it's got to be totally changed, or the thing is in such bad repair right now that maybe we shouldn't try to restore it. It's a building that only graces the ego of this government. The Premier can walk in and say, this is my big palace — Peter's palace — a palace for the rich people. The majority of people down on the street, 98 per cent of Calgarians, where are they asked to go when they go? To Peter's palace? Not to Peter's palace; the only relationship they have with the government is maybe to go down to Peter's drugstore, at one time called Ernie's. That's the access they have. They have easy access to that place, in and out. Access to Government House? What a joke.

MR. NOTLEY: Cash only.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I had some people from Edmonton a while ago phone me about touring Government House North. One, they had to get an appointment; two, they had to get some kind of approval from the

MLA — they wanted to censor who it was going in. They phoned me and said, isn't that our building? We can't even get into the place. I think it was a Sunday appointment they had to have. The people that day were visiting from out of town, wanted to see Government House, and couldn't even participate. You tell me what kind of access that is for the general public. Who will use the building? You talk about the Premier and ministers. There's the Bowlen Building with offices for the Premier and ministers to meet the general public.

The criticism of this government at the present time is that the people of Alberta can't meet with the ministers and the Premier, that the insulation being created in this province is unbelievable. It's to your negative, it's to our positive. We're gaining support because of that very fact and that's part of the political system. But in the concept you have at the present time, the palace you're going to build only brings a bigger insulation between yourselves and the people.

The biggest person who abuses that very concept of democracy where the minister is to listen to the people — and not only listen and interpret what the people say, but to try to react to that particular representation — is the Minister of Housing, who is trying to stand in his place and say, here is to be the symbol of open government. The Minister of Culture says, it will be not only our government it represents but governments way in the past that set up this building — most likely in the future. Well, the precedent that's being set in this province certainly in no way is an indicator of what should be done with a building such as that.

Mr. Chairman, I think the functions of the building are overstated. It's said, in the glory of this government, that they are going to open things to the people. But that's only to a few friends around Calgary — a few friends. The majority of people in or outside of Calgary are not going to participate in the activities or the floor space of this particular building.

We should think of some other things. We have criticized and said the priorities of this government are wrong. This only symbolizes that very argument. There are many other things needed. I think of the kids in Calgary. [interjections]

I'm sure there are hon. members from Calgary who can support this: many young people want to have the opportunity to skate, to play hockey. The scheduling that goes on in the arenas in Calgary is unbelievable, and I'm sure it's the same in Edmonton. The scheduling of opportunities in the cities of Lethbridge and Medicine Hat is unbelievable.

AN HON. MEMBER: We're okay now.

AN HON. MEMBER: We're okay in Calgary.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Yes, you should check with the kids on the street and see what it's all about.

MR. JOHNSTON: [Inaudible]

DR. BUCK: When is the last time you checked, Johnston?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Yes, I think that should be checked. Those are the priorities we should be looking at if we

talk about large capital expenditures. But how in the world do you spend \$3 million and say that's an important priority when these other services are lacking? Maybe we should have spent — if we could have discussed the priorities in this Legislature, where it should properly be spent — for a park in Lethbridge. The people of Lethbridge want a park in the river bottom. I think they'd have been very excited about a park in the river bottom. Medicine Hat — I haven't explored all the possibilities there, but I'm sure Medicine Hat could use the same type of facilities. This \$3 million would have gone a long way to establishing that type of facility. We could go on down the line, about social services and various things like that that are necessary, but I don't think they're considered in the priorities.

I think few people are going to have access to this . . . \$3 million plus an in-built high operational cost to build up a few ministers' egos is just a bad expenditure. I feel — and I'm sure I can talk to my constituents and they'll support the stand I take — the money in the heritage fund is misplaced with this expenditure. The benefits are not to the people of Alberta. I'm sure that with a lot less cost the basics of this building, if we want to preserve it, could be preserved. I think this is an indicator the government is on a spending binge with the heritage fund, has lost sight of what it's really doing, and is managing and making decisions by impulse rather than some real, concentrated research.

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

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Hunley	Planche
Appleby	Hyland	Purdy
Backus	Hyndman	Russell
Bogle	Jamison	Schmid
Bradley	Johnston	Schmidt
Butler	Kidd	Shaben
Chichak	King	Stewart
Cookson	Koziak	Stromberg
Crawford	Kroeger	Taylor
Donnelly	Kushner	Tesolin
Farran	Leitch	Thompson
Fluker	Little	Topolnisky
Foster	Lougheed	Trynchy
Getty	Lysons	Walker
Gogo	Miller	Warrack
Hansen	Miniely	Webber
Harle	Moore	Wolstenholme
Hohol	Musgreave	Young
Horner	Paproski	Yurko
Horsman	Peacock	Zander

Against the motion:

Buck	Mandeville	R. Speaker
Clark	Notley	

Totals:	Ayes - 60	Noes - 5
---------	-----------	----------

Agreed to:

Government House South

\$3,000,000

## Health Care Facilities and Applied Health Research

### Hospitals and Medical Care

#### New Health Care Facilities

##### 1. Southern Alberta Children's Hospital

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you have any opening remarks?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to take the opportunity of committee study to follow through on my commitment last fall on the first allocation on the heritage savings trust fund to health care projects to provide a progress report to this House.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon I tabled the McKinsey & Co. *Financial Post* report that demonstrates we are in now in a position in health care that is subject to the law of diminishing returns. Our initiatives in the Alberta heritage savings trust fund, both in the capital project and the applied research areas, have to be developed compatibly with the other challenges and problems in the longer term we must meet in health care. The McKinsey & Co. report also demonstrates that while we must pay careful attention to what we have spent in health care historically, and apply corrective measures, nevertheless we have to pay more stringent attention to the choices we will have to make in future if we are to meet the necessary challenge of ongoing expenditure restraint.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Assembly, the expenditure restraint is here to stay. It is not just now. It is a longer term management challenge in health care. Certainly if we are not successful in controlling the annual cost escalation in the most major area of public expenditure, it bodes poorly for negative impact in the longer term on our society and the things we take pride in, in terms of the personal incentive and reward provided to our citizens. Mr. Chairman, while we are fortunate that we can apply innovative procedures to capital projects and to the applied research area in Alberta, we do so recognizing that we must develop them consistent with longer term health care challenges. In this sense it is our intent to make the principles and ideas I initially reported to the House in October 1976 an operating fact in all our programs — the health care projects in the heritage savings trust fund and the health care projects funded through any other normal government budgetary mechanism.

Mr. Chairman, the Alberta heritage savings trust fund initiatives in the capital projects area and in the applied research area presented certain dilemmas related to the control of future years' operating costs. It was necessary to recognize that what we did through the heritage savings trust fund could impact on future years' operating costs, that it would be necessary to build-in ongoing professional evaluation of effectiveness, and also to ensure financial control of future years' costs.

I am pleased to report to the House that the various boards we have been working with have been co-operating with us and assuring us they agree with the objective of controlling future years' operating costs escalations as a result of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund initiatives. In doing so, we were working and developing with broad input from the Alberta Medical Association, the College of Physi-

cians and Surgeons, College of Family [Physicians], other health professions, and of course lay citizens.

Mr. Chairman, the Alberta heritage savings trust fund approach recognizes that we are funding through that mechanism highly specialized facilities that are related to the availability of manpower in the population centres and not solely on the basis of institutional competition that might exist between different hospitals. As an example, through the Alberta Health Sciences Centre it allows us to put a central focus on the testing of equipment, practice and principles before they are expanded on a province-wide basis — intended to complement the role of other metropolitan and rural hospitals and not supplant that role.

I'm very proud of the fact that for the first time we have developed, through the heritage savings trust fund initiatives, an approach that we are agreeing with a board to a four-year operating budget that will be developed on phasing-in the operating programs included in the capital projects built through the heritage savings trust fund. This development of new budgetary techniques, in my view, must also include recognition in mechanisms to ensure that hospitals spend the funds provided to them on agreed-upon priorities, and that we aren't faced at a later date with the hospital shifting funds internally and then coming back to government on an emotional program, saying they didn't spend the money on that program and that we have not adequately funded them.

The Alberta heritage savings trust fund projects also allow an initial position on technology. Medical technology, Mr. Chairman, is very expensive and is rapidly obsolete. It is becoming a major cost factor in our health care system. It also allows minimizing duplication and competition between hospitals. Mr. Chairman, it's in recognition of the fact there has been no long-term plan for the development of Canadian rural and urban hospitals and it signals at this time to our larger hospitals which spend most of the health care dollars, a developing plan that future facilities will be built in recognition of these principles.

While applying initiatives in the Alberta heritage savings trust fund area, we do so in recognition of the need to strengthen the role of rural hospitals in Alberta and their relationship to the referral facilities in our larger urban centres. Certainly there is a great deal of evidence to show perhaps the pendulum should swing back to primary care and not solely to sophistication and technology. In doing so we will be examining those approaches in relationship to what we do through the heritage savings trust fund. Mr. Chairman, it recognizes that while we must monitor what we have done in the past by old standards, nevertheless we must move to a more contemporary approach and alter procedures for health care in the future.

At this stage I would like to file, for members of the Assembly, the status reports on the capital projects funded through the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. In doing so, I would simply indicate that those under construction are within cost targets and construction is progressing satisfactorily. I would just like to make a few brief remarks about each of them.

Mr. Chairman, the Alberta Health Sciences Centre: our preliminary reviews indicated certain shortcomings in the planning process that arrived at the Alberta Health Sciences Centre. Subsequently — and you will recall in the spring sitting some questions I raised

on a province-wide basis relative to the planning process for hospital construction — these have now been enunciated in departmental studies undertaken since the spring sitting.

It was for those kinds of reasons and the fact that we have never before in our history in Alberta dealt with health care projects of the magnitude of the Alberta Health Sciences Centre — and, of course, the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre which we spent a great deal of time on in the heritage fund committee — that we had to have new approaches. I'm again proud of the fact we have come up with an implementation committee first used in the case of the Health Sciences Centre to monitor both the policy implementation that the Health Sciences Centre is intended to serve, and the ongoing cost-control portion of that. I would commend to hon. members that they read the chairman's status report on the Health Sciences Centre for their information.

Mr. Chairman, the Southern Alberta Children's Hospital: suffice it to say that this, I think, demonstrates an exciting partnership between citizens — certainly in Calgary the Kinsmen Club are to be congratulated on their local raising of funds and the construction of the Kinsmen pediatric research centre in conjunction with the Southern Alberta Children's Hospital. In addition, of course, the provision of \$2 million to part of the construction cost of \$26 million by the Alberta Children's Hospital foundation, with the province putting in \$24 million, is another demonstration of an important partnership in southern Alberta between citizens and government to meet the needs for diagnosis, assessment, and treatment of Alberta children's health care problems.

Mr. Chairman, the objective of the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and related auxiliary services is to provide and maximize the quality of cancer services to the citizens of Calgary and the entire southern part of our province. This was the heritage savings trust fund and, when announced in the fall, it was at the earliest stage of planning. I met with the chairman of the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board and Dr. Walter MacKenzie on September 7 with respect to an approach to the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre. On September 19 we subsequently received the first firm costs on the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre. Those costs, at somewhat in excess of \$75 million, are the ones that have received a great deal of publicity.

Mr. Chairman, the idea of the implementation committee was in place with the Health Sciences Centre, and was fully intended to be used for the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre at the appropriate time. If you compare, I think you will find we had made a decision to use the implementation committee in connection with that.

Mr. Chairman, I just simply make the comment I made in the heritage fund committee. I believe the Leader of the Opposition lacks the understanding to separate the agreement of government to a concept and to components in any health care project from acceptance of those components and concept at any cost — unlimited cost. In my view that would be an irresponsible position for any government to take.

Mr. Chairman, I'd now like to move to the applied research initiatives through the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. Our approach to the allocation of applied research funds recognizes the high incidence of non-communicable diseases; namely, cancer and

heart disease. These two areas demonstrate some important principles developed by the Ministry of Hospitals and Medical Care. First, the allocation of public funds within citizen priorities and citizen need on the basis of what I describe as the priority of incidence of disease. The second important principle the applied research initiatives demonstrate is looking toward future needs in health care programming to recognize, as the World Health Organization definition indicates, that they must be geared to the total person and total health in mind, body, and emotion.

The applied research initiatives in cancer were much simpler to deal with. The reason was that we have had for some years a Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board, which has responsibility for the development and strengthening of cancer services throughout the province. Historically this board had to overcome a lot of resistance from the medical profession and others who feared it might somehow infringe on their practice. But I think history now shows that the fact that we have a Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board allows for cancer research initiative.

We were very quickly able to agree upon a five-year applied research program in cancer which meets several criteria, subject of course to the annual approval of the Legislature. The first criterion is that it meets the oft-asserted need of the medical profession for ongoing commitment of research funds, if medical scientists and practitioners of the quality required are to be attracted to our province. Secondly, the board has accepted the ministry requirement that we establish a twofold evaluation criteria with the faculties of medicine and the Treasury department to avoid the mistakes of the past in not providing effective evaluation. In addition I think a very important thing incorporated into this five-year applied research initiative is the agreement of the board to control future years' cost escalations within 5 to 6 per cent. Mr. Chairman, I think this represents an important rounding out of cancer services for the citizens of Alberta.

There is no greater problem in health care than cardiovascular disease. In Canada and Alberta it causes over half the deaths of our citizens. A federal statistics report in 1973 indicated heart disease was responsible for utilizing — get this — more than 8.5 million hospital days, with conservative cost estimates of more than \$1 billion. The earning loss in Canada was conservatively estimated in excess of \$50 million annually. They cite the economic losses due to premature death at \$2.5 billion in a single year.

Mr. Chairman, Canada is high in world incidence of heart disease, along with the United States and Finland. But of very dramatic concern in Canada is the fact that the incidence is increasing very rapidly in the young, 25 to 45 years of age. The increase in that age group is 250 per cent for men and 150 per cent for women.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like now to report to the House on the findings of the ministry, and the work we have done in the area of cardiovascular disease. Very early we found a lack of co-ordination of programs, in fact a diffusion, through a multitude of hospitals, of programs for heart patients in Alberta. The initial studies indicated great strides had been made in treatment of the acute-care phase of heart disease and in surgical procedures once a person has suffered a heart attack. Exploration through lay and medical

consultants also indicated that Alberta is high in the rate of elective and non-elective surgery undertaken in Canada, and Canada has one of the highest among modern industrialized nations in the world. Yet no scientific study that we can pull demonstrates any long-term benefit to heart patients as a result of surgery. Where surgery has been utilized and shown spectacular results it benefits the very few, and only after the disease has become established and irreversible. The cost of heart surgery is extremely high.

Mr. Chairman, in focussing on the questions raised in the spring sitting relative to cardiovascular surgery, I can simply say to the House that the surgical facilities we have in Alberta are equal to the finest available, and they should be maintained and upgraded but not expanded at this time. I would point out that that position is documented by the Alberta Medical Association, the federal task force reports, the World Health Organization, and the International Society of Cardiology.

Mr. Chairman, objective decisions in this area are very difficult when you're faced with the high degree of emotionalism and emotional reaction obvious for a member of a family who has suffered a heart attack. When that is additionally heightened by the news media, it is even more difficult to make rational decisions in the allocation of public funds based on citizen need and priorities. You will all recall very early in the portfolio when I was faced in the House and charged by the news media that heart patients were dying because of lack of budgetary support. Quick checking of these allegations indicated that heart patients were gaining easy admission, for non-emergency, within 48 hours, and ready admission for emergency cases.

More recently, in a hospital in Calgary, there was again an accusation of dire restriction of services for heart patients because of inadequate budget. Checking by my office found that this particular hospital had an affluent budget compared to the Canadian average, yet it also ended up with an operating surplus at the end of the year, with no information to indicate the surplus had been utilized in any way for the alleged priority of surgery for heart patients.

Mr. Chairman, I simply raise these points for the House to recognize that rational decisions in the allocation of public funds in health care areas are made extremely difficult in the face of emotionalism, resistance, and institutional competition. I would say that while they are natural, they nevertheless must be recognized and faced by the ministry and by this Legislature.

Mr. Chairman, examination further indicates that the development of facilities — and surgical facilities in particular — in the area of heart disease was not made on any rational basis. The Alberta Medical Association indicates that there are no known, definable criteria for the development of surgery programs, but that a reasonable rule of thumb would be one surgical unit per million population. Historically, in Alberta we had two units substantially in advance of our population being 2 million. That was in excess of the Alberta Medical Association recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, recognizing this, the approach to resolution and implementation of strengthening of programs for heart patients in Alberta, I recommended and have developed an *ad hoc* cardiac care implementation committee. On this committee we have

representatives of the Alberta Medical Association, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the faculties, the deans of medicine, cardiologists, general practitioners, lay citizens, officials, and advisers. I believe, with the difficulties that I've indicated, that this committee will be very helpful in terms of analysing proposals and making recommendations to pursue the objective I have stated, of developing in a balanced and comprehensive way heart-disease programs throughout our province to meet the needs of existing and future heart patients.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased, acting on the advice of advisers and consultants, to retain the services of a man of Dr. Rossall's competence, who is the chief of cardiology at the University of Alberta Hospital, to help us plan and implement in a balanced way programs for heart patients in our province. In addition, I am pleased to have world-renowned authorities like Dr. Pisa, the chief of cardiovascular programs for the World Health Organization, and Dr. Kellermann. I am pleased to report to the House that these latter two gentlemen who have visited our province have indicated that by way of our approach in Alberta we have a chance to have balanced programs for heart patients, second to none in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to turn to a component of heart-disease programs upon which a considerable amount of work has been done. Historical analysis would appear to indicate an over-focus on surgical treatment of heart patients. We have in the city of Edmonton a 10-year demonstration project started initially by the co-operation of a hospital in Edmonton and a physician, applying total care to heart patients in northern Alberta, right from the acute through to the maintenance and rehabilitation phases. This pioneer work was carried forward by the interest of heart patients and citizens, by cardiologists who believed in the concept, general practitioners, and allied health professionals.

Mr. Chairman, my interest in this was to determine through preliminary review whether, in a balanced program of heart disease, this should receive attention along with the other areas which had historically received attention. In my preliminary review and talks directly with cardiac patients and their families I was to find that there was a great deal of fear for the heart patient and for his family; a great deal of adjustment that had to be undertaken. While private doctors in their practice genuinely tried to allay those fears of the heart patient who had first suffered an attack, it was very difficult and impossible for them to do so without any organization or back-up services. Patients would talk about the fact that they had lost their job, that their life style had changed, and they described themselves as cripples as a result of the heart attack.

For that reason, I decided to take a systematic approach to analysing this component of heart disease, and in particular used the World Health Organization which has co-ordinated heart programs in over 20 countries. A number of the reports, Mr. Chairman, which have been studied in depth and which are available in my office, will be tabled in the Legislative Assembly for the review and reading of hon. members who are interested. These have been obtained on the basis of a systematic evaluation of this aspect of heart-disease programming.

Mr. Chairman, the World Health Organization stud-

ies confirm that cardiac rehabilitation improves the well-being of patients. Return to work and return to normal life is earlier for the heart patient and the quality of life, in short, is improved. While the findings are not all in yet, it nevertheless has received more research than cardiovascular surgery. Proper cardiac rehabilitation would be developed as part of a comprehensive program for heart patients in Alberta, and in that sense would develop a new kind of public health stance, aiding and abetting the work of the individual physician in the community.

Mr. Chairman, through this approach, the possibility for the education of the young is beyond the research phase. I would draw hon. members' attention to the material of the North American and European studies which I will be tabling in the Legislature.

We have entered into a dialogue with the medical association and with the college from the very beginning and will be continuing dialogue with the Alberta medical professions, cardiologists, and surgeons as we move towards a plan for implementation.

Mr. Chairman, there is strong support from heart patients. The majority of the medical profession is in agreement with the need for this to be developed as a component of comprehensive cardiac care programs. We would build upon the work of the Edmonton Cardiac Institute in northern Alberta which has been endorsed as advanced and scientific by pre-eminent authorities locally and throughout the world. It would include programs that relate to the total health needs of cardiac patients in terms of mind, body, and emotions. We'll continue to develop these, as I said earlier, in dialogue with the Alberta Medical Association and the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Recently, the cabinet made a decision, Mr. Chairman, to allocate \$500,000 to develop a plan for cardiac rehabilitation in Alberta. We will be moving towards that and be providing further progress reports to the House.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's an excellent example of a development related to citizen need and priority that has been developed through broad input of the medical profession, allied health professionals, focussing to a province-wide program, using a systematic approach and with links that can be developed and expanded on a province-wide basis.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion on the Alberta heritage savings trust fund: all my remarks today have been geared to the capital projects and applied research initiatives of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. They demonstrate an approach by our government that is consistent with the policy of restraint in health care expenditure: demonstrate principles, being adopted and applied in the portfolio, related to the need for ongoing evaluation of capital and operating budget cost control and a decision-making process that is related to citizen needs and priorities for all of Alberta, incorporating ongoing evaluation for effectiveness; and beginning and evolving policy approaches for the portfolio of Hospitals and Medical Care that are contemporary to the health care challenge of today and tomorrow.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just before I agree, I would ask Mr. Minister, whenever we come back to these estimates, which I guess will be the first part of the week, if you could give us the projected operating costs for the Southern Alberta Children's Hospital, in

light of the comments you've made about the need to talk in terms of four-year budgets and so on. I think if we could get the projected operating costs for the Southern Alberta Children's Hospital, the Alberta Health Sciences Centre and the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre, that would be a good place for us to start because we'd have a chance to kind of look at what operating costs were involved here also.

Also, Mr. Minister, you made reference to an *ad hoc* cardiac care implementation committee — I believe that was the general term you used. It would be very helpful if we could get the names of the individuals whom you've appointed to that committee, if you would please.

Thirdly, could we get a list of any of the commitments that have been made to the Edmonton Cardiac Institute?

MR. MINIELY: What was your third one?

MR. CLARK: Any commitments that have been made to the Edmonton Cardiac Institute. Perhaps in light of the time and so on, we might adjourn the debate there.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Chairman, whereas I could answer one of the items immediately, perhaps it's best to leave it for today and bring all the answers next time we're in committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable to the committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions and reports the same.

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979, amounts not exceeding the following sums be granted to Her Majesty from the Alberta heritage savings trust fund for making the following investments: \$2 million, the farming for the future program to be administered by the Minister of Agriculture; \$3 million, the Government House South project to be administered by the Minister of Housing and Public Works.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration a certain resolution, reports progress on the same, and begs leave to sit again.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, before moving that we call it 5:30 p.m., the Assembly will not be sitting tomorrow evening. Tomorrow afternoon is private members' day. I would move that we call it 5:30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Before putting the motion of the hon. Government House leader, may I say that I had said earlier this afternoon that I would report concerning my examination of the point of privilege raised by the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works and that I would do that tomorrow. The hon. Leader of the Opposition would prefer that I postpone that until next Monday because he will not be able to be here either tomorrow or Friday. I have agreed to that request.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree that it's 5:30 p.m.?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

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