

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Committee of Supply

Subcommittee A

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

8 p.m.

THIS TRANSCRIPT HAS NOT BEEN THOROUGHLY EXAMINED FOR ACCURACY AND IS,
THEREFORE, AN UNOFFICIAL DOCUMENT.

Committee of Supply -- Subcommittee A

Department of Transportation

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

Chairman: Mr. Campbell

8 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, Subcommittee A will come to order. This evening we are dealing with departmental estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1980, for the Department of Transportation. We'll ask the minister if he would like to make some opening remarks.

MR. KROEGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have an overview that should help. The first item relates to the fact that PWA and the railroad were removed from the department. I'm going to go through this for the sake of detail. I'll go through it in the form that I have in front of me.

Where is Tom Sindlinger? He walked out on me this afternoon at the Plaza, and I just want to keep an eye on him.

Transferred to the Department of Economic Development: reporting of PWA and ARR, \$10,300,000, no staff. Those are two reporting rather than administrative factors. Economic planning, provided economic research, assistance in movement of goods and services, (inaudible) freight rates, shipping, et cetera -- \$1,200,000, 25 permanent staff.

The overview: although the department estimates have increased by 18.3 per cent, the major thrust which accounts for the large increase is a six-year \$750,000,000 urban transportation grant announced in January. Assistance to towns and villages has also increased substantially. The remaining increase will be used primarily to offset rising prices due to the drop in the Canadian dollar. Program activity will remain relatively constant in relation to last year. A major portion of capital expenditures is for reconstruction projects, as opposed to new construction. Permanent staff increase is 1.5 per cent; 33 positions have been kept to a minimum again this year.

Specific program thrusts: primary highways. Alberta has 7,700 miles of primary highways, of which 6,700 are paved. Poor breakup this spring has necessitated increased activity in reconstruction over what was originally planned. The primary bridge program was expanded by 25 per cent. A major project is the Fort MacKay bridge. The major thrust in this program is upgrading existing structures to increase load capacity, thus allowing the freight industry more efficient handling of goods.

Rural-local highways: this program relates to the 8,500 miles of roads in the secondary system, of which approximately half are graded to a standard which could be paved. The major thrust is the new \$20 million resource-road program announced by the Premier during the election. Another major thrust is (inaudible) bridge construction. Currently, the department is responsible for 10,000 bridges, many requiring upgrading due to load capacity increases and deterioration of timber substructures. This year these bridges will be

inspected, and a multiyear reconstruction will be undertaken next year. ID road construction was increased to provide access to agricultural (inaudible).

Financial assistance for rural-local: major program thrust is in providing grants to towns and villages. This program was doubled from \$4 million to \$8 million. The program was essentially oversubscribed in its initial year. And even in doubling the program, not all requests will be met this year. The \$2 million hamlet grant program: \$1 million for hamlets in IDs and \$1 million for hamlets outside.

Maintenance of primary rural-local bridges and ID roads: basically this is a status quo year, with no major increase in the program. As a result of the poor spring, increasing pressure will be applied to maintain the roads in a safe condition.

Airport construction: major decrease in airport program is a result of the planned completion of the Lethbridge and Grande Prairie terminal buildings this year. Last year, construction costs for these terminals was \$7.2 million. This year, completion of the projects will cost \$1 million.

Highway user services: the major increase is for a public awareness program on highway safety -- I don't know whether I should read this in brackets, A1 -- seat belt usage, and pedestrian safety. The commercial bus safety inspection program will become operational this year. The motor transport branch will increase its staff this year to open more weigh scales, especially at border points, to 24-hour operations.

Urban transportation, the new six-year program announced in January: capital grants are increased by 48 per cent; includes arterial roads, 65 per cent; public transit capital grants, 43 per cent; new programs for railway separation, \$7.5 million; transportation management, \$1.5 million; and urban signing program, \$.5 million. The new program allows for transferability of moneys between certain programs, and the unused portions of the grants may be carried forward to future years.

Operating programs are also substantially increased, with the transit operating assistance program increased by 114 per cent to \$7.50 per capita and a \$2.00 per capita grant to those cities, towns, and villages without public transit, to assist with the transportation of senior citizens and the disabled. Included in the operating program is a new program for primary highway maintenance assistance. The level of funding is \$2,000 per lane-mile.

Surveys and mapping: major increases in this program are for staff to clear the backlog of legal survey plan examinations. This increase in staff should allow for better turnaround of plans, thus decreasing the time for subdivision developments, utility and pipeline corridors, et cetera.

Future concerns: maintenance of roads is becoming increasingly difficult due to increased traffic volume, increased load capacities, and the aging of the highway system in general. Overlays are required to maintain and upgrade the existing plant to meet the expanded economic activity of the province. This process substantially increases the life expectancy of the highway system. Bridge inspections this year will require a special multiyear program to reconstruct many of the structures. Included in this program will be reconstruction of irrigation bridges which are in urgent need of repair.

Mr. Chairman, that is our opening statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. I think maybe we should get a few rules straight before we go on. Would you please direct your questions to the minister through the Chair. Also, we would like short questions and short answers. We don't need any speeches at this particular time.

If everyone is agreed, I think we'll move on to Vote 1, page 329. We'll deal with these element by element. Just a moment; before we do that, we have some maps. We'll just take a minute and pass these maps around.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Chairman, I think it was very good of the minister to bring his deparment along with him, but I'd like to know whom we have here as a resource, unless that was done at the start.

MR. KROEGER: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I missed that. I think the easiest way would be if each one were to stand and introduce himself and the area they are involved with -- unless you want to do the honors, Ken. We'll start with Ms. Duncan.

MS. DUNCAN: Merriene Duncan, ADM urban transportation.

MR. CRONKHITE: Bob Cronkhite, Deputy Minister Construction.

MR. McGEACHY: I'm Al McGeachy, ADM administration.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'm Ken Kowalski, Deputy Minister -- Regional Transportation Services. Perhaps, Henry, I could introduce our regional directors with us. At the extreme left, Charles Lenzion, regional director for the St. Paul region, on your map as region 4, which essentially goes from Wainwright to the Northwest Territories boundary; Nestor Chorney, regional director for the northeast region, No. 5 on your map; Vance MacNichol, regional director for the Peace region, region 6 on your map; Peter Elias, executive assistant to the chief deputy minister; Chuck Moser, executive assistant to Mr. Kroeger; Doug Porter, director of finance; Dan McKeigan, assistant director of finance; the gentleman behind me, Harvey Alton, director of regional co-ordination; and the next gentleman is the MLA from Cardston; Jim Bussard, regional director from the Red Deer region; Leon Root, regional director from the Lethbridge region, No. 1 on your map; Bernie Kathol, regional director from the Calgary-Airdrie region, region 2 on your map.

MR. KROEGER: Thank you, Ken. That's why I thought they should do it themsleves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe we'll go along here, element by element. If there are any particular things pertaining to the overview you have to bring up, we can catch them on the element. Is that satisfactory with everyone?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, before we start, I'm not going to hesitate to call for information from all of the people involved. Because obviously I didn't invent this one. Next time around, I'll find it a little easier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We certainly sympathize with you, Henry.

MR. KROEGER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll start; there's John Thompson and Shirley Cripps. Would you like to handle it that way?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mine's general; it won't come in on the items.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How about you, John?

MR. THOMPSON: Mine's on an item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, fine. If you're general, Mrs. Cripps, please.

MRS. CRIPPS: On the reconciliation sheet, there's a transfer of over \$6 million, from 3.2 to the Department of Economic Development. Can you explain that, how it happened, and whether it's interdepartmental or departmental?

MR. McGEACHY: Mr. Chairman, I think I can explain that one. When the Department of Economic Development was formed, the Alberta Resources Railway was transferred from Alberta Transportation to Economic Development. Reference to the \$6 million is last year's spending on the ARR, which is now transferred to Economic Development. So that when we're comparing budgets, we're comparing what we have left and what they have. It's the same dollar amount in each case.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay, that's what I wanted to know.

MR. McGEACHY: If you look on page 107 of the estimate book, under Economic Development, you will find the '78-79 estimates. Right there.

MRS. CRIPPS: I've got it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that suitable, Shirley?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes, that's what I wanted to know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll start off with Vote 1.0.1, Minister's Office: \$203,047. All agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 1.0.2, Chief Deputy Minister: \$160,928. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 1.0.3, Legal Services: \$32,695. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 1.0.4, Public Relations: \$150,733. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. KUSHNER: A little more audible, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Stan's having a tough time just getting this down on paper. Vote 1.0.5, Program Evaluation: \$50,000. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 1.0.6, Deputy Minister Construction, \$153,694. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 1.0.7, Assistant Deputy Minister, \$63,421. Agreed?
Question? Mr. Pahl.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering, this certainly isn't for all the assistant deputy ministers here. Where do you find the rest?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whoever feels capable of answering, just grab on.

MR. McGEACHY: Mr. Chairman, there are four assistant deputy ministers in the department. One is located under the Deputy Minister Construction; that is, the deputy minister and the ADM in construction. The element in question, 1.0.7, is my office, which is a staff of two people, myself and a secretary. The ADM-urban is located when we get to the urban vote, Vote 5. The other assistant deputy minister is in Vote 4, under program support in both cases -- once we get to those votes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that suitable, Milt?

MR. PAHL: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, Assistant Deputy Minister, 1.0.7, \$63,421. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.0.8, Personnel and Management Services, \$518,466. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. KUSHNER: We've got to be a little more enthusiastic about this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: A question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Too late on that one. Do you want it on the next one? Sorry; it's already been agreed to. Vote 1.0.9, Finance and Office Services, \$1,093,967. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 1.0.10, Computer Services, \$1,733,444. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.0.11, Equipment and Supply Services, \$873,882. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we've come to the total amount of \$5,034,277. Agreed?

MR. PAHL: A question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Milt Pahl.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the aggregate, I note \$1.7 million for computer services. It was my understanding that the overall government had a central computing service I think in Treasury. Perhaps you could explain that.

MR. McGEACHY: Mr. Chairman, the situation with the government computer is this: they work under a system called the enterprise system, where they bill us for our usage. It's in their revolving fund. So, yes, they do supply us with the computer. We do not go outside for computer time or hardware. Even hiring a systems analyst is done through Government Services. But we get billed for it.

MR. PAHL: So it's a transfer.

MR. McGEACHY: It's a transfer, yes. I think slightly over \$1 million of the \$1.7 million is for computer time, charging from Government Services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that suitable, Milt?

MR. PAHL: A supplementary to that. It would show as a revenue item in Treasury?

MR. McGEACHY: In Government Services, under the revolving fund.

MR. PAHL: The revolving fund; okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. We have \$5,034,277. Are we agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 2, page 333. Vote 2.1, Program Support, \$15,211,283. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 2.2, Improvement of Primary Highway Systems, \$132,770,602. Tom?

MR. LYSONS: A question. Could we get a bit of a breakdown of what primary highway system construction will be this year?

MR. KROEGER: What kind of breakdown would you like, Tom?

MR. LYSONS: What roads.

MR. KROEGER: What roads?

MR. LYSONS: Yes.

MR. KROEGER: You mean to identify, road by road? Tom, if you could identify a road; but it would be pretty wide open to try to enumerate all of the areas.

MR. LYSONS: The roads I'm thinking of are the Yellowhead Highway and Highway 41, in particular, as well as Highway 36.

MR. KROEGER: Well on Highway 41, which in parts obviously involves me, the decision will probably will be taken that there will be some paving this year from Wainwright north. We haven't established the exact amount. There is a variety of work on Highway 16, and either Bob or Ken might comment on it.

MR. CRONKHITE: It's not a large program in any area of Highway 16. The programs in the Spruce Grove area involve making it six lanes from the Stony Plain interchange back toward Edmonton through Spruce Grove, which is the major one in that particular area. We are still contemplating having to overlay some pavement in the Elk Island area, because of the severe spring we've had. As you know, we're starting to assemble right of way in the area near Innisfree. That's basically a right-of-way assembly issue for this year, starting on the worst curved section out there, probably until next year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the people here, for some time we have had this supplementary information, the element details. It goes into some detail regarding bridges, campsites, and rest areas, coming to that total figure. Does that answer your question? We have to move along, because certainly you realize the situation as well as I do, Tom. Nevertheless we don't want to cut anyone off.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Chairman, if I could ask another supplementary. I would like to know how many miles from Wainwright north, as well as when is the plan to straighten those curves on Highway 16 that you mentioned, Bob.

MR. CRONKHITE: We're talking about assembling right of way this year. And as good as we can get budget support, starting the construction next year. That's what we're working on. But I'm just saying that if you have to go through the budget process again, as you know . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alan Hyland.

MR. HYLAND: My question is on No. 1, Mr. Chairman. To the deputy minister: what construction is envisaged on No.1, especially from the Saskatchewan bridge at Medicine Hat going through Redcliff?

MR. CRONKHITE: There will be no physical construction outside the city this year, although we're sending the right of way to join them as they proceed to twin their bridge and get their construction up to the boundary. So we're in a commitment to meet them and to continue it on toward Redcliff. But we don't want to start in a gap, so we will probably be starting the actual construction next year. Real estate is pretty costly, so we've spent a fair amount of money there. We are also designing an interchange at some of the main intersections, (inaudible) road, and that sort of thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. Are we agreed? That was 2.2.

Vote 2.3, Improvement of Rural-Local Highways, \$85,091,997. John Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. What is the department thinking of in these areas that have had their rail lines abandoned. We more or less had an idea that they would get special consideration once the rail line is taken out. I have one of these in my constituency, on account of which (there is) the gap. That will mean real help.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Thompson, the policy of Alberta Transportation announced last year was that in the event of rail line abandonment, Alberta Transportation would very, very diligently try to assist the local municipality in upgrading most of the roads that could be affected by rail line abandonment, secondary roads for the most part. That particular project you're talking about, Mr. Thompson, is a road that is under review. I'm not sure at the moment if we've committed massive amounts of dollars to upgrade it, but it can be clearly proven that there will be a detrimental effect on the highway because of added truck traffic as a result of lack of grain movement by rail. Alberta Transportation would look at assisting.

MR. THOMPSON: A supplementary then. Is any definite amount especially set aside in your budget this year for those roads where the rail line has been abandoned?

MR. KOWALSKI: No specific amount has been set aside out of the amount of money set aside under the secondary road program. Each project would be looked at on its own merits.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that satisfactory? Ian Reid.

DR. REID: They were given an assurance that the Coal Branch road would be oiled this year, and now it has been backtracked to about six miles of oil surfacing and the rest calcium chloride. I just got a nice petition on my desk this morning.

MR. KOWALSKI: That would come under Vote 2.5, Maintenance of Primary Highway Systems. We could comment on it now or wait until we get to it at that point.

DR. REID: That's a primary highway, is it?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes, it is a primary highway.

MR. CRONKHITE: Could I answer, Mr. Chairman? You're talking about the road from 47 down . . .

DR. REID: This is from Macleod Crossing to Robb.

MR. KOWALSKI: Nestor has been working on that one.

MR. CRONKHITE: With the regional transportation director in that area, we have set up some additional funds to strengthen it. We've had an awful softening up this spring, as you know. It would be ill advised under that circumstance to oil it. We'd simply be blackening it for a couple of days. So we must strengthen first, and that's the action we're taking.

DR. REID: That's the answer I'll give them back in Robb, then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Charlie Stewart.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I'm looking at the \$85 million in the rural-local road improvement. We also have the \$20 million for resource highway maintenance. I wonder how you differentiate between the two (inaudible) in allocation of money to a specific secondary road.

MR. KOWALSKI: Under this \$85 million, the budget for secondary roads is \$45.7 (million) and the budget for resource roads is \$20 million. Essentially the resource road program announced this spring is to address itself to those roads of a secondary or local nature where industrial activity has caused some problems. They may not have the same kind of usage from the volume of traffic -- trucks, cars and the like -- that an ordinary secondary road would have. There's a pretty fine line in terms of distinguishing between the two.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alan Hyland.

MR. HYLAND: You said, Ken, that the resource road program was out of the \$85 million.

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes, this is correct.

MR. HYLAND: And that is a new program.

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes, that's correct.

MR. HYLAND: But that, put together, is a 13 per cent increase.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, in one of the budget books that you have, Mr. Hyland, you have the breakdown of that \$85 million. It includes more than just secondary roads and resource roads. It includes six separate programs by itself.

MR. HYLAND: The question I'm asking is: then indeed, with the \$20 million on top of it, over and above last year, it isn't really a 13 per cent increase, if the \$20 million is additional moneys.

MR. KOWALSKI: The 13.1 per cent increase is for that whole program of all six programs attached to it.

MR. HYLAND: Except that one part of that one program wasn't in existence last year.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom Lysons.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Other times we've had an indication and a map of what was going to happen in our constituency, some of the roads -- the secondaries and the primaries -- plus other things. And we don't have that to go on this year. I wonder why, and why it couldn't be in the estimates on a general basis.

MR. KROEGER: Actually, again, you want to see the whole map, Tom. We have a map in the office that's 4 by 8 feet or 4 by 6 feet, something like this. And the only way I could point anything like that out to you is to take you up there. We also have a book about an inch thick that gives every specific project on a separate page, on a map. But we don't have a map that indicates it all in one piece.

MR. LYSONS: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman, if I may. It's all right to be able to go down to the office and have a look at a map. But it's pretty hard

to maintain that map idea in your mind and go down to talk to people down the road. We're looking at a pretty hefty budget here.

MR. KROEGER: But are you suggesting that people in your area would be asking you about work in other constituencies? Is this what you're saying?

MR. LYSONS: No, primarily in my own constituency, that I'd be asked questions on. But on the other hand, it would be worth while to know what else is happening, and why, in other parts of Alberta. It gives you some idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, if I could answer that. Tom, I think Henry would be only too pleased for you to drop in and maybe make a few notes in regard to the particular projects that you're interested in. If we start discussing every road that going to be constructed in Alberta, I think we're going to be in problems here tonight. So I would suggest that we follow that route. You'll have another shot at it in Committee of the Whole.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Chairman, if I might. I was always under the impression at other meetings that this really was the time when we got a lot of that information clarified.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You want the complete road system for Alberta. Is that correct?

MR. LYSONS: Primarily for my constituency, but I would like to see what is happening in the rest of Alberta. It's pretty hard . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Really, Tom, we have to go into too much detail right here to take in the rest of Alberta on a comparison basis.

MR. PAHL: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I think the point is well taken, that we could ask the minister if he would consider having his department prepare some sort of set of maps, either by constituency or by the divisions they have here, in terms of their 1979-80 program. I know that would be helpful for me on the urban equivalent. I don't think any more time than that needs to be taken. But I think basically that's what you're asking, isn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that correct, Tom?

MR. LYSONS: I want some information, yes. And how the heck ever we get it, I want it.

MR. KROEGER: Well, we can identify for you, Tom, everything that is slated for the Vermilion-Viking constituency at any given time, without taking up the time of all the people here. I really don't know what you want beyond that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ernie Isley.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister. My question is probably a bit general, and it applies to the various sections under Vote 2. Is all the money we're looking at here already committed to specific programs? Or is there some money with respect to which you people are still making decisions?

MR. KROEGER: There's very little flexibility left, Ernie.

MR. ISLEY: It's pretty well all committed.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Isley, it has to be committed by this time, because most of it will go under contract. And unless it is contracted earlier in the spring or during the previous winter, you'd never get the program under way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom Sindlinger.

MR. SINDLINGER: With regard to item 2.3, the comparable '78-79 forecast is \$75 million, and the comparable '78-79 estimate is \$56 million, which is a difference of 36 per cent. Could we please have an explanation of the large increase between the estimates and the forecast for '78-79?

MR. KOWALSKI: The estimates of \$55.7 (million) last year was the basic budget. The \$75 (million), as I recall, was the actual. Under the secondary road program \$15 million in special warrants was approved last year. The base last year was \$41 million; the actual figure expended was approximately \$56 million. I think that's indicated in one of the books you have.

MR. HYLAND: \$56,297,992.

MR. KOWALSKI: The 13.1 per cent is the difference between the forecast and this year's estimates.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary. I understand where you get the 13.1 per cent, and you told me why there's a difference of 36 per cent. But you said "special warrants".

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes.

MR. SINDLINGER: Could you give me a one-line explanation of what the special warrants are for, please?

MR. KOWALSKI: For secondary roads -- \$15 million approved last year, \$10 million approved during the summer and another \$6 million in March of this year, for secondary road work completed last October and November.

MR. SINDLINGER: Then a final supplementary. Why was it necessary to issue special warrants?

MR. KOWALSKI: Essentially because our construction progress in the secondary road program through May, June, and July of last year was rather excellent. We approached the government to get an additional \$10 million in funding. They said yes. Then we approached September, and it started to rain. So we put out another \$6 million in work, assuming that with the previous magnitude -- 41 plus the 10 -- we wouldn't get it all done. Fortunately for us, but unfortunately for the bookkeepers in the government, October and November were excellent; and we ended up spending \$56 million. And we then had to go back and get that additional money to pay for the work completed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 2.4, Financial Assistance for Rural-Local Highways, \$27,097,000. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 2.5, Maintenance of Primary Highways Systems, \$34,275,000. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 2.6, Maintenance of Rural-Local Highways, \$10,551,296. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Apprenticeship Training, 2.7, \$1,441,142. Bill Mack first.

MR. MACK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Could you tell me if there are any new apprenticeship schools, and if there are, where are they located? Or is it going just strictly to the existing (ones)?

MR. KROEGER: That is not a school *per se*. It falls under Advanced Education and Manpower. But if you'd like more detail on it, Bill, Mr. McGeachy can give it to you.

MR. McGEACHY: Mr. Chairman, this program covers the hiring of 105 apprentices to work in the repair shops we maintain throughout Alberta. We contract out to Advanced Education and Manpower and take the people under the apprenticeship training program. We're merely a user like any other company in terms of hiring young people to go on the apprenticeship program.

MR. MACK: These are salaries, then.

MR. McGEACHY: These are salaries, correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed? Questions? Cripps? Osterman?

MRS. CRIPPS: It's answered.

MRS. OSTERMAN: He answered mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the total amount of \$306,438,320, agreed?

Vote 3, Construction and Maintenance of Airport Facilities, 3.1, Program Support, \$640,050. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 3.2, Design and Construction of New Airport Facilities, \$4,747,990. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 3.3, Improvement of Existing Airport Facilities, \$2,452,010. Milt Pahl.

MR. PAHL: It was Mr. Sindlinger.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom. Sorry.

MR. KUSHNER: Stick your hands up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Stan's the man.

MR. SINDLINGER: Again, Mr. Chairman, a question with regard to the forecast and the estimate. What's the difference between the two: \$11 million for the forecast and \$2 million for the estimate for '78-79?

MR. KOWALSKI: The \$11.1 million figure is partially and primarily, I guess, the result of a \$7.2 million transfer that had to come from the heritage trust fund capital division, for the construction of two airport terminal buildings, one in Grande Prairie and the other in Lethbridge.

The arrangement negotiated between Alberta Transportation and the federal government was such that we were making money on the deal. We were lending the money to the federal government; we were receiving an interest payment on it, which didn't seem to fit in well with the rules of the heritage trust fund. The original intent was that the \$7.2 million was to come out of the heritage trust fund. It came about that it could not come out of the heritage trust fund, so it had to be paid for by Alberta Transportation under this particular appropriation. That's why it's as high as it is. It's inflated by \$7.2 million. The special warrant item in one of the documents identifies that.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary then. I think you said that we were getting interest on the money. Did you say that?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes.

MR. SINDLINGER: Could you tell me what rate?

MR. KOWALSKI: Perhaps Mr. Cronkhite might provide the details.

MR. CRONKHITE: Both Lethbridge and Grande Prairie are federal airports, Mr. Chairman. When we were attempting to get an agreement to put improved facilities earlier than they would build them, we had to enter into the terms of how it would be handled financially, and who would run it.

The final decision was that they wanted to have the option of buying back the buildings, with us picking up part of the cost for accelerating the time, putting it ahead of their schedule. So what it amounts to is that they have the option of paying it back totally, any time, or on a 20-year basis on an annual payment equal to the earning power of the money. So it's an either/or situation. We can't tell you which one they will action as their option.

MR. SINDLINGER: But I understood from what you said that they were paying interest on the money.

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes, we said that.

MR. SINDLINGER: What rate of interest?

MR. CRONKHITE: It's a standard federal rate of interest which was what they would agree to. I think it was around eight or nine. It basically floats with Canada Savings Bonds, which are between eight and nine, something of that nature.

MR. SINDLINGER: Could you please find out what the agreement is and advise me in writing?

MR. CRONKHITE: If Mr. Kroeger wishes, we could certainly pass a copy of the agreement. It was tabled in the Legislature at the sitting last fall. So I suppose we could obviously do that.

MR. KROEGER: We can dig that up for you.

MR. CRONKHITE: The whole agreement; both of them, if you like.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ernie Isley.

MR. ISLEY: Yes, I note the '77-78 actual was considerably higher than your '78-79 estimate or your '79-80 estimate. Does this mean that existing airport facilities are in adequate condition, and you're cutting back on this program?

MR. KROEGER: It means, one, that the estimate Dr. Horner came with was cut back, which is a little unusual for him, by -- as I got the numbers -- around \$3 million. The effort was made to get more into the system this year. Apparently he wasn't able to convince (on) priorities.

MR. CRONKHITE: I think we shouldn't misinterpret this. Could I speak for a minute on this? Because the \$11 million figure there from last year is a result of a special warrant which was simply a transfer arrangement to take these major terminal buildings out of the heritage trust fund and put them into this. So it's a paper transaction. There wasn't a difference in money between those to build airports last year.

MR. ISLEY: No, I'm clear on that. My concern is basically the difference between the '77-78 actual, which was in excess of \$4 million for improving airport facilities, down to our projection for this year of \$2.4 million. I'm concerned about the drop there.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, it's never been the practice, at least with the funding that we have been able to receive, to see a guaranteed escalation in the dollars each year, Mr. Isley. Under this improvement of existing airport facilities--and I'll give you an example which is close to your home. The airport in Bonnyville was originally built, then we had to come back two years ago, I think it was, to upgrade it. That was a one-year thing, an exceptional situation, where you had to go back and overlay. So whatever the dollars were for that project would have been in the part of the budget. That doesn't happen every year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Connie Osterman.

MRS. OSTERMAN: An example, please, of a provincial airport and of a community airport.

MR. KOWALSKI: Rocky Mountain House would be (an example of a) provincial airport -- there are 13 in all -- the Consort airport would be (an example of a) community airport.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, are we all agreed on 3.3?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 3.4, Airport Maintenance, \$1,154,967. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the total amount, \$4,995,017. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 4, Transportation Planning Services. Vote 4.1, Transportation Research and Development, \$1,193,152. Agreed?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Hold it, a question. What kind of research does Transportation do?

MR. KROEGER: Well, it's pretty ordinary, I guess. It provides data collection, analysis for the department, traffic count, movement of goods, prepares long-term plans for transportation network, this sort of thing.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Is any of it contracted out?

MR. CRONKHITE: Oh, yes; consulting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 4.2, Highway System User Services, \$6,585,915. Agreed?

MRS. CRIPPS: What is that?

MR. KROEGER: That is traffic safety. That's part of the safety awareness, school bus inspection program, commercial bus inspection programs, collection and analysis of accident data, driver safety program, this kind of thing. Motor transport branch, and board.

MRS. CRIPPS: Well now, \$6 million, does that include . . .

MR. KROEGER: ^{Weigh} ~~Wage~~ scales take \$1 million of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Total amount: \$7,779,067. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 5, Urban Transportation Financial Assistance. Vote 5.1, Program Support: \$303,320.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. My understanding of this program is that it is basically a grant program. It responds to the needs of the urban areas. I have a little problem. If it's a cheque-issuing organization, why does it cost almost \$0.33 million to administer.

MR. KROEGER: You have a total of \$106 million to administer, with a staff of nine people.

MR. PAHL: Well, Mr. Minister, with respect, I think you have a whole battery of resources here, and obviously when you're talking construction programs, you have all sorts of input to the regional urban network, and I understand you have a DM of administrative services, and I am sure he issues all kinds of cheques to the amount of \$106 million, so I still haven't really had the question answered.

more sentences

KROEGER:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to comment on that, Merriene?

MS. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have a staff of five professionals plus me, and it's not quite as simple as simply issuing a cheque. We do have to scrutinize the projects that are submitted, make sure they meet our criteria, and provide some assistance to the smaller cities which don't have very much in the way of engineering staff who are capable of providing all the design work that's necessary. So there is some service element there as well as the scrutiny and trying to safeguard the provincial investment.

MR. PAHL: May I pursue direct questioning for a moment? Does that mean that you actually do design work for smaller urban centres?

MS. DUNCAN: We scrutinize it and, with the assistance of construction, try to provide assistance if it's necessary.

MR. PAHL: So if I can interpret what you're saying, you're basically, if you will, in-house consultants to small urban centres which are applying for the grant program?

MS. DUNCAN: We try to ensure that standards are met. We don't sit down and do their design work.

MR. PAHL: I haven't quite got it clear. Are you overseeing the grant thing, or are you actually involved in design?

MS. DUNCAN: We're involved in the sense that they have to submit their designs. They have to meet certain standards and criteria that are set. We have a grand total of three engineers who are looking at the designs on the many projects that the cities are putting forward, which obviously means that we're not sitting down and doing the design work for them.

MR. PAHL: Am I to understand that that sort of expertise is not available in the construction department, for example?

MS. DUNCAN: We have to draw on them as well.

MR. KROEGER: There's still a charge-back, the same as a computerization within the system. We're charged for whatever we use. Construction (inaudible) and charge for what they do.

MR. PAHL: Maybe it's a little unfair to the people involved, but I sense this frustration as an urban MLA that we feel that the province has virtually no input into the decision-making, and yet we have a staff and \$0.33 million on the outside basically duplicating functions in the design shop and in the administrative shop. I can't quite see it.

MR. CRONKHITE: Could I speak to this for a minute, Mr. Chairman?

I'm beset for about three days this week with urban people, and particularly members of the engineering staff of Merriene Duncan, dealing with some city questions right here in Edmonton on the Highway No. 2 route. It's extremely important that we do have input to the kind of standards that they will put in place because of the pressure of developers, et cetera. It's a very, very important role and a very intensive one. It requires somebody to monitor for consistency; we have to treat the cities the same.

Consultants do most of the work, and the cities design all their own work, but we have to monitor for justifying spending this money, frankly.

MR. PAHL: So this group reports to the construction deputy?

MS. DUNCAN: No, Mr. Chairman, they report to me.

MR. PAHL: Well, I find that very strange. You must report to a deputy minister.

MS. DUNCAN: I report to Mr. MacFarland.

MR. PAHL: So you're an assistant deputy minister who reports to a chief deputy minister. So it's basically three organizational functions within the department. Does anyone want to answer that?

MR. McGEACHY: Five, Mr. Chairman. Construction, administration, urban, the research area which we covered in Vote 4, and the regional transportation are the five programs that report to the chief deputy minister. Three are what I would call delivery programs: construction, RTS, and urban transportation. Two are support in the terms of research and administration.

MR. PAHL: In that sense, then, what are the criteria for a DM? Is it the amount of money involved, the amount of people supervised, or what are the criteria?

MR. KROEGER: For the amount of money assigned to this?

MR. PAHL: Yes. Is it the size of the program that defines the staffing reporting level, or is it the importance of it ~~relevant~~ *relative* to the things that you need to be concerned with?

MR. KROEGER: Milt, I'd have to assume something here. It should relate to the amount of work actually done, including the nine permanent people plus the crossover from engineering, and this kind of thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that satisfactory?

MR. PAHL: Well no, it really isn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's get to the point.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Chairman, I support Milt in his questioning, by the way. I think he should be given an opportunity to be heard fully.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's being heard. Just get right to the crux of the matter. Let's not . . .

MR. PAHL: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the point escapes you, the point is that here we have assistant deputy minister status at the head of a program that has nine people and, as far as I've been able to determine as an urban MLA, it's basically a granting function; a cheque disbursement overview function. That's what I'm having trouble with. So I'm trying to determine the rationale for putting it at this level. Is it the amount of money involved, the \$106 million, or is it the quality of the work done by the very small staff?

With respect, I think an assistant deputy minister with a staff of 10 is rather an anomaly in the whole government structure, and if I'm wrong, please tell me. I'm just trying to get some terms of reference.

MS. DUNCAN: Mr. Chairman, if I might. One rationale behind it is in fact that because we're dealing the cities, and dealing with their staff who are at a very high level, it was felt that it would be advantageous to have a similarly high level dealing with them on the provincial level. And it does in fact make the work a lot easier than if it were, say, at the director level.

MR. PAHL: So it's a status thing more than anything else?

MS. DUNCAN: In terms of being able to deal directly with the higher levels, the commissioners, particularly in Edmonton and Calgary.

MR. PAHL: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that pretty good? Are we agreed on 5.1?
Oh, pardon me, I'm sorry. Ernie Isley.

MR. ISLEY: I'll pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.2, Financial Assistance -- Capital, \$93,710,000. Connie.

MRS. OSTERMAN: What are continuous corridors, for \$30 million?

MR. KROEGER: That relates to the new total granting factor of approximately \$274 million to the city of Calgary; about the same amount to the city of Edmonton where we're helping them with the continuous corridors through the cities. A continuous corridor I suppose would be in its simplest form Highway No. 2 running through the city of Calgary.

MRS. OSTERMAN: So it's a grant to the cities.

MR. KROEGER: Well, ^{that noise} I'm told \$274 million is a grant to the city over a six-year period. We have an increase of . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: Am I looking at a different figure than you are? I'm sorry, Mr. Minister, I can't find the 200 and some million you're talking about.

MR. KROEGER: It isn't here. I'm talking about the six-year thing. You've got one year of a six-year program shown here. That total program of \$274 million is made available to the city for various uses over a six-year period. You can expand on that if you like.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that answer your question, Connie?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 5.3, Financial Assistance -- Operating: \$12,740,000.

MR. MACK: Mr. Chairman, does that cover all the urban centres using public transportation, or just what does that cover?

MR. KROEGER: Grants, transit operating assistance, \$9,640,000; the \$7.50 per capita assistance for disabled that I mentioned in the opening statement; the \$2 per capita of cities, towns, and villages for a similar thing on the small scale. Anything else on that?

MR. MACK: I guess it's general. I'll try to get more information from you another time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Amount to be voted: \$106,753,320. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 6, Surveys and Property Acquisition. Vote 6.1, Surveys and Mapping: \$4,848,489. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. CRIPPS: What survey ^{control?} (inaudible). ~~Survey control.~~

MR. CRONKHITE: Mr. Chairman, the survey control was the (inaudible) system. We're modernizing it by putting in control points which aren't going to get knocked out so quickly in all the fence corners, and a much more accurate survey because we've had to go in to tie down the oil-rich areas in the northern areas. With the explosive growth of our cities it's been a requirement. The way they haven't taken nice north-south-east-west shapes we've had to get into a control system which could be easily traced without a heck of a lot of duplication. So the control system is a modernization of the old survey township system; a much more secure one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 6.2, Property Acquisition: \$1,777,443. John Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could explain why there's such a lag in some areas between the time they take to survey the right of way and sending the money out.

MR. KROEGER: Bob, would you like to . . .

MR. CRONKHITE: I wouldn't like to.

It depends an awful lot on how the land is held. We have as many as 100 encumbrances on some land, all of which must be legally traced if we're dealing with disposal of land, or taking land out of title.

If you go to expropriation, the formal process, you have to do the legal surveys, and on the basis of the legal survey the expropriation proceeds. If there's an amicable arrangement the legal survey generally follows. So there can be a variety of times.

We've said we've had to build up the staff, and that's one of the reasons for an increase in some of the control people to scan plans, because land is a very personal thing and has to be dealt with almost individually. It can't be mechanized too far. I think we're trying to shorten the time. There's an awful lot of activity in the province demanding an awful lot of surveying. Even in the private field which are very heavily used they're running into some time restraint.

I agree with you. I think that it would be nice to shorten that time. It's plenty of time in some of the instances.

Land buying is taking more time because of The Expropriation Act. It tends go through a negotiation process, and some of them end up in expropriation which can take a year.

MR. THOMPSON: A supplemental, Bob. I'm talking about where you don't have expropriation. Sometimes the road has been built for two years and people are still waiting for their money.

MR. CRONKHITE: I don't know whether we're doing that or not. If we are, we should be chastized. But in dealing with municipalities, and having done so for many years, I find that they've gone through the process of taking some land on diversions and this sort of thing, have done the survey, and have not had the plans registered. They've sat and accumulated dust. I think that's being improved substantially; a great deal to the extent with the approach by the regional people. I don't know of a (case of) two years in our transactions, but if you have one I'd like to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. Agreed?

MR. KROEGER: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. Do you have a specific that we could deal with, John? I don't mean here tonight. A specific case that's been . . .

MR. THOMPSON: Well, I think Jack's working on one. I'll let it go at that.

MR. KROEGER: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 6.2. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Amount to be voted: \$6,625,932.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll go back to the first. We have a department total of \$441,625,933. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd ask if the minister has any closing remarks, and maybe that we could have a motion probably to adopt this.

MR. KROEGER: Well, Mr. Chairman, my remark -- whether it's a closing remark or not -- is that while we're here . . . Are you handling another one tonight?

AN HON. MEMBER: Environment.

MR. KROEGER: I don't want to hold it up. I'd be quite prepared to go back though. Tom Lysons wasn't satisfied, and that was an all-encompassing thing. It wasn't any particular vote. I'd be quite prepared to get a description of his concern, and see if we can deal with it in a way that would satisfy him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good. I vote that we take possibly three minutes and we can go through this.

MR. KROEGER: It was just one specific where he was concerned about how he finds out what's going on in the whole system, I suppose. This is the way I took your question, Tom.

MR. LYSONS: Yes, that's right, Mr. Chairman.

It's one thing to argue, explain, or whatever, on a particular vote, the whys or reasons. But if you have a general idea of what's going on in the province then you can get a much, much clearer picture of why things happen.

MRS. OSTERMAN: A supplemental to that, Mr. Chairman, if I might ask the minister. We have this particular map, and I wonder if it wouldn't be possible to reproduce something like this for all MLAs concerning construction that will take place this year?.

MR. KROEGER: In the whole province?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR. KOWALSKI: We're looking at thousands of projects. As an example, under the secondary road program there are approximately 90 specific projects for the province.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Primary and secondary?

MR. KOWALSKI: No, the secondary program alone. I'm not sure what the number would be under the primary program.

MR. CRONKHITE: Depending on the magnitude. The programs we could have going in some of our small improvement districts could be as small an amount as \$10,000, \$15,000, or \$25,000. It would certainly help if you wanted to identify what kind of projects you'd want listed, because that map would be nothing but one (inaudible)

MRS. OSTERMAN: Right. Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does this satisfy you for the moment?

MR. LYSONS: I'll talk to these guys after.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Connie.

MRS. OSTERMAN: That's fine. I didn't realize.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One final question, Tom.

MR. SINDLINGER: As a follow-up up to this, I can understand the complexity when you have a large number of projects, but wouldn't it be possible to make a map that would illustrate, say, 80 per cent of the projects?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes, we could certainly come up with a map showing the secondary road projects.

MR. HYLAND: Would it be easier to do it on a regional . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: However.

MR. KROEGER: How would you use a map that gave you the whole process?

MR. HYLAND: I don't know. I'm just suggesting that (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. KROEGER: How would we use a map that has the total construction superimposed on it?

AN HON. MEMBER: It changes all the time.

MR. CRONKHITE: You're asking me?

MR. KROEGER: Well, either one of you two, because you were supporting that.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I am too.

MR. SINDLINGER: I'll respond to that. We're spending a lot of money on roads, and projects in total, and I think it would be worth while knowing where those expenditures are being made. You've given us a map for illustrative purposes. It makes things much simpler. I'm just saying, expand upon that and show us where those projects are located.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I might say that I'm not realizing the magnitude of the point that I was trying to make, and maybe it would have to be done in terms of what would be designated as major. But it would be very helpful. I ran into this even when campaigning, in terms of people to whom I quoted figures wanting an overview: what is transportation really doing in this province?

MR. KROEGER: Let me give you an example. Of the \$132 million that appears here for primary, 58 per cent is on rehabilitating that (inaudible), so that it's really not new construction. And yet that represents over half what is being expended in that one element of \$132 million. You've seen the tar on the road where the road is cracking and breaking. An overlay is put over that, so that's not really new paving; it's rehabilitating existing paving.

MRS. OSTERMAN: A second layer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Norm Magee.

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that to come up with a series of maps is going to be a costly affair and very time consuming and is going to take the department's time. Probably a brief description by constituency of the major projects taking place in that area, by having a girl type it out, and duplicating it . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: A person.

MR. MAGEE: . . . would be sufficient. Or a person.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. Order, order.
Peter Knaak.

MR. KNAAK: Excuse me. I just have a general comment, if I may, Mr. Chairman. Being a new MLA and having missed the last meeting due to necessity, perhaps I haven't quite caught on to the process here, but it seems to me that I'm not here to rubber-stamp anything, and in order to have a reasonable idea of what's going on, and if we, as legislators representing our individual constituencies and the province as a whole, are intended to approve something, certainly we should have a pretty good idea of what we're approving.

Perhaps I'm at fault by not studying these estimates in more detail, but I don't know if the rest of the MLAs feel much the same way I did when Milt Pahl started getting very particular about a question. I noted a certain amount of resistance, and I don't know whether I sensed that incorrectly, but surely if we're not wasting our time here, even if it's a significant expense of the department and from the MLAs, it should be done so that we feel comfortable that we're giving our approval with the full understanding of what we're approving.

Again I apologize for perhaps not researching the subject a little bit more. But I feel, even though I have every confidence in the department and in the minister, that he (inaudible) just approving something that I don't know.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, could I comment on that?

Actually, all the information Tom Lysons asked for on the road system, for instance, is available to him.

I've been in here now since about March 20, and working every time I have any time, I still haven't identified all the projects, even in primary or secondary, and I don't know how I could provide information of this kind that would mean anything to him. Now that doesn't quite relate to what you said, Peter. But the magnitude of the work that is being done, with me trying to understand it so that I come here and make some sensible comment -- and you saw that I had to have the support of most of the people here -- just to explain it, having worked at it now for two and a half months, or whatever, is such that I've just scratched the surface. The thing is pretty large.

Now that isn't to say that you shouldn't be able to understand it, but I think that Tom Lysons should identify what he's concerned with, and he'll find just to follow through on it's a pretty big job. I'm quite prepared to give any part of what's here to anybody.

Now, relating to the specific that you referred to on what Milt Pahl was asking for, and the breakdown of the \$300,000-odd that was spent to administer \$106 million, I'm not qualified to do that, and I don't pretend to be. I said for openers that I wouldn't be prepared to comment on it. Merriene Duncan works in that area; she identified a certain number of people of a certain calibre required to work with city commissioners, plus the crossover from engineering, for instance, and I don't know how all this money is pro-rated when you get into it. It gets a little complex to break it out in just such a way that it would be very easily understood. I don't know that I'm helping you, but I'm just trying to give you the picture as it hit me. It's overpowering.

MR. KNAAK: Well, maybe there is no way that we can ever be informed (inaudible).

MR. KROEGER: You could be on specifics, though, that relate to, say, the city of Calgary, or the riding of Viking-Vermilion, or even the surrounding ones.

MR. KNAAK: Thank you.

MR. KROEGER: Sorry that that's the best I can do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that fine, Peter?

MR. KNAAK: It's an answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: An answer. Okay.

I think if we could have kept this off we'd have gone through and agreed to all them and probably . . . Tom? Okay, one more; that's it.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, can the department give us some assurance that we will get a regional breakdown of the expenditures in this program that we're being asked to approve?

MR. KOWALSKI: You would like a regional breakdown on all of the programs?

MR. SINDLINGER: Excuse me. Let me rephrase that. I'd like a geographic breakdown of the expenditures.

MR. KROEGER: By the six regions the province is divided into?

MR. SINDLINGER: I'll leave that up to your judgment. A reasonable geographic breakdown.

AN HON. MEMBER: It can be done.

MR. SINDLINGER: Something of that nature. Would you give us that reassurance?

MR. KROEGER: Would you identify? You're leaving it a little too flexible for us if you say how we would want to go at it. The province is divided into six regions. For instance, would you like it by the six regions?

MR. CRONKHITE: They are highway or transportation regions.

MR. SINDLINGER: Okay. I would accept the regional analysis, but I would prefer constituency breakdown.

MR. KROEGER: How would we break that out in the cities?

MR. SINDLINGER: All right. If you have a city, then it would be reasonable to group it as one area, rather than breaking up, say, Calgary into . . .

MR. KROEGER: So it wouldn't be by constituency.

MR. SINDLINGER: No, but when you get to a rural area, I think it wouldn't be unreasonable to expect a breakdown by rural area.

MR. KROEGER: So you'd like a breakdown on the six regions as they relate to the rural scene. On primary, secondary, or . . . ?

MR. SINDLINGER: On a substantial proportion of the total expenditure in an area. I'm not saying 100 per cent because you pointed out that there are many small projects, and I notice one here that's very small. But something that would cover something, say, 80 per cent of your projects would be satisfactory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that possible, Mr. Minister?

MR. KROEGER: Well, it's possible, depending on the degree we go to on this thing. If we could put a dollar figure on it, keeping in mind that a mile of construction, total finish, and paving of a highway can run to \$0.5 million, so that if we're talking about a dollar figure it might help.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you be satisfied with that, Tom? A dollar figure. Of course we all realize that a mile of construction varies in different areas.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, all I want to know is where this \$441 million is being spent in Alberta. That's all I want to know, and unless I can get

reasonable assurance that we'll be given that information, I can't approve this this evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. ISLEY: A question, Mr. Chairman. Isn't that type of information already available on a municipal basis with the exception of, let's say, the primary highway system?

MR. KROEGER: On a municipal basis? No, I would think only the part that applies to municipalities.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's why I'm excluding the primary highways.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we get back to the . . .

MR. KROEGER: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, but even there we cross over where the department will move in on helping municipalities on a certain project, as has happened. Do you want to comment on that?

MR. CRONKHITE: I'd like to comment on this. I think that the information can be made available. I think you have to recognize that it will have to be used with discretion, because in the \$400 million capital program -- just using that as an example -- you have projects which are continuations from the previous year. You have projects which will continue into the next year, even two years. Some of them are two and three years in duration. So that when you see a list, you may see a list of \$400 million of the capital project, so it really then totals up to six. What we're afraid of, and I think there was some hesitancy, was because expectations can be raised that it's all going to be done right now, rather than in the progression of the actual program. In that program list of primary highways, which I have here, for \$112 million on the road part without the bridges, there's probably \$160 million total work.

This information can be put on a map and shown and used at his discretion. I don't see any problem. But, you know, it does raise the fear that the expectations of some people you may talk to may be raised that we're going to do everything now and finish it all this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ken Kowalski.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Sindlinger, we can provide you all the historical information for the last number of years based on every MD and county to March 31, 1979. That's all historical. That's all tabled in the annual report. We'd have a difficult time giving you all the information for this year's budget because -- as an example I'm holding a sheet in front of me which is the expropriation for \$35 million for maintenance of primary highways; it's broken down into 15 districts and what I have for my administration bookkeeping is simply 15 figures of approximately \$1 million to \$1.5 million for each district -- we don't know at this point if we're going to expend all these moneys that we've set aside by district for budgeting by the end of March 1980 because, as an example, if we have severe winter storms in district 1, which is the Medicine Hat district, we may have to take money out of, say, district 15 which is the Peace River district and allocate it down there to cover it. And that sort of thing goes on all the time. It's basic management with dollars throughout the whole year.

We can provide all the historical information to March 31 to you, and you've got an excellent overview as to what's happening where. But to do it for the current year, we've got kind of a management problem.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, no. It's not such a . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: What do you wish? Now just lay it right out on the table.

MR. SINDLINGER: I'll lay it right on the table. Somebody came up with a number of \$441 million, more or less. They didn't start at \$441 million and work down, and say we'll start with \$441 million and spend some here and some there. What they did was start at the bottom and said we need some here and some there, we need this project and that project, and they added them all up to get the \$441 million. There must be some idea within the department as to where that money is going to be spent over this next year.

I'm asking that that be illustrated to us, or divided up and given to us on a geographic basis in the province of Alberta. I left it in their best judgment to decide what that geographic unit should be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this possible, Henry?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, let us start by the six regions excluding the cities, and then we can go into the funds allocated for cities, if you like. You've got 11 cities with \$106 million going into it. Two of them are easily identifiable, Calgary around 274 and Edmonton about the same. So that gives you that much.

Then if you take the six regions and we start there, and then see what you do with that, and perhaps we can help you beyond that if you want some more. Can we stage it in this way?

MR. SINDLINGER: That would be fine.

MR. KROEGER: All right, that's good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good.

Would the minister like to close the debate? Then we could have the motion that this be reported to the Committee of Supply.

MR. KROEGER: Well, I don't have any specific closing comments other than I appreciate the assistance. I appreciate the questions, as a matter of fact. This could be relatively easy. When I get in the House I won't have the kind of support that is here, and I didn't attempt to inject very much comment. Far from resenting the kinds of questions that were here, I have appreciated them.

I want to thank the group. I want to thank the people who came here in a support role, and that's my closing statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we'd like a motion for this to be reported to the Committee of Supply.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ernie Isley makes the motion.

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:22 p.m.