

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: Monday, April 17, 1978 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, Dr. Suganuma. Dr. Suganuma is an executive member of the Hokkaido/Alberta Dairy Science and Technique Association and teaches social science at the dairy college in Sapporo, Japan. It would be of interest to members to know that Dr. Suganuma has just finished a sabbatical leave from the college in order that he might travel to Scotland and there translate the Old Testament directly from the original Hebrew sources into Japanese.

Dr. Suganuma, who is accompanied by his wife, will be visiting a number of dairy farms in Alberta over the course of the next five or six days. They are seated in the members gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask that they rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 32****The Court of Queen's Bench Act****Bill 33****The Court of Appeal Act**

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in introducing today, and request leave of the Assembly to introduce, two bills: Bill 32, The Court of Queen's Bench Act; and Bill 33, The Court of Appeal Act.

Mr. Speaker, these two bills will merge the District Court of Alberta with the trial division of the Supreme Court of Alberta under a new name, to be known as the Court of Queen's Bench. In fact the trial division of the Supreme Court of Alberta is being continued and styled the Court of Queen's Bench, and members of the District Court will be appointed through that court.

Mr. Speaker, the court of appeal presently described as the appellate division of the Supreme Court of Alberta will now be known as the Court of Appeal, as a separate court in the province.

[Leave granted; bills 32 and 33 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file a number of important documents relating to the very productive conference of western premiers held in Yorkton,

Saskatchewan, last Thursday and Friday. They comprise seven communiques on the subjects of the economic situation and the federal budget, trade, agriculture, transportation, the second report of the task force on constitutional trends, comments on the proposed Canada referendum act, and a communique on regional energy co-operation; as well, the full copy of the second report of the premiers' task force on constitutional trends, dated April 1978; also a copy of a position paper setting forth western trade objectives; and finally, a document setting forth the non-tariff barrier codes in the multilateral trade negotiations.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. BUTLER: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 29 grade 11 social studies students from the Hanna high school. I'd like to say at this time that the Hanna high school is the home of some of the finest authors and athletes from Alberta. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Margaret Steward, Mrs. Tivadar, and their bus driver the Rev. Harold Adams. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I'm very honored and privileged this afternoon to introduce to you 35 students from Mayland Heights school in my community, and the principal Mr. Carrick and his wife. It was very nice of some of the fathers and mothers to come along: Mrs. Billing, Mrs. Bishell, Mrs. Dickieson; and the two teachers, Miss Collins and Mrs. Betts. At this time I would like the students to rise and receive a welcome from the Alberta Legislative Assembly.

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 35 grade 5 students from the Brigadier Gault school in my constituency. With them this afternoon is Mr. Murchie. They are seated in the public gallery. I'd ask that they stand and be recognized.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the House, some 27 students from grades 5 and 6 in the Coronation school in the riding of Edmonton Jasper Place. They are in the members gallery. I'd ask them, with their teacher Mr. Lucas, to rise and be recognized by the members of the Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Western Premiers' Conference**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier. It flows from a number of items discussed at the four premiers' meeting last Thursday and Friday at Yorkton. Can the Premier indicate to the House the position of the government of Alberta with regard to the question of an Alberta-Saskatchewan-Manitoba electrical grid? Is it still the position of the government of Alberta that Alberta

should strive to be self-sufficient in the generation of its own energy in the province?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, what was agreed to was that a study would be undertaken of the feasibility of a western electric power generation and distribution grid. This study will take some six months to complete. All four western provinces will be involved in it. It's not known in advance whether or not it is technically practical. There are some synchronization problems, as between the electric generation in Manitoba and Saskatchewan and a tie-up with Alberta. Of course, some discussions have been going on with British Columbia with regard to electric generation there.

Our judgment will await the feasibility study in terms of evaluating whether less expensive electric energy can be acquired from the surplus power supplies of either Manitoba or British Columbia. In this regard we have therefore responded positively to the initiatives taken by the government of Manitoba. The Alberta Minister of Utilities and Telephones has been in discussion with them as to the way in which this four-province review will be set up: its terms of reference, its organization, and its funding.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. It really flows around this question of the position of the government on Alberta's attempting to continue to be self-sufficient in our power-generating capacity, which I think is the aim of the electrical planning council. Is it still the position of the government of Alberta that Alberta should strive to be self-sufficient in the generation of electricity?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, as a broad initial objective that of course is desirable. On the other hand, I think it would not be responsible of the government to be in a position of not having examined alternatives that might have developed over time. The assurance that with those alternatives can come some other benefits as well, including the benefit, which many Canadians would like to see, of the development in this country of a national electric grid — that is part and parcel of it. I think the spirit of co-operation exhibited at the meeting in Yorkton was a recognition that we should at least be examining these various options.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier with regard to the conference. What was the result of the conference with regard to Alberta's proposal for \$6 wheat, and what steps will the province take from here on that proposition?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, because of preparation time and other factors that were on the agenda, the only way in which we could handle that matter, which was raised in this Legislative Assembly by the Minister of Agriculture, I believe just a week ago last Friday, was to respond to it on the basis that we would like very much to have the other governments support us. Because of the timing, we were not able to get their specific support for a figure. They naturally and quite properly wanted to think more about whether \$6 was or was not an appropriate figure. But they were prepared to go along with the statement contained in communique number three on ag-

riculture, to the following effect:

The premiers agreed that the current domestic price for wheat, \$3.55 a bushel, is not adequate compensation for producers, and that a substantial increase was necessary.

So despite the short time period, I felt that the excellent initiatives taken by our Minister of Agriculture really now in a general way have the concurrence of all western governments, which I think is a very positive move. The word "substantial" increase was really all we could expect under the circumstances of the timing.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, the third supplementary question deals with the federal budget and the kinds of consultation which went on prior to the federal budget's coming down. My question is to the Provincial Treasurer. On April 11 the Treasurer made the following statement in the Assembly with regard to the question of consultation between Alberta and the federal government: "In telephone conversations over the past couple of weeks, I was made aware what the federal proposals would be."

My question to the Provincial Treasurer is: during the course of those discussions between Ottawa and the Provincial Treasurer in Alberta, did the federal minister indicate to the government of Alberta that the federal government would be taking the initiative it did in the area of provincial sales tax?

MR. LEITCH: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thought I'd said that in the answers to the question the hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring to. I think I said there were discussions which were really in the nature of advice from the federal finance minister to me on what they were working toward.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Premier, if I may. It relates to the question of a power grid. Is it the view of the Alberta government that the study being undertaken on a western power grid should be the harbinger of a national power grid? Is it the position of the government that we support in principle a national electrical power grid?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I don't think we can say at this stage of the game that we would support a national power grid, but merely that we're prepared to examine whether or not a national or a regional power grid is feasible. That's the essence of the discussion, and that's what's taken place.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In light of the communique issued from the premiers' conference, is the Provincial Treasurer in a position to indicate whether the position of the government of Alberta vis-a-vis the decision to modify provincial sales taxes has changed from one, I gather, of acquiescence on budget night to one of considerable concern at this move by the federal government?

MR. LEITCH: I would say not, Mr. Speaker. I think we are really talking about two different things. The question of what was done was something I had responded to in earlier question periods, indicating our concern on principle: that if this marked a new trend or if it were to continue beyond the six months'

period in the budget, it would be something we were very concerned about. Of course the communique goes further and deals with a somewhat different aspect, Mr. Speaker, in the sense that it deals in detail with the way it was done.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Provincial Treasurer in a position to advise the House whether the government of Alberta has some very definite concern, then, about the consultative process prior to the federal government's move?

MR. LEITCH: Well, certainly, Mr. Speaker. That is referred to in the communique.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. At the Yorkton conference, did the premiers discuss methods of consultation on federal decisions that have provincial implications — whether there could be a change in the consultative process? Was there any consensus on what kind of consultation should in fact occur before a federal government were to move in areas that have normally been considered provincial jurisdiction?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, Mr. Speaker, very much so, as communique number one sets forth. First of all there was the strong feeling, important from the western point of view, that was put forward by the Premier of British Columbia and followed some statements we had previously made: that the first ministers' conference should be regular, at a specific time — at the end of November each year — and that adequate work should be done on the agenda. Then, coming into a matter such as the budgetary measures of the federal government that might affect provinces, the communique said that insistence on budget confidentiality by the federal minister made normal interprovincial consultations difficult, if not impossible. I think the problem in answering the hon. member is that in a situation where there is a suggestion that there is budget confidentiality, it's really not possible to have the full degree of consultation that should occur if it affects all 11 governments, so that it truly could be a joint decision.

The criticism being levelled at the federal government, I think very appropriately, is: when this matter was a subject raised by C.D. Howe Institute and others, why was it not brought forth by the federal government at the first ministers' meeting in February, thoroughly discussed, and all its ramifications considered? Then they could have moved forward on their measure. We and the other provincial governments in the west just feel that we should not have this happen again in terms of Canada and federal/provincial relations.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Is the Premier in a position to outline to the Assembly whether it is the position of the government of Alberta that decisions by Ottawa that relate to provincial taxation, such as the sales tax, are a matter where the consultation should occur at federal/provincial meetings? Or was there any consideration of some kind of formal consultative process, beyond the suggestion of the Premier of Brit-

ish Columbia that we have regular annual meetings of the first ministers?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it was definitely felt that it should be part of the first ministers' conference, together with possible cases where the meetings of finance ministers could be held on a specific situation. I think what we've seen here is that the traditional aspects of budget confidentiality simply will not work when we're involved in 11 governments in Canada discussing a matter of this nature, and that pressure should not be exercised upon this or any other government. If that matter is initiated again in the future by the federal government, and perhaps all . . . Hopefully the federal government would have learned from this lesson.

Nursing Education

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It flows from that announcement in the Speech from the Throne that during the current session the government would bring down legislation regarding nursing education. When does the minister intend to introduce that legislation; and is it the government's intention to deal with that legislation during this spring session or let it sit over until the fall?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to check the throne speech, but my recollection is that likely it didn't speak about legislation so much as it dealt with an intent to bring down a policy position with respect to the education of nurses.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The 1976 task force on nursing education, headed by Dr. Walter Johns, recommended that all nurses graduating after a certain year be required to have a university degree. Has the government yet made a policy decision on that recommendation; and if so, what is it?

DR. HOHOL: Yes, we have, Mr. Speaker, and we made it public some time ago. It's to the effect that while the recommendation has an appearance and a real kind of virtue, it is our position that a formal degree would not be a requirement for nursing education at this time or in the very few years into the future.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, another supplementary question to the minister, regarding the question of funding from the minister's department to deal with refresher courses for nurses. I ask the question because at the Foothills Hospital a 10-week course was cancelled Friday and then reinstituted this morning, for nurses who had been out of the nursing profession and had to have a refresher course before they could become actively involved in the profession again. Can the Foothills Hospital in Calgary look to the minister's department as a possible source of funding, not for this program but for future programs? Because it's my understanding they won't be able to do that unless some source of funds is available.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the recommendations of the Johns task force report, and it's a significant report. The final answer on this particular recommendation is yet to come in. With the groups that are affected and are very concerned with this recommendation, I've taken the position that it's the responsibility of a professional person to maintain his professional competence, and to invest in it in terms of a long-term commitment to a career that brings back obvious recompense to the person as well as service to the community. At this point that's the position, but it's more a portfolio than a personal one. In the longer term that could change, but it's not likely to.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can the Foothills Hospital look to the minister's department as a possible source of funding for more of these 10-week refresher courses for nurses?

DR. HOHOL: I wouldn't be prepared to say yes, Mr. Speaker, because this specific question has been brought to me from various groups across the province. In addition to Foothills there are many hospital groups and other professional groups. We really have to come down on the proposition of a definitive kind of statement as to what is the person's own responsibility for his professional maintenance, updating, and upgrading.

Now in another arena entirely, that of continuing education, there could be the possibility of local further education councils which administrate certain funds for the improvement of any group of people. That's a totally different matter, and managed in a different part of the department. But with respect to professional self-improvement, we take the position that in particular it's the responsibility of the individual professional.

Peace River Region

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I wonder if the minister would please advise us what the position of the Alberta government is concerning a statement made recently by a very prominent Calgarian concerning the possible secession of the Peace River region from the province of Alberta.

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose hypothetically that kind of comment might be made by someone who formerly held a high position in municipal administration who might want to become an instant premier but had no convenient constituency from which to do so. [laughter]

Hospital Construction

DR. BACKUS: Mr. Speaker, my question does not arise from the previous one.

In view of the significant meeting in Grande Prairie last Friday by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, has a target date been set for going to tender for the hospital?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, it's hard to stop laughing after the last answer.

We did have an excellent meeting with the Grande

Prairie hospital board. It was the desire of the province to have a specific target date for the commencement of construction of the hospital, but the board of the Grande Prairie hospital did not want to have a specific target date.

MR. CLARK: A supplementary question. I was waiting for the Member for Grande Prairie to ask this supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister in a position to indicate or to confirm to the Assembly that there will be psychiatric beds in the proposed regional hospital at Grande Prairie?

MR. MINIELY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Can the minister indicate how many beds the government is planning in the Grande Prairie hospital for psychiatric purposes, having regard for the regional concept of the hospital?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I have a figure in my head, but in order to be perfectly accurate I would rather, in that specific, be ready for examination of the estimates, because I might be wrong by five beds, give or take.

DR. BUCK: Like zero beds.

AEC Investments

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It flows from reports attributed to the president of the Alberta Energy Company. Have there been any discussions with officials of the Alberta Energy Company with respect to the option of the company to obtain up to an additional 20 per cent of the Syncrude venture?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, in the course of discussions with the president of the Alberta Energy Company, he's indicated to me that sometime by the end of this year the board of directors of the company will be required to come to a decision on whether to exercise their option on Syncrude. The option is to acquire not less than 5 per cent or more than 20, or none at all.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy. Will the position of the Alberta government be that the decision to obtain an option for whatever the AEC chooses, or not at all, will be exclusively a management decision? Or will it be the position of the Alberta government that some very definite input will be made by the government on that decision?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, that will be a judgment for the board of directors of the Alberta Energy Company. I should point out to the hon. member that they will have to make their decision in advance of the actual option time running out, because the government of Alberta would like to know before the term is completely over. It may well be that something else may be done with the option.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Dur-

ing the course of the minister's conversations with the president of Alberta Energy Company, has there been any indication that other participants in the Syncrude venture would like the AEC to exercise the option? For example, has there been any representation from the federal government, Ontario, or the private participants in the Syncrude venture?

MR. GETTY: It's hard to guess at a participant's real interest. However, I could give a feeling from the discussions I've had with other participants. They would prefer not to have the Alberta Energy Company exercise its option. They are getting more and more enthusiastic about the investment, and if the Alberta Energy Company exercised its option each of the participants would then have a smaller interest in what I think is an outstanding investment in our province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder, the representative on the Syncrude board. Is the hon. member in a position to advise whether this question of the Alberta Energy Company obtaining its option has been discussed by the board? If so, is the hon. member in a position to advise the Assembly of those discussions?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with conventional government policy I would refer that question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

DR. BUCK: What are you getting eighteen grand for, Tom?

MR. GETTY: He doesn't get eighteen grand.

Mr. Speaker, most discussions by a board of directors are just that. They're discussions intended to be held at the board of directors' level. I have discussions from time to time with the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder, but I don't try to get from him information on discussions that are carried on at the board of directors of Syncrude unless it involves a government position.

However, I could tell the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that I'd be happy to discuss the matter with the Member for Edmonton Calder. If there's anything he feels I can advise the House, I'd be happy to.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. It flows from that portion of the minister's answer, I believe to the second or third last supplementary question, when they were talking about whether or not the AEC would exercise the option. The minister said the government would need to have a decision sometime before the deadline so that something else could be done with the option. My question is: what contingency plan has the Alberta government in mind if the AEC chooses not to exercise that option?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I thought that might intrigue somebody in the Legislature. Actually, we just want to have a period of time between the decision by the Alberta Energy Company to consider the matter. We have not developed a contingency plan.

Rapeseed Freight Assistance

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Deputy Premier and Minister of Transportation. Could the minister indicate whether the topic of freight assistance for rapeseed processors was discussed at the recent conference in Yorkton?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, that is subject to ongoing negotiations amongst the three provinces, and as such was only referred to at the Yorkton meeting.

Customs Procedures

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Transportation and Deputy Premier. In light of the fact that the Commonwealth Games will be here in August and that lineups through customs at the International Airport seem to be running up to two hours now, can the minister indicate if he's made any formal presentations to his counterpart in Ottawa to try to solve the problem at the International Airport?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, as has been noted in the House and during my estimates, that has been a subject of consideration between us, the city of Edmonton, and the aviation committee of the Chamber of Commerce. All have had some discussions with the federal MoT relative to that matter, stressing the importance to the federal government of at least having some temporary contingency plans for the Commonwealth Games, relative to customs clearance.

We will be following up that matter with the city and other interested parties, and I would hope to have something further on that in a matter of a couple of weeks.

MR. KING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If we cannot get any co-operation from the federal government . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: If, if, if.

MR. KING: Thank you. [interjections] I always appreciate direction from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, particularly since it's so unusual to find it of assistance.

Would the hon. Minister of Transportation consider requiring any aircraft registered by the Ministry of Transport of the government of Canada, and their passengers, to go through customs preclearance when they land in Edmonton during the Commonwealth Games, in order to serve as an object lesson to them over the difficulties they're creating at the International Airport?

DR. HORNER: Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think that with the assistance of the hon. members of the Assembly, led by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands, we've highlighted the difficulties we're now having at the Edmonton International, and out of that may come something useful.

Research Funding

MR. DONNELLY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My ques-

tion is to the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. In the federal budget of last Monday there were incentives for industry in the research and development field. Would the minister please inform the House if this incentive program is available to Alberta companies; or is it like the federal assistance for new product development, which excludes Alberta companies?

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the hon. member should be addressing that question to a federal minister or a member of the House of Commons.

MR. DONNELLY: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, that may be true; but I'm having a little problem following this situation, where the federal government has a program and excludes Alberta. I would like the minister to tell me why.

MR. SPEAKER: Really, the hon. member's addition to the question makes it even clearer: if Alberta is excluded, his inquiry should be directed eastward.

MR. KING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister received any communications from the federal government explaining why the province of Alberta has been excluded from this program?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I wanted so badly to get up.

I thank the hon. Member for Calgary Millican for having alerted me earlier to the problem of an earlier program the federal government designed that excluded Alberta companies. We have been in touch with the federal authority with regard to that first program. I haven't a response at hand to offer the hon. member and the House. We have been in touch — in the normal course we would do this — with the federal authorities with regard to the new program involving research. The moment that response comes from them indicating that we are going to be participants, I'll apprise the House.

Rail Passenger Service

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Transportation and Deputy Premier. Has the government been advised that VIA Rail is shortly going to complete its organization?

DR. HORNER: Just offhand, Mr. Speaker, my latest communication from VIA Rail is now some month or two old. I'll have to recheck the correspondence with Mr. Roberts.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Has the government made any representations to VIA Rail to this time in regard to passenger service in the province?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, we have reiterated the stand we took before the Jones commission relative to passenger service in the province. It was our understanding that VIA Rail had generally accepted that submission. The question of the use of the Calgary-Edmonton corridor for rail passenger service is still outstanding but, having regard to the major capital investment that would be required, is not one

of those that I think we can push with any degree of credibility.

Fort Saskatchewan Jail

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Solicitor General and is a follow-up to a question I asked the hon. minister last fall: whether the minister or his department is considering phasing out the female section of the Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Institution. Has the government changed its policy? Is the government going to phase out or close the female section of the Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Institution?

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker. As I explained last fall, we have moved some female inmates to Belmont, but we still maintain a facility at Fort Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, the number of female inmates has increased from 46 at that time to 86 today. So there is no likelihood that in the foreseeable future we'd be able to phase out the housing of female inmates at Fort Saskatchewan.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister indicate if some of the staff members in the female section of the correctional institute have been asked or are going to be ordered to work in the remand centre in Edmonton?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, of course we have to maintain the right and the flexibility to move our personnel wherever there's a demand. Some of the female correction officers from Fort Saskatchewan will be required to work at Belmont, and it's possible that some will be required in the Edmonton remand centre. The facilities are there not for the convenience of the people who work there but for performing a service to the public.

Sports Stadiums

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier, in his capacity as chairman of the heritage investment committee, and ask whether the government is giving any consideration, as a birthday present to Edmonton and Calgary on the seventy-fifth anniversary of the province, to the covering of their two respective stadiums.

MR. LOUGHEED: We have a number of projects that are going to be considered. I'm sure that could be one. I'm sure there'll be a lot of others, having regard to the imagination of Albertans. But we're at least many, many months before any decision of that nature.

DR. BUCK: Six?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. At this stage, has there been any consideration by the investment committee of the covering of either of those stadiums?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no.

DR. BUCK: Before or after the election?

MR. KING: What do you suggest?

DR. BUCK: After.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Assembly agree to revert for a moment to Notices of Motions?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **NOTICES OF MOTIONS**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to give oral notice:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta urge the government and the universities of the province to take whatever steps may be necessary to ensure that no quotas are placed, for any reason other than the selection of well-qualified candidates, on enrolments to the faculties whose graduates are urgently required in Alberta.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that this was on the notice Thursday; it was not. It doesn't meet the full day's clearance in Votes and Proceedings, so that it can't be on the Order Paper today.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree to the request of the hon. Leader of the Opposition?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

head: **(Committee of Supply)**

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

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

Department of the Environment

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

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can be very brief. Members probably notice that an increase in manpower is requested in this vote this year. This reflects two things: one, an increase in work; and, secondly, a reorganization with respect to our stock advances. I just wanted to mention that to emphasize the fact that nine new positions are delegated for our northwest erosion control program, which came about as a result of the ECA hearings in that region and the motion put forward by the Member for Lesser Slave Lake and adopted by the Legislature last year.

I should say that the department is now administering in excess of 650 separate contracts a year. This is some indication of the activities going on within our buoyant economy. A point I would also like to

emphasize is the ongoing financial support for the very popular programs of municipal sewage and water systems. There are some extra votes under the pollution control section this year, Mr. Chairman, dealing with extra funding for what we call north gap funding, which will bring water and sewage treatment systems to Fort Vermilion and La Crete. Those programs are now under way. There's also a special, one-time-only vote here for financial assistance for relocating the sour gas line around the town of Crossfield.

Before we leave that particular part of the department, we should note that there are also substantial capital funds, not shown here, in the heritage savings trust fund program. For example, the entire Oldman River basin management program is located there. However, the Red Deer project is here, in that it was a specific project commenced before the heritage savings trust fund was commenced.

I think hon. members are now aware of the increased financial support for drainage control projects in northwest Alberta. This is another aspect of the additional manpower and financial assistance going into that area to try to cope with that fairly serious program there.

There's increased funding for operation and maintenance of irrigation headworks, above the level there would ordinarily have been. That is explained by the fact that the Auditor tells us that some of the components of that program that had originally been recommended for heritage savings trust fund votes were deemed not to fall within the purview of that act in the strictest sense. So those activities had to be transferred to our current budget.

You'll notice, Mr. Chairman, there's a continuation substantially for the development of the Vegreville lab. Of course construction is well under way on that very major project. There's also continuing support for AOSERP, the environmental research program we're carrying out in partnership with the federal government in the oil sands region. Members will note that Alberta is now going to be the banker for that program. This is in response to a federal request whereby the total \$4 million vote will be put forward by Alberta, and then we will charge the federal government for their 50 per cent share of the various components.

The last thing I wanted to mention, Mr. Chairman — and I think it's important — is the continuing support for the new Environment Council of Alberta. We're going forward with generally the same percentage increase in funding as other agencies in government, notwithstanding that that may be able to be cut down in future years, depending on experience.

So that's a quick overview of the general activities being recommended by the department for this year.

MR. PURDY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of questions for the minister, and a couple of concerns I'd like to get his opinion on, or what the department may be doing.

About a year ago, there was a study commissioned by the minister's department to look at the Sturgeon River basin. The report has been in front of the municipalities and the people affected. I'd like to know if the minister or the department has any intention this year of starting some of the work for flood

control and stabilization of water level on Lac Ste. Anne and Lake Isle. The minister is familiar with the problems we incurred on the lake last year.

The second point I'd like to go on to is: in the House on Friday, the Member for Drumheller asked a question about burning of sanitary landfill sites, and the minister indicated that municipalities are now being allowed to do this. In view of the statement by the minister, and in view of the case now before the courts where legislation is being tested — the department has taken the town of Stony Plain and the county of Parkland to court on a similar thing where the town and the county were having problems because of burning when people weren't there; people were knocking gates down, dumping garbage in, and then lighting it — I'd like to have the minister expand on his statement last Friday in the Legislature.

The other point: I wonder if the minister has any information regarding the Energy Resources Conservation report regarding the Amoco blowout at Drayton Valley. I understand the report has been released or will be released very shortly.

The last point is regarding another Energy Resources Conservation matter; that is, the Keephills power plant, which has been given the go-ahead by the Department of the Environment. Recently another hearing was held regarding the ash lagoon or dry haul system. One of the proposed quarters of land being looked at for the ash lagoon is agricultural land. In fact, through the office of the Minister of Transportation we saved it last year from being severed by a secondary roadway. The Department of Transportation was ready to put a road through the middle of this quarter section. [Through] my involvement and the minister's involvement, we saved that particular piece of agricultural land, and the highway went in another area.

Just so the minister may have some further information, at the Sundance plant they have a dry haul system now. The hearing in front of the board in the last couple of weeks was dry haul versus ash lagoon. I don't think the report has been completed yet, so the minister may not have any answers on that. But I have discussed this with a couple of people with Calgary Power, indicating my objection to using agricultural land in this particular area for ash lagoons. We now have in place, I believe, the technology to go into a dry haul system and utilize the mined-out pits for the dumping of this waste product.

About half a section of land is in question here. None of it has coal under it; it's been proven. As I indicated, one quarter is good agricultural land. The second quarter is a good recreational area, in that it has three lakes that a lot of people use for fishing. In my discussion with Calgary Power I've indicated that maybe they should be looking at mining out some of the Keephills area earlier, then turning that into an ash lagoon.

Those are the four concerns I have, Mr. Minister, so I'm looking for your answer. Were there five? I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. minister like to get all the questions and then give the whole thing?

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, my questions don't really fit into that area. Perhaps just two comments to start

with.

One, I look forward to some assessment from the minister with regard to how the Environment Council of Alberta is functioning, because last fall when the legislation was passed the minister indicated that after one or two years, I think, he was prepared to have a look at what I consider to be a very unwise move. I recognize that the minister isn't going to be in a position to give us much of an assessment after 6 months. But in light of the interest there's been across the province in the winding down of the Environment Conservation Authority and the winding up of the Environment Council of Alberta, Mr. Minister, I think it would be helpful if we got some reaction from you as to the kind of progress or lack thereof that the new council has been able to make to date.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, it isn't my intention to reflight the issue of the Red Deer Dam here this afternoon, simply to say once again that I believe the government has made a very serious mistake on this issue, an issue I'm sure will be discussed for some time across this province.

My third area, Mr. Minister: what plans does your department have this year with regard to Buffalo Lake, in the Stettler vicinity? The people in the Stettler area were quite enthusiastic about some of the possibilities for Buffalo Lake when they looked at the reports by the Environment Conservation Authority.

Fourthly, Mr. Minister, could you give us the final figures with regard to the Red Deer regional water line, perhaps not today but in memo form at some future time?

Mr. Chairman, I'll stop with those four areas and raise some more later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, there was one more point — thank you, hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place. Mr. Minister, I wasn't in the committee, so it could be covered in the transcript. If it is, I'll get it from there.

Can the minister indicate to us how many emission orders were granted last year? When that legislation was approved two years ago, the minister will recall that he agreed to report to the House each year on any exemptions which were made as a result of new plants starting up. If the minister could give us that information, if he hasn't already, that would be helpful also.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Chairman, my questions all relate to the Vegreville environmental research lab, about which there was some comment by the minister in his opening remarks. But if he could, I'd like him to give a fairly comprehensive outline, at least in terms of the parameters, of exactly what kind of research is occurring there. What is the relationship between the research going on there, that being carried out by AOSTRA, and that being carried out by the Alberta Research Council? I'd also like to know what staffing complement will be there, whether work going to the lab will be totally funded, or a good portion of it, by the Department of the Environment, or whether the department lab will be working on contract for other

departments of government.

Mr. Chairman, I think that will give the minister a good idea of the nature of the information I'd like on the Vegreville environmental research lab.

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

During study of the estimates in subcommittee, we did take some time discussing the question of overall water management on the South Saskatchewan River basin, which really looks at three river basins in Alberta: the Oldman, the Bow, and the Red Deer. It strikes me that perhaps much of the discussion that has raged in the province for the last year or so has centred around individual river basins when, from reading over the transcript, it would strike me that, as Mr. Melnychuk has indicated on page 5:

Yes, the planning for the entire South [Saskatchewan] which would lead toward ... co-ordinated management of all three rivers is under way now. Decisions that have been made on the Red Deer and that may be made on the Oldman will be in tune with that.

Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that while there has been some reference to it, the whole question of the integrated management of the three rivers leading into the South Saskatchewan is probably one of the major questions in water resource management in Alberta today.

Having said that it seems to me we're looking at a co-ordinated three-rivers approach, nevertheless I'd like to ask several questions with respect to the discussions on the Oldman. First of all, Mr. Minister, I would like to have updated figures, if you possess them, on the proposed cost of the so-called Three Rivers Dam. I realize that no decision has been made on that and that hearings will be held shortly on the entire river basin management on the Oldman system. But if my statistics are correct, I understand there was quite a substantial increase from 1975 to 1977, from approximately \$78 million to \$115 million. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether we have any updated figures for 1978, or whether that 1977 figure would be approximately accurate.

The second question that flows from the Oldman aspect of our South Saskatchewan River policy is with respect to the canal that, I gather, connects the Lethbridge Northern Irrigation District. I understand it goes through the Peigan Reserve at this time and that there is some problem with the negotiations as to widening the canal. I gather it would be necessary to widen the canal, but the officials of the reserve are — I don't say they're opposed to it, but at this stage they are still negotiating. I wonder if the minister would perhaps bring us up to date on just where that matter of the canal stands.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, the other day in question period we discussed a report that been released, as a matter of fact, through *The Lethbridge Herald*. It wasn't released by the government, but I gather at some point it will be released by the government. That deals with irrigation strategy. I realize we're looking at something that crosses the boundaries between the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Environment, and the heritage trust fund committee. So we're really looking at three separate areas in a sense. But the information contained in this suggests to me at least, Mr. Minister, that the irrigation experts feel that expansion in the Leth-

bridge Northern district would not be our wisest course to follow; that the best opportunities identified for expansion of the irrigation system would lie in the St. Mary system as opposed to the Lethbridge Northern irrigation system.

Mr. Chairman, in summarizing his answers to the various questions, I would like the minister perhaps to give us some indication whether or not the government has developed an approach to either one or both systems, whether the emphasis should be on expanding the St. Mary system, or whether there is a feeling that substantial expansion of the Lethbridge Northern system is possible. That strikes me as obviously something that will be discussed at the Environment Council of Alberta hearings in the fall; I would assume so anyway. But I would be interested if the government has any position or any preliminary assessment at this time.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I have some items that are good and some that are bad. I think I'll start out with the good items.

The first thing I'd like to mention is the program the hon. minister initiated in regard to cleaning up eyesores throughout the province. I think this excellent program is having an effect throughout the province not only in cleaning up messes that have sometimes been there for many years, but also in making land available for subdivision and other useful purposes. I think this is an excellent program.

I'd like to commend the minister again for the decision on the Red Deer River Dam. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned he thought it was a mistake. I think it was an excellent decision and will go down through the years as a decision by a government not afraid to consider all the facts and rule in accordance with those facts, in spite of the recommendation from the Environment Conservation Authority.

I'm not going to enlarge on the subject, other than to say that in my view the recommendation of the Environment Conservation Authority was at least partially contrary to what the people of the area wanted. When the Authority considered a person making representations on behalf of 7,000 as one, compared to one individual, certainly you have to question the recommendation. That's exactly what the Environment Conservation Authority did.

Thousands of people are looking forward to the completion of this dam, not only for the stabilization of the water in the Red Deer River but for the strong potential of getting water to towns, villages, and special areas where hundreds of acres will be reclaimed.

That brings me to the next point. Water is becoming a very serious problem in many of our towns and villages. It's difficult to find. I appreciate the help the engineers in the Department of the Environment give to the towns trying to find water. But sometimes it just can't be found in sufficient quantities to provide for the area.

A number of towns in my constituency are having problems. Tremendous growth in the town of Strathmore is causing a great deal of concern in connection with the future water supply. The town council and engineers are looking over the entire area to tap every possible source of water. Some feel we're not too far from the time when water's going to have to be moved from the Bow River, Eagle Lake, or irrigation ditches into dugouts and dams. These cause a

lot of concern, because piping water from Eagle Lake or the Bow River to Strathmore-Hussar is a very expensive proposition.

The people of Hussar have a good supply of water for the time being. But they would rest a lot easier if Deadhorse Lake were brought up to a higher level, and would provide a future water source. Water is a concern, and I want to thank the minister for the time he's giving to it and for the importance his engineers place upon this matter.

The other point which might be classified as bad is the difficulty many of our municipalities are having with garbage. I can't say the minister hasn't given very careful attention to everything brought to his attention, because he has. His answer in the Legislature the other day, referred to by the hon. Member for Stony Plain, was very pleasing indeed, because it makes ordinary, everyday sense. When you have lumber you can burn without polluting the atmosphere, it seems rather ridiculous to have to haul it a number of miles where it probably has to be burned anyway, and the hauling is costing money.

I am concerned with some of the work of the sanitary engineer in the Drumheller Health Unit who, in spite of everything, is pushing for the removal of garbage a number of miles into common spots without any regard, in my view, to the cost going on the people's shoulders. If you can have a clean, acceptable garbage pit in an area, I see no reason to haul garbage a number of miles at sometimes three, four, and five times the price. Eventually when our population gets much larger than it is today, this haulage might be economical. But I have to repeat what many, many people in my constituency say to me: money doesn't grow on trees.

Adding two and three times the cost of garbage handling on each householder is a pretty serious problem. It's upping their costs, and they don't have that kind of money to pay. If it's absolutely essential for health reasons and so on, people will go along with it and probably find the money somewhere. But in many, many cases it's simply done as a convenience or as a more acceptable way of handling garbage. It's very nice to haul garbage 20, 40, 60, 80, 100 miles and put it in an area that can eventually be redeemed as a golf course, a park, or something. That all sounds fine. But hauling the garbage those numbers of miles is running into a lot of concern in almost every home where it's being perpetrated or advanced. Many are throwing up their hands and saying, what's the use, we just can't get anybody to listen to us. They're becoming very worried.

I would like to see the hon. minister and his department take a realistic view of this matter of burning garbage on site, or even garbage pits in local areas. Take the Drumheller valley, where we have scores of hills and coulees. Because a garbage pit is not looked after properly in any instance really isn't a reason to decide that all garbage has to be hauled into the city of Drumheller. I'm not sure the city of Drumheller appreciates it that much either. But it is a concern to the people. As a matter of fact it's one of the major concerns in that riding, largely because of the irresistible stand taken by the sanitary engineer and the Drumheller Health Unit in regard to this matter. Where it can't carry the judgment of the people, don't think this should be forced upon them.

The mayor of the town of Gleichen came to me

some time ago. The council was told by the said sanitary engineer that they're going to have to haul their garbage whether they like it or not. I came to the minister, and he advised me by letter, which I sent on to the town of Gleichen, that this wasn't so. There was a choice. They would have to have a satisfactory garbage pit and so on in the town of Gleichen, and properly so. The mayor wants it to be proper too. This was very satisfying to those people in the Gleichen area.

Now the story seems to be rising again. In the village of Hussar, where they kept a very well kept disposal area and did their burning under control, they were forced to stop this burning, much to their anger and increased expense. The whole matter is causing a great deal of concern. I feel that if a garbage pit can be kept in proper condition and burning is sensible and kept under control, at this time at least it's really a very sensible thing to do. I would like to hear from the minister in regard to this particular problem.

This didn't happen in the Drumheller area, but it's been told several times there that some town east of Edmonton had some kind of arrangement with someone upstairs, and every Friday morning lightning would strike the garbage pit and set it on fire. It would burn all day, then they'd put it out. The officials of the town found this very convenient. They couldn't take responsibility for it, they tell me, but they found whoever was doing that was doing a very fine service for the people of that area, because it was burning stuff that could properly be burned without polluting the atmosphere and so on.

I simply want to ask the hon. minister, who gives these things personal attention, if he would look into this matter of burning in garbage pits in the province of Alberta, because the people are really concerned about same.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to make a few comments relative to the minister's department. I think the Member for Drumheller made very clear the importance of water, particularly fresh water, not only in Alberta but indeed in Canada. I'm reminded of a policy conference in California last summer, which was perhaps the most serious drought time for southern Alberta. In the concluding remarks, the chairman made the prognosis that he had some good news and some bad news. The good news was that by 1990 perhaps we would be drinking sewage, and the bad news was there wouldn't be enough to go around. That may sound facetious, but I think it very clearly indicates the concern not only of the Member for Drumheller but of the minister.

Last summer the mayor of Lethbridge, in concert with many elected officials in southern Alberta, held a water policies conference. I think they came to some very interesting conclusions and recommendations that I believe were forwarded to the government. I thought most of them were positive. I thought they were all positive, although there was that concern regarding the Three Rivers Dam that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview has raised. My question to the minister would be: has he studied that document, and has his department indicated to him in a responsive way the reasonableness of the document? I'd like to leave it at that.

Recently the secretary of the St. Mary's River Irriga-

tion District, who I think has been very successful in helping there, has left and come to your department. Mr. Minister, I think Lethbridge's loss is your department's gain. I know the very high standards your department has, and I'm very pleased to see that rumors that outsiders can't get in are now refuted. Here is a clear case of a man from the private sector, with St. Mary's, who has now come into government. I think this certainly proves that government and municipalities can work together for a common objective, and I think Mr. Thiessen will be a definite asset to your department.

Mr. Chairman, two other points to the minister. I think the paper recycling is very exciting. We in Lethbridge, the Member for Lethbridge East and I, have had a lot to do with the Rehabilitation Society of Southwestern Alberta, which historically has dealt with mentally retarded people, who were pretty well restricted to basket weaving and so on until this government came to office. We first saw a very positive step, as a result of The Beverage Container Act, when they became a bottle depot. Just this past summer they were very fortunate, I felt, and richly deserved a grant from your department to go into the paper recycling business. I understand that's very successful; it has received the response of the community. But more importantly, I think it gives a new lease on life to the Rehab Society to take in these disadvantaged people. I think that's working out extremely well.

Finally, Mr. Minister — I know the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest may well have asked this in subcommittee, and I missed subcommittee — the decision on the storage facilities of the Oldman River. It's been said many times, I believe publicly by you, that no decision would be made until public hearings were held. I understand it was anticipated those hearings would be concluded by late summer or early fall and that a decision — good, bad, or indifferent — would be made probably after harvest this year or even perhaps in early winter. Mr. Minister, I think you've had ample input, if that word is not over-worked, from those in the south who feel the decision should be made for storage in the Oldman River basin. I would just like you to confirm that it is a fact that hearings are being conducted, concluding hopefully in late summer, and that a decision will be made. I know many people out there are waiting for that decision in late fall or early winter.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, just very brief remarks. I wonder if the minister would comment on this in his closing remarks. Having raised over the past two or three years a concern that has been expressed especially in other jurisdictions around the country regarding the increased threat to Albertans as well as others in view of the vast number of chemicals and pesticides being introduced in our society, I'm certainly pleased the minister, through other members in the House, has brought about The Hazardous Chemicals Act and The Agricultural Chemicals Amendment Act.

I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House in his closing remarks whether there is an ongoing re-evaluation of that section of his department which deals with that particular issue and concern, in order that we in Alberta are ahead of the

possible problem to protect our consumers. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the bills are here and will probably be passed; but in addition to that, that evaluation and re-evaluation keep on going, ahead of the possible problem, in view of the numbers of chemicals and pesticides being introduced in our society, which I understand are a real hazard and threat to our consumer.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to review a couple of areas with regard to the Department of the Environment.

The question raised by the hon. Member for Drumheller is very interesting. I have had to go through the same type of questioning in my constituency with regard to solid waste disposal. There have been a number of problems, particularly in the Crowsnest region, with regard to burning of solid wastes in the area, which created an incredible amount of concern by a number of people it affected. The almost continuous burning in garbage dumps adjacent to residential communities created a considerable amount of hardship. There have been complaints by citizens living there; it has been going on historically, but the complaints came in for three or four years.

I was very pleased that the Department of the Environment acted in a co-ordinating capacity to assist the municipalities to solve their problem. The solution was to set up a regional solid waste disposal site. It has caused the problem of having to haul to that solid waste site, which serves the Pincher Creek and Crowsnest Pass areas. But it has certainly also solved the problem of continuous burning in these dumps, the hazard to health of the citizens caused by the smoke, and the improper location of these dumps with regard to groundwater pollution. I'd like to congratulate the minister and his department for having taken this step in setting up this regional solid waste disposal site for the constituency and the towns in it.

I'd like to ask the minister: what is the status today of the ongoing discussion within his department to set up a solid waste management policy for the province?

Another area of concern I'd like to raise with the minister is with regard to the Oldman River water management committee and its deliberations. I'd like to ask the minister if the committee is on schedule with the studies it has conducted. What time does he expect the committee to report to him? How is the timing coming along for the public hearings? Will they be on schedule for this fall? And will we be in a position to make a decision on future water management for the Oldman by the end of this year?

Another area I'd like the minister to comment on is with regard to the appointment of individuals to the ECA hearing on the Oldman river. How does he go about determining who in fact will sit on that panel? Who does he approach to ask for the submission of nominations for that panel? Generally, how does he go about the appointment of members to that panel?

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a few comments pertaining to the Minister of the Environment and the operation of his department.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to compliment the minister on the work the Department of the Environment has done in our area. The water supply has certainly been enriched in many of our small towns

during the last couple of years due to the efforts of the Department of the Environment, mostly through drilling of wells and locating adequate water supply. I compliment him for it, because it has certainly enriched the supply of water to our smaller towns.

Water is certainly the most valuable commodity we have in the dry area, mostly because of its scarcity. You never really miss the water till the well runs dry. I'd like to compliment him on the study on our creeks, being done at the present time. Several creeks in the area have been studied many, many times throughout the years, but the studies have been done with the idea of bringing in more water through diversion of the Red Deer River. I think the present studies will be practical and that some really worth-while developments will come from them, because the practicality of the study is that we're going to see what can be done with the water mother nature has brought into the area.

Some developments have been done in the past, the one on Blood Indian Creek. It's just a small creek, and the PFRA dammed it, I believe, in about 1965. The Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife has stocked it with rainbow trout. It is now amongst the 10 most popular fishing holes in the province. I believe several locations in the dry area of the province, in the Hanna-Oyen constituency, can be developed in the same manner, and I am sure the study being done on these creeks will prove that to be true.

I have one concern. I'd like to reiterate the remarks made by the hon. Member for Drumheller. Garbage disposal has become a real problem. Most of the areas do burn a certain amount. No doubt this minister has been asked this question many times, and I will be interested in his answers. It appears that burning is really the only answer to garbage disposal in these small towns, where they cannot afford to keep equipment available to bury it. If it's not disposed of at least once a week, it blows around the country and just becomes a hazard again. I will be listening with interest to the minister's remarks on garbage disposal.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I'll try to deal with the problems brought up by the hon. members.

First of all, the hon. Member for Stony Plain asked about capital works that might follow up relating to the Sturgeon River basin study. No capital funds are allocated in this year's budget for flood control or works stabilization. I understand that discussions are going on now with the local authorities at MD and county levels, and hopefully next year we'll have made enough decisions so that we can proceed.

Several members dealt with the matter of garbage disposal. I'll try to deal with all the comments at this time. The hon. Member for Stony Plain introduced the matter. It is a problem in Alberta, and I recognize what the smaller municipalities are faced with. I think hon. members are aware that at the present time the help we can give is to buy a sanitary landfill site if it goes forward on a regional basis. So at least that's some help. If at least two municipalities are involved on a partnership basis, we will provide the funds for the purchase of the site.

But I recognize that's only a first step in a meaningful program. We're trying to do better. We've had a fairly successful experiment with the project men-

tioned by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, whereby we actually acquired the site, did the capital improvements to it — that is, the road, the scales, and the fencing — and purchased the initial equipment. It's then up to the municipalities within the partnership to operate it, collect their garbage, and take it there.

I would like to see such a program proceed throughout the province. Based on our experience, I think we could make these regional sanitary landfill sites successful and within the economic feasibility of the participating municipalities.

The way it is now, we permit some burning; that is, if the wet garbage is separated generally from the dry garbage and burning is carried out that way, it is possible to carry out the kind of burning referred to by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

The other side, of course, is that we have legislation to uphold. If a municipality is permitting burning within its sanitary landfill site — and this was the experience the hon. Member for Stony Plain went through — I think we're obliged to ask them to stop and, if it persists, to prosecute. That's what we did in that case. I was disappointed we lost our first round in court, and we're appealing it. I think this is important legislation that must be supported, because complaints are brought to us by private citizens who find the burning a source of annoyance. I guess I'm saying we recognize the problem, and a considerable amount of work has gone into it. Quite a bit of funding has gone into it and, based on our experience of the last two or three years, I'm hopeful we will very shortly be able to bring in a meaningful program.

I recognize that garbage dumps or sanitary landfill sites aren't the only answers. Recycling, incineration, and the other chemical processes are important too. We've worked on draft legislation and done some overall provincial budgeting insofar as a meaningful program might be involved, and I'm hopeful we will eventually be able to bring forward something like that. In the meantime many municipalities aren't very happy, and we're trying to take rather the firmer stance, particularly where we're supporting local health officers. All of us have been over substantial areas of the province by air. And when you're flying over Alberta, I think you have to be impressed with how clean it is. Whenever you come to a place where there is air pollution, it's generally visible several miles away. This isn't so in all provinces; there are some where there's a haze over practically the whole province. I think we're very lucky, and we're trying to maintain that cleanliness. Of course there are more of us each year, and we're all producing more garbage each year, so that adds to the problem.

I'm saying I think we have some reasonable guidelines concerning burning — as long as the garbage is separated and not all mixed up. In that case you practically have to have two sites, one for burning and one for burying. But some burning is permitted under those kinds of guidelines. We are trying to encourage the regional concept, whereby the costs are shared among municipalities and brought down to a level that I think is acceptable by the citizens. In the meantime, though, we will probably try to uphold the legislation in effect which bans indiscriminate burning.

The member also asked me about some ERCB reports dealing with the West Pembina blowout and

the ash lagoon for the Keephills plant. Other than the news report over the weekend about environmental damage in West Pembina, I must admit I haven't yet had a chance to be briefed up to date. I know the department fellows who are working very closely with the ERCB and at the hearings with respect to the inquiry into the damage. From the preliminary information available, it appears that not very much serious environmental damage happened.

I share the hon. member's concern about not unnecessarily using any productive agricultural land as an ash lagoon at the Keephills plant, and I concur in his remarks about using the old mine pits for disposal or some other method like that. That's the kind of thing we're now able to deal with when the proposition of a scheme puts in his land reclamation and environmental impact assessment studies prior to receiving approval for the operation.

Going now to the comments by the Leader of the Opposition, the first thing he asked for was an assessment of the present status of the Environment Council. I have to say I'm encouraged by the way things are proceeding. At the annual meeting of the public advisory committee last fall, we had what I guess you'd call a real frank, almost showdown, kind of meeting. I explained as straightforwardly as I could why we had done the things we had and what I was hoping to see the new ECA do. Mr. Crerar, the new chief executive officer for the ECA, was with me at that meeting, and we had a good question-and-answer period that went close to three hours. With the exception of two resignations, the public advisory committee kept going, and I think that was pretty good when you consider there are in excess of 90 members. They decided to at least give the new system a working chance, and I appreciated that very much. The new man, Mr. Crerar, has since come in, settled the staff down pretty well, and provided a good, workmanlike atmosphere and good administrative direction, something which was lacking prior to his tenure.

Based on the forestry hearings that were held, I think it's not going to be a bad arrangement. The feedback I've had with respect to the forestry hearings is that the citizens on that panel performed very well, and everybody felt they had a good chance to present their briefs at the various places throughout the province. We haven't got their report yet. As a result of some of the points made during the briefs, they're continuing field trips starting next week. It appears we're getting excellent service from people who are appointed to a temporary board dealing with one thing at a time. They work very earnestly, and they're anxious to get their report in. Of course the proof of that will be when we receive the report and see what they have discovered and what they're recommending.

The last assessment I had, which coincidentally was this morning, is that the ECA is functioning well. The staff generally has stayed there, and the administrative reorganization within is taking place. The advisory committee has stayed on. Mr. Crerar appears to have been well accepted by environmentally interested groups throughout the province, and I'm hopeful that we'll have a good organization.

Insofar as the plans for Buffalo Lake are concerned, this is something that arose from the hearings on the Red Deer Dam. One of the alternatives mentioned in

the off-stream storage scheme was the stabilization of Buffalo Lake. It came about not only that it could serve as a flow regulation reservoir, but that it had several other benefits connected with it. So what we're trying to do now — we have a study under way — is to see if we can't take advantage of those other benefits by stabilizing the level of Buffalo Lake, but without getting into the very massive capital and operating program that would have been involved using it as a flow regulation reservoir. So that's under way. We're looking at it in conjunction with some drainage problems that are also occurring within the adjoining region; and, as I say, that study is well under way.

I think I will have to get the final costs of the Red Deer regional water line to the hon. leader. He asked for the exact cost. I don't have it. I know it went well over the original estimate. We got caught up with a major project there during a period when inflation in the construction industry was really escalating at a very rapid rate. I know the line went at least \$2 million or \$3 million beyond the original estimates presented to the Legislature.

The leader also asked for some data on the number of emission control orders. I'm not sure if he meant those or the certificates of variance. I will very shortly be submitting a report on the certificates of variance to the Legislature. We undertook to report at least once a year. I think we're up to about six or seven. I saw the updated report the other day, and I believe they're being kept within reason.

The Member for Edmonton Jasper Place asked for an overview of the Vegreville lab — now he's gone. Very quickly, it's about a \$22 million project, which contains equipment and furnishings. Any who have been in the Vegreville region lately will have seen it. It's a vast building, because it's only one storey high and covers a lot of the landscape. It's built in nodes or sectors for each user department, and these are connected by wings. The number of employees will probably be up to about 235 by the time it is operational, about 1982. A number will be new employees, and about 70 will be transfers. The user departments will be the Research Council of Alberta; Agriculture; Alberta Environment; Energy and Natural Resources; Recreation, Parks and Wildlife; and, to a smaller degree, Alberta Labour, insofar as occupational health and safety is concerned.

Some of the programs will be carried out directly through departmental funding, and some will be done by contract. For example, I imagine work done either by or for the Alberta Research Council would go on a contract basis. I don't want to detail the programs carried out under each jurisdiction. Very quickly the major components are chemistry, biology, technology, and animal science. A common service wing would service all of those. If any hon. members are really interested in the Vegreville lab, I'd be glad to send them a copy of this brochure on the lab produced when it was announced. By the way, that's still up to date.

I'd like to move now to the comments by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. He spent some time talking about the overall management of the South Saskatchewan River basin. I'm comfortable that it's being handled properly. I think there will be no problem counting as part of the river basin management the components now being carried out

on individual streams within the basin. We're looking not only at flow regulation of the different tributaries, which is an important part of river basin, but also at land management, erosion control, the addition of pollutants to the basin, and the connection between water management and land planning.

Of course the last item I mentioned, Mr. Chairman, is very difficult to deal with, where good water resource planning is interfaced with land management planning. The classic case where there was difficulty deciding which way to tilt was on the Red Deer project, where on one hand some agricultural land was involved, and on the other a program was being proposed that would help most agricultural land in the region. I'm not sure I understood the detailed concerns of the hon. member, but I would just repeat that I want to assure members that I don't think any individual works done on a stream within the river basin should be seen as limiting our options insofar as the total management of the river basin is concerned.

The member asked about possible problems with respect to the Indians on the Peigan Reserve. That problem is associated with the rehabilitation of existing works that are part of the \$200 million program we announced for irrigation upgrading in southern Alberta. Environment has the responsibility of upgrading these headworks and the major canals. Our problem there is a structure that is above ground level in many cases because of the contours and gravity involved. We have a control weir on the river within the Indian reserve and a takeout, like an aqueduct, which leads to storage facilities. In one case, our structure actually crosses below the river just as it goes off the reserve onto patented land.

This year the band council has said that perhaps they won't give us access to the reserve to repair those works. The dilemma of the government is whether to do all the works of the structure on the many miles downstream and not have access to the structure itself. I don't think it is an insurmountable problem. We can work within the existing right of way if we have to, and it may come to that.

The second part of the problem is that the access between the highway through the reserve and the right of way we have for our structures requires equipment and trucks to cross reserve land on an unsurveyed road. I guess you'd call it a trail that has been there many years. There's some question whether they'll permit ongoing access across it. Again, if we had to we could probably carry out the work without having legal access in that way, but of course we'd rather continue to work with the band council the way we have in the past years. I think they see it as an opportunity to settle a lot of past grievances by having this bargaining position.

As for the reports released by *The Lethbridge Herald*, a management committee meets every two weeks in preparation for the Oldman River flow regulations. In preparation for that, I believe some 14 or 15 reports have been commissioned that deal in detail with all aspects of the Oldman River basin, both land use and water use. We've asked the committee to release the reports and make them public immediately they get them. That's what they're doing in the Lethbridge area where they meet. So it just makes sense that *The Lethbridge Herald* would receive them before I would.

The member asked what the government's approach is to expansion. Insofar as government funds put in, our approach has been that we want first to rehabilitate and improve irrigation facilities in existing irrigated parcels within existing irrigation districts. As a second step, we would hope to see expansion of lands within the established districts. The third step would be the expansion of the districts themselves, or perhaps formation of new districts. The question of whether we prefer expansion in one district or another, like St. Mary's or Lethbridge Northern, is one where we will have to wait to see what comes out of the consultants' reports I just mentioned, and the recommendations we might receive by way of the management committee and later from the hearings. But in answer to the direct question, the ECA hearings will be dealing with that matter as a term of reference.

I appreciated the remarks of the hon. Member for Drumheller. The land reclamation projects he referred to are carried out under the heritage savings trust fund budget, so they actually are not contained within this budget. But I agree with him; it doesn't matter where the dollars are. I believe it's a good program too.

While I have the chance I'd like to plug for more MLAs to give us suggestions as to project sites that might be rehabilitated. Although we asked for them a couple of times, I'm getting fewer suggestions than I would have hoped.

I think we both recognize the long history Deadhorse Lake has had. I have to be very frank and say at this time it's hard to promote this as the best project of that type in the region, but we're always willing to listen to new viewpoints a citizen or citizens might have. As the hon. member is aware, we have been examining alternatives in the region.

Responding to the Member for Lethbridge West, I want to assure him that the unique seminar or policy conference convened by Mayor Anderson last year was excellent. It brought together what until then had been competing rural and urban municipalities, the urbans centred by the city of Lethbridge of course. They sat down and looked at their water requirements and each other's needs in a very positive way. We got an excellent report from them and have assured them in writing that it's going to be very useful when the final decision-making time comes.

I was glad the member commented on the paper recycling project. Of course this has become popular within the last year or two. Combined with the home insulation program and the increasing cost of newsprint, I'm delighted to see so many tons of old papers recycled.

We have been able to help a number of voluntary agencies by giving them funds for paper recycling bins or helping them establish depots. The kinds of letters the hon. member mentioned are coming in from all over the province. Many of you have agencies within your own constituencies that have taken advantage of that. I'm pleased to say our grants for the fiscal year that just ended were completely used, and we have a waiting list for next year's grant list. In many cases it just involves a grant of \$300 to help them build or buy a bin they can locate somewhere for old newspapers. A lot of voluntary agencies are making additional funds this way.

The member also referred to The Beverage Con-

tainer Act and how that's also helping various rehab societies around the province. It's interesting to note we've been carefully reviewing the effectiveness of The Beverage Container Act and wondering if it should be broadened. Members will recall we passed legislation a year ago allowing us to broaden it if a need was perceived to do that.

It's a big business now. Last year Alberta consumers paid \$6 million to have all these containers recycled and returned through depots. I think something between 600 and 700 people are working in the system in Alberta. Many of them are getting jobs and incomes. Ordinarily they wouldn't have the opportunity to work. That's an unexpected but very pleasant spinoff benefit from the program. We're getting a lot of interest from other jurisdictions about how it's working.

I want to emphasize again, for the two members from Crowsnest and Lethbridge West who brought up the matter about the scheduling for the Oldman River flow regulation hearings, that most of the consultants are just finishing their reports now. A couple have been finished. A couple have asked for two or three extra weeks. We've emphasized to them many times the importance of getting their reports in so the management committee can put them together and report to government. It's our intention to go into public hearings immediately after the fall harvest session is finished down there. That will permit us to use the harvest season for establishing our information centres, et cetera. Of course, depending on how the hearings go, we've targeted the end of the year for a decision on that project. It has been a long time coming. I'll be glad to see it made, and the blueprint for work under way.

As for the growing concern about chemicals and pesticides referred to by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, I agree with him that it is a growing problem. The scientific specialists involved in this field are just beginning to identify some of the things that could or might be happening. With that in mind we have considerably strengthened and expanded our existing Agricultural Chemicals Act. The proposal is before the members now.

We've brought in a companion act dealing with other non-agricultural chemicals. This item is becoming of more concern within the department. Of course the lab does monitoring all the time and works very closely with the Department of Agriculture. Insofar as our foods are concerned, there's a pretty good centre of expertise in the department on the technical side, not only the lab but the support fieldmen.

We spend a fair amount of money sending department people to seminars and international conferences. In some cases Alberta people present papers at those things. I'm trying to say that I think our Alberta department is really holding its own and setting a good standard insofar as chemicals and pesticide controls are concerned.

I believe I dealt with all the questions on solid waste management put forward by the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. I've outlined for the members the scheduling for the Oldman River flow regulations. I appreciated the comments from the Member for Hanna-Oyen on our water supply program. Members will recall a year ago in this Legislature we came up with a drought contingency program, and under it

our department had the authority to spend \$1.2 million by way of special warrant. We spent only about half that amount, and I think we were able to help a substantial number of communities with that emergency program.

I hope I've dealt with everybody's questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CLARK: I wonder if I might ask the minister three specific questions. Mr. Minister, with regard to your comments on the Buffalo Lake matter, when will the studies there be finished? Once the studies are finished, is it the government's intention to make them public? And is it being done by an outside consulting firm or within the department?

Mr. Minister, I was interested in your comments with regard to the Environment Council of Alberta. I would just make this cautionary comment. I think the minister should be extremely careful in the appointments he makes with regard to the flow regulation question in southern Alberta. I had the opportunity to spend a short period of time at one of the hearings of the Environment Council dealing with a specific problem west of Calgary. I know two of the people on the council personally. I think on that occasion the minister made some very good choices of individuals to be on the council. But, Mr. Minister, you'll recall that one of the concerns expressed by a lot of people outside this Legislature was the people you would appoint to the council in the future. I would say perhaps you're over the first hurdle as far as initial appointments to the council are concerned. But I'm sure many people will watch the kinds of appointments made, especially for the Oldman River hearings in the southern part of the province.

Mr. Minister, the third point I would like you to respond to is: not long ago when I had the opportunity to be in eastern Alberta, out in the Hanna country, I was advised that the government has some rather extensive plans with regard to irrigation for that part of the province. I told the individual who raised them with me that it seemed to me the most appropriate place for me to raise this was during the estimates, because I haven't heard of any extensive irrigation plans the government has in that area. If I read the transcript from the committee, Mr. Minister, you or your officials indicated that when you look at the volume of water that comes from the Oldman, the Bow, and the Red Deer, you feel with careful management that can meet the agreement that's been entered into between the provinces. My question very straightforwardly is: what is the dope on irrigation in eastern Alberta, out in the Hanna area? Really, what plans does your department have in mind in that area?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, as to Buffalo Lake, I'm sorry I can't give you the details about cost and scheduling of the study that's under way, but certainly it's our intention that if anything looks feasible and economically reasonable, we'd want to proceed with it. I know the hon. Member for Stettler has been very insistent upon our taking a careful look at this. I'll get the hon. member a memo if that's agreeable to him.

As for the comments on the selection of the ECA members, I was intrigued by this because — I don't know if he'll believe me or not — I hadn't met any of those panel members prior to their appointment.

After the order in council appointed them, I asked them to come to the office so we could have a kind of briefing session and get to know them. But those were all names submitted by what we thought would be appropriate groups who would know knowledgeable people. We tried to explain the kinds of people we were looking for and the disciplines, et cetera, but I hadn't met any of them. I don't know how often that will happen.

We're using the same system with these Oldman flow regulation hearings at the present time. I've sent out a number of letters very recently to groups throughout the province, and we're going through the same thing looking for names.

I think it's important that one person has to be continuous on this. Of course that's Mr. Crerar's job, to know the administrative procedures and what support services are available from the ECA. But we're using that system. I know a lot of people are sceptical. They don't really believe we're doing this, but there it is.

As for irrigation for eastern Alberta, we don't propose to do any. In my own layman's way I'm advised that much of the soil is probably not suitable for large-scale irrigation projects, and furthermore it's doubtful the water supply is there. So the proposals being carried out for the Red Deer River flow regulation don't contemplate large-scale irrigation projects in the sense that are being carried out in southern Alberta. That's not to say some individual landowners along the river course may not get their own irrigation schemes going by way of water licences and proceed that way. That's all I can say on that one. We've never considered it as part of the plan.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address just a few brief remarks to the Minister of the Environment, mainly in the form of compliments to the minister on his responsiveness to the concerns raised in north-western and north-central Alberta. On behalf of my constituents I would like to compliment the minister on the manner in which he has moved on the ECA report on soil erosion in northwestern Alberta by giving the matter high attention and adjusting the cost-sharing to the municipalities from 50/50 to 75/25. I've received from constituents congratulations that I've been asked to convey to the minister on his responsiveness to the proposals contained in the ECA report.

Also I'd like to comment on the announcement in the budget of funds being allocated for the Lesser Slave Lake sub-basin. We're very pleased with the department and the minister giving this important matter a high priority within the department's activities. I know from time to time in the past year the minister has been subject to considerable criticism. In the north there is a good deal of interest and receptiveness to the steps being taken by the department in this area.

Also, the minister recently established a Lesser Slave Lake basin advisory committee. The advisory committee has worked very closely with staff members of the Department of the Environment in order to study the problems and difficulties related to water management and erosion in northwestern Alberta, particularly in the sub-basin of Lesser Slave Lake.

As a part of those discussions, information meetings have been held in Slave Lake, Kinuso, and High

Prairie, which were very well attended by citizens who have had a long-standing concern going back into the '60s. They're very pleased with the co-operation from the department and the intention of the minister to try to find solutions to the difficulties that have been encountered there. The agricultural future of that part of Alberta depends to a large extent on the activities and actions undertaken by the government in the next few years. We feel it's vitally important, and it should remain a priority, because there is the potential for over 30,000 acres of agricultural land to achieve a much higher and better use as a result of the steps that have been taken.

Agreed to:

Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services:

1.0.1 — Minister's Office	\$116,477
1.0.2 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$291,642
1.0.3 — Finance and Administration Office	\$65,460
1.0.4 — Accounting	\$264,588
1.0.5 — Personnel	\$175,618
1.0.6 — Office Support Branch	\$348,039
1.0.7 — Systems and Computing	\$782,284
1.0.8 — Management Training and Development	\$59,161
1.0.9 — Solicitor's Office	\$38,689
1.0.10 — Library	\$157,710
1.0.11 — Communications	\$146,537

MR. CLARK: Mr. Minister, in one of the other departments we've been able to work out an arrangement for some specific information, where if the minister would just agree to send a memo with the information later on, that would be quite agreeable.

With regard to the detailed breakdown under professional-technical staff, I notice in Vote 1 a 31 per cent increase, in Vote 4 a 20 per cent increase, and in Vote 5 a 110 per cent increase in the moneys allocated for professional-technical staff. Mr. Minister, I'm looking at the object of expenditures, the printouts. I have the information from the printouts. Could you perhaps outline for us in memo form the reason for the increases in votes 1, 4, and 5? Mr. Minister, I say that very frankly, because you talk about the increase in the departmental staff. Several departments use this technique to get in additional people under the guise of people working for the government. So if you could give us the reasons and the projects, that would suffice for the additions in those three votes.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support

Services \$2,446,205

Total Vote 1 — Capital \$29,004

Vote 2 — Pollution Prevention and

Control:

2.1 — Program Support \$1,477,470

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment with regard to this program element. It relates to the tippie at Coleman operated by Coleman Collieries. There have been a number of discussions between the department and Coleman with regard to upgrading or improving that particular tippie operation, or with respect to its relocation. Presently Coleman Collieries is under some difficulty with regard to negotiating new contracts

with the Japanese for their coal. One of their questions is with regard to continued operation of that particular tippie beyond March 1980. My question to the minister is: is the department open with regard to the continued operation of that plant beyond 1980?

MR. RUSSELL: That's a pretty loaded question, Mr. Chairman. We've tried to encourage — and I say encourage — the plant to relocate by 1980 that tippie or plant out of the town of Coleman, where it's presently located. Of course we'd hoped to keep to that objective. Insofar as their production from their activities on Tent Mountain is concerned, we are getting a reclamation deposit, a levy on every ton of coal produced, and that money is being invested in order to assist with the relocation.

It's a very important part of the clean-up of the Crowsnest Pass. I think members are aware of a sanitary landfill project that was mentioned. Substantial improvements by way of utilities are going into that scattering of hamlets and towns through the Pass, and I know the Minister of Transportation is considering fairly hefty expenditures for the upgrading and relocation of Highway 3 as it goes through there. So the relocation of the tippie is all part of an important program for the Pass region.

I can remember Charlie Drain when he was a member here extolling in his own folksy way the need to clean up that valley and get some co-ordinated government there by way of municipal government structure. We're attempting to do that. So I guess I'm trying to say to the member in my roundabout way that we'd be very discouraged if the plans for the relocation of that tippie were set back.

Having said that, I'd have to say, however, one recognizes that the major economic activity of the Pass is predicated on the successful operation of the mine. So if there isn't a mine in operation, or there is in operation a mine that can't relocate the tippie, that becomes an academic question. Put into simpler words, we're hoping they can meet their deadline, but we'll listen to reasons that show why they can't and hope to be open-minded about it.

Agreed to:	
2.2 — Air Quality Management	\$2,094,208
2.3 — Water Quality Management	\$971,207
2.4 — Municipal Water and Sewerage Management	\$6,219,649
2.5 — Earth Contamination Prevention	\$1,238,724
2.6 — Waste Management	\$587,383
2.7 — Chemical and Pesticide Management	\$922,288
Total Vote 2 — Pollution Prevention and Control	\$13,510,929
Total Vote 2 — Capital	\$5,431,165

Vote 3 — Land Conservation:	
3.1 — Program Support	\$72,775
3.2 — Land Conservation and Reclamation	\$1,518,991
3.3 — Land Assembly	\$4,344,984
3.4 — Resource Co-ordination	\$1,116,496
Total Vote 3 — Land Conservation	\$7,053,246
Total Vote 3 — Capital	\$3,616,530

MR. CLARK: I have a question with regard to the grant situation on page 149. Mr. Minister, can you very briefly give us an outline as to what happened

between the estimates of \$340,000 that were approved last year and the forecast this year of \$100,000, and the maintenance at that level? What happened which led to the decision of \$240,000 not being spent; and secondly, to whom are these grants payable? If you want to send a memo, that's quite agreeable.

MR. RUSSELL: There are a variety of those grants to organizations like Outdoors Unlittered, et cetera. I'd better send you a memo compiling them.

Agreed to:

Vote 4 — Water Resources Management:	
4.1 — Program Support	\$62,889
4.2 — Surface Water Development and Control	\$14,172,792
4.3 — Regulatory and Regional Advisory Services	\$962,541
4.4 — Operation and Maintenance of Water Resources Systems	\$3,758,436
4.5 — Data Collection and Inventory	\$2,954,576

4.6 — Water Resources Planning and Co-ordination

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, just a question on this vote. The minister indicated in committee that there were going to be some studies on the South Saskatchewan basin. I would like to ask the minister if they anticipate any interbasin studies. Are any studies planned as far as interbasin water management is concerned?

Another question, Mr. Chairman. The government has committed itself to putting from 500,000 to 700,000 additional acres under irrigation. Could the minister indicate what effect this would have on the flow of the South Saskatchewan River? We have a water agreement at the present time that we have to have so much water flowing over. What effect would this have on the river flow in the Saskatchewan if we have another 500,000 or 700,000 acres under irrigation?

MR. RUSSELL: That's a fairly complex question to answer. I think the best manner in which I've seen it laid out, whereby a layman like myself could understand it, is in the reports done in response to the Eastern Irrigation District relating to their concerns about Eyremore or Bassano. There they go into the needs, the potential, and the available management techniques. If I understand the hon. member's question, if he's looking at some of those options about what would be the effect if something happened, that report about predicted needs to the year 1985 shows you very well how a variety of off-stream storage facilities could meet those needs and how existing canal systems must be upgraded; and the last major factor is the assistance of Calgary Power in regulating their storage dams used for hydro-electric purposes.

MR. MANDEVILLE: The other question: were any studies planned as far as interbasin water management is concerned?

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Chairman. We've said many times that the only transfers that might occur would

be within a basin itself. Certainly the massive inter-basin transfers envisaged by the PRIME program have been abandoned as far as we're concerned.

Agreed to:

4.6 — Water Resources Planning and Co-ordination	\$2,676,896
4.7 — Groundwater Development	\$1,638,027
4.8 — Water Rights Administration	\$679,326

MR. CLARK: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, just a moment. Mr. Minister, I'm not sure this is the exact place to raise it, but I'd like to outline a series of events that happened right in my own constituency. I raise it because of water rights. I know the water rights you're talking about here likely deal with irrigation, but it's a question of whether the Department of the Environment or the Department of Municipal Affairs is responsible.

The scenario goes something like this: the Department of the Environment told the town of Carstairs that by a certain time they had to get their system up to certain requirements or they couldn't expand. Fair ball. That was acceptable. The town then got involved in getting engineering reports to build a sewage system some distance east of town, and a location was agreed upon by the town and their consultants. Now in the course of this acquisition of land — in a down home expression I guess you'd say, but some of it is in a slough — the town started negotiating with the farmers involved when all of a sudden some civil servant came along and said: well, that's a slough, so the land is owned by the province, and why don't you try to lease the land from the province rather than buy it from the farmers?

The town council have found themselves in an impossible situation. On one hand, if they don't try to lease that land from the province they've got their own people in Carstairs saying, you're not looking after our money very well. The other side of the coin is that the farmers, who have paid the taxes on this land for years and years and years, can expect, legitimately I think, that they should be paid for the land even if it goes through the expropriation situation.

Now, Mr. Minister, I raise it here because it's happened as a result of the order issued by your department. There is your department, the associate minister, the people involved, the Department of Municipal Affairs; there is a recent court case that went against the existing legislation and that the province is appealing. It's a sordid mess, to say the least. I recognize that some of the civil servants involved feel there are very heavy stakes in this case. I raise it here, Mr. Minister, not expecting you to have an answer, but to outline the situation, and to say that in all likelihood the town and the farmers affected are going to come to see you and your two colleagues, because it ended up in a very difficult situation, for the farmers affected, for the town, and for all concerned.

As I say, I don't expect a solution. Mind you, if the minister had one we'd all listen with open ears. But it's a messy situation, to say the least.

MR. RUSSELL: The member's right. I don't have a solution; I know what the problem is, though. I hate to do this, but I have to turn back the clock a few years to when you sat on this side and I sat over

there. At that time I think The Public Lands Act was amended whereby all bodies of water were deemed to be lakes, and title rested with the Crown. I didn't know what it meant, but I can recall my colleague from Barrhead at the time predicting dire problems, which are now coming true. It goes back, and we're still carrying on with that. The members will notice in the amendments to The Agricultural Chemicals Amendment Act and The Hazardous Chemicals Act that the definition sections of those still contain references to bodies of water in excess of 10 acres. Of course the darned things move — they dry up and fill up — and what is magic about 10 acres? I understand there is at least one legal case pending on this particular situation in the area, and I'm just as anxious as the hon. member is to see it clarified in the court. I think the people involved were doing the right thing. They went out to acquire land for a sewage lagoon, and when it was discovered that the land was a slough — or a little lake, or whatever you want to call it — it did in fact legally belong to the Crown. That's the explanation of the background of the situation.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, might I say this, and I'm sure the Deputy Premier will fully appreciate this: that isn't the first time the Deputy Premier's been right.

DR. HORNER: Very generous.

MR. CLARK: Well, very generous. But seriously, once the court cases get out of the way, is the government looking at making some changes in The Public Lands Act — whether it was passed prior to or after 1971, and whoever was to blame? I don't mind taking the responsibility. But let's say, after seven years of Conservative government, let's get the thing straightened around if you had such foresight seven years ago.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 4 — Water Resources Management	\$26,905,483
Total Vote 4 — Capital	\$14,487,664

Vote 5 — Environmental Research:

5.1 — Environmental Research Co-ordination	\$919,911
5.2 — Alberta Oil Sands Environmental Research	\$4,000,000
5.3 — General Environmental Research	\$668,280

MR. CLARK: The last question I have, Mr. Minister, really deals with the whole Cold Lake situation. A few days back your colleague the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources outlined what he sees his department doing in this area. My question is: what have the present activities of the Department of the Environment been with regard to the proposed Cold Lake oil sands project? Secondly, Mr. Minister, what activity in that area does the minister's department anticipate being involved in this year, given the fact the ERCB will shortly be opening hearings again to deal with the deficiencies and the possible scenario of, let's say, a decision being made at the end of this year or the first part of next year? I raise the question because I find the people in the Cold Lake area

basically saying, look, we'd like to see the proposition go ahead if some of our concerns can be dealt with. One of the concerns raised very often is this whole environmental impact, as far as the lake itself is concerned and in the area. So that's why I'd like to pose the question to you and have you take a few minutes to outline what your department has been doing there in the past year and, more importantly, what involvement the minister's department sees for itself in the next number of months.

MR. RUSSELL: That's a good question, Mr. Chairman. When the company outlined its plans to government with respect to the proposal several months ago, the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources set up an interdepartmental task force, for lack of a better term, that could work with the company. Our major input on that has been in two fields: land reclamation and water resource management.

The advice I've been given is that the land reclamation aspect is probably, in a relative sense, not a very serious problem. In other words, there's a good history of drilling activities in the province, and I think that can be handled pretty expeditiously.

The problems concerning water resource management, the waste water and the make-up water, are more serious, but not ones that we see as being insurmountable. They're serious in that the large quantities of water being used in the process make it a big problem to handle. But I can only say that for several months now there has been ongoing communication and work with the company by way of our department insofar as those activities are concerned. Of course most of those will be identified, and the weaknesses have been identified in the environmental impact assessment stage.

If coal operations are going to be involved, of course the Department of the Environment would be directly involved there in land reclamation requirements and, again, with the reclamation levy by way of cash requirements. Also the Deputy Minister of the Environment now sits as a member of the ERCB in hearing applications where coal activities are concerned. So we're trying to work with the company from the ground floor up.

I'd say that the major problems are associated with the handling of the water used in the process.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I make the same point to you that I made to your colleague the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. I think the government is spending too much of its time working with the company and not enough time letting the people in that area know what your department is doing, Mr. Minister. Just in your own comments I jotted down here about working with the company involved. I recognize that that's a major portion of the department's responsibility. But, Mr. Minister, one of the concerns I feel pretty keenly in that whole area is that while your people are working with the company, somehow that information isn't getting to the people out there who, rightly or wrongly, feel that they can be adversely affected if your department doesn't look after their interests pretty seriously.

I make the same pitch to you that I made to your colleague the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. For goodness' sake, take these people

into your confidence. In some of the negotiations between the company and the government I recognize that may not be possible, but basically on a day to day situation that should be the case.

I make the point again, as I have several times in the course of this session, that I think the government can save itself a lot of grief down the road if when you talk about working with the company, in the same breath you will talk about working with the people in the area, give them all the information possible. I would say also, get out there and assure the people who possibly can be affected that you are prepared to do that.

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, I believe that is happening and will happen. We have the community advisory committee now. I look back on prior experiences similar to this, like Cooking Lake or the Oldman. I think members have probably seen some of the tabloids and met some of our people who go out and try to work with this communications thing. I think there's a limit to the role Environment has if they deal with environmental problems, but certainly our experience has been that any time spent in communicating with the citizens of a region is time well spent. I can't disagree with anything the leader proposed.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 5 — Environmental Research	\$5,588,191
Total Vote 5 — Capital	\$524,000

Total Vote 6 — Overview and Co-ordination of Environment Conservation	\$917,836
---	-----------

Capital Estimates:

Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$29,004
--	----------

2.1 — Program Support	\$77,450
2.2 — Air Quality Management	\$152,900
2.3 — Water Quality Management	\$50,600
2.4 — Municipal Water and Sewerage Management	\$4,979,600
2.5 — Earth Contamination Prevention	\$95,345
2.6 — Waste Management	\$58,500
2.7 — Chemical and Pesticide Management	\$16,770
Total Vote 2 — Pollution Prevention and Control	\$5,431,165

3.1 — Program Support	\$1,200
3.2 — Land Conservation and Reclamation	\$4,930

MR. CLARK: Mr. Minister, I assume a portion of this, about one-third of it, is aimed at the Red Deer Dam project. Either now or sometime in the future, can you give us a breakdown of the other broad general areas?

MR. RUSSELL: In land or the Red Deer project?

MR. CLARK: Land assembly.

MR. RUSSELL: Land assembly covers a variety of projects, not only for our own programs, such as for drainage districts or lake stabilization, where it's necessary to acquire lands usually from individual farmers. We also act as a purchasing agent for other departments of government, such as Recreation, Parks and Wildlife and, sometimes to a degree, Agri-

culture, and the Associate Minister of Energy and Natural Resources responsible for Public Lands in the acquisition of properties for grazing reserves.

Those are the major expenditures. The other ones would be acquisitions that might occur in restricted development areas.

Agreed to:

3.3 — Land Assembly	\$3,604,400
3.4 — Resource Co-ordination	\$6,000
Total Vote 3 — Land Conservation	\$3,616,530

4.1 — Program Support	—
4.2 — Surface Water Development and Control	\$11,559,070
4.3 — Regulatory and Regional Advisory Services	\$5,145
4.4 — Operation and Maintenance of Water Resource Systems	\$715,865
4.5 — Data Collection and Inventory	\$81,000
4.6 — Water Resources Planning and Co-ordination	\$1,222,516
4.7 — Groundwater Development	\$896,493
4.8 — Water Rights Administration	\$7,575
Total Vote 4 — Water Resources Management	\$14,487,664

5.1 — Environmental Research Co-ordination	\$5,500
5.2 — Alberta Oil Sands Environmental Research	\$334,500
5.3 — General Environmental Research	\$184,000
Total Vote 5 — Environmental Research	\$524,000

Vote 6 — Overview and Co-ordination of Environment Conservation	—
Total Capital Estimates	\$24,088,363

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we have a report from the chairman of Subcommittee A, please.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, Subcommittee A of the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the estimates of expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979, for the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Subcommittee recommends to the Committee of Supply the estimates of expenditures of \$9,278,466 . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it's the Department of the Environment rather than . . .

MR. KROEGER: I have all three, Mr. Chairman. I'll read them all. We'll try number two.

Subcommittee A of the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the estimates of expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979, for the Department of the Environment. The Subcommittee recommends to the Committee of Supply the estimates of expenditures of \$56,421,890.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that the report of the chairman of Subcommittee A be received?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Agreed to:	
Department Total	\$56,421,890

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

[Motion carried]

Department of the Solicitor General

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

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that these estimates were gone over exhaustively in subcommittee, I thought I would refrain from boring hon. members with further remarks, in the hope that the age of miracles is not yet past and we can do something in 15 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any general questions to the minister?

Agreed to:

1.0.1 — Minister's Office	\$88,460
1.0.2 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$110,176
1.0.3 — Finance and Administration	\$769,382
1.0.4 — Personnel	\$563,460
1.0.5 — Staff Training	\$339,208
1.0.6 — Research, Planning, and Evaluation	\$166,304
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$2,036,990
Total Vote 1 — Capital	\$28,630

2.1 — Program Support	\$950,376
2.2 — Institutional Services	\$25,742,580
2.3 — Community Corrections	\$5,507,129
2.4 — Native Courtworkers	\$742,000
Total Vote 2 — Correctional Services	\$32,942,085
Total Vote 2 — Capital	\$647,310

3.1 — Program Support	\$793,338
3.2 — Financial Support for Policing	\$41,012,900
3.3 — Highway Motor Patrol	\$2,037,563
Total Vote 3 — Law Enforcement	\$43,843,801
Total Vote 3 — Capital	\$325,025

Vote 4 — Motor Vehicle Registration and Driver Licensing:

4.1 — Program Support	\$4,141,112
-----------------------	-------------

4.2 — Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to pose a question to the Solicitor General on this with regard to some of our smaller centres. I understand only the major centres in the province are now selling PSV and E licences. Could the Solicitor General indicate the reasons for some of our smaller centres not handling these types of licences, the public service and the E licences?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Chairman, we had an efficiency survey done by a consulting firm. The demand for PSV licences is limited, and in a period of financial restraint it seems only reasonable those special categories should be concentrated in natural focal market centres rather in the numerous centres we had before. In the hon. member's particular area, Brooks

seems to be a natural place to have facilities for that sort of thing. It requires a little more skill than the issuing of licences for Class 5 types of vehicles, private passenger vehicles; all private issuing agents are not competent to handle it.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, one quick question to the Solicitor General. I wonder when the department is going to clear up the problem. I don't know if it's evident in the urban areas such as Edmonton and Calgary, but I know in my area of Stony Plain you have to go to the treasury branch twice to get your driver's licence. You have to go in and get your picture taken and come back and have it all sealed. I wonder if there's some way we can speed this process up, so people don't have to come in twice?

MR. FARRAN: We've got the new way. The new licence will be a one-stop deal, the new two-part licence. Anybody who comes up now for renewal or a new licence will only have to go once. We are in the process this year of taking over the function of the treasury branch satellite offices, so we'll be able to operate in better than banking hours.

Agreed to:

4.2 — Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing	\$8,462,342
4.3 — Information Services	\$1,000,107
Total Vote 4 — Motor Vehicle Registration and Driver Licensing	\$13,603,561
Total Vote 4 — Capital	\$77,787

Total Vote 5 — Control and Development of Horse Racing	\$1,540,000
--	-------------

Capital Estimates:

1.0 — Departmental Support Services	\$28,630
2.0 — Correctional Services	\$647,310
3.0 — Law Enforcement	\$325,025
4.0 — Motor Vehicle Registration and Driver Licensing	\$77,787

Total Capital Estimates	\$1,078,752
-------------------------	-------------

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we could have a report now from the chairman of Subcommittee B with respect to the Solicitor General.

MR. DONNELLY: Mr. Chairman, Subcommittee B of the Committee of Supply has under consideration the estimates of expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979, for the Department of the Solicitor General. The subcommittee recommends to the Committee of Supply the estimates of expenditures of \$93,966,437.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've heard the report from the chairman of Subcommittee B. Are you agreed the report be received?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Agreed to:

Department Total	\$93,966,437
------------------	--------------

MR. FARRAN: I move these estimates be reported.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman the miracle is even greater than the hon. Solicitor General thought. We did it in seven minutes. [laughter]

[Motion carried]

[The Committee of Supply recessed at 5:22 p.m. and resumed at 8 p.m.]

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

Executive Council

Agreed to:

Vote 1 — Executive Council

Administration:

1.0.1 — Office of the Premier	\$297,330
1.0.2 — Administrative Support	\$896,736
1.0.3 — Office of the Lieutenant Governor	\$43,086

1.0.4 — Project Management

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we might start the discussion here by asking for some elaboration with regard to just what's involved in Project Management. I see an increase of something like 27.4 per cent.

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, I'd be happy to answer that. The addition in Project Management is due largely to the special adviser to the Premier on medical research, Dr. Bradley. It amounts to some \$82,270. That of course includes Dr. Bradley's contract, the secretary who works with him, and the very heavy travelling expenses that we estimate for him for the coming year.

In addition, the balance is not much of an increase. In fact, I think it's fairly flat in terms of Project Management which, as hon. members know, is a unit within the Executive Council given assignments from time to time and, in addition, provision of some \$135,000 in general consulting fees.

So there are really three elements to the \$361,000: \$135,000 involving consulting fees, some \$82,000 involving Dr. Bradley and his organization, and then the people who are working on Project Management, being seven total man-years.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the Premier. Mr. Premier, would you elaborate somewhat for us on the \$135,000 addition as far as consulting fees are concerned?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, it's really an amount we put in to cover a forecast. Some years we have not spent very much of it. If hon. members look back, for example, at the estimates under '76-77 actual, they'll notice quite a small figure of \$80,000 compared with the comparable estimates or the forecast for the current year. It's an amount we place in there when we feel we need consulting fees over the year.

We usually use that account if we find it's consulting that covers not just one portfolio but a number of them.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the Premier. Could you explain for us the relationship as far as Dr. Bradley is concerned? I really ask this for two reasons. One, what kind of relationship is there with Dr. Bradley and the line department? Secondly, what kinds of responsibilities does Dr. Bradley have with regard to, I think, the heart research that's going on?

I ask the question because I've had some people say to me pretty directly: look, we've got someone in the Premier's office; we've got a new Department of Hospitals and Medical Care; what are the relationships? What really was the basic thinking behind going that route, rather than leaving Dr. Bradley in the department so he would be able, for lack of a better term, to intermesh with the line department itself?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, the reason was this: it was felt that the plans we have with regard to medical research although they bear extensively upon the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, for obvious reasons, and there will be some interface with the appropriations in the capital projects division with regard to applied heart and cancer research, they also interface very closely with the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower in the sense of working with the two medical faculties at the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary. They interface, as well, with the Department of Social Services and Community Health in terms of other health needs.

So our plan with regard to medical research does not relate exclusively to any one line department. It is a plan that is in the evolving stage of assessing the degree we would go to with regard to a medical research plan, the way in which it is to be funded, the priorities it would be given, the vehicle that would be established, and the vehicle in terms of its relationships to at least those three departments.

We have a subcommittee of the cabinet, chaired by the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower with the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care and the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, that will take over, so to speak, from the office of the Premier when a certain stage is reached. That stage, of course, would be when proposals are made to the Legislature.

MR. CLARK: What time line is the government looking at for these proposals being made to the office of the Premier, then the Premier's office bringing some sort of outline to the Legislature of what the government's going to do in this area? Also, how is Dr. Bradley's office going about the process of developing this framework that's going to be used for health research?

As I assess the thing, from talking once again to people in the medical community, we have a pretty exciting possibility here. But if we get the thing off on anything other than the right feet, we can spend an awful lot of money without getting very much result. That's why I asked the question on the time line; secondly, and more important, the mechanism Dr.

Bradley and the Premier's office are going through in pulling this thing together.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, I really think the first question is partly answered by the second question, because it's quite true that the vehicle that would be contemplated by a government, such as the Alberta government at this stage, is unique in Canada. Certainly we have the very disastrous circumstances of the federal government policy on medical research, the up and down policy, which has really set back medical research in this country, in my judgment.

If you are going to involve people in research — we're talking now about pure research as distinguished from the applied research within the two appropriations in the capital projects division — you can't put them in the position of justification of results in anything other than a fairly significant time frame. Some people suggest a five-, eight-, 10-year time frame; that that is the only fair way to make that sort of assessment. We are trying, therefore, to establish an organization and vehicle which will meet the longer term needs of certainty in order to attract outstanding researchers to the organization; give an opportunity to people who are now on the research side or inclined toward the research side of medical research here in Alberta; and, in addition, provide some relationship with the university and with universities throughout the country for people to come here to make this truly a medical centre.

So I fully concur in the observation of the Leader of the Opposition that it is important that this vehicle when it's established be established in a way that maximizes its probabilities of being able to meet those objectives and minimizes the expectations of our citizens as to immediate, short-term, or even intermediate-term results. For that reason we have not put any particular time line on when we evolve this plan. It would be our undertaking to the Legislature that when the plan is evolved, it would be presented at either the forthcoming spring or fall session. So I am not sure whether it would be next fall, next spring, or after that.

It's an evolving pattern. There are an awful lot of people to consult. Dr. Bradley is consulting with a number of them. There are internal meetings and discussions with the medical profession, other health groups, medical faculties, university people, research people generally, people in medical research in various centres in Canada, and already with some people in the United States. So I can't give the hon. member even a time frame, except to say that when we feel we have a vehicle worthy of debate in this Legislature, it will be presented forthwith.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, what kinds of ballpark budgetary guidelines have been given to Dr. Bradley in the course of putting this together? I ask that because I'm sure one of the criteria he has to keep in mind is what kind of money we are looking at over a period of, the Premier said, five, eight to 10 years.

MR. LOUGHEED: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition is talking about the guidelines for the vehicle itself, we purposely haven't given him any. We want him to conduct a study, and come back to us with a proposition that provides a range of financial support, then an evaluation as to the as-

assessment of what will happen within a given range. Then we would make a decision based on alternatives.

If we give him a range, guidelines, or parameters for a dollar commitment by the government, I think that in itself may tend to create at least some aspects of the very vehicle that we want him to be free to recommend to us, either with alternatives, or one in preference to others. So we haven't given him that sort of direction. Our objective has been general: give us a proposal, after full consultation with all the people you can discuss it with that are worth while, that you think is practical for us to present to the Legislature as a vehicle for medical research to make this truly a medical research centre for Canada.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the Premier. Dr. Bradley has been given no financial guidelines. We may be looking at, let's say, \$5 million or \$10 million over a period of five years. That's still in the air, a decision the government hasn't made.

Secondly, to the Premier. What priorities in the area of medical research . . . It's fine to say we want to be the leader as far as medical research is concerned. Previously we've talked in terms of, if I recall correctly, cancer and heart. Are those still the two areas the government is zeroing in on, tying in with what's been approved earlier in the heritage savings trust fund budget?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, a very useful question. The answer is no. I think it's very important for hon. members to keep clear the way we consider and assess the two applied research areas under the two appropriations within the capital projects division of the heritage savings trust fund, and the concept of developing a medical research vehicle.

Under applied research we have areas dealing with heart, cardiac care, and cancer, and many aspects — as the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, I believe, pointed out on a couple of occasions to the Legislature — involving upgrading of equipment, taking some of the facilities now in operation and expanding their utilization factor, taking some of the things proven in other areas and putting them into force here, and taking some areas that have perhaps passed the pilot stage — some of the cardiac care rehabilitation I think the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care brought forward that we're trying to evolve now into a rehabilitation emphasis. This is what we call applied research in terms of those two votes.

The medical research does not feel — and I made it abundantly clear to Dr. Bradley and the others involved, and the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care is well aware of this. The proposal they put to us should not be constrained by pure research into those areas. They may be the areas they come up with, but they may well not be. One of the difficulties in this whole field for an area such as ours, segregated as we are in North America, small in population, is not to duplicate research done in other parts of the world.

We're very privileged. About five weeks ago tonight I met with a group of 14 people from the university and medical community across the province, mainly from the university in the research area. I think we're very fortunate that Dr. Bradley can call

upon the talent that is already available. They are people in the medical field. Just to mention one: Dr. Walter MacKenzie, who has a renowned reputation in the world in these matters. He, amongst others, has said to us that we should go very carefully here, and we should make sure we're not establishing the priorities too early in this field.

Agreed to:

1.0.4 — Project Management

\$361,615

1.0.5 — Protocol

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I presume this is the vote where whatever expenses the province assumes with respect to the visit of Her Majesty the Queen will be taken up.

Mr. Chairman, to either the Premier or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs: are we in any better position today to outline what the plans will be this summer with respect to the visit?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, a very appropriate question for this item; but the answer is we're not. We've had some discussions, through Mr. de Rappard in my office together with Major Whalley in Protocol, with Mr. Henry Davis of Ottawa. Mr. Davis is going to be discussing a preliminary itinerary, and it's strictly preliminary, in the Palace in early May. We haven't wanted to be public about those discussions until we have some awareness of whether or not what's being discussed is considered acceptable to Her Majesty and to representatives in the Palace. I think the hon. member and all hon. members would agree that perhaps nothing would be more unfortunate than to give people a sort of feeling that something was going to happen and was part of a program we proposed, then have the Palace come back to us and say, no, that doesn't fit their approach to it.

So regrettably I can't respond to that question. I would hope before the spring session concludes we could make the itinerary public in this Legislature.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the reason I ask is that there have been reports that the Queen will be visiting particular communities, and of course this creates widespread interest in other communities. I had understood from the questions last week that there hadn't been a nailing down, if you like, of the itinerary. So at this stage those reports would be speculative. Would that be a fair appraisal? With the exception of the Queen's presence at the Commonwealth Games, which brings her to Alberta in the first place, has the rest of the itinerary not been finalized at this juncture?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, in response to the hon. member's question, rather than use the word "speculative", I'd tend to use the words "preliminary" and "tentative". There has been no official statement from our office or from the office of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, for the reasons I've explained. I can say, so this would exclude a fair number of constituencies, that we intend to follow the Speech from the Throne statement that the visit will include those communities in northern Alberta.

Agreed to:

1.0.5 — Protocol

\$158,944

MR. CLARK: Just before we pass, Mr. Chairman. To the Premier: when the government announced the guidelines they expected municipalities and local governments to follow, perhaps the criticism heard most often of the way those guidelines were implemented was the fact that Executive Council itself, as individual members, chose to live by those guidelines, but in fact the staff of Executive Council were exempt. I believe the increases went from — I'm trusting to memory here — something like 18 to 25 per cent. When I look at the total Executive Council appropriation, the estimates last year and this year, there was a 22.1 per cent increase. Now even taking out of that an 81.5 per cent increase for hospitality, and saying that the bulk of that is for the Queen coming to Alberta, that still leaves the Executive Council appropriation well above the kinds of guidelines we've been telling municipalities across the province that, in fact, they should be living with.

I raise the point here, Mr. Chairman, because I think it's pretty difficult for us to be that convincing to some of the people who have to carry the load locally, when we look at this kind of situation. So I ask specifically of the Premier his justification for the pretty sizable increases that took place with regard to assistance to the Executive Council, which was primarily the area that most criticism was made of the government when it brought down the spending guidelines.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the only way I could respond is that if you look at the five votes in the Executive Council, first of all you see the Office of the Premier being at a 6 per cent increase, then the Executive Council administration at 12.9 per cent. That's due to a number of factors that I already have been describing.

When you deal with a matter of salaries, I look at it particularly this way: any one of these organizations that we involved in grants will make their decisions with regard to compensation in a multitude of ways. They'll make it on a basis of overall collective bargaining. They'll make it in terms of management and supervision management cases. Essentially our view is that we have and need to have in the Executive Council of this province as effective people as we can get. They're mainly on contract, and we intend to be able to maintain them.

Part of our problem in government generally, as I'm sure the hon. leader is aware, is that as the situation becomes prosperous in the province, the competing or bidding for people increases. Therefore it's important that we compare them truly with what goes on in the private sector. If the people involved in this area are management, supervision, administrative people whose salaries are ascertained on the basis of comparison with the private sector — and I believe very clearly we're talking about the management side. Now the grants we give, be it to universities — I'm not sure they'd want to make this comparison very closely — to city governments, municipal governments, to other organizations, is a matter, therefore, of comparison with regard to the people at the senior management level.

These people involved primarily within my office

are at the centre of government in Alberta, at the senior management level. That's the way I look at them and expect them to be able to perform. We therefore do not think it is at all a credible argument to suggest that our position with regard to management people on staff and on contract is relative to the guidelines, because all those organizations in terms of their grants have within their own budgets full flexibility to do that.

We have, however, responded to the general tenor of the credibility of our guidelines in the place that it's meaningful. That meaningful place is of course the remuneration that goes to members of the Executive Council. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is abundantly clear that the decision we have taken in that regard was crucial in terms of the credibility of our guidelines, and has been accepted so by the citizens of the province.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 — Executive Council
Administration

\$1,757,711

Total Vote 1 — Capital

\$3,600

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would take it that during the course of this estimate we probably should be dealing with both votes 2 and 3, because Vote 2 deals with the Native Secretariat and Vote 3 deals with assistance to native organizations. Before I proceed I'd be guided by the Chair. I'd like to make a number of points. I think it would be appropriate if I made them all, and they deal with both votes 2 and 3.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to pose a number of questions to the Minister Without Portfolio in charge of the Native Secretariat. These questions flow from a number of meetings I've held during the past year, some are specific and several are of a more general nature. Shortly after the Legislature reconvened, a meeting of zone six Alberta Metis Association was held in Peace River. During that meeting a number of the specific questions I'll be putting to the minister were brought to my attention.

However, Mr. Chairman, before getting into those I'd like to deal with some of the more general issues that I think have to be assessed when one looks at the relationship of the Alberta government and our native people. The first issue of some concern to me is the approach toward funding, the so-called program funding as a substitute for core funding. As I understand the government's announcement last fall, shortly after the Legislature prorogued, the provincial share of funds for the Indian Association of Alberta, the Metis Association, and the Voice of Alberta Native Women was changed from core funding to program funding. In the case of the Metis Association, it's my understanding that decision was made on a retroactive basis. I believe the announcement was made early in November, but the core funding was cut off October 1. In any event that is the information I've been given.

I would ask the minister first of all to advise the Assembly what reasons motivated the government's change in policy. I remember discussing this in the House in 1972, I guess it was, the first time I had occasion to deliberate on the estimates. At that time there was support for the concept of core funding for native organizations. Now we find a situation where the core funding for the Metis Association and the

Indian Association comes in large part from the federal government and the provincial share is restricted to various program projects.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is a danger in that kind of shift. I say that hoping not to be combative, but to lay out the other alternative. The whole thrust of the argument for core funding during the late '60s and early '70s was to give disadvantaged people an opportunity to have sufficient strength in their organization to begin to do the job themselves, a bootstraps approach, if you like, which would underline the tremendous resource of volunteerism that exists among people whose organization was receiving core funding.

Mr. Chairman, in my view, the shift from core funding to program funding, particularly as it appears that no money will be made available to the senior organizations to set up these projects; that is, either the Metis Association or the Indian Association — I gather there will be salary and remuneration for some people working on the projects. But it's my understanding that the organizations trying to set up the field projects will not be able to charge salary, remuneration, or expenses in the process.

I would say to you, Mr. Minister, that's going to pose a pretty serious problem, at least that was the representation unanimously brought to my attention by zone six of the Metis Association. First of all is the problem of getting these locals all registered under The Societies Act. That's going to take a fair amount of field work. Who's going to do it? Who's going out to the communities to go through the process so applications can be properly made out and processed? A good deal of field work is involved in establishing projects to meet the qualifications of the Native Secretariat. Who's going to do that? If money isn't made available to the field staff of the respective associations, or at least if the money that is made available is the federal portion and not the former provincial share of core funding, then it seems to me that these organizations are caught in a very difficult financial bind. The inevitable result has been substantial cutback in staff, at least in several organizations.

Mr. Minister, in my view, however attractive one might find the local projects, the restriction of the latitude of the central organization to act on behalf of a group of people will be a very serious obstacle in tackling some of the long-term problems that native Albertans face.

The second major area I'd like to deal with is where things now stand with ANDCO. It's my understanding that on January 25 the doors were essentially closed on ANDCO. Last fall we had considerable debate on the audit that was to take place. I would like the minister to bring us fully up to date on where things stand on that. Even more important, Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it is vital to know what strategy we have to substitute the policies in the future to take the place of ANDCO. If ANDCO is in fact dead, if it's wrapped up, what mechanism are we going to utilize in the future? Where do things stand on the whole question of the equity fund? If we aren't going to develop specific policies for native people, what changes have been made as far as the Alberta opportunity fund is concerned?

While I am dealing with that question, Mr. Minister, another specific issue of concern that has been

brought to my attention is the problems faced by native contractors who would like to get a piece of the action in northern Alberta. Unfortunately under Indian Affairs the extent of the backing for a contractor is a \$15,000 bond. For them to participate fully in some of these larger projects, we're obviously going to have to look at substantially larger bonding. To what extent would the province be prepared to underwrite the difference in the bonding to make it possible for some of these native contracting firms to move into the development of projects in northern Alberta?

Mr. Chairman, moving from those general questions, I'd like to deal with three or four specific matters. I gather the friendship centres are in the process of trying to set up a provincial association. At this stage I gather the government is not in favor of funding a provincial association. Why not? It seems to me there is some merit in having a provincial association, rather than seeing our Native Secretariat become more and more the centralized control mechanism of native projects in the province.

DR. BUCK: The handout system.

MR. NOTLEY: The hon. Member for Clover Bar says "the handout system".

The fact of the matter is that the Native Secretariat does seem to be exercising an enormous amount of power, influence, and control. I would say to members of the House: we have to take a pretty close look at whether that's the route we want to follow. Obviously it's the route the Tory caucus wants to follow, because I gather this was all discussed in caucus. But it hasn't been formally aired in the Legislature. Probably it's time we did discuss it in some detail.

A very specific question also was brought to my attention at Peace River: the land claims at Grovedale, south and west of Grande Prairie. I understand there have been some problems in that area. I think people would like to get a claim on approximately three-quarters of a section. It involves the planning commission. I wonder if the minister would bring us up to date on just where that matter stands.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, one of the questions that related not only to native Albertans but to the whole trapping industry is this business of what happens to traplines when seismic work, oil exploration, or even lumbering takes place, and we have the trapline destroyed. The Trappers Association has been arguing for some time that we should establish a board, a trappers' compensation board, similar to the Surface Rights Board, or some kind of mechanism that will allow a proper adjudication of claims trappers make against industry that is interfering with their traplines. In raising that issue I would just underscore that while it's a matter of more than a little concern to native people, it also was discussed at some length at the Alberta Trappers Association convention in Grande Prairie last year and, if I'm not mistaken, I believe it is the official policy of the Trappers Association.

So these are some of the issues I would invite the minister to respond to.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In response to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, who has raised a number of questions in a very delicate area, I

might first go to the general concept of project funding. Just to clarify for the hon. member, we are talking about project funding rather than program funding. The concept is one we've been working on in Native Affairs and with the Native Secretariat and various native organizations for some time. It's not something that was developed late last year and then sprung on some organizations.

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that while I stood in my place last year during estimates, I spoke about the isolated communities and the way we as a government, and we as the native affairs portion of government, intended to deal with those various communities. That was basically through a project funding arrangement. We were quite satisfied — "we" meaning both the staff of the Native Secretariat as the public arm of Native Affairs, and me as the elected person, the minister, in consultation with MLAs in whose constituencies the various isolated communities were located — that it was a worth-while project.

For some time there's been concern as to the overlapping of funding by the federal Secretary of State on the one hand, and us in Native Affairs on the other. The hon. member made specific reference to the Metis Association of Alberta, the Indian Association of Alberta, and the Voice of Alberta Native Women. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate that in no way has there been a cutback in funding to those organizations. On the contrary, the budgets of all three organizations have been increased by 10 per cent. In a year of restraint, I think that is significant in itself.

But, Mr. Chairman, going back to the original concern we had, that the overlapping of funding provided by the Secretary of State and us was not a healthy situation, in the late summer or early fall of this past year the office of the Secretary of State came out with a new set of guidelines for funding native organizations. This was not done entirely in isolation. Various members of the Native Secretariat staff had considerable input with their counterparts in Ottawa.

The policy of the Secretary of State called for funds to be provided to the Indian and Metis associations to cover what we basically refer to as the core funding operations: funds to provide for a full-time president, an executive officer, certain field officers, and support staff in the area of secretaries and clerk-stenos. In addition to funds for wages, salary, and honoraria — money was also set aside for travel and honoraria for board members so they could meet on a regular basis — there was a special allocation of funds for an annual assembly to be held once a year. The operations of the office itself — rent as well as utilities, telephones, and sundry expenses — are also covered by the Secretary of State's funding. In the case of the Metis Association, the first of the organizations mentioned by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I might mention that the total funding for wages, honoraria, and travel, as well as the operation of the office itself, is in excess of \$300,000 per year.

While the House was in session last fall, Mr. Chairman, meetings were held with the presidents and executive members of the Metis Association, the Voice of Alberta Native Women, and the Indian Association. All the meetings took place while the House was in session, not after as has been indicated by the hon. member. The concept of project funding was placed on the table, and an indication was given that

it was our intent as government to move to project funding for those organizations from that point on.

In the case of the Indian Association and the Voice of Alberta Native Women, their third quarterly cheques had been sent out. Therefore, we were speaking of their fourth quarterly cheques as of January 1, 1978.

In the case of the Metis Association, as there had been some questions with regard to the budget of the third quarter, that cheque had not yet been issued. Once this new policy came into effect, after the meeting held with the president and executive of the board, the funds to be provided to that association would be on a project funding basis rather than on a core funding basis. At that time, I myself made an offer to the Metis Association executive — it's in our minutes and their minutes — that if there was a shortfall due to the change from the old core funding project approach to strictly project funding, we as members of Native Affairs would certainly be willing to look at that, to sit down and see if we could make some kind of compensation for that shortfall.

To me the concept of project funding is an exciting one, Mr. Chairman. It's exciting because it gives us an opportunity to get to the local level of the Metis Association, the chapters in the Voice of Alberta Native Women, and on the reserves in the Indian Association, and to do things with people on that level. We want to do it with the assistance and co-operation of the central executive bodies, but part of the concept is to see that more of the funds are channelled down to the local level.

With regard to the meeting held in Peace River, a zone six meeting of which I understand the hon. member for Spirit River-Fairview attended a portion, there was a social on the Saturday evening and the actual working meeting was on the Sunday. It's my understanding the hon. member for Spirit River-Fairview was at the social portion on the Saturday evening. The working meeting, which took place the following day and was attended by the executive director of the Native Secretariat, Mr. Calvin Lee, is the portion of the meeting when they actually got down to business, when they talked about project funding.

I must say the report I had back was encouraging. It was encouraging because once the presidents of the various locals from northwestern Alberta realized that for the first time their individual locals had an opportunity to obtain some government funding for specific projects, there was a new awareness, a door was being opened to them that never had been opened before. With the kinds of projects coming in from not only the locals but the various chapters of the Voice of Alberta Native Women, I note that the concept is taking hold, that various groups across the province are becoming involved and want to develop projects in their own communities.

If the hon. member has any further questions on project funding, he may raise them later.

Mr. Chairman, another concern was raised with regard to ANDCO, the Alberta Native Development Corporation, an organization which was established, as all members know, by the Indian and Metis associations of Alberta. A request was made in 1974, I believe, for funding from the provincial government. Funds were provided at that time by the Department of Labour and Manpower, and during the past year the funds were transferred to the Department of

Business Development and Tourism.

Members of the Assembly will recall that certain unanswered questions as to the audit of ANDCO were giving great concern to us as members of this government. In a clear communication with the presidents of the two parent organizations, as well as with the president of ANDCO, I stated that before any further funding from the province of Alberta would be provided, those areas of concern had to be clarified and that would be done through an independent audit and management evaluation. Once those questions were answered, we would proceed with establishing funding for ANDCO for a three-year period at, I believe, approximately \$240,000 per year. Half was to be used in the core funding office operation and half for specific projects very much like the kind outlined by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview when he asked about bonding.

Mr. Chairman, the answers were never given. The Indian Association agreed to the audit; the Metis Association did not. It was not our intention as a government, as was suggested by one native person in this province, to send in the RCMP. We weren't talking about fraud; we were talking about an audit, to find out where government funds had gone — public funds, the people's funds. Those answers were never given; the funds were not released. It's my understanding that ANDCO has officially folded and closed its doors.

With regard to friendship centres, Mr. Chairman, I'm extremely proud of the development that has taken place in the nine friendship centres in this province, a development that has taken place from the grass roots level; not under the guise of anyone else, or any other group, or government, but by each individual friendship centre. Those centres are moving ahead today. In fact a week from this Sunday I, along with the MLA for the constituency, will have the pleasure of attending the opening of a the new Napee friendship centre in Pincher Creek. Calgary is rapidly moving along under a very dynamic building committee headed by Mr. Ray Lee. Their new centre should begin sometime this summer. They've had excellent co-operation from the city of Calgary and various citizens in the city, both on an encouragement basis as well as through direct participation in funding.

With regard to a provincial association, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to clarify one fallacy the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has placed on the table with regard to this government's approach to the provincial association. Rather than opposing a provincial association, we encourage it. We encourage it to the point where we sent two delegates to a regional meeting in Vancouver in January this year and two delegates to a national meeting in Ottawa. We asked them to come back and report to the various friendship centres.

One thing should be kept in mind, Mr. Chairman. If the provincial association is to represent the nine friendship centres in this province, it must be responsible to those friendship centres. Rather than receiving the funding from the top and funnelling it down to the provincial association, it's our concept that the funds should be provided to the nine friendship centres in the province. They in turn have a choice as to whether or not they wish to fund their provincial association. If they do, they have every right. But in

turn that association will be held accountable to the nine centres. That's the concept we've been going on for the past three years. It's the one we will continue to follow, recognizing that we support a provincial association but not by providing funds directly to the association and around the nine centres; it will be through those centres.

The area of land claims is another item raised by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I can't go into detail on that tonight. The question of the three-quarter section southwest of Grande Prairie is an ongoing concern, one that is being looked at by the Land Tenure Secretariat. Certainly the Land Tenure Secretariat, under the Minister of Municipal Affairs, can't solve overnight all the problems that have developed in the area of land; it's going to take time. They've been working very hard in the area of Wabasca-Desmarais, the largest unorganized community in this province. Once that task is complete, they will be moving to other centres like Anzac, Fort Mackay, and some of the isolated communities. In time they will get to the situation raised by the hon. member, and we encourage MLAs to work with the Land Tenure Secretariat in that regard.

Traplines, the last area raised by the hon. member, is indeed an item of concern. As the province develops and as more people move out to what was once referred to as unoccupied Crown land, and as there is greater activity by the oil and gas industries as well as other groups looking for various sources of wealth, the trapper — that individual, hardy, free-spirited person who has been able to make a living for so many decades off the land — finds he is coming into conflict with these groups. I've had numerous discussions with members of the Trappers Association and with some of the native people involved. We've examined some ways in which we might be able to assist. I hope that before my tenure in this position is up I will be able to come back with something in a very positive way in that regard. But at this time, it's an item we're giving serious consideration to, and we want input from both sides. We want input from the oil and gas industry and what they feel their obligations should be, and we've been getting that.

I want to mention some of the excellent co-operation we've received from members of the oil and gas industry in the area of employment of native people, which brings me back to one of the real concerns raised by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview: economic development and what can and should be done in this area for native people.

Mr. Chairman, the private sector in this province has moved ahead in a dynamic way unparalleled in this country. Through the example of Canadian Bechtel and the co-operation of Native Outreach and the laborers' union in that area, the private sector has provided a beacon of light, a way that other groups can follow, and it's happened. In conversations with the promoters of the gas pipeline that is to come from Alaska, they are now actively involved in conversations with various native groups along the route to see how they can be brought into the employment picture. Imperial Oil officials who are working to develop a project in the Cold Lake area have worked with the hon. member of this Assembly for Bonnyville. There has been good co-operation with both the Metis and the treaty Indian people in that constituency, to ensure that they share some of the economic

benefits that accrue to the area and have an opportunity to plug into the activities in those areas.

Mr. Chairman, I've briefly tried to cover some of the concerns raised by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview with regard to the Native Secretariat estimates.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just begin by advising the Minister that I wish he had been at the zone six social evening. I say this because I think it's worth noting and underlining, not to be defensive on my part but to make a point that should be made for Albertans, that here was a group of people who had been meeting during the day. At 6 o'clock my wife and I arrived. At 6:45 we began the meeting, Mr. Minister, and that meeting continued until 11 o'clock. So the suggestion that it was a sort of nice social evening, like many of the social evenings all of us as hon. members go to where we sit down and slap a few people on the back and have a friendly convivial discussion and that's it . . . I want to make it very clear and to set the minister straight that we had over four hours of comprehensive discussion, in the course of which I took eight pages of notes. If that's a social evening — the company was very convivial, but it was a hard-working group of people who discussed all the points that were discussed the following day.

Mr. Chairman, I might just point out one of the concerns the people brought to my attention. In organizing the workshop, which various members of the Legislature had been invited to attend, particularly this evening session, an undertaking had been made by the Native Secretariat that funds would be forthcoming for the expenses of that workshop. I gather they were, but the following day when Mr. Lee arrived. On the Saturday evening the member of the board was more than a little concerned, because she had had to make personal financial arrangements to cover the costs. I would say to the minister that in projects of this nature in the future, if we are in fact going to fund workshops surely the bureaucracy can move a little faster so an individual board member doesn't have to go to the bank and make personal financial commitments in order to cover the costs of the project.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister's answers don't really deal with the concern the people brought to my attention on the substitution of project funding for core funding. It doesn't surprise me. But we had a nice discussion on what the minister hopes to do with project funding, getting back to the communities. But the underlying concern expressed at that meeting over and over again, Mr. Minister, was that the problem with project funding is that it centralizes the control in the hands of the Native Secretariat and that — this is one thing the minister didn't answer — the whole question of honoraria, salaries, wages not being part of the project funding, at least not at that time, for the association to get the show on the road hampered the Metis Association. While I can well imagine that presidents of the locals would be interested in community projects — fair enough. But I don't think any of us in this committee would argue that to get community projects for locals that are scattered over an area of 10,000 or 15,000 square miles involves a phrase the Tories often use, "seed money". I think one of the major concerns of the Metis Association people is that the new funding

arrangement makes it difficult for them to allow the locals to establish the kind of locally based projects the minister was talking about.

The other thing one of the board members brought to my attention at this social evening was that on two separate occasions the board of the Metis Association had to come to Edmonton at their own expense, because once the provincial share of the core funding was cut off — there was apparently funding from the province for one meeting, but there were two meetings where board members arrived from all over the province at their own expense. I say to you, Mr. Minister, it's not a very easy thing for someone to hop in an airplane at High Level and come to Edmonton. That's an expensive proposition and again just confirms in my mind whether it was wise, and I would say it wasn't wise, to do away with core funding and substitute project funding without giving the associations the necessary central funding, I suppose is the best way of describing it, in order that they could do this job.

I could see moving into this sort of thing over a period of several years. But to end the core funding as of October 1 and then say, all right we're moving into project funding — that kind of sudden break in my view, Mr. Chairman, can only create difficulties for the organizations themselves.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to respond briefly, if I may. I recall receiving an invitation to the zone six workshop of the Metis Association held in Peace River from Maxine Lay, who co-ordinated that meeting. The invitation clearly stated that on Saturday evening there would be a banquet and that my wife and I were invited to attend, but that the working sessions would not begin until 1 p.m. Sunday, the following day. I was unable to attend that meeting. In fact it's difficult to get around to all the various meetings throughout the province, and I'm encouraged that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, as an MLA from that area, was able to attend the social portion of the meeting. I do know that the hon. MLA for the Peace River constituency, Mr. Adair, would have liked very much to have attended, but was unable to because he was in Medicine Hat at the opening of the Alberta Winter Games. It's my understanding that the hon. member for one of the other constituencies, Smoky River, was unable to attend due to a gas co-op meeting in his constituency.

One of the things we communicated to Maxine Lay was that in organizing meetings some lead time should be given because of the heavy commitment of MLAs' and ministers' itineraries. The lead time for this zone meeting was very short indeed, and for that reason the two members I've mentioned were unable to attend.

But as I've said, on the invitation the actual work session was to commence at 1 p.m. on Sunday. At that time the executive director of the Native Secretariat was present and gave a cheque in the amount of \$2,902.15, which represented three-quarters of the total amount requested for the workshop. The total amount requested was \$3,869.53, which covered everything from travel for the various members of the locals to come in, to hotel accommodations and meals.

With regard to the Metis Association executive and

the meetings held with me, I believe the first meeting took place on Thursday, November 10. At that meeting several members of the executive brought to my attention how difficult it is for them to attend meetings in Edmonton during the week. I saw that as a concern and indicated that in future we would have our meetings on weekends.

At that time I offered to have a follow-up meeting in approximately one month's time to review project funding as it affected them. I offered that it should be held on a weekend and that Native Affairs would pay the travel expenses of the board members who were coming in for the meeting. That meeting was held on Saturday, December 10.

One further meeting with the board was held on February 25. That was a regular board meeting, and we did not cover any of the costs as they were covered in their budget from the Secretary of State.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a few comments on this particular area of the budget. It's not an easy situation to grasp, in that there are certainly two ways of dealing with the difficulty and the objective of having social, economic, and educational progress made in those small communities in northern Alberta. There are definitely two ways in which the government could go. One is the easy, political way of funding province-wide organizations.

The other way, and this is the method that has been chosen by the government, is to deal with the people in the communities. I subscribe to that approach. In travelling around and visiting these communities there is quite often a difference of opinion between the leaders as represented on the province-wide organizations and the people within the communities. I think the government has a responsibility to deal with the people in the communities. By using the method of project funding, we have an opportunity to deal directly with the people in the communities.

I've seen some very worth-while examples of this type of funding. One example that comes to mind is in Faust, where the Metis local has gotten together with the other part of the community. They have worked together to develop a youth group. They're using the Metis hall. They're accessing funds through the project funding program to develop just a tremendous program. I'm not sure whether this sort of activity would have been imposed by a province-wide organization, but it has developed from within the community.

There are other examples in other isolated communities within my constituency. I think we've chosen the correct method. It's not the easy way; it's not the most politically expedient way. But it is the best way, because you're dealing directly with the people.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word or two on this particular vote, because I have worked with native peoples. I have had them work for me. In fact, I have worked for them at times, and have a great deal of affinity for them and some of the things they have to adjust to in the various social aspects of living today. I've also had the pleasure of teaching a number of the native peoples in school, and counselling them in my position as high school counsellor. I always have a fond feeling when I meet one of them on a weekend, or somebody writes me a note and

asks my opinion about something, or asks for a reference because they are applying for a position or something like that.

Mr. Chairman, I know there are divisive elements in our society that affect not only native people but all people. Perhaps other ethnic groups have had more experience and time to adjust to these sorts of elements to which they're exposed. Native peoples are coming in contact with these values today and are finding that they have to have a certain type of adjustment that, once achieved, is very, very credible.

I have talked with a lot of them recently. I would say without a doubt that they have today a much greater sense of awareness of the type of society in which we exist and of the accomplishments that can be obtained and attained through their own efforts and abilities. I think I can also say they have a greater desire to make their mark in society as it exists today.

I went to Grouard a couple of years ago to speak at one of the graduating exercises, and came across some of my ex-students who had taken some upgrading and had graduated in various programs there. Of course the native people always have had a very keen sense of humor. They like to laugh. They like to tell jokes. One of the prime examples I have is working with a group of native people on a fire-fighting crew one time. Sitting around the campfire drinking coffee at night they would laugh and tell stories, and I would wonder what it was all about. So they would translate to tell me what it was about so I could laugh too. I enjoyed those occasions. They have had and still have that type of personality.

I think what we have today, as the hon. minister has indicated many times, is the fact that they are becoming so aware of the possibilities open to them, the things being offered to them, and the way they can develop themselves. That is their main desire, Mr. Chairman. Not to be told what to do, not to be told what is expected of them, but to say: these things are here, now what do you think about it? They want to make their own decisions, decide their own future. Because the possibilities are so much greater today than they were 10, 15, or 20 years ago, and because the social aspect of everything has changed so much, I think they are ready to begin to make those adjustments, to make their own decisions, and to keep the sense of humor and atmosphere they've had over the years, bring it into the modern way of living they have to have today, and combine those things. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, they're even going to be a lot happier than some of us are.

Thank you.

DR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add a few remarks to those of the hon. Member for Athabasca. I would like to mention some of the problems with some of the Indian people in the south of the province. We've been hearing a lot about the north. But our big problem in the south is abuse of alcohol and drugs. I am glad to say the Alberta government has assisted enormously in this regard. We have opened an AADAC centre in Claresholm, The David Lander Centre. This is being upgraded and made more permanent in this next year or so. The budget also calls for money toward a detoxification centre in Fort Macleod.

I think the minister has taken an excellent approach

in all of this, in that we are now trying to get a municipality type of atmosphere into the reserves rather than their being totally responsible to the federal government. But responsibilities also come with this municipality approach. They may have to drop some of the protection of the federal government which has been traditional in the Indian Act and in the Indian treatment. We would like to get to the stage where Indians are treated the same as other Albertans in every way.

As the hon. Member for Athabasca says, there is a definite native personality. Their values are very different from the white community's. They look at the sun, the stars, the earth, and the flowers and wildlife they produce. In the south they have a god called Napi. Napi is the great god who lives in the mountains. The river that flows out of that mountain was originally called the river that flows out of the mouth of the old man, Napi. This later became shortened to old man's river and is now known as the Oldman River. The whole area in the foothills of southern Alberta is known as the old man's garden because of the very beautiful wildlife and wild plants that abound there.

The white man came to this area and destroyed a great many of the old Indian values, especially the value they put on people. We came; we gave them our religion instead of their own. We said it is wrong to trade a bride for so many horses and cattle. But that was worth something to the Indians, and they prided themselves in their marriages and the way they behaved, and their morality was high. We put nothing of value in its place and spoiled many of the features of the Indian people.

Now I think we are looking at putting something of value back into the Indian reserves. I think we are making a very good start with it: the prospects of possibly improving life on the reserves to such an extent that emigration from the reserves to the big cities in Alberta might slow down, that there might even be a return of many people living in the urban areas to the reserves, where life could be improved and, I hope, will be in the future.

On the Peigan Reserve we have a factory set up by the federal government. It's not very productive. The cloth for the factory is sent from Montreal and manufactured into mail bags, convict's clothing, and so on. It is then shipped all the way back to Montreal, and then shipped back in bits and pieces all over the whole country. It's really not a very economic way of doing things.

I think our attitude of trying to help in specific areas — let the native do things, do them properly, and do things they can do well. And they can do very many things well. I remember well a few years ago trying to get financing for a very clever young Indian boy to go to university. Mr. Faulkner was the Minister of Indian Affairs at the time. I wrote many letters, and I remember one line that really stuck in my mind: we, the federal government, do not believe in educating Indian people beyond high school standards. I'm glad to say that attitude has changed, and I hope we can help change it a great deal more from the provincial standpoint.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make five very direct comments to the minister. Mr. Minister, I

found the most positive thing in what you said was that portion as far as job opportunities were concerned. I welcomed your comments there.

I notice that no place in the course of your comments this evening has there been any reference to this question of native housing. I remind you once again of that rather ludicrous portion of the budget, Mr. Minister, the statement about all the housing programs which in essence says that the government would not consider itself responsible if the native housing programs don't go ahead. I'd like some explanation of that, Mr. Minister.

While you're giving us that explanation, let's hear how the rural and native housing program is doing, with some specifics, and the transitional housing program, the emergency mobile trailer program, the native senior citizens' housing program, and the housing grants for natives. If this Legislature is to accept that portion from the budget speech, which in essence really said the government wouldn't be responsible if the objectives aren't met — I see there's a copy coming to the minister — then what steps are you as the minister taking to see that these programs do move along the way most members in this House hope they will. If those programs don't move along, the buck-passing has to stop squarely at your desk, no place else.

Mr. Chairman, the second point I want to make deals with the question of the funding approach, whether you go the project funding or an allocation per year. But the real comment I wanted to deal with was that local people don't always agree with the leaders. Mr. Minister, you're right, but can you tell me one community in this province — be it a native community, your home town of Milk River, or my home town of Carstairs — where people always agree with you or, in my community, with me. That isn't the kind of thing that happens just in native communities. Let's not try to kid the troops when we imply that kind of thing is happening.

Thirdly, Mr. Minister, on the land tenure question you said, let's not get too excited, these things can't be done overnight. Well, I know we've had a land tenure committee working on these problems for at least 10 years. That's hardly overnight, Mr. Minister.

Fourthly, Mr. Minister, you'll recall several times last year we talked in question period, and I believe in your estimates, about some kind of special assistance that would be available to native businesses. You kept throwing the ball to the Minister of Business Development and Tourism and he kept throwing it back. I get the impression from the fact that you made no comments tonight about what's happening in that area — and nothing is in the budget — that likely nothing has happened, that it's still some place between your department and the Alberta Opportunity Company.

Mr. Minister, you've been there three years now. Tonight might be a very good time for us to hear from you just the kind of things you're doing to ensure that those native housing programs outlined in rather glowing terms in the budget are going to become a reality. Let's also hear specifically what happened in the last year in assistance to native businesses, what your projections and aspirations are in that area as far as the rest of this year is concerned?

Mr. Minister, one other comment I know you would just love to explain to me. Why is support for native

organizations all-inclusive down some 19 per cent this year, and at the same time manpower cost in your office is up 11.8 per cent, when there is no increase in manpower numbers? Those are from the estimates which the House approved last year, to the estimates this year.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, to respond in the order in which the hon. Leader of the Opposition made his points, I'd like to begin by saying how regretful it was that the hon. Leader of the Opposition wasn't in his place on March 17 when I rose to speak on the Speech from the Throne. If the hon. leader had been here, he would have heard me go into some detail about the various housing programs that have been initiated by the province of Alberta, programs which are second to none in this nation. When we look to a program like the rural and native housing program, let's not forget that this was developed in Ottawa, initiated by the bureaucrats in eastern Canada, then tossed in our laps. We were told the federal government would pick up 75 per cent of the costs; all you would have to do is assume 25 per cent of the costs and go out and build 400 to 500 houses per year.

Well, the program isn't that easy. The Minister of Housing and Public Works has stood in his place on any number of occasions and reported to this Assembly on some of the problems he has encountered and, yes, some of the progress that has been made. But let's not blur the entire housing program with one program which was not initiated in this province.

Let's not forget some of the innovative programs which were developed here by Albertans for Albertans, programs like the emergency trailer program to help people who, through some unfortunate circumstance — a fire, health, or other reasons — are being forced out of the living quarters they occupied for some time. Mr. Chairman, we've got a program which allows us to put in place an emergency trailer as quickly as physically possible. We can't always put the trailer exactly where the old house was, because it may have been back in the bush some miles away from a power line. We have to work with the local community, and we are. That is an example of a program we developed and on which we are working very closely with the native community. It might do well to have the Leader of the Opposition, in some of his tours in various parts of the province, check in some of the various communities where emergency trailers are located and find out how the program is really working.

Let's take a look at the transitional housing program, Mr. Chairman, initiated by Advanced Education and Manpower under the very excellent, watchful eye and guidance of Mike Cardinal, a native from northern Alberta who understands the problem better than any of us do and who has a program in place in three communities of northern Alberta — Slave Lake, Grande Prairie, and Fort McMurray — to help relocate native people who are moving from various isolated parts of the province, moving into those centres, looking for employment; to help the wives with some of the fundamental tools of running a home in a modern environment, recognizing that some of the women are not used to electricity because the homes they came from did not have it. How to run a vacuum cleaner is an example of some of the things we take for granted. Mr. Leader of the Opposition, you may

smirk. But I don't think it's a smirking matter; I think it's pretty serious.

You know, we can always complain about what's not being done; we can point the finger over the hill and look to the neighbor who's not doing the job he should be doing. Mr. Chairman, from reading the reports I know the kind of conditions we inherited in 1971. I know how little was done before that, what's being done today, and what's been done since 1971. A track record is there and it speaks for itself.

Mr. Chairman, in the area of local autonomy I had some difficulty following the Leader of the Opposition when he made reference to his home town and my home town, and how people don't always agree. I don't remember ever suggesting in this Assembly that we do, or that native people should agree any more than we do. I do remember saying that as much as possible the control should be at the local level, which seems to me very similar to what I often hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition talking about — local autonomy, letting people decide for themselves what's best, letting them direct their own future.

In terms of the Land Tenure Secretariat, I was somewhat puzzled when the hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned we've been in this area some 10 years. That's news to me. Mr. Chairman, I recall the first RFD I had the honor of taking through cabinet was an RFD to establish the Land Tenure Secretariat in the Department of Municipal Affairs. I haven't been here 10 years; I've been here three years. That action took place about two and a half years ago.

I'm not sure anything had been done prior to 1971 in terms of land tenure. If it had, many of the problems we inherited wouldn't be there. They would have been solved — problems in communities like Wabasca-Desmarais, to name the community with the greatest problems because of numbers, and the situation raised by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, where you have a family or group of families looking for parcels of land.

In the area of native businesses, again I believe there are some references to ANDCO. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to conclude by posing the question: is the hon. Leader of the Opposition really suggesting we should not demand accountability for public funds? Is there a suggestion that because it was a native organization, the rules should have been bent? I'd like to know.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd be pleased to enlighten the minister on three scores. Mr. Minister, if you would like to check with your colleague the Minister of Housing and Public Works, the minister's office will be able to point out to you that on several occasions, most recently when I met with a group of native people in the Peace River area, one of the problems they raised specifically was the emergency housing program. I took up the matter with the minister, and he was able to straighten it away, so let neither of us pretend to be holier-than-thou in that area.

Mr. Minister, the part I refer to in the budget speech is on page 22. After it outlines the possibilities for improving housing for citizens outside the metropolitan areas and talks about transitional housing, rural repair programs, emergency trailer programs, Metis colony, and isolated community housing

programs, it says, and I want to read it into the record:

Our ability to complete these programmes depends upon the cooperation of local governments and involved organizations to give speedy approval. The provision of funds is not a provincial commitment to complete.

Mr. Minister, when you started your comments you were blaming the federal government for some of these programs not being finished, because the programs were designed, I think you used the term, by the bureaucrats in Ottawa. Now the budget speech clearly points out it's a matter of co-operation of local governments and involved organizations to give speedy approval. I hold you, as the minister, responsible to do what you can to get those speedy approvals, because a lot are in ID areas or in areas owned by the Crown. We can't pass the buck very far to local governments there, because that area is controlled by the province.

Mr. Minister, I'd like to know what you are doing in that particular area, so in fact we don't come back in a year's time to find we're only able to spend half or a third of the money for these five points in your budget speech. You have the specific responsibility there. The Minister of Housing and Public Works has the overall responsibility across the province. You're the person native people in this province look to to get things going as far as native housing is concerned.

I really would appreciate it very much if the minister could elaborate on that one paragraph in the speech. Are there other reasons that aren't mentioned here that we should know about? It would seem to me the minister would want to outline to the House any other policy he'd have, so that next year he can say, I pointed these out to you a year ago when you were studying my estimates. Are there problems here the minister wants to outline with regard to land tenure?

Let me put it this way to the minister. In 1971 when the present government took office a land tenure committee was involved with the human resources area. They'd been working at least two or three years in that particular area. That's why I say we've been involved in that area for something like 10 years. Maybe they didn't get done what should have been done, but suffice for me to say we really haven't been moving with indecent haste in the past seven years, either, as far as land tenure is concerned.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, on the question of accountability. I'm not suggesting the government should have poured money into ANDCO without asking any questions at all; that's not what I'm advocating. But, Mr. Minister, you'll recall that last year we talked about a proposal you had given to the Minister of Business Development and Tourism to use either a portion or some arm of the Alberta Opportunity Company so that individuals of native ancestry could go to that organization and make applications. I got the impression from you a year ago that there was consideration of some stretching of the basic terms of the Alberta Opportunity Company so that some native businesses would be able to get more favorable consideration. If you're asking me if on occasion I would be in favor of taking a chance on some of those propositions, I say yes, I would as far as individuals are concerned. If it's a borderline

situation, yes, on some occasions I'd take a chance. I'd be the first to say some of them are going to go down the tube, but some of the other ventures we get involved with in the Opportunity Company go down the tube also.

So, Mr. Minister, in responding would you outline some of the problems you anticipate, as this housing program may not reach the lofty terms set out here for the year? Also, what progress have you made with your colleague the Minister of Business Development and Tourism on this matter of using the Opportunity Company as an arm of the government that might be of help for small business loans?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, first with regard to emergency trailers, as raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. A program that's developed to meet the broad needs of a group of citizens within the province certainly has to have some flexibility and latitude in order to meet all those needs. I hope the hon. leader did not interpret from what I said that the program was developed without flaws or that it could not be improved in certain areas. I might mention that within the past two months a communication has gone from the Department of Housing and Public Works to the native community in Alberta that porches will be included in new emergency trailers. So there will be a small porch, because one of the things requested was to have a cold porch. A valid point, and that has been done. I don't for a moment suggest that other things cannot be done to improve the emergency trailer program. But I don't want us to lose sight of the fact that it's an excellent program, and I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition agrees.

With regard to the statements on page 22 of the Budget Address, in the overall statement under the heading Housing — the hon. leader has written the statement into the record — I don't think there's any inconsistency there, Mr. Chairman. I was talking about the principle of developing a program. What's referred to on page 22 and inserted by the Minister of Housing and Public Works are some of the difficulties in planning he has to overcome in various communities of the province. MLAs from the constituencies know that when you're trying to develop housing for native Albertans in a particular community, there are concerns at the local level. The native community has concerns as to the location of the housing, the subdivisions, and things such as that. I interpret the statement on page 22, under the general heading Housing, to be that kind of interpretation.

Approximately a year ago, Mr. Chairman, I did make reference, along with the Minister of Business Development and Tourism, to certain conversations we would have with the chairman of the board and the board of directors of the Alberta Opportunity Company to see if in fact there was some way the Alberta Opportunity Company could get into a special kind of lending, if you like, for native business ventures. We've had one meeting that I recall with the entire board. We've had at least two or three meetings, as ministers, with the chairman of the board and part of the board, and our officials have been meeting on the subject as well.

They're currently working on a proposal. It's not something I can elaborate on today, because it's still in the proposal stage. But it's a subject we are working on. Rather than rushing ahead and putting

into place a half-baked idea, we're going to ensure that the proposal we eventually recommend is one the Opportunity Company can live with and feel comfortable with, if in fact that's possible, and one the native community is comfortable with. So considerable consultation must take place before anything more definitive can be said.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, one last very brief question to the minister. Mr. Minister, the discussions in this area were going on last year, so let's assume they've been going on for at least six months before then. They've been going on for a year now. How much longer before you're able either to work something out with the Alberta Opportunity Company or go some other direction?

MR. BOGLE: Correction, Mr. Chairman. I don't have *Hansard* in front of me so I can quote my speech back, but if memory serves me correctly I indicated to this Assembly that those discussions would take place. They had not taken place at that time. So in fact we have not had six months or any other number of months of discussions with the Alberta Opportunity Company.

MR. CLARK: Then, to get a more precise interpretation, the discussions have been going on for at least a year. How much longer, Mr. Minister?

MR. BOGLE: As long as it takes, Mr. Chairman, to come out with a good program.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to make an observation or two with regard to the minister's portfolio. If I could I'd like to make a comment not as a member of the government of Alberta but as a Member of the Legislative Assembly. I've been here three years and quite candidly, Mr. Chairman, I think I came to the Assembly quite ignorant of native people.

Through the association I've had with colleagues here, in particular the Member for Lesser Slave Lake and the very eloquent Member for Macleod, who I'm sure far more than most of us — he not only brings many Indian people into the world, but he sends them out of the world — has an insight into the native people that most of us don't appreciate. I'm quite proud to be associated with him and his comments tonight. He has an understanding that certainly I don't have and perhaps other members don't have.

The Minister responsible for Native Affairs came into the constituency of Lethbridge West on a couple of occasions. I was pleased to meet him because it was the thing to do, not out of a sincere desire to be helpful to native people. But I assure you, Mr. Chairman, by the time he left — we'd attended a four-hour meeting with the native friendship centre — I had not only a greater respect for the minister but a profound respect for the native people who are urgently trying to help themselves. I recognize that, and I must confess that had I not come to the Assembly from the constituents of Lethbridge West, I'd never have known that. So I'm deeply indebted for the opportunity to find that out.

Mr. Chairman, I have a little difficulty in rationalizing that Indian people really have two governments looking after them. I know we can be technical and

talk about the Metis on this hand, who are the primary responsibility of this government. But that's not the way it is. When people from the Peigan Reserve and the Blood Reserve come into the urban centre of Lethbridge, you really don't know who they are, but suddenly they are the responsibility of this government.

I think I can understand the difficulties the minister has, particularly with regard to the Indian people, where on the one hand Albertans are equal if they are Metis. They're entitled to all our programs, no ifs, ands, or buts. Yet on the other hand if they're from the reserve, and many are — we don't have liquor stores and institutions like jails on reserves, so they end up in communities like Lethbridge — suddenly it appears that this government is faced with that tremendous responsibility of looking after them. I can appreciate the minister's problem, when the federal jurisdiction looks after the Indian people until half past 2 in the afternoon, then suddenly they're in Lethbridge and they are his responsibility.

I'd just like to indicate that I think he's doing a remarkable job. I sometimes wonder how he's able to do it.

I want to close with a question, Mr. Chairman. Where do we stand at this point in time, recognizing that Indian people in Alberta are Indians as far as this government is concerned, yet differentiating between programs such as health care and social assistance from the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health? I know we give them the benefits, but are we getting from the federal jurisdiction the dollar return that we perhaps should?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BOGLE: Briefly, Mr. Chairman, if I may I will use one program as an example, because this area could take a considerable period of time, and I don't want to get into that. The Department of Social Services and Community Health has entered into an agreement with the Blackfoot Reserve, an agreement that I believe is at least four years old now whereby the province has agreed to contract work on the reserve. It's reimbursed by the federal government on a 100 per cent fee-for-service basis. The Indians are comfortable with that particular arrangement which was worked out by the department. The department and the government of Alberta is comfortable with it. We assume the federal government is comfortable with it as well. That's an example.

We've also extended programs to the reserve; for example, the senior citizen home improvement program, the \$1,000 repair program for senior citizens to use on their homes. We've extended that to senior citizens on the reserves, recognizing that housing is totally a federal jurisdiction. But we felt, more out of compassion than anything else, that we're trying to help in the area of greatest need, and that was certainly one of them.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make several quick comments and then pose a question to the minister.

First of all, dealing with the issue of housing, I would just like to say this: the rural and native housing program has had its difficulties. There's no question about that. I would say that any program of this nature is going to be fraught with all sorts of

administrative problems in getting it off the ground. To that extent I think I would share some of the sentiments the minister expressed on this particular matter.

However, Mr. Minister, I do think we have to ensure, when we establish these housing committees, that we follow the recommendations of the local housing committee as much as possible. I realize how easy it is to stray from the recommendations of the local housing committee. As a matter of fact, I had a situation in my own constituency where, quite inadvertently, a series of problems arose. I would just underscore the importance of following through as much as we can with the recommendations these housing committees make, once we get them established.

In fairness to the government, though, I think we're making more progress through the rural and native housing program and it has fewer difficulties than the emergency trailer program. In my capacity as a northern MLA I've had more complaints about the operation of the emergency trailer program, quite frankly, than about the rural and native housing program. I'm not saying there aren't problems with both, and I don't think any member of this House is going to be so naive as to assume you aren't going to run into problems with both programs.

An emergency trailer program is just that, an emergency trailer program. People don't want it now; they want it yesterday. So you're going to have difficulties with it. A number of complaints have been brought to my attention about the inordinate delay, in certain cases at least, in getting trailers to people who need them. I cite the example of the Grovedale incident where a fire took place in a gentleman's home, and he waited for more than a year. The trailer was sitting in Grande Prairie, and because of various bureaucratic problems along the road that trailer wasn't out where it was needed. We had 15 people living in totally inadequate accommodation. We can't blame that on the Ottawa bureaucrats, but I use that as one example. There are many other examples.

We are making some progress on the rural and native housing program. I think that's important. I just stress and underscore the need to pay close attention to the local committees. In at least one area in northern Alberta, Mr. Minister, there is now a debate over who constitutes the committee. I won't name the area, but I think the minister probably knows. A committee was set up several years ago. Now some people are suggesting it doesn't in fact exist, but the committee is of the firm conviction that it does exist.

The second point I'd like to make is with respect to this whole issue of the alternatives. The Member for Lesser Slave Lake raised it. Do we stimulate projects at the local level? After all, that's a question of local autonomy, and rather than having the big, powerful Metis Association deciding what's going to be done, it'll be done in each of the smaller communities. That would be fine in theory, Mr. Minister, except for one important point you didn't point out.

As I read those application forms, somebody has to agree to the projects, and the somebodies who have to agree to the projects are the people in the Native Secretariat. What we are doing is substituting the provincial association for the Native Secretariat. Mr.

Chairman, the minister shakes his head. When I read over the form that is going out, in the final analysis the Native Secretariat says yes or no on the projects. Proposals may be made by the local communities, but in the final analysis that extra \$330,000 we're allocating in the budget will be determined by the Native Secretariat on a project-by-project basis.

The point of what happens after ANDCO was raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I would just reinforce my view that we should move as quickly as possible with a program. Maybe it's reasonable to say it takes some time, but this committee should be given a time frame. Because when the minister stands up and says, as long as it takes, we are just not making the kind of progress native people have a right to expect at a time when there are opportunities in northern Alberta. When I look at the economy of the north, at this stage of the game there are definite opportunities we should be following up as far as our native Albertans are concerned.

The specific question I would like to put to the minister flows out of an exchange on March 30, 1978. The hon. Member for Lethbridge West raised it in a peripheral way, but I'd like to deal with the specific comment on page 386 of *Hansard*, March 30, where the minister says:

I think the question of a meeting relates to a newspaper article the hon. member may have read. It's been our desire as a government, Mr. Speaker, to be as open and frank as possible with our Indian people. What was proposed was that on a given day I would make the province's position paper available to the 42 chiefs in this province, a position that would be the umbrella under which any future services the province provides to treaty Indians would be given. That offer was made through the president of the Indian Association.

I would like the minister to take a moment or two, because I think it's a pretty important question. When I say a moment or two, I mean long enough to fully advise us where things stand. Is there going to be a formal statement in the House, a position paper tabled in the House, with respect to the provision of services to people living on Indian reserves?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the first item raised by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, local housing committees in the communities, I certainly concur with the hon. member when he suggested that wherever possible we should be listening to those housing committees. That's the very reason they've been struck. But I have to inject a word of caution into the debate. Like all other committees . . . I can recall once working on a committee in my home community to obtain a senior citizens' lodge. We wanted things that no other lodge in the province had, and we had to sit down and literally negotiate with departmental officials and come to a practical solution. That is happening in many cases. That's not to suggest there isn't room for improvement; there's always room for improvement.

With regard to the two housing programs mentioned, the rural native housing program and the emergency trailer program, I'm somewhat puzzled by the hon. member's comments that the rural native housing program is in some way better than the emergency trailer program. In listening to the mem-

ber I decided I would try to glean from his comments why he favored one program over the other. The only thing I could come out with was that in some cases there is a delay with emergency trailers.

He gave the example of Grovedale, where more than a year passed. Well, we are not dealing with a pure white or a pure black situation in that case. We're dealing with people who are legally squatting on Crown land. It's one thing for people to be occupying a small home they've built themselves, legally, on Crown land, and a squatter's situation. It's a completely different situation for the government of the province to move in an emergency trailer, bring in power, and do all the other things for people who are legally in that position. That's one of the things I hope the hon. member for Spirit River-Fairview will take into account when he's reviewing the situation at Grovedale.

On the matter of project funding versus the old global approach, Mr. Chairman, one thing I would like very briefly to put on the table is that the approach isn't all that different. In the past, the Metis Association, for example, submitted a yearly budget which would cover their operations. So for the funding they would receive from the provincial government, all the items would be accounted for. That budget had to be approved by the Native Secretariat. Four quarterly audits were done on that budget, and the cheques were issued on a quarterly basis.

The present situation isn't all that different. The total funds are in place for the Metis Association, not only for the locals but also for the regions and the executive itself. In fact it's my understanding that the executive has put through several projects to this particular point in time. So the two are not all that different in terms of administrative supervision by the Native Secretariat.

The area of economic development was again touched upon. I think one thing hon. members in the opposition — at least the official opposition, the Social Credit Party — and the New Democratic Party member are overlooking is some of the very effective things taking place today. I'd like to direct hon. members' attention to North Western Pulp & Power at Hinton. A project called Beaver Bones has been in operation for some number of years, where a group of native people are contracting work to North Western Pulp & Power. That is something they were able to develop themselves, the private sector and the native community, and it's working. We're now looking at ways to increase the number of native people who are contracting work to North Western Pulp & Power. Simpson Timber at Whitecourt is looking at a similar project, and others have been. So let's not forget that the private sector in this province has done a great deal to satisfy the concern in helping native people gain better employment.

The hon. member asked if a statement with regard to the extension of services would be made. The answer is yes.

MR. NOTLEY: When does the the minister propose to make the statement? Is there a time frame? Will it be during the spring session of the House?

MR. BOGLE: It's my intention, Mr. Chairman, to make the announcement in the Assembly.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, can you be just a little more specific? Will it be made in the Assembly this spring?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I'll send a note to the hon. member just before it's made, so he is the first to know.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that very much. However, I put again to the minister or the Premier: is it the government's intention at this stage to make an honest run at tabling this position paper during the spring session of the House, or are we going to look at the fall session? [interjections] Mr. Chairman, I do want to put this to the minister. I don't think we want to keep this particular department going until he makes the announcement; that could be some time. But I think some concern has been expressed about this statement, to me at least, and I'd like the minister to describe — if there are problems with making it in the spring session, let's hear what they are.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I'm certainly overwhelmed by the interest the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has in this subject. I look forward to discussing it with him after the announcement has been made in the Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to hold up the debate, but I think three or four things should be said. When the BNA act was passed in 1867, the Indians were made the responsibility of the federal government. After almost a hundred years of mismanagement by the federal government — and I say mismanagement in some degree, because there was some attempt to try to do something worth while — some people now expect the provincial government to press a button and suddenly have everything resolved.

Well, I've been around the table with Indians for quite a time. I have a large band in my constituency. I sit around the table with their band council, and I visit the reserve. I find that Indian people are just as concerned as we are about welfare. They're concerned because the amount of welfare on our reserves is running from 50, 60, 70, to 85 per cent of their people. This is after more than one hundred years of administration by the Canadian government. The Indian people do not expect the provincial government suddenly to solve all their problems.

As a matter of fact, the message I get from the Indian people is that they would like help in resolving their problems themselves. They don't want white people telling them what's good for them, and I like their ideas in that regard. Too many white people want to tell the Indians what they have to do, how they have to do it, when they have to do it, and within which time frame they have to do it. Well that's not the Indian way of life. I think we should recognize the Indian people and their culture, that they are human beings who have a culture of their own. They've developed in their own way, and they're not suddenly going to become white men. They don't want to become white men; they want to remain Indians. They want to have an opportunity to live as human beings. Too many governments are trying to tell the Indians what's good for them and how they should do

it.

I like the approach of the present minister and the present government, because they are endeavoring to help the Indians to help themselves. I think that's a proper policy. They're not trying to tell the Indians what kind of culture they have to have or what they have to do. They're letting the solutions come from the Indians and from the meetings, and I think that's a proper solution.

When I was with the Blackfoot band council just a short time ago and spent three hours around the table with them, I found their concerns were just the same as those of most municipal councils. They're concerned about the drinking on the reserve and the use of drugs by their young people. They want a crisis centre, and AADAC is going to help them get one. As a matter of fact their band council operated a crisis centre at one time.

While I was visiting there, I was most impressed with the way they were trying to resolve that problem of alcohol and drugs among their own people. They have to do it their own way. The Solicitor General is helping them police their reserves, not by sending in the Mounties as was done for many years but by having their own people administer the justice and enforce the laws on that reserve. The Indians like that. They want more of it. Most of them are law-abiding citizens. They want to have the opportunity.

If we were in the same condition with the small tax base they have, I'm just wondering if we would be half as good as our Indian people are today. They don't have any tax base. They have to hold out their hands to Ottawa in order to get every cent they want. They haven't been given self-government. Some of them now are looking to the provincial government to help them become trained in democracy so they can run their own affairs, and they won't have to stand with their hands out trying to get money from other people.

Too many people think they're simply beggars. They aren't beggars. There's good and bad among the Indians the same as there's good and bad among the white people. A vast number of those Indian people want to live normal lives. They want their children to have an education. It takes a long time to come out of that hundred or two thousand years that's in their blood.

I think there should be a little understanding and less criticism of what the minister is doing, because he's trying to help the Indians to develop themselves. I think I can say the Blackfoot Indians appreciate that. I don't go to the reserve and tell them what they should do. I go to them and ask, as the minister did in my presence, what can we do to help?

We are tied by the BNA Act, but the present government is not taking the attitude the previous government took for many years: we will just not touch the Indian problem; let the federal people look after it. That went on for a number of years until, through the work of Fred Colborne, we did get an inkling of the Indian problem. But that was done in spite of the Premier of the province, not because of him. The Premier wanted the federal government to continue to have the whole responsibility for our Indian people.

Many of our Indian people now want to develop as citizens and solve some of their own problems. I think they can if we give them a hand. We are stuck

with the BNA act at the present time. But in spite of that, the present government is going to the Indians and saying, what can we do to help? If more white people would take that attitude, I think the Indians would develop and get out of the position they're now in a lot faster. They want jobs for their young people. They want industry. But they realize they have to learn how, and they are prepared to learn slowly. Let's not think we can press a button and suddenly make them into white men. They don't want to be white men. They want to remain Indians, but they want to live happy, fruitful, productive lives.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 2 — Ministers Without Portfolio	\$163,430
Total Vote 2 — Capital	\$800

Total Vote 3 — Support to Native Organizations	\$1,631,758
Total Vote 3 — Capital	\$5,000

Energy Resources Conservation

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, one very brief question to the minister. There's a cost-sharing arrangement between industry and government. I see a 1.4 per cent increase in the budget this year. Is it the anticipation of the ERCB that in fact that's all the increase they need this year, putting a comparable amount in from industry?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not quite sure of the question the hon. Leader of the Opposition is asking.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could rephrase the question. Mr. Minister, if my memory is accurate it's a joint venture between the government and industry. Now the government's portion is going up by 1.4 per cent, and I think it's a sixty-forty, or fifty-fifty split, isn't it? Is it the anticipation of the ERCB that their budget will only increase by something like 2 per cent this year?

MR. GETTY: I might say, Mr. Chairman, the ERCB is able to do that with a really tremendous increase in the amount of work for which they are responsible. Well licence and pipeline applications, new well completions, and gas processing plants have increased tremendously, as have hearings for which the board is responsible. I think they deserve our thanks that they've been able to handle this dramatic increase in activity without substantial increase in money.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 4 — Energy Resources Conservation	\$6,280,000
--	-------------

Vote 5 — Women's Information

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments with respect to Vote 5. I would simply like to make some suggestions to the hon. minister for consideration as to the role the Women's Bureau

plays.

Over time I've had numerous representations with regard to the nature of the office, the facilities it provides, and whether some consideration might not be made to expanding that role in a meaningful way, particularly not to highlight that there should be any recognition, separation, or special status with regard to women. But at a time when there is an examination of the equality of opportunity that may or may not exist, perhaps the imbalance insofar as our laws are concerned, at a time when there has been a great deal of examination of the status of women in society and the benefits they may or may not enjoy in contrast to their male counterpart, I think it would be worth while to examine from that point of view whether it might not be useful to have a concentrated period of time and effort to attempt to overcome many of the problems being put forward by women's organizations and women generally, insofar as a proper recognition of the role they play.

Certainly representations have been made to me that perhaps the bureau might play a more significant role in creating, on the part of all citizens, a recognition of the real and essential contributions women make to our society. They are certainly considered as part of our human race, entitled to an equality of dignity and respect which in many cases is certainly not reflected. They're entitled to share equally in the benefits of our society.

I would like to suggest to the minister some areas that may be taken into consideration, if they have not been to this point: an enlargement of the bureau, not only to serve as an information office, but perhaps involving the bureau in the examination of departmental practices in hiring and promotion. I continually get general criticisms that the female sector within the public service often is discriminated against, but these discriminations are so subtle it is difficult to provide clear evidence. Perhaps in a neutral way the bureau might be used as an effective mechanism through which to have a closer examination of the truth of these criticisms. I think the bureau might be used more effectively in an examination of the balance in appointments of women to boards and advisory committees. It might be used for an examination of suitable women candidates in the legal profession for Queen's Counsel and judiciary appointments.

When we are embarking upon new legislation dealing with matrimonial property and in the domestic area, I think it may be a worth-while time to have a close examination of the possibility of having more women appointed to the judiciary. Although that in itself wouldn't resolve many of the problems women currently face in the courts, certainly it would be a step forward.

From time to time, I have received complaints that women applying for legal aid with respect to domestic problems or personal matters are not fairly dealt with. Because their spouses' financial position put them into a certain category, the female applicants are not considered eligible for legal aid. Even though the spouse controls the financial purse strings, the fact they are in an economic unit puts them out of the realm of this qualification.

I think it would assist the minister, and perhaps other members of Executive Council, to utilize the bureau to make some examination of the processes,

whether within the departments such steps are being put forward which we as a government espouse as a policy with respect to the interest of women, not to put them in a preferred position, but in a balanced position with other members of the society.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, in view of pending matrimonial property legislation, I wonder whether we couldn't have a Vote 6 entitled Men's Information.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, that has to bring a retort, because I think we must surely recognize there has been a great deal of inequality. It's time we put some equality in place. I think men have the opportunity and the favored position 365 days a year. Let's give women at least one day.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm waiting for the minister to respond. I didn't know who the minister was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. minister wish to make any remarks?

MISS HUNLEY: No, Mr. Chairman. I've listened with great interest to the lobby from my hon. colleague and the counter-lobby from the hon. Member for Lacombe.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 5 — Women's Information	\$81,506
Total Vote 5 — Capital	\$200

Vote 6 — Multi-Media Educational

Services:

6.1 — Program Support	\$1,357,859
6.2 — Development and Production	\$5,568,192
6.3 — Media Utilization	\$1,463,526
Total Vote 6 — Multi-Media	
Educational Services	\$8,389,577
Total Vote 6 — Capital	\$583,000

Vote 7 — Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Response

MR. PURDY: One quick question to the minister. I notice there is about an 87 per cent decrease in grants for municipalities. I wonder if the minister would outline in what sections these grants are being decreased.

DR. HORNER: The obvious thing of course is that the primary grants are done by special warrant, because nobody can predict ahead of time the nature of the disaster.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, just very briefly I'd like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the effective and efficient work this small group of dedicated people has done, work which isn't always known, to have this province in a state of preparedness to handle civil disasters. It might be of interest to the committee that the legislation we have on the books is now being looked at by the majority of the other provinces in Canada. Indeed they are following our training programs, and we are now the leader relative to civil disaster preparedness

in Canada. That reflects upon the very effective leadership of this group by the director of Disaster Services and his chief lieutenants, who do a job and do it extremely well.

Agreed to:

7.1 — Program Support	\$387,150
7.2 — Disaster Preparedness	\$870,600
7.3 — Emergency Response	\$20,000
Total Vote 7 — Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Response	\$1,277,750
Total Vote 7 — Capital	\$15,700

Total Vote 8 — Public Service Employee Relations Board	\$214,000
Total Vote 8 — Capital	\$1,000

Capital Estimates:

1.0 — Executive Council Administration	\$3,600
2.0 — Ministers Without Portfolio	\$800
3.0 — Support to Native Organizations (Native Secretariat)	\$5,000
4.0 — Energy Resources Conservation (Energy Resources Conservation Board)	—
5.0 — Women's Information (Alberta Women's Bureau)	\$200
6.0 — Multi-Media Educational Services (ACCESS)	\$583,000
7.0 — Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Response (Alberta Disaster Services)	\$15,700
8.0 — Public Service Employee Relations Board	\$1,000
Total Capital Estimates	\$609,300

Department Total	\$19,795,732
------------------	--------------

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Premier, I move the resolution be reported.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, just before the final vote is called, can I have somebody give a written breakdown — not now — on how Vote 6 breaks down into staff, equipment, contracts, and consultants? Just send a memo.

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 the following resolution, reports the same, and asks leave to sit again:

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979, amounts not exceeding the following sums be granted to Her Majesty for the Executive Council: \$1,757,711 for Executive Council Administration, \$163,430 for Ministers Without Portfolio, \$1,631,758 for Support to Native Organizations, \$6,280,000 for Energy Resources Conservation, \$81,506 for Women's Information, \$8,389,577 for Multi-Media Educational Services, \$1,277,750 for Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Response, and \$214,000 for the Public Service Employee Relations Board.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 10:31 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]