

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Friday, November 9, 1979 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 77****The Alberta Heritage Savings  
Trust Fund Amendment Act, 1979**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Amendment Act, 1979.

Mr. Speaker, this amending Bill has two objectives. Firstly, it will give added flexibility to the Alberta investment division by providing that investments may either strengthen or diversify the economy of Alberta. The existing Act requires that an investment in that division must both strengthen and diversify the economy.

Secondly, the Bill will confirm the wide jurisdiction and range of review of the special select committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, making it clear that the committee may review and report not only on existing investments but also on new and alternative investments.

[Leave granted; Bill 77 read a first time]

**Bill 64****The Statute Law Correction Act, 1979**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to introduce Bill No. 64, The Statute Law Correction Act, 1979.

Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill which in similar form is traditionally presented to the Assembly once in each session, and makes only incidental corrections of obvious errors in the statutes. It does not have a matter of principle raised in it.

It's customary with such legislation to consult the opposition ahead of time in order to satisfy both the opposition and the government that there is nothing of substance in the sense of controversy or new principle in the matter. It's corrective only, and the tradition is that as a result it is normally not debated.

[Leave granted; Bill 64 read a first time]

**Bill 237****An Act to Amend The Liquor Licensing Act**

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce for first reading Bill 237, An Act to Amend The Liquor Licensing Act.

This Bill proposes the establishment of a new category of liquor licence to be called the community pub licence. The Act would allow an organization comply-

ing with the provisions of the Act to establish small community centres serving alcoholic beverages in neighborhoods which support the concept.

This legislation is introduced in order to reduce the driving and drinking phenomenon and, hopefully, the excessive consumption of alcohol.

[Leave granted; Bill 237 read a first time]

**Bill 78****The Mines and Minerals  
Amendment Act, 1979**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, The Mines and Minerals Amendment Act, 1979.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide the procedures for entering into major development agreements with respect to mines and minerals. It also contains provisions enabling lending institutions other than chartered banks to take, as security for loans, interests in Crown agreements in the same way that chartered banks may now do. In addition, it contains a concept of metallic minerals which is somewhat wider than the concept now in the legislation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should advise that it's not my intention to move the Bill beyond first reading at this sitting of the Assembly. It would be held over for comment by those interested or affected by the legislation, and brought back at a subsequent sitting of the Assembly.

[Leave granted; Bill 78 read a first time]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I notice in the members gallery two distinguished Albertans, and I thought it would be appropriate to introduce them to you and to Members of the Legislative Assembly.

They are the deans of the two medical schools in the province of Alberta: Dr. Tim Cameron, dean of the medical school at the University of Alberta, and Dr. Lionel McLeod, dean of the medical faculty at the University of Calgary. I wonder if they'd rise so we could welcome them to the Legislative Assembly.

**head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation**

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, last April in Banff I announced the introduction of the Alive trailer, a mobile display and training unit, which is an integral part of the occupational health and safety Alive program, aimed at increasing an awareness of health and safety at the worksite.

After the initial television, newspaper, and poster advertising campaign in the spring, the classroom on wheels continued throughout the summer to carry health and safety messages directly to worksites and committees.

During April and May, the Alive display was geared to the petroleum industry. Display panels, audio-visual presentations and specifically prepared printed materials were produced to reflect health and safety con-

cens in this industry. The trailer visited many work-sites of the petroleum industry during the spring.

In the second phase of the trailer schedule, the focus was on industry from June to September. Again, display panels and presentation materials were changed to meet this new audience throughout the summer. In August new panels were added to the display, promoting health and safety in the field of radiation.

Another change of theme was made for September and October, when the Alive trailer was loaned to the Alberta Construction Association for promotion of health and safety at the construction worksite.

It has been a busy season for this new project, and I feel it has been a very successful first year of taking health and safety promotional and educational messages to Alberta worksites. I would like to express our appreciation to the participating industries, unions, and workers. From their interest and co-operation, I know they also feel the Alive program is important.

As this season for the Alive program ends, plans are already under way to assess and meet health and safety needs in other areas of industry and the community in the spring.

Today we have parked the Alive trailer at the east door of the Legislature Building. At this time I would like to invite members to take a few moments immediately following this session to tour the displays. We welcome your questions and comments.

#### head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Crime — Released Prisoners

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Solicitor General. It concerns an incident that took place in Edmonton Wednesday evening, when an Edmonton woman was assaulted. I understand that the individual arrested in connection with the incident has been charged with 13 sex-related offences.

My question to the hon. Solicitor General, with no prejudice intended to any individual who is innocent until proven guilty: what is the government doing about the extent of violent crimes committed by individuals out on bail, parole, or probation?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, there has been a concern, particularly in the Edmonton area, related to offences committed by people on parole. I might point out that parole is granted under federal legislation. As far as I have been able to determine, most of the incidents that have come to my attention have involved parolees from federal penitentiaries. I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the Parole Board, and it received a fair amount of comment over the summer.

One area I have had a concern about has been that not too many people who reside in Alberta have been members of the Parole Board. That matter was taken up with the federal Solicitor General during the summer. At a recent federal/provincial meeting in Ottawa, officials in our respective departments were able to get together, and hopefully we will have some progress in the area of trying to ensure an Alberta perspective on the federal Parole Board.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Given that the individual is released on bail, I assume that the length of time that the individual is

out on bail — several months in the case at hand — reflects a backlog of cases before the court. What action or steps has the hon. Attorney General taken to cut down the backlog and, secondly, to investigate this specific situation?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are at least two parts to the hon. leader's question. I'll respond to the spirit of those questions to the best of my ability.

One deals, of course, with the nature of the granting of bail. As hon. members would know, that application is made on behalf of an accused, and a determination is made by a judge, who to the best of his ability considers the arguments brought before him by the Crown counsel, in the event there's objection to bail in that particular case, and of course by counsel on behalf of an accused.

I would suggest that that procedure, historic as it is that bail may be granted by a judge upon conditions or indeed without conditions in some cases, is not directly related to the other question the hon. leader raises with respect to the workload of the courts. In response to that, I think it's fair to note that, despite the fact that it sometimes takes some time for a case to come to trial, it is far from clear in any individual case that that's a result of anything within the control of the courts. Very often it is the intention and desire of the accused, using the systems available through various applications to the court, to ensure that the matter doesn't come up for trial until a certain time further along. Sometimes, of course, time is required for investigation, the bringing of necessary charges. It's only partly a case of the workload of the court.

The court does move swiftly and efficiently by any comparison. Recent reviews of our provincial courts, where almost all criminal matters come in the first instance, have indicated that the time lag in our provincial courts should make us proud of the administration of justice in Alberta in that respect, as compared with other jurisdictions.

I'd just add one thing to the hon. member: of course we're aware of the publicity surrounding the regrettable, indeed more than regrettable — the very, very sad case that the hon. leader has asked the House about today. But since those reports came to my attention I have not made any inquiry along the lines the hon. leader has asked about with respect to the granting of bail in that case.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I pose a supplementary question to the Attorney General. Through the responsible officials of the department — perhaps through the Crown prosecutor, or whatever route the Attorney General chooses — would the Attorney General investigate the circumstances and report to the Assembly whether in the opinion of the Attorney General's Department there was an undue delay in the case getting before the court and, if there was an undue delay, the reason for that?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to do that. I'm glad the hon. leader has put the question in the context that he has. Checking into the delay is clearly something I'm in a position to do. The hon. leader didn't ask, but I might just comment that the merit of the particular application of bail previously determined by a judge is not a matter that we would normally be making inquiries about.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct one further supplementary question to the Solicitor General. What representation did Alberta make on this specific question of bail at the federal/provincial meeting of ministers responsible for the administration of justice and correction held in Ottawa on October 25 and 26? Would the minister also be prepared to table the representation Alberta made?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, the subject of bail doesn't come within the purview of the portfolio of the Solicitor General. Therefore I'd refer it to my colleague the Attorney General.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to seek any information that can be provided to the hon. leader, and bring the matter back.

#### **Rape Crisis Centres**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question if I may, to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health, flowing from the widespread concern about the growing incidence of rape in our major cities. Is any consideration being given to additional or special funding to organizations such as the Rape Crisis Centre, to make possible not only counselling but better reporting of rapes which occur?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, until the present, funding for rape centres and various centres across this province has come directly through the local communities — the United Way, as an example. It's an area we're becoming increasingly concerned about. We'll certainly be looking at that in a personal way.

#### **Crimes of Violence**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. minister or the Premier. With the growing incidence of violence, has the government given any consideration, beyond the personal assessment of the minister, to either establishing a task force to examine the question of violence in our cities, or perhaps asking a caucus committee to look into the issue?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to accept the thrust of the allegation in terms of the violence relative to the nation at large. That's something that perhaps could be assessed. But I would refer to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health the thrust of the question, which I really believe he did answer in the first instance.

#### **Rape Crisis Centres** *(continued)*

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either hon. gentleman. Is the Assembly to understand from the minister's answer that the government is now actively reviewing the provision of funds to rape crisis centres in the province, and that that should become a provincial responsibility as opposed to a responsibility that has hitherto been met, in the main, by community sources?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the first part of the hon. member's question — that we are reviewing at the present time — is accurate. I'm doing that myself. What action might be taken will depend in part on that review. As I've indicated, to this point the funding has been provided through local community organizations, and that's being reassessed.

MR. R. CLARK: A further supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of problems the Edmonton centre is facing ... I would simply point out the problem in this way: they're not able to use some of the money they raised through their lottery permit to hire a person to be involved in an education program.

While discussions are going on between the minister's department and the Attorney General's people and we're waiting for the caucus task force report and all that, is the minister prepared to grant some interim funding to the Edmonton Rape Crisis Centre until this question has been resolved within the government, so that the educational program that they want to go on ... They had the materials printed, but they don't have the personnel to get out and do the work. Is the minister prepared to grant some interim funding until administrative decisions are made within the government?

MR. BOGLE: To my understanding, Mr. Speaker, a request has not been made of our department for that kind of funding. But I'll certainly undertake to review that in my review of the funding of rape crisis centres, not only in the city of Edmonton but in other centres in the province.

#### **Forestry — Berland-Fox Creek**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It deals with the Berland-Fox Creek proposals presently before the government. The hearings have now been held.

Can the minister indicate to the Assembly the status of the discussions between the government and the 17 companies who put bids before the committee headed by the Member for Athabasca? At what stage are the discussions now?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, as I think I reported earlier to the Assembly, we have had a number of meetings, not only with persons who submitted proposals but with MLAs directly affected by any decisions we might make in that area, various community groups, and representatives of the communities that are most directly affected by that decision. I think I can respond to the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition only by saying I am hopeful that we'll be able to reach a conclusion in the near future.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to indicate whether the government has made a decision to grant the bulk of the permanent area to St. Regis paper? Has that decision been made, and are other companies now being asked to look at taking small portions of what might be left on the surrounding parts of the Berland-Fox Creek allocation?

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

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, in the course of discussions now going on between the government and various companies, are companies other than St. Regis being asked to make modifications in their propositions to the government dealing with the whole area, or in fact is that an obligation? I raise the question because some firms which made bids indicate that they're being asked to vastly change their proposals. They're now being asked to make a second application on only a very small portion of the whole projected area.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I can respond in greater detail than to say no decision has been made. We have had a number of discussions with a number of the companies that made proposals, exploring adjustments and alterations to their proposals. But no decision has been made with respect to the allocation of any portion of the forest resource contained in the request for proposals.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then can the Attorney General confirm the comments made by one of the presidents of the local Conservative associations, that no announcements will be made until after . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Surely announcements by presidents of constituency associations of any party are not subjects for the question period.

#### **Dinosaur Provincial Park**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks. Now that Dinosaur park has been nominated to the World Heritage List, could the minister indicate what the policy of the government will be in relation to deeded and Crown land within the boundaries of the park? Will it be the intent of the government to purchase some or all of the deeded land within the park, and will they be renewing Crown leases when the dates come up for renewing?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I guess we're well aware that Dinosaur has indeed been nominated. The size of Dinosaur park is somewhere in the area of 14,700 acres. I've had no requests or representations from any people with deeded land in that area. I will certainly be willing to listen to a request from that area. If the hon. member has some requests from interested constituents, I'd like to hear them. So far we've made no changes to the policy we've had in effect for a number of years.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Now that we're going to get much more recognition of and interest in the park, will the Department of Recreation and Parks be improving and spending more money on facilities in Dinosaur park in the future?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure all hon. members are aware that with interest in the park and visitors coming to it, naturally we'll have to make some improvements. Of course that's a budgetary item. I hope to be able to go to budget sometime between now and the spring session and see what my chances are. I'm sure that improvements will have to be made; we'll have to work toward that end.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Transportation. Would the minister now be looking at the possibility of improving access to the park and paving the road?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, could I use the previous minister's answer? Budgetary and future.

#### **Students' Financial Aid**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question concerning students' finance to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, and ask the minister whether Alberta has taken any position in the Council of Ministers of Education regarding official student representation on a recently announced national task force on student aid.

MR. HORSMAN: The most recent Council of Ministers meeting in Toronto discussed this matter. I was unable to attend that conference; my colleague the hon. Minister of Education attended. A task force was established to review this question. Apparently, the decision has been taken that there will be no official representation of students on that task force.

However, invitations are going to be extended to student organizations throughout Canada to make representations on the subject of student finance and what should be done in the long term with regard to the Canada Student Loans Act, and to make recommendations through the various provincial governments as to the supplementary plans they may have in place.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower or the hon. Minister of Education. In light of student representation on the Grantham commission studying student aid in Alberta, at any time in this particular meeting did the Alberta government make a formal recommendation to other ministers that any national task force set up to examine student assistance should include a student representative — not just entertain submissions but have student representation?

MR. HORSMAN: No, we did not press that forward. It's true that here in Alberta we did make student representation on the Grantham task force open to various organizations, and students were represented. But on the national level it is important that, first of all, students' organizations of all types — and there are a number — should be able to make recommendations to the task force, and not to regard any particular one as being the spokesman for all students. I think that has to be the case, because in fact there is no one organization that can really call itself the spokesman for all students. That is one of the reasons, I gather, that there are no students on the actual task force, which has not yet been finally structured by membership.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. gentleman. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what changes, if any, will be made in student aid in the province of Alberta prior to the deliberations by the national task force? Or will major changes in student assistance await the actions of the national task force?

MR. HORSMAN: That question will depend in part on the federal government's decision whether to proceed with amendments to the Canada Student Loans Act during the current sitting of the federal House. But I've already indicated to this Assembly and to student groups and boards of governors that we intend to press forward with the complete review of the Grantham report, in consultation with the Students Finance Board, the Federation of Alberta Students, student councils — due to the fact that not all belong to the federation; of course we want to have their input as well — and the caucus committee on education. The caucus committee is meeting with the Students Finance Board next week, I believe, to review some of their recommendations. So we intend to press forward in Alberta regardless of the review of the Canada student loan program.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Will the minister assure the House that the review of the Grantham report will have taken place and changes in student assistance will be made prior to any formal increase in tuition fees?

The minister has been quoted as indicating there will be student fee increases. My question, Mr. Speaker, relates to whether we'll have a simultaneous announcement or whether student aid will be reviewed before any increase in fees is announced.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think it may be useful to go back a little bit. When I became minister, it was my ambition to deal with the student aid or student finance issue first and make an announcement without dealing with the student fee issue, because I felt that that would certainly have to wait until the fall of 1980. Now we're putting them together in our review, and in all likelihood they will be done concurrently.

However, I must add this: as minister I don't have the ultimate determination of what will occur there; the members of this Assembly will have that ultimate say. But we will be making recommendations on the joint package to cabinet, caucus, and this Assembly in due course, hopefully by next spring.

#### **Tuition Fees**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. During the review of tuition fees, what consideration, if any, is being given by the government to changing the two-tier or differential fee structure for foreign students? Has any consideration been given by the government, and is that part of the current assessment of the fee structure in the province?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the issue of the two-tier fee or the foreign student fee differential was raised in the Grantham report with a recommendation — not a unanimous recommendation — that it should continue. Therefore it is part, but I must say only a minor part, of the total review.

It is my sense of the feeling of Albertans that that is an appropriate differential fee. Despite the fact that some students and student organizations may disagree, I think it is fair to say that there is broad support in Alberta for the continuation of that differential.

#### **Committee on the Handicapped**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It's a follow-up question on the MLA/handicapped joint committee.

Representation has been made to all MLAs by the Alberta Committee of Action Groups of the Disabled, through a letter to the Premier also copied to all members. I wonder if the minister has had the opportunity of reconsidering the decision of reconstituting the committee less the MLAs from the opposition group?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the matter of a joint committee, where there would be representation from government as well as opposition members, has been reassessed. It's our feeling that the most appropriate way for the Action Groups of the Disabled to make their representation to the government is through the government caucus committee on health and social services. That advice has been given to the committee by my colleague the Minister of Labour, by the MLA who is the chairman of the caucus committee, and by me. We would also recommend, of course, that representation be sought from the other parties in this Assembly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In reaching that conclusion, did the minister have a discussion with the Alberta Committee of Action Groups of the Disabled prior to making the decision, or was it rather a unilateral decision?

MR. NOTLEY: Another unilateral decision.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, both my colleague the Minister of Labour and I met separately with the Action Groups of the Disabled within six weeks of our assuming these responsibilities. We advised them of our intentions at that time, and that was formalized later. A meeting has been established through the health and social services caucus committee.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister, as a former member of that committee, I guess, at this point in time. Could the minister indicate whether the Committee of Action Groups of the Disabled as such agreed with the decision of the minister or accept it?

MR. BOGLE: Well, that's a value judgment, Mr. Speaker. When we met — I well recall the president of the group, Mr. Leroy Thompson — I expressed some concern. On the other hand, for the first time we as a government have shifted the representation made to us as a government from the cabinet committee structure through the caucus committee structure. We felt this was an appropriate opportunity for the committee to have greater input with government MLAs, and at the same time encourage the group to meet with representatives from the other two parties represented in this Assembly.

#### **Medical Training**

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care would indi-

cate to the House whether there is any change in policy to increase support for family practice units in this province, which help to train family physicians and other members of the health team for the delivery of health care?

MR. RUSSELL: I don't know if it's a change in policy, Mr. Speaker, but certainly it's something we're trying to give added support to. Presently a program for the expansion of that particular practice is under way at the Misericordia Hospital in Edmonton which involves not only additional funding for programming but also additional physical facilities. I've discussed this briefly by letter with the deans of our two medical faculties, and I sense a message of encouragement from those sources as well.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. That's very encouraging.

I wonder if the minister would also indicate whether to this time there has been any consideration to setting up a special fund for health delivery, in training of these types of personnel.

MR. RUSSELL: If I understand the question properly, Mr. Speaker, I'd have to say no, there hasn't. This is a matter that relates to the global and specific program budgeting of individual hospitals. Of course, it has to have the co-operation of the medical faculties as well.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. In light of the research legislation introduced during this session, is the minister contemplating any change in the approach that the medical schools will be making to the government for funding? I raise the question because now the medical schools go to the universities, to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. A portion of the funding for the medical schools comes from the hospitals division of the minister's department, and a portion comes from the health care commission.

Is the government giving thought to some sort of reorganization that would take into consideration the new financial situation medical research is going to be in, and the fact that the medical schools have to beat paths to a number of doors for their ultimate financing?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say the hon. Premier will probably be addressing that point when he speaks to the Bill during second reading. As far as the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care is concerned, it's our responsibility to provide adequate physical facilities for the research programs that might be allocated to each of the institutions; and, as far as the hospitals within those facilities are concerned, to provide adequate global budgeting. I don't see any immediate need for a change in that system.

We are keeping a very close look at the method by which the heritage funds for applied research are being used by the various hospitals. But, other than some minor changes that may be contemplated, the answer to the hon. leader's question would be no.

#### **Beginning Farmers' Program**

MR. L. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question

is to the Minister of Agriculture. It arises from the many complaints I've had over the way funding for starting farmers is carried on through ADC. Is it one of the duties of the agricultural committee to look into the type of funding we have through ADC for starting farmers?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, as it continues, the review of the beginning farmer will certainly reach the committee of which the hon. member speaks, and we'll have the opportunity to discuss those areas of change.

MR. L. CLARK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister be making it a priority in the agriculture committee?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I think I stated some time ago that the beginning farmer program was one of the top priorities for the Department of Agriculture.

#### **Rape Crisis Centres (continued)**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It really flows from questions asked earlier with regard to financing for the Edmonton and Calgary rape crisis centres.

Mr. Minister, did the funds which went to both centres from the minister's department meet the requirements that the two centres made to the government earlier this year?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier that funding for these centres in the province is provided through community-based organizations like the United Way, but that I would certainly — and I am now reassessing whether the government should be involved in a direct way in the funding of the centres.

MR. R. CLARK: A supplementary question to the minister. Did the minister receive a request from the Edmonton and Calgary rape crisis centres for funding from the minister's department this year?

MR. BOGLE: That question was asked earlier, Mr. Speaker. I responded by saying that I was not aware of a request that had been submitted to the department.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then the minister isn't in a position to indicate to the Assembly today whether his department received a request for funding from the Edmonton and Calgary rape crisis centres?

MR. BOGLE: I thought I'd been clear on that, Mr. Speaker. I'm not aware of any request that has been made to the department. In my review, obviously I want to confirm that, to ensure that that is the case.

I also recall that concern was raised with regard to distributing some information which has been prepared for the Edmonton Rape Crisis Centre. I was asked whether we would consider funding a position; and I said, that will be part of the assessment we'll make.

### **Tuition Fees** (continued)

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It concerns reports — the minister is quoted as indicating an increase in fees — and subsequently again several times in the House today.

What considerations is the government assessing in determining the size of the increase? Will it be related to any general overall guidelines the government comes up with, or will it be related to a percentage of the university budget? What are the considerations in determining the size of student fee increases?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated a week ago in remarks to students at the University of Calgary, and in September in remarks to University of Alberta students, and on other occasions in meetings with students' associations at SAIT and NAIT and throughout the province, that in all likelihood there will be a student tuition fee increase in the fall of 1980. I indicated that some consideration was being given to tying the amount of the increase to the increase the government sees fit in each year to allocate to the institutions on a global funding basis, so that the proportion of student fees that students contribute to the cost of their education would not fall significantly below the level, which is now approximately 10 per cent. That is a fact being taken into consideration.

However, I did make it very clear that before any level was agreed upon there would be further consultation and discussions with the students' associations — both the organized federation and students' councils — boards of governors, and other interested people, before making any firm recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say the level at which the student contributes toward the cost of education has been declining. The question we must arrive at is whether we have reached the floor, and whether it's appropriate now to tie the cost of education more closely to the contribution the government and the student makes. Because it is the policy of this government that students will bear a portion of the cost of their education by way of tuition fees.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question for clarification. It flows from an answer the minister gave earlier concerning the Grantham report and the two-tier system, in which, if I didn't misunderstand the minister, he indicated the Grantham report had come out in favor of the two-tier system.

Was it not true that the Grantham report was not able to make any recommendation, that in fact it was a split decision, and that no recommendation was made by the report?

MR. SPEAKER: If the Grantham report, as I suspect, is available publicly, surely the hon. member doesn't require someone else to analyse it for him.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would want the hon. minister to be able to correct his position.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that there was not unanimity on that subject in the Grantham task force. Some question was raised as to whether they should even be considering that question. Neverthe-

less, it is the policy of this government to maintain and continue a foreign student tuition fee differential.

### **Weather Modification**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. It deals with the Alberta hail project five-year study report. Now that the report is available, what plans does the minister have for dealing with the recommendations? I suppose one would say the major recommendation is that a program should now go ahead.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, now that the recommendations are before us and the program has come to a close, the decision in reviewing the recommendations is of course whether the type of program should continue; if so, whether it should continue in its present form; and if not, what form it should take. That evaluation is going on at present.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Having regard for the fact that the board recommended extending the area of the project, is the minister in a position to indicate how this consideration will go on? Is the minister now seeking advice from the Research Council, from experts outside Alberta? In what form is that consideration going on, in addition to the financial considerations, which I recognize have to be considered?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, in the province there are a number of groups fairly knowledgeable with regard to various aspects of weather modification, regardless of the fact that there may be some differences of opinion. We have the availability of the members of the Research Council and the role they have played in total weather modification. We also have available the information and, I am sure, if necessary, individuals who have presented some very knowledgeable papers with regard to weather modification in a very general way in areas other than Canada. We also have views and background material available to us on a much broader weather modification program, indeed presented by farmers' groups that have some knowledge of their own in other aspects of weather modification.

So we have many areas available. I suppose it will be the collective views, once the decision is made whether we go ahead. If it's a go-ahead, I would suggest that it will be our responsibility to look at the areas of expansion, if that's necessary.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the member responsible for the Research Council of Alberta. Has the Research Council arrived at a conclusion with regard to whether the hail suppression program should be expanded, as recommended to the government by the committee?

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, we have the program under review. I have discussed it with the Minister of Agriculture and will be reporting our suggested recommendations to the department.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. member. I assume from that answer that, in fact, the Research Council of Alberta as a

council has not firmed up its own views on whether the program should be expanded.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, much of the work of the Research Council is on a contract basis for various government departments. Whether we've made up our minds what we should do about it, it would be in consultation with the Department of Agriculture and what it might request of us to perform that service.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

19. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

- (1) Be it resolved that there is hereby appointed a special committee of the Assembly, consisting of the following members.

S. McCrae, Chairman	A. Hiebert
E. Borstad	G. Notley
W. Buck	K. Paproski
D. Carter	W. Purdy
L. Fjordbotten	

- (2) Pursuant to Section 2.1 of The Election Act, the special committee shall consider the appointment or reappointment of a Chief Electoral Officer, effective March 14, 1980.
- (3) The committee shall lay its report before the Assembly, or if the Legislature is not sitting, file it with the Speaker of the Assembly in accordance with Section 2.1(3) of The Election Act.
- (4) Members of the committee shall receive remuneration in accordance with Section 59 of The Legislative Assembly Act.
- (5) Reasonable disbursements by the committee, for clerical assistance, equipment and supplies, advertising, rent, and other facilities required for the effective conduct of its responsibilities, shall be paid, subject to approval of the chairman, out of Vote 1.0.6. — Support to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the situation of course is that the legislation requires that a review of the appointment of the Chief Electoral Officer be done prior to March of next year. On that basis the work of the committee is both necessary and important. I am sure all hon. members understand the usefulness of having a legislative committee perform such duties. I think I need add no more in the sense of moving the motion and urging hon. members to support it.

[Motion carried]

20. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:

Be it resolved that the Assembly do resolve itself into Committee of Supply, when called, to consider the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research 1979-80 Estimates of Proposed Investments, of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, capital projects division, and that the message of His Honour the Honourable Lieutenant-Governor, the said estimates, and all matters connected therewith be referred to the said committee.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, insofar as this motion is essentially procedural, and will in future enable

estimates of the medical research foundation to be considered, I simply urge members to approve the motion.

[Motion carried]

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Minister of Agriculture revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

### head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

(*reversion*)

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege this morning to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, 30 grades 11 and 12 students from the Calmar high school, with their teacher Mr. Archer. They are seated in the members gallery. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

### head: GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS

(*Second Reading*)

#### Bill 62

#### The Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research Act

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 62 on the Order Paper, The Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research Act. It is my intention on second reading to review the background of the concept of this foundation; to analyse, to the extent I can, its implications in the area of medical sciences upon the scientific community in this province; and to look over the structure that has been established and how that structure that forms the basic nature of Bill 62 was derived.

Mr. Speaker, first I'd like to say that if the Legislature approves Bill 62, the passage will complete the platform commitments of the government in the election campaign of last year within a very short space of time. Secondly, it relates to matters I outlined in the Legislature on October 10, the opening of the fall session, with regard to the economic diversification of this province. One of the key areas was, of course, making Alberta a brain centre for Canada; this is a very key and integral part of the government's policy in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill establishes a foundation and an endowment fund. The interest revenue from the endowment fund will fund awards and grants-in-aid for medical research projects in the province.

During the course of developing this Bill for introduction in the Legislative Assembly, a great deal of work has been undertaken by me and my colleagues. I've worked with Dr. Jack Bradley, who has acted as a special adviser to me in the preparation of this Bill. We have held numerous meetings with members of the medical profession, the university community, and lay citizens, with regard to the development of the Bill and the structure. In addition, Dr. Bradley has travelled extensively throughout various parts of the world to receive input that would assist us in this very unique foundation concept. In addition to that — I will develop in more detail during the course of my remarks —



I've personally visited research establishments in the United Kingdom and had discussions with eminent scientists in the United States, and I've had the benefit of their advice with regard to this foundation. In addition, I have had an extensive day at the medical faculties of both the University of Calgary and the University of Alberta, and I had discussions with them related to their activities in research.

This is the background to the legislation that is before this House now. The nature of it is, first of all, to look at the why. It was our view that with the fortunate position of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund and the capital projects division, perhaps it would be possible for us to come up with a concept which would be beneficial not only to our economic objectives but to humanity in general, but without raising false expectations, of course. It was our judgment that the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund lent itself to a substantial investment in medical research. It was our view that in this province we had a very significant nucleus of very outstanding medical scientists to build upon. We were not really starting on a barren basis of development; a great deal had gone on.

Some members may ask, why medical research? First, as I've said, because the nucleus and potential are there to build upon. But a second reason is that historically in our country, support from the federal government for medical research has been very much up and down. It has tended to go in waves. And this has been — I don't think the word is exaggerated — discouraging to people who are involved in medical research throughout Canada and, perhaps even more important, discouraging to young people here in this province or elsewhere who might look at medical or scientific research as a lifetime career. It's that lack of continuity in terms of medical research that I believe is so much part of the "why" in our decision to proceed with what I consider to be extremely important legislation for the province of Alberta.

We felt that there must be a way in which we, with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, could make a contribution, not just to Alberta but to all of Canada and broader than that, and that a way of doing it was through supplementary support for medical research. Members of the Legislative Assembly, the investment income from this endowment fund would be equal to approximately 50 per cent of the total commitment to medical research through national organizations in this country at the moment. That is a very significant commitment, and I believe it is an appropriate contribution by the people of Alberta to all of Canada, and in this area, of course, we are involved in an international aspect of the benefit and communication that is involved.

I mentioned my two visits to our own facilities. I'm not sure whether I should specify at this stage — perhaps I should not — some of the very excellent work being done. It's exciting to see. In one way, perhaps it would be good to put in the record of *Hansard* the work being done right now, with the limited degree of support, in the faculties of medicine at our two universities. It's there, and it certainly needs to be encouraged. The work that has already been done is exciting. Mr. Speaker, surely that means that with the very substantial additional support that can flow from this foundation, this basic nucleus and the exciting work they're doing in a number of areas can develop

even further. As I say, I would like to mention to the Assembly some of the outstanding scientists and the work they're doing, but perhaps that's for another time and place. Suffice to say to the members of the Assembly that it is there, and I think it is really very significant in terms of a potential for the future.

Hon. members will be aware that in terms of facilities, we have seen the development of the medical faculty at the University of Calgary. We've seen their facilities; they have significant supplementary space for expanding their research capacity. It works in close proximity to the Foothills Hospital in Calgary. In addition to that, in 1976 we made a commitment, which hon. members will recall, to approve plans for a multimillion dollar health sciences centre at the University of Alberta. This is now in the process of construction and will form a very important facility base for the medical research foundation, in terms of researchers and the work they will do.

One of the first decisions we had to come to was, should we start with just medical sciences or should we broaden our approach at the outset? That is a very difficult decision, and there are different points of view, which I respect. However, everywhere we travelled the advice we received almost unanimously was to start with the defined area of medical sciences. After a number of years — and for obvious reasons I will refer to six or 10 as I proceed in my remarks on the Bill — if at that stage there is merit in broadening the scope to include what is defined as health sciences, I think it would be appropriate for our successors here in the Legislature to consider that matter. We felt, though, that in order to assure that adequate effort was being concentrated in terms of the management, the trustees, and the scientific community, at the outset at least we should have the area confined to medical sciences. I'm sure hon. members are aware that that in itself is a very broad area of activity. That's important to recognize.

The next decision we had to come to was: to what extent should we have this foundation working in conjunction with our university communities, in particular our medical faculties? It's been done differently in different parts of the world, but we felt that the right move for us was working through our medical faculties here and the related scientific faculties at the universities, in particular — without in any way putting down the University of Lethbridge, which I'm sure in time would have opportunities to participate — concentrated at the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary.

Because it's a team approach, in both cases we're dealing in conjunction with the teaching hospitals, the University Hospital and the Foothills Hospital. The co-ordination and co-operation is there and will continue to be there. It would be one of my objectives at the end of this fall session to meet with the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, the faculties involved, and the two hospitals I have mentioned. So in the early stages of this foundation, Mr. Speaker, the bulk of research work will be done within the milieu of the University of Calgary and the Foothills Hospital, and the University of Alberta and the University Hospital. But I can see a fairly logical evolution to other hospitals, particularly to specialist hospitals, and perhaps even beyond that to the sorts of things Dr. Bradley and I saw in Edinburgh, where over there a specialized project that is working evolves to a degree independ-

ent of the faculties themselves.

Now that involves a situation it's important the *Hansard* record reflect, that it is clearly aware and should be clearly understood by the university presidents and the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower that because of that, it is not in any way intended that the funding here should be disruptive of the global funding allocated to the universities and the various faculties. This is a distinct project on its own. The revenue will flow through the foundation to those involved.

The question of the teaching components at the two medical faculties will be, as it should properly be, a matter for discussion and review between those faculties and the universities' boards of governors in terms of the global funding. This is not and should not be construed in any way as a commitment to any supplementary funding from the teaching side, either at the medical faculties or with regard to any other faculties involved. They will make their submissions, but it will be a separate matter. It will not be a matter in which they will be able to submit to us that because of the foundation there should be extra funding for those other matters. They will have to make those arguments on their own merits. That needs to be said as part of the record, so there's no misunderstanding in the future.

University presidents are well aware of this challenge and the challenge involved in terms of having such a high component of research in certain designated faculties, the medical faculties in particular, and the recognition of pressures that may build from other related faculties relative to research. That is something which they will have to deal with and which the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower is aware of. So this foundation is for this defined purpose. It will be working, as we believe it should be, in close co-operation and close relationship with the medical faculties and the related sciences.

The next question is: how should the money be handled? This was a matter of extensive discussion. One view was that it should be merely a matter of annual appropriations here, with legislation, an annual commitment of appropriations of, say, \$30 million a year for 10 years, and that that is the approach used by governments generally in other parts of the world. Certainly, in American history I think it is fair to say that they have kept that commitment steadily through Congress, although pressures are building at the moment. On the other hand, we have seen the negatives of that on the Canadian side. So the annual appropriation argument was considered but rejected.

The next one was to establish an endowment fund of, say, \$300 million, and have the fund provide income revenue to the foundation for medical research. That is what we chose, for a number of reasons I'd like to outline to the members. But we'd made a very basic decision about investment policy, after the advice of a number of distinguished Albertans who have sat on boards and foundations of this nature — lay people, not scientists, who by their background perhaps would have a great deal of knowledge of investment. The advice we received at one of the dinners we had at Government House was, I think, very significant. It was described by one participant this way: if we leave to the lay trustees the question of investment of the \$300 million, you can visualize that at the meetings the trustees will have, the discussion, by the familiarity of it, will focus on the investment policy and, after that, on the difficult policy decisions on scientific priorities

and other matters.

The advice we received was: don't do that; leave those trustees to concentrate not on investment concerns but on the question of the very difficult matters for lay people to deal with, priorities and other matters relating to decisions relative to the foundation; then leave with the Provincial Treasurer and the Treasury Department the obligation to continue to invest, of course, as we are investing with regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and the General Revenue Fund. That was the decision we made, and that is the process that appears within Bill 62.

The next matter was: how do we assure that this fund is as far at arm's length from the emotions, variables, and other factors of political pressures as it is possible for us to do? I feel very strongly about this because of the discussions I've had. We therefore have structured a Bill that has reflected what we think is the maximum degree of arm's length from the Legislature to the foundation. Why? For a couple of reasons, obviously.

First of all because if the basic success and progress of this foundation is going to depend upon people, those people must be satisfied with regard to the continuity of the foundation in a number of ways. That again goes to the concept of an endowment fund, a fund where we would not merely be appropriating \$30 million a year and then nothing at the end of 10 years, but an endowment fund that would still be \$300 million at the end of 10 years. I'll come to the inflationary factors later.

So that was one aspect. Then there was the other: the very history we've had in Canada of the ups and downs of medical research support and the concern with regard to that because, as I say, the real success and progress of this foundation will depend upon people, scientific people, being satisfied, being assured both of the continuity of the funding and of the fact that the decision-making is decision-making that, to the minimum degree acceptable to the citizens of Alberta, comes from the variables of political pressure.

Therefore, what have we done within Bill 62? We have set it up that there will be an annual financial report to be audited by the Auditor General, but the review by the Legislative Assembly will be only every three years, and every three years by the select legislative committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund; and that there will not be a minister designated to be responsible to answer questions in this House, that a minister will be designated only to place into this Legislature that annual report, which will be made public and will deal with the fiscal affairs.

Mr. Speaker, what we have then proposed is an international board of review of distinguished international scientists — and we're satisfied we can attract them — who can review the progress of this foundation at about the sixth year of its operation. The report of the international board of review would then form the basis of discussion and assessment, intensively I'm sure, by the select committee of this Legislature at that six-year point. It is at that point, too, that I would hope the Legislature would assess whether or not the corpus or capital of the fund is adequate.

We felt that gives adequate opportunity for the foundation to start, in its embryo stages, to develop through and set up its organizations and by-laws, and to create the scientific advisory committee that I'll mention in just a few moments. I think all of that is required in terms of a period of time for a foundation

of this nature. I think it is unfair and not valid to expect them to provide, so to speak, results of a project of this nature on a short-term basis. That's not the way scientific research works.

Just as one example, when I was in the United Kingdom at the National Institute for Medical Research, I saw a group of four, I believe it was, who were working on just one particular project for 10 years. As they said, they hadn't got that far yet. The question of that project was: why is it that when you have damage to the brain, the recovery of that is entirely different than it is in other parts of the human body? Why? They had been working on that one, isolated question for a decade. I mention that by way of example so that hon. members can be aware that there should not be an expectation of the sort of headline breakthroughs, even with the exciting work going on, because other groups have gone on in this work all over the world and have continued with it. We're talking about a balance between basic and clinical research. So I say they need that time without pressure from this Legislature or from the public, and that is fundamental to the Bill and underlines the structure in which we have presented the Bill.

In short, we are saying \$300 million to a foundation; all that income is available to the foundation; and yes, in essence, we lose control of that as a commitment of an endowment fund for that period of time. At the end of three years, I would hope that this Legislature would consider that carefully, and that it is at the end of the six-year period that that assessment should really take place, despite public pressure that may develop to do it in a contrary way. I think that's important to the whole structure of what we're involved with here.

That brings me, of course, to the Bill itself. The basic purpose of the Bill is set out in the document. It is set out in some detail, Mr. Speaker, for the very reason I've mentioned, that we're launching this foundation.

Before I deal with the basic purpose as set forth in Section 3 of the Bill, let me present to the Legislature who the foundation will be, because that's important as well. The foundation is described in Section 2 in terms of the nature of the trustees and their appointments. There will be five citizens at large, probably all lay citizens, appointed by the provincial government at the outset, for a term of not more than five years. There will be four nominees: one nominee of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the province of Alberta, one nominee of the governors of the University of Alberta, one nominee of the governors of the University of Calgary, and one nominee of the board of trustees of the Medical Services Research Foundation of Alberta which, you'll recall, was the funding group involved in medical research, the outgrowth of the MSI organization.

At that stage the government would be appointing four, but on or after January 1, 1985, the government would appoint only four, the other institutions would appoint four, and those eight would appoint a ninth and elect a chairman. So that move at the end of five years is a further case in which the government, hence the Legislature, steps back from control of the foundation.

I believe the objects of the foundation should be read into the record. It's obvious why they should be read into the record, Mr. Speaker. The trustees are going to have to sit down with this obligation and say, now, what are our objects? So a great deal of time has been

spent on the objects clause:

The objects of the Foundation are to establish and support a balanced long-term program of medical research based in Alberta directed to the discovery of new knowledge and the application of that knowledge to improve health and the quality of health services in Alberta and, without limiting the generality of those objects, to

- (a) stimulate research in medical sciences,
- (b) implement effective means of using in Alberta the scientific resources available in medical sciences,
- (c) support medical research laboratories and related facilities in Alberta,
- (d) promote co-operation in research in medical sciences in order to minimize duplication in, and promote concentration of effort in that research, and
- (e) encourage young Albertans to pursue careers in research in medical sciences.

Just a couple of words, Mr. Speaker, about these objects of the foundation, which outline the purpose of the foundation. One would note the encouragement of young Albertans — and I suppose at committee stage we could debate the phrase "young". Still feeling young, I believe that covers a wide spectrum of Albertans.

To comment next on the question of duplication, as it was put to me in my travels duplication is to avoid unnecessary duplication. But it is clear from the visits we've had that duplication is not to be avoided at all costs, that it is part of the scientific community in this world today for people to be launched on the same tasks towards the same goals, but they're approaching them in different ways. Where they might not succeed here, they would succeed there. So a certain degree of that duplication — what some might call duplication — is in order and very appropriate.

I have been so impressed listening to people in the scientific community. I remember my conversation with Dr. Martin when I was at Harvard with regard to the fact that there is a flow of information that constantly goes on. They're travelling and communicating all the time. It's a flow within the scientific community. So a certain element of duplication is desirable, and that is implicit in it. What we're saying with regard to subparagraph (d) is to avoid unnecessary duplication.

That covers the basic thrust of the objects, the arm's length, and the structure of the board of governors. Because it's important both at committee stage and second reading, Mr. Speaker, let me now make reference specifically to the fact that the Bill outlines powers, and a number of them are listed in the Bill. One is to:

make grants or loans to any person or organization for a purpose consistent with the objects of the Foundation.

There is provision for the establishment of a scientific advisory committee of 11 scientists, of whom some would be here in Alberta, some would be other Canadians, and some would be international. We would expect the foundation would pull together this scientific advisory committee as quickly as possible.

One of their very first tasks would be to make an assessment of what is going on now, to make a decision as to what work being done now should be further encouraged, and to make a decision as to fields

not being pursued now in Alberta that should also be encouraged by way of priorities. Secondly, we would expect the scientific advisory committee to advise the foundation as to the way in which grants should be given, the structuring of grants. Specific proposals have already been made to me and to Dr. Bradley by the medical faculties as to the nature of the particular grants that might be awarded and the way in which they might be conceived. I would develop that in a moment as well.

Returning, then, from the scientific advisory committee to the powers, one of the other important powers is to:

fund in whole or in part research professorships or chairs established for a purpose consistent with the objects of the Foundation, at any university in Alberta

So that is a power of the foundation, one we anticipate they would be doing.

In both the cases I've mentioned — the making of grants and the funding of professorships and chairs — I hope it's evident to the Members of the Legislative Assembly that we anticipate the funding being used primarily to fund people, ancillary equipment and ancillary support, probably generally in the nature of units, but not always. There will obviously be cases of people who will be working on isolated research projects. So the funding is essentially from an operational point of view.

Although the Bill does not raise this matter, it should be said that it is the position of the government of Alberta that there is adequate space available now for the research facilities contemplated in the near term. However — I want the *Hansard* record to note this — if the development of the foundation requires additional capital facilities, it would be my hope that this Legislature would authorize at the time such submissions were made, with the endorsement of the foundation and the scientific advisory committee, any further allocation of funding in addition to the endowment fund, whether it would flow through the Premier, or in this case it probably would flow through the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it is not contemplated that the investment income from the endowment fund would be called upon for major capital requirements. That, if necessary, should come by special appropriation of this Legislature at the time. That's not to say that a significant portion of the annual investment income wouldn't flow for equipment and other related facilities to support a research unit.

Mr. Speaker, another power of the foundation is to:

enter into any patent agreements, royalty agreements, or commercial marketing agreements that may be considered by the trustees to be in the best interests of the Foundation

It is conceived that there would be breakthroughs. Chembiomed Ltd., in the support of the government of Alberta, is perhaps an example of that, where you move from a discovery to the commercialization of that discovery. It would be the foundation, working with its scientific advisory committee, that would enter into whatever patent agreements they believe are in the best interests of all involved. It would be the foundation, not this Legislative Assembly, that would be involved in the determination of what royalty agreements were appropriate and what commercial arrangements were made. That would be the power of the foundation, not

of this Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, there is also, obviously, the provision in the Act for the making of by-laws. Those by-laws do not need or are not required to have the approval of the Legislature or the Executive Council. Included in those by-laws are the by-laws:

respecting the procedures to be followed for the approval of projects within the research priorities established by the Foundation

I want to add those provisions, to underline again the arm's-length nature of this foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I have dealt in my remarks with the nature of the awards that might be made or the grants that might emanate. We have had proposals, and at committee stage of the Bill I'd be happy to discuss the nature of the categories of awards for research personnel that have been proposed by the two universities. But I would leave that for the committee stage, because I think it deals more precisely with how they might function.

I'd like to conclude my remarks about this important Bill with these observations. First, what is necessary with this piece of legislation, and with this endowment fund, is to create an atmosphere or climate which will stimulate medical research and stimulate young Albertans to have careers in this area. It will too, in my view, probably attract scientists from other parts of the world to come to Alberta. I would hope — and we have had some encouragement in this — that it would attract back to Alberta a surprising number of talented Albertans who have their roots in this province and have moved, most of them to the United States, because of the degree of support in this scientific area evident in that country as compared to this. Attract them back here. In discussion with some of the people who have been involved, in fact, their anxiety to move this foundation into action as quickly as possible — they just can't wait to get out on the recruiting trail to see what they can do about attracting them back to Alberta.

Mr. Speaker and members of the Assembly, over the decades we've had a brain drain to the United States. I think we're changing a fair number of things in Canada. Certainly, that can get us into a number of other subjects as well, as to what we're changing. But one thing we are also starting to change is that whole concept of the brain drain to the United States. I think one of the very exciting possibilities I'll look back on, in terms of presenting this Bill to the Legislature, is that in a very clear and specific way it may reverse that, to the benefit of this country as well as to this province.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to conclude with my final references to the Bill. I've said what it's not. It is not a supplementary funding for universities, it's not to displace voluntary fund-raising organization efforts, and it's not to supplement the traditional funding available to researchers in Canada from the Medical Research Council and other government departments.

But what it is is very significant. It will be a major supplement to Alberta in making this a brain centre in Canada. I believe it will attract young Albertans into lifetime research careers in science. It will provide both the continuity and security so necessary for those researchers, with the lack of interference from government or the Legislature. It could enhance the quality of life of people everywhere. And it will in time, I hope and I believe, make Alberta an outstanding medical research centre in the world.

I believe it's a very important piece of legislation. I submit it to hon. members, and ask for your support.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in taking part in the debate on second reading of Bill 62, The Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research Act, I want to say at the outset that it's the intention of my colleagues and me to support the Bill in second reading. It's also our intention to look carefully at the remarks which the sponsor of the Bill, the Premier, has made today. I look forward with considerable interest to the debate in committee, because I think a number of areas need to be examined carefully.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a number of comments today, after saying two things. First, my colleagues and I plan to support the Bill in second reading. Secondly, I want to go back and have an opportunity to look very, very carefully at the comments the sponsor of the Bill has made, especially in the area dealing with control of the Legislature and accountability to the Legislature with regard to this piece of legislation.

After making those two comments, Mr. Speaker, let me say that we project the benefits of the Bill, first of all, to improve the opportunity for high quality medical research in Alberta for Albertans. But I also think that as members of this Assembly and as Albertans, we should not lose the opportunity to point out that in fact that this has the potential to be a very significant contribution that Alberta can make to the rest of Canada. That's the point that all of us should continue to keep in mind.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that improved health care for Albertans due to the improved quality of medical research in this province and in this country stands to benefit all of us.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, we should not expect any miracle cures overnight. I very much agree with the comments the Premier made about false expectations. It's very easy, especially for politicians but not only for politicians, to attempt on occasions — regardless of where one may sit politically; I could even add that — it's very tempting on occasions to give the impression that we're going to solve problems overnight, very quickly. If there's one area that this absolutely can't be done, it's in this area of research, especially medical research.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that as enthusiastic as the government is with regard to this legislation, I think this legislation would have had even more impact as far as the broad research area in Alberta had it been part of an overall research or science policy for Alberta. On several occasions in the past members have heard me, if I might use the word, chide the government for not coming forward with its overall science policy that had been outlined in several past speeches from the throne. Casting that aside, I simply make the point that, as deserving of support as this legislation is, if it could be seen as part of an overall science policy for Alberta I think it would be even stronger than the legislation we're being asked to support on second reading.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us have to recognize that with this amount of money available for medical research, this is going to cause some very serious strains within the financing of the medical schools at our universities. On one hand, we're going to find other faculties looking extremely enviously at the faculties of medicine. It will be essential to guard the faculties of

medicine, if I might use that word advisedly, from what some people in medicine would interpret, I suppose, as raids from other faculties. And I use the word "raids" in a rather offhand manner.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment there is need for co-ordination between the departments of Advanced Education and of Hospitals and Medical Care, and the other government agencies that deal with this whole question of financing to our universities. In question period today I raised the question about the fact that medical faculties, as I understand it, now beat the doors to a number of government departments.

Once this legislation is in place, it seems to me the government would be very wise to sit down and reassess the wisdom of that kind of approach, not only for the good of the medical research foundation but from the standpoint of the medical faculties at the universities and the universities themselves. In the discussions I've had with people at the universities, in both the Faculty of Medicine and other faculties, one of the questions that comes very quickly from people in other faculties who are interested in research is about the kinds of funds that are going to be available for medical research, as opposed to the kinds of funds that will be available for other, non-medical but certainly worthy, research in the province. There I go back to the point I made about an overall science policy for the province.

Mr. Speaker, I think the role of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund in the course of accountability needs to be commented on from three points. Despite the fact that there's reference in this legislation to a role to be played by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, I think it would be a mistake to say that the Heritage Savings Trust Fund select legislative committee could concern itself only every third year with what's being done under Bill 62. I think the select committee would not be living up to its full obligation if in fact the committee looked only every third year at what was being done in the area of the medical research Act.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier made several references to the need to keep the foundation separate — at arm's length was the term used, I think — from the Legislative Assembly. I agree with the argument that there's a need for continuity. There's a need for independence from, if we can refer to them, the political whims of the moment.

But, Mr. Speaker, let no person or no group — be they politicians, members of the board of the foundation, or researchers — forget that what this Legislature does, this Legislature can undo. It must be that way. That is by no means a threat to what we're discussing here today. But I think it should be made abundantly clear that in the attempt to have arm's length for the foundation, there's a danger in what the Premier said today that we may end up with arm's length from the Legislature, but there can't be arm's length from the Provincial Treasurer, from the Premier, or from the cabinet, because the Treasurer is in fact responsible for the investments. The Premier, as chairman of Executive Council, is responsible for the people who are to be appointed to the board.

Mr. Speaker, I file this caveat here. I want to look at *Hansard* to review the Premier's remarks, but I would be very fearful if what we're substituting here is some kind of rather broad legislative accountability as opposed to a more narrow accountability which would be

at the executive level. That's a point I want to check. It may very well be an area of some discussion during committee study.

After saying that, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that I too recognize the need for us to have an arm's length relationship. But I would say that there isn't a member in this Assembly who wouldn't benefit a great deal from a far greater understanding of research and of university operations, not only in the area of medical research. But as MLAs, regardless of where we sit in this Assembly, for us to become far better informed on a reasonable, sensible basis as to what's going on, not only in the area of medical research but in a wide variety of other research areas, would in fact do all of us good.

Mr. Speaker, one of the concerns I had before the Bill was introduced was the question: is the \$300 million endowment enough? There's no question in my mind that in the initial years what will become, in essence, close to \$30 million available would be sufficient. But as commitments are made and as inflation continues, the purchasing value of that \$30 million, using that as a figure for interest, has to be assessed when it comes to equipment and ongoing research. I note the assessment made suggestion in the legislation that that could be done by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee when it receives the report. It seems to me that the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee must exercise the responsibility to make that kind of judgment in its recommendation to the Legislature at any time. I think any other member should also look at that responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated, it's my intention to become involved in committee discussion of the Bill. Our overall support for the Bill is very positive. I think it's a move in the right direction.

As far as development of patents is concerned, I would say to the sponsor of the Bill and to the government that it may be necessary for us to do more than simply make it possible for the foundation to enter into agreements. I would hope that in addition to medical research, one of the benefits of this would be the development of a scientific industry in the province, if I may use that term, which would take the advances which are developed and become involved in the practical application thereof, and that practical application would in fact be centred here in Alberta. This is somewhat outside the scope of this Bill, but be it the Minister of Economic Development or whatever other department would have the responsibility, that should not be lost.

In the past a number of very talented young Albertans have left Alberta and gone to other parts of this continent for not only research opportunities but opportunities to take the next step once the research work has been done, which is the practical application. We should not miss that opportunity as far as Alberta and Albertans are concerned. It's my sincere hope that a number of young Albertans who have left Alberta because of a shortage of research funds will see their way clear to come back to the province. It's also my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the course of talking about this legislation in Alberta and outside the province, all of us would emphasize the potential benefit not only to Alberta but to all of us as Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, the last comment I would make on second reading of this Bill is to say to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower: Mr. Minister, in

addition to Alberta becoming a "brain centre" for Canada, just what we're doing here isn't enough. It's going to be essential that we take some steps in funding our postsecondary educational institutions. Because of the kinds of opportunities that are being missed now in a number of faculties where we have quotas — I go back to a point we've made repeatedly in this Assembly — a number of young Albertans are not able to get into university today, not because they haven't the marks but because artificial quotas have been imposed. We've spent a great deal of time in this Assembly arguing over whose fault it is. Regardless of whose fault it is, in the end the real losers are those young Albertans who have academic accomplishments and ability but don't have these opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I too would urge members to support the Bill on second reading, and look forward to committee study.

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a member who from time to time has the odd difference with government, I certainly welcome the opportunity to rise today and support very strongly the principle contained in Bill 62, The Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research Act. While I will make a number of remarks in the form of questions and concerns that have been brought to my attention, that does not alter my intention to vote for this piece of legislation. And I would be less than chivalrous if I didn't indicate to the government my congratulations on moving in an important area, not only for this province but for Canada.

One of the observations made by the Premier in introducing the Bill probably needs to be reinforced by many of us as we take part in this debate; that is, over the years, the commitment to medical research in Canada has been a red-light, green-light situation, and often the red light has been on. You can't possibly develop any kind of coherent research in any field, let alone medical research, if the entire commitment is subject to the ebbs and flows of either of public opinion or of government policy, for that matter.

Mr. Speaker, that's why I would have to say that I too gave some consideration to whether it might not be better to deal with a foundation where there was an annual appropriation from the Legislature. But I think that perhaps we are taking the right course by setting up an endowment where the funds will be allocated on an annual basis, quite apart from the fiscal problems that a future government of Alberta may encounter down the road. I think the government is taking the right approach in this respect.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do suggest that one of the questions raised by the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks and alluded to by the Premier when he introduced the Bill — but as I listened to him, I don't really think he had an opportunity to expand upon it — is the impact of inflation and how we propose to deal with, if you like, maintaining the purchasing power of the interest from the endowment fund. If the present rate of inflation continues over a period of 10 years, Mr. Speaker, in 1989 that amount of \$30 million will be significantly less important in terms of medical research than it is in 1979. So I think it is important that the Premier deal specifically with that issue when he closes the debate.

Mr. Speaker, having said that Canada's track record is not good, a number of issues have been brought to

my attention by people in the research community in Alberta. I'd like to share some of those observations and concerns with other hon. members of the Assembly.

Perhaps the most important concern really deals with the issue of the environment in which this foundation will operate, not only the medical faculties at the University of Calgary and the University of Alberta, the Foothills Hospital and the University Hospital, but the entire associated academic and scientific community. Mr. Speaker, really I suggest to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower that we are going to have to be very careful to make sure that we do not inadvertently impose our restraint program in such a way that people who are presently vital to this effort are lost to the province of Alberta.

I cite examples right now in the city of Edmonton. It's my understanding that this year three top people have left the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Alberta. It's been brought to my attention that the last settlement with the academic staff was in the neighborhood of 6 per cent. However exciting the concept of this endowment may be, we are not going to retain in Alberta medical scientists or any other kind of scientists if the salary settlements lag significantly behind the cost of living. I would say that while the Premier has been careful this morning to suggest that this is not supplementary university funding, nevertheless we cannot divorce the fact that if we are to make this foundation a success, we have to have the people.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of retaining those people in an economy such as Alberta's, where over the next 10 years we're likely to see a very substantial boom — it's undoubtedly probable that wages in the private sector will move ahead very rapidly. I'm being told now that in northern Alberta some oil companies are offering up to \$75,000 a year to attract tool pushers to look after oil rigs. The problem, and I think it really has to be addressed by this government, is that if we bring in a serious restraint program that continues in the next several years a system of wages and salaries less than the cost of living on one hand, while on the other hand we have very substantial increases in the private sector, then we're going to have problems. We're going to have problems, keeping not only the scientific community but the support personnel who will be required to make this major project a success.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the most important observations that can be made is that both the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower and the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care are going to have to be very cognizant of the need to maintain the network of people required. Research is really a product of a network. The Premier mentioned that much of the research will be allocated to units, and that's true, because it is very much a network situation. But you know, if we lose key people from that network, we can very quickly set back the research for some period of time. I want to stress that point, Mr. Speaker, because almost without exception, the people I have discussed this with at both major universities have underscored the observation I have made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to some of the details of the Act, on which I'll have an opportunity to question the Premier during committee stage, I first of all want to deal with the foundation board of trustees. While we have representation from the College of Physicians and Surgeons and from what is the outgrowth of MSI — and I certainly think this is proper

— we have only two people who in fact are appointments from the boards of governors of the universities.

The concern, the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, and I'd welcome the Premier to respond: if we have two people on the board from the active practice of medicine, should we not ensure that we have at least that many who are practising scientists? At this stage of the game, what we're doing is — it's really up to the board of governors. The board of governors may very well choose people from this milieu. But if we're talking about a medical research foundation, it strikes me that if we're going to have the proper balance on the board of trustees — we already have the five people representing the public as a whole — should we not in fact single out people from the scientific, as opposed to the treatment or active practice section of the medical community?

Mr. Speaker, the arm's length issue has been discussed by the Leader of Opposition. I think there are certain concerns that we should express as members of the Assembly, but in the main they can be properly debated at committee stage. I would agree that it is necessary to maintain an arm's length relationship, if for no other reason than the track record with respect to medical research in Canada. Right now, I'm sure, the vast majority of people would be solidly in favor of a very substantial commitment to medical research. But after several years if we find there haven't been the kinds of breakthroughs — and I think we all have to be very careful, when we talk about this in our constituencies and throughout the province, not to mislead people that simply setting up a \$300 million medical research foundation is going to mean one great breakthrough after another. And I couldn't agree more with some of the comments that have been made.

But I suppose the problem that many of us honestly have to reconcile as members of the Assembly is the need for accountability on one hand, yet on the other the fear that if we have in fact too much meddling, too close a relationship, we're simply going to be getting into that stop-go, red-light, green-light arrangement that has characterized and, I think, crippled medical research in Canada. I think that is the kind of dichotomy, if you like, that probably troubles many of us.

I would just like to make one further observation. When I first heard about this international board of review of top scientists, I had to confess I was a little sceptical. Why do we really need an international board of review? But upon reflection, I think there is some real merit, particularly if we have the recommendations from the international board of review, so that the select committee is able fully to review this report from people who are clearly in a position to evaluate the operation of the foundation. Very few of us in this House would even pretend to be pretentious enough to say that we have the background knowledge to be in a position to offer any kind of judgment on whether the foundation has worked well or not. Perhaps the value of this international board of review is that we will have the context placed, so that as we assess it, we're in a better position to do so.

Mr. Speaker, just one final point. It's a relatively small one that could be raised in committee, but I think I'll raise it now. I notice that the board of trustees is being paid. When it comes to the scientific advisory committee, they "may" be paid. I would say that the scientific advisory committee, because the subcommit-

tees under the scientific advisory committee are going to be the panels to review applications — while I hardly think this is a major case that will decide the fate of the Bill, I was puzzled as to why we are not going to provide remuneration to these people. I would argue that much of the really effective work of this foundation is going to be carried out by the Scientific Advisory Council.

Mr. Speaker, having made those observations, though, the fact of the matter is that Bill 62 is an important first. I think it's a first that all members of the House can be proud of. It is an appropriate investment for the heritage trust fund. It's an investment that is not only of value to the people of Alberta and to the people of Canada, but as we improve medical research, however small this may be in the context of worldwide medical research, I think it is a contribution to people throughout the world. As such, it merits the support not only of members in this House but of the people of Alberta.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, it is for me a particular pleasure to rise and speak on second reading of Bill 62, establishing the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research. The hon. Premier has very fully described the foundation, its structure, and its objects.

As we all know, medical research is a bit of a motherhood issue. Over the years it has attracted the attention, support, and devoted work of a myriad of individuals who go out and raise funds for the Cancer Society, the Heart Foundation, the Multiple Sclerosis Society, just to mention three individually. These dedicated organizations have supported medical research over the years. In addition, there has been the support of the individually funded foundations. There are the internationally famous ones such as the Sloan-Kettering Institute in New York. But there are also ones in Alberta like the Muttart Foundation, funded originally by Mr. and Mrs. Merrill Muttart of this city.

In spite of the efforts of these two groups, the organizations and the individual foundations, there has always been a place and a need for government funding of medical research. The Medical Research Council in Great Britain and the similar organization in Canada are examples of this, and of course we all know the tremendous amounts of money the U.S. government has repeatedly voted for medical research. In fact, the U.S. government has a better record than the other two governments I just mentioned, in that they have never fallen down on the commitment. I sadly have to say that both the government of Great Britain and the government of Canada have not kept up their commitments over the years.

The very nature of that governmental support, and the support of the charitable foundations, has meant that they are unable or unwilling to make the long-term commitments required for basic research in medical sciences. As a result, it is possible that the two major problems of such research stem from that lack of long-term commitment. First of all, there is the tendency to publish or perish. The two deans of medicine, who I believe are sitting above me, know full well what that means. There is also the pressure on the researcher to spin off into any developmental research channel that may open up, so he can produce some "results" to justify the continued expenditure of funds. In view of the magnitude of the foundation proposed under this Act, and the magnitude of the annual income available

for distribution to researchers, I would hope that people funded by this foundation will not have those pressures upon them.

Therefore, I was somewhat interested in the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition on accountability to this Legislature. I had the impression from the Premier's remarks that what we were about was precisely to remove that accountability at frequent intervals, in order to do what I was just speaking about, remove those pressures for early publication and for swinging into developmental research. I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition will take my remarks under consideration when we come to committee study of this Bill.

The Bill introduces a foundation which almost exactly fits the first purpose of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund as listed in Section 6 of that Act: to invest in projects which will not return an investment or an income to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, but in those capital or social projects which are to the benefit of Albertans.

Among the many objects of the Bill, as presented by the hon. Premier, are the stimulation of medical research and the encouragement of young Albertans to take up careers in medical research. If that isn't an investment in the future, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is. I have known Tim Cameron and Lionel McLeod for over 20 years. They are both interested in research; that's why they are deans of medical faculties. I know that both of them will do their best to follow up on the allocation of these funds by recruiting the best people available. Initially some of them will be from outside Alberta, and indeed may well be returning Albertans. But in the future, I would hope and trust that the major staffing of the research projects funded by this foundation will be by young Albertans. The Premier has gray hair, and I don't have much, but I think we both classify ourselves as young.

Mr. Speaker, there is another facet of this foundation which I think should especially be drawn to the attention of the people of this province and, indeed, this country. If — and I'll use the word "if", because it is a possibility — if there are substantial benefits from the results of the research funded by this foundation, those results and the benefits will apply not just to Albertans and to Canadians; they will apply to everybody who lives on this planet. Just as the research by other foundations I have mentioned has been used for the benefit of Albertans, the Alberta medical research foundation will hopefully benefit all the people who live on this earth.

Mr. Speaker, it is a tradition of parliamentary bodies such as this that all remarks are addressed through the Speaker. This tradition commenced, I believe, to prevent personal insult, duels, and thereby depletion of the parliamentary and legislative bodies. It does, however, enable one to make remarks of a more complimentary nature which one might not make because of natural reticence. Bill 62 has been introduced by the hon. Premier, and I feel it's probable that in future, the judgment of history will be that among the major achievements of the governments he has led, along with the concept of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, will be the setting up of this foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my feeling that it is most suitable that this particular Bill has been introduced, and will be taken through this Legislature, by the Premier of the province. He has had a long-term interest in medical research, and I think it's



most suitable that he is steering the Bill through.

Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure both to endorse this Bill and to commend it to other members of this Assembly for their consideration. Thank you.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, on rising to support the second reading of this Bill, I really do feel that this is one of the times in the history of a province, and indeed of a nation, that is of great significance. I echo the sentiments just expressed very eloquently by the hon. Member for Edson.

Because of the importance of this legislation to the particular portfolio for which I am responsible, I think it's important that I take a few moments to express how I and my department see this Bill affecting the universities in this province. When I look at the universities we have, I am indeed very proud of the services they are providing, first to the students who attend those institutions — because after all, that's really why universities and colleges exist; I've always said that's the primary reason — secondly for the greater society, all of us and our fellow men, served by those institutions. Simply stated, I think there are three basic elements to universities. They are teaching, research, and scholarly study; that covers quite a territory.

What we're talking about in this legislation is research. I'll come back to it later, because it will have an impact upon the other elements, in particular on the teaching aspect of universities. This Act, however, provides the framework within which our Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund may be used to support a long-term program for medical research based in this province. Of course, this will have both immediate and long-term effects upon the research and, as I've said, eventually on the teaching programs in the universities of Alberta and Calgary, and upon the associated teaching hospitals in both cities. The Premier, of course, has mentioned that.

All of us here today, as Albertans and Canadians, sincerely hope that the outcome of these endeavors will be to improve health and enhance the quality of life and of health services available to Albertans, Canadians, and the world. That's the challenge we have before us with this legislation.

I'm confident that the framework outlined in this Bill will ensure that our resources are wisely and carefully deployed to the best advantage. I support the formation of a Scientific Advisory Council and an international board of review to assure that the best decisions possible are made with respect to these research activities, and with respect to the evaluation criteria which are applied.

These funds will further the development of scientific communities in both major cities in Alberta, and attract the best people available to Alberta. Much has been said about that by other speakers today. Many people have indicated they are anxious to see young Albertans participating. In the galleries today I notice young people who are attending school now and will hopefully move on to our colleges and universities. Perhaps one of these young people here today will some day be responsible for a major scientific breakthrough in the field of medical research. I hope that will be the case, and I hope there will be many more taking place as a result of this dramatic new program. So we want to attract the best people available to Alberta, but we also want to make it available to Albertans.

Our universities are now facing a tremendous op-

portunity to develop world-class programs for this research through teaching, and I'll come to that. Extensive consultations have already taken place with the university and hospital authorities, to ensure that there will be co-ordination and co-operation of these research activities. I'm convinced that extremely good relationships now exist between those institutions, and that that in itself will be conducive to the successful use of these funds and a continuation of the working relationship.

Certainly there will be strains; certainly there will be challenges. But I am convinced that men and women who are in the field today at our universities are people of good will, and that they will recognize and respond meaningfully to the challenge in the future.

The members of the opposition have mentioned the challenges we'll be facing. I want to say that as Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, I recognize that. There's no question in my mind about that. I will be discussing this foundation further with the universities to ensure that our anticipated research expenditures, which may amount to more than double the funds currently allocated to the faculties of medicine, will not have a distorting effect upon our ongoing instructional and teaching programs.

I am a little concerned, Mr. Speaker, with something brought into this discussion today by members of the opposition; that is, a suggestion that perhaps this research funding will become part of a collective bargaining process in the regular university funding programs. Mr. Speaker, we cannot permit that to happen. Quite frankly, I'm disturbed to see this sort of suggestion being subtly introduced into the debate today.

For the life of me, Mr. Speaker — you cannot attract to Alberta somebody who may be receiving far in excess of what other members of the faculty here are now receiving, and expect that that will logically lead up other salaries being paid in the regular budgeting process of the institutions. I want to say to members of this Assembly right now that if we think that's going to happen, we will be undermining the very principles of this whole foundation and this legislation. So be very careful, my colleagues and members of this Assembly, in dealing with the aspect of this legislation that has been introduced in debate today.

But I do expect that graduate programs, in particular in faculties such as medicine and the related sciences — I think that's very important. The Premier mentioned this, but I'd like to underline that there are related scientific activities in medical research, biomedical engineering and so on, that will be greatly enhanced through our attracting the best scholars and researchers in the scientific community.

The universities — and I underline this — the universities currently allocate to their medical faculties: at the University of Calgary about \$5 million a year, and at the University of Alberta \$10 million a year. The universities allocate those funds, not this Assembly. It seems to me that a lot of distortion goes on in speeches in this House by members of the opposition, that somehow or other my department or this government allocates funding to the institutions' faculties. We don't, and I'm not going to start doing it. I hope you don't expect that to happen. I just want to make that very clear. I recognize that if we pass this Bill and fund it at \$300 million, the heritage foundation will probably generate some additional \$30 million a year, much

of which will be expended in the university community. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, we can't mix the two, as some have tried to do today.

Finally, I believe that this heritage foundation is being established in recognition of the strengths we now have in our universities and teaching hospitals. It constitutes demonstrable evidence of how the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund is being put to work to improve our knowledge base and thereby enhance the quality of life not only for Albertans but for all people in the world.

Now I'd like to say how teaching will come into this. Research by itself is exceedingly useful, but when new knowledge comes forward from that research and study, it has to be taught. We recognize very clearly that that knowledge has to be passed on, and it will be. Therefore I underline the fact that through this research we will be able to move further in instruction and teaching. But it's not going to be done with the moneys that come from the research foundation. It will come from the regular budgeting process that we go through in this government which, as I've said before, is the most generous of any province in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this is a tremendous opportunity for Albertans presently here, for young people in the gallery and in our schools, universities, and colleges today. For Albertans who've had to leave this province to go elsewhere and for other Canadians and people throughout the world who want to come to Alberta, our doors are open. The challenges presented to us today are almost unlimited.

Therefore I urge all members to support this Bill and the very important principles which lie behind it. As we proceed with further study, perhaps I'll have more to say, and I'm sure the Premier will have. I look forward to committee study.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak in strong support of The Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research Act, I would like to say at the outset that I just have to disagree on one point the Premier indicated. He indicated to the House that we're launching this new Bill as if it were an embryo. I suggest it's a full-grown baby. With all the medical research scientists we have in this province, they're kicking well and ready to go.

But seriously, Mr. Speaker, this Bill exemplifies, in a very fresh way, the important value, both short- and long-term, that we place on the heritage fund for the generation now, our youth, and future generations. It further demonstrates a responsibility far beyond the borders of Alberta. It indicates responsibility, not only to Albertans and Canadians but to people around the world. It's truly a sharing and a giving in a very humble way which, I frankly suggest to members of the Assembly if they contemplate it for just a minute, cannot be measured. It provides the recognition of what we're talking about here, human health; not only the paramount importance of this entity for our citizens, but a determination to provide this in a way that is second to none in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, when we reflect on this Bill, as we should indeed as we're focussing on it today and in Committee of the Whole, we must remind ourselves that it is in addition to some \$1 billion budgeted for Hospitals and Medical Care; some \$200 million for public health care, for alcoholic and drug care, and through our community health services; some \$100

million we have already allocated this year via the heritage fund for various projects — cancer hospitals, children's hospitals, the W. C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre, and cardiovascular research. We allocated approximately \$100 million for that area last year. It's in addition to the total parameter of activities we're carrying on in this province in the area of food, clothing, shelter, recreation, social security, education, freedoms, and so forth.

The hon. Member for Edson indicated a compliment to the Premier; indeed, he deserves a compliment because if he'll be remembered for any activity in this province, it will be for the heritage fund and for this medical research fund that I'm sure will serve future generations for years to come, not only in Alberta but across Canada and the world. Of course he will also be remembered for The Individual's Rights Protection Act and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's vital that we in Alberta keep that perspective. That perspective is a commitment the legislators here are embarking on, but it's more important that we also acknowledge that we are here as trustees of the citizens of Alberta, who allowed us to do this. In Alberta we are able to share wealth: \$15 billion in 1973-79 via oil revenues, loans to other provinces. And now we have the medical research for all humans wherever they are.

Mr. Speaker, these comments are not intended to be artificial back-patting, because all of us are involved in this direction, but to humble us, because in Alberta we have so much and that opportunity to do so much good, as we are trying to do. The \$300 million endowment fund from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, with income flowing to the foundation of at least \$30 million a year, is immense in itself just to think about. I suggest from time to time we do think about it, because \$300 million is a lot of dollars. As we pass through budgetary allocations in this Assembly, I think most of us lose that perspective from time to time. When we say that at least \$30 million will flow from this particular fund to medical research, it represents half the total dollars spent by all of Canada in medical research. The hon. Premier indicated that the other day. I've evaluated those figures, and they're true. If we think of that, when Alberta has only 8 per cent of the population, this is a truly fantastic commitment.

Apart from these major aspects, Mr. Speaker, the Bill provides a diversification of our industry. I don't think it's been mentioned to any great degree here in the debate so far. I feel that is something we should raise and lay on the table. I don't think it can be challenged. There'll be many scientists and support staff. There'll be back-up services, technology, and associated industries that will undoubtedly be augmented and attracted over the years. This will be in addition to the significant benefits we already have in our economy. As the Premier indicated, I visualize that Alberta will truly be a brain centre ranking with the tops in the whole world.

I'd like to emphasize again and indicate to the House that I think it's very important that this Bill and the medical research funds it will provide will encourage young Albertans to pursue and enter these careers of research in medical science. I think it's of great consequence, because our future is in fact in the hands of our youth.

To encourage medical research which could not be carried out in hospitals under ordinary circumstances,

under ordinary annual budgets, is another aspect of this Bill which should be underlined; basic research, rather than the applied research that we have in hospitals.

I think members of the Assembly should recognize that at least three thrusts in this Bill have been alluded to by various members, including the Premier: to enhance and develop the scientific community in Alberta and Canada, and I'm suggesting we could add to that the world, because when the world finds out what we're doing in Alberta, I have no doubt they'll be attracted to the centres here in Alberta.

Number two, it will provide assurance of funding on a continuing basis, not to be tampered with by the politics of the day. I think it's a very important item to underline again. When the hon. Leader of the Opposition indicates even in an oblique way that we must increase our political involvement, I get disturbed, because that is tampering. If there's anything that we don't want with this fund and for the scientists of our society dealing with medical research, it is any uncertainty or feeling of distress.

The third thrust is serving to encourage young people. These are all areas that we should remind ourselves of from time to time.

Further to this, Mr. Speaker, I am confident it will help to interest Canadians to remain in Canada. It may not be the prime purpose of the fund — I'm sure it isn't — but with such dollars flowing and with co-ordination across this province, I'm sure many Canadians or Albertans who would seek work elsewhere in medical research will probably change their minds and stay in Alberta. In fact, it may encourage those who have left to return, and certainly should attract world scientists of that calibre. But most importantly and most significantly, I think it will provide support for the many outstanding scientists whom we already have and who are being developed in Alberta and Canada.

I'm pleased to see that Section [19] of the Bill provides for a Scientific Advisory Council and committee to assure adequate peer review of research activities. It will receive information from around the world to dovetail with the activities within the province. Section 23 will provide an international board of review, which will review research carried out to assure it's not a dead-end type of research project, although sometimes those projects do occur and we're not aware they're going to happen anyway. But it will assure that funds are being spent responsibly and for the best possible purpose with minimal political involvement.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, because I know other members of the Assembly want to participate in the debate, I'm pleased and I'm very excited. I compliment the Premier in a very direct way. I think it's a very human type of Bill that certainly should be applauded from one end of the province to the other — as a matter of fact, from one area of the country across to the other side. I hope that the Premier will take into account the need for flexibility and innovation. Although we raised the question for increased support for health delivery research in question period — and I recognize that this Bill is not intended for that — it's possible an evaluation should be done for additional research funds or funds for health delivery in future.

I'm pleased that the government representation, via the trustees on the foundation, will be at arm's length and that the four nominees will be from important areas; the council of physicians and surgeons of Alber-

ta, the governors of the University of Calgary, the governors of the University of Alberta, as well as the medical services research fund. Mr. Speaker, when we have members of the medical community in the gallery today — or had, I can't see them; yes they are there, I think — like Dean Lionel E. McLeod and Dean Donald Tim Cameron from the University of Alberta, they are humble men, but they're hard workers. There are many more out there, and we know it and they know it. As long as there are people like them around to influence the course of medicine, I am confident we will do well via this Bill and via the Act that will be enacted.

With these very brief comments, Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge members of the Assembly to support this Bill.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate briefly in the debate on Bill 62 this afternoon. It is my belief that medical and health delivery must be viewed from a total perspective. By this I mean that our concern for health must include programs of research, prevention, and treatment. The 1970s have been an extremely significant decade for health-related services in Alberta. We have taken immense strides in the development of preventive health programs, including home care, dental programs, and pre-school testing, to name a few. The construction of health facilities in our province has increased dramatically; facilities such as the health sciences building in Edmonton and the southern Alberta cancer research facility.

Mr. Speaker, in giving second reading today to The Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research Act, this government takes one more enormous step forward. I'm extremely impressed with the Premier's extensive research and investigation into this field. The model proposed encompasses several significant factors, only two of which I would like to comment on briefly.

Firstly, a number of comments have been made on setting up this foundation at arm's length from government and the possibility of any political influence in the future. I think that's extremely important.

Secondly, the Act incorporates a formal evaluation procedure. I think one of the difficulties in the provision of public programs is that there is often insufficient evaluation to establish any meaningful cost effectiveness. With this Act we have annual reporting, the establishment of an international board of review, and a triennial report designed to be a comprehensive report of projects approved over a three-year period.

This province has provided and is continuing to provide leadership in Canada. This Bill will contribute to intellectual leadership and, I am confident, will make Alberta a brain centre of the world.

I'm sure there's not a family anywhere untouched by a medical problem demanding new research. Having travelled outside Canada for medical care for a member of my immediate family, I strongly support the development of this new industry in Alberta, a medical research industry. This industry will establish a climate conducive to channelling many new careers toward research, where previously it was just not possible. Not only will there be a whole new horizon for Albertans, but a climate to attract top researchers from outside Alberta. In addition, this industry will no doubt be paramount in the acquisition of new and extremely costly research equipment that otherwise would be

unavailable to us, equipment that would be applied to pure research and also for the direct benefit of Albertans and the world as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research will challenge and excite our imaginations, and I very strongly lend my support to this Bill.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for the opportunity to close this debate. I want to make just a few brief observations; one is a very important matter of principle.

First, I'd like to say to the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway that I stand to be corrected. I think you're right. I think that what we have here is a baby already moving; from what I've seen it's at that stage. If my words were not well chosen, I think it was appropriate to correct them.

To the Member for St. Albert, I'd like to concur in her statement, which I think is important to focus on, of all the other steps that have been taken in terms of the overall situation of health delivery. I did not want to repeat that, but I think it is important to keep in mind not only the projects the hon. member referred to but, for example, the southern Alberta children's centre, which I think would be one of the finest in our whole nation in matters of that nature.

One of the notes I received from Dr. Bradley during the course of the debate — I think it's important to make sure that we have as accurate information as possible in the *Hansard* record of this debate. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because by the very nature of the foundation, the record of *Hansard* will have a significance for the foundation in terms of their deliberations. The research funding that would be provided here is accurate in terms of being an increase of approximately 50 per cent over other government funding coming from the Medical Research Council, some \$63 million at the present funding rate. But we would have to add to that to give it the appropriate balance; that is, with regard to the voluntary segment that is included.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview raised a couple of points which I thought I should respond to. I appreciate that this could be done at committee stage, Mr. Speaker, but I thought the hon. member might want the thoughts, so he could consider them prior to the committee stage of the Bill, as to why, for the trustees, the emphasis was on lay citizens as distinguished from scientific appointments. Now, there's no reason, of course, that the universities can't make scientific appointments, or the College of Physicians and Surgeons, or the other institution involved, or the government, for that matter.

But I think our basic view is that the trustees should not be scientists, at least in the basic thrust. They should be there as objective citizens — if you like, taking the place of legislators — with a view to not having any personal bias toward any particular scientific decision-making. It's thought that the Scientific Advisory Council would give the guidance in terms of that scientific direction in a way that the lay citizens could respond to it. It was our thought that, on balance, that was the better way to go. I do appreciate,

though, what the hon. member said in that case. That's a judgment factor, and it could well turn out that trustees either now or in the future were also scientists as well.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview raised as well the question of trustees being paid, and why the scientific advisory committee was on a "maybe" basis. The answer is that we felt our experience had shown that if you leave to the decision-makers, that is the trustees, the question of whether they would be paid in an optional sense, just by the very nature of the way this province works today, they won't. They're going to be asked, particularly in the early stages, to expend a very considerable amount of time, and some of them may be citizens whose income derives from time commitments. We wanted to say specifically in the Act that they would be paid, so there would be no argument about that in the future.

With regard to the scientific advisory committee, the advice we've received — and that's subject to checking at the committee stage — is that we should leave it "may", because there are circumstances from a contractual point of view where scientists tied to other institutions are not able to take remuneration for additional work they have. But I will check that.

The one point I want to reiterate in closing the debate is that we do not have false expectations with regard to this foundation. I also want to make clearer the point that perhaps I did not dwell on well enough in my opening remarks. When you look at the objects, we refer to the very important words "balanced long-term program of medical research". That means essentially a balance between base and clinical research. It's a judgment decision that is a very extensive debate right now in the United Kingdom, as the hon. Member for Edson is aware. And that's something we felt we would use in the Act, the word "balanced". From that point of view, it would therefore be left for the foundation to make the decision as to which emphasis it might be, or whether it ends up equally, which I think is a very important point.

In terms of the observations of the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I regretted the insertion, as the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower mentioned, of the whole issue of university funding. I've made it absolutely clear to the university presidents and to the deans of medical schools in discussions with them — and the records would say, on a number of occasions — that this foundation and the government's priority decision, and hopefully the legislative priority decision, in medical research is not to be used as a lever in terms of university funding. I think that should be clear and on the record. It's a decision we have made.

As the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower has said, the universities themselves will have to grapple with the fact of the involvement. We have made the decision, supportive, I hope, with the citizens of Alberta, that this funding would flow from the foundation to researchers. Not all of those researchers will be connected with the university and the various faculties. They will have to come to grips with that in terms of the global funding arrangements we provide. But it was not going to be acceptable to this government, and hopefully to this Legislature, that funding of this special project be used as leverage with regard to university funding. There may be cases that can be made in terms of improved funding, but

those cases are to be made on their own merits.

The final point that disturbs me is the one made by the Leader of the Opposition — I regret he's not in his seat now — who says that at second reading he will support the Bill in principle. Perhaps this is one of the difficulties in the parliamentary system, Mr. Speaker: I suppose a principle of the Bill can be interpreted in a number of different ways. At second reading we are voting on a principle of the Bill, but to me a principle of the Bill is the concept that it be at arm's length from the Legislature. In his remarks the Leader of the Opposition took issue with the view that the select legislative committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund should review it only every third year as distinguished, I took it, from annually. It is a principle of the Bill that it be reviewed only every third year. There was a suggestion that was erroneous that the government, on the other hand, was going to be involved in the review of this foundation in a different way from the Legislature.

If the hon. Leader of the Opposition read Section 8(1) of the Bill, it is clear that the Provincial Treasurer does not have any way in which he can say to the foundation, you're not entitled to the full income that's available there. The foundation makes the decision with regard to the investment income that flows from the endowment fund. They may spend it all in terms of their budget in years one, two, three, four, five, or so forth. They may not, and then it forms part of the corpus of the endowment fund. But there is not a matter of the Treasurer saying, you can't have that

particular funding for reasons that we, the Executive Council, determine. Under Section 8(1) the funds are available unequivocally. I suggest to the official opposition party that when we approach committee stage, they should think carefully about that.

Finally, I just want to say I appreciate the words that have been expressed in this Legislative Assembly. Without raising false expectations, I think it is one of the most important Bills that I have been involved in.

[Motion carried; Bill 62 read a second time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before adjourning until Tuesday afternoon, I would indicate that it's intended the House sit on Tuesday evening. The government has designated the one hour on Tuesday afternoon as well for government designated business. At that time we propose to begin with consideration of Bills in committee, with perhaps a few exceptions. If at some point in the evening all the work that's available in that respect has been done, we would return to second readings, starting with Bill No. 35. The only other comment on the business is that at the end of the hour on Tuesday afternoon, it may well be that members will want to consider extending that hour for the balance of the afternoon. That's a matter that can be dealt with at that time.

[At 1 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

