

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Thursday, November 13, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 87****The Ground Water Development Act**

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 87, The Ground Water Development Act. This Bill will replace The Ground Water Control Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 87 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 87, The Ground Water Development Act, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the response to Motion for a Return No. 115.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, may I please introduce to you, and through you to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, 45 senior citizens from the Open Door Senior Fellowship of Calgary. This society is sponsored by the First Baptist Church. Among the 44 attendees are four who received the 75th Anniversary gold medal and 14 who received the silver. They're looking forward to their visit to the Legislature. I ask them now to rise and receive the cordial welcome of the House.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of introducing to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, two grade 6 classes, their vice-principal, and their teachers, who have come here today all the way from Red Deer Lake school. There is a Red Deer Lake in the constituency of Banff-Cochrane. By a paper drive and bottle sales, these grade 6 students raised the funds themselves to charter the vehicle to drive them. They went all out to do what so many students across Alberta do, to spend some hours to see the Legislative Assembly at this very important time in the history of Alberta and Canada.

Before I ask them to rise, I'd like to share with you, Mr. Speaker, a little quote from a winning essay as a result of the recent visit I had with them. Brenda Riddell, the young lady who wrote this essay, said that after our

discussion one of the students said that you, Mr. Speaker, are a referee, and you ref the whole Legislative Assembly. She also writes that the pages are very neat.

So, Mr. Speaker, may I introduce to you then and to the members, Vice-Principal Mrs. Marjorie Huk, their teachers Miss Mary Lynn Werner and Mr. Don Lawrence, and all 35 students from Red Deer Lake school. Would they please rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce some special guests to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly. We have Mr. John Keates, the immediate past president of the Parents Organization of Michener Centre. He is accompanied by executive members Mrs. Dot Keates and Mr. Roy Martins.

The Michener Parents Organization took the initiative to raise a quarter of a million dollars to build a summer lodge for the residents of Michener Centre. Hon. Bob Bogle, our Minister of Social Services and Community Health, has presented this organization with a matching grant of \$250,000. Hopefully this will serve as a model for others to participate in such programs whereby they are not always looking for 100 per cent participation by government, but rather that the citizens become involved. I would like them to rise in the members gallery and receive the cordial welcome of this Assembly.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

**Department of Education**

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, the government of Alberta has now developed a policy for the evaluation of student achievement in Alberta. I stress, though, that this is only the first phase of a policy which will eventually include an evaluation of teachers, school systems, and programs. The policy has six major components, each of which I will deal with in turn.

The high school diploma: a high school diploma will continue to be awarded to students who qualify, as at present.

Comprehensive examinations: a system of provincially set and marked comprehensive examinations will be introduced in the 1982-83 school year. These tests will reflect the 'normal' or 'normed' expectations about the nature and extent of information, concepts, and skills that a well motivated and achieving student should possess upon completion of basic education; for example, grade 12. These will not be minimal competency examinations. It is proposed that there be four such examinations, one each in literacy, history and the social sciences, computation skills, and the physical and biological sciences. Writing of the comprehensive examinations will be at the option of the students, or of adults. Comprehensive examinations will be administered twice in a school year; that is, in each semester.

The comprehensive education certificate: effective in the 1982-83 school year, a comprehensive education certificate will be awarded to students who achieve a satisfactory score in the comprehensive examinations. Achievement of excellence on the examinations may be noted on the certificate. In addition, students will receive a statement of standing.

In this regard, employers and postsecondary learning institutions will be able to use any combination of the high school transcripts, the high school diploma, the statement of standing on the comprehensive education

certificate, and the comprehensive education certificate itself, for evaluation, hiring, and admission purposes.

Achievement tests: in the 1981-82 school year, a system of achievement tests will be introduced. This system will monitor student achievement by means of a sampling procedure that is significant at both the local school board and the provincial levels, in grades 3, 6, 9, and 12, in language arts — both English and French — social studies, mathematics, and the sciences. Selected achievement tests in the subjects just mentioned will be administered annually. These tests are intended to monitor the effectiveness of the curriculum relative to the standards and quality of student achievement.

Diagnostic testing: Alberta Education, in conjunction with other interested agencies, such as school boards and universities, will proceed to acquire or develop appropriate diagnostic tests for use by local jurisdictions and teachers. As a matter of policy, we intend to encourage appropriate diagnostic testing for every student as soon as is feasible after they enter the system and at appropriate intervals or occasions thereafter. These tests are intended to improve the educational opportunity for every child by early, systematic identification of problems or strengths that might affect learning.

Administration: a student evaluation branch will be established in Alberta Education which will develop, administer, and score the achievement tests, appeal examinations, and comprehensive examinations.

Certain other questions may be of interest, Mr. Speaker. As alluded to earlier, the present system of appeal examinations in courses commonly required for entry to postsecondary institutions will be continued. The student evaluation branch will develop and maintain extensive test material for the use of the teachers of this province. The present system of giving school boards access to departmental examinations for local purposes will be discontinued in 1982-83 when the use of comprehensives comes into effect. The present system of awarding the adult equivalency diploma will be retained.

That, Mr. Speaker, completes the policy of the government of Alberta relative to the evaluation of student achievement.

#### head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Oil Sands Projects

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It flows from the recent decision by the Alsands consortium to cut off its expected expenditure of \$200 million on Alberta's third oil sands plant. Is the minister in a position to indicate if the announced stoppage of expenditure reflects an intention by Alsands to shelve the whole project, or is it in fact simply a decision to stop work now but not to shelve the whole project?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had a discussion with Alsands as to their future intention or the decision the question of the Leader of the Opposition refers to.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister had discussions with Alsands management to ascertain how long they can keep the project in somewhat of a hold position before a decision would have to be made in fact to shelve the whole project? How long can they stay in a hold position?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, over the past year and a half I've had a number of discussions with Alsands management regarding that question. I don't know that a firm or fixed date has ever been expressed to me, although I have been aware for some time that a point would come where the Alsands consortium would have to stop spending money and postpone, delay, or abandon the project if there weren't approval for it to proceed. That, of course, would require approval from the government of Alberta and an acceptable pricing commitment from the Ottawa government. As the Leader of the Opposition will be aware, the Alsands consortium has said the pricing proposal in the October 28 energy program and budget with respect to new oil sands plants was not acceptable.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might pose a supplementary question to the minister. In the course of discussions between the minister and the Alsands consortium, has the minister asked Alsands how long they could keep the project on hold, and how long is that? Certainly that must have been part of the discussions that have been held.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had responded to that in answering the last question. I said we'd had discussions about the timing. No fixed time, no expression of view as to how long it could be done was ever given to me in definitive terms. Our discussions were always: we are spending a good deal of money; we cannot go on spending it in the expectation or hope that ultimately approvals will be given. But no fixed time had been given to me as to when a decision would have to be made by the Alsands group as to whether to continue to spend the money in anticipation of getting approvals.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the minister. Has the minister asked the Alsands consortium how long they can continue in a holding position before they have to shelve the whole project? I can appreciate that Alsands may not have indicated that to the minister, but certainly the minister must have inquired of Alsands, how long can you continue in this holding position? Have we not asked that question of them?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, yes. I thought that was implicit in the answer to the last two questions. The response was: there was no fixed date; we can't be precisely sure, but there comes a time when we'll have to stop spending money in anticipation. But no fixed time was ever established.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. The minister indicated that Alsands could not proceed because of the federal government's pricing re the \$38. Was that refusal made by Alsands directly, or has that been a refusal of the Alberta government to allow Alsands to proceed on that particular basis if they could?

MR. LEITCH: I gather, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is really asking what our policy is with respect to approvals of Alsands and Esso's Cold Lake project. I thought that was well understood, because for a long time now I believe it's been well known that our policy is that approval of those two projects was part of a satisfactory energy agreement, and we've not reached a satisfactory energy agreement.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister so we have it clearly understood. Have the Alsands people told the minister that the \$38 plus the inflation factor in the federal budget will not allow them to go ahead on the project?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, that's Alsands' public position.

MR. R. CLARK: But they haven't told the minister that; that's simply what the minister has read in the paper?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I am not at all satisfied that I should be giving in the Assembly particulars of conversations we've had with people who are discussing a variety of projects with the government, and feel it's only appropriate that such part of those discussions as the developers wish to make public be made public by them. As I've indicated, my understanding is that Alsands has made public the position that the pricing proposal contained in the federal energy program is not sufficient to enable the project to go ahead.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one further supplementary question to the minister. We clearly want to understand who is holding this project up. Is it Alsands or the Alberta government?

AN HON. MEMBER: Pierre Trudeau. The federal government.

MR. R. CLARK: The question to the minister is: is it the Alberta government or Alsands who is saying that \$38 plus the inflation factor is not enough?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, we'll let the hon. Leader of the Opposition draw his own conclusions. I'll try to give him the facts. As I understand it, Alsands has said they could not proceed with the price proposed in the energy program on October 28. Secondly — and this is really a repetition of the answer to the hon. Member for Little Bow — it is our position and has been our policy for some time, that we would not approve either the Alsands project or the Esso Cold Lake project unless we had a satisfactory energy package agreement with the federal government, and we do not have such an agreement.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Have there been discussions with the Alsands people concerning the practicality of the project? If \$38 a barrel is not sufficient to make the thing work, when we had an ERCB report on the Cold Lake project saying \$32 a barrel in May would make it work, my question is: have there been any specific discussions? Is the minister in a position to advise the House whether we have had any discussions leading to the cost of production or the price which would be necessary to make the Alsands project viable?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased the hon. member has asked that question because he asked a similar question a few days back. When reviewing the question in *Hansard*, I noticed he referred to a 15 per cent guaranteed rate of return. I simply wanted to remind the hon. member that there is no guaranteed rate of return in respect of either of the proposed oil sands projects.

With respect to discussions about what was needed for

the projects to proceed, it has always been our position — and we negotiated with both Alsands and Esso — that those projects should attract the world price. The royalty arrangements that we have been discussing with them have been based, from our point of view, on the premise that the projects would attract the world price, which was part of the energy package agreement we had concluded with Mr. Clark's administration.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. The question is not what the objective is. I can appreciate that. The question is whether there has been any specific discussion between this government and the Alsands consortium concerning whether \$38 a barrel is a sufficient price to make the project viable.

The minister has indicated in the House that public statements have been made by the company. The House needs to be assured whether there have been formal discussions between this government and the Alsands consortium on whether \$38 is or is not an adequate price and whether there is evidence to back that up.

MR. LEITCH: Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly there have been discussions on that question. I don't know how the hon. member could have listened to the questions and answers without appreciating that. I had said earlier that in my judgment, with those kinds of discussions, the developer's position ought to be made public by them and not by me.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In view of the ERCB report of a few months ago concerning \$32 a barrel, at what point will the government advise this Assembly, and through this Assembly the people of Alberta, what the price range is and what the figures are? At this stage no information has been made available either by the developers or the government. Is there going to be a point in time when this information will be made available to the people of Alberta?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, certainly that information would be made available. But in my judgment I should not be making discussions of that kind of information public now, when we have not yet completed an agreement with either Alsands or Esso with respect to Cold Lake. We have been negotiating, carrying on discussions about royalty arrangements, but we have not yet completed them. Certainly it would be a gross negotiating error on my part to say publicly what I thought would be the terms on which they might proceed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. The minister has indicated that it would be inappropriate to make statements while negotiations are taking place. Does the government's position that the projects are in abeyance mean that within that term "in abeyance" negotiations are still active on the two projects as far as this government is concerned?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, negotiations have been going on. We have been in the process of preparing agreements. I do not expect those to continue at the moment because, as has been announced earlier by the hon. Premier, if we were able to reach an energy agreement with the Ottawa government, then I would expect those negotiations to resume. But I don't see them continuing under the present state of the matter.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, just to confirm what I believe would be the answer. The tar sands plants will be held in abeyance, and no matter what price is offered by Ottawa — let's say they suggest another price — under the present policy, the Alberta government wouldn't give approval for those plans to go ahead unless a total energy package is agreed upon by Alberta and Ottawa.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, that is correct. Members of the Assembly will recall that we proposed this energy package, which contained an undertaking to proceed with not only these two oil sands projects but others, by using our best efforts to put a permanent work force in place. We did those things in consideration of getting a fair return for our rapidly depleting conventional oil. In exchange we had also asked that there be no punitive taxation on the industry within Alberta. We asked for that to ensure there would not be federal taxation proposals that would destroy jobs that Albertans are now working at.

In the proposed energy program and budget we find taxation that is going to eliminate jobs at which Albertans are now working. Those were the reasons for our proposing the changes that we had, royalty reduced from that applicable to the Syncrude plant. It was part of a package. That is the reason for our taking that position in the first place and for our continuing to maintain that position.

#### Apprenticeship Programs

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question really to the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration and the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It deals with the waiting times of almost two years for apprenticeship plumbers both at SAIT in Calgary and NAIT here in Edmonton.

My initial question is to the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration. What is the policy of this government with regard to the hiring of apprenticeship people? I ask the question in light of the situation at SAIT in Calgary and the difficulty the government is having in getting plumbers to teach courses, especially fourth year courses at SAIT.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleague the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower will want to supplement my answer. The hiring practices at SAIT, NAIT, and other educational institutes follow the government's policy of hiring people who are suitably qualified for those positions within the salary grid set out for the responsibilities required of that position.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to whichever of the ministers would care to attempt to explain the matter. Would the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration explain to the Assembly how it is, then, the case being as the minister just outlined, that SAIT instructors teaching fourth-year plumbing can leave teaching that program, virtually walk across the hall in the institution, become part of the maintenance part of that institution, and get \$6,000 a year more, because certainly in the private sector we don't pay maintenance people \$6,000 more than we do fourth-year plumbers?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, the questions asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition deal with detail involving a scarcity or an oversupply of particular persons who are qualified or eligible for employment. There may be times when some people will be hired at a second or third level because of the shortage of supply, as one would do in dealing with the clerks or any other classification level. People are hired on the basis of their background, experience, and need for the position.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister trying to make us believe that we're paying people \$6,000 more for maintenance work than instructing fourth-year plumbers because it's more difficult to get maintenance people than it is instructors to teach fourth-year plumbers? We have 170 students at SAIT. My question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I know the hon. leader hasn't exhausted the time limit for debate, but perhaps the question has been adequately put.

MR. R. CLARK: We have the same kind of answer.

MR. STEVENS: I am having difficulty understanding the question. Perhaps the member would like to rephrase it. I really do not understand the direction you are heading. If you are saying that some people are in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. minister please use the ordinary parliamentary form.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, the member is suggesting that some people are paid more than others for carrying out certain duties. That is true. Throughout the civil service there will be different pay schedules based on that person's experience, the need for that job, and the responsibilities of that job.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Perhaps he can shed some light on the matter. Can the minister explain to the Assembly why last year we had over 100 fourth-year apprentice plumbers who weren't able to get into SAIT and that this year the list now extends to 175 students waiting to get their fourth-year apprenticeship finished so they can be journeyman plumbers? What's the holdup?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is self-evident. We have had difficulty in attracting sufficient instructors to complete the courses. [interjections]

Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could be permitted to conclude the answer. It is also evident, and all hon. members are aware, that we have announced a major program to extend apprenticeship training into the colleges system throughout southern Alberta particularly, through Red Deer College, Medicine Hat College, and Lethbridge college. It is hoped that by doing that we will be able to free up some of the space now taken by various apprenticeship programs at both SAIT and NAIT.

Hon. members are also aware that a proposal to build a new technical trades institute in northern Alberta has been announced. It is true that we are experiencing some delays, but we are making a very real effort to accommodate that training not just in those two major institutions but elsewhere in the province.

Insofar as the question of the level of salaries paid to instructional personnel within SAIT, NAIT, and other

provincially administered institutions, all hon. members are aware that those questions are not dealt with by my department but by the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration and his department.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is it a matter of space at NAIT and SAIT, especially that we don't have the classroom facilities at SAIT, or isn't it, Mr. Minister, a question of not being able to attract the staff?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in some instances in various trades it relates to the availability of both space and suitable instructional personnel. I would bring to the attention of hon. members that the number of apprentices in Alberta has increased dramatically. Over the past five years, that number has increased from approximately 10,000 to something approaching 24,000 this year. That type of explosive growth has to be accommodated as best we can. I think we have done a remarkable job in accommodating that type of growth in that limited period, to the point where we in Alberta, with 8 per cent of the population, have 25 per cent of the registered apprentices in all of Canada.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the minister's hearty defense of an indefensible position. The supplementary question to the minister and the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration is simply this: if we can't pay enough to people to attract instructors to SAIT for fourth-year plumbing, when, Mr. Minister, in your own letter to me some time ago you said we had the ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the hon. leader wishes to ask a question, would he come directly to the question.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, the question is: why do the institutions that have their own boards of governors — Medicine Hat and Red Deer, if this is where the apprenticeship programs are going to be — appear to be able to attract people to fill these positions when SAIT can't?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that question. It is certainly true that there is more difficulty in the larger centres in attracting qualified instructional personnel. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the accommodation of apprentices in Alberta, throughout the entire system, has been a remarkable success story. Certainly from time to time there may be problems with regard to certain trades in certain institutions.

As I have indicated in this House on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, we are very carefully examining whether SAIT and NAIT would be better governed under boards of governors rather than provincially administered. I have indicated that that matter is under careful review at present. At the same time, while these matters of trades instructors and other personnel are under active negotiation with the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration, it is certainly inadvisable for this department to become involved in any activity which might be interpreted in any way as unfair labor practices.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question to the minister. The question of self-governance at SAIT has been under review by this government for

seven years. How much longer will it take until a decision is arrived at?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am sure I have answered that question. If the hon. member will refer to *Hansard* of October 28, he will see that those same questions were placed before the Assembly. I can only give the same answers at this time.

Obviously when matters of this consequence, relating to the negotiation under way between the employer and employees ... The hon. Leader of the Opposition may smile, but he would be the first person in this Assembly to rise and accuse my department of having been engaged in unfair labor practices if we made a move at this time which would indicate that a significant number of employees under the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees might be removed from that union. Along with the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, he would be the first to make such accusations.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. This would be the first time in history that an offer of higher wages would be considered unfair labor practices.

To the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration. What consideration is given by his department to competitive wages in the private sector when negotiations are carried on by the Public Service Commission?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, the negotiations and the process of meeting at the bargaining table involve preparation by both parties, the government of Alberta and the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees, that considers all the objectives of each. One objective our government has considered in negotiations includes not only wage guidelines that have been followed in various ways throughout the negotiation process but also market conditions. When we looked into the matter of teachers and instructors at these institutions, we compare teachers and instructors to other teachers and other instructors. We do not compare teachers to trades personnel. We compare them in the like area.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I supplement the answer to this extent. I don't think I should permit to go unanswered the insinuation contained in the remarks by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. The subject that would be complained about in terms of unfair labor practices has nothing to do with the level of wages. That does not come from my department. But the subject of whether to move that institution into board-governed status, thereby possibly removing those members from the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees, would certainly be so construed. [interjection]

The hon. member may shout all he wants. The facts are there. He would be the first — or I don't know who would be the first ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. With great respect, the hon. minister has gone beyond the area of fact and is now attempting to predict what is going to be done next by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

#### Nursing Homes

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, the chairperson of the Health Facilities Review Committee. Can the hon. member indicate if in the course of the chairperson's

tours of health facilities, the question of sedation of senior citizens in our senior citizens' homes was brought to the attention of the hon. chairperson?

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, that is a good question from the hon. member of the opposition party, because that matter has had the attention of the members of the committee, not necessarily as a result of complaints placed before the committee but simply of observation. The matter of sedation certainly has to do with the direction of the medical officers or doctors responsible for the medical care of the patients in these particular facilities. So I think the committee has certainly been very observant with respect to that particular matter.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. member. Is the member in a position to indicate how extensive the practice of sedation and oversedation of people in nursing homes is?

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my response to the first question, sedation and medications are under the instructions and observations of the medical practitioners. Whether overmedication or oversedation exists is very difficult to determine in any particular instance. However, I must indicate that the committee has requested the College of Physicians and Surgeons perhaps to inquire of their membership on the regularity with which medication and the level of medication needs are reviewed with respect to citizens in the health care facilities.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. member. Can the hon. chairperson indicate what recommendations or monitoring is going on now to make sure that if this practice is continuing, it will be discontinued? What recommendations or monitoring does the hon. member have to make sure this doesn't happen further?

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not clear on whether the hon. Member for Clover Bar has concluded that there is in fact a violation of the appropriate procedures. I hope he has not necessarily construed that from my answer. The committee as such has been following very closely the practices of medication distribution and the direction of the medical profession in making regular examinations with respect to their patients, as to whether the level that had been prescribed at any point in time is still needed, needs to be increased or decreased, or whether there needs to be a change. As they have visited the facilities, I think members of the committee are forever vigilant and continuously draw the attention of the administration of these facilities to ensure that there is no violation.

Perhaps to answer the hon. member more clearly as to whether there is an active program of investigation — if that is the appropriate word for what the hon. member is trying to allude to. I'm not sure investigation is the appropriate word, Mr. Speaker, because the fact that the committee is constantly observing to ensure that there isn't a violation might be construed by the hon. member as an investigation. It is an observation to see that the regulations are followed and that the medical profession examines at regular intervals the prescriptions and treatment that are given. Perhaps there is some concern that some of the doctors are not making their examinations as regularly as they might. That matter has been brought to the attention of the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. member. Can the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood indicate if, in the course of the member's duties to tour and review these facilities, there was any breakdown in the comparison between private and public nursing homes? Can the member indicate if there's any indication that there is more of a problem in one type of home than another?

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps it's a detail I would need to check on to be absolutely accurate. From our observations, I think the problems — if they exist, or as they come up or are observed — vary and are of a short term. At times there will be observations in private nursing homes where attention needs to be drawn to certain aspects of the care being provided. At other times perhaps we will find some problems in the publicly operated institutions. So it varies from one to the other. To say definitely that there are constantly more problems in privately operated institutions — I would have to check to be sure I give an accurate response.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary on this topic by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

DR. BUCK: For clarification, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member. Can the member indicate to the Assembly if, in this so-called observation, the committee was just walking through the institutions and observing the people, or was the hon. member actually looking at the records of what medication was used on these people?

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, the procedure the committee follows in its visitation of the various facilities is: committee members speak with the administration, administrators, staff, residents in the facility, relatives or other visitors, and observe the schedules in place for the various services provided. When it's food, we look at the guidelines and menus that are prepared on a rotating basis and their adequacy for nutrition. We look at the type of procedures that are followed with respect to dispensing medications.

The committee is not permitted to examine the private records of patients or guests in the facility, because those are of a private and confidential nature. In other words, the legislation neither allows us the privilege or the opportunity, nor do we follow a practice of looking at individuals' confidential records. But we will examine the procedures in place, whether the personnel, the staff on hand have the competence and training to carry out the function that they are recognized or hired, and the role they play in the facility. We go to the extent that our legislation allows: If there is any question with respect to whether any particular record or administration of medication or service may be inappropriate and requires an examination of a confidential record, the committee will request the minister, through his office, to carry out that further investigation.

DR. C. ANDERSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we could deal with it briefly. There are still three members who wish to ask their first question, and we're running out of time.

DR. C. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Member for Edmonton Norwood. I wonder if the member could tell us whether there are any scientific

studies or data to support the view being presented here that there is a problem with overmedication or oversedation of patients in nursing homes.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, the hon. member seems to be asking the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood concerning some medical research, which perhaps might be done otherwise.

#### Energy Negotiations

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. I understand the minister has had a conversation or a meeting with the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, Mr. Lalonde. I wonder if the minister could elaborate on that meeting or conversation at this point in time. [interjection] Within the last day or two.

MR. NOTLEY: Just a little summary.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, there has been no meeting. As I heard the question, it involved whether there was a meeting. As a matter of fact, there have been a couple of telephone conversations recently between me and Mr. Lalonde.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister indicate whether an agenda for further meetings has been established, with regard to discussion on the energy question between Alberta and Ottawa? If so, could the minister elaborate on that agenda?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I've agreed with Mr. Lalonde that there should be meetings between officials of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources and federal officials with respect to getting clarification and additional information relating to the energy program and the budget. But there have been no arrangements regarding any meetings by officials or anyone else, with respect to negotiations.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Was there any discussion with regard to a target date by which some type of agreement could be reached with Ottawa? Has Alberta a target date in mind, or has Ottawa suggested a target date for some of the finalization of discussions between Alberta and Ottawa, particularly with maybe an involvement of ministers of energy or first ministers?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, there is no target date. Perhaps the series of questions the hon. Member for Little Bow is asking calls for me to make some comments about my view, approach, or attitude toward further negotiations. In order to do that, I would need to review briefly my assessment of what has gone on in the way of negotiations with the present federal administration.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that some time ago the Ottawa government reached the decision as to their bottom-line position with respect to an energy package. I think we saw that bottom-line position in the budget and the energy program on October 28. I think it is equally clear that when they reached the decision that that was going to be their bottom line, they were also totally convinced there would be no way Alberta would agree to that and therefore no way they could reach an agreement with Alberta.

But they then had a problem, Mr. Speaker. They had to do something between the time they reached that decision and the time they could put a budget and an energy program in place. So the something they did was schedule a series of meetings and talk about the negotiating, talk about the number of offers they were making, and talk about walking the last mile. Members will recall my review of that matter of a Monday when we were debating Resolution 21. They could in no sense be negotiating; they were window dressing, public relations operations.

Now we had to go through them, because it was not until they concluded that we could be sure that that was the position. I simply want to add one other fact, Mr. Speaker: that in an effort to have meaningful negotiations, we made a substantially restructured offer to the federal government on July 25, which was not accepted.

In light of that history, Mr. Speaker, my position with respect to the negotiations simply is this: there is no point in having additional meetings, described as negotiating meetings, until we have received information from the federal government that they are prepared to make a significant movement from their budgetary and energy program positions announced on October 28. I think it [inaudible] to hold such meetings which create great expectations in the public if you're convinced they're going to be a repeat of what I regard as public relations meetings that went on between the time of the present administration's taking office and the budget of October 28.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. In the earlier answer, I believe the minister indicated that officials would again initiate some type of discussion from the conversation of the hon. federal minister and the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. What directive has been given then to those officials, if the federal government hasn't placed any position before us to examine? If negotiations are not going to bring about any type of new agreement, why have our officials in Alberta been directed to speak to federal officials at this time?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, it's not a matter of initiating new discussions. Those discussions have been going on. It's a matter of their continuing and of officials from the Department of Energy and Natural Resources here getting additional information from officials in Ottawa so we thoroughly understand the intentions with respect to the elements of the energy program and budget. There were a great number of gaps as to how these things might be implemented. We need to get that information. We've been doing that since October 28, but it will be continuing. That is the kind of meeting that has been held and I anticipate will continue to be held between officials from Alberta and the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER: We have just about exhausted the time for the question period, but I have already recognized the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. If the Assembly agrees, perhaps we might have time for one short question and one short answer.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, since my questions deal with the Blue Quill shopping centre, they may perhaps take a little longer than one short question.

Perhaps I could be permitted to put a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural

Resources. As I understand it, we are now having meetings of officials. That has gone on since October 28. In view of the Prime Minister's statement in his news release that the federal government is prepared to discuss items in the budget, at what point is the government of Alberta prepared then to enter into discussions? Surely we're not going to wait until we have the federal government publicly backing down and saying, no, we're going to throw out our budget in total. At some point discussions have to commence. At what point is that going to take place as far as this government is concerned?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, if I didn't cover that question adequately in my answer to the hon. Member for Little Bow, I'll repeat it. In my view, before we can begin further negotiating sessions, there needs to be an indication from the federal government that they're prepared to make significant alterations in the energy program. I wouldn't anticipate details of that, simply anticipate an indication that they were sincere and ready to make some appreciable or significant changes in the energy program and budget. Once I was satisfied of that, then I think discussion should start at the official level.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret that there were two members we didn't reach. I suppose that hon. members' tolerance for a list of supplementaries depends on how soon they're reached in the question period.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that motions for returns 127, 130, 133, and 134 stand and retain their place.

[Motion carried]

132. Mr. Notley moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a statement by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources of the total monetary value, from January 1, 1975, to date, of all cash grants, tax rebates, tax credits, exemptions, royalty deductions, and other incentives instituted under the Alberta petroleum exploration plan of December 1974, said statement to be given by year and by item.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I wish to recommend to the Assembly that this motion be rejected, though it may be that after I've made my comments the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview might consider withdrawing it and restructuring it. There are several reasons why I suggest that it be rejected. First, it asks for an assessment, and there is no such assessment in place. So the request is not for a document or information now in existence. I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that you would not have been aware of that when the motion reached the Order Paper, but the fact is that there is no such document, assessment, or information in place at the moment. I would think that in itself is justification for rejecting a motion for a return.

I might go on to add, Mr. Speaker, that the motion calls for cash grants, an itemization or addition of the grants under ALPEP. There are no cash grants under that program. It asks for tax rebates and credits under that program. There are tax credits and rebates under the

program, but the information with respect to those is not with the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. It's with the Department of Treasury. I wouldn't want to be taken as binding my hon. colleague the Provincial Treasurer, but I suspect if the motion were in that form, it would be found acceptable.

With respect to the exemptions asked for, I presume that relates to oil and gas royalty holidays under the drilling incentive plan, but again I'm not sure. With respect to royalty deductions, I don't know what that means. It may have reference to the adjustments in the oil and gas royalty rates, which are made as a result of changes in the select price for oil and lowering of the marginal royalty rate on natural gas.

Mr. Speaker, I simply say to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that it is a mind-boggling task if you ask us to go back and calculate what royalty would have been payable in respect of production from all the wells if we hadn't made that change. The hon. member will know that royalty payments are both production- and price-sensitive. There is a reference to other incentives, and I assume that refers to the drilling incentive plan. I'd simply advise the hon. member that that is not part of ALPEP. That plan was put in place before ALPEP came into being, although it was adjusted under ALPEP.

With respect to the royalty exemptions, if that is the royalty holiday under the plan, Mr. Speaker, again that would call on the minister to reach a judgment as to what royalties might have been payable in the absence of such a plan. Again it's my submission that it would be inappropriate for the Assembly to order ministers to make judgments.

Summing up, Mr. Speaker, there's no such document in place as is asked for; the information requested is not in the department referred to in the order — some of it would be in Treasury; and the other areas would, to some extent, call on a minister making a judgment and expressing a view or an opinion. I think any of those reasons would be ample justification for rejecting the motion. Combined, they make an irresistible case. I think it's so strong that perhaps the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview would just withdraw it and restructure it. We'll try to get him the information he's looking for.

MR. SPEAKER: It would seem to me, from the hon. minister's opening remarks, that I should be rising on a point of order. As the hon. minister has pointed out, there's no way for the Chair to know what information exists or doesn't exist within a department. But if the information doesn't exist and requires something in the nature of an assessment, then the question is not appropriate for the Order Paper, and I'd have to say it was out of order and couldn't be moved.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could rise on a point of order. I'll certainly restructure it and we'll take another run at it, because I want this information. I just point out that we didn't really have any problem getting this information, I believe, three or four years ago. But all of a sudden we find that there are insurmountable difficulties. I'll read very carefully the comments of the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources on this particular motion. We'll restructure the motion for a return to meet every one of the concerns and, rest assured, it will be on the Order Paper shortly.



MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, I just want to make a comment with regard to one area and one of the first statements of the hon. minister, which was with regard to the assessment the minister indicated does not exist. In terms of that, the motion for a return is not really in order. I think there would be cases in the Legislature — and it would be right for a minister to reply in written form — that an assessment is not available or has not been done, because maybe in checking through information or requiring information, that is one of the answers we would like for one reason or another. I would hate to see the remarks of the minister used as any precedent in other motions for returns we might place in this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, it would seem to me that an order for a return may not compel a department or minister to collate a whole lot of information and make assessments that involve matters of opinion — perhaps even expert opinion — on a question of economics: As I understood the hon. minister's remarks, it could very well be a matter of opinion or expert opinion to assess the values of some of these items listed here. However, the question is amply disposed of. The hon. member has agreed to withdraw it, and I've had to say that it's out of order.

#### head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

225. Moved by Mr. R. Speaker:

Be it resolved that this Assembly urge the government to implement additional policies and programs to reduce and prevent violence and violent crime in Alberta.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, it certainly gives me pleasure today to move this motion. The topic of the motion I am now introducing, violence and violent crime, is crucial and certainly affects the total fabric of our society here in Alberta. Because of the absence of factual information to guide what we feel are good policies and programs in Alberta, we in the Social Credit caucus asked some of the persons in the centre of criminology research at the University of Alberta to do some background work for us in preparation for this debate today. We asked Dr. James Hackler and Laurel Gauld to put together a paper and study that looked at three specific areas. For the availability of the members, I would like to table three copies of that report at this time.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

We asked these people to look at three areas. First, we asked them to accumulate background information that could aid in developing policy and programs and act as a starting point for public debate. Secondly, we asked them to assess practices and policies intended to deal with violence and violent crime to determine which were effective, which were not effective, and where the best results have been obtained.

The third objective was to discuss the implications of the findings for policy and programs to reduce and prevent violence and violent crime. The results of this study were released this September at a symposium the official opposition held here in Edmonton. In that discussion and symposium, we found a number of areas of agreement and disagreement. I'd like to say there were

some areas where we as a caucus agreed with the conclusions of the report, and certainly there were areas where we disagreed. But the report was an excellent starting point for our discussion.

Over 100 people interested and involved in either developing or administering public policy in social services and correction attended the September symposium to discuss their views among themselves and also with us four as members of the Legislature. Many different perspectives were posed at the forum. As I said, some agreed with Dr. Hackler, and some did not. But we had a lively and thorough discussion on the many different issues raised.

One point all participants seemed to agree on was that the solutions will be found only through a long and complicated process of much discussion and communication, not only between members of the Legislature and the general public, but also between the professionals in the field and certainly the consumers of some of the programs delivered in Alberta at the present time.

We found that the roots of the problem cut to the heart of our very society and do not lend themselves to easy solutions or one single solution. All people in society must work together to create a healthy society. To this end, it was felt that even the media have a very important part to play. It was suggested at this conference, and I certainly agree, that discussion and focus of the media on more exotic or sensational violence to the exclusion of the broader picture does not lead to some of the solutions we want.

I feel that we as politicians must adopt policies that are based not on unfounded stereotypes and public opinion but on solid data, so our policies really can reduce the amount of crime and violent crime among us today. As policy-makers, we must not confuse political expediency with effective legislation.

According to Dr. Hackler in his report — and I agree with this statement — society mistakenly focuses attention only on those who are considered candidates for long-term incarceration. This provides us and the general citizenry with a distorted and relatively useless picture for those interested in more informed and intelligent policy-making, which is really our responsibility. This picture leads to a reliance on the criminal justice system to deal with violence by taking action after the crime has been committed. It is hoped that conviction, in this case, will have a deterrent effect. Dr. Hackler's research indicates that although harsh penalties may make society feel better, it is more important to increase the likelihood that criminals will be captured and convicted regardless of the severity of the sentence, and more effective. A criminal must know that violence is unacceptable and that he will be caught and convicted. That seemed to be the focal point in the discussion and research we had. If a person knew they were going to be caught and convicted, there was a better deterrent effect.

In assessing such harsh stands and public opinion and response in the realm of sentencing and parole policy, Dr. Hackler concluded there could be a 5 to 10 per cent reduction in violent crime if there were stiffer offences. Long-range programs that focus on the modest reduction of the violence of many persons and families would have a much greater impact on the reduction of violence in the future. If we are serious about the reduction of violence, we cannot rely solely on the criminal justice system. We must consider policies and programs that act in a very preventive nature. For the most part, we find it is the socialization process and internalized values of people

that keep people from committing crimes. It's found that 48 per cent of prairie homicides results from domestic disputes; 83 per cent arises out of family, social, and business relationships. Only 26 per cent of homicides in British Columbia, and 30 per cent in Ontario, are domestic. Clearly, to reduce the amount of violence and violent crime in this province, we must deal with the acceptability of violence in interpersonal relationships and take steps to restore the strength of our family units and certainly, in turn, the strength of our communities in Alberta.

To these ends, I would like to propose that we consider very seriously factors that contribute to violent crime. One of these, which today is more commonly talked about than ever before, is the stress under which many individuals are placed. Looking at this, I feel as well that we should act on some recommendations.

We should look first of all at the possibility of lowering the unemployment of groups who traditionally are unemployed and among whom violence is a problem. Secondly, we should emphasize community participation and non-traditional better paying jobs for women, especially in some of our boom towns, to give them a sense of self-worth and decrease their dependence on others; thirdly, develop strategies to decrease violence in the media; fourthly, reduce alcohol abuse; and fifthly, one which I'm sure is very important to all of us, develop policy and programs specifically aimed at reducing the amount of family violence, including wife-battering and certainly child abuse, which we have spoken of in this Legislature.

I'd like to make a few further comments with regard to this last point of family violence. I recognize that each and every aspect of this problem could be dealt with extensively; however, this particular area warrants special attention in my opinion. Mme. Payette, MP for Montreal Mercier and Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, made the following comments at the symposium we held here in Edmonton:

Wife-battering is more than a legal problem. It is a moral problem, an economic problem, a civil rights problem, a health problem, and an educational problem. If children are involved, the consequences are even greater.

I've already pointed out that 48 per cent of homicides in this province may be attributed to domestic disputes. I've also learned that one in 10, or approximately 500,000, Canadian women are estimated to be battered by their husbands each year.

Recently, child abuse was said to be the major cause of death for children in this province. We as an Assembly must affirm our commitment to the people of this province to help them reduce and prevent this kind of domestic violence. A policy regarding women's shelters generally, and battered women's shelters specifically, must become a top priority item. To hire a consultant is indeed a step in the right direction, if we can class it as one direction. It may be a tardy one, but acceptable. However, Mr. Speaker, it is crucial that the Minister of Social Services and Community Health rally the talent he already has in his department and the communities in this province to get a system in place to deal with these needs as soon as possible. Programs and policies must be initiated and expanded within the ministries of Social Services and Community Health, the Solicitor General, and certainly the Attorney General.

At the present time, this province needs the following things. I'd like to list six: first of all, better preventive family counselling; secondly, funds for educational programs for rape crisis centres; thirdly, expanded home-

maker programs to relieve the pressures of families under stress; fourthly, funds to train municipal police forces to handle domestic disputes, funds and staff to provide support for these officers in dealing with the problem, and certainly funds available so officers can be trained and better prepared to handle situations and domestic fights that they encounter in their regular duties. Fifthly, there should be a policy and assistance to establish battered women's shelters throughout the province, not only for the victims but for those whose explosive home situations could result in violence. And the sixth item: to work with the federal interdepartmental committee on family violence to co-ordinate federal and provincial involvement in this specific area.

If these recommendations are implemented, I believe we will go a long way to reducing violence and consequent crime in this society. At the same time, though, even when we may follow through with these recommendations, steps must be taken, first of all, to provide more follow-up and assessment of juvenile offenders; secondly, to attract to Alberta more qualified and experienced family therapists and counsellors whose main perspective is that of corrections. Thirdly, we should develop more rehabilitative programs within provincially run institutions and support this kind of move in federally run centres; fourthly, develop more appropriate pre-release programs for inmates; and fifthly, encourage the judiciary to use community-based alternatives rather than incarceration in appropriate cases.

Mr. Speaker, as I gathered after reading the report and research presented to us and after sitting in the symposium and listening to the various delegates from a large cross section of professionals in the province of Alberta, from the police forces, departments of social services, the ministry, lay personnel, and hearing from people who were just interested in this whole area of crime and violence, we found there was really no single, simple dramatic solution to the problem. There was no single, simple dramatic change we could make to eliminate violence in our society.

But I feel and our Sacred caucus certainly feels, Mr. Speaker, that there are some basic policies and programs and some changes in present policies and programs that can reduce violence and certainly prevent the development of social situations from which violence emanates. At this time I urge the Assembly to examine these recommendations, to consider them very carefully. I hope that in the discussion hon. members of this Assembly can support some of those ideas and also add others, because I think the situation at the present time is most serious.

The root of the problem certainly is caused by various social pressures in Alberta at the present time, our economic pressures, and we as legislators must be responsive to those social and economic pressures and understand them. At the same time, we must listen to many of the professionals in the field, who I'm sure are attempting to direct us and give us answers to those specific problems. I feel we must be responsive and attempt in every way available to us to implement preventative measures to deal with the problem and reduce the amount of violence and certainly the amount of crime. That's the best we can do, but that is our responsibility as legislators.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak to this motion proposed by the hon. Member for Little Bow. I would like to thank the

member and congratulate him for bringing this matter to the Legislature.

I recall one of the first speeches I gave in this Legislature back in '75 in response to the first Kirby report. I stated that I had a feeling the public of this province no longer felt as secure as they once did. I had a feeling that they questioned the effectiveness of law enforcement. I had a feeling that they had lost confidence in the courts. I don't believe this situation has changed significantly since that time.

Mr. Speaker, the philosophy of prevention in law enforcement is nothing new. In fact when Sir Robert Peel organized the London metropolitan police force back in the early 1800s, he stated that the first objective of good policing was the prevention of crime. The manner in which the members of that force looked after prevention of crime was to see that criminals were moved off their beats and onto somebody else's beat to commit the offence. Believe it or not, when I started my law enforcement career with the Calgary city police, we followed exactly the same procedure. It was actually quite effective. They moved from beat to beat, and finally they were out of the city and out of the jurisdiction altogether.

But speaking of programs and crime prevention, the Calgary police were one of the pioneers in crime prevention programs in this whole country. I was appointed public relations officer for that force back in 1968, with a mandate to create and operate a number of crime prevention programs. I might mention, Mr. Speaker, how different the funding was in those days. For my first year I was assigned one part-time secretary and a budget of \$1,200. So it was necessary to seek out the assistance of various organizations, service clubs — we even had a funeral home sponsor one of our programs.

We called one of the first programs the Child Molester. This was a program to train parents to in turn teach their children to avoid the attacks of the child molester. In the course of the first two years we addressed over 20,000 parents. And believe it or not — this is one of the reasons I'm so suspicious of statistics — the police chief became quite upset at the end of the first year because the apparent incidence had risen dramatically. As I explained to him, the incidence did not rise but the reporting did. This is one of the principles of law enforcement reporting: the more confidence the public has in the law enforcement agency, the higher the rate of reporting you get.

However, one of the news types interviewed me and said, how's the program going? I said, as far as numbers are concerned, very, very well; we have standing-room audiences for most of the programs. However, I said, I think I'm talking to the wrong people. Maybe we should be setting up down in the local bar, because those are the parents who don't care about their kids. The parents coming out to the programs are the dedicated, responsible parents. So as you see, Mr. Speaker, I have some reservations about crime prevention programs *per se*. I think it's a real mistake to place too much dependence on them. As I found, there is no substitute for traditional police investigation and traditional law enforcement.

A significant portion of the report presented today has to do with domestic violence. Professor Hackler is quite correct: it's a very, very serious phenomenon in modern society. In fact I believe his numbers, if anything, are low. In 1973, the last year I was on the Calgary force, there were over 5,000 domestic complaints attended by members of that force, and many of them with considerable violence. But they did have a common denominator: liquor was involved in almost every one of those offences.

Another comment Professor Hackler makes is that it's also a sport of the upper echelon of society but the public, and more particularly the law enforcement people, are inclined to pick on the poorer people. I think this is a bit of a fallacy on the part of Professor Hackler, because the police respond to reports. If the offence is not reported, there's no way they can respond to it. The police don't go around neighborhoods in the evening, knocking on doors and saying, are any wives being assaulted at this address tonight. They wait for a report. If the higher echelon of society don't see fit to report it, there's no way they can become part of the statistics. So in my estimation the 5,000 attended by the Calgary police in that particular year in no way determine the total enormity of the problem.

Another area I'd like to look at is murder. Professor Hackler states, at least in the report, that approximately 48 per cent of all murders occurred during domestic assaults within the family. I don't question this for a moment. For many, many years we came up with the figure that two-thirds of all murders takes place either in the family unit or persons known to the family. And so what? But a mistake many of these analysts make is taking for granted that because two-thirds of the sample behaves in a certain way, three-thirds does. Nothing could be further from the truth. That other third is some of the most vicious, the most unspeakable offenders in our society. These people shouldn't be allowed to see the light of day. There is only one solution for them: keep them locked up for the balance of their natural lives.

I could tell you, Mr. Speaker, of a couple of offences I personally attended. We had a case a few years ago. At 4 o'clock one morning a local pimp and drug peddler was beating up one of his women on 9th Avenue and one of the east-end streets of Calgary, and a truck going through the city on its way to the highway came by. The driver, quite a small man, 57" or 58", came to the woman's assistance. Savard was the driver's name — and this is significant. The big pimp picked up the little guy, dashed him to the sidewalk, and jumped on his leg. Savard called out, please, leave me alone; you've broken my leg. Schultz said, I'll show you how to break your leg. He dragged him over to a light standard, wrapped the leg around it, and tore the leg off right on the spot. Now what do you with a man who commits an offence of that nature?

Long before I came to this legislature, I personally had a great deal to do with bringing crime compensation legislation to this province. I am happy to report that Savard was the first recipient of benefits from that Act. But I say to you again: what do you do to an offender who commits an unspeakable offence such as that?

I can tell you another one — a hostage robbery. The purpose of a hostage robbery is to extract money or information from the victim. Three of our worst criminals went into the home of a Safeway manager one afternoon. The first persons home were the Safeway manager's little 12-year-old daughter and her friend. They beat up the little kids; drove the little girl's teeth through her lips. The second person who came home was the wife of the manager. As she attempted to turn her key in the door, this fellow swung the door open. She screamed when she saw him. And I don't blame her. Most of you would be repulsed by the character if you saw him. He beat her down with the butt of a gun, kicked her in the face, and drove her teeth in. Then they got the little girl to phone her father at the store and say, please come home; my little sister is ill. He came home. He was stripped down in

front of his wife and his little daughter and her friend, and the family was subjected to 12 hours of torture and humiliation. Now I don't recommend that we have any rehabilitation programs for people of that nature.

One of the finest reports I ever had experience in was the McRuer report of 1957 by Mr. Justice McRuer of the Supreme Court of Ontario, which deals with the criminal law pertaining to criminal sexual psychopaths. I would recommend it to the members. It's the most complete study, and nothing has changed since '57. Mr. Justice McRuer was one of the first writers I ever heard define the objectives of penology. Good penology contemplates three objectives: one, the protection of society by the confinement of the prisoner; two, the reformation of the prisoner; and three, the deterrent effect of the sentence on the prisoner and others. Do you notice the order? The first objective of good penology is to protect the public by taking the offender out of society. For those types I told you about — and I can tell you of many more — there is only one answer: take them out of society.

Mr. McRuer also commented at that time on why the procedures were ineffective:

We are convinced that the law in Canada dealing with the "criminal sexual psychopath" is not accomplishing its purpose. This failure may be due ... to one or more of three things — (1) the phraseology of the law, (2) the lack of proper enforcement of the law, and (3) the reluctance of the courts to commit a person to imprisonment for an indeterminate term

...  
Members of the Legislature, that's what we need to return to.

One other area the report makes reference to is violence and the media. This is a significant problem in North America today. There is an excellent report by the president's committee on crime entitled just that: Violence and the Media. It is an area in which I detest censorship of any type. It's quite repugnant to me. But I think this an area we've just got to take a look at.

Indeed one of the areas the report dealt with even more than the violence depicted on the screens was the select life. You know, the people in the ghetto have been shown the beautiful life, areas they can't even attain, and they found that this precipitated a great deal of crime also.

If we are going to adopt programs for prevention and the assistance of the offender, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend that we concentrate on the juvenile. Most of the people I spoke of are beyond rehabilitation, beyond redemption. I am speaking of the criminal offenders, not the domestic offence. But the juvenile has a great deal going for him. All adult offenders were once juvenile offenders, and this is the area where our dollars should be going. To adopt programs — in fact a number of programs in the province at the present time dealing with juveniles are extremely effective and are to be commended.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this subject that has been introduced this afternoon is most interesting, and several other speakers would like to address themselves to it. So once again, my thanks and my congratulations to the Member for Little Bow for bringing this matter to the Legislature.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for letting me rise to speak to Motion No. 225. I would also like to thank the Member for Little Bow for bringing this to the Assembly.

It's with a great deal of interest that I peruse some of

this material and find that by definition of the Criminal Code crimes of violence are murder, attempted murder, rape, other sexual offences, woundings, assaults, and robbery. These are very interesting to me. Certainly the Member for Calgary McCall has been involved in this for some time. It was probably a lifetime's work. [laughter] I will not mention on what side.

This reminds me — I spent some years in a small town in east-central Alberta. I'll always remember this. I happened to be meeting a bus that day. In these towns at that time, for some reason you happened to get policemen from Calgary dressed in a stetson with the brim pulled over their eyes, a shoulder holster, and a trench coat that had enough straps, belts, and various other things to make another coat. Of course they used to stalk the streets.

This particular time I was in a hotel, and a gentleman came in. This policeman was just new in town. He mentioned to the people in the hotel how he was going to straighten out the traffic problems and parking in the town. I'll never forget this. An elderly man, a retired hoghead on the railroad, said, Mr. Policeman, do you carry a gun? The policeman said, yes sir, right here in my shoulder holster. Well, he said, if I were you, sir, I would go down to the local machine shop and get that front sight filed off. The policeman said, why would I want to do a thing like that? He said, because when those ranchers and farmers put that gun where they're going to put it, it's going to hurt if it has a front sight on it. [laughter] This is what happens when you have policemen coming into smaller towns. Of course this isn't the municipal variety, and it's some time ago. But these are things that happen.

In smaller towns in Alberta, boom towns particularly, you frequently have high violent crime rates. Towns in my constituency that have particular problems are Eckville and Caroline. Due to the fact that the police force is some 40 miles away in one case, for some reason or other — maybe it's due to the CBs we have in this day and age — an early warning system seems to be devised. By the time the RCMP gets to these towns, of course the damage has been done and everyone has left.

These are some of the things happening. As far as I am concerned, it is a problem. I can relate one instance when a gentleman stole a car in Red Deer. He went through numerous barriers the police had put up. Unfortunately, on this particular evening the power went off; there were no street lights. He came into this village, going in excess of 100 miles an hour. There was a gentleman crossing the street. I need not tell you what happened from then on. I will only mention that next morning I came into the village and some sea gulls and magpies were on the streets picking up what was left. From what I understand, this man was driving again within several months.

This is the point I bring to the Assembly this afternoon. These things seem to pass by. Of course time is a great healer. I don't know whether it's within our court systems, but I know full well that the officers of the law go to great lengths in order to get a conviction and get people to press charges. For some reason or other in this day and age, when it comes to pressing charges, whether the people are afraid of retaliation or whatever the case may be, it seems the police officer is wasting his time.

Nevertheless I'll get on to a few things like long-term incarceration. The criticism of this approach is that when the offender gets through this he has despair, hostility, and indifference to the consequences, and commits more serious crimes on release.

It is suggested that the real root of the problem is in the home; that a violent criminal is the result of a violent home. More concern with forms of domestic violence such as child abuse and wife batterings should be shown. The public asks, why was a person with a history of violence not put away sooner? The reply is that there is a problem identifying those offenders who will go on to commit more serious crimes and those who will not. The predictions of psychiatrists are not completely accurate. Therefore the criminal justice system tends to be cautious, taking action after the crime is committed, and hoping conviction has a deterring effect.

In the release of the Solicitor General just a few months ago, they're putting \$4.1 million into the cities and towns to assist them with the costs of providing police service within their boundaries. I hope and really do pray that this particular expenditure will result in some of the smaller villages — I'm talking particularly about the towns and villages below 1,500 population, because they certainly need additional policing due to the fact that we have pipelines, forestry, and all these different industries going on. Certainly when they get into town on a Saturday night — the Member for Calgary McCall would know what would happen from then on.

Members of the Assembly, I'd just like to go on to a few of the preventive programs they have: business security, credit card fraud, lady beware, neighborhood watch, operation identification and provident, ski check, theft of auto, and vandalism. These are just a few. There is \$50,000 in crime prevention grants given to assist the police forces, and a \$350,000 total Solicitor General's budget for crime prevention.

In closing, I really do believe in crime prevention. As I mentioned earlier, I only hope that some of the additional policing expected in this province will show up in our smaller urban centres.

Thank you.

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise for a few moments to contribute to the debate on Motion 225. I share the concerns of my colleagues and, I feel confident in saying, the concern of every individual in this Assembly regarding the incidence of violent crime in today's society. It is very, very justified. This concern is not limited to the people of our province nor to the people of our nation. The motion before us is broad in nature, therefore I would like to limit my comments to only two or three specific areas.

Before I begin I would like to thank the official opposition for showing their interest in this matter, also for conducting the study on violent crime in Alberta. It is a valuable supplement to the work now being done by the government and other people in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I conducted some research into the incidence and nature of violent crime in Alberta. In paper 1 of the study I have just mentioned I noted that crimes of the most violent nature, such as rape and murder, attract the greatest attention and result in public uproar and great emotional response. Of course, this is for a most valid reason.

Public knowledge of rash and violent crimes — and I'll admit they are often sensationalized by the media — frightens each and every one of us, although the most violent crimes may be those of the lowest incidence and just the tip of the iceberg of the crime problem. But it is these crimes that do most to shake our feelings and those of society in general.

We see numerous efforts to deter crime in Alberta. The

valuable and highly competent work of our police forces is the most visible example. We see that \$4.1 million will be allocated to the various municipalities by the Solicitor General. These funds are to assist the municipalities with providing police service. In keeping with local autonomy the funds are unconditional, and therefore will enable the individual forces in the province to respond to the conditions in their communities for which they feel they are best equipped to do. The government has established numerous policies and programs aimed at preventing violence and violent crimes. Yet I wonder if we might encourage greater attention to areas such as: what motivates criminal activity, whether heavier sentencing is in fact a deterrent, and the social conditions under which criminal activity is greatest.

I can well appreciate the difficulties involved in maintaining accurate statistics on crime, as I have encountered this problem in my research. As an example, I set out to determine how many rapes occurred in the province of Alberta last year. There are many sources for this information, and the Department of the Solicitor General was very helpful in obtaining this information. They are highly trained people, and explained the various reporting and interpretive problems I should encounter in analysing the information. I contacted some of the major police forces in the province, and they were also helpful in providing me with data with regard to rapes in the province of Alberta. I contacted the rape crisis centres in Edmonton and Calgary and was provided with their statistics. But then I found that only 50 or so per cent — and I may be overestimating here — of the rape victims who seek the assistance of the rape crisis centres eventually report the crime to the police. Of course, not all those who report to the police have gone to the rape crisis centre. Then there are the women, the victims of this crime, who have never reported to anyone.

I brought this example forward to point out how difficult it is to determine the incidence of criminal activity, for a variety of reasons, despite the work of many able and concerned people. As we all know only too well, statistics on any subject can be interpreted to suit the person using them. In terms of policy initiatives, I would like to see work on standardized reporting of statistics by police forces and other responsible agencies. Armed with such an understanding, policies can be tailored to combat crime more effectively.

It has been pointed out that we are experiencing a rather high violent crime rate in some of the province's smaller centres. This is an unfortunate circumstance that is aggravated by high growth and economic vitality. As the hon. Solicitor General noted in his announcement regarding increased funding to municipalities for law enforcement, a priority of the government is ensuring that all communities in Alberta can provide a high level of law enforcement. He added that this is particularly important because of the growth in population and economic activity we are experiencing in Alberta. Again, I believe this increased funding in the hands of municipalities will go a long way toward reducing crimes.

It is often pointed out that a large percentage of violent crimes occurs in a domestic situation. The violent attacker is more likely to be a friend, relative, or acquaintance than a stranger. This would suggest to me that we should be emphasizing policy aimed at preventing violence in the home. Recognizing that the family and community are important influences in the prevention of crime, a number of programs are available through Social Services and Community Health, including preventive social services

counselling, group homes, homes for battered women, and the list goes on and on.

One recent example of government initiative in this area is the child abuse hotline announced by the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. This service will allow individuals to report incidents of child abuse or neglect on a 24 hour a day, seven day a week basis. As the unit will be staffed and trained by social workers, they will be able to respond directly to the allegations of abuse or neglect of children. This initiative, Mr. Speaker, combined with the educational programs aimed at heightened awareness of this service and its benefits, is an important step toward control of a tragic and all too often hidden problem.

However, Mr. Speaker and members of the Assembly, I don't feel we should be too smug about what's happening. I'd just like to conclude my remarks with these few phrases: Bus fired on, girl injured; Father admits beating baby; Scream of fear in the dark; A grisly find begs an answer; Ontario man arrested in stabbing; Savage night of terror described during rape trial. Those were headlines that appeared in our local papers in the last two days, and those were incidents that happened in this province.

DR. C. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege for me to be able to rise to speak to Motion No. 225, which states that additional policies and programs should be established to reduce and prevent violence and crime in Alberta. As we enter the '80s, we observe the great advances man has made, and we expect to find happy people enjoying all the processes in the good life we have. Instead we find ourselves in an air of confusion that has grown out of a complex industrial and technological society. In spite of the benefits we have, it has brought us many problems. I appreciate the efforts of the official opposition, especially the Member for Little Bow, in focussing attention on this important issue. The Solicitor General and the minister and Department of Social Services and Community Health are providing an ongoing, concerned, realistic approach to the issue. I'm sure they're realistic, because you cannot legislate life styles.

It's very well to say the province should be doing more to protect and prevent tragic events, but where does one draw the line? Do we curtail the freedom of movement of individuals, and how far do we go? I feel that most of our problems have arisen from the morality we have developed within society. Through this morality breakdown and the breakdown of the family unit, we've seen a gradual decay of society and the establishment of more crime with more groups taking over. This crime is gradually going into the family, and more of them involve domestic situations. Spence said that when family life is destroyed, the very existence of a nation is threatened. Over the past years we've seen the development of more pornography, more films exploiting sex, violence, and whatever. I believe we see more playwrights and managers publicly using drama titles which are sexually suggestive. The dominant purpose of theatre and television concentrates on immorality.

The movie *Bonnie and Clyde* dealt with a killing rampage across the United States, with utter disregard for human life. It was depicted in a comedy situation and one found himself laughing at the antics. You became sympathetic toward the people when the FBI finally caught and killed them in the shootout. That movie led to designers developing Bonnie and Clyde fashion garments that stormed the markets, and was exploited by the

commercial industry.

Barbara Graham was the last woman executed in the state of California. She was a prostitute, and had viciously strangled an old lady in a wheel chair. Her actions were so repugnant that when her accomplices returned to the scene to remove the articles used to murder the poor old soul from around her neck, they subsequently reported the murder to the police. This event was used in a movie to show that this lady had been misrepresented and misunderstood. The movie was instrumental in abolishing capital punishment in the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the time, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the hon. member have leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS  
OTHER THAN  
GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Second Reading)**

**Bill 212  
The Utility Consumers' Advocate Act**

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill 212, The Utility Consumers' Advocate Act. As indicated at the time of introduction of the Bill, its purpose is to help ensure that Albertans affected by the decisions of the utilities tribunals in this province — and I'm speaking particularly of the Energy Resources Conservation Board, the Public Utilities Board, and the Surface Rights Board, to name some — will be able to receive a full and proper representation before those tribunals, regardless of their financial means.

This Bill will provide for the creation of the office of the utility consumers' advocate, who will be appointed for a term of five years and renewals thereof and will be dismissable only for cause — this is to ensure the independence of that office — and who, additionally, will be able to retain the technical expertise and legal counsel necessary to assist in properly representing Albertans before these quasi-judicial boards. It is the intention of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, to try to help balance the scales, if you will, between the utility companies, that are well-equipped to present their point of view in the essentially adversarial atmosphere of these hearings, and individual Albertans who may be affected by such decisions and who often lack the financial means and technical expertise to fully protect their rights.

The office of the utility consumers' advocate would be available to Albertans on an optional basis and would require neither consumers, consumer groups, nor other interest groups to use its services if they felt well able to represent their own interests, nor would it preclude any such individual or group from intervention independent of the utility consumers' advocate. The office is intended for and would serve those who seek its assistance and help.

Mr. Speaker, some may ask, why is such an office required? Don't these various tribunals presently have the staff and the ability to ask questions on behalf of the consumer, whether the issue be setting utility rates or the location of a transmission line? The fact is that while these tribunals do have certain inquisitorial functions,

they will not necessarily take into account all the interests which might be expressed by the individual citizen or citizens.

I want to make it abundantly clear that this is in no way a criticism of these tribunals. It is simply a recognition of the complexity of the issues these bodies face and the present essentially quasi-judicial nature of their role. But one may still say, surely the present regulations provide for an intervenor's costs to be compensated. Why can't a private citizen simply hire counsel and the technical experts required for this purpose? The problem of course is that the tribunal does not make any award as to costs until well after the hearing is concluded. Also there is no early indication as to what costs either the board or the applicant will consider reasonable. This has the effect of potentially creating great uncertainty in the mind of an intervenor as to the nature and extent of funding available to him. The net result of this uncertainty may well be no representation at all by that private citizen, or a minimal one which lacks either or both the adequate legal preparation and the technical expertise required in these tribunals for a truly effective presentation.

In addition, there may be those sceptics who would argue that this Bill may ultimately permit a self-perpetuating bureaucratic function that merely duplicates what is already being done. While that argument must be considered very carefully whenever government considers the expenditure of public funds, one must look at the inescapable realities of the Alberta of today. Alberta is an energy province, where we can and must anticipate more intrusion into the area of private rights; for example, in the placement of transmission lines, pipelines, and other carriers of energy. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the rising cost of energy, because of its scarcity, makes it clear that consumers will be faced with more and more applications for rate increases by utility companies in years to come.

To get a perspective and see how the scales sit between the utility companies and consumers, consider the following examples. Number one, Calgary Power's application to the Energy Resources Conservation Board to build Keeyik 1 and 2 sought regulatory approval of a \$660 million capital spending program. Number two, Alberta Power's application to that same tribunal, the Energy Resources Conservation Board, to build Sheerness 1 and 2 sought regulatory approval of a \$750 million capital spending program. Number three, in the case of major electricity rate cases before the Public Utilities Board, the combined revenue requirements of Calgary Power and Alberta Power are now in excess of \$400 million annually. The decision to approve or withhold approval for a 10 per cent rate increase is thus a \$40 million per year decision.

In contrast, the current annual budgets of consumer interest groups potentially capable of representing consumer interests in such regulatory decisions are: number one, the Union of Rural Electrification Associations, \$28,000; number two, the Alberta branch of the Consumers' Association of Canada, \$20,000; number three, the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, \$105,000, which is spread over a range of activities.

Mr. Speaker, I believe mention should also be made at this juncture of the office of the Farmers' Advocate. I want to make abundantly clear that the intent of this Bill is not to detract in any way from the function of that important office, and it would not. In fact the Farmers' Advocate has described his office's involvement with rural utilities as minimal. The fact is, of course, that consid-

erable specialized technical and legal expertise is required for effective representation before these quasi-judicial bodies.

Mr. Speaker, it is respectfully submitted to this Assembly that when one considers the wide discrepancy in funding available to the power companies compared to existing consumer interest groups, the minimal involvement of the Farmers' Advocate in this area, and the uncertainties of cost recovery and the cost of good technical and legal representation, it becomes abundantly clear that a void presently exists between the board and the intervenor. That void should be filled to ensure that no Albertan is denied proper representation in such matters because of limited financial means and, further, to instill greater public confidence that the interests of the individual are being properly protected. That is in no way an adverse reflection on any of the tribunals involved. The fact remains that the job is a mammoth one, and requires special representation.

It should be noted that in addition to the positive purpose that has already been enunciated, the office of the utility consumers' advocate would provide a valuable service by simply being accessible and available to Albertans for advice and counsel, which in many instances might well result in an intervenor determining not to proceed with an intervention, the approval process thereby being shortened, Mr. Speaker, rather than lengthened. In other words, the number of interventions may well be reduced. As well, in those instances where an intervention is proceeded with, the advocate's office may bring together a number of individual intervenors which will thus provide a clearer focus for common concerns at the hearing for all parties concerned.

It may also be suggested, Mr. Speaker, that the concept of the utility consumers' advocate could give rise to conflicts of interest between different intervenors who seek the assistance of that office. That argument raises the valid observation that there must be some discretion granted to the utility consumers' advocate in determining to act or not act in a particular case. So while information and technical and legal advice can be provided to parties with different interests in respect of the same hearing, if the office of the utility consumers' advocate concludes there is a significant conflict of interest between different parties who wish its assistance, the office would not act for one party over another at the actual hearing. In response to that argument, if it is being used to suggest the concept is unworkable, it must be noted that the concept is in place in over 21 states in the United States of America and is working well. It's working well despite that argument about inherent conflicts of interest.

It should also be properly noted and mentioned that members may have recommendations for amendments to fine tune this Bill in some way. I want to go on record, Mr. Speaker, as being quite receptive and pleased to see such amendments brought forward and considered during the committee stage of the Bill. What's important is the principle inherent in this Bill.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, it is respectfully submitted that the proposal entailed in this Bill has advantages that far outweigh the disadvantages. It is acknowledged that other approaches may be considered to meet the principle inherent in this Bill. One such approach, for example, would simply be to provide greater financial assistance to interested parties. However, while that approach would avoid the concern about an appearance of more bureaucracy, it is submitted that it might well provide a far less effective control over expenditure of public funds, and

really wouldn't allow for the development of a reservoir of technical and legal expertise for individual Albertans to call upon, and at arm's length from the quasi-judicial functions of these regulatory tribunals. In short, it is hoped that the concept incumbent and inherent in this Bill will be viewed in a favorable light by other members of this Assembly, with the goal — and I think we have to keep the ultimate goal very clear — being the protection of the rights of the individual citizen in this province.

Mr. Speaker, just prior to resuming my seat and affording other hon. members the opportunity to participate in this debate, I wish to acknowledge with regret, and by way of an apology to subsequent speakers, that I find myself with an unavoidable commitment in Calgary later this afternoon. As a result, I will be unable to remain in my seat in the Assembly for the balance of this debate. However, I wish to assure those members that I will read with the greatest of interest their remarks in *Hansard*, and look forward to having an opportunity to review this full debate.

Thank you very much.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to participate in the debate this afternoon on Bill 212. I might say to the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn that maybe he should stick around or he can read it in *Hansard*, but I think it's timely that he does bring this to the floor of the Assembly, with the number of submissions that have been made to me as a member of my constituency and, I'm sure, to a lot of other members in the Assembly.

I read with interest the Bill the hon. member has brought forward. I would think that the title of the Bill, The Utility Consumers' Advocate Act, might have some problems with the individual citizen in rural Alberta. Because reading through the various sections of the Bill, it doesn't actually do that much to protect the consumer, unless you're going to say you're going to protect the person who has the land the utility company is attempting to expropriate or use for a utility corridor.

The Bill has no section that deals with compensation. As I follow the various rulings of the Energy Resources Conservation Board and ones that have gone through the surface rights hearings and so on, I think this type of Bill should probably also be dealing with compensation because of the problems we have. We have a number of cases in my constituency where Calgary Power has expropriated land for plant use and then it has gone to hearings and subsequently been settled. But it took the people involved a considerable amount of time to get fair compensation for their land. So I think it's very important that if the Assembly does consider this legislation, the utility advocate would also have the power to deal with compensation.

I look at the Bill and go back about six years when by order in council the cabinet of the present government unilaterally placed a restricted development area around Edmonton and Calgary. Restricted development areas were primarily set up for utility corridors and so on: I'm wondering how this consumers' advocate would have acted in that particular case when the landowners in the area did not know what was happening to them. They read the next day in the *Edmonton Journal*, or saw when the O.C. came out on Wednesday morning, that in fact the land around Edmonton and Calgary had been taken for a utility corridor by order in council of the government. I have a fair amount of that in my constituency, and still have representation made to me on an ongoing basis about the unfair manner in which these particular

pieces of land were taken. Now the people who want to do particular upgrading, farm operations, or anything that may deal with expanding their livelihood have to come to the provincial government for permission to do any development on these sections or tracts of land. This is one area where I think even now, if the legislation were put in place, this advocate would be of some assistance to the many landowners around the cities of Edmonton and Calgary.

I go back, Mr. Speaker, and look at the vast development taking place in my own particular constituency, the Stony Plain constituency, especially in the Lake Wabamun area. Calgary Power has built one plant with six units on the north side of Lake Wabamun called the Sundance plant, which is under full production; and now the Keephills plant, which the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn mentioned, is under construction.

Power lines have to come out of those plants to distribute that electrical energy throughout Alberta. I believe that prior to 1970 there were little or no problems transporting the electrical energy out. After a lot of our environmentalists and a number of other people came into place, the problem became very evident. We recently went through a hearing where Calgary Power has applied to the board — and I'm not sure if a decision has been handed down — to run two 500 KV lines from the Keephills plant to a new substation south of the city of Edmonton for transmission into other areas. I'm not sure how the consumers' advocate could have helped those landowners along there. I think the landowners themselves, as interveners in the hearings, did an excellent job. I believe that the company involved, Calgary Power, considered the views and so did the board at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I have before the Assembly and have given first reading to Bill 226, An Act to Amend The Expropriation Act. That's the main concern in my constituency right now. I don't think the Bill will come up for debate in this fall session, but in the spring session of '81 I'll be reintroducing the Bill immediately so all members of the Assembly will get an opportunity to debate its very important principles. I think the principle of that Bill is to allow fair compensation for land being expropriated for plants and other natures.

Mr. Speaker, with The Utility Consumers' Advocate Act, I could actually see a duplication of services in some regard. The hon. member mentioned the Farmers' Advocate. I have high regard for the Farmers' Advocate and his office, because I think he is basically the watchdog in rural Alberta for our farm community and has done a commendable job in the past number of years since being in that office. The farmers in rural Alberta certainly rely on Mr. Entrup and his people to intervene on their behalf to try to get a fair settlement. He has done this in a number of cases. We know fewer cases have been made to his office regarding utility corridors and so on, but in the ones in which he has intervened it certainly has been beneficial for the farm community.

Mr. Speaker, just to summarize: I guess I'm lukewarm on the particular Bill. I think the Energy Resources Conservation Board now in place, and the appeals out of that, is a mechanism the landowners can appeal to to make their hearings known. I think that in some cases it may be beneficial. The one I outlined was the restricted development area around Edmonton and Calgary. If legislation were enacted, I believe that office would probably help these people deal mainly with the Department of Environment to which they have to appeal for any development to their lands.



I'm sure a number of other members of the Assembly would like to speak on this, Mr. Speaker, so I thank you.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise and participate in the debate on Bill 212, presented by the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn. I'd like to support the concept. As we develop as a province, I think it's important that we arm the consumer with the ability to challenge some of the assumptions utility companies make in their rate applications. The hon. Member for Stony Plain has dealt with the question of landowners and their dealings with utility companies, for power lines, for example. Those are all valid concerns.

I think we have to look at the nature of this question and what is happening across North America. For example, Mr. Speaker, I understand consumers in the state of New York are given the opportunity to match dollar for dollar the expenditures of a utility company that comes before a rate board with an application for an increase. Consumers there are dealt with in a way that equalizes the balance between the ability of a large company to put together a battery of technical experts, resource people, lawyers, and accountants to go and make their case for them. If they are to start a class action to try to question a rate increase that they are ultimately going to have to pay, most consumers don't have those resources available. The attempt of Bill 212 is, I think, to redress the balance.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill provides for a utility consumers' advocate. Probably the operative features of the Bill are in Section 4, where the advocate can retain counsel. He can collect evidence, he can retain experts, and he can report to the minister on any matter. Now the point I'm trying to make is simply this. I'll use the example of Calgary Power. The offer to purchase shares by several large companies in the province raised the question in the public domain, I think quite legitimately, whether the share offer would force a rate increase to pay off that very large cost incurred, the price of capital, to take over control of the company, and whether that cost bore any relationship to the actual cost of production for electrical energy. I think that's a reasonably good question to ask, but it would be a difficult one to ask with any degree of factual base unless one retained a number of financial experts, people able to gauge intelligently whether a stock offer for control of a company, for example, is a reasonable one — what impact that would have on the cost of doing business for the utility company and on the rates for the consumer.

So, Mr. Speaker, this Bill would allow a utility consumers' advocate to hire the kinds of expertise that would have to be found to make a good case to protect the consumer against unwarranted rate increases. Right now the balance quite clearly is weighted heavily on the side of utility companies which can afford to bring that expertise to a public forum, like a utilities board or the Energy Resources Conservation Board. But that expertise is not presently available to a consumer group.

Now it's true that a consumer group can apply for costs. But it's also fair to note that costs may or may not be awarded; they are discretionary. There's no way a consumers' group can anticipate receiving some payment for the costs of putting together a case. The costs are awarded only after the case has been decided, so quite clearly there's a bias against consumers' groups banding together to put a case before a tribunal or board.

I think Alberta, with sister provinces and other jurisdictions across North America, should join in the trend to

try to address this concern consumers quite legitimately have, and I view Bill 212 as being the logical outcome of that kind of concern.

The state of New York has a different approach, Mr. Speaker, and it might be worth while dealing with it briefly. I understand that in that state a consumer group may ask to have the same amount of money made available to it as the utility company has spent in preparing the brief for a utility board. For example, a power company, Consolidated Light, might ask the state of New York for permission to charge consumers a certain amount of money, and they might spend \$500,000 putting together that kind of case, assembling the financial and technical expertise to do that. Then a consumers group could apply to have an equal amount of money made available by Consolidated Light and Power to allow them to make a case on the other side, and they are matched dollar for dollar. It's a different approach, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the same concern. I think Bill 212 does this quite adequately. In this case I think the consumers' advocate is protected, because he is at arm's length from the Executive Council for five years. In that term of office the advocate can be relatively free of concern that the Executive Council can influence him or her with budgetary control, for example, or lack of tenure.

I think the approach the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn has outlined is a good one. It's reasonable. It provides protection for the consumer. It also gives the minister responsible for the process — I assume the Minister of Utilities and Telephones in this case — the opportunity in five years to review the performance of the office and make recommendations to the Legislature to continue or not, and to hire someone sensitive to those concerns. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a reasonable approach to a problem a lot of consumers across North America are starting to address. It's an approach that deserves the support of hon. members in the House. I look forward to hearing further debate on the issue.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to rise and participate on the Bill before us. I would like to start by expressing my agreement with what I take to be the intent of my colleague, the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn, in bringing this Bill for consideration.

As our society becomes more and more complex, we as citizens face an almost daily task of reconciling public need with private right. When we first became a province, the lines separating public need and private right were quite clear. We were directly involved in decisions that affected our lives. To relate this concept to the Bill before us, our needs to be exercised on our behalf by the government were comparatively small: building roads, other communications, and organizing a method of ensuring our children were schooled. Together with our neighbors, and with a collective assistance through public financing, we formed utility co-operatives. We helped each other build a strong province. While we did many things collectively, we knew the source of our independence and strength as individuals. As society and numbers grew, so did concerns and so did governmental responsibilities.

One of the earliest cases of regulations in Alberta, for example, was the equipment standardization regulations for telephone systems. The regulations were needed so we could talk to each other. Today governments do, and are expected to, formulate regulations in matters of public

interest.

Seventy-five years ago we could and would have become a government agent who would have had the audacity to march onto an individual's property and say, we're putting a pipeline or a transmission line through your property. Our society was small enough then that we as individuals had and took the time and energy to get together with our neighbors and provide these things for ourselves. That still is the case, of course, for many new and existing co-operatives.

But our society has grown by leaps and bounds since then. Demand for such services has grown greatly. Today we have a society that has all individuals dependent upon each other. The concepts of public need and private right and the arena for discussing these matters has grown as people need a service, Mr. Speaker. A price is paid. Some members of the public may be inconvenienced so that all can benefit. But proprietary acts and rights, fundamental in our free society, remain. If a person has to give up a possession so that society will benefit, we recognize those rights by fair compensation. We have mechanisms to ensure that these fundamental rights remain and that the individual is protected.

I understand and agree with my colleague's concern. If someone wants to enter my land to put in a transmission line, I want to be assured that my legal rights are recognized. Moreover, I want to know it is necessary. In our complex society today, many rights of entry belong to others, for the public good. The question, Mr. Speaker, is: what right do I have to deny my neighbor some conveniences? To be five or several hundred kilometers away, the same access to such services as electricity, as an example, that I have — what right do I have to deny my neighbors heating fuel, diesel, that I myself enjoy? I believe the answer is that we all have equal rights before the law. Our role as representatives in this Assembly is to ensure that the rights are preserved. Like it or not, we also have the responsibility to ensure that those rights are preserved.

We also have the responsibility to see that the public need and private right are complementary. When someone succeeds in putting up high voltage lines on our land, even though we receive compensation, we still have to drive our tractors around it. It is no doubt an inconvenience to do that, but we also have to realize that maybe somebody has to drive their tractor for our convenience, for some utility we are using.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague's concern. The Bill before us would establish an independent advocate to assist individuals and groups in ensuring that they have adequate representation when decisions are made regarding right of entry and appeals. For example, I want to express my appreciation to the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn for making such an eloquent and informed case for an advocate. On first consideration, I tend to think it's a good idea. I think many other people will feel likewise.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have several questions in my mind about supporting the establishment of an advocacy role directly from this Bill. How many people will demand such a service? If anyone affected by an increase in utility rates demands it, soon we will all be writing to him. If not everyone potentially benefiting from the advocate's service can have it, what then of our role as legislator in enacting fair legislation? Will the expense be justified by the value? Will the privilege offset the responsibility?

What of the current structure and mechanism we have? Under existing legislation, right of entry must first be

granted by the Energy Resources Conservation Board acting under the hydro and energy Act, also The Energy Resources Conservation Act. The surface rights then govern and establish fair rules for the Surface Rights Board. Granted, one lonely person may feel it's a tough fight against a corporation lawyer, and no doubt it is. But we have legislation that provides fairness, and what else do we need? We have the intervener regulations which permit the Energy Resources Conservation Board to award costs of intervening to the intervenor, including solicitors, normally awarded to the landowner. Granted, this may be unpredictable, but such protections exist and I think they go a long way to remedying the concerns before us today.

Mr. Speaker, the boards themselves perform a function in this regard, in ensuring fairness and reviewing applications. For example, what was the order to return some profits made by the utility company in our province not very long ago? An order the Public Utilities Board made.

As the former speakers mentioned, we have the Farmers' Advocate, who has played a very important role in this province over the last few years. I don't think there has ever been a tribunal or anything set that has brought such good results. I have never heard anyone say anything unfavorable about the services of the Farmers' Advocate, and I feel he can still do a lot in his capacity.

Very often we may complain that maybe power is expensive. And it is. Just the other day I looked at my first electric bill when I became a member of an REA. It has gone up almost five times in the last thirty years. But what hasn't, Mr. Speaker?

When I think back to thirty years ago when I just got electricity, I had a few light bulbs and not much more. When I wanted to start the car in the winter, a can of hot ashes under the oil pan would warm it and I was able to start the car. Now the car is plugged in continuously when it's standing, even if it isn't used for any length of time. So I am sure I must be using five or six times more electricity than I did thirty years ago. And with inflation, I don't know if it's really right that we complain that it's much too expensive. True enough — if we can get anything at all for a dollar less, we are all human beings and we appreciate it. But I must say that in those thirty years, being a member of an REA, whether we liked the costs of electricity or not, the service has been good. Whether it was a hailstorm, a lightning storm, a windstorm, or heavy snows, the service was exceptionally good over those thirty years. Now, whether we look at it one way or another, the one thing I can give the power company credit for is the good service we received, and I'm sure it's much the same throughout the province.

Those are just a few of the areas of my concern, Mr. Speaker. The question before us today is: to what degree do we as representatives in this Legislature want to control the rights of our citizens? Be they individuals, groups, or companies, I believe our current system goes a long way in balancing rights. In meeting the concerns reflected by the debates today, I also believe that the bill before us presents an interesting complement to those rights, and the merit of further study and review is a necessity. At present I would wish that more review be given before we take a vote and support this Bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, speaking to second reading of Bill 212 by the hon. member Mr. Zaozirny, the first question I ask myself is: why the Bill in the first place? As the hon. member mentioned, he had discussions with

many people who prompted him to take the action of sponsoring a Bill in the House, hoping to get support from his colleagues to pass this bill on having an advocate dealing with matters of utilities as they effect the consumer. I think we must recognize that we are in a day and age of rights issues and consumer protection. I sense that it is mainly a result of frustration by many people; that there is a mood throughout the province, and indeed perhaps throughout the country, to have those devices — and perhaps they're reflected here today in legislation — to protect the consumer. I am sure many of us are well aware that technically at least our interests are protected by quasi-judicial bodies formed by statute, such as the Public Utilities Board, the Surface Rights Board, and many other boards. Then I wonder, when I see the collective bargaining process that goes on within the country and the province, that in terms of economic costs employers generally determine at what point they can afford to pay employees. That decision, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, is made on the basis of what they can extract from the consumer to get the funds to pay the employees. And so it is, I suppose, with regard to utilities.

In addition, we look at the area of utilities. I think that is wide open to a definition. Some people seem to think utilities consist only of gas — natural gas in this province anyway, and not propane — and electricity. I suggest that when we look at the work habits and standards people have in this province today, gasoline is probably as much a utility as any other thing. Just try to get me to be without it.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, in looking at the bill, when we are dealing with matters such as — not access to land, because that's provided for by statute. Once a decision has been made that a supplier can provide something, another group looks after that. But there must be frustrations, primarily by rural people and farmers in particular, who perhaps don't feel there is adequate compensation pay when the use of their land is denied to them — almost by statute — because another quasi-judicial body makes that decision. I am pleased to see that the Assembly has struck a select committee from this House, under the chairmanship of the hon. Member for Barrhead, dealing with surface rights. I understand that when this House adjourns they're going to conduct public hearings around the province to get that information, which I know will result in more modernized systems in terms of the surface rights affecting Albertans.

One very significant part of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that if and when ... I'm looking at the history of private bills in this Assembly. It's really not much of a guess as to when, let alone if. But if the advocate were appointed — and I think this is comforting in looking at the bill — he'd be appointed for five years so he'd be immune from political pressure of any kind. I think that's reassuring. He could face his task with some degree of assurance that he would be immune from any pressures from either the applicant for the utility company on one hand or consumer groups on the other.

A particular point of interest to me is where the advocate may retain legal counsel to represent the interveners. He would represent the interveners in an indirect way. As I understand it, he would make representation from the Bill on their behalf to see that so-called justice was provided for interveners.

Realizing the motivation of the member who sponsored the Bill, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed one way of rationalizing in a meaningful way an end to the frustrations many people perceive. Just as we look ahead — as we know

from the budget of October 28, there is a very clear indication that that's not the end of rising energy and utility costs. Indeed many of us tend to forget that just 10 or 15 years ago, to heat one's home for an entire month took wages for about an hour to an hour and a half. And as we come to the end of 1981, a \$100 monthly bill is not going to be unusual for natural gas heating. I had one of those last year.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are certainly many Albertans who would support this type of legislation if only they had the feeling that the very complex procedure the Public Utilities Board goes through in arriving at a fair return for a utility company is going to have some semblance of justice applied to it by an advocate on their part. As we look at what appear to be offers by various companies seeking ownership or control — I guess they're synonymous with Calgary Power in this province — right away one wonders. If someone is prepared to pay 50 per cent more than so-called buck value for a company, are they not really looking for a qualified investment whereby they're going to earn money in the future?

I suggest many Albertans out there have that same question on their minds. Why would various companies pay 50 per cent more than the buck value to buy another company if the intent weren't to make money not just in the long term but in the intermediate term? Perhaps the very fact that we're discussing this Bill in the House today will bring to their attention that there are members of this Assembly who are concerned in a very significant way about their concerns and, for that reason, they sponsored this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, in principle I would support the Bill.

Thanks very much.

DR. C. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege to rise and speak to second reading of Bill No. 212, The Utility Consumers' Advocate Act. I feel it is necessary to bring in this kind of legislation at this time to represent those people who have had difficulties in the past and presently have difficulties with the energy companies supplying electricity and natural gas.

I have had a number of requests from a number of farmers in my area asking for assistance. I'm pleased to see this Bill would establish a utility consumers' advocate who would advise and represent on request of the landowner, and the advocate would not have the power to interfere without that request. A number of electrical lines have been established in our area in the last few years, bringing in high voltage lines that go through property and disturb the land. It created some concern for farmers when these lines were going right across their houses, and they were asked to move them.

One of the big problems was that they always got their information last. The companies had negotiated already and were ready to establish in the areas before they had an opportunity to carry on and get representation for themselves. They've had difficulties finding people knowledgeable in the area and in getting proper consultation.

I would like to see this advocate expanded to deal with other matters that occur in rural Alberta. I think this has become more essential since the REAs lost the responsibility they had when they started, where the farmer groups got together, developed the line, and were responsible for it. Now that responsibility is being gradually taken away from them, and they're in a position where somebody else is dictating to them. However, they still own the lines.

I'd like to see the advocate be able to intervene on

behalf of the farmer who has a power pole with a transformer in his yard, needs the pole moved, and is given an exorbitant price estimate for the move. Most farmers in my area feel they have the equipment and knowledge to move that pole themselves, not waiting anywhere from three to six months and having to spend between \$500 and \$1,000. So I hope we could have some way that the advocate could represent the farmer, especially in those areas where there is no competition for the construction of the project that is to take place. I found that the Farmers' Advocate has intervened and helped on a number of occasions in the constituency of St. Paul, trying to bring about co-operation between the utility company and the farming community. With a little give and take, the lines have been able to go ahead and provide the service needed in the area.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the time, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, before calling it 5:30, I should advise that the government intends to call estimates this evening on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. If, perchance, the House completes its work on the estimates, it would then revert to second reading of Bills on the Order Paper.

That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that when members reassemble this evening at 8 o'clock, the House be in Committee of Supply at that time. I therefore move that we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree that when members reconvene at 8 o'clock, they will be in Committee of Supply?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:25 p.m.]

[The Committee of Supply met at 8 p.m.]

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

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVINGS TRUST FUND  
CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION  
1981-82 ESTIMATES OF  
PROPOSED INVESTMENTS  
**Executive Council**

**Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments or questions regarding this \$1 million amount to be voted?

MR. R. CLARK: The minister was about to answer questions from the member from Edmonton.

MR. NOTLEY: We don't want you to be left out, Bill. Go ahead.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I think they were expecting a few answers from yesterday when we called it 5:30. The comments of my colleague the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont with regard to specific studies at the workplace are very timely. I had referred to the studies that are going now by members of the council and by the Alberta Federation of Labour. As the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview was concerned about, the private sector is doing a lot of it too.

Just for information, in the past year we did co-operate with the private sector. Dr. Kaegi, Western Health Services Research Ltd., did the study on the Prevention of Asbestosis Related Diseases in Alberta. Dr. A. Hayduk did the study on Teaching Voluntary Handwarming for the Promotion of Hand Efficiency at Cold Temperatures, very appropriate at this time of the year; we'll need it very soon. So we are involved with the private sector.

The lack of programs in the faculties of medicine is something I hope would be changed in time. I know my colleague the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower has shared with me that we hope we could bring about some interest in rehabilitative medicine, occupational health and safety interests in rehabilitative medicine. The challenges are there for both the private sector and the faculties of these postsecondary institutions.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, with respect to this whole question of the practice of rehabilitative medicine, what discussions are contemplated at this stage between the council and the two medical faculties? Are there any, not in terms of changing priorities but in terms of establishing a direction?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, there is a keen interest. I guess my answer to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview would be that I'm advised there's a need of personnel even in the faculty. This is a new area. Right now, most of our graduates in rehabilitative medicine are coming from postsecondary institutions in Ontario. Members of the Occupational Health and Safety Council have done some work trying to get commitments of funds from the private sector, prior to the announcement of this fund, as a result of the resolution Mrs. Embury introduced last year, which received a lot of debate and attention. The challenge is out there for those faculties to get involved. We don't have anything specifically designated in this appropriation for rehabilitative medicine, but we would welcome it. I would really look forward to some possible program to be able to enlarge, because the Workers' Compensation Board is much in need of people with that type of training in rehabilitation.

As the appropriation indicates, most of it is for health and safety research and education. I would hope this \$1 million is designated for research in health and safety, and that my colleague the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower would still find the appropriate funds to fund a program for rehabilitative medicine. We support it. There's some sharing in this interest. No doubt there's some overlapping and, to date, no specific discussions with the exception of the interest.

MR. NOTLEY: Just to follow that along, on what basis did the government arrive at the figure of \$1 million? It would seem to me that when one looks at the research going on elsewhere in the world, even compiling that information — when I look at the staff: one administrator, a research assistant, a clerk-typist — the compilation of research elsewhere is going to take up a large part of

the \$1 million. I guess I'd be interested in just what process the government went through to arrive at the figure of \$1 million.

Was the \$1 million figure recommended by the Occupational Health and Safety Council? Was it an arbitrary decision made by the government in the budgeting process, by the caucus? How did we arrive at \$1 million? It seems to me when I look at some of the other estimates we are making in the area of research — the Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority is an example, or the endowment fund for medical research — we're talking about very substantial amounts of money. I support those investments, but I wonder whether \$1 million is really going to be significant compared to the massiveness of the job, when one looks at what is going on in other parts of the world and, in many ways, how far we have to go to shift the emphasis. Our workers' compensation select committee report is based to a large extent on shifting our emphasis from just handing out money to prevention. Part of this kind of research has to be aimed in a pretty fundamental shift of direction. I guess I question whether \$1 million is going to be significant enough and, if the minister thinks it is significant enough, how that figure was arrived at.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I could be saying that it's \$1 million more than we had for this kind of research and education a year ago, or even five years ago. I did it in co-operation with my officials, my department, and my division of occupational health and safety. We felt we would be able to administer this kind of fund for this year. The announcement was \$10 million over the next eight years — not specifically. For the year '81-82, we're looking at \$1 million to be able not to find ourselves wasting. I'm sure hon. members wouldn't want to see us wasting any of these funds. We would want to make sure they are expended very frugally and very effectively.

The discussions I and my officials have had have produced a very co-operative approach with both the public sector and the trade union movement, and even the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. This is the suggested budget as a result of the discussion. This hasn't been anything that the Occupational Health and Safety Council has had an opportunity to set up. This budget was set by my office and my officials and, as I indicated earlier yesterday, would then receive perusal and screening from the council before it goes to the administrative officer and others.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The parameters of the foundation proposed by the hon. Member for Calgary North West were much more extensive than the fund your department has set up. I believe it was to encompass the private sector from the point of view not only of financial assistance but of input and skills from the private sector. Does the minister foresee the present fund as the nucleus or the catalyst to create a foundation as described in the motion?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, very appropriately the hon. Member for Calgary McCall has put his finger on it. The debate received good support and good interest. I would personally hope the foundation is not a dead issue because there was good interest, with the exception that the interest was: how much can we expect the private sector to contribute toward such a foundation? These were so very uncertain that we had to move with some program during this next term.

I would encourage, from my office and my own position, that the concept of a foundation not die. I personally would like to see it continue to be given consideration, because I was advised by members of the Occupational Health and Safety Council who have done some work on trying to solicit some funds that there was some interest in it. I believe that with some success from this fund, the foundation may become a reality. Then we would have to bring in an Act to encompass a foundation.

At present we have chosen not to go with the foundation, because we would have had to bring in an Act without the funds. Possibly we could get the funds in the future, in the next year or two or three down the road, and after the funds are in, then an Act to protect it, or both coming about the same time. The resolution of the hon. Member for Calgary North West, that I reflected on and you questioned, sir, let's not let it die. The foundation has some good possibilities.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I think I might ask the minister to reflect upon two items he mentioned yesterday in the course of his remarks. If I caught the significance of his comments properly, the minister indicated this \$1 million would be used for paying for training programs. If I caught the minister's comments properly, I frankly have grave difficulty understanding how this money will be used for the paying of training programs. I'd be very interested in understanding the rationale there.

Also, Mr. Minister, yesterday some members of the Assembly asked with regard to the role the Occupational Health and Safety Council will play in determining who gets the grants. Very specifically, Mr. Minister — once again, if my notes are accurate from comments that were made yesterday — it was indicated that they would make recommendations to you. Can the minister give us some assurance this evening that by and large the practice of the minister will be to take the recommendations of the Occupational Health and Safety Council, and in fact act upon those recommendations? Because failing such a commitment, if we're to be in a situation where they will make recommendations and the minister, let's say, in a significant number of cases is not accepting the recommendations; then we've got to ask ourselves a question about the effectiveness of the council and the role it's to play. I raise both questions, Mr. Minister, as a result of comments made by you in the course of remarks late yesterday afternoon.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I haven't checked *Hansard* that closely, but I hope that in the first question with regard to the training programs, I was referring to training programs through the postsecondary education institutions, if and when programs such as we now have at Grant MacEwan and Mount Royal in Calgary, where we have training for occupational health and safety nurses . . . That would have been my reference to training; at the same time, however, not to downplay the training presently taking place in the private sector. The Canadian Association of Oilwell Drilling Contractors has some varied training programs that my officials, in their review of these programs, have recommended as good programs. That could be an area where some of this appropriation could be used, to expand to non-members or smaller members of that association or the drilling industry that don't have their own programs. Because we can appreciate that the larger drilling companies we find in Alberta are well established with good training programs and proper audio-visual to provide on-the-job training. That

was my reference: both the postsecondary institution and what the private sector now has.

With regard to the role of the Occupational Health and Safety Council, it is the intent, and I hope I wouldn't have to duplicate it with another organization, but utilize the expertise of these members — some of them have been on that council from the inception — to help my office and me in screening and approving the applications that may come forward. I look forward to their coming to my office with regard to funding. I have had good co-operation from them. I don't know what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is alluding to, unless he would like to ask a supplementary on more specific areas where he has a concern. Maybe I could understand his question a little better. But I've had good co-operation in the area of council involvement.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the last matter first, might I say I'm not alluding to any particular situation. What I want to understand, for my own information and for the benefit of members on the committee to whom I have spoken, is that their recommendations on the allocation of this \$1 million are going to be taken seriously by the minister. Mr. Minister, I know very well that no minister can give a *carte blanche* approval that every recommendation for funding which comes from the committee will be granted. On the other hand, I think it's important that the members of the committee clearly understand that the minister will take very seriously the recommendations which come forward. If the minister chooses not to accept one of their recommendations for funding, I think the reasons should be clearly spelled out. I would certainly see that being the exception rather than the rule. That's the point I want to make, Mr. Minister. Frankly, I think it will be helpful to members of the committee and the minister to have some kind of commitment like that in *Hansard*.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I have no difficulty. I indicated I have had good co-operation from the council. They've been very enthusiastic about their role since my time in office. It has enlarged, broadened. Initially the parameters within which they were to be involved were established. We've had them involved to such an extent that they are now even visiting and planning to visit other job sites. Mr. Chairman, to the members of the committee: I can assure you that I do take them seriously and share with them any opposed view or different challenges I may have. They can be assured of a full, fair hearing, because the council is composed of a cross section of Albertans and members from the public, the trade union movement, the employer group, and one member of the Legislature, the hon. Member for Calgary McCall, is sitting on that council. I think the cross section will not permit, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition shares a concern, that I would just ignore any of the recommendations. I can assure them here, that it would be recorded in *Hansard*, that I will weigh all their recommendations carefully and dialogue with them on any one they propose to me.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that commitment from the minister. I have a concern as a result of comments that have just been made dealing with the financing of programs at the various colleges. I become quite suspicious when I see or hear of us taking money from the heritage fund and then really supplementing budgets at colleges or universities. In my judg-

ment that's a very, very serious practice for us to become involved in. Because what we're doing then is in fact funding our postsecondary institutions not out of the operating budget of the province but out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. When I hear comments about the programs, I'm not questioning the validity of the programs. What I'm questioning is the concept of financing ongoing educational programs at our colleges and universities out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, which we're supposed to be setting aside primarily for tomorrow and, secondly, for diversification. How do we carry these kinds of programs in the future when the day arises when we don't have this kind of additional — it really becomes a second budget to finance some of our programs in our institutions.

The second point deals with the comments about oil well drilling. For years in this province the oil well drilling contractors have done a considerable amount as far as safety is concerned. I recognize the study the department carried out. But did I understand accurately that we're now going to be involved in expanding the program the oil well drilling contractors have going, so that smaller sectors of the industry will be given the benefit of that program? Once again, if that is a good thing to do — and I'm not particularly arguing that it isn't, Mr. Minister — that funding should be coming from the operating budget of your department, and not through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects budget.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, on the first question from the Leader of the Opposition, can I just briefly say, yes, I accept his representation, and the representation will be well considered by my office and my officials. With regard to the concern about the possible funding of programs in postsecondary institutions through the heritage fund, I've only indicated that the institutions could be a vehicle where that program could be taught or expanded because that is part of the education program. The education program could even be provided in a local high school, if there is a need for any new program and the facility is there. In our places in this Legislature we so often speak about the fact that our institutions of learning are not utilized enough during the after hours, and that is what I alluded to. I know well that my own colleague the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower is concerned that we don't start any program and then leave him to fund it after we bail out of it.

So it's just that the institution is there. We've had some success. When I made my comments on it yesterday — I look at it as a vehicle, as a facility where that program could be taught.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, perhaps I haven't made my point clearly. I'm not arguing about using the colleges and universities after hours or whenever we want to use them. I'm in complete agreement with the idea of getting greater utilization of those facilities. What concerns me very much is if we're going to be funding programs — albeit good programs; I'm not arguing about the need for the programs either. But if we're going to be funding this \$1 million for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation, occupational health and safety research and education, those kinds of programs, out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund budget, we're just asking to get ourselves in trouble down the road.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I've indicated I receive the representation of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and I will be careful that that doesn't take place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

Agreed to:

Vote 1 — Occupational Health and Safety Research and Education	\$1,000,000
---	-------------

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

[Motion carried]

### Hospitals and Medical Care

#### 1 — Alberta Children's Provincial General Hospital

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments?

MR. NOTLEY: Perhaps we could have just a quick review by the minister as to where things stand on each of these projects.

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This project has been in front of members on occasions before this. It's ongoing and nearing completion. There are essentially two components to it: the children's school and the new hospital building and renovations to the existing. Originally scheduled for completion in the spring of 1980, it now will open in the spring of 1981 because of construction strikes and the slowdown that hit the construction industry in Calgary during the past two years. The project, of course, has been hit by inflation escalation, like other construction projects, in addition to the completion date delay. Other than that, things seem to be going very well.

I've met with some board members. They're busy putting the final touches to their programming. I think we're going to have a fine facility when it's completed early next year.

Agreed to:

1 — Alberta Children's Provincial General Hospital	\$9,200,000
---	-------------

#### 2 — Applied Cancer Research

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might ask the minister if this is the amount announced by the minister's predecessor Mr. Miniely, the \$10 million that was initially allocated on a five-year program. If my memory is accurate, in '79-80 expenditures a detailed breakdown was presented to the standing committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, as well as some additional information.

What has happened to the advisory committee that Mr. Miniely set up? I guess it was called the *ad hoc* cardiac care advisory committee. It's my understanding that the committee hasn't met since its initial meeting. What really is the status of that situation now? If this committee is no longer active, how do we see this phasing into the other more basic research we're doing?

MR. RUSSELL: It's true, Mr. Chairman, that the committee met just the one time. At that time they finalized the elements of the cardiac care applied research program, and all those components are now under way. Some are nearing a stage of completion; others are just getting started. This is one component of a two-part program, the other being cancer research.

By the nature of the programs that were approved under this, it really hasn't been necessary for the committee to meet, though I think the hon. leader is correct that there was a fair amount of discussion on this during the standing committee session. He may recall that at that time one of the new expenditures to be approved in the annual report of that committee was the evaluation report, which is an expenditure being requested of approximately \$1.2 million. This is a contract with the University of Alberta which will see to it that the detailed scientific analysis and evaluation of the composition of programs that have been funded are evaluated and assessed. The contract covering that work has been signed by me and the university representatives. That group the hon. leader referred to is still in place and is now ready to take up their second phase, which is the evaluation.

MR. R. CLARK: So what really happened, Mr. Chairman, was that the committee Mr. Miniely set up was so efficient that one meeting was held and it was able to make a decision as to how this \$10 million was to be allocated, and there was really no follow-up at all by that *ad hoc* committee until now when this evaluation is taking place.

It would be interesting to know the terms of reference of the evaluation and if in fact the people on the *ad hoc* cardiac care advisory committee are the people who are doing the evaluation, or is another group doing the evaluation?

MR. RUSSELL: My understanding is that it is the same people. I met with the chairman of that committee, Dr. Rossall, about two weeks ago. We went over this, and he's anxious to get this evaluation contract implemented. I understand the two parties involved are still making amendments to some of the clauses, notwithstanding the fact that the original contract has been signed. I'd be pleased to table that document, which has in it all the details for the evaluation process, if that would be useful to the leader.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, realizing that the negotiations and discussions are going on, when does the minister expect the evaluation to be finalized? Is the minister in a position to indicate that he will make the results of the evaluation available either to the select committee or to members of the Assembly?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, that would certainly be our intention. As I recall, the actual term of the evaluation is approximately 18 months, and they haven't started yet. The contract was signed, back-dated to the beginning of this fiscal year, but they're still not under way. They will require about 18 months from the time they commence work.

Agreed to:

Vote 2 — Applied Cancer Research	\$4,735,000
----------------------------------	-------------

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. You called cancer research and we were discussing heart research.

AN HON. MEMBER: The answers still satisfied the hon. leader.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, if that's the case then we can certainly get back to heart research at a more appropriate time, like the next vote.

### 3 — Applied Heart Disease Research

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. What are the terms of reference for people who sit on the evaluation committees about awarding research to fellow members on the committee?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry that during our question and answer period we got these two votes mixed, because the questions and answers that went previously referred to this heart disease research program. It's an entirely different concept for the cancer vote which we just passed. There they have a standing committee whose final authority is the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board. They have an scientific advisory committee that assesses cancer research applications on an ongoing basis. They're coming and going all the time, unlike the heart research program which is really a set of programs fixed in place and designed to run for a few years. So the terms of reference for the cancer projects advisory committee are based on scientific and medical criteria, and you really have the peer group assessing applications from within their profession.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Very specifically, has the minister set down any terms of reference with regard to individuals — competent individuals; I'm not questioning their competency at all — who sit on those advisory committees, as to granting research to either individuals on the committee or projects which individuals on the committee are working on? I do not raise the question from the standpoint of making any allegations at all about the professional competency of people who are sitting on the various committees. But when one looks at the breakdown of research over the past four years, in 1977-78 approximately 51 per cent of the money allocated went to members of, or members of research groups that had representation on, the committee itself, and in 1978-79, 68 per cent of the money. In that case some nine individuals were involved, who were on the various panels. As a result of those panels' various decisions, some 68 per cent of the money allocated that year, \$1.5 million, went to individuals who were directly involved on the panels. Now once again I make the point very clear: I'm not making any allegations at all, Mr. Minister. Then in '79-80, 52 per cent of the money granted that year once again went to individuals who either sat on the panels or individuals who were on the panels and involved in research projects they had a direct interest in. So far in the year '80-81, some 38 per cent.

I make the point very clearly, Mr. Minister: what kind of guidelines are there? It seems to me at best a very tenuous situation when that portion of the money being allocated each year, for whatever reasons — well, in the last three years, excluding '80-81, people on the various assessment panels have picked up over half the research money every year. So to me it becomes very, very essential that there be some direct guidelines from, I assume, if not the minister certainly the cancer board, to simply make very clear under what kinds of conditions we're operating.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, the leader raises a good point, and I'm not able to answer that question tonight. I think he knows that these committees for cancer and for heart research were both in place at the time I assumed this office. As he states the situation, it's quite correct: all the screening is done in a preliminary way, and the document I see is the request for funds which comes to the department directly from the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board. But I think I could take that question as notice and find the answers. Those boards were appointed with terms of reference, and I'm sure I could get the answers.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, however you'd prefer to handle the matter, just as long as we wouldn't close all the minister's votes under these estimates until we have that answer, perhaps after we've dealt with the other two or three votes; not have a final vote on the minister's estimate until the minister reports back to the House, hopefully tomorrow or the first part of the week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable to the committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Agreed to:

3 — Applied Heart Disease Research	\$12,440,000
------------------------------------	--------------

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave votes 2 and 3, might I ask the minister the reason for the various boards, both the groups dealing with heart and cancer research, being extremely reluctant to make public the projects which are turned down for funding?

This isn't something we found in our own office, but some members of the medical profession, in discussions not specifically on this question, but in discussions we developed later, have raised with us the very real difficulty in being able to find out the projects that have been denied funds for the various years. I can certainly see no reason for that information not being made public and would ask the minister to enlighten us as to the reasoning behind it.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I didn't know that was an issue, and I don't think it is an issue at all with the heart component of the program. As I mentioned earlier, that's a series of programs which are longer term and involve construction and supplies of equipment as well as manpower. They're in place, and I don't believe there is controversy about those. The cancer components are ongoing. I know that each year many projects are turned down using scientific criteria as guidelines. I didn't know there was a problem about not making public the ones that were turned down, and I didn't know there was any desire to have them made public. I believe that's the kind of information I could try to get from the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board and I'd bring it forward. This year, there was only one case I know of where a doctor who had applied for a project had it turned down, and managed to generate a relative amount of publicity and letters in support of the project. But that's the only instance I'm aware of. I'll try to get the others.

### 4 — Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and Specialty Services Facility

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Once again, this has been rather an ongoing issue, in fact



before the minister became the minister. I think it would be extremely helpful if at least two, perhaps three, bits of information could be made available. When are we now looking at completion of the project? What are we looking at as the final cost of the project? And is it possible, Mr. Minister, to give us some indication of what the operating costs are going to be now?

MR. RUSSELL: The original completion date was the spring of 1981. It is now estimated to be the fall of '81, again for the same reason of the construction strikes and delays that hit the industry, particularly in the Calgary area. This is very similar to the children's hospital. But because it's a larger project, they've managed to make up some of that lost time to a greater degree than the children's hospital was able to.

Again, I have to work in ranges of dollars. The April 1, 1980, estimate was \$82.9 million. This shows you what has happened to a project estimated for construction at only \$35 million back in 1975. By the time planning and consultants' fees, equipment and furnishings, changes to the contract, and inflation over the last five years, we are now looking at something in the range of \$82 million. That's as of April 1. I have an exact figure, \$82,914,699. Again, that will have to be escalated and inflated for about another 14 months, from the spring of this year until the fall of next year. That's a range of price I am giving, Mr. Chairman.

I think the other question dealt with the operating budget. Again, here is the range of the four-year operating budget for the total facility, given to us by the hospital board. These estimates were prepared some time ago. For fiscal year '81-82, spanning from October to March — that is, assuming it opens in October of '81 and going to March of '82 — \$5.3 million, then \$14 million for the first full fiscal year beyond that, then \$15.2 million, \$15.6 million, and \$16 million during the next three fiscal years. That's for the total facility; there are minor offset revenues. Those are gross figures I have given you. Taking into account the minor offset revenues, the net figures are roughly within the same range.

MR. NOTLEY: [Inaudible] the estimate on the final construction costs, Mr. Minister, do you have any breakdown on the increase that is attributable to changes in the plans from the original concept of 1975? As I recall a discussion we had previously in the committee, part of the change in the cost was due to additions to the plan, and part of it of course as a consequence of inflation. Do we have any breakdown between those two aspects?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do. It's just a matter of digging them out. I have a fair amount of detailed information here for various fiscal years. I'll try to get that right now.

The last estimate I have is for the first of this fiscal year, the \$82 million figure, is broken down this way — I'll round the figures — \$49.3 million for construction costs; hook-up of equipment and associated renovations, \$1.4 million; a construction contingency of \$1.7 million; another contingency allowance for design completion and unforeseen changes, \$3.3 million; giving a total building cost of \$55.9 million.

There's another group of what we call other costs, which involve the following: equipment and furnishings, \$12.7 million; consultants' fees, \$4.5 million; planning studies, \$1.1 million; landscaping, \$0.2 million; alterations and services, \$3.2 million; and temporary services

and commissioning — that is, the phase-in period when they're actually putting the thing into operational use — \$1.4 million; giving a total of \$23.2 million.

In July 1979, we approved an addition of \$3.7 million to accommodate specific renal and psychiatric services within the building. So your total project cost, estimated at the beginning of the current fiscal year, adds up to \$82.9 million.

MR. NOTLEY: I appreciate the breakdown. However, in terms of the reason for the increase, I understand we're looking at \$3.7 million of expansion in July 1979. How much of this "other" increase is due to changes from the original design, as opposed to the somewhat greater than normal inflation rate the minister alluded to?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, to give you an idea of the range of changes, the escalation cost for construction over the period has averaged 14 per cent. The inflation for equipment during this period has averaged 19 per cent. So the two components — equipment and furnishings, and construction — have escalated at different rates.

It's rather difficult for me to say what changes there have been. There haven't been any major changes with respect to the concept of the building. We all recall the controversial debate in the House when the auxiliary hospital, the provincial lab, the cancer treatment centre, and the hostel beds were identified. There have been no changes in those, other than perhaps changes in detail of design as the building has gone along.

But this particular building and the MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre in Edmonton are different from the children's hospital. The children's hospital was a fixed, tender sum based on a completely designed building. These other two, because they were long-term projects, went ahead under construction management. They are designed and tendered in components as they go along, so you never have had a total final tendered price of the building. You have always worked with a total estimated budget, which is changed for the inflation factors I mentioned.

I can assure the members that other than the changes we approved for putting in the specific design details for those renal and psychiatric programs, there have been no changes of substance in the buildings themselves.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just proceed along that line a bit further. I'd like to get a handle on what portion of this \$82.9 million is really going to this cancer centre. The figure I've heard bandied around is that about half of the projected \$82 million will really find its way into that part that was the original concept. I don't want to rehash the debate we had earlier, but the project was initially known as the southern Alberta cancer centre. Then these other parts were added. The best figure I've been able to get is that close to half the capital will find its way into use in the southern Alberta cancer centre. The reason I think it's important to get that figure is that when the project was announced there was a great deal of enthusiasm for the idea of a southern Alberta cancer centre. I think it's only fair that we get some indication of whether half, 60 per cent — what portion of this project, which has become far broader than I think any of us anticipated initially — is really going to what the original project was all about.

MR. RUSSELL: I would say the leader's estimate of 50 to 60 per cent for the actual cancer treatment centre is

probably close to being correct, because the 188 auxiliary beds of course are a much cheaper kind of construction with respect to unit cost. But I have to put a caution in there, because there are services that have been supplied to those auxiliary beds that are really above the level of the standard auxiliary bed in the rest of the province, which perhaps will permit them more flexibility in future use if that's ever a requirement. So it's rather difficult to put a figure against the question you asked, but I would say that your estimate is probably not far from being wrong.

MR. R. CLARK: That being the case, Mr. Minister, what mechanism do we have in place, once the southern Alberta cancer centre is finished, to decide who's going to be doing what as far as cancer care and research in Alberta are concerned between the cancer centre in Calgary and the one here in Edmonton, the W.W. Cross Cancer Institute?

MR. RUSSELL: That's pretty straightforward, Mr. Chairman. The only unique aspect of this project is that the one physical facility, which is now physically joined as one building, will actually be administered by two different provincial hospital boards. The Foothills Provincial General Hospital Board will have responsibility for the auxiliary beds, and of course the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board will administer the cancer treatment beds and the cancer treatment centre that goes with it, as well as the W.W. Cross facility here in Edmonton. So as far as cancer is concerned, nothing changes. The board is administering two hospitals now and will continue to administer two hospitals. The Foothills Hospital will have the 188 auxiliary beds in addition to its existing plant.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, then the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board, which Dr. Baker used to chair, and perhaps still does, will have the responsibility, when it gets down to the nitty-gritty of allocation of equipment and so on, for recognizing that there will be much duplication between Edmonton and Calgary. But at the same time they'll have the responsibility for seeing that's carried out in a reasonable manner, and that's where the decisions will be made. Is that accurate?

MR. RUSSELL: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

Agreed to:

4 — Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and Specialty Services Facility	\$27,000,000
---	--------------

#### 5 — Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions or comments?

MR. R. CLARK: I felt some Edmonton member might be interested in what's happening here. Mr. Minister, could I put the question this way: how many beds are we gaining as a result of the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre? Secondly, what is the anticipated total cost, and what are we looking at as far as a completion date is concerned?

MR. RUSSELL: There's a net loss in beds. I think the hon. leader knows that, because he's asked the question before. The exact numbers: it will be reduced from 999

beds, the old University of Alberta Hospital, to 870 acute-care beds, plus an additional 100 hostel beds. So we'll have 970 beds as opposed to 999, bearing in mind that 100 of those are hostel beds.

As far as the cost is concerned, again we're looking at phase one of a project that's designed to go ahead in two phases, several construction stages to each phase. Those of you who have visited the site and seen the existing buildings and the new construction replacing those, will recognize why it had to go ahead in phases. The estimated cost of phase one is \$148.3 million, with another \$93.2 million for phase two, giving a total cost of roughly \$241 million. Again, these are figures at the beginning of this fiscal year. There are some unknown figures in that \$148 million figure for phase one, which are being assessed at present. So again I stress that that is a range of price. But that's what has happened to an original estimated phase one of \$86.4 million, in 1975 dollars, actually escalated and built to April 1 this year at \$148 million.

MR. NOTLEY: Phase one has gone from \$86.4 million to \$148 million; phase two is \$93.2 million. My memory may stand to be corrected, but as I recall Mr. Miniely's testimony before the select committee, the total cost was to be somewhere around \$105 million to \$110 million. So if we could get the originally projected figures for both phase one and phase two . . . Now you say the final total for the completed project is \$241 million.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure we ever had an estimated price for phase two. I certainly could take that as notice and try to find out. Again, this is a project management building, whereby you take an estimated sum of money before the building is designed and constructed, and before you allow for inflation or equipment. That's where that original 1975 figure came from. The only additions I know of that have been made are provision for some underground parking, a library, and some planning office expenses, which are really current operational expenses but properly attributed to the capital project itself.

I should say that both these projects have implementation committees, which give final review to the project costs. Once a year they come in front of Treasury Board with a request for approval of two elements: the ongoing capital amount for the coming fiscal year, as well as the estimated inflation rate, which is really the best guess, really, when you're trying to project inflation, as hon. members know, but has been running very close to 12 per cent per month.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could just take a moment and compare. I know it's not entirely accurate to compare apples and oranges between the cancer centre in Calgary and the MacKenzie health centre here, but we're talking about two projects that have gone ahead under project management with implementation committees. While there's been a substantial increase in the cost of the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre — just doing some quick arithmetic here, we've seen an increase of about 80 per cent — on the other hand, in Calgary that increase has been something over 200 per cent. There's been a substantially larger increase. It's more than doubled from \$35 million, two and a quarter times compared to about three-quarters. In terms of your assessment of these two projects as minister, I wonder what discussions you've had with the implementation committees in particular. Because it seems to me,

just looking at it very quickly, but on the basis of what we've heard over the past four or five years, that the Walter C. MacKenzie centre strikes me to be more on course and always was, even when we had debates in the select committee, and that there were perhaps more serious problems with the implementation of the cancer centre project in Calgary. I would be interested in your response, Mr. Minister, as a result of working with the committees and the figures, and dealing with it on a day by day basis.

MR. RUSSELL: I'm not quite sure how to answer that. I want to emphasize that I replied to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, when I gave the \$241 million figure for both phases, that I believe there are still some outstanding costs beyond that, and I said those are the matter of a current study. I expect to have that assessment within four to five weeks. I want to emphasize to members of the committee that the 241 may not be the total figure. I think some other contract changes haven't been brought into the audit system yet, and we're trying to find out the extent of those.

MR. R. CLARK: Using, I'm not sure, the new math or the old math, but very roughly taking that information, Mr. Minister, we're basically looking at the projects more than doubling since the announcement was made. In retrospect, how could we better handle that situation so we don't find ourselves in a situation where we have the project doubling? What have we learned from those two situations that we can apply to other projects such as these? I'm not particularly being critical of the fact that they've doubled in size. We had a very major difference of opinion on the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and, I think, likely for the best at the time. I look at these projects and say, when the package was presented to us we were talking one price, now virtually doubled. This has to be as much a concern to the minister as I'm sure it is to the Treasurer and members on this side of the House — not being opposed to the projects, but simply what's happening to capital projects and the way we go about setting out those initial costs. I'm sure Treasury Board must have some concern about seeing projects like this, as desirable as they are, virtually doubling in capital cost.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, the leader has brought up a very good point. I'm glad I've got the opportunity to comment on it, because it has really worried me. I've talked to my colleague Mr. Chambers with respect to his capital projects. We're both facing the same problem; that is, trying to manage good financial control over capital projects which, the bigger they are, go over a longer planning period and construction time. I suppose there are two ways we could look at these; that is, try to guess what inflation would be for the next five years, if it's a five-year project, add that onto the current estimated costs of the project and bring the inflated costs to the Legislature, or else bring the dollars in current terms to the Legislature and then keep adding on the inflation. We've been doing the latter. I must say I'm alarmed at it. For example, in just the short time I've had my present job, the Grande Prairie hospital has gone from about a \$35 million project to close to \$60 million, and nothing has been built.

The program I announced in the Legislature in March, with all these projects in it, which in total value is about \$1.2 billion, is escalating at the rate of 12 per cent per month. So you can see what happens to a program of

that magnitude escalating like that. In many cases, construction on some of those major projects won't start for several months. The leader has two hospitals in his own constituency, and it's happened to them. It's a frustrating problem. I think members have seen what has happened to the costs of materials and to construction trades wage settlements during the past three-year period; they've been very generous. This is what inflation is doing to our capital building program.

So we have the two ways we can go: we can try to put a final escalated price on the project and design it first, then go out and get fixed, lump-sum tenders; or we can get the thing started at an estimated current price, go into project management, and keep building it and adjusting as we go along. I wouldn't be prepared to say which system is best, because I don't think the real costs are very much different either way. But it makes accurate estimating with a long lead time very difficult.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I guess that's really the point. The minister indicates he's not in a position to advise the committee, and I guess I can appreciate that. I suppose you'd be dealing with project management on larger projects, that would basically be the breakdown. While there has been an escalation in the smaller projects, Mr. Minister, would you not agree it has not been as great as it has in these major projects? I guess that's the reason I asked the question about the government's assessment of the work of the two implementation committees, because here we're talking about as close as we get to megaprojects in the area of hospital construction, and we go the project management route. One can look at the inflation rate in materials; you can't do anything about that. One can look at the construction trades settlements; we can't do anything about that. What we can do is assess the way the management of these projects has been undertaken by the department.

I guess the question I would put to the minister is: now that you've been in office for a year and a half, and with the experience of these projects for five years now, are you in a position to recommend to the committee changes that might be developed in terms of our management techniques as a government to improve efficiency on the major projects in the future?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I could respond to that by saying what we're doing. The bulk of the smaller hospitals, that are another part of the department's capital program, we're trying to put out as lump-sum, fixed contract tenders; in other words, the building will be designed and tendered competitively, and we'll have a fixed price and work to that. But I know the fixed price won't be the same as the estimated price I brought to the members earlier this year. It's going to escalate during that interim. I think there's a reasonable explanation for that. In the megaprojects, I don't know whether it's better to go as one or to go under project management. The private sector appears to be using project management more and more, so presumably it's a good way to go. It certainly saves time, and we've got the expertise here in the province to do it effectively. I really don't know how to answer the hon. member's question. I'll try if he has supplementaries.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Minister, I can appreciate the inflation factor of 12 per month, but let's look at the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre for just a moment. It's been under construction four years, has it? That would be

48 months, which is about 48 per cent. Add another 10 per cent, and that comes to just about a 60 per cent increase. Mr. Minister, I still have some difficulty finding where the other 40 per cent is coming from, because the cost has virtually doubled, hasn't it?

I might say, Mr. Minister, that a similar kind of general statement can be made as far as the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre here in the city of Edmonton is concerned. I don't argue the inflation question; I recognize that's something we all have to live with. But I see another 40 per cent on both these projects that's come from someplace else.

MR. RUSSELL: In the cancer centre, Mr. Chairman, I hope I emphasized that the \$35 million was construction only. You have to add to that the design services, the commissioning costs, and the equipment and furnishings. Those are fairly extensive. On top of that, you have to add escalation factors to those various components. I think that should explain it.

While I'm on my feet, I should say that we have available — not here but in my office — a very detailed breakdown with respect to inflation components for the various tenders that have been let as the project goes along. Although I've given an average of 12 per cent, which covers labor and materials, it's quite amazing to see the range of inflation with respect to the various subtrades. So it all depends what happens to these projects as they go along. For example, if you have a relatively low inflation rate at a time when you're pouring a lot of concrete, then inflation won't be such a factor. But if the project has advanced to the stage where perhaps you're putting in a lot of glazing, weatherproofing, metal flashing, and rainproofing, the inflation factor there is liable to be 150 per cent rather than the 14 per cent average. So it's very hard to break it out. But for anybody who is interested, I do have that detailed information on a monthly basis.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the last question I'd put before the minister in the matter is: I take it from the very frank discussion we've had, taking the costs, then the inflation factor of roughly 12 per cent per month, and that comes to roughly 60 per cent, that this 40 per cent other factor — and I recognize that's a ballpark figure — really has come from everything from furnishings, to consultant fees, to final upgrading of the place after, and so on.

Mr. Minister, in retrospect, and realizing the concern the minister has expressed this evening, are there changes that we could have made from the standpoint of organization, or things we've learned from the organization of these two mammoth projects, that we'll be able to apply to future very large projects? Or in retrospect, by and large does the minister feel we've got good value for the money spent?

MR. RUSSELL: I can say without any hesitation that I believe we've got good value for the money spent. I'd invite members to tour either project. They're in a stage now in both cities where you can get a hard hat and tour the thing.

The MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre is a very expensive building; there is no question about it. Alternate floors are taken up entirely with equipment, so you only have every other floor for the use of patients and staff. The floors between are entirely mechanical and electrical and plumbing equipment, which is designed in such a way

that it's completely flexible and can be brought up or down to the floor above or below in any given position.

This is really being set up as our future home of medical research in the Edmonton area, so it has to have that flexibility. I think it would be unfair to compare its costs to your standard hospital. I am certainly aiming to see that the unit costs on the new hospitals for Calgary and Edmonton come in much lower than the unit costs on this one. This is a very special kind of building and probably won't be repeated for a long time to come.

MR. NOTLEY: I have just one additional question. Looking briefly at Vote 4, the minister indicated that the consulting fees, if I'm correct, were \$4.5 million. Do we have any figure for the consulting fees now as far as the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre are concerned? I would be interested in whether there is a significant increase in the final consulting fee cost between our original estimates. We've talked about other things which have increased — materials, labor — and it's all quite proper to have that information. I am interested in whether there has been a substantial escalation in consulting fees between what was originally anticipated in the concept and what the final result will be.

MR. RUSSELL: Yes there has been, Mr. Chairman. That's one of the figures I referred to as a result of an audit and studies that are now under way, which I expect to have in a few weeks. Ordinarily, consultants' fees are based on a percentage of the cost of the project. In the case of the MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre, I understand it's on an hourly basis. So the owners pay for the actual work done rather than a percentage of the cost of the project. The last advice I have is that the hours of work are approaching almost double what was originally estimated five years ago. I'll have the details of that in a few weeks.

MR. NOTLEY: As a consequence, then, the department is reviewing. Is there some concern? Would it be a fair assessment that there is an unreasonable increase, or at this stage is it just a case of auditing it? Do we have any ballpark figure as to the — we have the \$4.5 million for the cancer centre in the south; do we have any approximation at this stage?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, I have a figure for the MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre. As of April 1, 1980, the consultants' fees are \$6.9 million on a total project cost estimated at \$148 million.

Agreed to:

5 — Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre \$46,000,000

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, in view of the request of the leader for additional information, I would withhold my motion to adopt the resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed by the committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### Recreation and Parks

##### 1 — Urban Parks

MR. CHAIRMAN: Has the minister any comments to open the discussion?

MR. MANDEVILLE: Possibly I could ask just two questions in this area. I see in the vote that there is no money for land assembly. It says under Environment that they're going to be purchasing the land to assemble for these urban parks. I don't see anything in Environment. Could the minister indicate if it's going to be up to the cities to purchase the land to assemble these parks? What role are the cities going to play in assembling the parks and setting them up? Are they going to be able to pick out their locations and so on?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, if you look at the estimates, the \$8 million under fixed assets is for land assembly. The city will play an important role with regard to location, design, and construction of the parks. We intend to move into the cities, have discussions with them, and make sure they're involved. As a matter of fact, we anticipate having the cities do the majority of the work, and we would be funding them on that basis.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that the total funds required will be \$57 million in 1979 dollars. The funds will become available about April 1, and will be advanced on need.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, one supplementary question. Could the minister indicate how they're going to establish priorities for going ahead with the parks? Are they going to go ahead with all the parks to start, or just one park at a time?

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, we would envision going with all five parks as soon as the appropriation is approved. We would ask the cities to get the land assembly in order and start the planning design with our people. We would be moving as quickly as we can in all five areas.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions on that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Grande Prairie was on the list first.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the minister for this very worthy project. I would like to thank him, on behalf of the citizens of Grande Prairie, for letting Grande Prairie be one of the first five. I would urge the minister, though, to continue with the program. I hope it would be extended to some of the smaller centres, especially in northern Alberta too, because the major parks are mostly in southern Alberta.

I have a couple of questions. I would like to know how the arrangements are going to be made for the development of these parks in this vote. Will a local committee be set up of members of the local council or committees along with government to oversee the construction? How will the maintenance costs be handled after the projects are completed and the 50 per cent is being picked up by the province? Will that be 50 per cent of the city's cost of operation for that year, or how will that work?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, we intend to use the same concept we did in Edmonton under the Capital City Recreation Park. We would work very closely with the cities. Their people would be on the board. We would set up a local co-ordinator in each city to help design,

manage, and construct.

We'll pay 100 per cent of the operating costs until the parks are completed. Thereafter it will be 75 per cent by the province, 25 per cent by the city for two years. Thereafter it will be 50 per cent split equally. We will fund it on the same basis as Edmonton. We'll review their operating budget and, if it's right on, we'll pick up 50 per cent of the cost.

The other question the member raised was, would we consider additional parks? Yes, I certainly hope we would go beyond the five we now have. As a matter of fact I'm now looking forward to seeing if we can get more parks in the next five years, whoever the minister may be at that time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to get a couple of things clear. Did I hear the minister correctly when he indicated the total cost of these five parks would be \$57 million by the time we're finished? Do we have a breakdown of the estimates among the different parks? If we do, could we have that? Presumably this is over the next five years, but do we have any target dates for completion? Are we further ahead in planning for some of the parks as opposed to others? I think it would be interesting to have that information as well. Perhaps if the minister is in a position to, he might give us a little information about each of the parks. In the city of Edmonton we had the Capital City Recreation Park, which was unveiled in the Legislature in 1974, and quite properly so. Perhaps we could at least have a summary of what we're looking at in each of the communities.

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, once the appropriation is approved, I'll make available to each member of the Assembly a design of all five provincial parks, with the drawings, what we envision they will look like when they're completed. We are planning on the parks, and I suppose we might find one city further advanced. I might say Medicine Hat would probably be a city that would move somewhat quicker than, say, Lloydminster, because we haven't had our planning quite as far advanced. Lethbridge also would probably move quicker than, say, Lloydminster. We anticipate moving on them all.

In regard to a breakdown of costs, this is just ballpark figures: Grande Prairie, land acquisition would be approximately \$2.5 million and construction would be, say, \$4.5 million; in Lethbridge the construction costs are approximately \$10 million and land acquisition approximately \$5 million; Lloydminster, construction costs are approximately \$3 million, land acquisition \$2.5 million; Medicine Hat, the construction costs are approximately \$8 million, land acquisition \$3 million; Red Deer, construction approximately \$11 million, and land acquisition \$6 million.

I believe that's all the questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, is the department in a position to give us an overview of what it has in mind once we approve this vote? What kind of formal structure is set up within the various communities to enable the department to get to where it is now, from the standpoint of consultation and so on?

MR. TRYNCHY: Up to now, Mr. Chairman, we've worked very closely with the MLA for each area and also with the city administrators. I don't know the names of the people. Our park planners from my department worked with the city people in each location, and it's

worked out really well. Mind you, I'd have to congratulate our people. They've worked really well with the cities. And I have to congratulate the cities, because they co-operated. We've advanced a lot further than I thought we would. We're prepared to move very quickly in all five cities. We've had nothing but really good co-operation with the cities.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I take it from what the minister says that in all five locations, the minister's parks planners and the local officials in each city have basically endorsed the project as just outlined from each of the communities. I notice the minister nodding his head.

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we've worked very closely with the cities. The concept I will make available to all members was approved by the city planner, the city people, and our planners. Mind you, we've had some changes with regard to the mayors and councils in those cities. In some cases, we'll have to refresh — you know, bring back to the table what we have planned, and hopefully the new councils will approve it. We're anxious and excited, because it is an exciting new concept in other than Edmonton and Calgary. We look forward to working with them.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question on that, if I may. I take it from the minister's remarks, since we have the design prepared and those designs are going to be released when this vote is passed, that sites have in fact been chosen. But sites for parks, like sites for almost anything, can become centres of considerable controversy. The minister has indicated he's held discussions with the MLA and the city administrators, but to what extent has there been formal approval at the local level? To what extent is the government at this stage committed to the designs the minister will be tabling in the House, in view of the fact that when I look at some of the communities we're assessing at this stage for parks, I'm sure there are optional sites. Where do we stand on that matter?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, as the announcement cited on October 17, we have announced the parks with consultation with the municipal representatives and the MLAs. They have studied the plans and approved of them in principle. Mind you, we're flexible because it's their park. We really don't want to say, look, you've got to have it here or you don't get it. We want to work with them. We want to advance the funds through them, and of course have some control over it. I don't think we're committed to any design. The design I will pass out to members was approved a couple of months ago. That's what they said they can live with, and we agreed. So it's their design. But if they want to change it, as we meet and set up the new committee with the cities and ourselves, certainly we'll do what they want. But we'll try to stay as close as we can to the cost figure so we do not exceed the \$57 million in 1979 dollars for the total project.

Agreed to:

1 — Urban Parks	\$11,000,000
2 — Fish Creek Provincial Park	\$2,807,000

### 3 — Kananaskis Country Recreation Development

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the minister may have some opening comments, and then hon. members.

MR. TRYNCHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly would like to make some opening comments. First, I'd like to give an update of what has taken place in Kananaskis Country: where we started and where we're at. I know I made a commitment some time ago that I would report to members on the progress of Kananaskis Country. I think you've just had passed around to you the first progress review of Kananaskis Country. This review takes us to March 31, 1980, and I want to say to members that it's a first progress report. We intend to follow up with another progress report at March 31, 1981, which will be more complete and comprehensive. Please study that report. There's a lot of useful information in there. If there are any questions, I'm sure I'd like to answer.

Let's go back to 1977, when the news release was announced by the Premier. At that time it was an exciting new concept for family recreation unparalleled in Canada. During that release the Premier suggested we would have a citizens' advisory committee to hear the views of Albertans and any other interested parties before we commenced construction. We had that set up and the chairman of that Kananaskis Country citizens' advisory committee is Bryan Targett. Of course our representative from government is the MLA for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest who, I might say, has done a tremendous job. That committee has heard from any and all Albertans interested in the development of the park who made submissions to them, and of course those submissions have been passed on to us. At that time we also took on a managing director, Mr. Ed Marshall, which I'm sure most people are aware of. He is the person responsible for co-ordinating and overseeing the implementation of government policy.

We also have an interdepartmental committee of all departments involved in Kananaskis Country. They hear the submissions, review them, and submit them to the Kananaskis cabinet committee for approval. Items not agreed on are passed on to a new committee of deputy ministers, which I set up. This was formed in April 1980 and has really worked well. We find that the channelling of information to them and then on to our committee has worked extremely well, and we've been able to move in pretty good fashion.

Mr. Chairman, going back to the announcement in October 1977, we should review just what it said. It was a dream of the government to present, implement, and construct a concept unequalled, as I've said, in Canada. At that time, the beginning total cost of that dream was \$40,520,000. It was broken down in this manner, and I'm going to round out the figures, Mr. Chairman: buildings, \$4.6 million; campground and day-use areas, \$10.4 million; trails, \$6.4 million; roads, \$10.6 million; golf course, \$3.3 million; regional utilities, \$4.3 million; fish and wildlife enhancement, \$575,000; Ribbon Creek planning, \$100,000; and miscellaneous, \$235,000. I feel it was a modest beginning for an exciting new concept of family recreation.

Let me put that concept to you in simple terms. I'd like to relate it to you the way I would see it. It's like a newly married couple renting a house and then planning and deciding that they have to do something different. They put their dream together and they design, plan, and develop a program. Let's look at the program they develop. It's a modest beginning: a two-bedroom home, gravel driveway, no garage, forced-air heating, general purpose carpeting, standard doors and windows, and they arrive at a cost of somewhere around \$50,000. They then review

that concept. They say to themselves, is it really the kind of thing we want? Can we expand this, is it big enough for our family, and could we do something different? So they talk to people. Mind you, they've got some friends, some advisors. They take that dream and expand it, upgrade it, and what do they have? They arrive at a three bedroom home with a paved driveway, a two-car garage, hot water heating, upgraded carpeting, and a cost around \$80,000. I say that to you because that's exactly what has taken place here. A dream of \$40 million is now somewhat more. But it's not because of overspending, as in cases we've heard on a number of occasions; it's because of upgrading and expansions.

Mr. Chairman, the original concept was \$40 million. We moved with program expansions of \$128 million and program additions of \$27 million. Of course the inflation factor brings that to \$200,394,000 in 1980 dollars. Mr. Chairman, what were the expansions? I'd like to go over them, because I'm sure the members would like to hear. The buildings went from \$4.6 million to \$15.3 million; campgrounds were expanded, upgraded from \$10.4 million to \$24.6 million; trails were increased to \$10.4 million; roads were increased [to] \$114.3 million; the golf course was expanded to \$6.3 million; regional utilities went to \$10 million; fish and wildlife enhancement went from \$575,000 to \$4.7 million; Ribbon Creek planning went from \$100,000 to \$3.6 million; where planning and administration was zero in the first concept, it is now \$3.5 million for the total park; and miscellaneous was increased to \$7.8 million.

Mr. Chairman, the figure that has been bannered about is the transportation budget. You'll notice that the original request was \$10 million. At that time, it was thought that the balance of the funding for roads would come from the general transportation budget. After some discussion, it was agreed that the Kananaskis Country road upgrading program should come from the heritage fund. So instead of a \$10 million road program, it's now \$103 million more.

Let's look at the program expansions of \$128 million. Where are they? Under buildings, we have the special user facilities, the park visitor centre, the park administration centre, the Bow Valley shop, the Elbow/Sheep administrative complex, regional information centre, park and day-use areas, interlake camping and day use, trails for snowmobiles, hiking and horse trails, bicycle system, roads, golf course, regional utilities, fish and wildlife enhancement program, and the alpine village planning; program expansions, Mr. Chairman, of \$128 million.

Let's go to the second issue, program additions. What have we added? We've remodelled the forest experimental station, landscaping, gravel for all roads, the Kananaskis recreation centre, the 1981 Boy Scout Jamboree, the Ribbon Creek alpine village access road and infrastructure, Evan-Thomas recreation vehicles campground, the Bragg Creek information centre, redevelopment of the Boy Scout Jamboree site for future public use, a user survey, inventory of potential ecological reserves, range improvement for domestic cattle, day-use areas, Fortress Junction service centre, a solid waste transfer station at Highwood, emergency services capital works, major signage, planning and administration. Mr. Chairman, that amounts to \$27.5 million.

Why do we have an increase of budget? I want to spend some time on that. Last year I stood before the Assembly and asked for \$41.9 million, bringing a total request to \$81 million. It was approved; we were all satisfied. Yet this year it was a surprise to many that the price had gone

beyond the \$40 million.

So what do we have? Number one, we have expanded programs; two, we have upgraded programs; three, we have additions; four, we've had changes of sites; five, we've had upgraded standards to protect the environment; and six, we've had inflation. Speaking of inflation, Mr. Chairman, I would like the members to bear this in mind: I have here an inflation sheet, provided by Statistics Canada, that tells us that inflation between 1977 and January 1, 1980, less than a three-year period, is 45 per cent on building costs alone, and some 32 per cent on site development. So we have an inflation factor somewhere around 40 per cent for the total project.

I think we have an exciting program. Between June 1 and September 1 this year, we had an estimated 130,000 units visit Kananaskis Country. For the people of Alberta we have provided cross-country ski trails, hiking trails, equestrian trails, bicycle trails, snowmobile trails, back-country trails with walk-in camp shelters, special user facilities for the handicapped, boating, some swimming, golfing, fishing, camping, day-use areas, and interpretive trails.

Mr. Chairman, where are we at? Very quickly, we have some 71 projects. In regard to completion, I think I should put this forward for the record: the Canyon campground is 90 per cent complete; Elkwood campground is 85 per cent complete; Elkwood amphitheatre is 20 per cent complete; Boulton visitors' service centre is 20 per cent complete; Boulton Creek campground is 40 per cent complete; Boulton Creek day-use area is 80 per cent complete; walk-in camping areas are 10 per cent complete; Elkwood campground extension is 10 per cent complete; we've cancelled Mud Lake campground because it's in a very sensitive wildlife habitat area, and moved the site; interlakes camping and day-use area is 30 per cent complete; the Smith-Dorrien-Highwood day-use area is 40 per cent complete; buildings are 90 per cent complete and landscaping 25 per cent complete at the special user facilities for the handicapped; the temporary visitor centre is 90 per cent complete; the building is 100 per cent complete and the landscaping 20 per cent complete at the park visitor centre at Kananaskis Provincial Park; the Highwood satellite interpretive unit is 90 per cent complete; back-country trail system is 75 per cent complete; facility zone trails are 80 per cent complete; Kananaskis Provincial Park administration operation centre is 80 per cent complete; park radiotelephone system is 30 per cent complete; the water intake distribution system is 30 per cent complete; sewage and garbage system is 70 per cent complete; seasonal staff housing at Kananaskis Provincial Park, 15 per cent complete; fish and wildlife habitat improvement program, 10 per cent complete; Kananaskis golf course, 22 holes seeded, the rest cleared and ready for seeding, 75 per cent complete; three small parks, Deadman's Flat, Bow River, and others, 85 per cent complete; Barrier Lake day-use, 90 per cent complete; Bow Valley Provincial Park, 70 per cent complete; Bow Valley park shop and staff quarters are 25 per cent complete; Elbow/Sheep office is 95 per cent complete. Mr. Chairman, I think I should stop there. There is more, but I think that gives you a pretty good idea of where we're at. We intend to have this park in operation about 90 per cent complete by the year 1982. Some work will be carried on in 1983.

The request this year is for some \$60,321,000. I am not going to go through that, because you have that in front of you. As I've said before, Mr. Chairman, it's an exciting project for all Albertans. I would request your approval.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Chairman, as a good deal of Kananaskis Country and Kananaskis Park is in my constituency, I'm quite interested in it. I must confess that for a time, with some of the stories I was hearing, I wondered what in the world was actually going on out there. But some of the members of the advisory committee took me for a helicopter trip over K-Country and the park, and I tell you it's quite a view. I want to compliment the pilot. He was an excellent operator and really showed us the true picture. I must now say that any doubts I had about what was going on out there have been dispelled. When you see some of the facilities we hear about and how they are done in such an excellent manner, I think those who are responsible, and the minister and his staff, have done an excellent job.

Some of the answers to some of the questions I have may be in this first progress review. But in case they're not, I'd like to ask the minister some questions. With his consent, I'd ask them all at once. One of the stories I have heard, but couldn't tell from the air, is that the topsoil for the golf course was being imported from a good many miles away. There was a pile of topsoil nearby. I was wondering where it came from and whether there is enough to finish the holes that haven't been seeded. Another question was how the length of operation during the summer, the operational season, compares with, say, Banff or Canmore. Also, other than access roads, will the streets be paved down to the lake cottages and so on? Will those all be paved or will they be gravel, other than the access roads to the area? Also, what safeguards does the department have in place to ensure that taxpayers are getting full value for their money in some of the tendered projects?

There seems to be some concern about grazing leases. I remember the promise being made that if anyone lost a grazing lease because of the activity going on out there, they would have another type of lease so they wouldn't lose any grazing per head. I was wondering if that is still the policy. I noticed from the minister's remarks that there is quite an increase in fish-stocking. Could the minister enlarge a little on that? Those are the ones that come to mind for now.

Thank you, Mr. Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Does the minister want to respond to those questions? There are a number of other speakers. Does the minister want to handle them individually?

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd be pleased to handle it on an individual basis. The first question raised by the hon. Member for Highwood was topsoil. I am pleased to say no topsoil was hauled in from Strathmore or anyplace else. It was on site. As a matter of fact, the topsoil we've used comes from right within the golf course area. We've made some lakes where we'll have fish stocked later on. We have more topsoil there than we actually need. We also went to Wedge Lake, about a mile away; dredged the lake some 15 to 20 metres deep. The soil was exactly what they thought was suitable for the golf course. We've used that, and we still have a number of yards of stockpiled dirt which we do not have a use for because we have more topsoil right there than we actually need. I'm pleased to say the topsoil had not come from anyplace but the actual site.

The length of season for the golf course is something that bothered me too, so I've checked that out. They tell me they have a pretty good golf course in Banff. It has a

pretty good season. The season in Kananaskis is as long or longer, because of the sunlight. Depending on weather, the season in Banff ranges anywhere from 20 to 23 weeks, so we should have that in Kananaskis Country.

Will the roads to cottages be paved? No, Mr. Chairman, the roads to the cottages are not in Kananaskis Provincial Park. They are in the Kananaskis Country. They are under the jurisdiction of the local ID, not ours. So we will pave the roads to the park, the entrance, access roads, but the roads leading to the cottages will not be paved from the heritage fund.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

Do we get value for money on tenders? Mr. Chairman, that's a good question. I would like to illustrate how we keep a close watch on the public purse here. Of course, all projects are costed out by department people: all the departments involved, be it Transportation, Environment, Municipal Affairs, or my own department. I'll just give a couple of examples, because I think it's worthy of notice. We just had a road upgrading tender called for Kananaskis. The road tender was awarded for \$2.8 million. It's interesting to note there were 10 bids, so we feel that's a pretty good safeguard. Also the tender cost was somewhat below what we anticipated.

Another case is if we find the tenders are too high or we receive only one tender, we reassess our position. Here's a case where we did something on our own. The tender for a clearing and grubbing project was open on August 14, 1980, for \$118,664. We felt we could not accept that. We didn't; we did it with our own forces. That's the flexibility we have in Kananaskis. We estimated it should cost roughly \$45,000. Well, this is interesting because we estimated it should cost \$45,136. We did it ourselves, and the total cost with our own people was \$45,466. So we feel we've had very good control of the public purse. The tenders are coming in; and if they're not, we do it ourselves. So there is a safeguard.

The next question was grazing leases: do they lose any land? No, Mr. Chairman, we've made it very clear that any grazing lease that would be taken away from a leaseholder would be replaced from some other area. To my knowledge to this date no leaseholder has lost any land through Kananaskis. If there is, I'd sure like to know about it.

The next question was fish stocking, and what have we done? Public Lands and Wildlife has an exciting program to offer within Kananaskis Country, but the one that intrigues me is the project we have at Wedge Lake. We've done a considerable amount of work at Wedge Lake, which is a mile out. Before we commenced work, it was what I guess you might sometimes call in your country a slough. It was anywhere from zero to six feet deep; some years it dried up. It's spring fed; no fish in it. We moved in and dug it to a depth of about 36 feet. It's now being filled by the springs. We've had fish and wildlife people there to check it out. They feel very satisfied that it will sustain fish. We intend to develop that into a put-and-take fishery for the handicapped, and of course other people, but basically the handicapped. We're quite excited about that.

Also there'll be fish stocked within the golf course; it'll be controlled water from the river in the man-made ponds where we got our soil, which we talked about earlier. So we're looking forward to a very exciting fishery in that area. I believe those are all the questions I had from the hon. member.



MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Chairman, there's one I neglected to ask. I want to compliment the minister on his answers; they were in far more detail than I had expected or hoped for. But I will know what to expect in the future.

Now then, is the road being built through there — there's some avalanche areas — going to be capable of year-round operation, or will it be closed from the summit south in the wintertime because of avalanche possibilities? I see it's been straightened and tried to be put on opposite sides from the avalanche routes. But the pilot couldn't tell me whether it would.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that the road has now been put in such an area that the avalanches should not affect it. As a matter of fact, when I flew over the area you could see where the old avalanches had taken place. We've moved the road over, so we feel — well nobody can be sure. I guess there's only a couple of things you can be sure of, and that's death and taxes. But as far as we know, avalanches should not affect the roads where they're going now.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. In responding to a question from the Member for Highwood, the minister partially responded to a question I wanted to raise. But I do request a bit more clarification with respect to a particular road that was raised during the select committee discussion about Kananaskis Country and Kananaskis Park on October 14, 1980. I now understand from the minister, in responding to a question just previous to this, that the particular road is outside Kananaskis Country. It's a road that appears to be partially paved and partially gravelled. I wonder if the minister could clarify who the governing authority is with respect to that particular road, and why the road might have been only partially paved and partially gravelled?

When he's on his feet responding to those two questions, might he also identify, please, the governing authority with respect to the leases that cabin occupants might obtain, and in what year they might have received their leases?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I have before me the document that the hon. member raises. It's unfortunate — and I don't think the Leader of the Opposition was very serious when he asked that question. He made a statement on October 14 that the people who had that road paved were stupid. I don't think he meant it that way. Certainly, I hope not. If he did, it's very unfortunate, as I said. I checked that out as soon as the question was raised. The road was paved under the direction of Local Improvement District No. 8. The total cost was borne by the ID, not one cent from the heritage fund. It's not within the jurisdiction of Kananaskis. The total cost of that road was some \$87,000. So I hope that clears up that issue.

With regard to leases for cabins, it's my information that there are 70 lots in total. These leases were approved in 1961. They had to readvertise 10 lots, and they were approved in 1964. It's my understanding they were all done at that time for 20 years. The first 60 leases will be up for renewal in 1981 and the other 10 in 1984. These leases were not the creation of this government but of the previous one.

DR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to extend congratulations to the minister for all that has

taken place with regard to Kananaskis Country, especially as recorded in the First Progress Review. I'm sure he knows I want to make a few brief comments with respect to the former Canadian Forest Service building at Kananaskis at the north end of the park.

The remarks really emanate from the fact that a large group of former German prisoners of war who were held in the camp, visited the site earlier this fall. They were obviously pleased very much with the condition of that site, even at the present moment. For them and their wives, it was a time of nostalgia. They also are interested in the fact that they, along with other former prisoners of war, come back on some sort of pilgrimage every year to visit that particular site because they know they were very well treated in Canada.

The minister and I have had conversation with respect to the use of the former commandant's cabin there. At this stage of the game I would hope that at some time in the future, through the appropriate channels, he would consider that we might rename Barrier Lake to Prisoner of War Lake. Also, with respect to the cabin itself, I'll make an offer that won't be influenced by inflation: if he's willing somehow to fit in a spare \$5,000, I'll donate a few yards of barbed wire, former prison camp lights, and various other artifacts related to use of that particular site for aliens, refugees, and prisoners of war, so that we might indeed develop this as a museum site. It would also be a reminder to Canadians that a federal government can step in at any time and put some of us behind barbed wire.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from the Member for Calgary Millikan. In regard to the prisoner of war camp, I can assure the member that that will remain as such. We intend to keep it as close as we can to the original state. We intend to upgrade it where necessary. I've now visited the site twice. I think it's a fine thing for us to have, and really appreciate the advice to rename Barrier Lake to Prisoner of War. I suggest the member might want to write a letter to the Kananaskis citizens' advisory committee. Those are the people who will submit recommendations of name changes to us and I'd like to see them be involved in that.

I can assure the hon. member that if he has some artifacts he would like to place in that cabin when we get it as close to natural as we can, I would sure appreciate him making those available to the Kananaskis citizens' advisory committee or to the managing director, Mr. Ed Marshall.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, in light of the information we've had, I wonder if it would be possible to hold the estimate so we have a chance to look at the information the minister has made available and given the Assembly tonight. Then we can perhaps get back to the matter Monday, if that's possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that the estimate be held for that purpose?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

**Transportation**

Agreed to:

1 — Airport Terminal Buildings \$4,646,000

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

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPELBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolutions and reports as follows:

Resolved that from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982, for the purpose of making investments in the following projects to be administered by the Minister responsible for Workers Health, Safety and Compensation, \$1,000,000 for occupational health and safety research and education project; the Minister of Transportation, \$4,646,000 for airport terminal buildings project.

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

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, because the only items in Committee of Supply that haven't been dealt with are ones which have been asked to be held, we won't be returning to Committee of Supply tomorrow morning. We propose to go to second reading of Bills on the Order Paper, but would not be calling Bills 6, 34, 60, or 84. The other ones would be taken in order, according to the availability of the sponsors of those Bills. I don't think there would be time after second readings tomorrow to consider other business, so we'll just leave it at that.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House now adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, could I ask the Government House Leader if it's still the government's intention on Monday to move on Bill 84, The Health Occupations Act?

MR. CRAWFORD: That is the present intention, Mr. Speaker. I suppose it could happen that with the estimates coming back on Monday as well, that might cause Bill 84 to come on at a slightly different schedule. It certainly would not be until Monday, and possibly Monday evening.

[At 10:17 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]