

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, October 31, 1979 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we have with us this afternoon, sitting in the members gallery, students from Concordia College, which is located in my constituency, Edmonton Highlands. They are accompanied by an instructor, Mr. Gordon Olsen. I would ask that they rise to receive the welcome of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Beny Collection

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier. Is the Premier prepared to request the Auditor General to investigate all the circumstances surrounding the near purchase of the Dr. Roloff Beny collection?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that's certainly not a matter that has been under active consideration by the government.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier. Is the Premier prepared to take the matter under active consideration and to report to the Assembly the conclusion of that deliberation?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to do that, although I'm advised the matter is under negotiation. I would doubt whether such a matter can be dealt with until the negotiation is concluded, but we would certainly think about that and advise the House if there's any worth-while purpose there.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. Could he indicate, when an order in council is submitted to his office for perusal, that not only the immediate cost or the initial cost for a project is examined, but also the long-term cost of such project? I'm referring directly to the Beny collection.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, all aspects of a potential future liability are looked into and reviewed when any of that kind are submitted.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Provincial Treasurer indicate to the Assembly at this time that he assured himself of potential long-term or final costs with regard to obtaining the Beny collection for the government of Alberta?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice. Quite a number of those documents cross my desk.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, did the Provincial Treasurer assure himself of the final cost or not? I'm sure the Provincial Treasurer would know whether that decision was made in his examination.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice, as I indicated.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, that's not acceptable. Does the Provincial Treasurer know what he does in his responsibility, or does he not? Did he examine O.C.s, or did he not? With regard . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is repeating the question. It very often happens during question period that a question is not acceptable to a minister or an answer is not acceptable to a member. But so be it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, if I may. Is the Provincial Treasurer in a position to advise the Assembly — or perhaps, when he checks, to obtain this information — whether the information compiled for the Executive Council when the order in council was passed was in fact consistent with the costs announced in this Legislature over the last few days by the hon. Minister responsible for Culture.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to look into that as well.

Willmore Wilderness Park

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. What is the present policy of the Alberta government with regard to the preservation of Willmore Wilderness Park?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I think the policy of Willmore Wilderness Park is known by most people in Alberta, in that it's part of the Eastern Slopes policy, and it's a prime protection area. As such it's regulated under the forestry regulations, but it's a prime protection area.

MR. R. CLARK: Then to the hon. minister. Has the minister had a chance to look over the petition presented to the minister by the Alberta Fish & Game Association and to satisfy himself that the petition supported the existing use of Willmore Wilderness Park?

MR. MILLER: As I understand it, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring to the petition that was brought forward by the wilderness association people, the 35,000 names?

MR. R. CLARK: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry if I said that. I was referring to the Alberta Fish & Game Association presentation.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I presumed that was the presentation when I met with the people. I took their

presentation under consideration. We had a very good meeting, and certainly we are together on all aspects as concern the Willmore Wilderness Park.

Cold Lake Oil Development

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. What's the government's present policy position with regard to the Cold Lake development? Where does it sit as far as firm government policy is concerned?

MR. LEITCH: Firm government policy in what respect, Mr. Speaker?

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Has the government a policy that the Cold Lake project will go ahead or not go ahead? Has that policy decision been made yet?

MR. LEITCH: No, that decision has not yet been made, Mr. Speaker.

Gaming Controls

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney General and ask if he could indicate to the Assembly on whose instructions officials of the Attorney General's Department, the gaming licensing people, informed the Alberta Fish & Game Association that the organization would not be allowed to use proceeds from its lotteries for lobbying activities which were opposed to government policy?

The two areas of government policy that I refer to specifically are Willmore Wilderness Park and the Cold Lake project, on which we find on one hand the Fish & Game Association is agreeable with the government, and on the other hand the government has no position at all yet.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with what response might have been given to the Fish & Game Association by any official of the Attorney General's Department. But I would certainly be glad to check into it and respond further.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. minister in a position to indicate whether he's responded yet to the correspondence from the solicitor for the Alberta Fish & Game Association, Mr. Scammell, who asked the government to review the ruling that funds derived from lotteries licensed under the Attorney General's Department have to be approved by officials of the department?

The reason I pose the question is that officials of the minister's department have told the Fish & Game Association that they cannot use lottery funds in lobbying against government activities. Has the minister responded to Mr. Scammell?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think there are several things in the hon. leader's question. As to whether or not a response has been given Mr. Scammell, I'm not sure offhand, and will certainly check.

The other aspect I should remark on is that my response, I would think at this time — if response has gone forward on my behalf — would have made some

reference to the citizens' advisory committee. If Mr. Scammell was saying, why don't you do this or that in connection with policies, our policy during recent months has been to respond to people by saying that any views they express will certainly be taken under consideration. In many cases we've forwarded these presentations, whether in the form of a letter or something more formal, to the citizens' advisory committee.

As to the position of officials in the department, clearly it's their duty and responsibility to respond to people based on what government policy is. Whether the response given in the particular case reflected government policy is not something I could answer without checking.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister indicate to the Assembly now or, if he can't, then check and report back to the Assembly, whether in fact there is a government policy that says that the use of proceeds from lotteries, which are licensed by the minister's department, has to be cleared before that agency can use funds derived from that lottery to make public presentations to the Energy Resources Conservation Board on a project like Cold Lake?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, so that there's no doubt about the matter, the response as to how a particular organization is guided by officials in the department in respect of spending moneys raised by gaming events is based entirely on whether or not the official looking at the case, in his experience, is of the belief that that falls within the category of charitable or religious. That is the guideline there, established originally of course in its source, in the authorizations provided in the Canadian Criminal Code in respect of the objectives for which gaming can be carried on, and in the licensing practices of the province of Alberta — follows guidelines which are well established in respect of definition of charitable and religious purposes. It certainly would not be the case that the type of reference the hon. leader made would be relevant to any such consideration.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then just one last question to the minister. Has the minister had discussions with the officials in his department responsible for licensing of lotteries and so on, on the question of the use that these organizations are making of lottery funds to make representation to the Energy Resources Conservation Board or with regard to the Willmore Wilderness petition?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think that we don't normally use conversations with officials in response to an answer to a question, in the sense that those discussions are often confidential advice given by officials. But I can certainly say to the hon. leader that what is implied in his question is certainly not the policy of the government. I can assure him that I have never had a conversation with any official relative to the use of gaming proceeds in respect of the sorts of things he raises in his question.

Dependent Adults

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, with regard to The Dependent Adults Act. There are

indications that a majority of proposed dependents were not served with notice of their guardianship hearings. I wonder if the minister has any intention to amend the present Act to make that type of happening illegal?

Secondly, are there any indications that the regulations with regard to dependent handicappeds and the handling of dependent handicappeds may change?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the question of the need to amend certain portions of The Dependent Adults Act is currently being assessed by the government. I'll certainly take into consideration in that review the observations made by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that there are a number of cases where guardianship has been awarded without notification of the hearings?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'll certainly look into that matter and take that question as notice. It has not been brought to my attention. If it is true, I'll ask for the explanation. On the other hand, if there is some valid reason for that, I'll advise the member.

Petroleum Product Imports

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question today to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Has the minister asked the federal government to give consideration to imposing a tariff on all petroleum products imported into Canada, other than perhaps some very light fuels that are imported with a tariff? I ask this question because in Canada we have tariffs to protect most anything else that we have.

MR. LEITCH: The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a supplementary question of the minister. Would you consider making these recommendations to the federal counterparts?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, my offhand reaction is that it doesn't strike me as a representation I would act on.

Constitutional Talks

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the Premier. Can he advise the Assembly whether any discussions have taken place between the Premier of Alberta and the Prime Minister of Canada subsequent to the Premier's speech in Vancouver the day before yesterday?

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Does he anticipate an early meeting with the Prime Minister of Canada, or an early opportunity to discuss fully both the Premier's speech and the Prime Minister's answer in *Hansard* yesterday?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I have no anticipation one way or another in that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Is the minister in a position to outline to the Assembly what discussions have taken place subsequent to the paragraph in Communiqué No. 2 from the premiers' conference in which:

The Premiers reaffirmed provincial responsibility over natural resources. They noted, however, that important differences remain over the future of oil prices in Canada. They agreed that the question should be given further consideration in the course of interprovincial and federal-provincial ministerial meetings ...

Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to outline what follow-up steps have been taken?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I can advise the hon. member and the Assembly that the continuing committee of ministers on the constitution did meet in Halifax last week. While there was no resolution as to any of the very contentious issues on the constitution, I can advise the House that the short list of the very important constitutional points was narrowed down. Alberta's position was that resources clearly had to be one of the most important issues. We did manage to have that on the short list of items for discussion. Whether it can be referred to the first ministers' conference, as the Prime Minister suggested previously, is still open to some question. As to progress, the best efforts draft which we have arrived at before is still really in debatable position, and we really haven't moved much beyond that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the Premier or the minister. There was a degree of consensus at the La Malbaie meeting. However, with respect to paragraph 3 of the Premier's statement concerning natural resources:

how to produce its natural resources — when to produce its natural resources — whether or not to sell its natural resources.

Is either the Premier or the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what consensus there was among the premiers of Canada on that particular paragraph, as opposed to the general statement?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the paragraph was not discussed in La Malbaie in a specific way, but only generally, as part of the discussions. Some provinces did not deal with it, some agreed with the statement, and others did not.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. What steps has the government taken subsequent to that meeting, and what intention does the government have subsequent to the Premier's speech in Vancouver to follow up with other premiers these discussions with respect to paragraph 3?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, there was no intention of doing that. The statement was circulated to all the premiers. They're well aware of the Alberta government position. It's set forth very clearly in paragraph 3.

Hog Industry

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. Minister of Agriculture indicate whether his department has any statistics or information that would indicate Alberta's deficit position in hog production?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure of the question asked by the hon. member. I gathered it was a deficit position that the hog producers find themselves in.

MR. R. CLARK: Production.

MR. SCHMIDT: A deficit in production. Numberwise, Mr. Speaker, the hog production in the province has been on the increase. Of course, there is no shortage of hogs in the province of Alberta at the present time.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister had any information that there is a possibility of the import of 150,000 hogs per year from Saskatchewan to the province of Alberta, or has the minister met with the hog marketing board in this regard?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the hog producers' marketing board for the province of Alberta has some negotiations going on with its counterpart in the province of Saskatchewan, and is indeed negotiating an amount of hog production that would be marketed in Alberta.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Minister of Agriculture confirm that the figure of 150,000 hogs is somewhere in the ballpark as to, the number being imported into the Alberta market?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the number 2,000 a week rings a bell, so I would think that the figure the hon. member is mentioning is somewhere in the ballpark.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Due to this fact, is any consideration being given by the minister, or by the Agricultural Development Corporation, to increasing loans or initiating new loans to hog producers in the province of Alberta?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, loans have been available to those interested in the hog industry, and will continue to be available to those who qualify and wish to make application to the Agricultural Development Corporation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Minister of Agriculture aware that applications in the last few days have been refused by the ADC because they feel that Albertans are supplying adequate hogs to the market at the present time? Is the minister aware of the restrictive policy of the ADC board at this time?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the comments made by the hon. member, no, I'm not aware of anyone who has made an application to ADC that has been turned down dependent upon the production

of the area for which the individual made the application.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the minister check that with ADC and report to the Assembly?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, yes. Will do.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. There's a slight preamble, if the Speaker would permit me. Apparently hog production has gone up 18 per cent in Alberta, 20 per cent in Canada, and about 20 per cent in the United States last year, and the projection is the same for the coming year.

Mr. Minister, in light of the high interest rates and the market being something like 56 cents a hundred-weight, do you foresee the strength in the hog industry declining in Alberta, and in fact some problems being incurred by hog producers?

MR. SPEAKER: First of all, could I mention that it would be welcome if the hon. member would use the ordinary parliamentary form. In the second place, the question falls into that category of invitations to prophesy which really should not enter the question period.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the minister held discussions with the hog marketing board with respect to initiatives that might be taken to achieve self-sufficiency in the province of Alberta, so that at least we are supplying our own market?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to meet with the total hog board some time ago. I don't think the problem is self-sufficiency within the province. The negotiations with the sister province with regard to marketing of hogs in the province of Alberta are, indeed, tied not to the lack of production in the province but to the lack of facilities in the slaughter area in the neighboring province.

MR. MOORE: The NDP drove them out, Grant.

Private Schools

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question arises from an evaluation done by the Department of Education of the several independent Mennonite schools in Alberta. I wonder if the Minister of Education would advise if the evaluation was made public, and what the conclusion of this evaluation was.

MR. KING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The evaluation has not yet been made public. Copies of it are being printed now for public distribution, and as soon as the printing is completed the report in its entirety will be available. It was conducted by the student evaluation branch of the Department of Education. It was based on the administration of a test to all the students in all 11 of the category 4 schools in the province. I would like to make some correction. While a number of them are Mennonite schools, they are not all Mennonite schools.

In brief, Mr. Speaker, the results of the administration of the test suggested that the students were achieving more than satisfactorily with respect to lan-

guage arts, and satisfactorily with respect to all other courses they were taking. Their weakest performance was in mathematics or arithmetic, but even in that area they were performing satisfactorily relative to the performance of students of comparable age and grade in public school systems throughout the province.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, in light of the high standard of education presently taught by these independent schools. What qualifications have their teaching staff?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, we seem to be getting into an area or topic which could require quite a lengthy, detailed answer.

MR. KING: You won't believe this, Mr. Speaker, but I can be very brief.

AN HON. MEMBER: We don't believe it.

MR. KING: Category 4 private schools in the province do not require and do not use certificated personnel. In other words, their teachers have not been certificated by the Department of Education.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Education. With regard to his previous answer, could he assure the House as to whether class 4 schools receive the same funding as the public and separate schools of Alberta?

MR. KING: Class 4 private schools receive no funding from the provincial government, Mr. Speaker.

Single Men's Hostels

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. The question is with respect to the operation of single men's hostel facilities in both Calgary and Edmonton. What is the present policy concerning the length of stay of residents, please?

MR. BOGLE: Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, the policy with regard to length of stay in the men's hostels in Calgary and Edmonton is that an individual is allowed to stay two weeks. If, in the opinion of the director of the facility, the individual has a job but has not yet received a pay cheque, he may authorize that individual to stay an additional two weeks.

DR. CARTER: A supplementary. I understand part of the policy is to help persons gain employment. Is the minister aware that job counsellors are truly available at peak load periods when the residents are there, such as in the evening?

MR. BOGLE: We've tried very hard, Mr. Speaker, to assist employable individuals coming into Alberta, in both Edmonton and Calgary, in their efforts to seek employment. It is my understanding that there is a very good turnover at the hostels, and it is not causing inconvenience.

DR. CARTER: A final supplementary. With winter coming on and the potential for exceeding the load capabilities of the institutions, have any recommenda-

tions been made with regard to facilities at Gunn and Youngstown?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, two men's facilities are operated by the department at Gunn and Youngstown, as the hon. member has indicated. Those facilities are for individuals who require medium- and long-term accommodation. In fact, you might describe them as overflow facilities for the hostels. To my knowledge, and I've had an opportunity to visit the facility at Youngstown, they're providing an excellent service for a certain number of people in the province of Alberta.

Forestry — Whitecourt and Grande Cache

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Fairly recently the minister met with 16 Whitecourt and Fox Creek officials about the development of forestry in the area. Can the minister indicate the outcome of that meeting, if a decision will be made as to proceeding with cutting of timber in that area?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, along with my colleague the Member for Athabasca I did have the pleasure of meeting with representatives from the city of Whitecourt and the surrounding communities. We heard their representations and concerns with respect to the allocation of timber which had been included in an invitation for proposals extended by the government some months ago. We assured them that their views would be given very careful consideration during the process of review going on now of the proposals we have received.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate when a final decision will be made as to what will happen with the timber reserves in the Grande Cache and Fox Creek-Whitecourt areas?

MR. LEITCH: No, I wouldn't be able to do that, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Economic Development. Has the minister had any meetings with business people in the Grande Cache area indicating the severity of business problems because of an economic downturn? Has this matter been brought to the minister's attention, and has the minister promised to try to encourage his colleague to speed up the decision as to the timber reserves?

MR. PLANCHE: There are quite a few questions there, Mr. Speaker. I haven't been in direct contact with the residents of [Grande Cache], although I believe my predecessor was.

AN HON. MEMBER: Grande Cache.

Prison System — Edmonton

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Solicitor General would confirm to the House that the correctional services division of his department is officially taking over the prisoner escort and detention responsibility of the Edmonton police department.

MR. HARLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As of tomorrow, November 1, the intention is to take over the operation of the city police cells and to carry out the escort duties between the city police cells and the remand centre.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House what advantages to the Edmonton city police department or to the city of Edmonton result from that important change.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, when the hon. member asks the minister to list advantages or disadvantages we're getting into the realm of outright opinion and, of course, debate.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, maybe I could rephrase the supplementary. Does the minister have any information to indicate how the change will affect the Edmonton police department?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, the benefits are that the Solicitor General's Department of course has the expertise in the correctional area, and I think it has been of interest to the city of Edmonton police to be able to free city policemen for policing duties. The effect of the decision which has been negotiated by officials in the Solicitor General's Department with the Chief of Police and confirmed by me is that we will free dollars and men in the city police force in Edmonton to carry on police work, and we in the Solicitor General's Department have been able to take over the escort duties and duties in the city police cells.

DR. PAPROSKI: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Recognizing that there'll be a freeing of dollars from the expenditures of the Edmonton police department, does the minister intend to cut back any funding for the Edmonton police department as a result of that change?

MR. HARLE: No.

Firefighters and Policemen Legislation

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour. Could the minister outline to the House what consultation he has had with the Alberta Fire Fighters Association regarding proposed amendments to legislation before the House?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, with respect to consultation concerning amendments to the legislation, I have had three meetings with a large portion of the executive of the Alberta Fire Fighters Association since the legislation was introduced. The question dealt with amendments, and that's the answer.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to confirm to the Assembly that at a meeting which took place yesterday the government's commitment to an amendment was simply to defer the law's coming into effect until proclamation, as opposed to assent?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I had some conversations yesterday with the representatives of the executive. I have made a suggestion. I think I indicated to the

executive that I would be making a statement concerning that suggestion when the Bill was in committee study. That is my present intention, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate to the House what negotiations he had with the Alberta Fire Fighters before the Bill was introduced in the House and who he spoke to? Were they representatives of the Alberta or Edmonton firefighters?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry will read *Hansard* during my introduction of second reading, it is all there.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister prepared to reassess the section dealing with deputy chiefs — plural — because of the concern expressed by the Alberta firefighters' union?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think that's part of the committee study of the Bill. We could get into it here. It is in relation to that matter, I believe, that the meetings have been taking place. I do propose and expect to deal with it rather extensively at third reading.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. The question is really so that we can properly prepare for the discussion. I'm sure the minister would want to see that occur.

Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether it is the government's view that negotiations will simply continue but the Bill will be passed and it will be a question of the proclamation? Or is the government prepared to entertain seriously the proposition of the Alberta Fire Fighters, that we should not insert "deputy chiefs" in the legislation?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I really don't know how I can respond to these questions without engaging in what will shortly become a debate which would preempt debate at committee study. In any event, I'm sure the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview will be prepared, regardless of whatever information he may receive today, for whatever debate may come forth at committee study.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Basically, what the Legislature is asking of the minister is a commitment. Will the minister make a commitment in the Legislature that amendments will be coming in or not? That is the question we're asking. It's a very simple matter of government policy. Will the amendment be coming in, or will it not? Does the minister know, or does he not?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I believe I indicated yesterday with the expression that there was a high probability or likelihood of that happening. I don't think the probability or likelihood has changed since my response yesterday.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification. Is the minister saying yes or no?

MR. NOTLEY: He's saying maybe, like they always do. [interjections]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a minister responsible to this Legislature can surely tell the Legislature . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

DR. BUCK: Is the minister going to proceed with that amendment, or is he not?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, as I have already indicated, I have had a number of discussions on this matter with a number of parties, all of whom have interests and concerns. As I indicated earlier in question period today, as a consequence of one of those discussions I had a commitment that at committee study I would make certain other commitments.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister for clarification. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly why he is choosing to proceed with the Bill at this fall session of the Legislature, in view of the very definite differences of opinion between the firefighters on one hand and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Surely the reasons for proceeding or not proceeding with any piece of legislation are properly dealt with when that legislation is up for debate.

DR. BUCK: By that time it's too late.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister responsible for Culture would like to supplement an answer given, I believe, yesterday.

DR. BUCK: I hope it's written.

Plains Indian Cultural Survival School

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to the question asked yesterday concerning the plains Indian cultural school, we sent them a form in June and it was returned to us October 29. Our department will look into it and get a reply back as soon as we can.

MR. R. CLARK: What are they supposed to run on in the meantime?

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Assembly agree that the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works might revert to Tabling Returns and Reports?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that. I'd like to table the annual report, as of March 31, 1979, for the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation. I regret that I didn't have the copies with me at the appropriate time earlier. I might add that copies will be distributed this afternoon to each member.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

17. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that the Assembly adopt the following amendment to *Standing Orders*:

Standing Order 50 is struck out and the following is substituted:

- 50(1) At the commencement of every Legislature the Assembly shall elect:
 - (a) a Chairman of Committees who shall also be Deputy Speaker of the Assembly, and
 - (b) a Deputy Chairman of Committees.
- (2) The Members elected as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees and Deputy Chairman of Committees shall continue to act in that capacity until the end of the Legislature for which they were elected and in the case of a vacancy by death, resignation or otherwise, the Assembly shall proceed forthwith to elect a successor.
- (3) The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees shall, if in his place in the Assembly, take the chair of all committees of the whole Assembly.
- (4) In the absence of the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees the Deputy Chairman of the Committees shall take the chair of all committees of the whole Assembly.
- (5) In the absence of both the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees and the Deputy Chairman of Committees, Mr. Speaker may, in forming a committee of the whole Assembly, before leaving the chair, appoint any member as chairman of the committee.
- (6) While acting as chairman of any committee of the whole Assembly, the Deputy Chairman of Committees has the duties and powers exercisable by the Chairman of Committees, and any reference in any standing order to the Chairman shall apply to the Deputy Chairman.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move Motion No. 17 with respect to the appointment of a deputy chairman of committees at the commencement of every Legislature. The form in which the motion is before the House is more extensive than that, in that it also deals with the position of chairman of committees, who is the Deputy Speaker. The rule has been redrafted and presented in the form of this resolution to cover the entire matter, the new portion being that in relation to the deputy chairman of committees.

Mr. Speaker, the motion has been before hon. members for some time. I think it is a narrow, limited change and one for which most hon. members who are frequently in committee would see the need. I mention that it has been before the House for some time in the sense that I don't think my remarks in connection with it need be long or particularly argumentative.

Quite apart from any need that might be involved in the sense of the increasing amount of work this Assembly has been doing and the additional work that is therefore done by committees, the government has also ascertained that where this has been used, in a

number of other legislatures in Canada, it has been a useful and satisfactory position to create pursuant to the rules in order to help the House carry on its work in committee stage. Having mentioned the experience of other jurisdictions, it runs in my mind that at least five other jurisdictions in Canada, including the House of Commons, have followed this procedure. I think there is ample evidence therefore that it's in accordance with practice and precedent.

Mr. Speaker, I think that would conclude my remarks, and I would ask hon. members to support this resolution.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the Assembly, I'd like to ask that we revert to Notices of Motions in order that, having adopted the resolution, a name might be placed in nomination for the vacant position of deputy chairman of committees.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **NOTICES OF MOTIONS**

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I place before you in nomination for the position of deputy chairman of committees the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

[Motion carried]

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

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

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

ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVINGS TRUST FUND CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION 1980-81 ESTIMATES OF PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

Department of Environment

1 — Capital City Recreation Park

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments or questions by any hon. members?

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, one question was raised the last day we had this vote under consideration. I wonder whether the hon. minister had time to examine my question with respect to any possibility of considering extending Capital City Park westward to at least link up with the Fort Edmonton site. If the hon. minister doesn't have that within his portfolio, perhaps he would consider some discussion with the Minister of Recreation and Parks, from a point of view of the interest that I think is being developed, the benefits that could accrue under the city's tourism, and the growth potential available with respect to that kind of development in that area.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I think it's an excellent thought on behalf of the Member for Edmonton Norwood. Of course, one knows that under the process a defined area is established, in this case for Capital City Park. This was done in the past. I don't know whether it sets any precedent. It's quite conceivable that one could adjust the boundaries, having in mind all the kinds of demands we get across the province for these types of projects.

I would relay this submission to the Minister of Recreation and Parks. We in Environment have done most of the land purchasing and, as you know, we based it on a defined area. This may require a whole new kind of submission through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee. I'm not sure about that. But I hope the Member for Edmonton Norwood will follow through on the concept she has proposed.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the Acting Minister of Recreation and Parks is very knowledgeable on Capital City Park in Edmonton. I was wondering: has the hon. minister ever visited Dinosaur Park in Dinosaur Valley? Just to correct the record — I see the hon. Member for Drumheller is here. I wasn't here Friday, and I understand he wasn't here. The acting minister indicated that he had good news for the hon. Member for Drumheller. I'd just like to indicate to the hon. acting minister that Dinosaur Park is in the Bow Valley constituency.

MR. COOKSON: Thanks very much, Freddie. My oversight. However, I notice the Member for Drumheller was very quick to accept the accolade. I hope that has been corrected, then.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, just one other comment. If the hon. Member for Drumheller wants to take any credit for Dinosaur Park, he can take credit for the road going into it. You have to have a dinosaur to get into the park.

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I don't mind his taking credit for having Dinosaur Park in his constituency; it may be changed later. We might confine it within the rest of the Drumheller area.

Agreed to:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|
| 1 — Capital City Recreation Park | \$3,725,000 |
|----------------------------------|-------------|

MR. COOKSON: I'd like to move that the resolution be reported.

[Motion carried]

2 — Fish Creek Provincial Park

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the minister have some remarks?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I would say just a few words about Fish Creek Provincial Park. It is slightly different from the one in Edmonton, which is a Capital City Park and is jointly administered. Fish Creek is a provincial park.

Both Environment and Recreation and Parks are working in co-operation with the city of Calgary to develop this park, which is in the southern part of Calgary. When completed, it will be somewhere in the

area of 2,900 acres of land, complete with recreation facilities, and will provide city dwellers, rural members surrounding the area, and tourists with a year-round natural retreat.

Perhaps one would be interested in the progress we are making with the park. With the exception of the one large purchase to be negotiated, the majority of the land for Fish Creek Provincial Park has been acquired. Final payments for a few parcels will be in accordance with The Expropriation Act. The total spent to date is approximately \$15 million, and we're asking for this additional. It's pretty well within the guidelines laid down at the time we initiated the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments to the minister with respect to this resolution?

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister. With respect to the recent extension of Fish Creek Park eastward across the river, what is the disposition with regard to surrounding properties, the access to the park from that whole area east of the river? What type of access will there be from the west side in the development across the Bow River to the east side?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I have some difficulty with the geography. I'm not familiar with the total area of the park in Calgary. But to answer the Member for Calgary Millican, I think you're referring to the most recent purchase from Daon, which will be incorporated into the park. At present, both we and Recreation and Parks are in the process of completing an agreement with Daon, in this case, as to certain specifics. One deals with the use of the area. When we're completed, I think we will have concluded that the best practical use would be a golf course. The other part of the agreement is that Daon would be permitted to remove some gravel from the area. This also lends itself to this concept.

Daon is insisting there won't be access, at least from their property which is on the crest or high area, to the . . . Will it be west? I'm not sure. At least it will be on the high land away from the river. I've also asked that in our agreement we make sure the government is protected conversely, that something unsightly isn't to occur on that high land. We will be including that in our agreement. I don't think there is a problem there, because it's zoned for residential.

Also with regard to access, my understanding is that eventually we will have access across the river in some form or another, although that won't necessarily be part of the contract. Daon insists that there be no access through their property. I believe there will be access, because there is a road and overpass pretty close to that area from which there will be access to the property.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister. I take encouragement from the minister's comment that nothing unsightly will be built on that escarpment overlooking the eastern portion of the park. I am afraid that I will be back to check with him again and again, to make sure we don't have some of those unsightly condominiums that have been slapped together put up on that escarpment.

One other aspect with regard to that park is the matter of the timing. I wonder if the minister might comment as to when he sees that eastern part of Fish

Creek Provincial Park in any stage of development for access to the general public.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether I could give you a firm commitment on that. The agreement with Daon is proceeding as quickly as possible. The funds have been made available. As soon as we complete that process Recreation and Parks, under the Hon. Pete Trynchy, will take the responsibility of the development.

DR. CARTER: Just a final comment. That part of Calgary, the southeast portion, has been neglected in so many ways that if you can speed up the process in any way, Mr. Minister, that would be greatly appreciated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments or questions with regard to this resolution?

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Agreed to: | |
| 2 — Fish Creek Provincial Park | \$3,750,000 |

MR. COOKSON: I would like to move that the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

3 — Irrigation Headworks Improvement

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

MR. COOKSON: To update members as to what's happened in the past with regard to headworks and the position of Environment, Environment has taken over the responsibility of maintenance and construction in all our water systems used in irrigation, up to what we classify as headworks. Once the water leaves that point, the responsibility is assumed by the Department of Agriculture. Three or four years ago the province and our government committed a total of \$200 million towards irrigation, of which \$110 million became the responsibility of Environment, and the balance under the Department of Agriculture. I think the hon. Mr. Schmidt has reported on the expenditure from the headworks on.

Just to give you a brief overview of the progress that's been made to date, perhaps I could say this. After careful and detailed negotiations, agreements transferring ownership of irrigation headworks to the province, and responsibility for operating, maintaining and improving these headworks, have been concluded for the following. Bearing in mind that the headworks originally rested in the name of the federal government, an arrangement was made to transfer over to the province and in the process we were given certain concessions. Now in some cases they are owned, as yet, by districts. So, as to agreements of transfers of ownership, in 1973 under the PFRA the province took over Waterton, St. Mary, Carseland, and Bow. Those of you who aren't in irrigation areas, and even I, perhaps need some clarification from the members for Bow Valley and Little Bow. The provincial district has also taken over Lethbridge Northern and Western. Now agreements that still have to be negotiated are the headworks of the Eastern, Ross Creek, Mountain View, Aetna, and United.

A major 10-year capital program has been established and is being financed by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, to restore and improve the headworks and ensure the reliability of the source of supply for irrigation and other water users. Irrigation headworks improvement is a 10-year project with total heritage fund investment estimated at \$110 million. The design, construction, and rehabilitation of headworks systems, including reservoirs, canals, and structures, is required to meet the objective. The project also recognizes that future water demands dictate further flow regulation in the South Saskatchewan River system. In this regard the Oldman feasibility study is of high priority.

The project is in the third year of its 10-year program, presently scheduled to terminate in '85-86. I would like to draw to the attention of the members that we have had some delay. One of our great problems, as you know, is the settlement with regard to the Piegan band claim at Pincher Creek. The other delay was because of the Oldman River basin study report and the hearings, review, and decision on that study. At present that study is before an internal committee. As I've said publicly, I hope by the spring of 1980 to be able to make a report on the areas in which the province will move, the areas where there will be disagreement, and so on.

The total expenditure to date is \$6 million. We are asking for a further \$6.4 million in our 1980-81 year.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister mentioned that there was one problem with taking over the headworks on the Bow River owned by EID. This has been a long-standing problem as far as the headworks there are concerned. The Eastern Irrigation District is faced with the problem it was faced with on the St. Mary, the problem of Indian aboriginal rights on land close to the dam on the Bow River. The federal government allocated, I think, in the neighborhood of \$28 million to rehabilitate the Bassano dam and put in new fill to replace the aqueduct. But at this point, Mr. Chairman, that \$28 million certainly won't go anywhere towards repairing the Bassano dam, because it's getting into a state that it certainly needs repair. They did spend a big portion of the \$28 million — if that is the right figure — to replace the aqueduct in the Brooks area.

I would like to ask the hon. minister: has he met recently with the Eastern Irrigation board with regard to repairing the Bassano dam or taking over the headworks on the Bow River that belong to the Eastern Irrigation District?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I haven't yet met with the Eastern Irrigation people. If I can identify that correctly, that's the dam which I understand is very close to one of the major Indian reserves and which as yet is in the name of the Eastern Irrigation District. I try to keep updated on progress, and we're trying to move as quickly as possible in this area. Of course, it does involve the Eastern Irrigation District. Until the district is able to negotiate through the federal government a clearance in terms of ownership, until that is completed, the position we take is that we wouldn't accept the responsibility of the headworks. Of course, you know the reason why; it's the dilemma we face in several other instances, in particular the one on the Piegan Indian Reserve.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman. That's right, as the minister has indicated. It is the dam on the Bow River, and it's going to be involved as far as the Indian situation is concerned.

I would like to pose another question to the minister. We have a situation there; we have an alternative to repairing the Bassano dam. I don't know if the minister is aware or has had any figures on this. There have been some studies on putting a dam downstream, some 20 miles from the dam. Lots of figures have been batted around of the cost toward putting in the dam. I've heard the figure of \$200 million. Many figures have been put before the people in my constituency with regard to putting in the Eyremore dam. If we did get the dam in, it would replace the Bassano dam. That would divert the water into the Eastern Irrigation District, and we wouldn't need to repair the dam. That would serve the purpose of storing 300,000 acre-feet of water and diverting the water into the Eastern Irrigation District.

It's not a question, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the minister if he would see fit to meet with the federal government or federal officials to see if they would be willing to put in some more money and if it wouldn't be more feasible to put in the Eyremore dam at this point. It's going to cost a little more money, but it'll be more permanent, and it'll store water as well as divert the water into the irrigation district. So I would ask the minister if he could meet with federal officials of the new government and see if they would contribute the money they have already approved to repair the Bassano dam, to put in what they call the Eyremore dam.

MR. COOKSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's a good presentation. I presume we would do this on the assumption that negotiations were not successful with — I believe it's the Blood Indian Reserve, isn't it? I'm not sure whether we should make that assumption. It might be premature to do that. I could perhaps update the member on just what stage those negotiations are at with regard to ownership. I think the member is correct when he says that it is a considerably higher cost. Probably the member is more familiar with what the increased cost is than I am. I just recollect that it is a major cost to divert and create the Eyremore dam. But I would undertake to see if I could update with regard to the stage of negotiations at this time.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I presume the department considers many different projects or program suggestions for the heritage fund. I would like to ask what criterion is used to select one program for promotion as opposed to another program.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, just to answer briefly the Member for Calgary Buffalo, the general procedure is to make submissions through a committee charged with the responsibility of administering the Heritage Savings Trust Fund in terms of capital.

Both opposition and government are free to make those submissions at any time. Then it goes through the process. Finally, after following through this process, we reach a point of arriving at what we consider priorities in terms of capital funding from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. That's really the basis of it. At present, the ones we're discussing — in fact the last

three: Fish Creek, Capital City, and the irrigation headworks — are ongoing programs to which there has been a commitment sometime in the past.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, please. The point I'm trying to get at is the criteria used. I imagine that all departments, prior to proceeding with a suggestion or request to the investment committee, would have to assess each of those programs relative to the criteria set out in The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act.

In specific regard to the capital projects division, the criterion is quite clear. Section 6 (1)(a) states: "the making of investments in projects which will provide long term economic or social benefits to the people of Alberta . . ." The question I would pose in the light of that criterion is: what are the long-term economic or social benefits to the people of Alberta resulting from this investment of the heritage fund?

MR. COOKSON: I imagine the member is speaking specifically with regard to this irrigation program. I have a better understanding of the point the member is making. Probably, in terms of long-term social and economic benefit to Alberta, we have to look at the total picture of agriculture in particular in Alberta, and assess in our own minds whether an increased water supply — by the way, a resource that generally finds its way into Hudson Bay or wherever — that that water source is either lost, through flowing out of the province, or whether we can in some way tap it to derive a long-term social and economic benefit. Any studies that I've seen or read about seem to indicate that any expenditures in agriculture, particularly in the area of irrigation, will have a long-term social and economic benefit because of the tremendous spinoff from the production of a raw product consequently winding its way through different secondary and tertiary stages to the point where it becomes a final product. I guess it's a deep philosophical question as to how far or how much you can expand in this area and still have a long-term social and economic benefit. That's the balancing thing.

The other balancing thing in this case is the supply of water. That deeply concerns me, because we in the department issue a licence to use water. In that licence we have to define the number of acre-feet that are to be permitted to be removed from the basin. So as I say, the long-term social and economic benefit is limited by that. It's also limited in this respect: if we double production, for example, and by doing that cut the price of the product in half, I don't really know what we've accomplished.

So our hope — and I think the Minister of Agriculture will agree with me — is that, first, we're making use of a resource in this area which is very unproductive without water; and second, that it will encourage farm people in that area to get into production of products which are not competitive with the dryland areas. I think economics will take care of that problem, because the cost of water will almost dictate the kinds of crops grown. I suppose, thirdly, as I've mentioned, the spinoff from all this process in terms of alfalfa pelleting, rapeseed crushing, and the beef industry, which is highlighted in the Oldman report as being probably still a major thing in southern Alberta in terms of agriculture — I think it would be safe to say to the Member for Calgary Buffalo that on that basis

we can substantiate long-term social and economic benefits.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, if I were assessing two stocks or something of that nature to make an investment, I'd look at the rate of return on one as opposed to the other. That which had the highest rate of return, all other things being equal, would be the one I would invest in. That's the point I'm trying to get at here with regard to this investment of the heritage fund. You can't really sit down and say the rate of return on this investment will be X per cent or Y per cent compared to this other investment. But you can make some attempt at quantifying the long-term economic or social benefits.

Those were the matters to which the minister just addressed himself. He's touched on them briefly. But I wonder if he could be more specific in quantifying such things as the secondary and tertiary stage benefits that he mentioned, like construction and employment that would result, the acreage that would benefit from these things, the yield that would result from those acreages being irrigated, the addition to the gross provincial product, the net impact that would have on the balance of the gross provincial product in its payments, and things of that nature.

The reason I get into this, Mr. Chairman, is that in this province any private firm or industry investment of large proportions has to do an economic, social, and environmental impact analysis prior to getting government approval. The best example of this is the large projects in the tar sands; Al sands, for example. They spend a great deal of time and money demonstrating that there are tertiary benefits and spinoffs. They are required to somehow quantify those benefits prior to getting legislative or regulatory approval. If private industry is subjected to those types of regulations and requirements, I think the provincial government should do the same in its large-scale investments, especially with the trust that the people of Alberta have in us with regard to the disbursement and placement of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get into a deep philosophical argument with the Member for Calgary Buffalo, who is an economist in his own right. Perhaps we're getting into an area that could be better answered by the Minister of Agriculture. However, my responsibility is to provide this water. Even though my responsibility stops at the headworks, the water flows on. So I guess I have some responsibility for this.

About all I can say, from my own experience in agriculture, is that generally speaking most people out there are pretty practical. In other words, they don't usually build a two-car garage if they have only one car. That's the sort of basic philosophy. Even though we don't have a budget sheet or a balance sheet that says, these are your assets and liabilities and there are your expenditures and your revenue, we have a certain intuition. Of course, mistakes are made, and one learns by his mistakes.

My personal opinion is that, aside from all those extremely important points you've made, and keeping in mind that I've inherited a responsibility of \$110 million that has to be used for irrigation — that's my instruction — the farm people themselves who will be

using this resource will pretty well determine the economics of the process, even though they may not have the budget sheet, the breakdown, and the end profit in front of them. Our experience in agriculture is that you never have a dollar until you have it in your pocket. Most farm people — and there will be exceptions — will not, for example, invest in major overhead for irrigation facilities or channelling, or pay for the acre-feet required, unless they are pretty certain in their own minds that there's going to be an economic return. I think that's the basis of the thing. We in Environment are continually being demanded to expand the facility and the supply of water. My intuition tells me that that says somebody out there is using that water and making a buck. That's sufficient for me.

The only area — it's touched on in the Oldman report — that I think we should address ourselves to, and we will, is the concern expressed about the efficient use of water. It's going to require major expenditures, but the loss through evaporation and improper use — the fact that there's no monitoring of the supply and therefore you don't turn off the tap — has come to an end, I think. We'll have to do it in a more businesslike manner. If there is anything I want to underline with regard to supplying funds for irrigation, it's that point. We must improve the efficiency of the use of water.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe this discussion is developing somewhat along a philosophical line and a matter of personal opinion — actually into a dialogue. Perhaps sometime the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo might meet with the minister on a more personal basis and discuss it further.

MR. SINDLINGER: [Not recorded] if I may, please. I would tend to agree with you that perhaps part of this discussion and dialogue has turned into a philosophical discussion. But I would submit, sir, that it's more on the part of the minister than the person questioning. I would submit that the questions of construction cost, employment numbers, acreages, and yield are pretty specific quantifiable subjects. I think they deserve an answer. I think it is very germane to what we're doing with the heritage trust fund.

What are we doing with that, and what rate of return are we getting? A specific criterion is set out in The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Act; that is, that there must be long-term economic or social benefits. The question is, what are those long-term economic benefits? And I submit, sir, that the response to that question must be more than the reply that it's good common sense of farmers; they wouldn't invest in something if it wasn't going to give them a return.

Too often I've seen governments spend money on projects like this, and rather than investing in the projects it would have made more sense to take the money and just pay it directly to the recipients. So if we have \$110 million in this investment, I'd like to know how many people are going to benefit, and by what amount. Would it be less expensive to take that money and endow it, and pay those recipients of the benefits the interest from that money, rather than invest it in this project? I don't know.

I won't withdraw the questions. I will leave them here and not pursue them any longer. But I think the one important question that comes out of this is, why do we invest in one project and not the other? What is

the criterion for investing in project A as opposed to project B?

Thank you, sir.

MR. L. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm concerned about the report on the Oldman River basin. Two studies were done, and I believe they were comparable. If the three rivers dam were built for on-stream storage, it would increase the acreage by a 166,000 acres, and with the total rehabilitation the acreage under irrigation would go from 516,000 up to 929,000. This study was very complete.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister whether as complete a study will be done before they start on the South Saskatchewan River basin, as has been done on the Oldman River, so we will know whether the Eyremore dam is feasible, or whether off-stream storage should be developed, as the Oldman River basin study first suggested, and the upgrading of the ditches should be done first to prevent the waste of water. Just how much benefit would be gained from a dam the size of the Eyremore dam, which is, I believe, 280 million — the last figures they had on it. I just hope there would be a study on the Saskatchewan River basin before we start building dams on it, comparable to the two studies done on the Oldman River.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, the figures that the Member for Drumheller has thrown out are — I suppose it's going to be give or take, but they estimate about a 200,000 to 300,000 acre increased capacity, based on the Oldman report. The Oldman report deals primarily with off-stream storage. They feel that that can be accomplished without any on-stream storage whatsoever. So when they say that, I haven't got any cost figures, but it would be likely.

There are two problems. First of all, the difference in the cost; and secondly, when you talk about the three rivers site, that site runs into the Piegan Indian Reserve. It's above the reserve, isn't it? It's just above. It shows it right on the edge here. But it does create some problems, again, with regard to flow of water through the reserve.

Aside from that argument, the Oldman report really suggests that — at least for the time being, and I don't know how many years ahead — off-stream storage should really accomplish what they would like to see accomplished, in terms of investment and the increased area for irrigation.

The Oldman report — I have before me the general map area which includes the flow from the Bow River, the Little Bow River, the Oldman River, and on down to the Waterton River. As you move east, all these combine into the South Saskatchewan River, and when you're talking about the South Saskatchewan River study you're talking partly about the Oldman report. I'm not sure whether there's an overlap there, but part of the report includes the areas I've suggested. It involves about 11 irrigation districts and that kind of area.

I think your question was whether we would have a comprehensive study — before, for example, we initiated a major expenditure on the Eyremore dam concept — to see whether the economics warranted such a thing. Maybe that's premature because, as I've suggested to the Member for Bow Valley, there's still some hope that we can negotiate with the Blood Indians with regard to Bassano, which will deal at least with

part of the problem in that area.

I don't know whether that helps you at all, hon. member.

MR. L. CLARK: A supplementary Mr. Chairman. It does help some. But my understanding is that the Bow River and the Red Deer River are not included in the Oldman River report and the Eastern Irrigation District, which now comes from the Bassano dam on the Blackfoot Indian Reserve. They've done two studies on the southern area. Are they going to proceed with a study on the northern area before any major work, such as the Eyremore dam, is done there?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, it's a good point. I'll take that as notice. There's no commitment at the present time.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I'd like to make a comment or two with regard to the study done about a year and a half ago on the Bow River irrigation project. The recommendations in that report indicated that the headworks facility at Carseland would possibly have to be enlarged, along with a widening and deepening of the canal from the Carseland dam down to Lake McGregor. I certainly hope that, as the study on the Oldman is reviewed by this internal committee, that study is taking equal priority and has an equal place on the table for consideration. Because the work that has to be done in the Bow River project, particularly headworks and rehabilitation works, is comparable and similar to that in the Lethbridge Northern Irrigation District. So I hope the minister is giving equal treatment to both reports and studies.

In that study on the Bow River Irrigation District, there's an indication that we're within approximately 4,000 to 5,000 acres, or even less now. I think in 1980 we will reach the maximum potential irrigation acreage of around 175,000 acres. At that point, as it is now, no new acreage is being made available to the farmers. But I would like to say that there certainly is a continuous demand on the board for more acreage to be put under water. My question to the minister is: one, will both reports get equal treatment? Secondly, has any consideration been given to the headworks that provide the water for the Bow River Irrigation District?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, we'll try to treat all Albertans equally as to work on headworks. I don't have that information with me, but perhaps I could provide that for you.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to place it on the record, number one. Number two, I'd like an indication from the minister if he has had the opportunity to review the submission from the Bow River Irrigation District. If not, should some type of procedure be established where the board meets with the minister or officials to bring it up to date? Your colleagues the former Minister of Environment and the former Minister of Agriculture did review those studies; however, I'm not sure whether you and the present Minister of Agriculture have had the opportunity. I believe he has.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I want to pose a couple of questions to the minister. He made reference to PFRA

and the transfer of headworks from the federal government to the province. I have a couple of questions. First of all, are any headworks still under the jurisdiction of the federal authorities? I understood they all had been transferred to the provincial authorities. Also, because as an urban member I don't understand some of this, I want to ask the minister about the ownership of water as it flows through the rivers and streams of Alberta. Who actually owns that water, if indeed anybody has ownership outside the jurisdiction in which it lies?

Mr. Chairman, I look at the responsibility of Environment, which is essentially for the rehabilitation and upgrading of headworks and water storage systems. First of all, I think the minister's department has been super in responding to the needs of Alberta. Certainly the co-operation with the new water treatment plant in Lethbridge, for example, has been just great, and I think it's indicative of policies instituted by the former minister of accommodating the users of water.

In drawing a parallel the minister made reference to having a two-car garage with one car. All the eastern papers I read indicate that Albertans have two-car garages with three cars. I don't really understand where that comparison is.

I'm a little confused by a matter raised by the Member for Calgary Buffalo, and it's not on a philosophical basis. Maybe the minister can clarify it. I understood, from the studies that have been carried out and from the water policy conference carried out a year and a half ago in Lethbridge, that about 85 per cent of the results of irrigation in Alberta go to the community as opposed to the owner of the land. Indeed, only 15 per cent goes to the owner of the land. I'm a little confused when I hear some of the questions being asked relative to water supply. I would submit that essentially the role of Environment is to supply the water; the distribution falls within Agriculture. I know there are those out there, Mr. Chairman, who feel very strongly that we have great difficulty selling what we're producing today, and that in concert with this type of consideration we should be giving consideration to ways and means of marketing the crops that we produce both in terms of marketing research and transportation research.

Finally, I would like to ask the minister, in terms of jurisdiction under the BNA Act, whether water within the province of Alberta is exclusively under the jurisdiction of Alberta. The Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs may want to comment on that. I've had some difficulty understanding the Piegan situation. It's not clear to me who has exclusive jurisdiction. If you must cross federal land to get to the water, does that mean you have to go through federal authorities? If in fact the ownership of the water is by the jurisdiction in which it resides — that is, the province of Alberta — do they have exclusive jurisdiction?

I don't want to confuse the minister by asking so many questions, but if he wouldn't mind taking just a minute to explain those points of view. And maybe the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs could add to it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COOKSON: I would be very happy, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs wanted to get into this one.

On the question with regard to ownership of water, I don't know whether that's been totally resolved. But

my understanding is that sometime in the past the ownership of water under The Water Resources Act was transferred to the province, and that at the present time the province is responsible for administering water. The Department of Environment is responsible for issuing licences and permits for well drilling and testing and for domestic and irrigation use. We're also involved in channelling, drainage, and storage. All that has to be done through the province.

However, if you go out somewhere in the boondocks and start telling a farmer that that mud puddle is owned by the province, you get into an area which I don't know has been totally resolved. It's an area which requires a legal interpretation. But the very fact that we have authority to do these sorts of things — and it hasn't been contested — indicates that we have a major responsibility and ownership in terms of water.

Just touching on the Piegan problem briefly and going back to its history, they objected to the province, and in this case the irrigation district, having access to the headworks located on the Piegan Indian Reserve. If you go through that period of time, there was a subsequent blockade and some very delicate manoeuvring. The Piegan native Canadians threatened to turn off the supply of water. They threw into the argument the ownership of the land beneath this body of water. So the question arises as to who has ownership and then who has ownership of the land beneath the waters; as to whether it's Crown or whether under the agreement it was turned over to the native Canadians when the reserve was established. That area has yet to be resolved. That's the point we're at now. As you know, in the case of the Piegan Indian Reserve we have agreed and paid a substantial amount for the opportunity to have access to the headworks to maintain and supply the irrigation district with water. In the process we've also agreed with the native Canadians to surveys and hopefully to purchase, somewhere along the way, a right of access. The major concern in this case is not necessarily the water supply but the ownership of the land beneath the water.

In terms of ownership of headworks, Mr. Chairman, at the present time the province is still negotiating with Eastern, Ross Creek, Mountain View, Aetna, and United. Those five headworks are in the name of either our native Canadians and/or the Crown and/or the irrigation district concerned. That area has to be clarified.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions or comments with regard to this resolution?

Agreed to:

3 — Irrigation Headworks Improvement \$6,400,000

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I move the amount be reported.

[Motion carried]

4 — Land Reclamation

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

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, as far as I'm concerned, of all the votes we have this is probably the most important and the most significant in terms of

improving the environment. As you know, about 1972 we put legislation in place, provision for deposit funds for reclamation of any land disturbances whatsoever. Those are in place today, and we administer them under the reclamation and conservation Act. However, prior to that we had a large number of land disturbances which were created in a number of areas, and it's in this area that we are administering this fund.

The majority of the projects are carried out on lands which were disturbed prior to the passing of effective legislation requiring their restoration and reclamation. In addition, part of the \$5 million is undertaken to do research and to reclaim land throughout Alberta. The variety of projects deal with the following: garbage dumps, again prior to our legislation; sewage lagoons; gravel pits; mine hazards; and mine sites. The magnitude of each project varies with the degree of surface disturbance, the availability of equipment and materials, and the proposed end use of each project.

The project also co-ordinates and funds reclamation projects in the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, the Department of Recreation and Parks, the Department of Transportation, and others, through the chairman and deputy chairman of the Land Conservation and Reclamation Council.

The projects are undertaken after the signing of formal agreements with local authorities. I just want to underline that: we work through the local authorities throughout Alberta. They make their submissions, we review them and determine whether they qualify under our requirements. The department staff then hires the necessary equipment and engineers, and supervises the various projects.

I'd like to say that we foresee a slowdown of municipal projects in '81-'82 because of the number of municipalities presently improving their sewage handling facilities and moving toward the regional landfill concept.

Reclamation of major mine sites is 75 per cent complete. Whoever represents the Forestburg area might be interested to know that we will require an expenditure of approximately \$800,000 to reclaim about 600 acres. That will be one of our major expenditures.

The Department of Energy and Natural Resources, which also uses some funds from here, does most of its work in the green zone of the province and expects to complete most of that in '80-'81. The number of projects completed in the white zone is small in comparison with the area under their administration. Under the Department of Transportation, we will have completed all their projects by 1980-'81 and won't require further funding. The Department of Recreation and Parks has completed the majority of projects in its area and hopefully will not require further funding after 1980-'81.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's one of our more successful projects under the capital funds.

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions and

reports as follows:

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, 1981, for the purpose of making investments in the following projects to be administered by the Minister of Environment: \$3,725,000 for Capital City Recreation Park project; \$3,750,000 for the Fish Creek Provincial Park project; \$6,400,000 for Irrigation Headworks Improvement project.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain other resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I will shortly move that the House adjourn until tomorrow afternoon in order that members of the Assembly might take part in the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held immediately following that. In order that members won't misapprehend anything that is going on, I might say that it will be necessary for His Honour the Speaker to leave the Chair and make his usual daily retreat, but that we should bear in mind that he will be back to chair the meeting to follow.

Mr. Speaker, in respect of business tomorrow, I regret that I am not able to indicate whether it is intended for the House to sit tomorrow evening, and will have to get word, if I can, to hon. members of the opposition as early as possible tomorrow in that regard.

[At 4:30 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]

