

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Friday, November 2, 1979 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 70****The Department of Social Services
and Community Health Amendment Act, 1979**

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 70, The Department of Social Services and Community Health Amendment Act, 1979. This Bill will permit the authorization of advisory boards and committees to the minister to exercise responsibility for their own administrative support services.

[Leave granted; Bill 70 read a first time]

Bill 234**An Act to Amend The Alberta
Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 234, An Act to Amend The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, the principle contained in Bill 234 would be to set out investments from the fund only in Canadian-controlled private or public corporations.

[Leave granted; Bill 234 read a first time]

Bill 236**An Act to Amend The Builder's Lien Act**

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 236, An Act to Amend The Builder's Lien Act. Mr. Speaker, the principle of the Bill is to amend the Act whereby the time period for lodging a lien will be extended from 35 to 45 days.

[Leave granted; Bill 236 read a first time]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 53 grade 10 students from Victoria Composite high. They are seated in the members gallery and are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Scragg, Mrs. Melnychuk, and Mr. Mock. I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 22 high school exchange students from the province of Quebec, seated in the public gallery.

They are accompanied by their Alberta hosts, 23 Alberta high school students, 19 Alberta teachers, and ministry officers from the departments of education in Alberta and in Quebec responsible for this first significant pilot project of educational co-operation between Alberta and Quebec.

Les élèves du Québec proviennent surtout des régions du Saguenay/Lac St. Jean et du nord de Montréal. Ils sont parmi nous depuis le début du Septembre et ont été répartis dans quinze centres en Alberta, que ce soit Peace River, Spirit River, Fort McMurray, en passant par Bonnyville, Jasper, Medicine Hat, et Pincher Creek.

May I also ask the members to extend their recognition particularly to Mr. Marc Champeau of the Quebec ministry of Education, who is participating in this project mid-term evaluation, and to his counterpart Mr. Nick Chamchuk of the Alberta Department of Education. Would the students, their hosts, and the members of the departments please stand to be recognized by the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Heritage Savings Trust Fund**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question today to the Provincial Treasurer. What consulting services have been acquired or contracted to advise the government on possible means to use the Heritage Savings Trust Fund to provide loans, or to guarantee increased venture capital, to Albertans?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that issue, with others relating to the heritage fund, should properly be discussed at second reading in committee study of the Bill on the heritage fund, which should be coming up early next week.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the comments the minister made to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee, indicating we had no studies going, and the comments made yesterday by the Deputy Provincial Treasurer that in fact, we do have studies going, I think in fairness the House . . .

I'd like to put a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate to the Assembly: do we have two consulting contracts with firms, asking those firms' advice on how we might use the Heritage Savings Trust Fund to increase venture capital for Alberta business?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, we have advice and are getting information from a number of sources. One; I know, is the firm of Wood Gundy, which is assisting and will be providing the government with advice with respect to aspects of that matter.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In addition to the Wood Gundy contract, is the minister in a position to indicate who the other contract is with?

MR. HYNDMAN: I'll look into all aspects of the matter, Mr. Speaker. As I said, I think the subject could be usefully discussed, probably at some length, when

the Bill comes forward. It's an issue which, without getting into debate, it's difficult to discuss in full in question period. I'd be happy, though, to get the information the hon. member desires.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Don't you know what's going on? We're always getting that answer.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, that's the traditional answer we're getting from the Provincial Treasurer these days.

MR. R. SPEAKER: We're going to look into it. We're going to review it.

MR. R. CLARK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister give assurance to the Assembly that once the province has received the Wood Gundy report, in light of its nature, the minister will table it here in the Assembly?

MR. HYNDMAN: Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker, no. I think, as has been the case in past years, what the Assembly will have to discuss and look at is any proposed final government policy that is put forward. Such information and advice as is received in the making of policy can, of course, take a number of different shapes and sizes. But it's the final government policy, when it's arrived at and proposed to the Assembly, which is a subject for debate. So I couldn't give that assurance.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary question on the question of open government. In light of the fact that the Provincial Treasurer indicated the Heritage Savings Trust Fund select committee was a major source of advice to the government on investment policies, is he prepared to indicate to the Assembly that the government will make the report from Wood Gundy available to the select committee, so they have the benefit of the recommendations and advice from the consulting firm?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can't do that, because the reasons given in my previous answer apply equally well to the select committee.

Health Facilities Review Committee

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the chairman of the Alberta Health Facilities Review Committee. What recommendations has the committee made to the government with regard to medical facilities at Cold Lake?

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, at the moment I would say no action has been taken by the committee with respect to that particular facility. I would have to take the question under notice and review any matter that may require some particular attention. However, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition has a specific matter and problem in mind, I would appreciate having notice of that.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. member. Has the committee visited the Cold Lake area and looked at the health facilities at Cold Lake? Is the chairman in a position to indicate to

the Assembly if the committee has made a recommendation to the minister with regard to new facilities at Cold Lake?

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. leader's question, I can indicate that I personally have not made a visit to that particular facility. However, I would undertake to review the list of the many facilities that committee members have visited, to determine whether there has recently been a visit to that particular facility and, if not, whether that is on our agenda for consideration during our next meeting.

Mr. Speaker, if I could just advise the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the process we follow on visiting the various institutions is set on a calendar at our regular monthly meeting. The committee members then visit the facilities in groups of two or three, depending on the size of the facility. If a concern about a particular facility is brought to their attention, that facility gets immediate attention and does not necessarily await a monthly meeting in order to make the visit and determine whether in fact the problem exists.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the hon. member a supplementary question. Has the hon. member visited the Fort Vermilion hospital and made any recommendation to the government as far as that hospital is concerned?

MR. COOK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Here again the hon. Leader of the Opposition is asking for advice that the member proposes to offer the Crown. Again, it's clearly in contravention of the forms and procedures outlined in Section 171 of the Fourth Edition of *Beauchesne*. I appreciate it's not the same edition we're following; but, Mr. Speaker, it's clearly out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the hon. member and to the authority which he has cited, I would have difficulty in relating a question which asks whether a member or minister has visited a certain place, to confidential or other advice that might be given to the government.

MR. COOK: With respect, Mr. Speaker, referring to the same point of order, the second part of the hon. leader's question was: what advice did the member propose to offer the Crown? I have no concern with the first part.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just before you rule on the rather elusive point of order that's been drawn to the attention of the Assembly, sir, might I point out for the edification of all members that in the release which came from such an impeccable source as the Premier's office on May 17, 1979, 8 a.m., this committee is charged with responsibility for reviewing existing facilities in the field of health care and providing recommendations to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care for improvement in their operations. The hon. chairman of the committee gets the sum of \$600 per month plus travelling expenses.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, the questions the hon. leader posed are on specific matters on which I would have to recheck my records. However, if the hon. leader requires some detailed information, I have no problem.

I'm sure the hon. minister may wish to make some comment, and he may be able to supply the specific answer.

Just to indicate to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in his last remarks with regard to any pay the chairman may receive, that pay doesn't necessarily have to be reflected in the number of visits the chairman makes to indicate the performance or the workload. However, the chairman has certainly undertaken to travel to as many facilities as possible. Of course, it does require time, and we have been in session since the beginning of October. I have no concern over the hon. leader's concern, but I think that the hon. minister could perhaps . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: Are you apologizing?

MRS. CHICHAK: There's absolutely no apology being made, because I think the hon. chairman has fully involved herself in the work of the committee. Perhaps the hon. minister may wish to make some remarks.

MR. RUSSELL: I would, Mr. Speaker, because I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in quickly reading the news release he referred to, has overlooked one very important word, and that's "existing" health facilities. I can assure all hon. members of the House that the chairman and her committee are doing an excellent job in carrying out their mandate in visiting existing health facilities.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister, of course, is not responsible for interpreting news releases to the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NOTLEY: Nice try.

MR. SPEAKER: And if he insists on saying what an excellent job the chairman is doing, the hon. Leader of the Opposition must of course have equal time to disagree with him.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. chairman of the committee. I'm sure if the hon. member had been to Fort Vermilion, the hon. member would have remembered looking at that facitious facility.

Has the member been to Lethbridge and looked at the problem of the existing hospitals in Lethbridge? Has the committee made a recommendation to the minister as to what should happen with regard to the general hospital and St. Michael's hospital in Lethbridge?

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, members of the committee did make a visit in the past month to that particular facility. Their reports will be under study at the meeting next Wednesday. We will have some determination to make as to what recommendations will be going forth to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. I think that answers the hon. member's question.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to supplement that answer for the information of hon. members. There seems to be some confusion in the minds of some members about the responsibility as to the provision of new facilities or the inspection of existing facilities.

Quite clearly the responsibility for developing new facilities, and recommendations relating thereto, are up to the appropriate hospital boards. All members of the House got copies of the manual and the bulletins printed for the hospital board members. Those responses to proposed new health facilities are under way. It is not within the purview of the Health Facilities Review Committee, which deals with visiting and examining existing health facilities.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, thanks to the minister for that definition.

A further supplementary question to the hon. member. Has the committee sat down with hospital boards in Edmonton and Calgary and discussed the hospital bed situation and, in some cases, the board's inability to use all the beds because of budget restraints? Has the committee made recommendations to the minister for additional funding for certain hospitals in Edmonton and Calgary?

MR. NOTLEY: You're being unfair, Bob. What do you expect for \$600?

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. leader cannot ask the member to give internal advice to the House. The Member for Olds-Didsbury is asking the chairman of the board to give to the Assembly internal advice that she is giving or will give to the minister. That's clearly out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, the Chair is really not expected to anticipate under what circumstances the government may or may not wish to disclose advice it has received. I would find it difficult to intervene on every occasion when that sort of thing comes up.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I really have no problem with the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I think the hon. leader recognizes and is aware — and I would suggest he is probably just playing a teasing game — that the committee's function is not to determine matters that come under budgetary or financial matters of the hospitals. The role of the committee is to determine whether the level of care being provided to the patients and citizens in the health facilities is at a level or standard that has been established and recognized in the province of Alberta.

On other matters, if there are impediments in the design or structure of various facilities to being able to provide care in these facilities, the committee certainly takes note and makes recommendations to the minister for consideration in their future design, or whether certain decisions need to be made insofar as assisting in making alterations, if the errors have been made in the construction plans that were under the minister's jurisdiction. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows very well that matters concerning budgets are not within the purview of our committee.

MRS. EMBURY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, please, what criteria are used when you are assessing the health care in an institution?

MR. SPEAKER: If that question is susceptible of a very brief answer, it is in order. Otherwise it should go on the Order Paper.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood wishes to . . .

MRS. CHICHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The committee has a guide it follows in its approach to visiting the various facilities insofar as what personal treatment the citizens in the facilities receive. We obtain a determination on that by speaking with the patients themselves. We speak with the staff to ascertain the morale within these facilities; generally, the treatment that is obtained. We also take into consideration the food being served, to be sure that that area is properly determined, and we inspect the entire premises for cleanliness and hygiene. We have a very long list of guidelines that we follow.

MR. R. CLARK: I'd like to direct just one last supplementary question to the hon. member. Perhaps the member could indicate to the Assembly if she can recall whether the committee has visited Innisfail, Ponoka, and Devon hospitals and made any recommendations . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the hon. leader is looking for a travelogue, it should go on the Order Paper.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, we're just refreshing the member's memory before she gets there.

Cold Lake Project — Infrastructure

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier and ask if the government is in a position to confirm the existence of a special planning report prepared by Stanley Associates on infrastructure as well as the provision of social services in the Cold Lake-Bonnyville-Grand Centre area?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm not able to do that. I would presume that that is within the purview of the economic planning committee of cabinet. I'll take it as notice and have the appropriate minister respond in due course.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can I ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Minister of Social Services and Community Health whether either of those gentlemen can confirm the existence of this report?

I ask, Mr. Speaker, because there is some concern among the members of the citizens' advisory committee, because a member of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member isn't required to underline the importance of a question. He himself, of course, is the judge of what questions he considers important to ask. But it would seem to me that with the reply from the hon. Premier saying he will have the appropriate minister give the answer, we

shouldn't follow up by shopping among the ministers to see if we can find the appropriate minister.

MR. NOTLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, may I follow the question by asking the Premier what emphasis the government of Alberta is placing on the provision of infrastructure in the Bonnyville-Cold Lake-Grand Centre area, in light of the Premier's Vancouver speech, where the issue of infrastructure was noted?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no approval has been given yet to the heavy oil project by Imperial Oil in Cold Lake. Advance planning is appropriately being done by this administration, and that's the nature, I presume, of the thrust of the original question from the hon. member, of which I took notice.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. What priority is the government placing on the advice presented and the information obtained by the citizens' advisory committee, and will that information be the primary information on which the government plans the infrastructure development in the region?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, as we always do, we certainly will have extensive input by citizens affected in the area and particularly, of course, from the MLA involved. But again I hasten to add and underline that that project has not yet been approved by the administration.

Social Assistance

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Could the minister advise whether he has received any communication from a business firm in Vegreville requesting payment for furniture or appliances purchased by a social assistance recipient?

MR. BOGLE: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise whether he has received any communications from anyone about this?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, if I recall the specific instance the hon. member may be referring to, there was correspondence recently with one hon. member of this Assembly regarding the provision of services to a social allowance recipient in the Vegreville community.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister advise with whom he had such communication and the circumstances of the communication?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. With great respect, we're dealing with a matter which may not be of general provincial interest, and that is really what the question period is for, just as in the House of Commons the priority is on matters of national interest. I would respectfully suggest to the hon. member that he might seek that information in another way.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I ask this question because I think it is a concern to the province, because if this is

a precedent, what would happen in the future.

Would the minister be in a position, if he's not able to answer this, to table whatever communications he's had?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, as the correspondence was with another member of the Assembly, a request from that member and a reply from me to that member, I would only do so with the concurrence of the hon. member who asked the original inquiry.

Beef Trade

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of State for Economic Development — International Trade. At an agricultural conference held in Banff, a Russian delegate indicated that they wanted more beef consumption per capita in Russia. Has the minister investigated the possibility of selling cows to Russia?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, this section of international trade still remains with the Department of Agriculture. I suppose my hon. colleague Dallas Schmidt could answer that question.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Could I supplement the question then, and ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture if he has had any investigation of the possibility of marketing Alberta cows in Russia?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, we have indeed had interest shown by many European countries interested in upgrading their livestock production, and over this last summer have been and indeed are working at the present time with the All Breeds Association in whatever area of their choice. The interest is being generated in recognition of Alberta's being the supplier for North America of perhaps the choice breeding stock in all breeds.

Premier's Vancouver Speech

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier. I wonder if the Premier could advise if there's been any contact between the Premier's office and the Prime Minister's office since his speech last Monday in Vancouver?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the only contact has been the request for a transcript of the address, which I filed in the House yesterday and which was provided to the Prime Minister's office yesterday morning. I speak from notes, so transcription had to take place.

Dependent Adults

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health is to follow up questions I have asked on The Dependent Adults Act. I ask the minister whether he could indicate today whether he has had the opportunity of reviewing the cases under that particular Act to assure the Assembly that the dependent adults who have received guardianship have been provided legal representation and were given proper notice that they were going to enter under guardianship.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the only part of the question that I need further clarification on is the reference to cases. If the hon. member could clarify what he means by that, I'd be in a better position to respond.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the minister, at present something like 54 guardianship cases have come before the courts and guardians have been appointed for dependent adults. Across the province are a number more; I haven't got the provincial number at the present time.

I want to ask the minister whether he has reviewed these particular cases with regard to the two items I raised.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the question as to the number of cases — the hon. member has used a figure of 54, which I believe was contained in a report done for the Canadian Mental Health Association, although that report has not yet been presented to me or, to my understanding, the department. It would not be proper for me to respond to a specific number of cases until I have an opportunity first, to see the report, and secondly, to assess whether the information contained in that report is accurate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. My question certainly wasn't with regard to the report. My question to the minister was with regard to the administration of The Dependent Adults Act.

I'm asking the minister whether he has assured himself that in the administration of that Act the persons affected have been provided with legal assistance when necessary and that they have been given adequate notice that they would come under guardianship as a person.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in my responses to questions in that general area I attempted to indicate that the Act provides ample scope and opportunity for the judge — if in his opinion further information is required, whether in the form of reports from professional people or information from family members or other interested citizens — to direct that that information be brought forward before any decision is made.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I'm not arguing with the minister that there isn't ample scope under the Act, because there is. Complete guardianship can take place under the Act as it stands.

I'm asking, is the minister prepared in his responsibilities to review the cases that have come under this Act up to this point, to assure himself that the dependent adults who have received guardianship have had full opportunity for legal help and have had adequate notification that they were going to become guardians under The Dependent Adults Act? Will the minister take that on as a responsibility and report to this Legislature prior to the end of this fall session?

MR. BOGLE: As was pointed out yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the legislation was passed approximately two years ago and proclaimed approximately 11 months ago. I indicated that some proper period of time should be allowed to pass whereby we would be given an opportunity to see the Act in operation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. With great respect to the minister, it appears that we're getting off the subject of the question.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, there are two basic principles which I believe the hon. member is inadvertently mixing. One is the question of legal assistance. There should be no doubt that every Albertan has the opportunity to receive legal assistance, either through Legal Aid if they cannot . . .

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. minister, as I recall the question it was whether the minister is prepared to do something.

MR. BOGLE: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. I thought it important to clarify that point for the hon. member. If the hon. member is asking if I'm personally involved in the review, the answer is yes.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the other part of my question: will the minister report to this Legislature prior to the end of this fall session with regard to that review?

The minister indicated yesterday that he wanted to wait until spring before he would indicate any information. The matter is more urgent than that, Mr. Speaker, and I think there is enough information for a review and a report now.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to give an undertaking as to the time. I did indicate that the matter is under review and that if the hon. member has some specific instances in mind I'd like to hear about them, and not just generalizations. [interjections]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, that's unfair, because yesterday I indicated in my . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We're just getting into a debate concerning this matter.

Metric Conversion

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Speaker, in my view of the many letters received in opposition to the implementation of the metric system, could the hon. Minister of Government Services inform the Assembly as to the possibility of slowing down or rolling back implementation in Alberta?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, that's a very timely question, and I welcome the opportunity of saying a word or two on metrication. Hon. members would know it goes back to 1970; it had its genesis at that time with a white paper by the federal government. Subsequently, having regard to the fact that our international trading parties were moving to the metric system, all provinces agreed to co-operate with the federal government in moving toward metric. We have made considerable progress, as have all provinces at this juncture.

The specific question was, have we any plans to slow it down? Mr. Speaker, I'd be interested in knowing in what particular areas he wanted us to defer implementation of metric.

MR. PENGELLY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister give consideration to tying the entrance of the livestock industry to the metric system with the time when the United States will adopt the system?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, that is a very good question. We've had a considerable amount of correspondence on this topic. I should tell the House that the government of Alberta really has had no input into the determination as to when the livestock industry should adopt metric. The best advice I have is that that was a decision of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, probably in conjunction with the federal government, who have responsibility for weights and measures. Of course that is getting into the Weights and Measures Act. My further advice is that the beef industry was to adopt metric on January 1, 1980.

There is an overview committee appointed by the federal government to look into this area. I would suggest that the proper place for representation as to a deferral of the implementation of metric with regard to agriculture and beef industry weights and measures would be more appropriately to the overview committee of the federal government or the two ministers responsible.

MR. PENGELLY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In light of the letters received in opposition to that, could the hon. minister inform the House whether he will be making representation to the overview committee to slow down entrance to the metric system in the livestock industry?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I believe the overview committee is meeting with the Cattlemen's Association sometime in mid-November. I think that would be the most opportune time for representatives of the industry to make their representation.

At this time I would say it is not my intention to make any representations to the overview committee. But I think it's an opportunity for all members here who have a direct interest or concern in the area to take advantage of, and perhaps make personal representations.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a supplementary question of the minister. Do I take it from your previous answer . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. LYSONS: The previous answer said you were listening to the Cattlemen's Association.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member please use the ordinary form of address.

MR. LYSONS: Sorry, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister be listening to organizations and groups of people other than just the Cattlemen's Association?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, what I attempted to tell the House was that the decision as to the adoption of metric vis-a-vis the agricultural industry, the beef industry, was not made by this provincial government but by the federal government. Yes, we do listen to all our constituent bodies in Alberta, but representations

on this question really should, go to the federal government.

MR. L. CLARK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the letters I've had from the livestock industry, I have visions of myself sitting in an auction market trying to judge cattle by the kilogram. As a rural person, that just throws me.

I would like to ask the minister why we are doing this. What advantage is it to Canada for the livestock industry to go to the metric system?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, that kind of topic would be very suitable for a motion on the Order Paper because, if I might respectfully point out, a question that starts with "why" asks for reasons, and of course reasoning is debate.

MR. L. CLARK: I will rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker. What advantage does the "minister see in going to the metric system in the livestock industry?

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the hon. member, may I just say that the disguise is too thin.

Feed Freight Assistance Program

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister advise this House what representations the Alberta government will be making to the federal government in regard to the federal feed freight assistance program, inasmuch as the intent is to expand that program to the Yukon and the Northwest Territories?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, at the present time it's not our intention to make any overtures to Agriculture Canada in regard to the announcement. The industry in the province of Alberta could benefit from the federal announcement of the extension of the federal feed freight assistance program, allowing the areas of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon to enjoy that assistance. The feed industry in Alberta, being next door, perhaps could become an outlet for another area of sale for some of our feed grain. So until there are some changes, we have no intention of making any overtures to the federal government, other than to support the program.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, sir. Mr. Speaker, could the minister inform this House whether or not the government has assessed the impact that this expansion in the program will have on the poultry, turkey, hog, and beef industries in Alberta?

MR. SCHMIDT: No, Mr. Speaker, not since the announcement of the program. It's my understanding from memory many, many years ago that some sectors of the livestock and feeder industries had made some overtures. I would hesitate to do anything, either, until I had some communication from our own producers to hear their regards in respect of the program.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary please, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as several studies, including federal and provincial studies, have indicated that the feed grain assistance program has a deleterious effect upon these programs, would the minister undertake to assess

the impact that that expansion of the program would have on these indigenous Alberta industries?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, we would certainly monitor, and if we find the program itself is injurious to any segment of agricultural production in the province of Alberta, we would certainly have to assess that and, if it were, make the appropriate submissions to the federal people.

Consumer Protection

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs regarding consumer protection, or the department taking action on behalf of consumers.

Has the department recently had a change in policy regarding the department's executing some action for the protection of consumers? I'm referring particularly to the case of car motor mix-ups; the department took very positive action in that regard. Has there been a change of policy in that direction?

MR. KOZIAK: No, Mr. Speaker, there's been no change in policy. As a matter of fact, in the case the hon. member refers to — that of the General Motors vehicle, the Oldsmobile, and some others in which a Chev engine had been installed in place of an Oldsmobile one — that was as a result of investigations undertaken by the Director of Trade Practices under our legislation in this Legislature, in this province. The Unfair Trade Practices Act. As a result of the sterling efforts of the director and his staff, we were able to reach a satisfactory conclusion for consumers in this province who had been affected by that decision.

DR. PAPROSKI: One supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister then inform the House whether there has been any change in regulation to initiate action on behalf of a group with that type of case?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, an inquiry as to what's in regulations should be made outside question period.

DR. PAPROSKI: I'll rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the minister could indicate whether there has been a change in policy with respect to regulation.

MR. KOZIAK: No, Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in policy, but sometimes the actions under our legislation receive more publicity than in other cases. The publicity attributed to the action and to the results might indicate that. There have been a number of instances where The Unfair Trade Practices Act has been used to assist consumers in this province; not only that, but I think to bring about a change of attitude in the whole market place, one in which people respect the rights of the market, the vendor, and the purchaser. That's good for the consumers of the province of Alberta.

Oil Development

MR. KNAAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Premier or the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. The province of Ontario has indicated its concern for both the increase in the price of

crude oil and the supply of crude oil. Notwithstanding that, it sold its 5 per cent interest in Syncrude, even though the Syncrude production goes primarily to Ontario.

Mr. Premier, has the province of Ontario given any indication that it is willing or interested in participating in an equity way in the two new heavy oil and tar sands projects?

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't. And, subject to correction, I don't believe the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources has received any indication at all of any interest by the province of Ontario in participating in those projects as they did in Syncrude.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that I haven't received any such information either.

MR. KNAAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Premier in a position to indicate in a specific way the extensive infrastructure costs that would be involved in the development of those two projects?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that's difficult to answer in question period. I think we're all aware of the very heavy infrastructure costs that are and have been involved with Fort McMurray's Syncrude project. Obviously there's a heavy infrastructure cost with Al-sands, in the sense that we've announced a new community. That would be a heavy infrastructure cost there. There's no question that if the projects go ahead, there'll be a heavy infrastructure cost with regard to the Cold Lake project, which I'm sure was implicit in the earlier question in this question period.

I don't have a figure I could give to it in question period, but would take it as notice. If there's an appropriate time we could provide the House with some rough estimate as to the infrastructure commitments by the government and the people of Alberta to those two projects, I'd certainly try to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: We barely have time for a short question by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Then I believe the hon. Provincial Treasurer would like to supplement an answer.

Postsecondary Education Financing

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, my short question will be to the Premier or to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It flows from remarks the Premier made at a conference in Edmonton in the last two days, dealing with postsecondary educational institutions and how they need to reflect the public view in establishing their priorities.

In what manner does the government expect the universities to reflect the public view? I use as an example the Faculty of Business Administration and Commerce, where for the last two years the university has asked for additional funds from the province to take the quota off that faculty. Is that the kind of representation the government expects to reflect public priorities, or is it a different kind of representation?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I was just repeating the views expressed in this House earlier by the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. We have followed a procedure of global funding with in-

creases. We respect the autonomy of the universities. So in terms of the increases, they're the ones that have to come to grips with the priorities.

Heritage Savings Trust Fund

(continued)

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like just to correct part of an answer I gave earlier to a question by the Leader of the Opposition on work being done on the concept of the heritage fund possibly being used in venture enterprises. I said that the work was being done by Wood Gundy. That was wrong; Woods, Gordon is the firm doing it. I wanted to get out of the woods on that one. [laughter]

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

(Committee of Supply)

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could the Committee of Supply come to order, please.

head: ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVING TRUST FUND
CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION
1980-81 ESTIMATES OF
PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

Department of Environment

4—Land Reclamation

MR. CHAIRMAN: When we last rose to report, I believe I had recognized two hon. members who wanted to comment, the hon. Member for Wainwright and the hon. Member for Grande Prairie. Does the hon. Member for Wainwright wish to comment now?

MR. STEWART: As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, this program has a specific amount of money to be utilized in reclamation of land that has been disturbed, mostly through industrial use. In his closing remarks on this item, I wonder if the minister would give us some indication of whether he considers that the amount of money funded is going to achieve the amount of reclamation we would consider adequate throughout the province, or whether additional consideration should be given for this type of land reclamation.

I will also ask him in his remarks to give us some indication of whether they take into consideration the reclaimed value of the land compared to the cost and whether, as a future valuation they put on the land they are reclaiming, they consider it from a potential of future agricultural use or industrial use. I realize that in most cases the land they're reclaiming has been stripped of its gravel, so it's had an industrial use from that point of view. I doubt that it will have a future industrial valuation. I wonder if in reclaiming this land they take into consideration the value of the property from an agricultural viewpoint, or whether they are doing it basically from the point of view of an

environmental clean-up that would exceed its value after it's completed.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, two good questions from the Member for Wainwright. I'm convinced that the funding that has been allocated through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund — \$5 million per year until '85, I think — will take care of most of our problems in the area of land reclamation. As you know, The Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Act came into being around 1972-73. Under that program, we require a deposit either in cash, bank security, or a guarantee in the way of a bond. Therefore, we have assurance by industry, municipal governments and, hopefully, individuals, that we'll be able to keep up with the problem from now on. It is an extremely important program. As I say, if we can't do what we have to do in the defined time, I would be the first to ask for an extension from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

The other question with regard to reclaimed land value: at present, if Environment undertakes the responsibility of reclaiming garbage dumps, sewage lagoons, gravel pits, or whatever, as a rule — and I guess in practically all cases, but certainly in the case of municipal authorities — we make an agreement with the municipal authority involved. In other words, generally speaking the land involved has to be in the name of the Crown or the municipality. Under that agreement we do the reclamation and contract work under our own supervision, and we make sure that we recover the cost of this process to the general revenue of the province. In those cases we generally recover our costs. I agree that in some cases it has changed the intended use of the land, but it's sort of an agreement with the municipality that as long as we recover our costs, even though the land value may have increased, we accept that that would likely flow back to the municipality. Under our terms of agreement we do specify certain uses when it's reclaimed. For example, if we think we could reclaim it to agricultural use, that's the direction we go. If not, we attempt to reclaim it for perhaps a golf course, a fish pond, or whatever. If you see those kinds of things happening around the province, they are based on the agreement we come up with.

MR. BORSTAD: I believe you mentioned that the Act was passed in 1972. It is my understanding that those who disturb the land presently have to re-establish it. So part of this vote is for reclaiming land that happened prior to '72. Is that right?

MR. COOKSON: Yes, that's correct, Mr. Chairman. I guess in my earlier remarks I related to the present situation. Firstly, we foresee a slow-down of municipal projects starting in 1980-82, because of municipalities that are improving their sewage and moving towards regional landfill. We transfer funds to the Department of Energy and Natural Resources for dealing with problems on Crown lands, and we estimate that further funding will not be required after 1980-81. So that's winding down. In the area of the Department of Transportation, we estimate again that further funding will not be necessary after '80-81. With regard to Recreation and Parks, we again estimate that the majority of those projects prior to the incorporation of

our legislation will be completed by the end of '80-81. So it is a wind-down.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to extend my compliments to the department in terms of this land reclamation project. I think it's been very significant throughout the province in reclaiming some of this land that has been disturbed by industrial activity prior to 1973.

I'd like to discuss briefly the situation in the Crowsnest Pass with regard to the Blairmore coal slag piles, give some background, and make a request that assurance be given that this project, which could be one of the major reclamation projects the department would be involved in, could proceed. There have been several private schemes to reclaim the coal piles in the past, but to date it appears that negotiations on that have collapsed. It doesn't appear to be economically feasible from the viewpoint of the energy content of the piles. Over a million and a half tons of slag piles adjacent to the town of Blairmore were abandoned about 20 years ago, and they have created problems over quite a long period of time in terms of aesthetics and pollution of not only the watercourse but also the air. I wonder if I could receive assurances from the minister, since private proposals to reclaim these piles have collapsed, that the department would undertake to achieve reclamation and removal of those piles in conjunction with the relocation of Highway 3 through the area, which I understand probably will take place in '81-82. I would ask that this particular project be considered in any extension of the funding under this appropriation.

MR. COOKSON: The Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest raises an important question with regard to the problem of slag piles in the area of Blairmore which have been there for some 20 years. I can't really give him assurance with regard to the time frame or the type of project that Transportation will be involved in. That would be the responsibility of the Minister of Transportation. But I understand that his interpretation in terms of a time frame is what is contemplated. I can assure the member that of the \$5 million allocated for '80-81, we have allocated \$3.3 million for land reclamation. That \$3.3 million will be mainly for municipal projects, mine sites such as possibly the Blairmore coal piles, the Forestburg area, and transfers to other departments to complete projects. All I can say is that I hope the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest continues to remind me of this project, and we'll sure do our best to accommodate it.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the nature of the commitment of the Minister of Environment, but I'd like to receive assurances, because of the scale of this project, that it will in fact go forward.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I'll do my best.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, could the minister explain the procedures used for identifying areas that should be reclaimed?

MR. COOKSON: Generally speaking, Mr. Chairman, we ask municipal governments throughout the province to submit projects. They have an opportunity each year, or we may have them on file from prior years. It's

important that municipal governments — counties, municipal districts, local improvement districts and, in some cases, as the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest has mentioned, it may be within the boundaries of a town, city, or whatever — submit these. We take a look at them and base our final decision on priorities — it has to be priorities. We try to distribute our reclamation projects as fairly as we can throughout the province. So if there is a concern, for example, in the area of the Member for Innisfail, it's important that a request be made through the municipal government.

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, my question is kind of a supplementary to one you had before. The slag piles from mining, as in the Drumheller valley, have become quite valuable assets in some communities, and I don't believe they should be wasted. In the Drumheller region, for instance, they use them for gravel, and they have a brick plant making brick out of some of them. Rather than just wasting this material, I wonder if the minister is looking at whether there's some use it could be put to. It is good in private industry, in gravel and other areas.

MR. COOKSON: That is a good point too, and I think it bears out what we've been attempting to do. In the Blairmore area we've tried to encourage industry to make use of those slag piles. I think there have been at least two projects. One involved an ERCB hearing. We got almost as far as that point. As the member said, really what's the point in spreading this material if there is an economic use for it. We're looking at that and attempting to encourage industry to use the material. Certainly, I think if there were a submission from a municipality or county with regard to leveling, we would have to take very seriously the submission by the council. But I would also like to make sure that they were aware of the alternate uses of this material.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Can individuals apply for assistance or whatnot to have, for example, a gravel pit filled on their land?

MR. COOKSON: At the present time, generally speaking we make our arrangements through the municipal authority. I think it would have to be a special arrangement with an individual if we were to expand heritage savings trust funds in that way. I could be corrected on this, but I think it's safe to say that our agreements are generally with municipal authorities.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, on that specific point. Mr. Minister, it was my understanding that in fact these were all done with municipal authorities. If there have been any special arrangements — to use your term Mr. Minister — worked out between individuals and the Department of Environment, would the minister be prepared to table those special arrangements?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I was just looking through the work that has been undertaken by the department. In answer to the Leader of the Opposition: there's a list of all the municipal projects we've been undertaking. For example, Athabasca, Athabasca county, Bawlf, Beaverlodge, Bruderheim, and so on. Also a list of the sewage lagoons: Falher, Fort McMurray, Grande Prairie, and so on. Sand and gravel pits: in this

case, one in my own constituency, county of Lacombe, Cardston, Athabasca.

Mine hazards is where I hesitate to use the term "totally" municipal districts. In the area of mine hazards, for example, there's the Nielsen mine, Strandberg mine; Municipal Affairs Department has a mine. A number of mines are listed.

Then the Crowsnest Pass slag piles: as I understand it, the slag piles are also located on privately owned property. But the town of Blairmore itself is extremely interested in it.

There are surface mines: Canmore mine, Forestburg mine, which would be privately owned; and so on.

With regard to a specific individual, I don't have any information at all that there would be a specific individual. Some of the funds that are transferred, for example, to recreation, parks and wildlife — in a sense we lose control of their specific expenditure. Except, we have a list here of the parks within which reclamation has taken place.

To answer the question of the Leader of the Opposition, I think your question deals with agreements with a specific individual. If there are any of these, I'd be happy to provide the information.

MR. STEWART: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman. In listening to the minister describe the different projects, am I to understand that for existing companies that have not reclaimed surface mining projects in the past and are still in operation and still functioning, we are undertaking the cost of the reclamation of some of their earlier activities and are not recovering the cost from the companies?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, we're trying to deal with the problems that happened before the legislation came into position. For example, if the mine has been operating since, we'll say 1965, and is still operating, the Heritage Savings Trust Fund would deal with that problem prior to the legislation, prior to '72 or whenever that legislation came in. But once that point has been reached, it becomes the responsibility under the Act with regard to a deposit fund and security. That will deal with it then. That would be the cutoff.

MR. STEWART: Supplementary, Mr. Chairman. Once it's reclaimed, the property reverts to the Crown in ownership?

MR. COOKSON: Not necessarily. We would recover the total costs back to general revenue of the province. That would be part of the agreement. But the property would not necessarily refer back to the Crown.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions or comments regarding this resolution?

Agreed to:

4 — Land Reclamation \$5,000,000

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the amount of \$5 million be approved.

[Motion carried]

5 — Lesser Slave Lake Outlet

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, any comment?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, just a brief overview of Lesser Slave Lake and the problem.

For some time, there has been a variety of problems in the Lesser Slave Lake with regard to water levels and flooding. As long ago as 1920, area residents petitioned the government for action on what was seen as the most serious water problem: flooding, caused by cyclical high water levels of Lesser Slave Lake. During the past 10 years, many residents believe the lake has been at flood level more frequently and for longer periods than was historically the case. As a result, they have become more insistent that something be done.

On July 21, 1978, the Minister of Environment announced that the government would proceed immediately with a project to stabilize water levels in Lesser Slave Lake. The project announced at that time was designed to eliminate flooding of a total of possibly 30,000 acres of agricultural land. As well as benefiting agriculture, stabilized lake levels would permit expanded use of excellent beach and park facilities.

Just to describe the project we are working on: the natural drainage outlet of the Lesser Slave Lake basin is the Lesser Slave River, which flows easterly to join the Athabasca River at Smith. The Lesser Slave River, below the lake, meanders over flat, sandy terrain, which was formerly the lake bottom. The upstream reach of the river, especially the first 13 miles, acts as a control to the lake discharge. The proposed project will increase the lake outflow at high water levels by means of a canal some 5 miles long, which will parallel the 13 miles of meandering river. So what we're attempting to do is compress the flow from 13 to 5. The proposed canal will have a 40-foot bed width and 6:1 side slopes. The canal inlet will be at a river offtake structure located downstream of the Highway 67 bridge crossing.

Other structure components of the project include a sheet piling weir to restrict canal flows during low lake water levels, an outlet sill structure, road and bridge relocations, and pipeline modifications. The estimated cost of the project is in the area of \$8.4 million.

The environment impactment assessment, along with the engineering design report and detailed cost, has been completed. During the balance of the '79-80 year, detailed design and preconstruction surveys will be completed as well. Land assembly will commence this year.

I'll just add a little more to that. I have been in recent discussions with our engineers working on the project. My understanding is now, based on their studies, that they may be able to accomplish the same accomplishment, that is, to free about 30,000 acres from flooding, not necessarily by totally straightening out 13 miles of meandering at the outlet. We're looking into that. I think if we can accomplish it with less expenditure, that's the way we'll go. So what I've advised you of here — maybe within a year or two we will have to shift our funding to accommodate the other alternative.

Mr. Chairman, that basically is the project on the Lesser Slave outlet.

MR. BORSTAD: There has been a local environmental committee working for some time, Mr. Minister. Have they completed their report to you? While I'm on my feet, when will this project be started and completed, and will it be let as one contract?

MR. COOKSON: I don't get local presentations directly, although I'd be happy to get them from those in the area who are concerned about the environment.

MR. BORSTAD: I think this was a study group reporting directly to you.

MR. COOKSON: To me?

MR. BORSTAD: To you, I believe.

MR. COOKSON: I haven't recollection of that. I could check that.

Again I hesitate to give the details here because of this most recent shift in expenditure, but the total plan in 1979-80 is for surveys, engineering, land assembly, and construction. In 1980-81 we're looking at construction, which is what the \$5,944 million is for. In 1981-82 construction completion is planned, and an amount is provided in there. So that's the time frame.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Mr. Minister, I'm interested in your comment about looking at some alternative. If my recollection is clear, representation was made by the department in the last year with regard to the removal of an old weir under the water there. Some old-timers in the area make the point that if that old weir were to be removed, over a period of four or five years, with the new flow of water, much of the work being proposed now would not be necessary.

Now I want to make very clear, Mr. Minister, that I have no qualms about the need for work to be done in the Lesser Slave Lake area. But I find most interesting the comment about the possibility of some major rethinking, not on the worthwhileness of the project, but on a different route.

I'd like to ask very directly: are department officials now looking at that specific proposal to move out the old weir, which I understand would mean going under the present lake level in a certain area? I'm told it could be taken out with a small amount of explosive and that quite a portion of the problem we're dealing with for possibly several million dollars could be handled in a manner that perhaps wouldn't be as dramatic budgetwise, but would have the same effect in the long term. Is that the project now being considered by department officials, Mr. Minister, and could you elaborate on it?

MR. COOKSON: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I think I could get that information quite rapidly for you, perhaps in the meantime once we get on to the other. My immediate information is that it doesn't deal with that, but more in terms of the way in which the channelling is done. But I can perhaps get that information.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I think a project of this nature is well worth consideration and the use of the heritage trust fund money. Just from lack of information of the area personally, I would like the minister to give us some indication in his remarks. You mentioned 30,000 acres of farmland would be reclaimed. Is there any indication of how much Crown land that has historically never been developed because of the flooding nature of the lake would also become available for some form of agricultural use? Or is the bulk of it considered more in the recreational area?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, probably some members of the Assembly are far more able than I to comment on the question from the Member for Wainwright. My understanding is that there is a large area to the west and north of Lesser Slave Lake that was settled in earlier days, because it had better quality soil, was more accessible, and so on. I guess over the years we've interpreted that that particular area is the most acute and most concerned area, something like 30,000 acres. As I indicated, there have been heavy submissions through their elected representative over the years, to attempt to stabilize that particular area because of its variation in flood levels due to the outlet from the lake.

Now I suppose it would be unfair to prejudge whether this area should or should not have been developed or settled during those earlier years, going back to 1920. The fact of the matter is, that happened. That particular area was settled without taking into consideration the problems of flooding, which is often the case in other areas of the province, particularly in the early days. The government of this province has undertaken the responsibility to stabilize the lake in such a way as to upgrade that 30,000 acres for farming or whatever.

As for areas around the lake, I don't think the problem is as acute, because in these instances you're dealing more with recreational use, and our priorities have been in the agricultural areas.

I don't know whether that helps the member at all, but that's basically what resulted in our accepting this as a heritage savings capital project.

MR. STEWART: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman. What percentage of this 30,000 acres we're talking about now would rest with the Crown as the title holder and what percentage would be held under private titles?

MR. COOKSON: I don't have that answer, but I can get it for the member. Maybe he could ask a few more, and I'll get them all at once. I wish someone could help me on that one.

MR. R. CLARK: Mostly Crown.

MR. COOKSON: Is it mostly Crown?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions or comments on this resolution?

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go back to the minister. Relating to the earlier comments that were made, I got the distinction that the government or the department officials are now looking at some other alternatives, perhaps not straightening the channel. Are the officials looking at simply not straightening the channel to the degree that was anticipated earlier, and is that the thrust, if I could use the Conservative term, of the most recent thinking of the department on that matter?

MR. COOKSON: I hope to get that information back to the Leader of the Opposition. That's my understanding. But I want to be sure, and that information is forthcoming, hopefully before we complete. If you want to hold this one and perhaps go on to the other, that's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed, could we have the agreement of the committee for the Member for Calgary McKnight to make an introduction?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS** (*reversion*)

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the members of the Legislature, I would like to introduce to you five members of the 72nd Cambrian Heights Boy Scout Troop, who are attending the Legislature with their leader, Mr. Randy MacSorley. They are working towards their citizenship badge; that's why they have come here to see us in action. I'd like Mr. MacSorley and members of his troop to rise and be accorded the usual welcome of the House.

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

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

Department of Environment (*continued*)

5 — Lesser Slave Lake Outlet

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe the Leader of the Opposition asked that we hold this vote until we get the information that's been requested. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

6 — Paddle River Basin Development

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Assembly, the Paddle River basin is an area not far from, I guess, Whitecourt.

MR. R. CLARK: Mayerthorpe.

MR. COOKSON: Yes, Mayerthorpe, in the hon. Mr. Trynchy's area. I know he keeps reminding me of this.

This proposal has been in the offing for some time. Just to give you a little bit of background, the Paddle River runs through some 30 miles of flood plain and periodically inundates approximately 25,000 acres of agricultural lands. As early as 1912, farmers petitioned the government for assistance. In the 1920s, farmers tried unsuccessfully to control flooding. In the 1950s, the counties of Barrhead and Lac Ste. Anne were offered financial assistance for channel clearing. In 1966, PFRA reported on the feasibility of providing storage reservoirs and channelization for flood protection. In 1971, the province initiated a program of brush removal, channelization, diking, and selected cutoffs. This program is nearing completion at this time.

In 1974, a comprehensive study of the Paddle River basin was conducted by Alberta Environment, followed by the environment council of Alberta public hearings. The ECA recommended that a management committee

and a local advisory committee be formed. The management committee consisted of senior staff from six departments and the regional planning commission. They commissioned studies into four major aspects: structural flood control works, watershed management practices, consideration of fish and wildlife, and consideration of transportation.

Four structural alternatives were outlined by the committee. From these alternatives the government selected No. 3, consisting of a multipurpose storage reservoir at a site called 7B on the upper Paddle River, and completion of the channelization and diking program within a five-year period to achieve the one-in-eight-year summer flood protection. Implementation of this program was announced by the Minister of Environment on June 28, 1978.

As for the project itself and the description, the reservoir will be located near Rochfort Bridge and will have a design storage capacity of 40,000 acre-feet and a permanent pool of 18,000 acre-feet. The multipurpose uses of the reservoir will be primarily: flood control for agriculture and downstream roads; water supply for the town of Mayerthorpe — and I think that's a very significant, important contribution for these types of reservoirs in areas where potable water is limited; downstream erosion control; river flow augmentation and water supply for the town of Barrhead is perhaps in the offing; and water-based recreation.

When completed, the main dam will have a height of 115 feet and a length of 2,940 feet. The top width is under review, pending discussion with CNR regarding a possible relocation of tracks. At design flood level, the reservoir will cover an area of 1,290 acres. The permanent pool will flood an area of 655 acres, with a maximum water depth of 74 feet. Structures include a reinforced concrete spillway, with a capacity of 30,300 cubic feet per second, and a diversion conduit with a capacity of 2,800 cubic feet per second at design flood level. The Evansburg road will be relocated to accommodate the reservoir. Other utilities to be relocated include pipelines, power lines, and AGT facilities.

To give you an idea of the status of it at present: the environmental impact assessment has been completed; current activities include detailed soil investigations and laboratory analysis, detailed surveys, design, and land assembly.

Mr. Chairman, the amount requested is \$5,097,000, to continue with the stage of the development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding this resolution?

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. You may have mentioned it in the course of your remarks, Mr. Minister. If you did I apologize and will get it out of *Hansard*. What are we looking at as a completion date? What are we looking at as the total cost, and when do we expect the major construction work to be being done?

MR. COOKSON: In terms of a time frame, based on our present work — surveying, engineering, land assembly, river channel construction, and bridge construction — in 1979-80 we asked for \$6,112,600. This time we're asking \$5,094,000; 1980-81 will be land assembly, river channel construction, and dam construction. In future years we've left that open. We haven't placed a time frame on that yet, because it does

hinge on some things. We estimate the cost of the dam construction in future years as \$11,546,700. So you're looking in the area of \$23 million.

MR. NOTLEY: How long a period?

MR. COOKSON: We're just asking for the '80-81 allocation; I really couldn't answer the completion date. I don't have that information here, but I can assure you that we'll finish it as quickly as we can.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, what we're really doing here is embarking on the second phase of what appears to be a four- or five-year project, then leaving it in mid-air. You're asking us to approve the second \$5 million, after the \$6 million from last year, and saying that you're going to come back to us for some more in 1980-81, and that's going to have the project maybe half the way along. On a \$23 million project, Mr. Minister, you're telling us you don't know when you're going to finish the rest of the project? I think we'll have to have a little better than that.

MR. COOKSON: The projected cost, first of all, is the amount asked for in '80-81. Again, for construction in '81-82, we're looking at a projected cost in the area of the same amount. I don't know why we want to talk about that now, because that will be in the next request through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It would be in the area of \$5.6 million. We have left open the cost to completion. You're going into '82 to completion. We've left that open, because we're projecting quite a way ahead on it. The amount to be spent is estimated in the area of about the same amount. Looking at the information I have, it would appear that we should be able to complete the project no later than '83.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. Mr. Minister, I'd like to make two comments. One of the reasons I think it's important that we get some feel as to the time schedule is that the select committee has repeatedly asked the government to give us the total cost of a project as opposed to a year-to-year basis. The second thing the select committee has recommended in the past is that we get some indication of the ongoing operational costs. So, Mr. Minister, once we have this project in place, are there going to be ongoing operational costs which will find their way into the budget of the department?

MR. COOKSON: No, the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is just dealing with capital costs. Operation will come out of another ...

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Mr. Minister, it seems to me that is one of the real points. As a result of the project being finished in '83, what are we to expect as operating costs which we're building into the minister's operational budget? I raise it because the committee has batted this around several times. If my memory is accurate, last year during study of the estimates the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care gave us information as to anticipated operating costs. I don't expect exact figures, Mr. Minister, but certainly there should be some ball-parking as to the ongoing operational obligation we will have as a result of this project. And that's the question I also

wanted to ask as far as the Slave Lake project is concerned.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask a couple of questions too while we're on this subject. Mr. Minister, I must confess that I'm rather surprised that we as a committee aren't in a position to know when the project will be completed. It strikes me that when we embark upon a project, particularly a project as controversial as the Paddle River ... We've had hearings by the Environmental Council of Alberta. We've had all sorts of controversy, and were assured by the Deputy Premier that this government knew where it was going. One would assume that if we knew where it was going, we would have a very clear indication of when we get there. At this stage we seem to be ball-parking when we get there.

The first question I'd like to have clarified in my mind is, are there any specific obstacles at this stage? Are there any other hearings that have to be held? What are the obstacles to the minister's being able to advise the committee what the time frame is? It would strike me that we all need to know. We as a committee need to know before we grant the money from the heritage trust fund. But the people in the area need to know too. As the Member for Olds-Didsbury has indicated, you don't want a job half done or partly done. It seems to me that that kind of information is necessary. Are specific obstacles standing in the way of having a completion date?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't see any at this time. But remember we're dealing with the capital costs for 1980-81. I appreciate the point you're making, that when the total project was considered we should be able to project the total cost in terms of capital and time frame, and I've given you that. From the figures I have it is about \$23 million total, and the time frame in terms of completion is about 1983.

If you want to talk about forecasts of operational costs, I could go through this document in front of me and review it. The forecast operating costs for manpower will be in the area of \$14,000 in 1980-81 and in '81-82 and '82-83; in terms of annual operating costs upon completion, \$35,000; upon completion, supplies and services annual operating costs, \$135,000. If you go to the grants part of the forecast operating costs, for '80-81 it is \$6,000 and the same for '81-82 and '82-83. The total annual operating cost upon completion is \$10,000; the purchase of fixed assets on a yearly basis is again an annual operating cost of \$10,000. The total annual operating cost upon completion is projected at \$190,000.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, in summing that up, looking at inflation and whatever else, by the time we get to '82-83 we're likely looking at a quarter of a million dollars for the operating costs. Is that a ball park estimate that seems to be in keeping with the figures you just gave us?

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Leader of the Opposition, I think we're getting into a matter of opinion on that kind of question. I'm not sure the minister wishes to respond to that kind of judgment.

MR. COOKSON: If you want to use the term "ball park", that's fine with me, because that's really what

they are. It's a projection based on approval of the project. This is the sort of thing that was agreed to at the time the project commenced. That's all I can do.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, in listening to the dialogue, I recognize that the minister is dealing with a lot of intangibles. What I'm really concerned about in the heritage trust fund committee, and one of the things I've emphasized, is that we identify items project by project. I'm glad that in going through this, the Department of Environment has done exactly that. The thing that concerns me is — possibly my own ignorance, or maybe the information is available. But at the start of the flood control project on the Paddle River, were there definite parameters of what we were anticipating to achieve on completion? Or is it an ongoing thing that has the scope to broaden out and get involved in additional improvements to the system?

I'd like to relate it to rehabilitation of irrigation works through the Department of Agriculture, which, if you want to take it in that scope, has tremendous flexibility. We know that the amount of money voted would not completely rehabilitate the whole irrigation system. I wonder if we have definite parameters of what would fall under the guidelines or where the limitations are of this Paddle River development project?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I guess we get into a kind of philosophical debate again, such as we had yesterday with the Member for Calgary Buffalo, when he raised the point whether we're clear when we initiate capital projects as to whether they accomplish the guideline which says something to the effect of long-term social and economic benefit to Albertans.

Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I didn't have the opportunity to be involved in the debate with regard to the Paddle River proposal when it was initiated in '79-80. But I can simply reiterate the submissions, presentations, and, probably, debates in this Legislature about the benefits of flood control to agriculture and other areas. I did mention that I think it's extremely important when we're constructing these dams that we take into consideration the spinoff effects into other areas; for example, the community of Mayerthorpe, which has recently been talking to me about a supply of water where potable water is not available. Without that dam, and that storage capacity of water, it could conceivably restrict the growth of Mayerthorpe.

I don't know how you measure that in terms of social and economic benefits. It's a very difficult thing to do. Barrhead is also involved in perhaps a pipeline. Recreation and Parks is involved in terms of recreation for our citizens. Social benefits there are extremely hard to measure. The very fact that we're able to control those years of flooding, and increase the total production of that considerable acreage ... I think in that area you could probably measure the economic benefit a little more closely.

The dialogue we had yesterday indicated studies done of a 85:15 benefit over the long term. Perhaps you could apply that to this area too. But it goes beyond that, into benefits for ministers responsible for other departments. So it's a very interesting philosophical question.

MR. STEWART: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman. I recognize that some of our members like to lead ministers into philosophical questions, but my question

wasn't philosophical. We have two definite interpretations of what we're doing under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. We voted \$200 million to irrigation rehabilitation in southern Alberta. We put a dollar figure on it. Quite frankly, we can't recognize whether it will complete the project. But on the Paddle River project we have neither a dollar figure nor terms of what the total project is. Out of the heritage trust fund, I think we put either one limitation or the other on a particular project: either what we're trying to accomplish, or a total dollar value.

DR. BUCK: How to be, Charlie. Shake them up a little.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify this point with regard to philosophy and the economic measurement of the benefits, I'd like to point out that I wasn't criticizing the investment in the irrigation project. My personal opinion is that it's a very good investment. I'd like to point out why it's a good investment.

First, the irrigation project would benefit 65,000 acres of land. Second, it would create construction benefits in the province of Alberta of \$243 million. There would be spinoff benefits in other provinces of \$73 million. In terms of new crops in Alberta, there would be benefits of \$267 million. Indirect benefits in other provinces would amount to over \$500 million. Furthermore, direct employment would be created of 318 jobs in Alberta, and indirectly there would be over 600 jobs in Canada benefiting from this investment.

Is this a good investment? The answer is unequivocally, categorically, yes; it's a good investment. For every dollar we spend on irrigation, we get \$10 back. I think that's a pretty specific measurement and a commendation of the project itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's commendable that the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo has done the necessary research to answer the questions he asked in the last sitting of the committee.

Are there any further questions or comments?

Agreed to:
6 — Paddle River Basin Development \$5,097,000

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the vote be approved.

[Motion carried]

5 — Lesser Slave Lake Outlet

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, the question was raised by the Leader of the Opposition with regard to a shift in the Slave Lake project, which we haven't approved yet. I suggested I could get that information. I have it now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the committee wish to revert to Vote 5 under Environment, the Lesser Slave Lake Outlet?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I don't think it would cause any disruption if we were to hold that for a few minutes. The Leader of the Opposition will be back in

a minute, hon. minister. We can come back to that; that's the only vote we're holding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the minister agree to that?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Clark did wish to make a comment or two, Mr. Minister, if you can hold it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee agreed that we hold that for a few minutes?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Department of Hospitals and Medical Care

1 — Alberta Children's Provincial General Hospital

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

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have any extensive comments. I think members in the House are familiar with this project. It's going well and will be completed during the coming fiscal year. Other than that, there's nothing new to report.

Agreed to:

1 — Alberta Children's Provincial
General Hospital \$7,835,000

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

[Motion carried]

2 — Applied Cancer Research

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, any comments?

MR. RUSSELL: Again, Mr. Chairman, this program has been in effect for a couple of years now, and we're going into our third year. I can report that the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board is doing an excellent job receiving and vetting applications through their advisory committee, and getting them to the department with the scientists' and medical practitioners' recommendations and comments.

Members will recall that our original commitment for this program was \$3 million per year for five years, making a total of \$15 million. You see more than \$3 million because we're carrying the rollover from unspent funds from the previous year, plus adding an inflation factor to keep those in constant dollars. That's why \$5.2 million is being asked for this year.

Agreed to:

2 — Applied Cancer Research \$5,281,000

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

[Motion carried]

3 — Applied Heart Disease Research

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have any comments?

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, just a very brief comment on this particular item — not to say that the other items were not also very important. Recognizing that heart disease in our society is such a common North American problem, striking people in the prime of life, I wonder if the applied research portion of this grant is also considered for a network of cardiopulmonary instruction across the province for members of our society, so there's an opportunity for people who have acquired this entity in the acute phase to have a better opportunity to recover. If not, would the minister at least inquire and report to the House, or to me privately?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I'd be please to do that. Of course, I want to make sure of the terminology so the hon. member and I are speaking of the same thing. The applied research funds are spent on a variety of projects for program and equipment support in institutions throughout the province. Simply because of their size and the level of treatment care they give, the majority tend to be in the major Calgary and Edmonton hospitals. I have available for members details of specific program elements, but I'm not sure if that would answer the member's question.

DR. PAPROSKI: Just for clarification, Mr. Chairman. Is the minister saying that it's strictly for institutions in institutions, not outside? No applied research or treatment or provision of treatment is being carried out outside the facility *per se*?

MR. RUSSELL: Essentially that's correct, Mr. Chairman.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. I'd just like to make one or two comments. If I were to make a criticism of the way we as North Americans operate, I would probably say that in most of our programs — and this has been brought to our attention on the legislative committee on workers' compensation — we always seem to try to solve the problem after it has occurred. The small point I'm trying to make to the minister is that in granting funds such as this, I support them 100 per cent, but what are we doing in the line of prevention? I'm thinking of the great North American disease of obesity. We should be taking that preventive measure, and we may not have to spend so many dollars on recovery from heart attacks and so on.

I would like to know if the government or the minister, in his role as the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, has given any consideration to looking at obesity clinics, to further encourage people to 'participate'. I think we should be looking at prevention in the area of cardiovascular problems, as much as trying to do something for people after they've had the problem. I would like to know if anything in the area of prevention has been looked at in the department.

MR. RUSSELL: Yes it is, Mr. Chairman. I agree completely with the remarks just made by the hon. member. I've met with some practitioners in private practice and, in conjunction with my colleague in Social Services and Community Health, we're trying to devise a preventive health program that I think would be acceptable and attractive to Albertans. If we can get one in place, I hope to bring something forward

during the next few months.

The member made reference to the participation program. I think that's a good example of a government program with respect to preventive measures that has caught on well. Instead of building obesity clinics, we could all do our own bit. Use the stairs instead of the elevator in the building — I'm always bugging members about that. Keep all the chips and gravy and meringue pie off your plates in the cafeteria — I see too many members having that kind of junk instead of apples. And quit smoking. There's some free advice worth quite a bit.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. This goes along with what the minister just said about junk food. It's too bad the Minister of Education isn't here. I'm really quite pleased to see that in our school environment we are finally starting to find out that maybe we should take the pop and junk food out and allow milk machines in. This used to appal me. We would encourage our young people to eat so many foods that aren't doing them any good. Maybe the minister can encourage the Minister of Education to have the people in his department look at putting in some machines, and possibly look at school cafeterias more than they have.

Mr. Chairman, just in case you think this doesn't relate to the topic at hand, it does. We're really looking at heart-attack patients 40 years down the road, when we look at the bad diets young people are starting out with. I think the minister has made some moves in this direction. I would like him to consort with his fellow Minister of Education to make sure we move further in providing nutritious food for young people.

DR. PAPROSKI: One more comment, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the previous comments on prevention, there's no doubt about that. The reality of it is that we still have the problem. I'm going to zero in again and ask the minister if he could at least review whether cardiopulmonary instruction could be carried out in hospitals on an ongoing basis for spouses and their families. This will benefit not only heart attack patients but other patients who may have a problem respecting heart disease or other problems that may hurt the individual or hurt the heart. If it were possible that this particular vote regarding applied heart research could institute such a program in active hospitals in cities, more of our population would be able to treat that entity on an acute-phase basis. I'm wondering if they shouldn't be looking at that. Then a network of people around this province would have that training and effectively treat patients when they have an acute problem.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I think there is some of that going on. I'm looking at the program elements here, and of course there are many pages of them. But I see in the Calgary General, for example, under rehabilitation there is therapy and counselling as well as diagnosis for patients and their families.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate it very much. I'm sure that is important and going on in a very specific way, cardiopulmonary resuscitation — so that patients and their relatives will know how to carry out this important procedure.

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

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to pose a question to the hon. minister. I recognize that the vote here deals with the provision of funds for such research projects as are approved in the treatment of heart diseases and heart conditions. Is there any co-ordination or direction for the program to carry forward some sort of educational process in the prevention or the recognition of conditions which leave one susceptible to heart failures and heart attacks? Is part of this research to do with that aspect of heart disease as well?

MR. RUSSELL: No, it isn't, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure if some of the things the hon. member was referring to would come within the definition of pure or basic research contained within the terms of reference of our medical research foundation Act, which is now before the Legislature. The programs supported in this are basically applied research, and really the bulk of them occur in the hospital ward, in the bed, and in the counselling and rehabilitation that follow.

Agreed to:
3 — Applied Heart Disease Research \$15,716,000

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

[Motion carried]

4 — Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and Specialty Services Facility

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

MR. RUSSELL: Not particularly, Mr. Chairman. Again, it's a project that's been before this Legislature and its committees on several occasions. Those of you who have been through Calgary can see the massive project that's being built with these funds. Construction and equipping is well under way. As you notice, we're asking for a lot of money for the next fiscal year. We expect another substantial amount of progress to be made; hence the request for \$38 million.

Agreed to:
4 — Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and Specialty Services Facility \$38,365,000

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

[Motion carried]

5 — Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, will you comment on this one?

MR. RUSSELL: Again, Mr. Chairman, it's a project that has been in front of the Legislature, as well as Public Accounts, on many previous occasions. I can report that work is progressing extremely well, on schedule except for the time lost during construction

strikes. Otherwise the critical path schedule plotted at the commencement of the program is being adhered to, with those adjustments for strikes. The budgetary control is also more than satisfactory. Other than the effects of inflation, the thing is right on target, and I can report good progress. I'm requesting \$40 million, again to carry out substantial work during the coming fiscal year.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to pose a question to the minister with respect to the existing University Hospital and the services provided there. Is it intended that the hospital services provided at the University Hospital at this time would become part and parcel of the complete Health Sciences Centre complex, operated as a total research centre in the area of health care? Or is it intended that to some degree the basic hospital services, or some portion of that hospital and its services, would be operated on a budgetary basis like all other hospitals currently are in the province or in the city of Edmonton; for example, the Royal Alex, the Misericordia, and so on. Has the Health Sciences Centre a specific and individual role apart from the existing hospital?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, the Health Sciences Centre will continue to function as a hospital for the Edmonton-metro region, but certainly at a much higher level of care than I think the University of Alberta Hospital, which it is replacing, used to. For example, there are going to be fewer beds in it; there will be a much higher percentage of referral cases to the hospital from the northern Alberta region, and a much more sophisticated and higher level of care than most general hospitals.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to have a little clarification to see if I understood correctly. It is designed and intended, then, that when the Health Sciences Centre is completed and fully functioning, at some level or some point the University Hospital and the services as they are today would be phased out, and the whole area would then become a project as identified under this vote, and the kind of care would constantly be examined from the research point of view rather than as a general hospital?

MR. RUSSELL: I wouldn't want members to emphasize the word "research" too heavily. There probably will be some. Under the Bill I previously referred to, it's inevitable that the Foothills Hospital in Calgary and the MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre in Edmonton will be the two major hospitals attached to the universities with medical faculties in them that will be the centres for that basic medical research.

Insofar as being active treatment hospitals, they will continue that role. Certainly, the MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre will be at the highest, the third level of treatment. It will therefore become more of a regional hospital than a straight municipal hospital. The level and sophistication of services and the numbers of private and semi-private rooms will be much higher than the U. of A. Hospital it is replacing.

MRS. CHICHAK: If I can just proceed with one more question. Does the hon. minister have some indication at this point as to what effect, if any, this move would then have with respect to some of the advanced treat-

ment that is carried out, for instance, in the Royal Alex Hospital? Will the assistance for special programming in hospitals like the Royal Alex be affected, or will some of these other hospitals still be able to continue to do some of what perhaps in some sense can be interpreted as research or advancement in treatment of certain illnesses? Would that kind of recognition in these other hospitals be terminated to centralize the nature of this kind of service in the Walter MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre?

MR. RUSSELL: I don't believe so, Mr. Chairman. As far as I know, the present practice will carry on; that is, in developing its budget each institution, if it has requests for new programs, submits them to the government at that time. Certainly, it would be our responsibility to co-ordinate and finance them in a well organized way. It wouldn't be the intention to see other hospitals in the metropolitan centres suffer because of the level of services provided in the MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, along the line the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood was asking. What will be the net gain of active treatment hospital beds when the new complex is completed, in addition to what the University Hospital has now?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, we had an extensive debate on that matter in Public Accounts this year. Of course, there's not a net gain; there's a loss. An existing 999-bed hospital is being replaced by one that will have 870 active beds, plus 100 hostel beds.

DR. BUCK: To the hon. minister. Just a point of clarification then, following what the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood was saying. The old University of Alberta Hospital will still be retained and will be an active treatment hospital? Is this what is projected?

MR. RUSSELL: This replaces the University of Alberta Hospital.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The old building will be demolished when the new building is in place? The reason I'm asking, Mr. Chairman, is that I've not wanted to berate the government or the minister on the fact that the old hospital is becoming — as an Albertan, I'm not very proud of the University Hospital now, because it was our flagship hospital at one time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Flagships get old.

DR. BUCK: Flagships get old, that's right. Every time I go to that hospital I think, you know, maybe \$50,000 worth of paint would get us through the next couple of years, because it looks like some of the hospitals in some of the downtrodden portions of the major cities in the United States. Like I say, I wouldn't berate the minister if I know that in a couple of years we're going to tear it down. I want to know if that is exactly what's going to happen.

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd be pleased to go over a detailed site plan with any hon. members who are interested. A number of buildings of that entire four-block complex are being torn down. A

couple are being rehabilitated; for example, some hostel beds are going in an old interns' residence. A couple of buildings worth saving will be rehabilitated. But I can assure members that the active hospital unit, the 870 beds, is going to be enclosed in a facility that I think will be the envy of North America.

Agreed to:

5 — Walter C. MacKenzie Health
Sciences Centre

\$40,000,000

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

[Motion carried]

Department of Environment (continued)

5 — Lesser Slave Lake Outlet

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Environment is with us again. The members of the opposition have agreed we could proceed with Vote 5, the Lesser Slave Lake Outlet. The minister has some more information, I believe.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition asked with regard to perhaps a shift in the design work on the Slave Lake scheme. I could just say that the intent is still to proceed with the channelization program. But rather than necessarily straighten out the total channel, if you remember, we were trying to constrain 13 miles down to five. The intention now is that we can accomplish the same thing by improving the channel itself, rather than constructing a new one. So it has nothing to do with any weir, which was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, but specifically deals with the channelling itself.

Agreed to:

5 — Lesser Slave Lake Outlet

\$5,944,000

MR. COOKSON: I move that the resolution be reported.

[Motion carried]

Recreation and Parks

1 — Fish Creek Provincial Park

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the minister have any comments regarding this resolution?

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. These funds will be used for further development of the park at Fish Creek. Most of the development will take place just west of the Macleod Trail. In the development we're including day areas, picnic areas, trails, swimming facilities, equestrian trails, resource and recreation management. This will be the last part of the three-year program outlined in 1977. Hopefully this will see most of the park completed. I'm prepared to take any questions.

Agreed to:

1 — Fish Creek Provincial Park

\$3,532,000

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I move the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

2 — Kananaskis Country Recreation Development

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I passed out to all hon. members a brochure on Kananaskis Country. I hope they will look at it. Just to go through it quickly and briefly, the park itself is some 190 square miles. Country is approximately 2,000 square miles. We're continuing to develop some 3,000 sites for overnight camping. The road program is under way and progressing. Equestrian trails, cross-country ski trails, and camping are all under progress. Mr. Chairman, if members wish, I can give a report on where we are on all of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. TRYNCHY: The golf course, as we're all aware, is now being increased to 36 holes. On the progress report to October 1, the special user facility is 90 per cent complete, the exterior and the total project is 70 per cent complete. Boulton Creek visitors' service centre, a contract of \$542,000, is in the design stages and the major contract tender will be in January 1980. The tender drawings for the park's regional shop at Bow Valley are under way. The park visitors' centre amphitheatre is about 90 per cent complete; exterior framing and the parking lot is about 75 per cent complete — on schedule and on budget. Bicycle trails are about 70 per cent complete and on schedule. The administration building is about one week behind, Mr. Chairman.

For transportation, as I mentioned, we have a budget of \$9 million; \$5 million was expended on that date. All projects are on schedule. The forestry service: Sibbald flats and Andy McNabb campgrounds is 80 per cent complete. The Elbow/Sheep office project is on schedule, working on exterior. All snowmobile trails are moving ahead well except in McLean Creek where we had some contract problems. I understand that's been resolved since and is going on. Hiking trails are about 80 per cent completed. Surfacing is in progress on all interpretive trails. Kananaskis golf course, as I mentioned, has been expanded to 36 holes, and the project is well ahead of schedule.

DR. BUCK: What stage is the first 18 at?

MR. TRYNCHY: My understanding is that we're prepared for seeding the first 27 holes next spring. They're doing some experimental seeding this winter, with all types of grasses. I understand they're going to use some of our Northern Fescue, which I think is a good move, to see which will stand up the best in that country.

Back-country trails in Kananaskis Provincial Park: about 70 to 80 per cent complete and on schedule. The Smith-Dorrien/Highwood day-use area is 95 per cent complete and on schedule; Interlake day-use area is 95 per cent complete and on schedule.

Mr. Chairman, I think that pretty well covers the important parts of where we are. Of course, the budget is for continuation of progress in that area. I have that too. I think possibly we could stop now and have questions.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister a question if I may. Some constituents have expressed concern to me that with a 36-hole golf course, there'll be a problem having topsoil for this large area in not only the cost but where it will come from. Could the minister please indicate where they will be getting the topsoil?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, the topsoil for the whole golf course is right there. As a matter of fact, we have difficulty in disposing of a lot of our topsoil; we have more than we need. So topsoil is not a problem. It's a problem of having too much, and we're having to find other spots to put it. We're moving along really well. It's ahead of schedule because we have all the facilities there, such as topsoil.

MRS. EMBURY: May I please ask a supplementary question, Mr. Chairman? If one tries to picture the topography of Kananaskis Country, one sees a lot of trees and some road areas. I guess I would like a little more specific answer from the minister. Where exactly are you getting this topsoil?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, the topsoil is right within the construction area of the golf course itself. It's in the plains and flatlands. Also on our building construction sites there is an excess amount of topsoil, which we're preserving and hauling down to where we need it.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, would the minister please give the exact location of the golf course?

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes. If you have your map ready, the exact location of the golf course is in the Evan-Thomas area. If you have a good look, you might even see the golfer taking a swing. Just down Highway 40 you see the Evan-Thomas, by Ribbon Creek. It's just in there.

MR. LITTLE: I have the Evan-Thomas Creek.

MR. TRYNCHY: I can pinpoint that on the map for you after.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, an additional question regarding the golf course. I understand the original plan was 18 holes, and the costs at that time were \$3 million. What is the additional cost for the second 18 holes?

MR. TRYNCHY: The final phase of construction to a level of 36 holes is \$2.1 million. I think the first part was \$1.7 million.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister a couple of questions. I recall the enthusiasm that went with the Premier's statement at the birth of Kananaskis Country. I recall specific comments; for example, the intent of the park was to serve Albertans as opposed to tourists from North America. For that reason normal promotion steps were not going to be taken to make this wide-ranging in the oil company road maps of the northern states. I wonder if that is still the intent. Perhaps the Minister of Recreation and Parks doesn't have responsibility in that area, as opposed to tourism, but I'd like him to comment.

I recall statements being made, for example, that within that 190 square miles of Kananaskis Park one primary function was to serve a variety of people, including the handicapped. There would be a little lake set aside with small cabins and so on, so the disadvantaged segment of our society who tend to be institution-bound would have an opportunity to get out to Alberta parks and spend a week or two in supervised groups. I'm kind of interested. I understood there was a lake area where that was to happen. I hope the topsoil the minister talks about doesn't come out of where that lake was.

I had another point, Mr. Chairman. I see there's a budget of \$9 million for roads, of which, the minister indicates, about \$5 million has been spent. I think this matter of roads has been raised by several members in the Assembly. We tend to believe that we can spend many dollars in upgrading roads within a facility. We perhaps don't take the time to consider the impact on roads that lead to these areas. I recognize there probably won't be heavy trucks on them, as opposed to people touring in automobiles. But when I look at the map, the roads leading to Kananaskis Country as opposed to those within it still concern me. I suppose it's not fair to ask the minister, of that \$9 million, which I assume is being spent on roads within the Kananaskis Country and park itself, what, if any, consideration has been given to upgrading roads that would feed into that area?

Perhaps I'm being unfair to the minister in asking questions that are not within his portfolio. The one I would specifically address to him though, is: has there been any change with regard to the concept of the area allocated within the park that was to be dedicated for the use of community groups, specifically handicapped people?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to answer that, because we feel very strongly that Kananaskis Park and Kananaskis Country is for all Albertans. We are moving with great haste on facilities such as the hon. member asked about; that is, making a lake with provisions for wheel chair people to be able to fish off the bank. It will be a put-and-take lake. Some of the topsoil has come out of the lake, because we wanted to get it deeper so it would provide a little more capacity for that kind of thing.

Certainly, I don't think we will have to advertise Kananaskis Country. Once it's completed and people have been there once, they will want to come back, and it will be world-known. So it's going to be hard for us to try to stop people from coming to that area.

With regard to roads, our road budget in this year's program will be some \$24.2 million. If I could run over that: the road from Highway 2 — Highway 40 — is a good road. It's a high-grade standard, and we'll be moving from the Kananaskis Park entrance on toward Highwood House. Construction will take place there, and it's our intention to have a completely paved road from Highway 2 going out to Highwood House and over to Longview. We'll also have to consider roads outside the Country as feeder roads, because they're very important to get the people there, too.

I think those were all the questions, raised on that. The other roads out of that budget will be graded, gravelled and oiled. So we'll have some pretty good roads in the whole Kananaskis Country.

MR. GOGO: Could I ask the minister a supplementary question, Mr. Chairman? It doesn't deal specifically with Kananaskis Park and Country, but I would think it's a desired effect to have. Does the minister, in his responsibility for parks within Alberta, believe that this will significantly reduce the incidence of those Calgarians and Edmontonians — who, I suggest, have been adequately looked after in terms of parks — can restrict their activities to Kananaskis Country, and not fill to capacity those provincial parks in other parts of the province really intended for those rural Albertans in the boondocks?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is asking for an opinion. If the minister wishes to reply . . .

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, it will just be an opinion. I think it's going to be pretty hard for us as government to restrict the travel of anybody to, say, Lethbridge or any place else. Even if they want to come to the boondocks, I'd appreciate if they do. They can come to my constituency, because we have some favorite spots there too.

But certainly, with the development in Kananaskis and the progress we're making — and it will be another three or four years before it will be completed — we expect that many Albertans, and Calgarians and Edmontonians, will be going to Kananaskis Country, because it will be a lovely site. Possibly that will restrict some of the people moving out to other areas, but we can't guarantee that.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, just one quick question. Can the minister or the minister of highways give us any timetable when the main road will be completed from Highway 1 down to Longview? Will the road to Spray Lakes eventually be paved? Can the minister of highways or the Minister of Recreation and Parks give us some idea on that?

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Kananaskis Country and the roads are all one package. We hope to have it all completed by 1985. Our estimation of road budget is on a yearly basis to 1985. We're progressing now from the Kananaskis Park area toward Highwood House, and will continue on. So within the five-year program we hope to have all the roads in our budget upgraded, and of course that will include Longview.

From Canmore to Spray Lakes is not in the program yet. We expect to move from the park entrance up the Smith-Dorrien road to Spray Lakes. That road will be within the five-year budget, and will be gravelled and oiled.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Can you get through to the Spray Lakes along the road that says "summer construction"?

MR. TRYNCHY: Not in total. The road up to Mud Lake and just about to Spray Lakes is all new construction and gravelled. It's a good road, but in the winter that road will be closed because of the snow. But we hope by next year or the year after to reach the site of Spray Lakes, and that will be opened for summer travel. That road will be gravelled and oiled.

DR. BUCK: The last point I want to make is to tell hon. members a story about a provincial park. I would

like to say to the minister, I'm glad to see they have put a second golf course in there, while we're building the one, because these courses do get loaded, and the criticism we receive of the federal courses is that they are for the rich so-and-so's.

Anyway, when we were at the Canadian Parliamentary Association conference in New Brunswick, we were playing on a provincial golf course called Macquatac. At that time, the Premier of the province was the hon. Louis Robichaud. Apparently the hon. Premier is addicted, the same way many of us are, to that little round ball and the idiot stick that you swing at it. Also, the Lieutenant-Governor was quite an addict of the game of golf. But both hon. gentlemen were not too proficient at the sport. As a matter of fact, they were so bad that if the members of the course heard they were coming, they would either get out an hour ahead of the Premier and the Lieutenant-Governor or two hours behind them, because it took them a long time to play their game.

Anyway, the secretary of the Premier told me that the Japanese Consulate from Ottawa had phoned, wanting a golf game. The secretary, being a good public relations type, said, we'll be glad to do that for you, sir; I'll arrange a match. So she arranged the match with the Consul of Japan, the Premier of the province, and the Lieutenant-Governor. But the Japanese gentleman said he was just a beginner. The Premier's secretary thought, ah, I have a chance for the Premier finally to beat someone at the game of golf. So she got the three of them together, and went on her merry way.

This was on a Saturday or Sunday. The next morning, she opened the newspaper and there was a picture of the Japanese Consul adding up the score, and the Premier and the Lieutenant-Governor were reaching for their wallets. So she said, the Premier couldn't even beat a beginner.

But I do wish to say that the people there were very, very proud of their provincial golf course. I'm sure we will be equally proud of the facilities in the Kananaskis. I wholeheartedly support the project.

MR. TRYNCHY: Just to follow that up, Mr. Chairman. I too am very pleased that we're moving ahead with 36 holes. I might mention that each nine holes will begin from the clubhouse, so everybody can be taken care of, and there will be no waiting. If there's a professional team out there, they can move on the first nine holes, and so.

I might also say at this time that I hope the Japanese Consul, when he comes here to play, will not expect to beat our Premier. I golfed with him some time ago in Banff and I can tell you, he's a pretty good golfer.

MRS. EMBURY: I'd like to make just one last comment, since Kananaskis Country is not too far west of my constituency. I'm very fortunate to have two roads already there for easy accessibility.

But having been there, and listening to the minister's report today when he outlined for us all the individual projects — and, as you notice, I think all but one is on schedule — on behalf of the constituents of Calgary North West, I'd like to commend the minister for this tight schedule. I trust he will pass this compliment along to the people in charge of this project, the senior members of the staff, because I understand they are working very hard to fulfil those

obligations. We do appreciate it.

Thank you.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister. The minister and I have talked about this, but for the record I would appreciate hearing from him as to the proposed disposition of the Kananaskis forestry experimental station, a portion of ground, I believe, still owned by the federal government which carries some measure of historical significance for the province.

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that total area is still under federal government jurisdiction. The whole area was to be turned over to us on October 5. It was delayed somewhat by the federal government. We expect to see that happen in the near future, this year or next spring. After it comes within our jurisdiction, we expect to sit down and meet with our citizens' advisory committee and any member of the House interested in seeing what we can do to preserve what's there. I understand it is quite an exciting area. That's the only place through that area that I haven't been, but I expect to get there as soon as I can.

MR. KNAACK: Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted a general remark, I think the House and *Hansard* should make this observation: as a member of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee and of this committee here, I've heard the Member for Spirit River-Fairview express very strongly and vocally that all investments of the trust fund should be open to the House. One of the most important, of course, is the capital projects division, which we're examining now. They are investments that are not expected to pay a return. What I want to point out — and *Hansard* doesn't keep attendance of committee meetings. But I think we will notice that the member is absent, and so are most members of the opposition. Surely their argument loses a lot of force when they don't even attend in that area where, in fact, we as a Legislative Assembly do question the estimates prior to their being made.

Thank you.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to that cheap shot from the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud. It's an indication that the quality of the representation from Edmonton Whitemud has gone down considerably since the hon. Don Getty left this House.

Mr. Chairman, there should be no place in this Assembly for those types of remarks.

MR. COOK: Oh, can you say that?

DR. BUCK: Oh, what a cheap shot from a cheap, no-good member. [interjections] Really, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for that remark, because I would just be lowering myself to the level of the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud.

I would just like to say that the things that are good in this province are not just because the government brings them into being. It's our role in this Assembly to act in the best interests of the people of this province. I would just like to say to the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud that I'm very disappointed in his remarks.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to join in this debate. In fairness to the members of the opposition, I think we should point out to the newer members of our Assembly that in view of their small numbers they obviously have other responsibilities. As we all know, there are times when we can't be in the House, but that doesn't mean we're not representing our constituents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question on the vote?

MR. KNAAK: I would like to respond to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the topic is not really relevant to the resolution being discussed. I have to rule it out of order from here on.

Agreed to:

2 — Kananaskis Country Recreation Development	\$41,772,000
--	--------------

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, just before I move the vote be reported, I'd like to thank the members for taking part. I'm sure we haven't asked as many questions as we'd like to. We could have discussed a number of things. I have a number of things in my hand that I could distribute to the members. If they have any questions from now on, I wish they would get to me and I'll try to answer them. Thank you again for your co-operation.

I move the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

reports the same, and requests leave to sit again.

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: \$5,000,000 for the Land Reclamation project; \$5,944,000 for the Lesser Slave Lake Outlet project; \$5,097,000 for the Paddle River Basin Development project.

For the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care: \$7,835,000 for the Alberta Children's Provincial General Hospital project; \$5,281,000 for the Applied Cancer Research project; \$15,716,000 for the Applied Heart Disease Research project; \$38,365,000 for the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and Specialty Services Facility project; \$40,000,000 for the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre.

For the Minister of Recreation and Parks: \$3,532,000 for the Fish Creek Provincial Park project; \$41,772,000 for the Kananaskis Country Recreation Development project.

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 think it most likely the House will sit on Monday evening. The business for the day will be second reading of Bills, on the assumption that the balance of the estimates which we've just had under consideration will be done relatively quickly in the afternoon. Whether or not that's so, we will follow that with second readings and, if there's time, committee study of Bills.

Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 1 o'clock.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 12:56 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]