

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Monday, October 30, 1978 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES**

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, the Select Standing Committee on the Offices of the Auditor General and Ombudsman has had under consideration the question of the appointment of an Ombudsman after the expiry of the current Ombudsman's term of office, and wishes to recommend that Dr. Randall Ivany be reappointed as Ombudsman for a further term of five years from the date of the expiry of his present term of office.

head: **NOTICES OF MOTIONS**

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask unanimous consent of the House to designate the first hour of business tomorrow as government business.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the notice and the motion by the hon. Deputy Prime Minister . . . Sorry, Deputy Premier. [laughter]

MR. CLARK: We're not prepared to agree to that.

MR. SPEAKER: With a suitable amendment for the time being, does the House agree with the motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 244****An Act Respecting the Withholding
or Withdrawal of Treatment
Where Death is Inevitable**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, An Act Respecting the Withholding or Withdrawal of Treatment Where Death is Inevitable. The purpose of this bill is simply to make it possible for any individual, on a purely voluntary basis, to choose to decline any artificial life-supporting or -sustaining devices in a case of terminal illness.

[Leave granted; Bill 244 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, as required by Section 14 of The Legislative Assembly Act, I wish to table

reports of payments to Members of the Legislative Assembly for the years ended March 31, 1976, March 31, 1977, and March 31, 1978.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to table the response to Question No. 144.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report of the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority for the year ended March 31, 1978.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, a group of some 30 social studies students from the Sundre high school. They're in the public gallery. I've assured them that when they rise they will receive an enthusiastic welcome from members of the Assembly. So I ask these students from Sundre, accompanied by their teacher Mr. Dean Wood, to rise and be recognized by members of the Assembly.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of
Utilities and Telephones**

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Utilities and Telephones, I'm very pleased today to inform the Legislative Assembly, in conjunction with my colleague the Minister of the Environment, of the decision of the Alberta government to undertake a study into the feasibility and merits of developing the hydro-electric energy potential of the Slave River at a location near the boundary between Alberta and the Northwest Territories.

In a recent report by the Energy Resources Conservation Board, Alberta's electric energy requirements by the year 2000 are projected to amount to some 72,000 gigawatt [hours] per year. Electric energy production in Alberta was in the order of 17,000 gigawatt hours in 1977; over time the per cent generated from hydro sources has been shrinking. If feasible, a Slave River development could add significantly to existing hydro-electric projects and important potential projects such as Dunvegan on the Peace River. Having regard to this continuing increase in energy requirements, while at the same time recognizing the need to conserve our non-renewable resources and mitigate adverse environmental consequences arising from energy production, it is clearly evident that an adequate understanding of the options for meeting public energy needs is essential to ensure sound decisions.

The large hydro energy potential of the Slave River near Alberta's northern boundary has been known for many years. Various studies and investigations have been conducted by private companies, some as early as 1953, but none of these in sufficient depth to give a clear view of the relative merits of developing this potential. If developed, the Slave River at this location could produce almost half the 1977 electric energy production in Alberta. However, a development of this magnitude would involve a large number of technical, environmental, and economic

considerations.

The Slave River is shared by Alberta and the Northwest Territories. It also forms the eastern boundary of Wood Buffalo National Park. The Slave River is the life source of the environmentally sensitive Great Slave Lake delta. Change in the levels of Lake Athabasca could have effects over wide geography. It is essential that these and many other matters be given careful and thorough scrutiny while considering the merits of such a development.

In keeping with this government's responsibility to ensure that these matters receive in-depth study and evaluation, a four- to five-year feasibility study is to be undertaken immediately. It is emphasized that this investigation will not produce the details necessary to proceed with construction, but it will provide information not presently available relative to engineering, environmental, and economic aspects, which is essential for a proper perspective in planning for the future electric energy supply for Alberta.

The cost of the study will be about \$6 million to \$7 million. The study work will be carried forward under the Alberta Hydro Committee. Detailed terms of reference will be developed in ensuing weeks.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

School Construction

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Education. It's with regard to the minister's recent announcement concerning increased funding for school construction, and the implications of the Woods Gordon report, on which the minister has answered questions on previous occasions in the Assembly. My question deals with the adjustment according to the distance of any construction site from the nearest urban centre. Will the minister please advise how the percentage increase figure was arrived at?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition isn't interested in a mathematical calculation, because that should be evident on the face of the record. The adjustments we make in the support prices on a semi-annual basis under the school building plan are such that we take into account the actual contracts that have been awarded for the construction of school sites across the province. We've found increasing evidence that as you move away from major construction centres, the cost has been increasing. So adjustments have been made on the ring system of additional support that we provide under this formula for those jurisdictions that are of the distances set out in the formula.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Can he be a bit more explicit on what kind of criteria go into arriving at that decision as to how much the allocation per square foot will be increased? Specifically, is there an arrangement whereby this information is fed from the Alberta Construction Association to the minister or his committee?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the information comes to me via the expertise of the school buildings branch

and the people who work with the branch, including the advisory committee which provides assistance there. As I indicated earlier, it's also based on actual information on construction costs based on tenders accepted by school boards, and on such other factors as information the school buildings branch acquires on the cost of materials and the increase in the cost of materials, the cost of labor and the increase in the cost of labor — the two factors that go into the provision of school construction costs.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, following that up with the minister. For the last period of time there have been, I believe, six-month adjustments to the allowance. Is it the intention of the government to continue to review these allocations on the basis of six-month adjustments?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, a review of the support prices has been made every six months. Adjustments have been made sometimes on a six-month basis, sometimes on an annual basis, depending on the nature of change in costs in the period. The other aspect of the hon. leader's question dealing with what the future holds would be determined to a large degree by the government's ultimate response to the Woods Gordon study.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, that leads into the other part of the question. What decision has the government made with regard to the Woods Gordon report on school facilities?

MR. KOZIAK: As of this date, Mr. Speaker, no decision has been made. However, the recommendations that flowed from the Woods Gordon study and the reactions to those recommendations, as developed by school jurisdictions across the province in meeting with the task force, are under consideration.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. We had the same answer last spring. School boards have had their reactions to the Woods Gordon report in the hands of the advisory committee, in the hands of the government, since last spring. The question is: when will the government be making a decision on which recommendations in the Woods Gordon report are going to be accepted and which are not?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, in the budget of the Department of Education we have an annual allocation of approximately \$50 million for the provision of capital. It's an important aspect of the budget and one that we want to approach in a deliberate and resourceful manner. The whole matter of the provision of school facilities is an important one and one which must be considered in light of shifting populations, somewhat stable or possibly small declines in student enrolments — many very important factors. These are presently under consideration. I expect that over the course of the next month or so we'll be in a position to provide some definite news.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps in an effort to speed up the minister's decision, some examples of communities that really do require immediate attention regarding school facilities are areas like Aldergrove and Belmead in the city of Edmonton. You've

got communities of close to 10,000 people and no schools. Can the minister indicate when he will be able to tell the Edmonton public and separate school boards whether they can go ahead and plan facilities in those areas? When can the boards expect answers on that specific problem in the Aldergrove and Belmead areas?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. Leader of the Opposition would like to be correct in his questions. There's no restriction now in terms of the provision of the elementary six-by-six and eight-by-eight core schools in new subdivisions of the cities of Edmonton and Calgary. So the problem is not quite as placed on the floor of the Assembly by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can the minister indicate to the Assembly when the people who live in the Aldergrove and Belmead area of Edmonton can expect an answer from the minister so the school boards can go ahead and do some planning of total school facilities? We could add Mill Woods as another example where they've just had to wait and wait as a result of no decision from the minister. When are you going to make up your mind and make the adjustments?

DR. BUCK: Just before the election he'll make the announcement.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I think I've given . . .

MISS HUNLEY: It's going to be on December 4 isn't it, Walt? Pretty soon now.

DR. BUCK: Pretty soon, maybe Friday.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, in responding to this question I won't involve myself in predicting the date of the next election. But I've already indicated to the hon. Leader of the Opposition when I expect the government will be in a position to provide a definitive statement on the Woods Gordon recommendations and the reaction thereto. I've also indicated that none of the school boards in the province are prevented from making application now for facilities that can be approved under the existing plan. That includes elementary facilities in jurisdictions where there's a new subdivision. The only matters in question now would be the provision of junior high school and high school facilities in the new areas of such jurisdictions at the same time as such facilities might in fact be available within the central cores of those cities.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister, one last . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary.

MR. CLARK: Simply one last question, Mr. Minister. Can the minister give some sort of commitment to the Assembly when the people in Mill Woods and the Aldergrove and Belmead areas of the city can logically expect junior high school facilities in their areas? Given the fact the minister has begrudgingly admitted this afternoon that he may make a decision in one month, can people in those and similar areas in

Calgary expect junior and senior high school facilities within 18 months after the minister makes up his mind? Will the minister give it that kind of priority?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, it's an attempt at skilful determination of the decision before it's announced. I don't think I'll fall for that.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, hopefully the people in those constituencies won't fall for the Conservative candidate either, after an answer like that.

Northern Development

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. It was going to be to the Minister of Agriculture. I need a very brief preamble. It deals with the presentations made to the government by the mayors and reeves of the Peace River area earlier this year. On April 18, 1978, the Minister of Agriculture indicated that the presentations had been made to the government and that:

... an opportunity over the course of the next few months to assess the matters which had been brought forward. It would be my intention, along with the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, to ensure that where concerns were raised, the various ministers would get copies of [their] briefs.

My question to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife is: what follow-up has the government given to the Peace River mayors and reeves in light of presentations they made to the government last spring?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, any of it relating to the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife has been followed up directly. I might add that on our September cabinet tour that same presentation was again made to the group in Peace River, I believe headed by the hon. Deputy Premier. A commitment was made at that time to follow the additional concerns that were raised with the body at that particular meeting. I'm not sure just who the ministers were at that one. I was there for a moment and went over to the hospital opening.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I ask the question in light of the commitment made by the Minister of Agriculture that he and the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, because they are members from that part of the province, would really take on the responsibility of seeing that this presentation made by the association of mayors, reeves, and municipalities of the Peace River region would get adequate attention from the government. My question to the minister: in what form has the government followed up the presentations by the mayors and reeves to a number of government departments?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the provision of the document to the various departments requested specifically in that document to assess, review, and respond directly. The hon. Deputy Premier may want to respond further.

DR. HORNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In fact, as the hon. minister has noted, a cabinet committee met with the mayors in Peace River, and we had an interesting discussion relative to their concerns. There is a continuing follow-up relative to the matters they have raised. As the hon. leader may know, some of them are of a longer term nature and will take some time to respond to in some detail, having regard to the propositions they put forward.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then a supplementary question to the Deputy Premier on the question of rationalization and equalization of some of the rates charged to people in the Peace River area, primarily utility rates and the cost of gasoline. This was in the presentation made to the government early last spring and again when the cabinet was in that area. What answer has the government given to the people in the Peace River area, or what studies have been initiated as a result of that presentation?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, discussions and/or studies of that have taken place with the major suppliers of fuel in the area relative to the transportation costs involved. Insofar as the freight rate question is concerned, ongoing discussions have been held with both major railways, but particularly with Canadian National inasmuch as it is of prime importance in the Peace River area. Of course the other matters relative to those kinds of costs are ongoing. Some of them relate to the question of hydro-electric power, the question of the Dunvegan dam, and a number of matters in that area.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, following up the comment the Deputy Premier made with regard to the question of equalization of some of the rates, specifically with regard to the rates people in that part of the province pay for gasoline, fuel, and so on, what specific discussions have taken place between the province and the various refineries or oil companies in the province with regard to that matter?

DR. HORNER: On that specific matter, Mr. Speaker, a number of cabinet ministers were involved with the direct discussions with fuel suppliers. I think I'd have to take notice and have the Minister of Agriculture respond tomorrow.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just along the same line to the Minister of Utilities and Telephones. With regard to the question of telecommunications, the suggestion was made by the mayors and reeves that the RITE service to local government authorities in the Peace River country be extended. That would mean that local governments in the Peace River area would have free tolls as far as calling Edmonton is concerned. What action or what consideration has the government given to that particular suggestion?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, the brief being referred to by the hon. Leader of the Opposition had a number of areas that referred to my responsibility in Utilities and Telephones; that follow-up has taken place. Regrettably he's hit the one that doesn't fall to me. The RITE system is the responsibility of my colleague the Minister of Government Services.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Government Services, then. I'd be pleased to hear him make the announcement that all municipalities in the province will be able to take advantage of the RITE system.

DR. BUCK: He's too busy handing out money these days.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, the RITE system operation — in other words, answering the phone calls — is handled through Government Services. But the actual installation of hardware is really handled by the Minister of Housing and Public Works. However, I can only say, as I have said before, that the RITE system in general is being looked into because of the demands that are being placed upon it. It would have to be either substantially expanded to include all businesses, municipalities, hospital boards, and so on, or else continued even more than it is presently. We do have questions, for instance, from school boards as well to enable them to join the RITE system. These are considerations we are presently giving to that system, with the Department of Housing and Public Works.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, now I know how municipalities feel when they run around the bush.

My question to the minister: when will those studies be finished?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I would have to get to the Minister of Housing and Public Works to see how far they are with their deliberations on the costs of expanding this service.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then to the Minister of Housing and Public Works, assuming he is the minister who has the ultimate responsibility. When will the studies be completed with regard to the possibility of the RITE system being expanded across the province so that all municipal governments, school boards, and hospitals would have the benefit of toll-free calls to Edmonton?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, at this point in time I can't say the exact date that any such study would be completed, but I'd be happy to check on it and respond back.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. Does the minister have any indication of the costs involved — not in the study, but projected costs as to what a system would entail?

MR. CHAMBERS: I'm sure in due course, Mr. Speaker, when the studies are completed the costs will be accurately estimated and arrived at.

Pipeline Safety

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Recently a rupture of a gas pipeline occurred in the southern part of the United States, resulting in an explosion and a serious fire, with loss of life and the destruction of a mobile-home park. I would like to direct the following question to the minister: has the minister

undertaken to send a member of his department or of the Energy Resources Conservation Board to confer with the appropriate authorities responsible for this line to determine first-hand what happened and get a complete account of the major catastrophe that occurred?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the information from the hon. member regarding the tragedy in the United States. I have not discussed the matter with the Energy Resources Conservation Board, which would be responsible for pipelines within the province. However, I will take the opportunity to do so, to see whether they feel it would be wise for them to follow up in some way in order to obtain additional information.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. First of all, I would like to advise him that in asking a previous question I was motivated by my actual concern, and not by the fact that I may have been seeking some publicity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

DR. BUCK: We'd never accuse you of that.

MR. YURKO: I would now like to direct a very specific question to the minister in regard to the Alaska pipeline.

DR. BUCK: Write another book, Bill. We'll read it.

MR. YURKO: Will the minister seriously consider making the appropriate representation to the federal authority in regard to the routing of this pipeline, so that in fact it wouldn't be routed either through or in the proximity of any populated areas within the province?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, my experience with the hon. member has been that normally his skin is not quite that thin.

With regard to his request, I think we will be under umbrella agreement that the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has signed with the federal government. We will be in close co-operation and co-ordination with the pipeline agency that has been established by an act of the House of Commons regarding the manner in which that pipeline is built, its location within the province. I assure him that we will do everything possible to make sure it's built within safety and other concerns of the people of the province.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, another supplementary to the minister. Inasmuch as this particular pipeline happens to be larger, under greater pressure, and has a greater potential than most pipelines built in North America, will the minister undertake or give consideration to undertaking the establishment of a joint task force between the Energy Resources Conservation Board and the federal authority to investigate at the earliest opportunity and publish all aspects of the safety consideration of this pipeline through the province of Alberta, and make such study public so that it might relieve the anxiety of many Alberta citizens?

MR. GETTY: The answers would be no, and no, Mr. Speaker.

Transportation Systems

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Deputy Premier and Minister of Transportation. Could the Deputy Premier outline what an Alberta transportation company would involve, which was discussed late in September?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the hon. gentleman is talking about. The only notation I know of is that a reporter asked me whether we've ever given consideration to an Alberta transportation company. My short response was yes, that's one of the options we've looked at. We have gone no further than that.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Deputy Premier outline what it would involve? Would it be patterned after the Alberta Energy Company in order to sell shares to the public, or would it be the amalgamation of all our transportation systems in the province?

DR. HORNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. gentleman didn't hear me right the first time. We have done nothing more than answer a reporter's question correctly, that that is one of the alternatives you look at. But we have given no consideration to the form or the nature of any such company.

PWA Operations

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Deputy Premier given any consideration to making PWA a Crown corporation?

DR. HORNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think there are other more pressing problems insofar as the structure of Pacific Western is concerned at the moment; that is, to finalize the merger with Transair so that we have a proper and viable western regional airline. At the present time, of course, with the government owning over 99 per cent of the shares, my understanding is that it's considered a Crown corporation for tax purposes in any case.

Hydrogen Sulphide Emissions

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. It deals with the very high levels of hydrogen sulphide in the Redwater area. Can the Minister of the Environment indicate if the government has taken any action to halt the release of high levels of hydrogen sulphide in the air?

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the matter has been referred to the Energy Resources Conservation Board, which is responsible for the policing of such matters within the industry. I think we're obviously going to have to continue and perhaps upgrade our monitoring there. I discussed the matter with my deputy minister after the hon. member brought the matter up in the House last week. I was trying to get a better feeling for the source and the frequency of the high readings we are getting out there. They're

due to a variety of sources. There's no one problem; a number of complex industrial problems are involved. We're concerned to the point that we think it calls for some pretty meaningful action by the ERCB.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Can the minister indicate just what discussion has been going on with the producers in the area as to the concerns the department has, I presume, or should have, with the high levels of hydrogen sulphide? What discussions have been going on with the companies involved and the minister?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I can't give a detailed list. But I can say that in cases like this, when we get citizen complaints concerning odors, the department usually tries to track them down and go back to the industry or the source of the odor. That's been done in this case. But I'm unable to give you specific details today.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister indicate if the levels of hydrogen sulphide, which have been well above the optimum as defined under The Clean Air Act, have decreased? Or are they still at the high level they were at when the study was done?

MR. RUSSELL: I can't answer that today either, Mr. Speaker. I should say that a fairly detailed memorandum on this is being prepared for the hon. member, who raised the matter in the House last week. I saw the first draft of that and sent it back to the department for additional information. You should have that within one or two days. I'm taking note of your further questions today and will try to deal with all those matters.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Have there been many prosecutions under The Clean Air Act since it was passed in 1971?

MR. RUSSELL: I don't believe there have been many prosecutions. There have been more emission control orders and less frequent stop orders. There are three kinds of pieces of paper that you can issue to an offender. As I've said many times in the House, usually in the case of a major industrial concern you try to lay out a course of corrective action for them while still keeping them operating. Against that background, I have to say prosecutions have been far less frequent than emission control orders.

DR. BUCK: A further supplementary. Have there been any prosecutions?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, there have been prosecutions. But if you're specifically referring to the Redwater area, I don't know. I'd have to go back and check department files and report to you.

Slave River Hydro Study

MR. TESOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Utilities and Telephones in regard to the Slave River project announced today.

If development is found to be feasible, could the minister advise the House what the lead time for project development would be?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, that answer can be given only in an approximate way. In terms of initial power production, it would be approximately 10 years. That's why there's a need to think ahead on these matters and compare alternatives. However, there would be units in addition to the initial power production, and this would take a period of time. So over the full scope of such a project, if found feasible, it would be a 10- to 15-year lead time, with the initial production being in about 10 years and its completion, with the full amount of available production that such a project could carry, approximately 15.

MR. TESOLIN: A supplementary if I may, Mr. Speaker, again to the minister. To what extent would such a venture decrease the coal needs in terms of energy development?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, that is a significant amount. One of the reasons favorable to generating electricity with non-renewable resources such as hydro is exactly that point, the saving of depleting or non-renewable fossil fuels. An estimated 6 million tons of coal per year would be displaced by such a project.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister regarding the announcement made today. Will the minister also be considering the feasibility study that has been done by Calgary Power, using any information they may have to co-ordinate both studies?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. That is an important question. Preliminary work has been done for a considerable period of time, including in recent years, on such things as hydrometric studies on the flow of the river itself, ice formation studies, and the topography in terms of such things as channelling that might be necessary. This work has been done, but only in a preliminary way up to now.

The study I had the opportunity to announce today will take that as a base point and begin from there. So every bit of information we have that's already in place from previous studies, including by Calgary Power as mentioned by the hon. member, will be used. That will be a base point for the feasibility study to proceed.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. Will the cost of the study — some \$6 million to \$7 million, I believe the hon. minister indicated — be footed totally by the government? Or will the members of, I believe, the electrical planning council of Alberta be putting some money into the cost?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, we plan to foot the bill, as the Leader of the Opposition puts it, for this detailed feasibility study as an Alberta government expense under the Alberta Hydro Committee which, as the hon. member may know, consists of the Department of the Environment, the Energy Resources Conservation Board, and the Department of Utilities

and Telephones. So it will in fact be a government study. In that way it can have scope beyond what a developer would normally propose. Considerations can be taken into account in addition to those that would reasonably be taken into account by a developer.

In short, will the cost of the study be paid for by the Alberta government? The answer is yes.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the minister. When will the guidelines or the criteria for the work to be done be made public? And has a decision been made either tentatively or totally with regard to the consulting firm that will do the work? If I might add one more question, can the minister assure that it will be a Canadian consulting firm, preferably an Alberta one, that will have at least the prime contract?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I made reference in my ministerial statement that detailed terms of reference would be developed in ensuing weeks. It will take some time for that detailed work to be done. Indeed it may very well be that some phasing of those terms of reference will be necessary during the course of the work involved. Certainly no commitment has been made to anyone in terms of the work that's necessary. In terms of who will do the work, I think we would have to look at that on the basis of getting the work done as effectively and reliably as possible. I for one would very much hope that that can be done by Canadian firms and, to the maximum extent possible, by Alberta firms.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Inasmuch as the Athabasca River is an interprovincial waterway used extensively for transportation purposes, and the fact that navigable matters come under federal law, is the minister indicating in his release today that the federal government is in no way involved in the study, recognizing of course the federal government's recent propensity to remove itself or to negate its obligations in connection with these studies? In regard to the fact that the federal government has such enormous responsibilities in connection with this river and serving the north of the nation with transportation systems, is the minister suggesting that the federal government is not involved in this study?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that important question is no. The federal government will not be involved in financing the necessary feasibility study that we've made the decision to undertake, for we contemplate that the project itself, if feasible, would be located entirely in Alberta.

The hon. member mentioned the Athabasca River, but I think he means the Slave River. The downstream effects, however, could be significant, and that's a good example of the kind of detailed work necessary to have a fix on what impact, if any, would be involved.

Certainly it would be the intention of the government of Alberta that the downstream water use be respected because of its very great importance in the Northwest Territories for transportation and other purposes. I have had discussions with the Northern Canada Power Commission, last month with the hon.

Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, relative to the territories and Wood Buffalo National Park. We've also had discussions with officials in the governments of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon in order to consult with them in terms of all interests and possible impacts being evaluated in the study we're announcing today.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, just for the record, I was very specifically referring to the Athabasca River and the transportation systems from Fort McMurray north that eventually drain into the Slave River, as do other rivers. So my specific question was in regard to the transportation systems on the Athabasca River.

DR. WARRACK: Those would be upstream then. I guess we're in agreement, but we'd have to look at a map to get together on which river it is. My understanding is that the Athabasca flows into the Slave, as does the Peace, and the Slave River goes north from Lake Athabasca to the boundary between Alberta and the Northwest Territories. In any case, the short answer is yes.

Red Deer River Dam

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Has a decision been made by the government regarding the development of hydro-electric power on the proposed Dickson dam on the Red Deer River?

MR. RUSSELL: No, it hasn't, Mr. Speaker. But the consultants are being specifically asked to look into the feasibility of that. If it looks at all feasible in the future, the design of the dam would accommodate future installation. We've also had very serious inquiries, both from Calgary Power and from the city of Red Deer, which are interested in pursuing that specific aspect of the project on their own, with our co-operation.

Public Accounts

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct rather a perennial question to the Provincial Treasurer. When might we expect the '77-78 public accounts?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I will check and respond to the question tomorrow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (Committee of Supply)

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

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

ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVINGS TRUST FUND
CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION
1979-80 ESTIMATES OF
PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

**Improvement of Libraries at Colleges
and Universities**

Advanced Education and Manpower

1 — Library Development

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

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to provide you and my colleagues in the House with some details of the proposed allocations in support of institutional libraries from the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. In recognition of needs identified by colleges and universities, the government intends to provide a total of \$9 million to Alberta's 15 board-governed institutions. The funds, \$3 million a year for three years, are to be used solely for the acquisition of learning materials such as books, periodicals, journals, microfiche, microfilm, and audio-visuals. They will serve to maintain and enhance the high quality of educational services provided in the province today.

The project will be implemented through conditional grants to the universities, 10 public colleges, and The Banff Centre for continuing education. Grants will be based on need, the status and quality of current holdings, and related to the expenditures during the last three years. Since the funds are intended for above normal purposes, future budgetary allocations for library acquisitions by the institutions cannot and will not be less than the current levels. Procedural details to determine the methods of consultation and institutional allocations will be worked out by the respective department and institution officials. It is important that equitable supports are established to ensure that every institution is provided with a significant allocation.

I would encourage responsible officials within the advanced education community to take advantage of this opportunity to continue the development of a co-ordinated and co-operative library system for adult Albertans. Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that these additional funds will provide the opportunity for improving student access to the wide variety of learning materials so essential to quality education.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. First of all, can you give us some kind of breakdown as to how you arrived at the need for \$10 million for three years?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, if I get the import of the question, it is a constant assessment. I rather suspect the Leader of the Opposition knows how you do this.

MR. CLARK: Explain to me.

DR. HOHOL: Fair enough. You look at what happens to a particular area of service in an institution, a department, the home, or the community over a long period of time; in other words, look at the trends.

Secondly, you look at the impact of funding over the last number of years, say a decade, in particular during the period of restraint. The fact is that certain services and materials are affected differently from others, by two things: first, the global budget; secondly, the internal allocation of institutions. In the second case, it is not our direct responsibility or concern. However, it becomes our concern when the evidence is clear that regardless of what institutions do, the mode of funding becomes of the kind that the market place is damaging — not just in a peak or a trough, but on a long term — to a particular condition; in this case, the subject before us.

It's my view that this kind of expenditure is completely consistent with the statute and its description with respect to long-term benefits for Albertans in the years to come. If anything in the university environment, along with the professors of course, stores competence, knowledge, and information for now and years to come, it's things like books and allied kinds of services and materials.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, might I say to the minister: Mr. Minister, we had a certain amount of snow in my riding yesterday, and after that answer I think you and I are playing fox and goose. The question was very direct: how did you arrive at a need for \$10 million? And what portion of that do you see going to the universities and colleges?

DR. HOHOL: I don't know about the snow in his territory, Mr. Chairman, but there's no snow here. We're trying to do a job. I suppose it comes down to this: you have to make the best judgment you can on the evidence before you. That's what I was saying to the Leader of the Opposition, and I guess he was still wiping the snow off his brow or something, because that's the answer. That's what I meant when I said he knows how you make judgments like these, because he used to be the Minister of Education. If he wants to play some sort of game, I'm not interested. I'm here to serve the people of Alberta.

One of those is the institutions. They have become significantly behind in the matter of books. On March 15, 1978, the Leader of the Opposition stood in his place — and you check *Hansard*, sir — and said to me, to the government, and to the Premier: if there are two places that you can assist without interfering with the allocation system of the institutions, it's in the area of utilities — which we have addressed — and in the area of books — which we are now addressing. So if he wants to argue against himself with respect to his statements in this House on March 15, I am pleased to do it.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased that the minister listens so well and that he has done something in the area of utilities and finally moved as far as library books are concerned. But, Mr. Minister, it is a damning commentary on the fiscal policies of this government as far as universities are concerned that this government sat in the Legislature on that day and squirmed and said it was not prepared to make any additional funds available to the universities, and now you are coming through the back door using the heritage savings trust fund — not what it was intended for at all. It wasn't intended to keep the libraries of our universities and colleges in the condi-

tion they were in when the minister or I or many other members of this Assembly attended.

Really the minister has said to us today that as a result of the impact of the last several years' budgets — I think he went as far as 10 years, if I use the term correctly, and I'm quite prepared to accept that — we now find the libraries of universities and colleges in this province falling behind. Mr. Minister, as I told you that day in March or April when you were listening so carefully, and I tell you again today, there's no question about the need for additional library services at the universities. But you know as well as I do that traditionally, for years and years, the adequate funding of university and college libraries has been a function of the normal operating budget of the province. That's where it should be done.

DR. HOHOL: Why?

MR. CLARK: Why? Because when the heritage fund was set up, by your own Premier's comments it was to be for projects that a government couldn't ordinarily afford.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh . . .

MR. CLARK: Oh be darned. Go back and check *Hansard*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member please address the Chair.

MR. CLARK: Yes.

Mr. Minister, now we're really admitting that we have fallen behind in funding libraries in the universities and colleges, so we're using the heritage fund to do that. That was never, never, never the intention of the heritage fund. The definitions given for these kinds of expenditures were expenditures which governments couldn't ordinarily afford. Through thick and thin in this province we have been able to afford the very best university libraries in comparison to other provinces. To be doing it this way, Mr. Minister, simply makes it possible sometime down the road to cut back very, very substantively as far as university funding is concerned.

Mr. Minister, I appreciate your effort to get more money for the universities. I suspect — and I know the minister will never agree to this — that after the pleas that were made here in the Assembly and by the universities, the minister found this way of being able to get some additional funds for the universities. It's better than no funds at all, but it's really a breaking down, a tearing apart, of the basic concept of the heritage savings trust fund when it was established. The minister can shake his head all he wants. I get the distinct feeling that he and I aren't going to agree on this particular issue, which will not be the first time.

Mr. Minister, this kind of expenditure, \$3 million for three years, is good. But it should come out of the normal operating budget of your department. When we've got a \$2.5 billion surplus in this province, we shouldn't be dipping into the heritage savings trust fund, capital projects, to fund legitimate and ongoing — and that's the key, "ongoing" — expenditures by the universities in the field of libraries. All this does is simply allow them to catch up for three years. This

should properly be in the ongoing budgets of the universities.

DR. HOHOL: Just some brief comments, Mr. Chairman. One is that if we were to infuse money directly into the global budget of a university for any specific reason, whether it's this or, say, a faculty that has a quota and there are more students than the faculty can respond to because of space, professorial numbers, and so on, we would distort — and the hon. leader knows this — the nature of funding of the institution. If this is what he is recommending, he simply doesn't understand how institutions are funded. I can appreciate it. He used to understand, but he's forgotten since 1971. That's a long time ago.

The other problem I am disappointed about, and it's purely personal — obviously he isn't — is that he doesn't understand the nature of a book, that it is an investment in the years to come. What better investment? The universities have had within their normal budget, preceding and during the period of restraint, that amount of money that was allocated to them. From it, whatever they adduced to be the normal assignment for libraries, they were able to have.

So quite apart from looking at falling behind, quite apart from the other arguments which are as legitimate as can be, there is the other part of the discussion; that is, the intent of the fund being an investment. Things like art, things like the theatre — we're not talking about them, but they're analogous. But certainly things between covers, notable books, are investments for the years ahead. So we're taking out of the university something that isn't an ongoing thing. It needs to be; it has to be. But even if all the libraries and all the resources in the libraries in every institution in Alberta were where they ought to be, plus some more, I could still stand in my place and very, very honestly make the recommendation priority to my colleagues and get it approved if I can, as I did in this case, and present it to the House as a legitimate expenditure in the capital portion of the investment fund.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Minister, you'd have a far stronger case in getting at least my approval if for the past number of years the universities and colleges in this province hadn't in fact been saying, look, we're being underfunded, we have to cut back. And where do they always cut back? Libraries. Mr. Minister, it'll be great after three years, when the universities and colleges have to come on their knees, or whatever they come on, to the government to get a reinstatement of this program. That's why it should be in the normal operating budget, Mr. Minister. Then it's an ongoing part of the university and postsecondary educational function of this province. Being done here, it isn't.

Mr. Minister, could you go on and explain to us how you see this being broken down between the various institutions? I'll be quite local about it: I pit the new college at Olds against the University of Alberta as far as the possibility of both getting funds is concerned.

DR. HOHOL: The function of the estimates, of course, is to present to the House the amount of money for a period of time. That is what I have done. I have

indicated to you, Mr. Chairman, and to members of the House that when this is approved we will set up a mechanism or vehicle for the appropriate officials in my department and in the institutions to get together to recommend to me how this can best be done.

Now, I've indicated that the grants will be based on need, the status and quality of current holdings, and related to expenditure patterns during the previous three years. Those are the criteria, Mr. Chairman. I went on to say that procedural details to determine the methods of consultation and institutional allocations will be worked out by the respective department and institution officials.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Mr. Minister, surely we can have a more explicit definition or answer than that. Within the university community itself, take the numbers of students at Lethbridge and the University of Alberta. Now there's going to have to be some weighting, some adjustment, made for a university like Lethbridge in comparison with the University of Alberta. Just look at the size of the library, the call on library services. The same kind of recognition has to take place within the college system.

Really, Mr. Minister, what I want from you is some assurance that the colleges and smaller universities in this province will not find themselves in a situation of having to compete with the University of Alberta, which has a great deal more expertise. I'm sure the University of Alberta budget in the whole library sciences area is larger than the budgets for some of the colleges in Alberta. I'm trying to get an assurance from you that there's going to be some kind of equity, some kind of protection, for these smaller educational institutions.

As sympathetic as I am to the library needs of the universities, I know very well that when it comes to making presentations they're extremely able and have many more resources to call upon than have some of our colleges which just simply don't have the size. Mr. Minister, that's the kind of feeling or commitment I want from you before we move on.

DR. HOHOL: Well, that's certainly a fair enough proposition. Again, I'm sorry that I have to reread portions of this to the hon. Leader of the Opposition: it is important that equitable support levels are established to ensure that every institution is provided with a significant allocation. This isn't going to be a matter of the institutions presenting a case, and whoever makes the best case gets the most money. We will set out criteria, and one of the things we'll build in is a minimum below which no institution will get a less amount, for the very reasons the hon. member points out. Then certain criteria, certain conditions, will be described and defined by the department as it works with its appropriate counterparts in the institutions, then be worked out by my department officials and me. Then we'll meet with these institutions and lay this out before them.

This isn't going to be a grab bag of \$3 million a year for three years from which people are going to get funds based on the best cases someone can make. This is going to be a logical and reasonable approach that any reasonable person will accept as fair and equitable, given the different circumstances in which the institutions happen to be.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just one last question to the minister. Mr. Minister, then really what you're telling us is that every college, every university, will benefit somewhat from this fund, even though it's not in the right place, and that every college and every university will then be eligible for at least a certain portion of this \$3 million each year for three years? Then it's a matter of weighting based on need and what other case the college can make from there. But is there a guarantee, Mr. Minister, that every college will benefit, at least to some extent, from this program?

DR. HOHOL: That's correct. That's entirely the whole point of the allocation: in recognition of needs identified by colleges and universities, the government intends to provide a total of \$9 million to Alberta's 15 board-governed institutions. That's literal. It doesn't mean 14 or a dozen or 10; it means 15. As I indicated the last time I was on my feet, for this specific reason every institution will get some money regardless of what formulas are used. If the formula is the kind that provides a token or inadequate amount, we will set a minimum below which no institution will get less money and then apply the conditions, factors, and criteria from that point on.

MR. CLARK: One last question, Mr. Minister. Once you've worked out the criteria, the factors, and the formula, I assume you can give the House assurance that that'll be public information.

DR. HOHOL: Certainly. No reason why not, sir.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I'd like to commend the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower for a very, very innovative move. Now I really don't care whether he couldn't get increases in budget the other way, through cabinet. I think it's very significant that some of our institutions are going to benefit in a very material way. I've been told that every increase in spending with our universities is wages and salaries — 83 per cent. Well, I think it's very significant to take about 3 per cent of the total budget and be able to put it out in something as important as libraries. I certainly commend the minister for it.

Surely none of us here should be so naive as to believe that we're simply going to take \$9 million and divide it by student enrolments. I don't think anybody expects the minister to be that naive. Certainly the criteria, or the idea of setting up criteria based on need — some universities have allocated their funds in a different way, and obviously their needs aren't going to be the same. I would think the criteria spelled out by the minister — the present holdings, the need, the presentations they'll make based upon their particular institutions — should be the way the government responds. I have no quarrel with that at all.

I would like to commend the minister for coming out with a program that is kept outside of normal operating expenditures, because we believe that universities and colleges are autonomous because they have self-governing boards. The way those dollars are allocated depends to a great extent upon the politics of the institution at that time. Here is one way many students and the people of Alberta can benefit

through a very sensible program.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I want to say one or two words on this particular item. A few years ago we had a lot of complaints about the province not spending enough money on libraries. I, for one, am delighted that this additional sum is going to be added to the already reasonably large sum being spent on libraries in this province. The only concern I have in regard to the amount of money is that when we start working out the per capita amount being spent for libraries in this province, I hope we will take more than just the grant made to the various provincial libraries by the Department of Culture.

Some time ago, we had to deal with figures that were quoted from Saskatchewan and New Brunswick, indicating that the governments of those provinces were spending more on libraries per capita than Alberta was. I stated at that time that I hadn't been in the libraries in Saskatchewan, but I'd certainly been in two or three in New Brunswick, and the libraries could in no way compare with what we have in this province in our small towns, cities, even hamlets. I could only conclude they must have been adding to their total sum what they were providing for universities, colleges, et cetera. So I think Alberta should make sure we're relevant in that regard, that we include these large sums of money we're spending on libraries, colleges, universities, and high schools.

Secondly, I think this is a very excellent program. I'm delighted to see it and hope it will be the forerunner of a similar program, particularly for our large composite high schools and possibly for all schools, where some money can be spent from the heritage trust fund to improve the library facilities all over the province.

My third point is: I have no concern at all about this money coming from the Alberta heritage trust fund. I think this is an investment in the future that students are going to benefit from for many years. In my view it's logical to take this money from the Alberta heritage trust fund, one function of which is to try to provide things for the future that otherwise would not be provided.

I strongly support this vote and commend the minister for bringing it in.

Agreed to:

Advanced Education and Manpower

1 — Library Development \$3,000,000

Management of Water Systems

Environment

1 — Paddle River Basin Development

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you have any remarks with respect to this?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, both these projects were announced during the summer months when the decisions were made to recommend this as a heritage fund investment. I think it's not news to any of the members.

I must recall, though, the first year I was a member of this Legislature sitting over there in opposition, almost exactly 10 years ago. That's when I first heard

of the hon. Member for Barrhead. It was also the first time I heard about the Paddle River. At that time I not only met the hon. Member for Barrhead, I got well exposed to the problems of the Paddle River. I never dreamt at that time that 10 years later I'd be recommending this particular project to members. I think it's a good one.

In looking into the problems of that area I have found that the member and the Paddle River are alike in many ways: they both act up on occasion and at times have been known to be all wet. But other than that comparison . . .

Agreed to:

Environment

1 — Paddle River Basin Development \$3,056,300

2 — Lesser Slave Lake Stabilization

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the constituents of Lesser Slave Lake, I welcome the announcement of project No. 2. I would remind members of the Assembly that I believe the first occasion a request was placed before either a provincial or a federal government that something be done to correct the situation was almost 50 years ago, and that the most recent I'm aware of was in 1967, when the government of the day decided it would be more appropriate to buy out the farmers than to take action that would improve the agricultural situation in the lake area. Subsequent to that decision more than 50 families were bought out as a result of the continuing problems with the frequency and severity of flooding, with a loss of agricultural production of some 30,000 acres and significantly affecting another 30,000 acres.

So, Mr. Chairman, this project is most welcome, because it underlines the kinds of things that can be done with the capital projects division of the heritage savings trust fund. It's most appropriate because in the mid-50s, when there was considerable oil exploration, seismic lines, and road building in the Swan Hills, the problem intensified to where the land was in a state of almost continual high water and flooding.

As I say, on behalf of the constituents we're most appreciative of the support of the minister and the government in moving forward with this project. The benefits will be to agriculture to the extent I've mentioned, as well as to tourism and commercial fisheries.

I'd like to ask the minister a question. Since the positive effect will be to reclaim about 8,000 acres of Indian reserve land, is there any indication by the federal government that there will be sharing of this worth-while project?

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Chairman. We did investigate the feasibility of cost sharing and have abandoned that possibility. We want to do it as a provincial project. We think we can get it done quicker for one thing, and in a more reliable way.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, could the minister indicate the total cost of the complete project? Is this one phase of it, or will \$1.5 million be the complete cost of the project?

MR. RUSSELL: Our best estimate at this time is that this is the first of a four-year total budget expenditure close to \$8 million, and annual operating costs of about \$300,000.

MR. MANDEVILLE: That indicates that it's going to be four years before the project will be completed. Will it be completed at the end of the four-year term?

MR. RUSSELL: That's right, Mr. Chairman. Because of the nature of the geology up there, the construction alone will run over two construction seasons.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, while we're on the topic of management of water systems, I'd like to ask the minister again if he's had any further consultation with the Eastern Irrigation District board in my particular area in regard to the Bassano Dam. Is there any further development in getting the rehabilitation of the dam in Bassano started? If there's not going to be a decision, is the province going to be involved in any way to see that we get these funds from the federal government in some manner?

MR. RUSSELL: I must admit, Mr. Chairman, that when you look at the way things are going ahead in other irrigation districts, I'm disappointed at the lack of progress we have made with the EID. We can't seem to reach agreement on transfer of property and the takeover of the headworks system. The reconstruction of the Bassano Dam is entirely a federal expenditure. My present concern is that the negotiations have stretched over so many years that in these days of federal cutbacks the Bassano Dam may be a tempting item for the federal government to cut. I hope that doesn't happen, but I have to report to the member I'm disappointed by our lack of progress with that one particular district.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One further question, Mr. Chairman. Has the minister or his department made any studies with regard to putting in an earthfill dam? I'm not thinking now of the Eyremore Dam. I'm thinking of a dam just a short way downstream from the present Bassano Dam which is strictly a diversion dam. This has been considered by the PFRA. Has his department had any input or study in that area?

MR. RUSSELL: Only to the extent that the PFRA would have examined it, because that's who we used as consultants for the entire review of the reconstruction of the thing when the Eyremore project was put forward.

Agreed to:

2 — Lesser Slave Lake Stabilization	\$1,511,000
-------------------------------------	-------------

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, before we go to the total, I'd like to ask the Provincial Treasurer to explain the little footnote on the bottom of page 14, which says: "a) Does not include \$3.0 million for Government House South". I'd be interested in knowing the status of that project. I hope the government has decided not to move ahead with that project.

Mr. Minister, you'll recall the announcement by your colleague in the House, the then Minister of Housing and Public Works, that in fact this would be

funded out of the heritage savings trust fund. What's the status of that project?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, perhaps my colleague the Minister of Housing and Public Works will want to add to my remarks. As I understand the situation, there's been some planning but the process has not been moving ahead very rapidly. And while there will be some continued work on planning, it's not anticipated that any appreciable amount of funds would be spent. For that reason the planning will simply take place within the department and the departmental budget.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I don't have much to add to that. Of course it's an historic building. And because of the historic nature of the building, obviously we want to take appreciable care with the planning. So during the next year we'll in effect be planning the future of construction of Government House South.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Are you still looking at an estimated \$3 million cost to refurbish the building in a style that your predecessor outlined in the House? At that time the plans seemed quite complete. If I recall correctly, the minister filed plans in the House on that particular occasion. He even included in those plans offices for the opposition in Government House, even though he'd never discussed with us the possibility of our using that facility.

Now I find that a rather strange situation. Today, Mr. Minister, you're telling us the plans aren't finished, yet the day the announcement was made in the House the members of the media and ourselves were furnished with plans setting out which room was going to be in what area and, as I say, indicating the official opposition would have some office space in this building. Now, Mr. Minister, you're telling us the plans aren't finished. Come on. To be very direct about it, this is a politically sensitive project, and you decided not to go ahead with it during election year so you could take off some of the political heat. [interjections]

MR. CHAMBERS: I didn't realize the leader was so sensitive about the project, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CLARK: I didn't realize the government was either.

MR. CHAMBERS: If the Leader of the Opposition had ever practised any engineering, he'd know that you can draw a sketch plan. But then detailed engineering is a very elaborate and painstaking system, to do things right. Obviously, when you're dealing with an old, sandstone type of building, it requires very careful engineering and very careful planning. It's an historic building, and in my view an historic building requires that kind of careful and thorough planning. So we're going to take the next year. I expect it'll take us another year or so to carefully assess the input with regard to the historic nature, and to work on the plans.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I think this is most humorous. A year ago we had a professional engi-

neer get up and announce that the plan was going to go ahead right away. Now we're being told by another professional engineer in the same portfolio that we've got to move very slowly on this, that it's an historic building. Mr. Minister, that's hardly new information. Your predecessor knew that when he made the announcement. The old courthouse in Calgary isn't something that just emerged on the scene since you became minister. If I ever heard a bunch of flimsy, flimflam excuses, we're hearing them here today.

Clearly what's happened here is that the government has found it very hard to justify taking \$3 million out of the heritage savings trust fund to spend on Government House South, so we're being told today that we've got to go very careful with the engineering and so on. The real reason is that politically Government House is a project that Albertans say we'd far better not go ahead with, and spend that money on hospitals, schools, and roads across this province. So the government hopes it is going to avoid that kind of criticism until after the next election. That's the real reason we're getting this pussy-footing around here today, that it's going to take more engineering. Certainly with the myriad of engineers they have in the Department of Housing and Public Works, they knew that before they made the announcement. If they didn't, it sure says something about the competence of the decision before the announcement was made.

MR. RUSSELL: Oh, Mr. Chairman, I just have to get into this. The problem is, there are too many engineers and not enough architects involved. I don't know if the hon. leader realizes what's going on down in Calgary now . . .

MR. CLARK: I realize very well.

MR. RUSSELL: . . . with respect to the restoration of historic buildings. I refer to three sandstone buildings that are now being or have been reconstructed and restored historically along the 8th Avenue mall. I think the hon. minister, in fairness to him, outlined very clearly the problems when you put new guts, mechanically and electrically, and all the services and new partitions, into an historic building of that age built of Calgary quarried sandstone, which is very fragile and has all kinds of structural problems. You know, the hon. leader's arguments might have some justification if the announcement in the book was that we were abandoning the thing. But we're not. It's being delayed for a year while the proper . . .

MR. CLARK: While the election comes along.

MR. RUSSELL: . . . planning is being done.

The other aspect I wanted to talk about was the reluctance of the hon. Leader of the Opposition to bring full government services to the southern half of the province. That's the whole thrust of this project. We recognize that that's been out of balance for many years. The Premier's office in the Bowlen Building, which was put in by the former government, went part way to restoring that, but not all the way because it's strictly an administrative branch of the government side of the Legislature. Government House is going to bring to Calgary and to the entire

southern Alberta region the full gamut of government services for almost half the population of the province of Alberta. There's space there for His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, the Leader of the Opposition, opposition MLAs, and government members. And there's space for public functions to occur.

I can't think of a better investment for the heritage savings trust fund. You know, we've had our fun talking about the time the engineers are taking. But I don't mind going back to Calgary and fully justifying and defending this project. It's a good one, and I think it's unfortunate that it has been delayed for a few months. But as a result of the delay, perhaps it'll be all the better when it is finished.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it abundantly clear that the delay is the result of the architects and not the engineers. [interjections] On all building renovations or all new buildings, the architects are always totally in charge. Basically, the engineers work for the architects. And as the architects change design, the engineers necessarily have to change their design. I just want to disagree with the hon. Member for Calgary Elbow when he places the fault amongst the engineers. The fault is entirely with the architects, and that's where it consistently is in terms of getting projects on stream, in this area of building, in the appropriate time span.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, this is a most delightful discussion, because normally we hear that the lawyers are delaying.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, frankly I don't like the criticism of the engineers, because I find that engineers are very, very thorough. When they finish a job, it's finished, and you don't have to worry about it. I don't know who the engineers on this project are, but I have the highest regard for engineers, their efficiency, and the way they dispatch the business that's given to them.

The other point I'd like to mention is that I supported this program when it first came to the Legislature, and I still support it. When I meet constituents in Calgary I find it quite embarrassing to have to take them into a hotel room or to the lobby of a hotel. I think the people of southern Alberta need this service.

The hon. minister just mentioned that there'd be space in this for the opposition. Well, that's more than we provided when we built the J.J. Bowlen Building. As a matter of fact, the opposition were told they couldn't use the building. So I'm glad to see that opposition members are going to have a place there too.

We heard this same criticism, the very same thing, when Government House was being renovated. Now everyone who goes to Government House in Edmonton is just filled with admiration for what was done there. I've had people up from the Drumheller area who've been there, and they're simply delighted that we have a place like that. When you hear the admiration of people from other provinces, I think we really have something of which to be proud.

But southern Alberta deserves the same thing. It's not wasted money; it's money that's going to be used for years and years to come. It's a facility that's going to be used for years and years to come. If I recall

when the announcement was made, it didn't say the plans were all complete. It said the plans were being prepared for these things. The same as many times when I announced a highway a few years ago, I didn't say the detailed engineering had been done. I said, we plan to build that highway; we plan to put truck stops along the side. But all that had to be engineered by people highly qualified to do so, and all of them create problems.

I'm glad we're going ahead with this building. I think the proper place for it to come from is the heritage trust fund, and I think it's going to be something the government will receive a great deal of commendation for, whether it's before or after the election.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a couple of concluding comments. I found it most refreshing to get an architect's point of view as to how we should have full government services for southern Albertans. Right on, hon. Mr. Russell, Minister of the Environment. But since when did we use the heritage savings trust fund, capital projects portion, to get to the point where we have full government services for people in southern Alberta? That's the logical area of the normal operating budget of the province. This is the bind that the government and some members of the opposition have themselves involved in. There's no clear line of distinction between what you use the heritage fund for and what you don't.

I should just add this comment. I found it very interesting over the past three months. We've had the Provincial Treasurer, in the course of meeting before the heritage trust fund committee, admit quite frankly that it's a matter of judgment as to where things should fit, whether they should be in the heritage savings trust fund, capital projects, or the normal operating budget of the province. We've had the Premier shift his position from what the province could afford to — well, "unique projects" is the term the Premier is now using. Now we have the architectural representative in the Assembly, the Minister of the Environment, get up and freely admit to us that we're now using the heritage savings trust fund to guarantee that southern Albertans are going to get full government services. We've seen, for all members here, the cloud that hangs over the way this government makes decisions as to whether it's going to come out of the heritage fund or the normal operating budget of the province.

I just leave that with the members. I've made this point several times during this session. I guess it's a basic philosophic difference between the Conservative government and the Social Credit opposition.

I would just make this other comment. Despite whether it's the fault of the architect, the engineer, or the lawyer, the fact is that some months ago the government was going to go ahead with this project right away. They've received a great deal of criticism from people who can't understand how come we can't build hospitals and have schools in some areas, because we can't get decisions from the Minister of Education even today, yet we can go ahead with three million bucks on Government House South in Calgary.

The government isn't going to admit it, but the real reason they're not going ahead with it this year isn't the problem of shifting sandstone and that kind of stuff, or not enough engineers in Public Works or enough architectural advice. It's simply that politically the government has decided we won't go ahead with this this year. We're at least glad they've listened as far as this year is concerned. If they're going to go ahead with this project, once again the logical, sensible place to fund it from is the normal operating budget of the province, like the Minister of the Environment inadvertently admitted.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I find this argument very, very amusing. The severest criticism the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury can come up with this is that you're taking it out of the wrong pocket. You're taking it out of the heritage savings trust fund instead of the regular government program. I wish the hon. member would realize that whether you take it out of the heritage trust pocket or the regular fund pocket, both pockets are in the same trousers. The people of this province couldn't care less where we take the money from, as long as we do the things that have to be done in Alberta.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, during last year's appropriations on the heritage savings trust fund I supported this particular appropriation, and I support it again this year. I think the concept of putting heritage moneys into restoring a significant sandstone building in Calgary is an appropriate use of heritage savings trust fund, capital projects division appropriations. I'd like to see this capital projects division expanded to include other historic buildings in the province. There's no finer heritage we can leave the future citizens of this province than restoring some of these significant historic buildings throughout the province. I'd like to see this area expanded.

Agreed to:
Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund,
Capital Projects Division,
1979-80 Estimates: Total \$229,671,300

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I move that the resolutions of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund estimates for 1979-80 and supplementary estimates for 1978-79 be reported.

[Motion carried]

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

Resolved that from the Alberta heritage savings trust fund sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1980, for the purpose of making investments in the following projects to be administered by

Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care: \$12,000,000, southern Alberta children's hospital; \$45,000,000, Alberta Health Sciences Centre; \$35,000,000, Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and Specialty Services Facility; \$16,397,000, cancer and heart disease research.

Minister of Agriculture: \$9,000,000, irrigation rehabilitation and expansion.

Minister of the Environment: \$5,500,000, irrigation headworks improvement.

Minister of Energy and Natural Resources: \$590,000, Alberta Reforestation Nursery; \$5,424,000, grazing reserves development; \$1,000,000, maintaining our forests.

Minister of the Environment: \$5,000,000, land reclamation.

Minister of Energy and Natural Resources: \$38,200,000, Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority.

Minister of the Environment: \$6,270,000, Capital City Recreation Park; \$3,500,000, Fish Creek Provincial Park.

Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife: \$3,719,000, Fish Creek Provincial Park.

Minister of Transportation: \$5,300,000, airport terminal buildings.

Minister of Education: \$3,888,000, Alberta heritage learning resources.

Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife: \$24,316,000, Kananaskis Country recreation development.

Minister of Agriculture: \$2,000,000, farming for the future program.

Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower: \$3,000,000, library development.

Minister of the Environment: \$3,056,300, Paddle River basin development; \$1,511,000, Lesser Slave Lake stabilization.

Resolved that from the Alberta heritage savings trust fund, sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979, for the purpose of making further investments in the following projects to be administered by

Minister of the Environment: \$4,085,000, Capital City Park.

Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife: \$731,000, Fish Creek Park.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask leave of the House to revert to Introduction of Bills?

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Deputy Premier have the leave requested?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS** (*reversion*)

Bill 72

The Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Supplementary Act, 1978

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 72, The Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Supplementary Act, 1978. This being a money bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill would be to have the Legislative Assembly vote the appropriations that have been under consideration by the Committee of Supply with respect to the supplementary estimates.

[Leave granted; Bill 72 read a first time]

Bill 73

The Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1978

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 73, The Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1978. This being a money bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide the appropriations for the Alberta heritage savings trust fund, capital projects division, which have been under consideration by the Committee of Supply, for the period ending March 31, 1980.

[Leave granted; Bill 73 read a first time]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS** (*Second Reading*)

Bill 61

The Students Finance Amendment Act, 1978

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 61, The Students Finance Amendment Act, 1978.

In particular, it deals with three matters, one having to do with the capacity of the Students Finance Board to delegate. In this instance, the concern is that the board delegate those things which are administrative to provide it time and also to make certain that it functions in that area which is its major responsibility, policy development. Secondly, it provides for reporting procedures of the Students Finance Board, indicating the kind of relationship it has with the minister and Executive Council. Thirdly, the amendments provide for an appeal board of not more than 12 people. It is significant that this board can be broken into groups of no more than three so

that appeals can be expedited and heard more rapidly. One of the concerns of students who, in their opinion, have grounds to appeal a determination of the board with respect to an application for student finance is that those appeals be heard as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, those are the three major propositions in the amendments.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, speaking very briefly to Bill No. [61], it's our intention to support the bill. Mr. Minister, I would ask, though, that you give consideration to entertaining an amendment to that portion of Bill 61 that deals with the student appeal committee. I think if provision were there for some student representation on the appeal committee, it would strengthen the act and would also be seen by students as being somewhat more objective. I'd appreciate it very much if you'd give that some serious consideration, so that once we get to committee study either the minister can bring forward an amendment or we can discuss the matter at that time.

[Motion carried; Bill 61 read a second time]

Bill 67
The Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Statutes Amendment Act, 1978

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 67, The Consumer and Corporate Affairs Statutes Amendment Act, 1978.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is to place certain amendments in several pieces of legislation in the portfolio of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, specifically The Credit Union Act, The Debtors' Assistance Act, The Franchises Act, and The Trust Companies Act.

With regard to The Credit Union Act, all the proposed amendments basically have come to us as a result of the proceedings of the federation and are really the request from The Credit Union Federation of Alberta to improve their legislation. It's been my privilege to be able to work with the federation and its membership and to bring before this Legislature the changes they request. Of course, there are times when we may agree to disagree; that is as it should be. I will say that any time they have made a request and we have gone back to the federation with our opposition to it, and with the reasons for that reluctance to take it further, by and large that has been accepted. I think it's worked very well.

The federation asked that government agencies, trust companies, and other corporations that have funds to deposit should be able to place their funds in credit unions. The problem has always been that ordinarily to put moneys on deposit with a credit union you had to be a member. It seemed inappropriate that institutions such as government agencies, trust companies, and other corporations should have to be a member of the credit union.

I think it's fair to say, however, that the success of the credit union movement has depended very greatly on membership and the contribution individual members make to the credit union. In fact, credit unions would not be successful without it. However, I think they would like to see the accessibility to those funds. I see no reason this Assembly should restrict credit unions from being able to seek deposits from such

groups, including municipal corporations and their agents, and not only this government but the government of Canada as well.

Another requested amendment which appears in this legislation is the change to the prohibition regarding overdrafts in members' accounts even when the overdraft does not exceed the unused portion of a line of credit approved by the credit union itself. So amendments have been placed in this bill to permit a line-of-credit agreement so that it's simpler and perhaps easier for credit union management to operate. They obviously have the decision to make as to how much credit should be extended, and it seems to me we should leave it up to the credit unions to establish what's needed in line-of-credit agreements.

In the requirements for the line-of-credit agreement there's the problem of notes. When credit unions have been dealing with their customers they have found some problem about making sure that they have the note to cover the advance. The Credit Union Federation has some opinions indicating that they may have some difficulty, as of course the banks do, and for this reason the line-of-credit agreement is thought to be appropriate. They would of course have to ensure that they have adequate security for whatever loans they make. That is something they should be able to resolve.

A task force was struck to investigate and consider the implications of changing the credit union statutory fiscal year to other than December 31. After a great deal of study it was determined that as December 31 conflicts with statutory holidays and other calendar year end work, it was not consistent with the reporting systems of financial institutions. Therefore October 31 was felt to be a more suitable choice. Members of the Assembly will notice that we have in effect changed the date of the fiscal year.

It will be mandatory for credit unions to send an annual corporate summary to the companies branch. This is part of the very extensive improvements being made in the companies branch to be able to handle the ever-increasing volume of work. This involves improvement in the forms used and of course in computerization to improve service. The present method of assessing credit unions for the Stabilization Corporation annual assessment is based on year-end balances of the outstanding shares, savings, and deposits of the credit union. Basing the assessment on the average month-end balances on a quarterly basis will be a more equitable method of assessment in relation to the earning power of those assets on which the assessment is based.

The proposed new formula places the assessment on a quarterly basis. In addition to assessing the total aggregate balances in shares, savings, and deposits, the aggregate total will now include the credit unions' borrowed capital. The new assessment formula will not reduce the amount paid into the stabilization fund each year. In fact, it will do the opposite; it will provide a slightly higher assessment which the credit unions will have to pay into the stabilization fund. It will be mandatory for the stabilization board to undertake a review of the adequacy of the fund at least once a year. Again this is a recommendation that has come from the federation, and we would agree with that request.

Moving now to The Debtors' Assistance Act, the amendment will provide the authority to obtain the

services of qualified individuals to act for and on behalf of the board should the need ever arise. It will provide the board with greater flexibility. It is consistent with other similar legislation, and was not available in the existing act. There are amendments which will enable the board to provide professional analysis and recommendations to courts as to the financial capabilities of parties involved in a maintenance proceeding. It will therefore expand the powers of the board to include this activity. These amendments are the result of recommendations by an interdepartmental committee whose members represented the Department of Social Services and Community Health, The Attorney General, The Solicitor General, and Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Recommendations for this activity were also included in report no. 27 of the Institute of Law Research and Reform on matrimonial support.

So basically the main amendments included here will give the board some duties and responsibilities if called upon by the courts when dealing with matrimonial matters. The board will therefore have the authorization to assist the courts in complying with an order to interview and make a report to the courts in maintenance actions. If the amendments are passed, the board will have the ability to submit this report as prima facie proof of the facts. The reasoning for this is that based on the volume of actions in this area, a submission of a report in this way should greatly reduce the amount of time the board will have to spend on court proceedings.

There is a small amendment to The Franchises Act that will allow the commission to appoint officials to administer this act and to have substitute administrators in case the regular official is away from the office. Presently there's no provision for that, and when the administrator of the program is on vacation or absent from the office there's just no legislative power to deal with anything.

The amendments to The Trust Companies Act follow the amendments placed in the act in previous sessions of the Legislature and are ones which for one reason or another took more time to deal with than could be dealt with when we were dealing with the major amendments on previous occasions.

As I suppose is true in any piece of legislation, The Trust Companies Act is a fairly substantial piece of legislation and requires a great deal of work when you start making changes. I can add that we have had very successful meetings with the Association of Alberta Trust Companies. I have met with that group and on each occasion each of the Alberta trust companies has been represented at the meetings. They have given us a great deal of help and assistance. Several briefs have been submitted by them, all of which resulted in the amendments proposed in this bill. Most of them are very technical. When it comes to trying to illustrate some general principles, it's very difficult to be able to give a concise thread, because the amendments touch so many sections of the existing legislation.

One of the areas where we've had some particular problem relates to the use of electronic data and data processing equipment. It's possible now for records to be kept virtually anywhere by the use of computers, and I think it's incumbent upon the Legislature to update the legislation as it applies to the use of these electronic gadgets which speed up the record-

keeping process but which obviously result in the fact that the material itself can very well be located outside the jurisdiction. Obviously if you have a director of trust companies, he must be able to get at the records, and if those records are located in Vancouver, Toronto, or elsewhere, it becomes rather difficult for him to carry out his function. So in order to get around this problem there is some new wording to relate to this area of electronics and data processing. It's similar to the definition contained in The Financial Administration Act, and to the wording being used in the Canada Business Corporations Act of the Statutes of Canada.

Interestingly enough for those of us who wonder how old we're getting as the years go by, I notice a reference in this bill to the Bretton Woods Agreements Act of Canada. I'm sure those who came through the war years and the problems anticipated following the end of the Second World War, which resulted in the Bretton Woods Agreements — it's sort of interesting that today, in 1978, we're making an amendment that should relate to something that occurred way back then. But it's there because of a slight change in wording.

About a month or maybe two months ago, we received a request from the Canadian Commercial and Industrial Bank to provide a mechanism in our legislation so as to be in conformity with other Alberta statutes which had been amended to permit the investment in so-called MICs. That was done in some of the other legislation, but for some reason or other it had not been done in The Trust Companies Act. We were quite prepared to accept the recommendation, and you'll see the appropriate amendments as a result.

Mr. Speaker, I think that covers most of the major parts of this bill, and I would ask all hon. members to support it.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make two quick comments. First of all in connection with The Credit Union Act, I'd like to commend the minister for the amendments. I recently had the pleasure of attending the opening of a brand-new credit union building by the mayor, Mr. John Richter, and by the hon. Dr. Allan Warrack, the MLA. At that opening the officers of the credit union made very fine comments about the co-operation from the minister and the government, and everyone was delighted with the growth of the credit union movement in that area. It is providing a tremendous service to the people, and the people certainly appreciate it.

The second item I'd like to mention is the delegation of powers under The Debtors' Assistance Act. The present act permits the delegation of powers of the board to any member or members of the board. I see now there's another extension of that; the board may extend or delegate its powers to people who are not members of the board. I'm wondering where the responsibility rests and why we're now extending the powers of the board to people who are not members of the board.

It seems to me a question of responsibility is there that the board will have to assume. From experience with the board of public utility commissioners and the CTC, it seems to me that awkward situations arise now when only a few members of the board deal with an important question, make a decision, and that

decision is then binding on the whole board. If people are going to be given this authority to act as the board when they're not even members of the board, I'm just wondering how that's going to be received by the general public, particularly if an adverse decision is given in regard to something dealing with The Debtors' Assistance Act.

I'm wondering if the hon. minister could give us an enlargement of why we are now delegating powers by the Debtors' Assistance Board to men or women who are not members of that board.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HARLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Debtors' Assistance Board is one of the anomalies, in a sense, in the structure of government. In reality the Debtors' Assistance Board is part of the department. While there is a statutory need for the board and it has some functions to perform, in actual fact it's the department and the people employed in government who are the agents of the board. For that reason I think it's a question of being able to delegate it, because the board really consists of only relatively few people and in order to carry out its functions it needs to have the personnel. By and large those personnel are officials within the department. We want to be able to have the board delegate some of those duties so we can have departmental staff attend to it.

Now it may well be that for some reason there is a need to employ someone else who is not on staff, and that too is provided for in the right to delegate. But it really is the department. Frankly, I think eventually that board will disappear. But at the present time it's part of the statute, and I think it should be left in place until we resolve how to deal with it.

[Motion carried; Bill 67 read a second time]

**Bill 54
The Alberta Heritage
Savings Trust Fund Special
Appropriation Act, 1979-80**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 54, The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1979-80. This bill authorizes the transfer by the Provincial Treasurer of 30 per cent of all non-renewable resource revenues received by the provincial government from the general revenue fund to the heritage savings trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, during the committee stage of the estimates with respect to the capital projects division of the fund, the hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to projects within that division being within the normal budgetary process. I expressed the view that I disagreed with the philosophy he was supporting and would have something to say on second reading of this bill. On reflection, I've looked over what I had to say on that point before the committee of the Legislative Assembly reviewing the report of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund, and what my colleagues have had to say at various stages of the committee study of the appropriations, and I doubt

that I can really add to what I said or what my colleagues have had to say on the issue.

I would simply leave it at that for the moment, Mr. Speaker, and move second reading of Bill 54.

MR. CLARK: In commenting on second reading, Mr.

Speaker, I'd hoped the Provincial Treasurer would outline a bit more fully the government's thinking with regard to the kinds of projects we might find there.

However, the real point I want to make on Bill 54 is simply this: hon. members, what we're doing is putting 30 per cent of our non-renewable resource revenue for next year into the fund. The estimated resource revenue for this year is some \$3.6 billion. We'll be transferring 30 per cent of that. We've already agreed to that for the year we're now in. But that gives us some kind of magnitude of the kind of transfer being made this year — 30 per cent of some \$3.6 billion.

This piece of legislation is saying that next year, when we don't know how much that resource revenue is going to be — but I think even a conservative estimate would be more than \$3.6 billion. This afternoon we're agreeing in principle that we're prepared to put 30 per cent of that into the heritage savings trust fund. The position my colleagues and I take is that we should not do that until we have a system of revenue sharing with municipalities across the province.

The heritage fund will be in excess of \$4 billion at the end of this year. We remember that today the Premier of this province is in Ottawa making a strong pitch for strong provincial governments within a strong Canada, albeit with a strong federal government also. But the pitch that should also be made is the need for strong municipal governments at the very same time. We're not going to have strong municipal governments in this province until we get out of a system of municipal finances that's grown out of character with Alberta in the 1970s. As we approach the 1980s with a heritage fund of some \$4 billion and \$2.5 billion of accumulated surpluses, at the time we're approving the 30 per cent transfer for 1979-80, members of this Assembly should be stopping and saying: look, the heritage fund is over \$4 billion, we've got \$2.5 billion in accumulated surpluses, let's stop, let's go the route of sharing a portion of our renewable resource revenue with municipalities.

I would suggest to members that if we talked in terms of sharing 10 per cent of our resource revenue with municipalities, for the year we're in now it would mean approximately \$360 million. To give members some sort of feeling as to what portion that is of property tax paid across the province, I think it's fair to say that's in the ballpark of about 50 per cent.

So, to hon. members of the Assembly, my colleagues and I plan to vote against Bill 54 on the basis that this is the time when we should stop and say: look, before we put additional funds of this magnitude into the heritage savings trust fund, we should go the route of sharing revenue with our municipalities. It may be that we could afford to share revenue and still put an amount close to this in the heritage fund. Fair ball. That may be a possibility. But it seems to us that we should not agree to that kind of transfer until we first of all have a commitment towards revenue

sharing.

We can spend a lot of time looking over the past about things that should or should not have been done. But when we look at the kind of resources we have today — we talk about strong provincial government. I think a move of this nature towards revenue sharing would make it possible for us to have stronger municipal governments in this province. Yes, they'll make mistakes; but let none of us sitting in this Assembly — that we don't make mistakes either.

So it's from that point of view, Mr. Speaker, that I plan not to support Bill 54, The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1979-80.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to participate in the debate on Bill 54, but since the hon. Leader of the Opposition has led us down the obscure path of debating revenue sharing and the very important and meritorious concerns he's expressed in the heritage savings trust fund, I think it's appropriate that at least some balancing comments be expressed. For fear of being ruled out of order on the debate of revenue sharing, I hope I can at least have some opportunity to express some of the balancing views.

Let me just restate what the hon. Leader of the Opposition has really said. First of all, he has said that the way in which municipalities in this province are funded out of operations is not appropriate; it does not meet the needs of the municipalities, and in fact the province is being tight with the funds we have here. Secondly, he has pointed out, I think inappropriately, that the funding of the municipalities should be on some large scale and out of this very special savings fund, which we are attempting to set aside for the future of the municipalities and of all Alberta when our resources start to trend down, the flow of funds for our province is more difficult, and we have to rely on other sources of income.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, the source of funds to our municipalities is really a form of block transfers. In effect, the funds that flow to the municipalities flow through the general operations of the province. These funds are approximately 55 to 56 per cent from resource revenue. The amount of money which we transfer in aggregate through 1978-79 — if my estimation is correct and you allow me the leeway of error in my dollar amounts — is about \$300 million in the current budgets. I don't think that's an inadequate source of funds for the municipalities. And I don't think we can attach more flexibility to our transfer to the municipalities and still hold ourselves as being responsible legislators of the province; responsible, first, for a balanced fiscal policy in terms of our operations and, secondly, responsible to carry us through the horizon — say, the 15-year period ahead — when royalties and the flow of resource revenues to the province will in fact decrease.

Add to that, Mr. Speaker, the autonomy we have given municipalities in terms of access to a very dynamic tax base, the property tax base. I think you'll find that the source of revenue for municipalities is in fact dynamic, growing, particularly in this province, where private-sector activity has been substantial over the past four years and is predicted to be more so in the future, and that the municipalities have a very lucrative source of income, both from the direct

transfers from this province — some \$300 million — and, secondly, through their own tax base, the property tax base. To argue otherwise, to suggest we have been parsimonious in the amount of money and resources given to the province, is in fact inaccurate. And to suggest we should allow the municipalities an opportunity to move into the resource or income tax revenue would be fraught with difficulties.

Those difficulties, Mr. Speaker, have been brought home to us in the last year. We find a federal government with an uncertain and frail fiscal policy intruding in the area of provincial jurisdiction on a random basis without much consultation. I note that in the past year such concerns have been expressed first of all in the sales tax area, where in fact the federal government has unilaterally adjusted the sales tax calculation, and secondly in the area of our resource agreement, where in fact after the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources hammering out a very difficult agreement with the federal government, we find the federal government generally attempting to delay that increase and defer the flow of funds to the province.

Other municipalities in such jurisdictions as Manitoba and Saskatchewan have experienced this difficulty. While the provinces there have agreed to allow access to the lucrative tax base, the direct tax base, in the case of Manitoba that amount of money has in fact decreased in 1978-79 over what was predicted, for the very reasons I have outlined: that federal intrusion, particularly in the area of sales tax, has been very difficult in the planning process. There has been little certainty and little assurance that the flow of funds to the municipality would be any better than we have here.

It's my view, Mr. Speaker, that the concept of the heritage savings trust fund, the fact that we are setting aside money for future generations, will be of major benefit to municipalities as we move into the 1980s and 1990s. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think the people of this province really expect us to commit a dramatic amount of dollars to municipalities on the formula suggested by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, but in fact have agreed with our position that the combination of conditional and unconditional assistance and a very live property tax base is the best way to ensure the future of strong, dynamic municipalities in this province.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a point or two on the bill before us. The Leader of the Opposition has stated that the reason we are opposing this bill is that before we commit the funds as stated under this bill, we feel municipalities must be treated as equal partners.

Mr. Speaker, we hear the talk that goes on about how we want to be treated as equal partners. When we are looking at taking funds and committing them to a large fund that is growing larger all the time, people in the province are starting to question our credibility as politicians, as members of this Assembly. What we are really trying to tell the people at levels of government immediately below us, who are elected by the same people who elect us to this Assembly, is that they at the local level do not know how to administer. That's what this government seems to be saying. We are saying that we feel there will be a responsibility on the people at the municipal

level to administer the funds. That's why we are saying we do not want these further funds committed until the government and the members of this Assembly pledge revenue sharing with those municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, it's fine for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to say the economy ebbs and flows. That's fine. I'm sure the people at the local level can adjust as well as we can. Are we that much wiser? Is the provincial government that much wiser than the mayor of Barrhead or the mayor of Medicine Hat? Is that what he's saying? I'm sure he doesn't mean that, and I'm sure he's not inferring that. We have to give more responsibility to the people at the local level, because they know better how their funding should be spent than we do in our wisdom under this dome.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs says the tax base is growing. That's fine. Nobody can argue with that. But is the minister willing to tell us that the costs of providing services are also escalating more rapidly than the tax base?

AN HON. MEMBER: Wrong.

DR. BUCK: Wrong? Well then, some of the mayors and councillors of the municipalities in this province wonder why there isn't enough money to go around. Why are they having difficulties? Why are the mayors constantly coming to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Premier and saying, we have some problems. Really, what seems to be implied is that the government is not placing sufficient confidence in the people at the local level.

I'm glad to see we're going to be getting a speech from the Deputy Premier; at least maybe we're going to get a speech from the Deputy Premier. We well know that the Deputy Premier said that municipalities are children of the provincial government. Sometimes I think the government treats them as children. The Minister of Municipal Affairs talks about the major benefits that will accrue from the Alberta heritage savings trust fund in the 1980s. Mr. Minister, if we put the funds in the hands of the local people, maybe the future will be assured now. Or has the minister forgotten what "now" means? Maybe he has.

The commitment to revenue sharing would be politically safe for the government. But maybe the government doesn't want to give up the power that's transferred when we give local governments autonomy, the right to decide how their money should be spent. We now operate under a beautiful system. We say to municipalities, we in our wisdom will give you special grants, but they must be spent only in special areas. The provincial government looks like the good guys. They are being so benevolent giving funds to the municipalities, but with strings attached.

Maybe they don't need extra police grants; maybe they need transportation grants. If we were to share revenue, they would decide where that money should go. I think they know better than we do, than the government does, where those funds should go. That's why we are asking this government to make a commitment to local government, that they know how to spend the funds. Mr. Minister, this is why we are opposing the transfer of more funds into the Alberta

heritage savings trust fund.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I've listened with interest to the arguments from the other side with respect to why they can't support Bill 54, suggesting that revenue sharing is the only barrier in the way and that if revenue sharing were provided, support would be forthcoming from the members of the Social Credit Party. I find that very interesting, Mr. Speaker, because what we've heard this afternoon is an unwitting attack on the whole concept of the heritage savings trust fund. I say "unwitting", because I don't think the opposition would ever do anything like that in a witting fashion.

DR. BUCK: Only a lawyer could interpret that that way.

MR. KOZIAK: What we have here is the first bite, the first step. You know we had the estimates of all the departments before the Legislature this spring. At that time I didn't hear from the opposition that another some \$324 million was required for the operation of municipalities across this province. All of a sudden I hear that this afternoon. We take that 10 per cent and set it aside for municipalities, and we've got revenue sharing. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what we do with \$4.3 billion a year: share revenue. In the case of education \$603 million, plus the additional funds available by virtue of the school foundation program fund, is directly shared with school boards across the province. That's revenue sharing.

What I expect will be the next argument, probably in Committee of the Whole study, if we acceded to this argument, is: well, now let's give 10 per cent for another local government because we haven't given them enough — that's the school boards — and then I suppose we should give another 10 per cent to the universities, and another 10 per cent to social services and community health. And what do you know? When we start divvying up all these 10 per cents, pretty soon there's no heritage savings trust fund left.

So that, Mr. Speaker, is what we have this afternoon. The argument being put forward by the opposition is a direct attack on the whole concept. That's why I support the bill, notwithstanding, as I say, the unwitting comments of the two members of that opposition party who spoke in that attack. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I want to make one comment on the debate with respect to municipal funding which, to my surprise, arose out of second reading of this bill. I think my colleagues the Minister of Education and the Minister of Municipal Affairs have very admirably answered the arguments put forward by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Clover Bar.

But I did want to make this comment in respect of the opposition's position: they seem to be leaving the impression that things are different today than they were when they were in office, that the municipali-

ties are worse off today than they were prior to 1971. Also I think the Assembly should be aware, or have recalled to its attention, the fact that in 1971 there were appreciable surpluses in the government of that day.

When this argument over municipal funding started to develop, I checked to see what percentage of the disposable income of a tradesman owning a modest three-bedroom bungalow would be municipal taxes in 1971 and what percentage it would be now. It was interesting, Mr. Speaker. I found that in 1971 such a person would pay about 7 per cent of his disposable income in municipal taxes whereas in 1978 the figure would be down to about 3.5 or 4 per cent.

MR. CLARK: And the provincial budget's gone up four times. That's the part you forget.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'm always astonished at the capacity of the Leader of the Opposition to drag in irrelevancies. [interjections] His ability in that area is quite astonishing.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to add that one comment . . .

DR. BUCK: Listen to the master.

MR. LEITCH: . . . in respect to debate on second reading of this bill and move that it be supported.

[Motion carried; Bill 54 read a second time]

Bill 66
The Fuel Oil Administration
Amendment Act, 1978 (No. 2)

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 66, The Fuel Oil Administration Amendment Act, 1978 (No. 2).

As I mentioned on introduction of the bill, Mr. Speaker, we propose to amend two areas by this bill. The first is a series of largely technical amendments relating to the certificates and so on that would be used as evidence in prosecutions under the act for the illegal use of marked or blended fuel. In my judgment, none of those amendments would involve any change in policy.

The second proposed amendment, Mr. Speaker, would enable the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make regulations designating certain operations as farming operations. We're proposing that amendment because during the few months this legislation has been in operation, we found that we were having difficulty with the definition of farming operations in the sense that it's hard to determine exactly what operations fall within that definition which would normally be regarded as farming operations. That's not a new experience for legislatures when they come to defining farming operations. I don't know of any instance where anyone has been wholly satisfied with that definition, and we do find in our legislation a number of different ways in which the Legislature has endeavoured to cope with that definition. This will give us some flexibility and enable us to provide the transportation allowance to operations which, I think, would be regarded by the farming community as farming operations but which do not fall precisely within the definition now in the legislation.

I'll simply give a few examples of operations that might be included. I'm not wishing to make a commitment to the Assembly that they would be, but the kinds of things that I would recommend be included are such things as greenhouses, nurseries, and sod farms, at least in respect to the fuel consumed on the land in the actual growing operation. There are a number of similar examples.

I think those are the only two areas in the proposed legislation that I would wish to comment on in moving second reading.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on Bill 66, The Fuel Oil Administration Amendment Act.

I'm pleased that the minister is bringing in regulations, because it's certainly always been a problem to try to define who is and who is not a farmer, especially as it relates to fuel oil or marked fuel. One area I know we've had a problem with is irrigation districts. The minister didn't mention that. As to whether or not it will be covered by regulation, I don't know. But I certainly hope that irrigation districts will be covered as far as the regulations are concerned, or regulations will be set up to cover irrigation districts for our irrigation farmers. That's what they're producing: agricultural products pretty well exclusively.

An irrigation district could be called a co-op. Most of the irrigation districts prefer not to be called co-ops, and they're not called co-ops. In my own constituency I have the Eastern Irrigation District, which is really a large co-op. All the farmers got together, and they operate as a co-op to provide water to the farmers in the irrigation district. But they also have around 600,000 acres of grass that they provide to the farmers and ranchers. They provide this grass at a cost. They set up co-ops to handle the livestock and put them in there at so much per head. So it's pretty well exclusively a farmer-owned operation. In the past few years the Eastern Irrigation District has seeded around 17,500 acres back to grass. It's strictly a farming operation. Every year they're seeding approximately 2,000 acres back to grass for the use of our ranchers and farmers in the irrigation district.

So I certainly hope that in the regulations . . . I think it is covered in the act, and I thought it was covered in the original act before it was amended. It says:

"farming operations" means the production, or any step in the production, of livestock [or] grain . . .

I thought that would cover an irrigation district, because irrigation districts are pretty well exclusively for the production of livestock and grain.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Member for Bow Valley for his comments. I could very easily have included irrigation districts in the examples I gave on moving second reading, because we are looking at them. Some aspects of their operation would certainly be within definition the hon. member referred to. Other aspects may well be covered and included within the regulations. As I say, that is one

of the other examples, and we're looking at some additional ones.

[Motion carried; Bill 66 read a second time]

Bill 68

**The Maintenance and Recovery
Amendment Act 1978**

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of The Maintenance and Recovery Amendment Act, 1978. As the members are aware, the act has two substantive parts. The first part deals with collection of payments from putative fathers. I'm sure hon. members don't know what that word means, but if they ever have cause to find out, they're probably in trouble. The second part deals with the recovery of overpayments or mispayments of social allowance.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amending act is to standardize the collection procedures between those two parts.

[Motion carried; Bill 68 read a second time]

Bill 69

**The Municipal Taxation
Amendment Act, 1978 (No. 2)**

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 69, The Municipal Taxation Amendment Act, 1978 (No. 2). This bill is to provide clarity and some certainty as to the way in which business tax in the province is collected for municipalities.

By way of interest, it should be noted that business tax in this province dates back to 1904, when it was first introduced under the city of Edmonton charter. Generally it has remained in our legislation to the present, with the possible small exception of the period 1912 to 1917, when the province imposed what was described as a single tax — which might be of interest to the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar and others — when in fact there was no tax on the improvements.

However, in this legislation we're providing clarity to a process which has been with us, as I indicated, through the 1900s and well into 1978. However, in drafting this act in 1970, whoever was responsible wrote in a conflict between the two sections. We're attempting to rectify that conflict and provide municipalities with a way to collect this business tax which has been part of their process up to this period. At the same time, we're providing for a change in the way the supplementary assessment is assessed and collected. That is also a subject of an amendment which we brought in early this spring, but in response to municipalities we are redefining and providing clarity to that legislation so they can proceed with the task of assessing the tax and collection.

I hope Bill 69 will receive second reading support by this Assembly.

[Motion carried; Bill 69 read a second time]

Bill 70

**The Social Care Facilities
Licensing Amendment Act, 1978**

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading

of Bill No. 70, The Social Care Facilities Licensing Amendment Act, 1978.

The purpose of this bill is to ensure that licensed facilities make public the fact that they are licensed. It requires the operator to post in a conspicuous place the licence of the particular facility. I think this will enable clients, consumers, or those taking those who need care to that particular facility to ensure that they are patronizing a licensed facility. It's our intention to encourage people to ensure that they patronize licensed facilities.

A second clause in here is as a result of submissions made to me regarding the strength in the old Welfare Homes Act, and it was brought forward just as it was in the old act in Bill 88, The Social Care Facilities Licensing Act. It was expressed to me that it was unusually strong terminology, and strengths were given to bureaucrats of either municipal governments or the provincial government. So it was our attention to soften it, and that's the procedure we followed in Section 9.

The other important principle in this particular bill is to enable the minister to stop or close down the particular facility if violation of the licensing requirement continues.

I move that hon. members support this bill.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I just have a very quick question. Perhaps the minister could give us the answer either at the end of second reading or in committee. Mr. Minister, can you be more specific with regard to the kinds of situations in which you feel you would use the last principle you referred to? Have situations developed in the last year or two where you in fact feel the minister needs that kind of power, to put it very frankly? Either now or when we get into committee, perhaps you could take the opportunity to be somewhat more explicit on some of the problems that have developed, or situations that you see developing, that should have been handled in a manner different from how the existing legislation allowed the minister to handle them.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MISS HUNLEY: It's to be hoped that no minister of the Crown will ever need to use the strength in that particular subsection to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition refers. However, as more and more various facilities are developed within the province, situations can develop which call for immediate and rather drastic action. Throughout The Social Care Facilities Licensing Act, which this particular bill is amending, there is protection for the operators; appeals and so on have been set up. But in the event those appeals or the continuing requirements under licensing are ignored, the time must come when the residents of the social care facilities — I could perhaps direct hon. members' attention to Bill 88, which was passed in this House last fall. A social care facility means "a place of care for persons who are aged or infirm or who require special care".

So we are seeking here a strengthening of the supervision, if necessary, for various social care facilities, the opportunity to instruct individuals to stop

operating that particular facility, or to stop a particular activity contained in the facility. While I am not aware of any specific that I as a minister would want to use at this moment in Alberta — thank goodness — I am well aware of a case which has just occurred in Ontario. It's a similar but not exact situation, because it occurred in a provincial facility there. A retarded woman was kicked in the face by an employee of that particular institution and forced to kneel on the floor because she had been stealing food. I would find unacceptable an activity such as making a retarded person kneel on the floor as punishment for stealing food, and having attempted to deal with it, would order such an activity stopped. That's one thing in a provincial institution; it could be managed. But in one which is not a provincial institution, you don't have the same authority. I believe it is essential at this particular time.

[Motion carried; Bill 70 read a second time]

Bill 75
The Companies Amendment Act, 1978

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 75. This amendment to The Companies Act is to permit the moving of the jurisdiction of a company from a foreign jurisdiction — that is, a jurisdiction outside Alberta and Canada — into this province. The provisions of the bill apply to a situation where a company has a subsidiary corporation. That subsidiary might be an Alberta company or the parent company might be an Alberta company, but the purpose of the amendment is to permit the company to amalgamate in such a way as to form an Alberta company.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the main provisions of this legislation at the time I introduced Bill 75, The Companies Amendment Act, 1978. The provisions are included in the bill. Where there is a merging of the existing capital of the wholly-owned subsidiary with the parent company, that particular problem is dealt with in this legislation. If either of the companies is a public company, the approval of the Securities Commission must be obtained. If the companies are private, that sort of approval of course is not required.

I think hon. members will be concerned about the position of creditors of either company. This bill ensures that the creditors of both companies are in fact protected. One of the other problems that arises

in this area is whether or not the foreign jurisdiction would allow that amalgamation to take place. It's of course essential that the legislation in that foreign jurisdiction permits the company in fact to become an Alberta company.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say that we don't know what might result from this particular amendment; whether in fact there will be a movement of companies from other jurisdictions into this province. Only time will tell. There are expressions of interest by a number of companies, and it's interesting to note that those companies also realize that if they become Alberta companies they have to meet the requirements of the residency of their directors.

This is an area of the law in relation to companies which is being dealt with by the Institute of Law Research and Reform. I hope that in the not too distant future I'll be receiving a report from the institute recommending a whole new companies act. In the meantime I have brought forward a couple of amendments to the existing companies legislation. The one that has already been placed in the act is the ability of a company to buy its own shares, something that was prohibited to Alberta companies. This is the second one. The institute has worked on this particular problem, and while they have not had an opportunity to sit as a committee to finalize the recommendations, these have been worked on with the institute. I must say I've got to give credit to the people in the institute for the work they've done in this regard.

I might add that when we finally get the final report on this matter, I would anticipate that this particular provision will be in the new draft legislation which is recommended. However, it might appear in slightly different form because, as I understand the process of developing the new legislation, it will make some significant changes.

With those comments I move second reading of Bill 75 and ask for the support of the Assembly.

[Motion carried; Bill 75 read a second time]

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, prior to calling it 5:30 and adjourning until tomorrow at 2:30, I might just say that it would be our intention to do committee study on a number of these bills tomorrow in the hour designated, and second reading and committee tomorrow evening.

[At 5:27 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

