

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Friday, October 23, 1981 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in introducing to the members of the Assembly two guests who are seated in your gallery. Yesterday a very successful banquet was held in Edmonton by the Gideons International of Canada, Edmonton area public relations. Today the Gideons International of Canada are holding their regional conference in Vermilion.

We were privileged to hear, as a guest speaker, the past national president of the Gideons International for India, a businessman who is visiting Canada for the fourth time, western Canada for the second time; a true Christian and a great supporter of the commonwealth of nations, in the person of Zak Patniak from Calcutta, India. Accompanying him is Mr. Waldo Siemens from Leduc, the zone leader and northern Alberta zone co-ordinator. I'd ask the two of them to rise and receive the cordial welcome of this Assembly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 74

**Social Services and Community Health
Statutes Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 74, the Social Services and Community Health Statutes Amendment Act, 1981.

This Bill will authorize appointed committees and licensing officers to enter day care centres during normal hours of operation for the purpose of inspection.

[Leave granted; Bill 74 read a first time]

Bill 79

Regional Municipal Services Act

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 79, the Regional Municipal Services Act.

This legislation is designed to allow us to have the statutory authority to implement the decisions made with respect to Edmonton annexation, in providing regional water and sewage services.

[Leave granted; Bill 79 read a first time]

Bill 72

**Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Statutes Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 72, the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Statutes

Amendment Act, 1981.

This is an omnibus Bill that, when passed, will amend three statutes: The Alberta Business Corporations Act, The Direct Sales Cancellation Act, and The Licensing of Trades and Businesses Act. The purpose for amending The Alberta Business Corporations Act is to clarify two sections of that Act. The Direct Sales Cancellation Act is to be amended to extend more protection to consumers, when dealing with direct salesmen, and to rationalize the licensing of direct salesmen. The Licensing of Trades and Businesses Act is being amended to require the registration of manufacturers of stuffed articles rather than the licensing.

[Leave granted; Bill 72 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: I move that Bill No. 72 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, as a kickoff to Consumer Week which begins on Monday, October 26, it's my pleasure to table a consumer booklet titled Mom, Buy Me That. I'm filing two copies and providing a sufficient number for all members of the Assembly. The booklet will assist parents in teaching their children how to look at advertising.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure an appropriate follow-up. I'd like to table in the House the briefs and recommendations from the Alberta New Democratic public hearings into the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, along with the Alberta development fund, and Alberta NDP alternatives. [interjections] Copies will be made available for all members.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table three items: first, the audited statement of the Metis Settlements Trust Fund for the year ended March 31, 1981, together with the annual report of the Metis Settlements Trust Fund, dated October 1981; secondly, copies of the Special Areas Board financial statements audited report for the year ended December 31, 1980; and finally, copies of the Department of Municipal Affairs annual report for the year ended March 31, 1981.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have two statutory tablings today: first, the financial statements of the Alberta Resources Railway Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1980; secondly, the review of activities and financial statements of the government land purchase fund under that Act for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1980.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the Alberta Opportunity Company for the year ended March 31, 1981. I should point out that I am tabling five copies, as a result of having sent the copies to all members of the House on June 29.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the response to Motion for a Return No. 114.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 40 members from the Alberta Association of the Deaf. These 40 participants, along with three interpreters, are attending a day-long orientation session here in the Legislature Building.

The purpose of this session is to provide the participants with a first-hand look at the Legislature in action and information on how their provincial government works. I'll be meeting with them right after the question period, to provide them with an insight on the role of the MLA. They are seated in the members gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce to you and to members of the Legislature 30 members from the continuing education class, a program established by the Edmonton Public School Board for new Canadians. They represent nine countries, plus three students from the provinces of New Brunswick, Quebec, and Ontario. They are seated in the members gallery. I would ask that they rise and receive the very warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Case Concerning MLA**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Attorney General is with regard to the principle of the rule of law that law applies equally to members of the Legislature as to the public.

Yesterday, the Attorney General made a decision not to appeal the impaired driving charge against the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. I raise the question for the benefit of members in the Legislature and information for the general public. I wonder if the minister could indicate to us at this time the role the breathalyzer now plays in determining impairment of Alberta drivers.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased the hon. leader asked that question in order that I will have the opportunity of placing certain matters on record. The hon. leader has twice now, today and a few days ago, raised the question of equal treatment. My view is that that is always at issue and is one of the hallmarks of the justice system that we all prize very greatly. In the course of answering his question, I'll be able to demonstrate to him that had any other decision taken place, there would not have been equal treatment before the law of one of his and my colleagues in this Assembly.

The Kushner case has received much publicity, but not on account of its facts; only on account of the name and occupation of the accused in that case. On any other basis, this case — many similar to it having been determined by the courts over the years — would have attracted no attention whatever.

The position of the breathalyzer test is not in any way affected by that decision. The provisions of the Criminal Code are plain and straightforward: a presumption in the first instance, so to speak, arises at a reading of 0.08 on the breathalyzer, as is well known. But in the same provision of the criminal law — indeed, I believe in the same section of the code or immediately following — is

the further provision, which is also part of the law to every extent as fully as the earlier part, that that presumption is rebuttable by evidence that may be presented in court on behalf of any accused. In this case, that was done. Expert evidence was called by a doctor, the evidence of a businessman was also given, and Mr. Kushner himself testified.

The judge then considered what was before him and raised, as he should do, first of all a discussion of what I have just described, being the fact that the findings of a breathalyzer test may be rebutted by other evidence. Then he remarked upon the fact that all that was required in any charge was that if a reasonable doubt was raised in his mind, the person should be found not guilty. He applied that ancient and respected tradition of our criminal law and found Mr. Kushner not guilty. I say at this point, since the case has been decided now, and it's fair enough to comment on it: he found the basis for the acquittal on reasonable doubt, as he should have done in those circumstances.

Now, as to the appeal, every consideration was given as to what should be done. More consideration was given to this case, because of its publicity, than would ordinarily have been given. I might indicate to my friend the Leader of the Opposition that my instructions to my deputy minister some time after the decision of Judge Campbell were that the case was to be treated in all respects the same as any other such case. Impaired driving cases are heard year in and year out, over and over again, by courts across Canada.

By the time I spoke to my deputy about it, the review of the record had already been commenced by legal counsel in the department, to determine whether or not they would recommend an appeal. That was in accordance with normal practice that any case where there's an acquittal is looked at to consider whether or not an appeal should be taken.

At the time I spoke to my deputy, I said to him, as I mentioned, that it was to be in all respects the same as any other case. I made the point that if it was a case either involving a point of law, as was suggested in some parts of the media, and if that point of law would be sufficient to call for an appeal, an appeal should indeed be taken. I also said to him that the mere fact that the accused in that case was a person who is well known in the public sense, in comparison with most other accused, should not affect any decision.

I merely ratified the decision taken after a review by five legal counsel in the Department of the Attorney General, and reported to me by the deputy.

Breathalyzer Test

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Solicitor General, relative to the use of the breathalyzer test. I wonder if the Solicitor General has given any directions to the force, relative to the application and utilization of the breathalyzer test to determine the impairment of drivers.

MR. HARLE: As far as I can make out from the question, I'm a little at a loss as to what the Leader of the Opposition is trying to get at.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, as of late, has the minister given any change of direction to the RCMP officers with regard to the use of the breathalyzer test, relative to impairment?

MR. HARLE: I still don't get the import of the question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the minister, of late, reviewed the matter of using the breathalyzer test as a factor in determining impairment of drivers? Has there been a recent review of the application of that law and how the officers use it? Secondly, if there hasn't been a review, does the minister intend to review that matter?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, the law itself is the Criminal Code. I fail to follow the drift of the question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in response to the minister. My understanding is that the Solicitor General is responsible for the application of that law in the province of Alberta. I'm asking the minister whether there is to be a greater intensity in the use of the breathalyzer test to determine impairment of drivers in the province of Alberta.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I understand that in many cases, policemen contemplating incidents involving alcohol and driving many times lay two charges: the charge of impaired driving and the charge of exceeding 0.08. The directions that relate to prosecutions are more properly the area of responsibility of my colleague the Attorney General.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, because of the subject matter, perhaps I can just add a little bit, and it really is consequential to many of the matters that were considered in respect of the appeal or acquittal, in effect, that I just responded to a little while ago.

The policy directions to police forces, of course, to a certain extent are passed on through Crown prosecutors, who are responsible to me. Nothing that has happened in respect of the Kushner case affects that in any way.

One of the important issues involved in the case is that the breathalyzer issue is not involved in any way. It will obviously continue to be used; the law is in the same form that it was. There have been many, many other such cases where acquittals have occurred as a result of evidence given by way of rebuttal. The breathalyzer is a useful tool in establishing whether or not an offence has occurred under a particular part of the Criminal Code. There would not be any thought of or any need to change or vary any instruction to police forces. They will simply continue as they always have.

Airline Services

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I did have a question for the Minister of Housing and Public Works, but I'll ask a question of the Minister of Transportation instead. It's with regard to the Time Air route and the PWA route into British Columbia. I'd like to ask the minister whether the government is intending to increase the number of routes, or the transport or passenger facilities, into British Columbia, in direct competition to private airlines such as Time Air?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, we do not involve ourselves at all in the route selection or general operational policies of PWA. The only reporting procedure we use is through the chairman of the board of directors to myself, and that doesn't include this sort of thing.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate whether he was involved in any decisions with regard to PWA's decision to put two daily flights into British Columbia, when the Canadian Transport Commission recommended that there should be only one daily flight?

MR. KROEGER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: With regard to the general transportation of passengers policy of the government of Alberta, could the minister indicate whether there is any part in that policy which gives some protection to private airlines that exist in Alberta and have intentions of carrying passengers not only within Alberta but from Alberta to other parts of Canada?

MR. KROEGER: No, Mr. Speaker. As I said earlier, we don't involve ourselves at all in the policy as described by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Transportation for clarification. What the minister has indicated to us in this Legislature is that the government will not intervene when PWA, which is a monopoly protected by government, funded by government, against private airlines in this province. Is the minister reconsidering that position whereby there is unfair competition in this province at the present time?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I thought I gave a pretty clear description of how we associate with the operation of Pacific Western Airlines, in that it's a strictly hands-off operation, and we do not involve ourselves. The decision whether there should be a service from Lethbridge through to Vancouver, and how it ought to be served, was made by the CTC. The arguments were made; the decision came down. We've maintained our attitude of not interfering at the level of government.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate whether there's any concern on the part of government with regard to the unfair competition occurring because of PWA's present position in the passenger transportation business?

MR. KROEGER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I can accept the premise that it's unfair competition. The fact that one airline has a different kind of service capability than the other may give it an advantage, but that doesn't necessarily mean the other airline couldn't also acquire the kind of equipment they're competing with. So I really can't accept the premise that it is unfair competition.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Transportation. With this now hands-off policy of the government, where does the third-level carrier policy announced six or seven years ago by the minister's predecessor, Dr. Horner, stand? Is that just going to be left, so that whatever expansion PWA decides, tough luck for any of the other airlines?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, some work is being done that relates to third-level carriers, and I'd invite the Minister of Economic Development to comment.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, in regard to the conversation going on earlier about how we see the airline

business in Alberta, it's well that the member across should know that this government has guaranteed the loans for Time Air's Dash 7s, in an attempt to balance their opportunities within the province. To reinforce my colleague's statements, the decisions on the Vancouver airline are those of the CTC. Both airlines are free to apply. They go before a tribunal, as does anybody else, and a decision comes down, none of which has anything to do with this government.

On the issue of third-level airlines on a province-wide basis, 83 per cent of Alberta residents are within 150 kilometres of scheduled air services, which makes us the best served of any province in the country. There are some anomalies, and we're going to address those, Mr. Speaker. But it's fairly difficult to become involved in a subsidy for one and not another. The dilemma we find ourselves in is to develop a fair policy without an extreme expense of tax payers' money.

As you know, we have done extensive airport construction and that, coupled with the aircraft loan guarantees, of course, has gone a long way toward ameliorating the disadvantages of third-level airlines. But we haven't completed a study of all the options, and we'll have more to say about that later.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either hon. gentleman. What assessment has been made of the need to reconcile, on one hand, the government guaranteeing a loan to Time Air to purchase Dash 7s and, on the other hand, a hands-off policy to a Crown corporation totally owned by the people of Alberta which is muscling-in on potential routes?

MR. PLANCHE: Well, I can't say any more than I've already said. You'd have to rephrase the question. On the issue of guaranteeing aircraft, all those who have ambitions to fly scheduled service within the province, with a presentation to this government, will be afforded the same opportunity as Time Air, providing there's a financial justification for so doing. More than that, I can't say.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Transportation with regard to PWA and its passenger business. Indications are that PWA may potentially be sold by the government. Could the minister either confirm or deny that fact at the present time?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, my personal opinion has been expressed; that is, some time in the future, PWA should move into private hands. Beyond that, there is nothing in the works. We aren't trying to make that kind of decision immediately, for reasons that aren't very important right at the moment. I think when the time is right, and the decision is made, then it will happen. But at the moment, we're not discussing it.

Housing Assistance

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It concerns the Central Mortgage and Housing report with respect to the number of Canadians in trouble. The hon. minister's colleague answered that with respect to people who might be forced to sell their homes. That report, as I'm sure the minister is aware, also deals with the issue of the number of renters in trouble.

My question to the Minister of Consumer and Corpo-

rate Affairs is: is the minister able to advise the Assembly this morning of the number of Albertans in that figure of half a million who are at the "hardship level" of spending more than 30 per cent of their incomes on rent?

MR. KOZIAK: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. When is the department, going to obtain that information so the government will have the background information to be able to make policy decisions?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member assumes that policy decisions cannot be made without that type of information. That presumption is incorrect, because it suggests that expenditure of money should be made in expensive surveys and monitoring, when that money can just as easily effect the necessary goals by providing for investment directly into housing.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I might just suggest to the hon. minister that, as with his hon. colleague, he just simply read the report that's already been prepared.

In view of the information in this CHMC report that indicates that only one in 66 renters can afford to buy a dwelling unit, I would ask the hon. minister whether the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has made any recommendation at all, or has commissioned any study, or done any review of the need to provide some kind of loan program to help those people who would like to buy apartments where condominium conversion is taking place.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, again, the affordability level the hon. member refers to is based on certain interest percentage figures. That's fine if you're dealing with them in a vacuum. Of course, the hon. member well realizes that through the Alberta family home purchase program, interest rates vary according to the incomes of the applicants and can be as low as in the vicinity of 6, 7, 8, or 9 per cent. That makes affordability to renters of their own homes substantially higher — well, not even comparable to the figures the hon. member suggested in his remarks.

My colleague the Minister of Housing and Public Works would probably want to assist the hon. member in providing exact details with respect to the way the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation provides funds, pursuant to the Alberta family home purchase program, on condominiums. The provisions with respect to condominiums were of course amended last year to include not only the row or townhouse concept of condominium, where they're built side by side, but was expanded to include stack housing also.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. minister. My question really relates to whether the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is making any recommendation where there have been slight adjustments in the family home purchase program. Those adjustments include discrimination against young couples who don't have any dependent children.

MR. COOK: Oh, Grant.

MR. NOTLEY: It's a fact. Read it, Rollie. Read the basic information here that would be helpful.

I would say to the hon. minister: is that department going to recommend to government any specific program which would permit money to be made available in those cases where there is condominium conversion, not units built as condominiums in the first place but condominium conversion?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, there may well be some provisions in the program of the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation which may affect the use of Alberta family home purchase mortgage funds for the purchase of stacked condominiums where there's been a conversion from an existing unit to a condominium unit. That probably should better be addressed to my colleague the Minister of Housing and Public Works, and he could respond to that. There would of course be such limitations as dollar amounts. The amounts available are less on existing dwellings than they are on new dwellings. There are other factors, such as square footage and things like that, but I would expect that my colleague would be in a better position to provide the exact details of those if they're not in front of the hon. member now.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the hon. member's comments about discrimination, those same comments would probably equally flow from the hon. member if we assisted childless couples and did not, at the same time, provide assistance on a priority basis for those with dependants. Our whole system of government, our whole system of taxation, discriminates.

One should not use the word "discriminate" without an appreciation for the true meaning of the word. "Discrimination" also has a positive connotation. That discrimination applies in April of every year when we fill out our income tax return, and taxpayers are provided with additional exemptions and deductions for dependants. We provide programs in this government, in this province, on the basis of discrimination on all occasions: on the basis of age for senior citizens, on the basis of handicap for the handicapped.

So, in his use of the word "discriminate", I'm sure the hon. member did not suggest a connotation that might be derogatory or something of that nature.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'm sure the childless couples in this province will certainly be enthusiastic about the minister's new definition of positive discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the \$200 million the minister alluded to several days ago, the fact that the housing programs and the new housing stock won't be available for some months and probably 1983 in most cases, and we have a very serious housing shortage in both our major cities, I'd like to ask the hon. minister if any program is being developed at this stage, any program to deal with the immediate problems faced by renters where rents are sky-rocketing? In particular, is the government going to look at amendments to The Landlord and Tenant Act which would force increases on a yearly or six-month basis, rather than every three months?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, in the first instance, in response to a question posed by the Leader of the Opposition on the first day, I believe, of this sitting, I did indicate that I would be bringing forward amendments to The Landlord and Tenant Act this fall, dealing specifically with the matter of interest paid on deposits. That would be the extent of the amendments proposed for these fall sittings.

With respect to the preamble to the hon. member's comments, I don't think the hon. member meant to suggest that there is a housing shortage. I'm sure what the hon. member meant to suggest is that there is perhaps an affordability crisis, but not a housing shortage. In fact, the situation would seem to indicate that housing prices have not risen in Edmonton, for example, to the same extent as the cost of living has increased in the past year.

So in real terms, housing has gone down in price. That housing has gone down in price specifically because of interest costs. I'm sure the hon. member can easily calculate in his own mind the difficulty of managing the interest and mortgage payments on a mortgage of, say, \$100,000, where the interest rate is 20 per cent compared to 10 per cent. That's the real problem in terms of housing, and that's the same problem that applies in terms of apartment rentals.

Now, rentals have in fact gone up, as the hon. member points out. But, if one takes a look at the relationship of rental increases over a 20-year period from 1961 to 1981 and compares the increases in the cost of housing, the increase in the cost of rents, and the increase in the average weekly earnings during that period of time, one finds that the highest increase has been in the average weekly earnings, the second in housing, and the third in rental.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It relates to the remark that the problem right now is income. Yesterday, the federal minister of housing, the Hon. Paul Cosgrove, indicated that if anyone in Canada were to lose their home due to the fact that they couldn't meet mortgage or rental payments, he would personally intervene. In his responsibility as a protector of consumer rights in this province, could the minister indicate that the government of Alberta or the minister will personally intervene and assist anyone in Alberta... Two days ago, the Minister of Housing and Public Works commented that 5,000 persons are under stress relative to their income. In his role as [being] responsible to consumers in this province, could the minister indicate whether he would intervene in any situation where a person is going to lose their rental accommodation or their home [through] no fault of their own but because of mortgage and interest rates?

MR. KOZIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad we have a commitment from the government that's responsible for the problem, to solve it.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Depending on the answer. Mr. Speaker, it's not good enough. Will the government of Alberta take on the same commitment, through the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, to do the very same thing? Or will this government sit in an insulated position?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is repeating the question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Yes, he didn't answer it the first...

Hazardous Wastes

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Environment on the subject of hazardous wastes. Can the minister advise what progress has been made by his hazardous wastes team on site selection for hazardous waste disposal facilities, and when he anticipates we will have proper hazardous waste disposal facilities operational in this province?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, the site selection committee has spent considerable time moving throughout the province, looking at potential sites for special wastes that have to be coped with. In answer to the question of the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn, I would say they are pretty close to making recommendations to the government.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Given that it will undoubtedly take some years before a facility is actually constructed and operational, can the minister advise what sort of interim arrangements are going to be made with landfill sites such as the one in Forest Lawn, which is presently receiving all the hazardous wastes of the city of Calgary, estimated to be some 5,000 tons per year? What will be done in the meantime?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, once the sites are zeroed-in on, I don't anticipate it will take too long to make preparations for perhaps interim storage on those particular sites. However, part of the inquiry the siting committee is going through now is also to look at potential existing sanitary landfills, where special wastes could be temporarily stored. So, essentially, the two are going forward hand in hand.

As we have in the past, we're also looking at storage on site of industrial plants themselves. That is done to some degree now, and we'll continue to do that. At the present time, one or two companies in the province, on their own initiative, have private storage facilities. We watch and monitor those closely.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps it should be directed to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, in respect of the licensing of landfill sites under The Public Health Act. With the Reid, Crowther report in 1980 revealing that some 5,000 tons of hazardous waste materials — pesticides, acids, sludges — are still being dumped every year into the Forest Lawn landfill site, is the minister giving consideration either to amending The Public Health Act or requesting voluntary action on the part of the city of Calgary to stop dumping these hazardous materials in the Forest Lawn landfill site?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the question of hazardous wastes, as they relate to landfill sites, is currently under discussion between the departments of Environment and Social Services and Community Health. But I would like to make very clear that our intention is to ensure the responsibility for municipal landfill sites remains a local health unit matter.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Followed by a supplementary by the hon. Member for Drumheller, then the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: While the minister may be of the view that it is a local responsibility, I would draw the attention of the House to a commissioner's report to the city of Calgary operations and development committee, which recently said that the current system of disposing hazardous . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member now debating the answer or asking a further question?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: The question to the minister is: given the position of the city of Calgary that until the province enacts a comprehensive waste management system, they intend to continue dumping hazardous wastes in this manner, can the minister advise when we'll have some legislation in place?

MR. BOGLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking a question of the wrong minister of the Assembly, as hazardous wastes are clearly the responsibility of the Minister of Environment. I've indicated that discussions are under way at the present time between the two departments, relative to an interim response until the hazardous waste sites are in fact operational.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Then a final supplementary. Could the minister advise the Assembly when he expects to come to some conclusion in respect of these interim measures, and what they may be?

MR. BOGLE: I'd be pleased to do that in due course, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister of Environment. He said the plant sites have already been pretty well picked, or the area has been laid out. Before the report is a matter of fact, I wonder if the people in these areas are going to have meetings or some type of information to inform the people they are coming in.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I think it should be made clear that the sites are not necessarily already picked, by any means. We have to go through a process in that respect.

We've had approximately 30 requests from municipalities for further information and actual support for siting a plant within some general area of their jurisdiction. I think that's pretty significant and speaks very well for the good work the siting committee has been doing with regard to this special problem.

The question was asked by the Member for Drumheller as to further input by the citizenry. I have no problem with that. We have had public meetings throughout the province, and we go in on request of local jurisdictions. In the near future, it is proposed to have a joint workshop so there is a complete understanding as to what we're really talking about here. That's ongoing. So I suggest to the member that there will be further input, certainly at the local level.

MR. L. CLARK: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could inform the Assembly if the responsibility for industrial and hazardous wastes will be under the Department of Environment and that other waste products will still be left with the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, under the health units.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I suggest we're dealing in a pretty complex area. The handling and coping with special wastes of this nature overlaps into — I think we have 28 departments, and it overlaps in some way or another into all 28.

We anticipate preparing a specific schedule which will spell out those special wastes which have to be dealt with in a special way. That schedule then would spell out where those materials must go. In that respect, I anticipate it would exempt the materials from finding their way into the present landfills now licensed by Social Services and Community Health. They would be exempt from accepting those, and that's the way we'll handle this sort of difficult problem.

Industrial handling as a responsibility of industry itself will remain under the supervision of the Department of Environment. We'll do the licensing and procedure in that respect.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Environment. Some of this waste problem has been manifested in pollution in the Bow River. The mayor of Calgary has called that a municipal disgrace and, to that end, has unveiled a four-point plan to clean it up. My question is whether or not the minister has had the opportunity to consult with the mayor and agree upon the role the provincial government would play in that plan.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had an opportunity to talk with the mayor. I publicly welcome any suggestions he might have in any way that we can work together on a common problem.

As an interesting aside, I was reading a recent article by Bob Scammell, who is a leading fisherman in the province of Alberta. In the article I read, his statement was to the effect that the fish in the Bow River are now bigger and better than ever.

DR. BUCK: They like that sewage, Jack.

MR. SINDLINGER: A final supplementary question to the Minister of Environment, Mr. Speaker, if I may. This issue has been brought up over the last two years since I first got here, and the minister's response to similar questions was that we were studying the problem. Could the minister please report now on the results of those studies and give the Legislative Assembly an indication of whether or not the government has taken any specific action over the last three years to remedy this problem?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to provide information to the member on our testing system, which sets the licensing and permit for the biological oxygen demand required to reduce the condition of any effluent that finds its way into the river system from the city of Calgary. I'll undertake to do that.

I have no indication at this time that the city isn't complying with our licensing standards, but I'll check that out for the member.

Agricultural Land Assessment

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs in regard to the area northeast of Edmonton which will be annexed to that city on January 1, 1982. I wonder if the minister would advise the Assembly if the agricultural land and improvements

will retain the same municipal taxation limits within the new jurisdiction that they now have under the present rural municipality.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, not exactly. I believe the present situation would see the agricultural lands within the urban boundaries assessed the same as they would have been in the rural area. The matter of improvements to the land is slightly different in that presently the residential buildings would be fully assessed in the urban area, while in a rural area they would be assessed at only that portion above a certain level of assessment which was established a year ago. In addition, under the present system of assessment, the outbuildings would be assessed at 50 per cent of the regular assessed value as a result of the cabinet decision taken about a year ago.

I might just conclude by saying that it would be my intention to recommend to cabinet that an amended order regarding Edmonton annexation, which will follow before the end of the year, will result in alleviating any taxation on farm outbuildings. So, it would be our intention that the only change that would actually occur when those farmlands are moved into the city of Edmonton would be that the residential buildings alone would be subject to a higher assessment than they presently are.

MRS. FYFE: A supplementary question. I wonder if the minister could advise if he intends to bring this new regulation forward before the annexation takes place.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, yes, it would be my intention. There are a number of anomalies, if you like, with respect to specific descriptions of land which was annexed to the city of Edmonton, and prior to the end of the year I have to bring forward to Executive Council a recommendation for an amended order. It would be my intention to recommend that this method of not assessing outbuildings on farms, such as dairy barns and so on, be considered at that time.

MRS. FYFE: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I want to clarify the intention of the minister related to the regulation. Would he propose any time limit on this limit of assessment on outbuildings on agricultural farms?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I haven't fully considered that matter yet. When establishing orders which result in a different type of assessment in an urban area than what might otherwise be considered, it's the general practice to place some time limits on that. I haven't fully considered that, but there would likely be some time limits as to the lifetime of the order.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for the question period has elapsed, but I have recognized the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury. If the House agrees, perhaps we could deal with this question.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Constitution

MR. R. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs that is a follow-up to a question I posed yesterday to the Premier regarding the Premier's attendance and participation in the November 2 constitution meeting with the Prime Minister. Having regard for

the fact that six premiers across Canada have now indicated they will be attending, can the minister indicate to the Assembly that the Premier of Alberta will be in attendance at that meeting?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, a telex to the Prime Minister is now being sent by Mr. Bennett on behalf of the eight premiers. That telex is expected to be here within minutes. When it is, I'll take an opportunity to file it with the Assembly.

With respect to the specific question, Mr. Speaker, I can advise that the eight premiers have agreed that they will attend the November 2 meeting in Ottawa at 10 a.m., to deal with the constitution. Of course, that will include our Premier.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

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

ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVINGS TRUST FUND CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION 1982-83 ESTIMATES OF PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

Department of Agriculture

Agreed to:

3 — Irrigation Rehabilitation and Expansion \$27,863,000

MR. CHAIRMAN: We also have a supplementary estimate for 1981-82.

Agreed to:

3a — Irrigation Rehabilitation and Expansion \$4,988,000

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, under Agriculture, I move that Farming for the Future, Food Processing, Irrigation Rehabilitation and Expansion, and the supplementary estimate be reported.

[Motion carried]

Department of Environment

Agreed to:

1 — Capital City Recreation Park \$1,000,000

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, could the minister just make a couple of comments with regard to the development of each one of these, what's happened, participation of people. I don't think it's really right that we move through \$3 million of expenditure without having a bit of accountability.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could just take a minute and speak in a general way on all six projects. I think it's really important that we project to

the public in the province the very significant amounts of money being expended through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund for projects of a capital nature. Of course the Department of Environment is one of the major spenders of the capital trust fund moneys.

One of the confusions amongst the public in general is that they find it very difficult to separate what comes out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and what comes out of general revenue for the province. One can understand that, when you think that 70 per cent of the oil and gas revenue and other resources flows into the general revenue of the province, 30 per cent flows into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and, of that, a portion is allocated for capital costs, a portion for investments within Alberta, and a portion for investments outside Alberta.

Of course there are also capital costs for facilities incurred from the general revenue part of the revenue of the province. This tends to perhaps overlap and make it difficult for the public in general to distinguish between the two funds. We have attempted and will continue to clarify in a better way these large sums coming out of the trust fund for the special capital projects

We're going to do that in a number of ways. One will be to continue to use the proper plaques to indicate the special work being done from trust fund moneys. I think the reclamation projects we undertake are significant to all Alberta. Often they are very small projects submitted by municipalities. They are unsightly areas that have been abandoned over the years. We didn't have any legislation in place at the time they were initiated: now we do. On recommendations of municipalities and so on, we have endeavored to clean these sites. So if you go through the province and see this kind of work going on, you'll likely see a tabloid and the logo which will clearly indicate the special use of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

In the area of irrigation I suppose we have the same problem. There are moneys provided out of the general revenue of the province, but in addition, we have this very special announcement, jointly made by the Minister of Agriculture and myself, which indicated we would be spending upwards of \$334 million over the years to totally upgrade and improve the irrigation facilities, of which the Department of Environment would be handling \$234 million and the Department of Agriculture \$100 million. That would be subject to review in a five-year period.

There are six projects in the department. Just to touch on each one briefly, we made a major announcement about two large city parks: the Fish Creek park in Calgary, which we'll touch on in the estimates, and the Capital City Park in Edmonton, which has been funded from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Generally speaking, those two capital projects are winding down insofar as the province's commitment to the cities. As I've mentioned, we have the major project, the whole of the southern Alberta irrigation area, 13 irrigation districts, and a major commitment to expend additional funds in an extremely worth-while and certainly well-supported project to improve the facilities in the south and to expand the capacity to retain water and thereby the capacity to irrigate.

The two projects of a water nature that we'll touch on briefly in the estimates are both in the north. One is the Paddle River project. It was a long-standing problem in the area, and there is sufficient indication now that the project is progressing quite well. Perhaps the members from the area might want to comment on the progress we're making there.

The other is the Slave Lake project, which is making

good progress. I'm happy to see that in our own interdepartmental assessment of the project, we came up with a way of accomplishing the same objective but with considerably less capital fund.

Those are the important areas. The only others I want to comment on briefly are the land reclamation projects being undertaken. They are all throughout the province. They involve submissions from municipalities and individuals, and an assessment through our department and from other departments as well. We take requests from other departments — Energy and Natural Resources in particular — on unsightly areas that have to be reclaimed. We were of the opinion that we might be getting caught up on this particular vote, but again we've asked to have it extended. As we go from individuals' garbage dumps, for lack of a better term, to regional systems, these dumps have to be reclaimed in some manner that would be generally acceptable, in terms of environmental matters.

We're also doing considerable research through our department in this particular budget. One of the most important is in the Halkirk area, where we're attempting to assess the reclamation value of lands and how we can handle coal stripping and still put the land back into production. That's a project which anyone in the area should visit. It indicates, certainly in that area, that we can reclaim the land to its agricultural potential. That doesn't mean to say that can be done in all parts of the province. I like to think it can, but I guess time will determine that.

Mr. Chairman, that gives a kind of broad overview of the six areas the Heritage Savings Trust Fund invests in through Environment.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister of Environment. This has to do with the vote we're looking at, the \$1 million dollar extension to Capital City Park. I have two concerns, and two areas I'd like the minister to look at. First of all, the entire area along the river from Edmonton to Fort Saskatchewan and a little past is all in the restricted development area. Now, the minister is well aware of areas along the river being mined for gravel. Those areas are going to have to be reclaimed. There is the sanitary landfill site, the sewage treatment plant along the river, and an area further downstream past the gravel development that the province has given to the municipality of Fort Saskatchewan to develop a recreation area.

What I am trying to indicate to the minister is: does the minister have any long-range plans for that strip from, say, the industrial area in Clover Bar downstream to Fort Saskatchewan? That area is going to have to be reclaimed. It is in the restricted development area — and I think the minister probably knows the area — which is really an excellent park site. There is some private land there, and there's some company land that will have to be restored. I'm interested to know if the government has given any thought to long-range planning to make that entire area a park site. There is certainly the opportunity to make that a provincial park.

I'm suggesting to the minister that the province could work with the local municipality, the town of Fort Saskatchewan, and the county of Strathcona to develop that entire area. The golf club in Fort Saskatchewan is willing to work with the municipalities and the province. I'd just like to illustrate to the minister that in discussions with the new reeve of the county of Strathcona last night, the best system I know of to provide recreational opportunities for our citizens is if a private club runs the facility but

the funding is done by a larger corporate body such as a town, county, or province.

Here's what happened in Fort Saskatchewan when we built our new curling rink about 12 or 15 years ago. The town raised the debenture for us, but the curling club looked after the repayment of the debenture and developing, building, and running the club. The story has been so successful, Mr. Minister, that the councillors of the town of Fort Saskatchewan have said: gosh, that's such a great system; would you like to have the swimming pool; would you like to have the arena? Where else can you get labor that costs you nothing to look after the facility and still make a profit?

Mr. Chairman, I am really saying to the minister that I would like to see the government look at some long-term planning and maybe develop the area just outside Fort Saskatchewan with a multi-use facility such as a golf club, picnic areas, and so on, then eventually link up the entire river valley with the extension of Capital City Park. I cannot see a better use of that restricted development area than as a recreational facility. We're going to have to do the reclamation on the gravel deposits. Also, the two things could be developed in tandem, where maybe the private sector could mine the gravel and still look at moving some of the dirt that has to be moved, using some of the holes as water holes if you're going to use it as a golf course. As the developers are mining the gravel, at the same time you're reclaiming it, you are doing some long-term planning to cut down the costs of developing a facility if, say, we're going to use it as a golf course.

I would like to know if the minister has any aspirations — and I know the minister is looking at being here for the next 20 years, or at least 18 months — to develop that facility, then link it to a giant extension of Capital City Park. Has the minister given that any consideration?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I think the member raises a good point. We've also had requests for a further look upstream from Capital City Park. I think now that we probably have a clear picture of whose jurisdiction we are in, we can continue to take a little more detailed look at the concept. Until the annexation took place, things were in limbo, in a sense, because we weren't exactly sure where the boundaries would be.

As the member knows, Capital City Park and Fish Creek park were established by joint agreement with the municipalities concerned. In the area the member is suggesting, it would likely involve two, and possibly three, municipalities: Fort Saskatchewan, the county of Strathcona, and the city of Edmonton. So it would be a project we could look at. The area is a restricted development area; therefore, we have control as to a good portion of what can be developed, what can be done in the area. In terms of private land, I guess we have a commitment to purchase at an agreed-upon price if they wish to retire or move out.

I might suggest to the member or any other interested city of Edmonton members that I think probably the best way to approach this would be to make a proposal, through the due process of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee, with regard to the concept of a future recreational park. Get the thing on record, then let it flow from there. Of course, we have some limitations in our total funding, but the two major parks are now winding down and it isn't beyond the realm of possibility that we could certainly have a look at the concepts. The thought about private enterprise being involved is certainly in line

with my thinking in general.

If an agreement is between three municipalities, eventually, under the agreement, and in the case of Calgary the arrangement is a little different from Edmonton, we pick up — and I'm getting into the area of Recreation and Parks — a portion of the operational cost on a sliding-scale formula. So the long and the short of it is: the suggestion is worthy of consideration. I've suggested a route to go on the proposal.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It's my pleasure this morning to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 36 grades 5 and 6 students from the Falun school in my constituency. They're accompanied by their teacher Larry Harris and by Mrs. Jackie Hanna. They're seated in the public gallery. I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

Department of Environment
(*continued*)

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, two questions at this point. The first one is in regard to the Fish Creek park. I note from page 37 of the annual report of the Alberta Heritage Savings Fund, that a contingency is set aside for "possible claims pending at March 31, 1981 in respect of Capital Projects Division land acquisitions". The contingency is somewhere in the area of \$37 million or \$40 million. I can't quite determine. What is the status of those land settlement claims in regard to Fish Creek park?

MR. COOKSON: Of course the biggest problem we have is the Mannix claim. We're asking for \$2 million in our budget this year. There are two other expropriations we're not going to proceed with, if we can work out something pending the Mannix settlement. I think they're Shaw and Sanderson. The Mannix case is before the courts now, and the only comment I can make is that it's a pretty complex issue. It's a long court case. I think it's still on. Until we get the results from that, we will have no way of knowing what the total cost will be.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. You referred to Shaw and Sanderson, in addition to Mannix. Is the Shaw and Sanderson land claim associated with Fish Creek park as well?

Secondly, when you were discussing this matter you indicated you're asking for \$2 million in our budget. Of the \$2 million I see here on page 12, is all that intended for the land claim? The final question I would pose to you: has there been a sinking fund set up for this contingency? The annual report says \$40 million. Do you have a sinking fund set aside for the payment of that land claim in the event it is successful for those claiming it? Or

would you come to the Legislature for an additional \$40 million at that time if in fact that does occur?

MR. COOKSON: Perhaps I can get some further information to the member on the outstanding title holders a little later. I'm sure I'm right on the two I've suggested, but I might be able to get some further information on that.

The hope is that the \$2 million we're asking for will be sufficient to deal with those cases before the court this year. But you asked whether that will be sufficient. If we conclude it isn't sufficient, then I think we would have to come back for a special allocation through the trust fund. Of course, until the court proceedings are concluded, we have no way of estimating what the amount will be. So that option is open to us: that we would have to come back, based on the final settlement. As of now, it's not included in our budget for this year.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman, for clarification. The minister keeps saying that \$2 million would be sufficient to deal with the cases before the court this year. Am I to take it that this entire \$2 million on page 12 is to deal with those land claims presently before the courts? If not, what portion of this \$2 million do you intend to allocate to those court cases? Perhaps in summary, you might indicate what those court cases have cost us to date.

MR. COOKSON: I just want to be clear on this point. The only case before the courts at this time is the Mannix one. We are of the opinion that, pending the outcome, we should be able to arrive at settlements for the other properties without going through the court system. So the \$2 million is really a rough estimate, I guess, for lack of further knowledge of what may or may not be used during this period of time to deal with those cases that at the present time are not before the courts.

As you know, under The Expropriation Act the property owners have two choices. First of all, it has to be proven that the land is needed. That has been done. It has to be included in the area of Fish Creek park. Once that is completed, the owners have the opportunity go either to the Land Compensation Board for a settlement, where both parties agree to that settlement, or through the court system to receive a settlement. They have the two options.

On the Mannix one, the decision has been to go to the courts. On the other properties, subject to clarification, that decision hasn't been made yet. Perhaps I can get some more information to you before the vote on that. But as far as I know, that decision has not been made. The \$2 million we are asking for is \$2 million that may be required for interim, whatever may be in the Mannix case, and possibly for something that can be settled on those properties that have not proceeded to a court case. It's so difficult to project the outcome. We could put \$30 million or \$40 million into the vote, which may or may not be needed. Rather than do that, it's the recommendation to keep it at this until we find the outcome of the total cost.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I get the impression from what you've said that the total of the \$2 million is predominantly for the Mannix case. I don't quite follow that, because there's an item in here that says purchase of fixed assets were almost \$1.5 million, which is almost 75 per cent of the total vote. I don't see how the purchase of fixed assets could be applied

against the court case, unless that's your intended settlement.

Perhaps a better way to put the question is that the annual report has a contingency for something in the area of \$40 million. I presume that's what the claimants are asking for. Has the government a counter position saying anything like: you're asking for \$40 million; we're willing to give you X million?

MR. COOKSON: Your assumption is incorrect at the . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will members of the committee please use parliamentary language.

MR. COOKSON: The member is making an incorrect assumption that we would be settling the Mannix court case on the \$2 million. That's an incorrect assumption. The \$2 million hopefully will deal with those smaller parcels that are still outstanding. The Mannix thing is a separate issue.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Could the minister give the Legislative Assembly any indication when a conclusion is anticipated for the court case?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I might be able to get some further information on that. They have been deliberating the issue now for possibly two weeks. I don't know whether I've got anyone up here who can get that information to you, as to just how close it is, but I can provide the information. It's awfully hard project this.

MR. SINDLINGER: One final comment to the minister, Mr. Chairman. I noted that when the minister was making his general comments he indicated that it was difficult for the general public to distinguish between those projects funded from the heritage fund and those which came from general revenue. The minister noted that many of the projects tend to overlap, and it's difficult to distinguish between the general revenue fund and the heritage fund. The question I would like to put to the minister in that case, please, Mr. Chairman, is: what criteria does the department use to determine which projects should in fact be funded by the general revenue fund and which should be funded by the heritage fund?

MR. COOKSON: That's a good question and one worthy of an answer, Mr. Chairman. I don't know whether I can answer totally for government. From my perspective, the requests for capital projects under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund normally flow from government members, the public, and from opposition members, through the special Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee by way of resolutions and submissions. Debate takes place in the committee as to acceptance or rejection, and I think the case as to whether acceptance or rejection is possible has to be made there. In the most recent proceedings of the committee, I noticed the kinds of projects that were accepted and rejected.

I guess the public has to understand, then, that the original intent of capital projects in the heritage savings trust was that they be projects of lasting benefit but not an immediate measurable economic return. Now, one can argue that those kinds of things could be applied to projects from general revenue too. So I think it really comes down to the debate that proceeds here in the

Legislature at committee stage, and the judgment of the government based on those recommendations. Other than those I've spelled out, I don't think there are any specific guidelines.

I think the confusion of the public could simply be expressed this way: why would the Paddle River project come under the heritage savings trust and the Dickson dam not come under the heritage savings trust? I really can't answer that question because I'm not clear on the background of the debate that flowed. [Interjection] I don't know whether that helps the member.

MR. SINDLINGER: Yes, it is helpful, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Minister. The question that comes to my mind after your comments deals with the department's efforts to identify those projects for the general public.

The minister has indicated that the public has difficulty identifying the projects which come from the heritage fund and those which come from the general revenue fund. That problem has had considerable discussion in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund legislative committee. So the question I put to the minister, Mr. Chairman, is: what is the minister and his department doing to ensure that those projects which are funded by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund are properly identified, so the public does not have difficulty distinguishing between those and other projects which are funded through the general revenue fund?

MR. COOKSON: That's a continual problem we have, Mr. Chairman, and we've had internal discussions about it. I've had my input to the internal discussions, and instructions have gone out to upgrade the capacity to clarify Heritage Savings Trust Fund projects. In that respect, I would think that a review is being made internally of the way in which they could be practically identified. In other words, going back to the Paddle River project, it would be inconceivable that a major project and a major investment like that out of the heritage savings trust would be complimented by a 6 by 12 inch plaque, in the corner of the dam structure, stating the investment. I don't expect to see something 15 feet by 15 feet, but certainly we have to do a better job of clarifying that, and that's one area we are exploring.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. If I might make a suggestion along those lines. All these types of labels, signs, et cetera, go to help the public distinguish between general revenue fund investments and heritage fund investments. But it has occurred to me that one of the first steps in helping to identify these projects is to name them in an appropriate way, a way that would be complimentary to the heritage fund.

I know it's a little bit difficult in your department, but the suggestion I would make is that Fish Creek Provincial Park might be called Fish Creek Heritage Trust Fund Park or something of that nature. The Capital City Recreation Park could be called the Capital City Heritage Trust Fund Park. Right away you have the label up front, and it provides a ready and easily identifiable means of the source of the funds.

I think it's important that we demonstrate to the people of Alberta that the trust fund is being used for them now. We know that many people are asking the question: what do I get from the trust fund today? Well, as the Provincial Treasurer pointed out last week, Albertans in fact benefit from expenditures from the trust fund today. I think that's a worth-while thing to point out, and I think

we ought to communicate it as broadly as we possibly can.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, in that we're dealing with the capital projects division on environment, an area under his responsibility. There have been various references this morning with regard to communication of the heritage fund — how it's communicated, invested, and so on. I was amused to see on my desk this morning, tabled by somebody in this House, recommendations on public hearings of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. There's quite a variety and, oddly enough, although the advertised purpose of the meetings is about investment, here it came out really in an area of expenditures. I find two somewhat amusing. One is applicable to the minister. However, in the first one someone suggested that MLAs and civil servants might be more sympathetic — this was in the heritage fund public hearing — to the needs of farmers if their salaries are indexed to the price of grains and cattle. So when you get into the heritage fund discussion, I guess it gets all over the map.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think there's any question that perhaps there could be more communication with regard to the parks in Alberta funded by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I think it should be noted that up until a year ago Capital City Park and Fish Creek park were known across North America as a real precedent in a provincial government, because the state governments don't have anything of that nature, in providing for the needs of the citizens of major metropolitan areas. Later on we get to urban parks — dealing really in another portfolio — concerning the constituency I represent, in addition to Medicine Hat, Red Deer, Lloydminster, and Grande Prairie. So of those five communities, although the Minister of Recreation and Parks is the minister primarily responsible, it impacts on the Minister of Environment.

I'd like to pose a couple of questions to the minister, Mr. Chairman, regarding urban parks policy as it affects the constituencies of Lethbridge. In those five communities we're about to spend considerable funds in urban parks. In the case of Lethbridge, it's in the river bottom, adjacent to the Oldman River. Various people in that community have made representations about dredging that river to prevent flooding. To my knowledge, based on the briefs submitted to the minister, they've all been for taking gravel out of that river bed. We have a situation now where the city of Lethbridge, along with the Minister of Recreation and Parks, is trying to put together this urban park in the city of Lethbridge. It involves the golf club. We have constant flooding of that river on golf club land. My concern is that when the Minister of Recreation and Parks puts this together with the city of Lethbridge — and as I understand the policy, the minister of the government will be funding it through the heritage fund appropriation — it's really the responsibility of the city, but it impacts heavily on the department of the Minister of Environment, Mr. Chairman.

The question I'd like to put to the minister, because obviously we get to the Minister of Recreation and Parks and won't be able to come back to the Minister of Environment: is there some provision whereby we could proceed in the very near future with the dredging of that river, as per the request of various people in the Lethbridge community? Obviously, what we don't want to happen is to develop an urban park policy in the river bottom and then be faced with flooding as a result of inadequate planning or removing gravel, for example,

from the Oldman River bottom. Two years ago that was made into a restricted development area. The Department of Environment essentially now has control over the entire area. Until we can reach an agreement whereby we can do work on the river bottom. I believe it's going to be either somewhat fruitful to proceed or very expensive after the fact, once the river valley park has been established.

Mr. Chairman, could I ask the minister directly if he, with his department, will co-operate with the requests of Lethbridge city and those people involved to see that provision is made whereby they can issue permits to dredge that river bottom, the river valley area encompassing the Oldman River, taking out its gravel, which will make the completion of the urban park not only more practical but more safe.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't have any problem with the submission by the Member for Lethbridge West. We have a problem with overlapping jurisdictions within government, as the member knows. It's quite likely that the problem would very much involve the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. His responsibility is to protect the fish situation. So you'd have to review that with him. In addition, the lands under the waters come under the jurisdiction of The Public Lands Act. So any input Environment has would simply be by way of recommendation.

But if the member wishes to put forth a memo to my own department, I'll try to pull the thing together and advise him as to our responsibility on it and what we can do.

MR. PURDY: When we're on Vote 2, which is Fish Creek Provincial Park, the Chair is having some difficulty with the questions and answers right now. I would ask members of the committee to stick to the subject of Fish Creek Provincial Park, and at the end of the vote we could sum up.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, my question was similar to that of the other member. The reason it came to my mind was that the minister had made opening comments in regard to park policy in general, provincial and urban parks. I thought perhaps we might go on to it, inasmuch as we're dealing with principle here. It's not just the money but the principle of provincial parks. I'll pose the question and see how far it gets, in any case.

Mr. Chairman, in regard to the Lethbridge area and the prospects of a provincial park in the river valley, has the government started to accumulate land there, around the golf course or Indian battle park?

MR. COOKSON: I don't know if the Chairman wants to accept that question.

MR. PURDY: Well, the question's been asked, so I would request the minister to answer it. But any further questions should be asked at the completion of the vote on the Department of Environment.

MR. COOKSON: On that particular question, we have the restricted development area. In some cases we do, and in some cases we don't. But specifically in the case of Lethbridge, if we are instructed to do so by Recreation and Parks, we proceed to purchase. However, under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I'm going to leave this for the hon. Mr. Trynchy to answer at his stage of the

proceedings. Funds for assembling parks are under his jurisdiction, other than the Fish Creek park and the Capital City Park. Those two came specifically under Environment, out of the capital funds. But when you get into areas outside that, we have no jurisdiction as yet in terms of our vote here.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman, for clarification. The procedure, then, is that if the Department of Recreation and Parks approves a project they then pass on to you the responsibility of acquiring the land for that project?

MR. COOKSON: Our responsibility in Environment is to acquire lands for a number of departments, with the possible exception of Transportation. They have their own procedures. Within our department, we have what is known as a land assembly division. Submissions are made from Energy and Natural Resources, Public Lands and Wildlife, Recreation and Parks, and so on. On the basis of that, our land assembly division acts on behalf of them. It's simply in the interests of efficiency. I know the member might question the government's efficiency, but one area has to be responsible for the purchases. That's where we fit in.

The only thing I can add to that is that when we get into the jurisdiction of Recreation and Parks, the minister concerned may have a procedure whereby he will ask the municipalities concerned to assemble the land, then transfer that out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Again, it's out of my jurisdiction. I don't want to comment on it further.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, a final supplementary, specifically dealing with the Fish Creek Provincial Park vote. From the comments of the minister, I get the impression that through the land assembly division the minister's department might acquire land for a project — such as the one in Lethbridge that we've been discussing — that has not yet come before the Legislative Assembly. My question, then, would be specifically in regard to this vote. Is there any possibility or potential for funds that are allocated under these particular votes to be used on an interim basis for another project to acquire land in the Lethbridge area? Is a monitoring system in place to ensure that these funds are used specifically for the purpose they have been designated for, rather than being used for something else as a transitional type of funding?

MR. COOKSON: Yes, I can assure the member that what we are agreeing to here, that those funds would be used specifically for the defined project . . . For example, Fish Creek Provincial Park land assembly, \$2 million, is to be pinpointed for Fish Creek park. And that applies in each project.

Funds are allocated through the legislative process each year from the various departments for land purchasing outside these projects. They're approved by the legislative process. It's an entirely separate operation from the vote we're looking at now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Macleod.

MR. FJORDBOTTON: Mr. Chairman, my question was with regard to Fish Creek park, so I'll defer.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I sincerely want to give a word of thanks to the people of the province, especially the Minister of Environment, with respect to Fish Creek Provincial Park. In the course of the last number of months, whenever the issue came up I've known generally where the park location was. But in the course of the summer, I made a point of travelling there with my wife and going through most of the park. I was quite amazed at the size of the acreage, but more important, I was impressed by the general atmosphere, the preservation of the river bank and the type of environment there with respect to trees, grasses, and so forth. I think commendation should be given with respect to the whole layout of the park, in addition to the preservation of the land.

The other comment that needs to be made is with respect to the eastward extension of Fish Creek Provincial Park, where it crosses the Bow River into what some people mistakenly believe is the deprived part of Calgary: the whole southeast quadrant. Since most of that area falls within the area of Calgary Millican, I'm here to disclaim the fact that it is a down trodden part of Calgary, but rather a very interesting one. With respect to the eastward extension of Fish Creek Provincial Park, I know the land assembly has taken place on the east side and some southern extension of the Deerfoot Trail is in place. But I wonder if the Minister of Environment might comment with respect to projected time lines as to the work being done on the park on the east bank of the Bow River.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, I think the question might better be asked of the Minister of Recreation and Parks at the time the vote comes up. We do the land assembly, then it's taken over jointly by a master agreement between Recreation and Parks and, perhaps in this case, the city of Calgary. So I think it would be better to defer that until the vote on Recreation and Parks.

Just to respond to the Member for Calgary Buffalo as to the Mannix situation, we expect the court trial will probably continue until November 30, but it could be extended until Christmas.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, if this matter was covered when I was out of the House, I'll simply read *Hansard*. Can the minister indicate the status of the expropriation procedures that are going on, and when we'll know the final cost?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, we did answer that. It was requested by the Member for Calgary Buffalo.

Agreed to:

2 — Fish Creek Provincial Park (Land)	\$2,000,000
---------------------------------------	-------------

3 — Irrigation Headworks and Main Irrigation Systems Improvement

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'd appreciate very much if the minister could indicate some projects that will be taken on. I left the House a few moments ago, and the minister was just indicating that 13 districts would benefit. I'm not sure whether specifics were raised. I'm quite interested in the Bow River Irrigation District's request through a study — I believe it would be four years ago — where they would like to widen the canal between the Bow River and the storage facility on Gregoire Lake and the Travers dam area. I'd certainly like to know if that's

on the agenda for capital money and, as well, where the facility on the Oldman River sits at the present time and the work with regard to Keho Lake and other storage facilities being planned in that project. I'd appreciate the minister's comments, specifically on those two.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, it might be just about as efficient to quickly run through the expenditures for each district. I can give you the estimated expenditure, but I can't tell you specifically what the project is in each district. Perhaps it will help to know the relative expenditures. All these things depend so much on the interrelation between the districts and ourselves as to timing, tendering, et cetera. Right now the Keho operation depends on buying right of way and some problems we're having in that area. The Forty Mile coulee is another one.

Just to give you an idea of the expenditure as we see it for '82-83: Waterton-St. Mary is estimated at \$100,000 this year; Carseland-Bow is estimated at \$50,000; Lethbridge Northern, a major project in Keho Lake and storage is estimated at \$24.4 million; Western, a small one in the south, \$20,000; United, about \$20,000; Mountain View-Aetna, \$10,000; Ross Creek, \$20,000. On-stream storage is at \$50,000. That would be in keeping with our statement at the time of the public announcement, in which we said that some portion would be used for on-stream storage. Reservoirs under 25,000 acre-feet come under Agriculture; over 25,000 come under Environment. At the time of the announcement, we said we would commit \$17 million to internal storage. We are now in the process of doing engineering in the Eastern Irrigation District at the Crawling Valley reservoir and in the Bow River Irrigation District at the Badger reservoir. So, it's in the engineering process.

I think that covers — the St. Mary River Irrigation District main canal, \$3.6 million this year. Forty Mile coulee, \$40.8 million. On the internal storage of the Bow River Irrigation District at Badger Lake, the expenditure is \$1 million. What's called the Dead Fish diversion project is \$4.9 million. Internal storage in the Eastern Irrigation District at Crawling Valley is estimated at \$2 million. Waterton-St. Mary, \$595 million. There are some further breakdowns on improved operational capabilities.

In the case of Keho Lake, we are in the process of acquiring right of way. We are proceeding quite rapidly — as rapidly as we can, given the complexity of the thing — on the Piegan Indian Reserve. As I've indicated, I think we've allocated about \$24 million toward that.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary to the minister please, Mr. Chairman. On the same irrigation development projects, I notice that most of them were in the low thousand range, not much more than a one man-year assignment. The \$24.4 million at Keho Lake is quite large. I wonder if the minister could please elaborate on that, giving specific attention to the breakdown between that amount of money that would be allocated for acquiring right of way and that amount that would be used for developing the project.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, we have to contend with two major off-stream areas. We think they are a priority, and I think it's agreed with the irrigation districts in general. One of the big ones is the Keho Lake development, and the other is the Forty Mile coulee reservoir. When I gave you the breakdown, those are

given priority because of the general condition of the system up to the main gate — which is our responsibility: beyond that it is Agriculture — and because of the major areas of those districts that require irrigation. Those three or four I mentioned — Mountain View, Leavitt, Aetna — are very small districts. Based on the input from the 13 districts and the Irrigation Council, we have prioritized according to our department's and Agriculture's input. Of course the discrepancy is great, but it is prioritized according to the demands and the urgency.

On land purchase, we are now in the process of acquiring land. It is not an easy undertaking. When you proceed to allocate such major funds for irrigation, it's surprising that you are then faced with mounting resistance to acquisition of right of way. I guess it's only understandable. The person from whom we are acquiring right of way may derive a very small portion of the total benefit. He naturally feels he should be compensated accordingly. We have to try to do this as rapidly as possible, though, because of the deteriorating condition of the systems. It may very well be that somewhere down the road we'll have to set a time frame for negotiations. If you stretch it out too long, it becomes a very complex operation.

So, land acquisition is proceeding. It's really important that we get as much co-operation as possible from the people in general in what we're attempting to do.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary to the minister again please, Mr. Chairman. The second part of my question specifically was: in your budgeted amount of \$24.4 million, how much of that was specifically allocated for the purchase of right of way as opposed to funds set aside for development of the project?

MR. COOKSON: If anyone else wants to make some comments on irrigation, it might be a good time to do so. I'll try to get the breakdown that has been asked for.

MR. L. CLARK: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, you mentioned a \$2 million allocation for Crawling Valley, which affects my area considerably. I wonder if that is for acquisition of land, engineering, or what? If it is for engineering, I wonder if the engineering and the feasibility study, if they're doing one, would be made public at some time.

MR. COOKSON: I have a lot of figures here. I don't know if they'll be of much value to the members in terms of breakdown. I'm not sure what would be of best value to give you. For example, let me give you the magnitude of the problem. We have a breakdown for main irrigation systems improvement for \$2.5 million for '82-83. I don't know whether I can really give you the detail of the breakdown as to which one of those systems would receive it. That's the magnitude of the problem I face. In 1982-83 there is a breakdown of \$452,000 for technical services on main irrigation improvements. Again, we would have to go into considerable detail to be able to determine which of those districts would receive the majority of the irrigation headworks rehabilitation I've mentioned. There's a total of \$24.6 million for main irrigation systems improvement. Then we can go to the various ones I gave the hon. Member for Little Bow, which gives a breakdown in each of the departments. Again it's a lot of detail.

Let me just run through them, and maybe you can gather something from it. For the Lethbridge Northern.

we have allocated \$24.4 million. When I look at the breakdown in terms of land purchase, it shows that we estimate purchase of real estate at \$870,000. So that's purchase of right of way. [interjection] No, that's for the Lethbridge Northern.

Now the others which the members mentioned, for example Western, are of such small capacity and so on — there's no provision there for purchase of land. It's really supplies and service. United is of the same nature — Mountain View, Aetna, Ross Creek. Let's see if I can get another one that would be . . . By the way, when I'm going through them, I should mention that \$100,000 is allocated to the Blood Indian irrigation feasibility, and that's proceeding. As part of our announcement, we agreed to do that.

There's an allocation of capital for water resource development projects. Again I could probably get the detail on how that \$32 million breaks up. Probably a lot of that is work being done on the flume on the Piegan Reserve.

Here is one the Member for Drumheller might be interested in, the Sheerness project. That's in the area of the Minister of Transportation. There's a breakdown of \$8 million for the pipe we agreed to put in. It will be a combination water supply for Hanna and for the coal mine there. Real estate is \$175,000; that's right of way. There's \$595,000 allocated for Waterton-St. Mary. Most of that is improved operational. Some construction machinery is involved and an estimated annual cost of operation of that. Carseland-Bow River has a total of \$243,000 allocated for improved operational capabilities, and a breakdown on those expenditures. I don't know whether that has helped to answer the question, but there are so many different subtitles it's pretty difficult to separate actual construction and purchase of right of way. It would be in here, and if the member wished, I'm sure I could dig it out for him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Macleod has been trying to get in on this discussion for some time. We've had quite a few supplementaries on the present topic. We can return to it, but I'd recognize the hon. Member for Macleod now.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Overall water management in the southern part of the province is vitally important, starting I guess at the top of the stream on the Oldman River. The control flow of the Oldman River is vital to the future expansion of irrigation. The first question is: how are the negotiations going with the Piegans, as far as the possibility of putting a dam on the Piegan Reserve? What time frame would you look at? Would it be in the short term or the longer term?

The second question would be with regard to the relocation of the main canal system that goes into Keho Lake. Where are we on that? You've had a few information meetings with landowners in the area. Have you completed your survey and all the testing? Are you looking at trying to relocate that canal in the long term, in 20 years, or within the five-year period? Is the surveying on the Keho Lake reservoir done? Are you still testing? Are you prepared to buy land soon? When we use heritage fund money for expansion of a system like we're talking about there, I'm concerned about what kind of communication you have with landowners so they know where you are in the process.

I'd appreciate answers to those, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, hopefully I can cover the questions asked by the hon. Member for Macleod. I was just going back to the original agreement we made public with regard to the development down there. First of all, with regard to Keho Lake and the channel that goes there, at present we are buying right of way. We have our people in the area working with the public concerned to acquire the additional. We've had delays with regard to survey and the exact boundaries, but I'm hoping we can improve on the progress we're making in that area because there is considerable urgency in the development of the project. Keho Lake, which serves the Lethbridge Northern, will be expanded from 30,000 acre-feet to 75,000 acre-feet. So it is a major project which we're undertaking.

We've had ongoing discussions with the Piegans as a result of the settlement we made with Chief Nelson Small Legs. In the agreement, as you remember, we have agreed to give the Piegans an opportunity to put a proposal to us on a dam which would be partly on the reserve and partly on non-reserve land. As you know, the other location is at Three Rivers.

The time frame was made fairly public at the time. We should try to get the whole system in that area on stream by 1990. The Piegans are working with us and are proceeding to prepare a proposal for us within a time frame of a year to 18 months, from the time we announced it. So they still have time to go. We're assisting them in any way we can by way of our own expertise. It's basically the responsibility of the Piegan band to put a proposal before us within a year, I would say now, so that we'll be able to determine whether we should construct on or off the reserve. I know it's a period of uncertainty, but a commitment was made. I think we're bound to follow through on that commitment.

Insofar as the other work being done on the Piegan reserve is concerned, we have made good progress since our agreement. The design, et cetera, on the flume is progressing and is well advanced. We're not handicapped in any way insofar as the progress there is concerned. It's really just a matter of time until we clarify the Piegan position on the potential dam. At that time, we'll be able to progress in one way or another with regard to the location of the dam.

But there is an urgency in the whole Lethbridge Northern Irrigation District area. It's a huge irrigation area. It's extremely important that we have some pretty fair time constraints on the total expansion and capacity of Lake Keho. On the part of all property owners and members concerned, all the co-operation is needed to expedite that problem as quickly as possible.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman. You say it's important that we move quickly. Are you looking at the canal on the five-year time frame, or would the dam on the Oldman would be in past 1990? Also the question on Lake Keho — I know there's urgency to it, but are you through with surveying and all the testing? Have you had any appraisals done or anything like that? Are you ready to start moving on buying land?

MR. COOKSON: At the present time we are purchasing land on Keho Lake and the surrounding area. Recently we met with the solicitor representing a number of private landowners in the general area, and hopefully we can expedite some of the earlier problems we've had in the area in terms of settlement.

I don't know whether I can give you a precise answer on the speed at which we are surveying and expanding the canal that will go into Keho Lake. Each of these projects hopefully is designed to be completed at the time we can turn the switch. I think our big challenge will be to make sure this happens. In that respect, I would appreciate any direction or support I can get from the members concerned, to make sure it does happen. We think it's extremely important that the tap turn at a certain time. We want to expedite it as quickly as possible. If members feel in any way that we are too lax in a certain area of progress, I think it's important that you communicate with me, and we'll do our best to keep the thing rolling.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few general comments on this topic this morning. I really believe this is a good example of what the heritage trust fund is doing for Alberta, what it was set up for. I may be prejudiced, but here is an area where we support our basic industry, agriculture. If you look at the history of irrigation, those systems were built 50, 60 years ago. They are wearing out, have been worn out for years.

I really think spending heritage dollars on irrigation is nothing but help. It helps not only the people out there distributing the water. I think the ratio is pretty accurate. There is a ratio in irrigation of 86:14, where the farmer directly pays 14 per cent, the government contributes 86 per cent, and the impact on the communities in the irrigation area — I think that ratio is close to being very accurate. So it helps the area itself. It's bringing new crops on stream.

In the past there have been sugar beets, but basically we have irrigated barley, white spring wheat, and that type of thing. Now we are starting to see corn creep into the areas that have heat units that can stand it. I think it's going to really diversify the crops in southern Alberta. In fact, I was talking to one of the executives of the seed growers, when they had their convention in Lethbridge. He told me a fact I was not aware of. Within 60 miles of Lethbridge, every field crop except tobacco that is grown in Canada is grown in that area. Of course that excludes fruit trees and that type of thing. It gives us all an idea of what irrigation can do for our province.

When and if we get the secondary industry down there to process some of these row crops coming on stream, I can see that as far as the province and the people of Alberta are concerned, the heritage trust fund is doing nothing but helping in this area.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo have a further question on the previous topic?

MR. SINDLINGER: I have a supplementary to the other question, Mr. Chairman, and I have a couple of other questions on the subject as well. First of all, coming back to this acquisition of right of way for the Keho project, when you were going through the details, I wasn't sure whether you had specifically isolated that number. The minister indicated that \$840,000 was being set aside for acquisition of right of way. But I'm not too sure if the minister meant that that \$840,000 was specifically for the Keho Lake project.

MR. COOKSON: I'm not sure whether I know myself. I was just looking over the total allocation of the \$62 million; maybe I can find that answer for the member.

The total \$62.8 million that we're asking for in the vote includes the following: the Lethbridge Northern Irrigation District diversion works and main canal, which would include a land assembly component; continue the St. Mary River Irrigation District main canal rehabilitation; initiate construction of the Forty Mile coulee and internal storage reservoirs; complete construction of the Dead Fish-Sheerness projects; and finally an all encompassing, continue South Saskatchewan River basin planning program.

Now, on the breakdown on the amount of money that would be allocated for purchasing land right of way, specifically in regard to Keho, I'll try to get that information to the member. I can't answer whether the \$840,000 was specifically for Keho or for general land assemblies. It's going to take me a little time to find it in here.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary please to the minister, Mr. Chairman. Could the minister also undertake, when he is attempting to find out how much money has been set aside for the acquisition of land for the Keho Lake project, to determine how much land will be required for that particular project and acquired under that allotment of funds? Could the minister also determine whether that land which is going to be acquired for the right of way is classified generally as prime agricultural land?

MR. COOKSON: Well, the second part I can answer quickly. Of course the purchase of land for right of way has to follow those canals. If they go through prime agricultural land, then so be it, as long as we follow those canals. If there's a change in route of a canal, and we're doing a considerable amount of this, we attempt to purchase, trade land, et cetera, and that could very well be good agricultural land also. But one has to remember that the old canal then will be reclaimed and put back into production.

The question of off-stream storage: again, we're limited in areas in which we can go, because there are two major off-stream storage areas. The lease we're working on now is the Forty Mile coulee reservoir and the Keho. In some cases this is good agricultural land, and in some cases it isn't.

A concern expressed by some of the irrigation members is that where we're involved in capital funding of on-stream storage which has not specifically been done yet, and off stream if necessary, we try to locate it in areas which have poor agricultural quality. That's what we'll attempt to do. I guess that's all I can answer in that respect, in terms of the quality of land.

For example, St. Mary, a long canal improvement, goes through varying qualities of land. It goes from pretty good land to darned poor land as you reach the Medicine Hat area. A lot of it is poor because of the limited water supply. It could be much more productive with water supplied. So we are restricted in the areas we can go into by the very fact that most of the systems exist, and we have to follow those as closely as we can.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I won't belabor that point any longer, except to note that the Keho Lake project and storage of \$24 million is almost 40 per cent of the total vote of 68 per cent. So perhaps the minister could provide us with that information in regard to how much of the \$24 million has been set aside for land acquisition. Secondly, how much land will be acquired for the project?

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go on to my second question to the minister now. The Member for Cardston was just talking about the importance of these irrigation projects and the relative value they have. There's no argument with that; they are indeed good projects. I note they've been partially funded from the general revenue fund and partially funded from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I believe it would be the responsibility of the members of this Legislature to ensure that the funds which are allocated for a specific purpose are in fact used for that purpose. The question I would ask the minister, Mr. Chairman, is: has any monitoring been done to ensure that we have got what we paid for?

When I look at the annual report of 1977-1978, on page 12, in the narration or description of the irrigation rehabilitation expansion project, it's indicated that the expenditure of these funds over the years will result in an additional 300,000 acres of irrigated land in the 13 districts. Going back even further than that, Mr. Minister, to the 1976-77 annual report of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, it's indicated on page 16 that undertaking these irrigation projects will add approximately 65 new acres under irrigation.

So, Mr. Chairman, the question I would put to the minister now: having had these years of experience with the program and these expenditures of funds, has there been any attempt to determine whether or not we have in fact got what we paid for? How many acres have come under irrigation or are now being utilized because of the expenditure of these funds?

MR. COOKSON: The first part on the land — I can give the member more figures. I hope it won't confuse the member. On the '82-83 estimate for the Lethbridge Northern of \$24.4 million, we estimate manpower costs at \$50,000, supplies and services at \$23,000,500, and fixed assets at \$870,000. That comes back to the purchase of real estate on the breakdown, so my conclusion is that the \$870,000 is set aside primarily for purchase of land for the total Lethbridge Northern District, subject to correction. That's the way I would interpret it, so if that helps to answer the question of right of way and so on . . .

I have a letter somewhere, but I can't locate it in all this paper. I'm not sure whether the member received a copy of that letter. I think the member raised the same question at an earlier committee meeting about the evaluation of the projects in terms of the costs, benefits, et cetera. If the member hasn't received a letter of explanation, I'll check back. I think it's gone to — I have it here — Dr. Reid, chairman of the standing committee, on October 8. It details the comparison of capital costs and land requirements. The member mentioned the '76-77 report that potentially 65,000 new acres would come under irrigation. Then in the '77-78 report it is anticipated about 300,000 acres will be added to irrigated lands. The 65,000 acres in the '76-77 annual report were

. . . the estimated acres of irrigation that could be added as a result of one years [1976-77] work under the rehabilitation and expansion program. It must be noted that all of these additional acres may not have been added to the district assessment rolls in 1977, however the district's capability to service this volume of additional acres was made possible. The 300,000 acres in the 1977-78 annual report was the total new acres of irrigation that was projected could be added as a result of the entire ten year rehabilitation and expansion program.

Then the letter details the actual increases in irrigated

acres within the 13 irrigation districts, from 1975 to 1980. In 1975, about 895,000 acres were on the assessment roll. In 1980, 1,037,000 were on the assessment roll. It is important to recognize that the primary purpose of the program is to rehabilitate the existing up to 60-year-old irrigation system which is presently servicing about a million acres of irrigable land. The first objective is to upgrade and repair the works to maintain the current level of irrigation acreage. However, the rehabilitation program provides a cost effective opportunity to include some enlargements to the irrigation systems and to incorporate some water efficiency measures, which generally result in the capability to increase the overall acreage. A member asked that question about separating the two. That makes it pretty difficult.

Therefore, the lands that are benefited by this program include the lands presently on the district assessment rolls and the new acres which will be added. The new acres added are an integral part of the entire rehabilitation program, and are achieved through intensification within the existing irrigation areas. That is why it would be difficult to provide a precise breakdown of how much was spent on system upgrading as compared to the amount spent on bringing in the new acres. So it is a complex area. That letter was sent to Dr. Reid, and I presume any information would channel back to the member.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, a supplementary to the minister. First of all, in regard to the LNID, the minister has indicated that purchase of fixed assets in the amount of \$870,000 presumably would be for the acquisition of right of way. The question still left outstanding is: how many acres is it intended will be acquired with that \$870,000?

Mr. Chairman, if I may now go on to some other comments you've just made. The words "cost/benefit" were brought up in regard to the irrigation programs. The minister read some numbers in regard to old acres that would benefit, new acres that would benefit. Also terms that were used were "cost effective opportunity" and "increase in the overall acreage". Mr. Minister, I'm not too well versed on the economics of agriculture, but of this total \$62.8 million that has been requested today, what would the benefits be, inasmuch as you raised the question of cost/benefits? I know it's difficult to say precisely how many acres would benefit in the sense of upgrading, as the minister has put it, and how many acres would benefit in the sense of "increase in the overall acreage". Nevertheless, it would seem to me that prior to undertaking a project of this nature, saying we want \$62 million to do this, the question has to be: \$62 million is required, but to do what? How many acres will be upgraded as a result of this expenditure of \$62.8 million, and how many additional acreages will come into use because of the expenditure of this amount of money?

I guess the point might very well be that if there's only going to be one additional acre, or if there's only going to be one acre upgraded, perhaps it might be better just to give \$60 million to the farmer who would benefit and tell him to go away with that, and then save the other \$2 million. Of course, that's an extreme example, but if you carry it a bit further, you have to get to the point where you say, it's not worth while doing this and it would be better to pay a subvention to do something other than that. Finally, Mr. Minister, the question is: to spend this \$62.8 million, how many acres will be upgraded and how

many acres in addition to those already in use will there be?

MR. COOKSON: Well, the first part of the member's question had to do with land purchase. How many acres would be involved? Mr. Chairman, I think it would be prudent not to talk about acres — that is an acreage figure — because at the present time we are into negotiations with a large number of landowners. It isn't hard to do a little mathematical calculation. Perhaps this would help the member in terms of land purchase. What we endeavor to do is get an independent appraisal, perhaps two independent appraisals. It's the privilege of the property owner to get his own independent appraisal. As a result of that our land buyers go into the area and attempt to negotiate a reasonable price for the acquisition.

The second part of the question has to do with the amount of acreage that would be put on stream with the work going on at Lake Keho, or the amount of additional acreage that would be available pending the expenditure of \$62 million. I think I can only refer to the letter to Dr. Reid, which gives an adjustment on the assessment rolls — at least we can go by that for what the present acreage is — and refer the member back to the early discussions and debate with the Environment Council of Alberta, the debate that went on in the House in terms of total benefit of the project, and comments made by Agriculture.

Based on \$62 million in total spent or \$24 million at Keho, I don't really think I could say specifically what increased acreage is going to result from that, because of the extreme difficulty of separating upgrading of the present facilities as opposed to what the increased acreage will be. I think enough has been said before about the general benefits that would be acquired from the development of irrigation and the expenditure of the moneys. We've heard from other members in the Assembly, who have spelled out very clearly the importance of what we're doing here. It's sufficient to say that this amount of money, \$334 million, that has been allocated to Agriculture and ourselves — to use a cliché, in terms of additional acreage, that's water under the bridge. That's where it is.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, a supplementary question to the minister. Notwithstanding the fact that there has been a lot of water under the bridge over the last five years, it's very difficult for me to understand the minister's comment that we can't identify the acreage that's going to benefit from these expenditures. The reason I find it difficult is that again I refer to the annual reports of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. The '76-77 one says specifically "approximately 65,000 new acres potentially will come under irrigation". In the other annual report, 1977-78, "this programme will add approximately 300,000 acres to irrigated lands".

Now it strikes me as being very inconsistent when the government comes to the Legislature and says, we want money to do this, and if you spend this money, this is what you will get, to justify the allocation of the funds for that project. Then once the project is completed, we have no measurement at all to determine if we have exactly what we were told we'd get when we spent that money. Now somehow someone must have sat down. When they figured out this estimate for \$62.8 million, they must have come up with some projects and said, well, this is what we're going to do with the money, and this will be the benefit.

Now we have to be consistent. On one hand, we have to either stop saying in this annual report that if we spend this money we'll get this in return or, on the other hand, saying we can't determine what you're going to get for this amount over here. Perhaps the Provincial Treasurer ought to give that some consideration the next time he puts his annual report together.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the delivery system from the Oldman into the Keho Lake area, I gather from the minister's comments that the land that is to be secured and purchased hasn't been designated at this point in time. My understanding was that that area had been surveyed, the soil samples had been taken, and the land to be either annexed or purchased is a public matter. Could the minister comment on that?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, at the present time, the areas that will be flooded because of expansion to increased acre feet — that boundary is pretty well known. But some parts still have to be refined, the exact detail of the line itself. It's correct that there has been testing in the area — we're talking about a fair number of property owners. There have also been some requests to put in water-measuring instruments. Some of the land has been purchased. But we're into the process of doing a refinement of that right now.

Agreed to:

Total 3 — Irrigation Headworks and Main Irrigation Systems Improvement	\$62,827,100
---	--------------

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, this is perhaps the stage to move adjournment. On behalf of the Government House Leader, I move the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolutions, reports as follows, and asks leave to sit again:

Resolved that from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1983, for the purpose of making investments in the following projects to be administered by the Minister of Agriculture: \$7,500,000 for the Farming for the Future project, \$3,150,000 for the food processing development centre project, and \$27,863,000 for the irrigation rehabilitation and expansion project.

Resolved also 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 of Agriculture: \$4,988,000 for the irrigation rehabilitation and expansion project.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask at this time that the Assembly revert to Tabling Returns and Reports, so

the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs can table copies of a telegram.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**
(*reversion*)

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd simply like to file for the Legislative Assembly copies of Mr.

Bennett's reply to Mr. Trudeau's request for a first meeting on the constitution. Copies will be available to members of the Assembly.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Assembly will not be sitting on Monday night. I move we call it 1 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 12.56 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]

