

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, December 9, 1981 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

Office of the Premier

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, today is truly a momentous occasion in Canada's constitutional development and in our history. Yesterday, the Canadian Parliament completed an historic debate on the constitutional accord signed by the Prime Minister and nine premiers on November 5, and ratified by a vote of 51 to one November 10 in this Legislature. The Joint Address to Her Majesty the Queen with respect to the constitution of Canada marks a significant stage in the evolution of our federation.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure members of this Assembly would agree that all Canadians can be proud of the Canada Act which has been transmitted today to Her Majesty the Queen. For the last time, the United Kingdom Parliament will be asked to make amendments to our constitution. Through democratic transition, Canadians will have achieved full and complete sovereignty — a made in Canada constitution. The measures which will be considered by the United Kingdom Parliament include a Charter of Rights which positively reaffirms our commitment to basic rights and fundamental freedoms along the lines of the first legislation introduced by this government in 1972, and an amending formula which reflects the fundamental federal nature of Canada's system of government.

Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to say that the amendments to the constitution contained in the Joint Address uphold the fundamental principles of federalism and meet the objectives of Alberta with respect to constitutional change that we have debated in this Legislature on many occasions since 1976. Of prime importance to Alberta is the amending formula, which was first proposed in a general way in 1976 and more specifically in 1979. It is a formula which we believe best accommodates and protects the inherent diversity of our federal system. All provinces have equal constitutional status, and the existing rights, proprietary interests, and jurisdiction of a province cannot be taken away without the consent of that province.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure members of this Assembly, and I believe Albertans in vast, vast numbers, will join with me in expressing our support and pride in the constitutional agreement which has been forwarded to Her Majesty on this momentous day.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to comment with regard to the ministerial statement by the Premier. I think all Albertans, and Albertans as Canadians, are certainly proud that we have our own Act, a Canada Act, that will be put into place, that has

been moved to the British Parliament in Westminster, and that will become the Act that makes Canada truly independent. I think that is the most significant item with regard to that move at the present time by not only the government of Canada but nine provincial governments in Canada, and the support of our Canadian Senate as well.

Mr. Speaker, that's the key that's most important at this time. We are now truly independent to determine our future: what we must do in the future, what we can do, and what is possible with our great land of Canada with its natural and human resources. I think that puts on us as Canadians a new responsibility to be even more committed and concerned about the future and the direction Canada takes. I believe the Canada Act sets up a format and certainly a working framework by which harmony and meaningful negotiations among provinces and the federal government can take place. We all in Canada, and even us here in Alberta, can certainly support a positive move in a positive environment such as that.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we go on with the oral question period, might the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MRS. CHICHAK: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It certainly gives me great pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly a grade 6 class of 21 students from St. Gerard school. They are accompanied by their teacher Ms. Behm and parents Mrs. Slavic and Mrs. Cugliata and are seated in the members gallery. I ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Heritage Savings Trust Fund Legislation

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General, the Government House Leader, with regard to the motion of closure passed in this Assembly earlier today. The motion of closure allows five days in Committee of Supply and a following day to study Bill 69 in Committee of the Whole. My question to the House leader is whether the government would consider granting unanimous consent to a more flexible agenda within those five days, so that if the study of supply moves ahead rapidly and takes only one day in that agenda. Bill 69 could become a priority item of that agenda in the next five days and become the topic of discussion for a greater period of time? My request to the Attorney General and House leader is to consider that. Would the government move unanimous consent to make the agenda more flexible in the next five days?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. leader for giving me notice of his intention to ask that question. It's a very important one in regard to scheduling the House's business. The answer is that the government members are not prepared to consider that rescheduling at the present time.

Since Bill 69's committee study was referred to, I might note that effectively an entire day is allowed for the study of Bill 69 in committee. That is in addition to time already spent by the Assembly in second reading and committee some time ago, and in addition to the time government members unanimously agreed to in order to facilitate the debate of a private member's Bill presented in regard to the Auditor General by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter in scheduling anything that can no doubt be done in many different ways, but the suggestion implicit in my response is that the thought having been given to the scheduling as it appears in Motion 16, my view is that it's better done that way.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier, in light of the House leader's answer. Bill 69 represents a transfer of some \$2 billion of funds to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, whereas Committee of Supply will study some \$400 million. Both are large sums of money, but the priority is certainly on Bill 69.

As chairman of the investment committee, would the Premier be prepared to sit in on all the discussions in terms of Committee of the Whole study of Bill 69, so that questions can be directed to the Premier with regard to his responsibility as chairman of that investment committee, an investment of billions of dollars in not only Alberta but other parts of Canada? Could the Premier make to us in this Legislature the commitment to be available during the study of Bill 69?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd respond in a couple of ways. First of all, with regard to the emphasis the hon. Leader of the Opposition is now placing on Bill 69, having served in the capacity as Leader of the Opposition for a short period I had some experience with judgments that had to be made by opposition members as to emphasis. Of course, the emphasis chosen by the Leader of the Opposition with regard to consideration of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund has been an emphasis that to a degree has been chosen by opposition members, which is their privilege, over the course of many, many weeks of consideration. The decision has therefore been made to emphasize the capital projects division, rather than the overall fund. That's a decision they're free to make, of course.

As far as I'm concerned, there has been full and adequate debate with regard to the matter of Bill 69. The questions involved are matters that will be responded to by the Provincial Treasurer, who introduced the Bill, as would be the normal case in any Bill at the committee stage. Whether I will or will not be in attendance at the time the Bill is considered in committee will be a matter of my schedule, but I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I will personally undertake to read in *Hansard* the points he, any member of the opposition, or any member of the Legislature may make, and will carefully consider them.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. The government sets the schedule, and Bill 69 has not come on the schedule of discussion in this Legislature. Under what circumstances is the Premier prepared to come and have questions asked of the him in this Legislature with regard to his responsibility as chairman of the investment committee? The commitment was made by the Premier in *Hansard* and at an earlier date to

have open discussion about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Under what circumstances will the Premier come to this Legislature and be questioned as chairman of that investment committee of billions of dollars? We have no other opportunity . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We don't want to retravel the fairly lengthy route we followed in the last few days, and repeat those arguments. That's now a matter that has been dealt with. As far as the question is concerned, I think it is complete without the hon. leader going on with these other things that have been previously raised.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, as far as the question raised by the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, on Wednesday, August 26, I attended the select legislative standing committee on which the hon. Leader of the Opposition is a member, to fully answer any questions. I recall that I was prepared to stay just as long as the committee wished me to, and I don't believe I left any questions unanswered. To me, appearing before the legislative committee is a process I'm prepared to continue in the future. This is a Bill being introduced by the Provincial Treasurer. At this stage of the game, that's how it should be responded to.

I would like to go on to respond to the question on the order of business. No request was made by the Leader of the Opposition during the course of the fall session to alter the process of the business from the capital projects division to Bill 69.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. In the select committee, the Premier protested about our asking questions other than about capital estimates. Under what circumstances can the Premier be questioned with regard to investments in other provinces of Canada? When can we raise with the Premier in this Legislature those about billions of funds loaned to other provinces? When do we ask those kinds of questions and hold the government accountable, specifically the Premier of this province, for those kinds of investments?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I don't know. Perhaps the hon. leader is tired, but the meeting of August 26 . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER: My state of tiredness . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the hon. leader please resume his seat.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Let's be responsible, let's be accountable.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, in view of what the hon. leader has just said in the several questions asked. I would have some difficulty in saying that he is at present in a strong position to object to inferences.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

MR. NOTLEY: I'd like to raise a point of order. If we are going to deal strictly with *Beauchesne* in that questions that incite debate should be ruled out of order, quite clearly answers which incite debate should also be ruled out of order. I raise that directly with respect to the Premier's first response. The Premier indicated that it was the priority of the opposition to deal with the capital works estimates. It should be pointed out very clearly, Mr. Speaker, to you, to members of this Assembly, and to anyone else who wants to listen, that it is not the decision of the opposition what government business comes before the Assembly; it is a decision of the government. Because we were dealing with capital works estimates, in no way, shape, or form has that any bearing on the priority we place on our obligations . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the hon. member is now purporting to debate the relevance or irrelevance of an answer given to another hon. member, my concern is that we do not use the question period for the remainder of this session to rewarm territory that has been traversed, criss-crossed, and retraversed for long hours over the last while. Any direct and proper attempts to get information are of course eminently qualified for the question period, but when those questions are replete with debate . . .

MR. NOTLEY: Or the answers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. When those questions are replete with debate and argument based on comparisons of amounts, comparisons of importances, and things of that kind, then in fairness there is no way I can prevent the answers from going along the same avenue and treating the matter the same way.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, if I could answer the question. The reason for my concern by the hon. Leader of the Opposition — and perhaps he just doesn't have the information. When I appeared before the Heritage Savings Trust Fund [committee], it was absolutely clear — and I have the transcript in front of me — that I answered questions entirely to do with the total investment policy of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I answered questions with regard to equities. I answered questions with regard to the Syncrude convertibles. I answered questions with regard to all aspects of the policy with regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

If there are matters the hon. Leader of the Opposition wishes to ask me about with regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, in this question period or at any time, I'd be happy to deal with them. If he has any specific questions he would like to ask during the committee stage of Bill No. 69 that he would like to raise with me, I'm certainly prepared to give an undertaking to be here to respond to any questions he would like. But with regard to a Bill that has been introduced by the Provincial Treasurer, I'm not prepared to say that I'm going to be here for the entire length of whatever period he would like to ask the questions in committee. If he has questions he wishes to ask of me during the conduct of Bill 69, though, I'll be here. I'll welcome the questions and the opportunity to answer them.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Good.

Airline Services in Southern Alberta

MR. R. SPEAKER: My second question to the Minister of Transportation is with regard to the PWA/Time Air dispute going on in southern Alberta and the further appeal. I wonder if the minister has investigated that matter. Has the government made any representations to the Department of Transport with regard to any further appeal applications?

MR. KROEGER: No we haven't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I understand that Mr. Sigler of PWA is reviewing its competition policy with respect to Time Air, and is considering applying to the CTC for service between Medicine Hat and Lethbridge to Calgary and Edmonton, which are presently Time Air routes. Is the minister aware of that change of PWA policy, and could he confirm whether that's a fact?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, that would be a management decision, and we don't enter into management decisions.

Regional Water Line to Vegreville

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Environment. I wonder whether the minister could report on the status of the regional water line between Edmonton and Vegreville.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, just recently we accepted a tender on the line from the Edmonton area to Vegreville. As far as I know, construction is now making good progress in view of the fall weather conditions.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Just a few minutes ago, I had a call from the secretary of the water board. He indicated that there appeared to be some problems acquiring easements. Could the minister indicate whether the number of easements not yet acquired is of any significance?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, we were having some problems with some easements. The normal process is to work with the property-owners concerned and negotiate an easement, in this case for a water line. It comes to mind that we had approximately 13 outstanding areas of negotiation with different property-owners. I think that process has been cut to about 9. Of course, next would be having to use the expropriation procedure under The Expropriation Act to acquire rights of way.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, when the estimates were discussed last spring, I proposed that expropriations should take place as soon as possible so 30,000 people would not suffer on account of 9 or thirteen, as the minister mentioned. Could the minister advise whether there will be a delay in the construction of the water line, and how long the delay would be because of expropriation?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I might take this opportunity to compliment the Member for Vegreville on the position he took with regard to establishing a water line to an extremely important part of the province, specifically one of his home-town communities. My information is

the member took a fairly strong position on the importance of getting the line through. In that respect, I think he may have been involved to some degree in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It would seem that the hon. minister is directing his attention to considerable admiration for the member rather than to the substance of the question.

MR. COOKSON: Well, I call them as I see them, Mr. Speaker.

To conclude response to the question, however, we don't anticipate any major delay. In this case, there is a procedure under The Expropriation Act whereby the contractor can proceed with the pipeline and eventually settle the right of way through the normal procedures under expropriation.

Alaska Pipeline

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Premier is with regard to the Alaska pipeline. Could the Premier indicate the position of the Alberta government with regard to the Alaska pipeline now that it appears it's going to be given final approval?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, our government's position is that we're essentially neutral on that project — whether or not it proceeds or whether or not it proceeds on schedule.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier with regard to the gas surplus we have. I'm thinking of the 10,000 capped wells in the province. Is the government going to commission any studies to see what long-term effect the pipeline will have on gas producers in Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, first of all, because the jurisdiction of such a pipeline is really with the federal government, we as a province obviously can't take the position of preventing our neighbors to the south from going across Canada with a pipeline to take their natural gas from Alaska to the lower 48 states. I think it would be both inappropriate and perhaps not even legal for us to suggest that we could prevent that occurring.

Over a number of years, we have worked to arrange for what they call "prebuild". That prebuild involves the sale of Alberta natural gas to new markets in the United States, which is very good for our producers and our province, in owning the natural gas. One leg of the prebuild is basically being completed and the other will be completed next year. To the extent that there is a delay over a period of years in the construction of the main pipeline from Alaska to the lower 48 states in the United States, there will be some benefit to Alberta producers and people, in the sense that the volumes that will flow from both prebuilds will be supplementary sales and very positive for our province.

So our position is basically that on one hand, we do not feel we could stop or in any way create obstacles to that international project, would not do so, and have not done so. On the other hand, there are advantages to us for the sale of Alberta natural gas through the prebuild. Our basic hope — and I was in Washington on this matter just four weeks ago — is to try to assure that when the pipeline is eventually constructed, we will have re-

placement markets for our Alberta natural gas in the American market.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question with regard to marketing, Mr. Speaker. Has the government or the Department of Energy and Natural Resources given any consideration to the recommendation from some of our small gas companies with regard to the province purchasing — say, under the heritage trust fund — some of the gas in these capped wells at this time, then marketing it at a later date?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I want to take notice of that question. It's a matter that should appropriately be answered by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources when he returns to the House next week. I'll give him notice of that important question.

Edmonton Annexation

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs if he or his department officials have been involved in discussions between the city of Edmonton and surrounding municipalities regarding the exchange of assets and liabilities which affect annexation January 1, 1982?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. Both I and my officials have been involved with the city of Edmonton and most surrounding rural municipalities.

MR. PURDY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The city of Edmonton has refused to place firefighting equipment in the Winterburn area and will only respond from the Meadowlark hall. Will the minister assist me in reminding the mayor and city council that they have removed a service provided by the county of Parkland and that the city has a responsibility to provide that same quality of service the residents of Winterburn now enjoy but that will disappear January 1, 1982?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the annexation to the city of Edmonton, approved by Executive Council last June, is the largest of its kind ever undertaken in Alberta, in terms of both land area and people in municipalities. A whole host of complications is being worked on. I think fairly diligently, by the city of Edmonton and other municipal authorities.

Over the period of time between now and the end of the year, and beyond that, it is my intention to try to make sure that the commitment the city made to provide residents being annexed to this city with a service equal to what they were receiving before in a variety of ways is carried out. To that end, I've had some discussions with the mayor of the city of Edmonton. I've recently directed some correspondence to the mayor, involving the particular problem associated with fire protection in one area the hon. member has spoken about. I'm confident that the city of Edmonton administration, municipal council, and mayor are aware of those problems and am hopeful that they will be resolved.

MR. PURDY: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the minister assure me that the farmers who will be within the annexed area will enjoy the same low mill rate and low tax dollar, and will not be facing great increases in taxes in 1982?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, there are two aspects to that question. First is the matter of assessment, which is in the control of the province, if you like, by way of the regulations we provide on assessment in rural areas as opposed to urban areas. There will be some changes there. However, within the next two weeks it is my intention to recommend to the Executive Council that an amended annexation order include a requirement that buildings used for agricultural purposes in the annexed area — i.e., dairy barns, some poultry operations, and so on — be assessed over the period of the next five years as though they had remained in the rural area. The only change, then, with respect to property assessment would be the assessment on residential property. Farm homes would be assessed in the newly annexed area as they would be if they were in any other city. So there will be some increase in assessment on farm homes which wouldn't otherwise have resulted. The land assessment will not change just because the property was moved from one jurisdiction to another. It could change for other reasons, if the type of use of the land had changed.

The question with respect to mill rates is not in my control. But I can recall many, many arguments being made before the Local Authorities Board to the effect that the effect on property-owners who were being annexed to the city of Edmonton, by way of mill rate change, would not be anything that they should be overly concerned about. So I'm hopeful that the mill rates paid by people being annexed to the city will not be any greater than might otherwise have been the case had they stayed in the municipality they are presently in.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister of Transportation. Has the city of Edmonton reached any agreement with Alberta Transportation regarding the highway maintenance from Hillview Road to 190th Street, so that my constituents can at least enjoy that portion of the city of Edmonton for safe speed into Edmonton?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, we're in negotiations with the city and working with their planners, but no final decision has been made.

Water Management — Peace River

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones. It flows from the observations in the Water Advisory Committee report with respect to the low-head dam at Dunvegan, and the suggestion that that dam might have to be reassessed. My question to the minister is to advise the Assembly what impact, if any, the Water Advisory Committee has had on the government's process of decision-making with respect to the low-head dam at Dunvegan.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the assessment of the potential for hydro development on the Peace River at Dunvegan has not been affected in any way by any of the studies undertaken with respect to water management. However, as members will recall, in 1980 invitations were requested to develop the hydro potential. The government received two. One of the responses indicated that there may be stability problems with the bank. The government commissioned preliminary geotechnical studies on the bank. That study, which was filed in the Legislature, confirmed that there may be some problems.

The government assessing what effect those difficulties may have on the cost of electric energy or the capital cost of the dam has resulted in the delay in decision-making on the project. So matters related to water management have not interfered in any way with the decision-making process on developing that hydro potential.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. What assessment is now being given to the other options? The initial announcement a year ago was with respect to the low-head dam. What assessment is now being given with respect to the power potential and capital costs of the medium- and the high-head dams?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the study that was completed by the government in 1977, I believe, indicated that the maximum potential for power generation and economies of scale of a hydro plant would be achieved by a high-head dam. As well, a medium-head dam would have greater benefits in terms of energy production than a low-head dam. Discussions were held with the B.C. government, and B.C. was not prepared to accept water being backed into British Columbia as a result of the construction of a medium- or a high-head dam. So the government chose to invite proposals for the development of the low-head dam. Since then, there have been some discussions by the Minister of Environment with British Columbia with respect to water agreements on movements of water from British Columbia through Alberta. British Columbia still is not prepared to allow the backing up of water into B.C. as a result of the construction of a dam.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the Minister of Utilities and Telephones or the Minister of Environment, with respect to the economies of scale. First to the Minister of Utilities and Telephones: is the capital cost of dealing with the bank stability question a major factor in the government renewing discussions with B.C., in terms of the efficiency, which will be even more important because of the bank stability question? If the bank is going to be unstable, it's going to cost us more to build the dam, and therefore the medium or high head dam becomes rather more important from an economic standpoint than it would be as outlined in the 1977 study. Was that the major reason the Minister of Environment sought to reopen discussions with B.C.?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Environment may wish to comment on the nature of the discussions he has held with British Columbia. But from the point of view of the Department of Utilities and Telephones, we haven't yet finally determined whether or not the banks are unstable. That would require fairly expensive and detailed geotechnical studies that involve tunneling quite large diameter tunnels into the bank, both vertically and horizontally, to determine the precise nature of the geology. That has not yet been done. So it would be too early to say whether it's critical that a medium-head dam be the one that be built, as a result of the higher costs related to overcoming bank instability. Until those geotechnical studies are completed, it would be impossible to say now whether that is the key factor.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. What is the most optimistic time frame the minister could advance to the Assembly? A time frame

was outlined in a general sort of way a year ago when the announcement was made, detailing construction periods, time for assessment, et cetera. Bearing in mind the complicated nature of the studies, what is the most optimistic timetable the minister could advise the Assembly as to the completion of a project at Dunvegan?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, that's a difficult question to answer. First of all, the geotechnical studies can best be undertaken in the summertime. So the earliest time at which the studies could be undertaken, if there were a commitment to undertake those studies, would be during the summer. The evaluation of the results would take some time. That's as close as I can be, in terms of the timing of a final decision.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Minister of Environment able to advise the Assembly when the discussions took place with B.C. officials, whether those discussions were on a ministerial basis, the major obstacle in the minds of the B.C. government, and whether there is any possibility of accommodating their concern — not with respect to the high dam, which I think is somewhat unrealistic, but the possibility of a medium-head dam?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, there haven't been any recent discussions with the Minister of Environment in British Columbia. We had one meeting at the ministerial level. One problem, to which the Minister of Utilities and Telephones alluded, is the problem of anything other than the low-head dam. Insofar as backing up on good agricultural land, the minister has said, quite correctly, that British Columbia would be very much concerned about that. As a result of those discussions, we're mostly interested in the low-head type of dam. Perhaps as a result of these further investigations, at some future date we may have to meet on a ministerial level.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Did the British Columbia government close the door firmly on the medium- and high-head options, or was it a matter of just expressing a strong preference for the low-head dam, which of course would not have any significant impact on the Peace valley in British Columbia?

MR. COOKSON: We would have liked to have drafted an agreement that we could agree in principle on this, and we weren't able to accomplish that. The door is not closed and, I guess, the door is not really open. It's a matter for future negotiation at this point.

Railway Level Crossing Accidents

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Solicitor General, I'd like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Transportation. I'm pleased to see that my hon. friend survived the session the other night. I was a little worried about him about 4 o'clock in the morning. But, Mr. Speaker, my old curling buddy, it just proves old curlers never die, we just lose our stones. I'm glad to see he's still here. [interjections] Maybe marbles.

Several weeks ago I asked the hon. Minister of Transportation if the report on level crossing fatalities had been brought to the minister's attention. If not, when can that report be made available to members of the Assembly?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. Member for Clover Bar that I'll stay with him anytime when it comes to hours. Secondly, no I do not have the report. I will get you some times on it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, has the minister had any correspondence or been in touch with his federal counterpart as to the use of fluorescent tape, especially on black railroad cars?

MR. KROEGER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have been discussing that. It is being fairly widely used. At the moment, I'm not just sure what the regulations would call for, or whether it's mandatory. Again, I'll get that information.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, has the hon. Minister of Transportation had any communication with any of the people in the Edmonton area, CNR or CP, as to the use of switchmen with lanterns or some type of signalling device to indicate to vehicle traffic that a train is switching at uncontrolled railroad crossings, where the crossings are used rather infrequently but they are crossing a main highway?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I've not been in any consultation on that matter, but I'm sure our safety branch people would be. If the member would like an expansion on that answer, I will verify that.

Grain Hopper Cars

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Economic Development whether a monitoring system is in place for the railway grain hopper cars owned by the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, no we don't at this time. Interestingly enough, though, the Canadian Wheat Board has a computer system that will indicate where the cars are, where they've been, and how long they've been where they've been. We've begun some preliminary discussions to see if we can tap in on that system, rather than spending a lot of the taxpayers' money for no particular purpose other than just to satisfy a responsibility, if you will.

The fact of the matter is that when the cars are committed to the railroads, even if we were to keep track of them we really can't do anything about what the railroads do with them without undertaking to manage the cars ourselves. As we discussed in the heritage fund committee. I think it's appropriate that we have some kind of spot-check system to see that they are properly deployed. The Canadian Wheat Board has one very inexpensive source of that information that we're now trying to develop.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the minister please advise the Legislative Assembly whether he has received any reports about the heritage fund hopper cars being reported in California?

MR. PLANCHE: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not. That would certainly be in contravention of the understanding we have with the railroads.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, could the minister advise the Legislative Assembly whether consideration is

being given to acquiring more railway hopper cars through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund?

MR. PLANCHE: Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, could the minister then advise the Legislative Assembly whether the railway rolling stock in western Canada is now at a satisfactory level to meet the requirements to 1985?

MR. PLANCHE: Well, I can't answer that question. I'm not sure that question can be answered, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is, as long as grain is travelling at 0.5 cent a tonne/mile, there is really no incentive to improve the turnaround times or invest in more capital rolling stock. It's essential for Alberta agriculture that compensatory rates are paid to the railroads to move grain.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Could the minister assure the Legislative Assembly that grain shipments will not be impaired due to the lack of rolling stock over the next five years?

AN HON. MEMBER: Why don't you ask Pepin?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, that's not our responsibility.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Economic Development. This has to do with the safety feature of railroad cars. Has the minister given any consideration to putting fluorescent slashes on the sides of the cars that do belong to Albertans, to improve their safety? Also, in light of the fact that Tory blue is starting to fade a little in this province . . .

MR. NOTLEY: That's true, among the voters. It's a fading rainbow.

DR. BUCK: . . . I just wonder if the government has looked at putting fluorescent tape on them?

MR. PLANCHE: To deal with the color first, Mr. Speaker, the polls will probably indicate how the color is for Tory blue. The car paint may be fading a little, but it's well to remember that it was their choice of colors — *Hansard* will recall that — not necessarily ours.

On the tape issue, we'll check that. My colleague the Minister of Transportation has indicated that they're already looking at that as an option for rail car safety, and we'll pursue it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: I've been asked to remind all hon. members that at 5:30 this afternoon, the press gallery would like to have the members for refreshments at a reception in the cafeteria. I hope members will be able to live up to that expectation.

head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

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

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

Department of Hospitals and Medical Care

2 — Applied Cancer Research

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the applied cancer research vote of \$4,628,000, the amount of grants is outlined. To start the discussion, could the minister outline those grants and indicate the division of that sum?

MR. RUSSELL: By way of background, Mr. Chairman, members will recall that originally there were two of these applied research programs: \$50 million to be expended over a period of five years, roughly \$7 million for heart research and \$3 million a year for cancer research. Changes were made last year whereby the heart programs, because of their capital nature, were rolled into the ongoing operating departmental estimates for Hospitals and Medical Care. Some cancer ones were as well. A commitment was also made to keep funding for the cancer program under way for another three years beyond the expiry date of the fifth year; that is, next year. That's to allow for a phase-in period until the medical research trust has a chance to get really operational, so there is no lag in the programs funded by the two departments.

I have a list of the specific research programs that were funded under three categories: first of all, for the initial period I mentioned; secondly, for the current year; and lastly, for the fiscal year to which we're looking ahead, in which there is a carry-over of some existing programs. In addition, there will be the responses to a new competition that will be held for requests for programs. Of course, those are unknown. I can give the hon. member the list of that \$4.6 million, if he would like it. It's rather substantial. I'll have to get copies made, but I'll see that that's tabled.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, that list would be key to the discussion of this vote in terms of applied cancer research. Maybe one of the best plans at this time would be to hold this vote and come back to it, and go on to the other item that was on the list today. I don't think it's very purposeful to try to ask about each one and go back and forth and draw it out that way. If we have a list, maybe I haven't any further questions on the list. Key to whatever areas we explored is the breakdown and what is happening. If the minister has all that, possibly it will satisfy our needs at this point, Mr. Chairman, if the minister would accept that. I'd certainly be agreeable to that procedure.

MR. RUSSELL: I'll certainly be glad to do that, Mr. Chairman. There was also the rather comprehensive report of the cancer research program that was tabled and given to all members of the select committee. I guess my only doubt is that being a layman myself in these fields. I'm not sure whether or not the information provided in

the list will be useful. But I'll certainly be glad to provide that for members.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, in regard to this cancer research program, the minister referred to a report that was tabled in the Legislative Assembly. I'm not exactly sure which report he was referring to. I do know that in 1979, \$12,696 was spent to evaluate the program. I ask the minister if it is this evaluation report to which he has just made reference.

MR. RUSSELL: No, I'm referring to the annual report of the Alberta heritage savings fund applied research cancer program that was submitted by the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board and distributed to the select committee of the Legislature.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might ask the minister if he would be kind enough to elaborate on the evaluation program which was initiated in 1979 and, first of all, identify the status of that report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When hon. members are asking questions, I wonder if they could perhaps be rather specific. Requesting somebody to elaborate on a report might cover areas in which they were not significantly interested or wishing to obtain information. If they could ask specific questions about certain sections of a report, it might make it easier for us to proceed with the work of the committee.

MR. SINDLINGER: Yes, that's good advice, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. I think I'll do that. My understanding is that in 1979 there was an expenditure of \$12,696 to evaluate this particular program that we have under consideration now. I guess the first specific question would be: when was that evaluation program initiated?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm hesitating on this because the hon. member has gone back two full fiscal years and asked about a program at that time. I understood the responsibility of this committee was to approve votes for the next fiscal year. That specific program, the evaluation of the programs, is carried on each year by different members of the medical faculties. As far as a '79-80 evaluation, I simply don't have that information in front of me. That's something that goes on each year and is funded each year.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that we are attempting to approve the votes for the next fiscal year, but it's my understanding that this evaluation program was undertaken to determine how efficient the allocation of the funds had been in the first instance. I get the impression from an evaluation program that there is some question as to whether or not the program should even be continued. I'm not saying there is anything untoward about that at all. For example, in the minister's earlier comments he indicated that the heart research program, because of certain capital costs which were common to other things, was being rolled in part or in total, I'm not too sure, into the operating budget of the department. So through an evaluation program it might become obvious that this would be desirable to do from an efficiency point of view.

In regard to this evaluation program, which I believe was information volunteered by the minister before the

heritage select committee, I'm just wondering if it was initiated in 1979 when that money was expended, if the evaluation and the expenditures went over the period '79 into '80-81, whether the evaluation has been completed or not. If it has been completed, what specific recommendations or observations and conclusions came out of that report? One would think that if the minister is back here today asking for another \$4.6 million for this program, the recommendation from that evaluation effort must have said this is a good project, everything is fine, so let's continue and do it. I guess we're having trouble finding the report over there. I don't know the name of it. The only thing I could do is go back to the transcripts and see if I could identify a specific name for it. The only thing I can recall is that essentially an evaluation program was being undertaken.

The more I talk about it, the more I recollect the circumstances now. It was in response to a question by the Member for St. Albert. The question posed to the minister at the time was, essentially, how do we ensure that the programs being undertaken here are not being undertaken in other areas within the province, or perhaps even in other jurisdictions? The member was concerned about duplication, reinventing the wheel. I think that was why it was pointed out that in fact an evaluation program was being undertaken to ensure that that sort of thing didn't happen again.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know how I can be more specific than that in asking if the report was in fact completed and what the conclusions and observations were, because obviously that has a very direct bearing on whether or not we should go the next step. If that report hasn't been completed, perhaps it might be prudent to wait upon its completion and see what the observations and conclusions in that would be before we go on with any recommendations for this. I've given the minister a few minutes to go through his papers again. I'm wondering if perhaps he has been able to recall the evaluation project.

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, I do. My difficulty was that I didn't have the earlier annual report to which the member was referring. I have the most recent one. Again, the evaluation votes are contained in there.

It's an ongoing program, so I can't say it's completed. It won't be completed until our last research project is completed and evaluated. For example, the March 31, 1981, report of the cancer board refers to two votes for medical faculty evaluation: one to the University of Alberta in the amount of \$29,476, and one to the University of Calgary in the amount of \$16,854. So the evaluation amount varies each year as to who's carrying it out.

The question that was asked, though, which I think was very probing, is: what recommendations are coming out of the evaluation? Late last year, I took a request for policy direction to the Treasury Board. As a result of the evaluation that had been done, the following recommendations were presented and in fact agreed to. The first was that expanded clinical services, which had been initiated through the capital projects division of this vote, should be continued by the vote in the operating portion of the department budget; that is, blended into department operations in the same way all heart research programs had been. The second part of that recommendation was to extend support for research activities for an additional four years beyond the present expiry date of the end of next March.

So now I'm asking for funds to support the financial requirements of the first year of the four-year extension

recommended as a result of the evaluation. That's for research activities as opposed to clinical services, which now will be blended into the department estimates. I'll be glad to go over that. It's a bit complicated. There's a split of the method of funding combined with a four-year extension, and the vote being requested by this committee today is the first of the four-year extension portion.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. With regard to that extension, the minister indicated the extension will be in support of a four-year program, but the commitment in funds for this year is only \$4.6 million. I wonder if, after the first year of the program, although it has been extended for four years, there would be the opportunity for the Legislature to review the commitment for the second, third, and fourth years in terms of the financial appropriation. That is, if we now commit for four years, does that mean we commit for the financial requirements for each of those four years, or after this first year can we then review the appropriation of funds for the second, third, and fourth years? I know it's a rather fine distinction, but I'm just trying to draw the line between whether it's a commitment to a four-year program and whether it's a commitment to a four-year appropriation of funds.

MR. RUSSELL: It's a commitment to a four-year program. What's being asked for is a one-year appropriation of funds. What's being estimated is \$3.5 million per year over the next four years, with inflation and a roll-over of unexpended funds from the current year being built in. Essentially, that was the same method and formula used for the two original programs.

Now, without question, the programs would have to come back twice each year: once to the select committee for past accounting purposes, and again during a fall session to Committee of Supply.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, just for certainty: we're actually looking at a commitment of \$4.6 million this year, \$3.5 million for the next three years, which is \$15.1 million. The total cost of the program, then, is \$15.1 million.

I might also ask, Mr. Chairman, specifically whether or not any funds from the general or departmental budget would complement this \$15.1 million.

MR. RUSSELL: No, there aren't, Mr. Chairman, because the funds from the department will be used to fund the clinically based types of programs. They're estimated to be, by the way, \$2.1 million a year, and that will be ongoing. They're now built into the hospital systems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Bow Valley wishes to ask a question, but if the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo has another supplementary, he can continue.

MR. SINDLINGER: I believe it is a supplementary, Mr. Chairman. But I think I'll come back to that, if I could, please.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that the 12-member Scientific Advisory Council was set up last summer to look into medical research. Could the minister indicate what terms of reference this council has, and will they be working in cancer research?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. member is referring to the science research advisory committee for the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research, which is quite different. That's a \$300 million trust fund established by a special Act of the Legislature. This cancer research program is very small in relationship to that. It does have its own working and advisory committees and a selection panel, or jury, that rules on applications for research funds. So I'm not sure which committee the member wants named. If it's the former, of course, that's described in the annual report, which was tabled during the current session.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is the committee I was referring to. I was wondering what their role would be in cancer research. Does this committee work on cancer research as well as medical research?

MR. RUSSELL: Eventually they will. I want to make it clear that this program, whose vote is now in front of the House, is anticipated to phase out in four more fiscal years. By that time, the new and current programs under way should be completed, and any clinical research or pure research undertaken in the field of cancer would then be established under the auspices and resources of the \$300 million trust fund. This is an extension to the original program started five years ago and is really a phase-in, or a bridging method, if I can use that term.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, possibly one thing I could suggest. If the minister could give the details that he has before him to one of the pages, we could talk about some other areas that are more general.

The questions I'd like to explore are with regard to accountability within the department. Here we are in a similar situation to the special hospital, the Walter C. MacKenzie hospital, where we are providing a grant of money to a group of persons to look at applied research. What is the administrative make-up of the department to assure the minister that there is supervision of the grant? What kind of communication goes on between the board that is administering the grant program and the department? I know, as we indicated the other day, that there is some financial expertise in the department, but maybe not necessarily persons who have expertise with regard to applied research. I think Dr. Bradley, for example, has that kind of expertise and could provide good accountability to the minister. Because of that experience we had with the Walter C. MacKenzie health centre, has the minister changed some of the administrative plans? Have new procedures been put in place? In terms of this program, is the accountability pattern the same as it has been over the last three years? Maybe the minister could fill me in. I'm sure there are some very obvious questions that could be asked as well.

MR. RUSSELL: The way it works, Mr. Chairman, is that this is a grant to an autonomous hospital board, the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board. They are the ones responsible for the administration and accounting of this money. They are aided by a selection jury and by a scientific advisory committee in so far as the selection of projects is concerned, and we mentioned some ongoing evaluation exercises being carried out by the two medical faculties with respect to all the programs.

I could describe the way the funds travel: they go from the Legislature to the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board, which then, through its grants panel, its research commit-

tee members, and its personnel assessment panel, makes the selections and recommendations for research. Those recommendations then come back to my office with the request that the funds be freed up for spending on particular projects. Naturally, in all cases, I have accepted the advice and recommendations of the medical experts and have signed the authorization. So the project then goes ahead at that stage. At that point, the auditing system of all these programs, administered by the Provincial Auditor in conjunction with the auditors of the provincial hospital, goes into effect, and the accounting or audit of the financing aspects of the program is presented to the Legislature in the routine manner. The progress of the programs is presented by way of annual reports to the select committee of the Legislature.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. In terms of the specific programs in progress, are the progress criteria, progress evaluation, left to the person who's doing applied research to judge whether progress is quick enough and that there is a post-audit at the end of the year, so that after the funds have been allocated, once a year, the minister receives a post-audit report? On an ongoing basis, is there anyone in the department or with the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board who co-ordinates, communicates, or has some evaluation criteria by which they judge the ongoing program?

For example, if it's off-track after three or six months, or it's not meeting the criteria as outlined in the submission, someone can say, hey, this program's got to be stopped; this person isn't reaching the goals established in the submission to the provincial hospital board and on through to the panel and to the minister, and then been funded. Can any situation occur where the program can proceed for one year and expenditures can be made, and we make an evaluation and at that point maybe the funds have been misallocated? Is that the situation, or is there an ongoing evaluation technique?

MR. RUSSELL: I haven't been made aware of such a situation arising, but I suppose it is possible that such a circumstance could happen. I should say that there's pretty careful selection of the proposed programs as put forward by medical practitioners or scientists. There's very careful assessment of the people involved, and there's the evaluation of how scientifically worth while the program is, through the evaluation votes we referred to. There's also the accounting. I suppose some year we will hear of a program that is deemed to be not worth while and should be abandoned. But when you are going into the fields of research, particularly in this field, I don't really know how such a situation could be 100 per cent avoided.

I think there's less danger of that happening in these applied research programs than there will be in the pure research programs that will be funded by the medical research trust. In those cases they are really venturing into new fields. A lot of this is the application of stuff that has already been proven in the labs or initiated by someone else, and a new twist is given to it, or it's applied from animals to people or people under certain circumstances in the clinical environment. For those reasons, I believe there's less chance of that happening. But I suppose it's possible.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I know this question has been raised before and the minister has responded to it. It's with regard to cancer research

in other jurisdictions. It's the kind of research being done all over the world, someone hoping to be the first person to find the total solution. I think it would be very difficult to co-ordinate that. At the time research is initiated, people can search through the North American and European continents and say, this kind of thing is not being done. But as we initiate one of these applied research projects, we're launching them from three or five years, maybe longer.

Is anyone continually monitoring that kind of thing to see that duplicate research is not occurring after a project has been launched? I'm sure in the initial stages it is. But is there a post-audit as to what other jurisdictions are doing? Is there someone responsible in the department or in the employ of the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board who continually monitors that kind of thing? Or is it a situation where, once launched, the project's on its own and people don't co-ordinate after that? Is there a requirement of the researcher to continually do that kind of thing? I could see that would be a very difficult judgment for a researcher. Usually they feel their process, their technique, their application is rather unique and that they're going to get to the goal faster than someone else. I certainly wouldn't want to turn the tap off because of that kind of factor.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, that question has been asked before under different circumstances. The answer that's been given to me is that the communications system in place in the scientific and medical communities takes care of that. In other words, there's a constant and current system of communications within the world of science, and particularly in the field of medical research: indexes of research programs being carried out are published in a variety of medical journals. There's constant communication within a variety of peer groups in different disciplines. It's really a thing that takes care of itself. For that reason, there is nobody doing the specific things that the hon. leader suggests. I don't believe they do them in other jurisdictions, either.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, if I could come back to the supplementary I had earlier in regard to the \$15.1 million for the program. Looking at the other numbers, I see there's what might be called a facility-oriented breakdown, in terms of the evaluation on an annual basis.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

Going through the material that was handed out to the select standing committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I note this evaluation program is ongoing; it did not occur just in 1979. The evaluation has occurred both at the University of Calgary and the University of Alberta. In regard to the other expenditures, the grants, is there a geographic breakdown of those? Is the research all being done in Alberta? Is the majority of the research going to the University of Alberta, as opposed to University of Calgary? Does the money go outside the province to any researchers?

MR. RUSSELL: I believe it's all in the province, Mr. Chairman. It's described in each annual report. Every program is described, the personnel who are involved and being paid for it, and the amount of funds that have been approved.

MR. SINDLINGER: You're saying in the annual report of the fund — not the heritage fund annual report?

MR. RUSSELL: I'm sorry, I was trying to arrange for the copies the hon. leader requested.

MR. SINDLINGER: Yes, I understand that. The geographic breakdown of the expenditures — when the minister was referring to the annual report, he was not referring to the heritage fund annual report, but rather to the annual report of the cancer foundation?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, I'm referring to this fairly voluminous report, which was distributed to the members of the select committee on the heritage trust fund.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Could the minister indicate if this particular document is supposed to be filed, or is it just for the information of the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. RUSSELL: I got 10 copies. The hon. leader asked for one, and I don't know who else might want one. It lists projects by scientific name, Mr. Chairman. I hope you would provide him with two or three of those copies, and then they're filed for whoever else may want them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I don't have the annual report the minister was referring to. But rather than going into specific details, I wonder if the minister might indicate the approximate breakdown of the program over the years, in terms of the funding between the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary?

MR. RUSSELL: I don't have that, but I can take it as notice. It's just a question of going through the reports and doing the addition, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SINDLINGER: Another supplementary, Mr. Chairman. In regard to a question asked earlier, I wasn't quite clear, following the explanation in regard to the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research Endowment Fund. Actually it's not in regard to that; it's in regard to cancer. I believe the question was, would there be duplication between these two particular programs? Or would any contemplation be given to rolling this program into the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research Endowment Fund? It seems that it would make more sense to put all these programs, not only this cancer research one but the cardiac research one, under the sphere of this \$300 million endowment fund, rather than having separate small ones. I'm not too sure whether that was, in fact, being contemplated. If it was being contemplated, what prospective target date might there be for combining the different programs?

MR. RUSSELL: That is contemplated, Mr. Chairman. As I mentioned earlier, that is the four year roll-over period we're looking at. The funds requested today are for the first of that four-year period. It's expected that at the end of that four years, cancer research would be totally funded from the medical research trust.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, then, Mr. Chairman. Would cardiac research also be rolled into the \$300 million endowment fund?

MR. RUSSELL: That has been, Mr. Chairman. You'll notice there's no request for heart research funds in this year's estimates. The established programs have all now been blended into the General Revenue Fund and are part of the operating vote of my department. Some of the cancer programs have been blended in, are part of the GRF, and will appear as operating funds in my department. On the basis that I mentioned, the others — research activities as opposed to clinical activities — will be carried on for this four-year period, at which time it's deemed that the medical research trust would handle any further applications for cancer research.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, in regard to the handout we've just gotten which shows the various programs approved to March 31, 1981, and ongoing into 1981-82, I must concur with the minister. When introducing these, he indicated that it would be difficult for a layman to understand the terminology, and there's no doubt that that's true. When I look at some of these things like adjuvant chemoimmuno and immunotherapy, and trophoblastic neoplasia, I have to agree. Perhaps I could bring it down to some simpler layman terms, at least for me, and ask a general question in regard to what has been accomplished or achieved to date. In research programs of any type, I know it's very difficult to stop at a point and say this is where we are and what has been done. It's not as simple as, for example, building a house. After working so many days we've dug the basement, and after so many days we've laid the foundation, and after so many days you can finally say it's completed and stand back and look at the house. In regard to research, it's never that easy to stand back and see where you've been and what has been accomplished.

There may be some things of significance for which some sort of international recognition has been achieved. I say "international" simply because it would seem to me that, since this is such an important subject area to people all around the world, there would be credible authorities who would say, yes, a significant milestone has been reached, there's been a breakthrough here, or there has been substantial progress there that has provided some enlightenment in this area and shows promise for the future.

I remember that when I was young, at a particular point in time the major concern was polio. During the summer we had closure of a different sort, not political, Mr. Forest Lawn. The swimming pools were all closed; the theatres were closed. We couldn't congregate anywhere because of the contagious nature of polio. I can remember one of my friends on our baseball team contracting polio, being stricken and left crippled for the rest of his life. But in the early '50s, there was a very dramatic breakthrough in terms of research. That was when Jonas Salk invented polio vaccine. Even though I was very young at the time, the impact and importance of that breakthrough were not difficult to recognize. It struck me, even though I was only 11 years old. It was a feeling that I know will remain with me for the rest of my life.

Although cancer strikes all age brackets, it's my understanding that it's more prevalent in older than in younger people. Now that may sound strange, but in the older age brackets — if there were suddenly to be some significant development in terms of not only treating but preventing cancer, it would be very dramatic. If you can hear political shots around the world, I'm sure this would be a medical shot that could be heard around the world.

The question I'm asking the minister now is, simply,

whether over the years of this program any substantial or significant development could be identified and reported to the legislative committee. I know very well that we haven't had one that's been decisive and conclusive in cancer research, but maybe there are some particular or general areas that we could convey to the constituents in Alberta and say, here's a program that has borne some beneficial results, one of which all Albertans can be very proud. On the other hand, it may be worth while, too, knowing whether this program has just really gotten us into the exploratory stages, exploratory not in terms of research but of organization.

It may be that these expenditures have just brought us to the point in time when we're trying to identify the problem in regard to focussing attention on a particular subject area, rather than everybody running off in different directions. I'm sure many people around the world are looking at this problem, but if there could be some focal point . . . I know this program by itself, right now — when we look at the funds we're talking about just a few million dollars — could not achieve that. On the other hand, if it's rolled into the \$300 million endowment fund, then we are talking about providing substantial tools and resources so that that focal point could be created. I know that was the intention of the endowment fund in the first place. It seems to me that some of the comments made about it at the time were that this amount of money would put Alberta in the forefront in medical research. Given the gravity and magnitude of the cancer problem, I think that would play a very significant part.

So I would just put that question to the minister, if I could, please, Mr. Chairman. What progress can be reported in regard to the program to date? Can it be characterized as achieving just the exploratory stage, or have we gone by that stage and are now in a preliminary stage, or are we in high gear and away on this matter?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, the best way to answer that question would be to look at the objective of the amount to be voted in the report. It's very clear that we are talking about applied research vis-a-vis pure research. I want to dampen any expectations that some major medical breakthrough may occur in Alberta as a result of the investment of these funds. They're primarily meant for three purposes: improved treatment of cancer patients, renovations to existing treatment facilities, and purchase of equipment for facilities.

I also mentioned earlier about how the two kinds of programs in here, those that are clinically based and those that are research-activity based, have been separated and are being funded hereon in a different manner. But in the report, an assessment of what has been accomplished over the past year is broken down into five different categories. Those categories are administration, research programs, research projects, research equipment, and publications. Again, the report refers in detail to the accomplishments in each of those activities for the past year. I could read those, but I'd only be reading from a report which the hon. members have. Furthermore, I think I'd be interrupting the meetings they're having.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, in the document that the minister just sent over, I see that there are funds for an occupational and environmental study. Could the minister indicate who is going to be carrying out this study, and what the content of the study will be? Will it

be to determine whether cancer is contagious, or what effect smoking has on cancer? Is that the type of study that's going to be under this particular expenditure?

MR. RUSSELL: No, that's a past expenditure. The hon. member will see that there are no funds in the current year or requested in the forthcoming year for that program.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I missed that answer; my apology to the minister. One of the questions is with regard to the insurance industry. My colleague from Fort Saskatchewan and I have had some conversations with them. It's with regard to insurance rates, cancer, and smoking specifically. I don't know whether that was covered in the question by my colleague.

In terms of the occupational study that's being done, the applied research in that area, is that to accumulate evidence as to which occupations there is a greater incidence of cancer in, and what the environmental conditions are? Is that the purpose of this study? Would the study have enough validity — and hopefully it would — that, say, if insurance companies wished to base rates on it, they could?

For example, the Mutual Life underwriters are meeting in Toronto today and this last week, members from all across Canada. The decision they want to make is whether persons who do not smoke should be able to buy term insurance for half the rate that smokers are charged. I understand that one of the companies in Canada has actually implemented that policy, and it's placing pressure on other life insurance companies to do the same thing. Would this kind of research be valid enough for companies such as those to base their decisions on? That's a secondary reason, the primary being that if we could isolate the occupational groups or the environmental conditions that create a greater incidence of cancer, that would have certain benefits as well. Is that the function of the study, Mr. Minister?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, that was one of the studies that ended during the last fiscal year. No funds are being spent on it this year, and no funds are being requested. Because of the nature and the titles of these studies, and without having the printed information in front of me, I have to admit that I can't answer a question like that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: That's fine. If the minister possibly somewhere along the line does obtain the information, he can send it to me in a note or something. I'd be interested in it because of the situation that I raised with the minister. So at a later time the minister can forward it to me. That's acceptable.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm having some difficulty responding to these questions. Many of them are historical, and most of them are answered, or the answers that I would give are in reports which have been tabled to members of the select committee. I'm assuming that your offices have these reports, and that your research assistants could readily look up those answers for the members. If that's not the case, I'll be pleased to get more reports delivered. The reports are really the fullest answer that I am able to give to questions of a medical or scientific nature that relate to these specific programs.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, that's acceptable. I have a pile of reports here, and that one hasn't been sent along with me.

Mr. Chairman, to the minister, if we refer to the last page of the handout, the University of Alberta evaluation and assessment, and the University of Calgary evaluation and assessment. These would relate, I believe, to the questions I raised earlier as to ongoing evaluation and assessment, and post-assessment of the various projects. Does this evaluation and assessment include all of the programs that are going to be funded this year, or is this evaluation and assessment for some other purpose?

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Chairman, it's for two purposes. It's for assessing the applications and then for evaluating the programs after they've been carried out. By its very nature, it's got to be ongoing. Naturally, some administrative expenses are involved with the assessment panel, insofar as the selection of programs is concerned. But the main amount of funding is for the evaluation of completed programs.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. I know that when we're looking at cancer and cancer research, at one time I believe we were talking about life styles. The minister remembers that; we expect to take a pill that will stop us from getting cancer, and we expect to take a pill that will cure the emphysema we've accumulated over many years of smoking. Mr. Chairman, it's an area we should all be concerned with, as people in a more urban population. It is directly related to some of the cancer research that we have. I'm genuinely concerned, as one of the puritans — I consider myself a puritan, being a non-smoker. [interjections] The hon. Leader of the Opposition was relating the story that I had touched upon when I went out to take some life insurance several weeks ago. The first question that the young lady at the other end — my life insurance agent — asked was not, how old are you? That's usually the question they ask. She said, do you smoke? I said, no, what's that got to do with it? Well, she said, as of January 1, the premiums are going to almost double if you are a smoker.

The comment the minister made about — maybe we who have to pay premiums through our health care, the taxpayer has to pay for hospitals or medical treatment. It's just about time that we in this province — a province that is expanding rapidly economically, occupationally, and in every other way — started looking at the preventive aspect of medicine, saying, hey people, you're killing yourselves. It can't be put any more bluntly than that. We're killing ourselves on the highways, but we're killing ourselves by smoking and by the use of intoxicants and drugs. It's just time that we started looking at what we are doing to ourselves as a society.

Mr. Speaker, I try to enforce this rule in my own family, my own house. Once your kids get to the age of 16 or 17, you can't tell them what to do. But I can tell them they're not smoking in my house, and I tell them they're not smoking in my car, not when I'm there. All I do is pick up the car, and it smells like they've had a smoke-out in there, or they've been smoking fish for about four days. That upsets me, but at least they know they're not going to do it when I'm there. Hopefully, they'll come to their senses in a year or two.

It will be interesting to know what the statistics indicate now as to what has happened to our general population as far as smoking and non-smoking are concerned. Mr. Chairman, to the minister — and I think the minister

would probably agree with this — I think smoking is not receiving the due, smoking is not given credit for as many deaths as it causes. I think we're on the ultraconservative side when — what does the little commercial say? — smoking may be dangerous to your health, the Surgeon General of the United States says. What it should say is: smoking bloody well kills you. No ifs, ands, or buts.

Mr. Chairman, if the members of this committee were to go over to the anatomy lab at the university, where they do the dissections, and see a smoker laid out beside a non-smoker, the smoker looks like he has been a coal miner all his life, compared to the non-smoker. If all the people dragging on the weeds went over there, they would never, ever smoke another cigarette. Throw them away. Ken. There is that big a difference.

So, Mr. Chairman, I guess today I'm really making a plea to the young people of this province and to the minister that we should be spending some dollars on telling the people in this province, you are killing yourselves with those nicotine sticks. Not only that, as a dentist I hate scrubbing that grubby stuff off the teeth of everybody who's a smoker. I don't mind cleaning teeth, but I sure hate cleaning off that grungy nicotine.

Mr. Chairman, it is serious. I believe it is becoming more prevalent in young females than in males. It seems that more girls are smoking now. That's not a statistical quotation; I just seem to think that, from a random sampling. Fortunately, members of the committee, it seems that more adults are quitting the weed, so that's a step in the right direction. But the young people seem to be smoking more. Really, it is an area of great concern. It is costing us money as taxpayers. It is costing us money because we are putting people in ... Lung cancer is becoming more and more prevalent.

I would like to say also to the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation, that branch is concerned about the effect in the work place of second-hand nicotine smoke on the non-smokers who have to be with the smokers. That's an area of concern, because now they're finding out that if you get it directly or indirectly, it does you just about as much harm. So maybe in this Assembly we're going to have to end up — never mind government side and opposition side — with smoking side and non-smoking side. At least we're making an advance in this area in public places now. As a non-smoker, I quite enjoy going out for dinner now. I don't have to be sitting downwind from some guy who has lit up a great big stogie. We're making some advances. [interjections]

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood says, travelling in aircraft. That's right, because when we on the workers' compensation committee were coming back from Europe, my seat mate had probably the worst cold I've seen for a long time. The guy could hardly breathe. We were sitting just ahead of the smoking section, but the air conditioner was picking it up from the seat behind us, and this guy was smoking the biggest, stinkiest cigars I've ever smelled. The poor guy sitting beside me could hardly breathe. He almost needed oxygen all the way back, because it was so bad. But it is a medical fact that it causes cancer; we are finding more and more that it causes cancer.

MR. CRAWFORD: May I ask a question?

DR. BUCK: Yes.

MR. CRAWFORD: As a way of preamble, Mr. Chairman, I'm a non-smoker, but I enjoy the odd cigar. Could I ask him what air line allows the smoking of cigars?

DR. BUCK: It was the good old taxpayers' air line, Air Canada. I said to the stewardess, Miss, it's not bothering me, because I don't have a cold, but my poor seat mate can hardly breathe. My understanding is that in air-planes, you do not smoke pipes or cigars. Well, she said, that's sort of the rule. I said, you mean it's not a mandatory rule? She said, no, we sort of use our discretion. I said, well, how deep blue does the man have to turn before you start using your discretion? She said, well, I'll suggest to the gentleman that maybe he doesn't smoke. Mr. Chairman, it is a genuine health factor. It is costing us money as taxpayers.

I was bringing up occupational health. I was absent yesterday afternoon because I was meeting with some of the county councillors surrounding the area of Fort Saskatchewan. We were looking at the effects, the monitoring, the safety features in the new Diamond Shamrock polyvinyl chloride plant at Scotford. They are taking liquid vinyl chloride monomer, which is a carcinogen, transporting it by pipeline to the Diamond Shamrock plant, making polyvinyl chloride, which is the non-volatile form, and making plastics out of it.

Now, the people in that plant are just as concerned as the Minister of the Environment. It's a new plant. They did have some spills. I was interviewed by one of the local papers. Of course, I gave them a reasonable explanation of what had happened. A reasonable explanation wasn't newsworthy, so I didn't make the front page of the *Edmonton Journal*, but all the halt, stop, walk, go people made the headlines, because there were spills.

But in any new technology, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister: I am not condoning pollution of the air or of the environment. But any new technology, program, facility, or plant is going to have start-up bugs, and I have checked very carefully with the Minister of Environment to make sure that the 'overages' occurred during start-up. To my satisfaction, that's when most of the problems occurred. We have been very closely monitoring, now that the plant has been in operation for a year and a half, and the problems are being solved almost down to where we don't have any problems. I was very impressed, because it is a very severe carcinogenic. To lay people, "carcinogenic" means cancer-causing after many years of exposure.

Mr. Chairman, to the minister, the people who work in the Diamond Shamrock plant in Fort Saskatchewan will be monitored and their records will be kept for 40 years, because a carcinogen as subtle as VCM does not show up for between 20 and 40 years. I am sure the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, the hon. Dr. Paproski, would be interested in what we found at that plant. Many of the plants going into my area are going to be petrochemical, some of them carcinogenic. Two of the new plants going in are going to be using benzene derivatives. Benzene shows up much more quickly, between 10 and 15 years. The plant manager out there told us a story that in England — this chap was from England — they were gluing leather soles on boots as a cottage industry and using volatile benzene glues. This glue had so much benzene in it that they were finding that within 10 years, these people in the cottage industries were developing cancers from the benzene derivatives in the glue. But they could switch that right away, because they found out within 10 years. But VCM, vinyl chloride monomer,

doesn't show up for years.

I am pleased that the Minister of Environment is checking very closely to make sure we do not violate those standards. I am pleased that this government is striving to make our standards as tough as any place in Canada. Now, the government's being tough and concerned is not going to make a headline. If I said that lousy government's doing nothing, that would probably make a headline. But I'm not interested in headlines. I'm interested in protecting . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: Now, Walter, you were doing well until you said that.

DR. BUCK: You don't seem to believe that, hon. Member for Three Hills.

Seriously, as we develop as a petrochemical-oriented society, we have to be very aware of the products we are developing, the petrochemicals we are using in these plants, because many of them are carcinogens. The monitoring has to be strict. Just to indicate to the committee — because I think it's very important to the government, and it's important to us to know what is going on, because we're voting on spending taxpayers' dollars for cancer research and treatment — the plant that I toured yesterday has air lines in the areas. Certain areas always have a higher risk factor than other areas. The high-risk areas are usually in autoclaves, where people physically have to go directly inside those tanks to clean them out maybe once every 24 or 48 hours. They do not go in there unless they are strapped to a life line, a compressed air line, plus they must have a self-contained pack. The hon. chairman, as a fireman, appreciates what I'm speaking of. The safety factors are that stringent. They have fail-safe systems so that if one man is working in the tank, somebody cannot inadvertently lock the door, locking the guy in the tank. There are two or three keying mechanisms whereby if one fellow in the tank has the key, nobody else can activate the door. You can't lock the guy in.

So industry is being responsible. Industry is just as concerned as we are, because industry has now developed an environmental conscience. Fifteen years ago when the word "environment" had just become a word that we were using in our vocabularies, I was appalled when a man of the executive level, a trained engineer whom I respected very highly, said: the only environmental standards we come up to are what you people legislate. Now that same company and that same man are in the forefront of environmental concern. That's how far the wheel has turned. I'm proud of that company's record at this time. How things have changed. We're all concerned about protection of the environment, because when we're protecting the environment, we're protecting our fellow man. And by protecting our fellow man, Mr. Chairman, we are saving money as taxpayers, because we do not have to spend millions of dollars treating people who have been affected by cancer, people who have illnesses related to carcinogens.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on for hours. It is a topic that I think is very, very timely. I believe the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care should be monitoring very closely what is going on in the Department of Workers' Health, Safety, and Compensation, because the two are related. The concerns are there.

Mr. Chairman, the note I want to end up on is to say again, smoking is not only injurious to your health: smoking kills you. All smokers don't have to feel too

guilty. They'll just die. Just let me know what kind of flows they like.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the hon. minister what we're doing. I raised the question the other day about the preventive aspect of medicine, and also if we're looking at the changing of life style, because it is costing us money as taxpayers.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting discussion. It doesn't really have much to do with the request for funds for the vote that's in front of us.

DR. BUCK: It's cancer research.

MR. RUSSELL: The members keep talking about pure research. This is not a pure research program. It's applied research, and it's to carry out treatment of cancer patients or buy equipment to do it.

DR. BUCK: You get lung cancer from smoking, Dave.

MR. RUSSELL: I'm a little concerned at the way we're veering away from the request that's in front of the committee, because we're now working under a time limitation. There are many other votes to consider. I guess it's got to be the decision of individual members, but I'm concerned that we're going to hit the end of five days and some votes will be voted upon that won't even have been discussed because of these very interesting but not relevant discussions, questions, and answers.

I want to say I have to agree with the thrust of the comments by the last speaker. Certainly any aspect of preventive medicine is just a matter of individual common sense. I don't know what the role of government is there, perhaps providing the proper information by way of educational programs and that kind of thing. We know things like using seat belts, not smoking, and not abusing drugs and alcohol all make good sense. Those who abuse them end up in the health care system, and we all pay for it. That's the bottom line. Not all cancer patients, of course, are people who have smoked or people who have lung cancer. There are all kinds of patients. The funds being requested are for applied research, which is really advanced treatment techniques, and should not be confused with pure research. The money that is ... [addressing the Clerk] Is that guy smoking, after all that's been said? I just caught a puff of smoke go up against the red drapes, and I couldn't believe it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chairman is not smoking.

MR. RUSSELL: I don't want to mislead people in any way. The programs funded under this vote will not lead to a major medical breakthrough. That will come through the pure research programs to be funded by the medical research trust.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, one last comment with regard to this vote. Maybe it's just a little off-subject, too. It's with regard to applied research and the incidence of cancer.

Across Canada, the statistics of cancer are kept, I believe, by the bureau of vital statistics in Ottawa. One of the concerns indicated in this report, Cancer in Canada, is that some provinces cannot supply the necessary statistics, and there is a distortion of those statistics because of that fact. On the other hand, it indicates Alberta has

legislation in place so that Alberta doctors, institutions, government, hospitals, or whatever may supply that information. But there is some concern that legislation is not complete that requires the various persons or institutions to report to vital statistics. To the minister: I was wondering whether that is or is not true, because I think that having a good record of incidence across Canada certainly can be good supportive evidence in other kinds of research.

The other question I want to ask in terms of this vote is about the researchers themselves and the research community. Often — and I think this is part of human nature — researchers will research a certain subject and hang onto their data until possibly they come out with a final conclusion or have explored all the possible avenues. During that process, there is not a complete interchange of material or findings between one group and another, and I suppose even in the area of applied research where one person finds that one thing works better than another. In terms of the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board and its responsibility in co-ordination, is there someone who rides herd on that kind of responsibility to assure everyone that this information is interchanged and that there's a bit of a compulsory aspect to the interchange of that information, the findings, even before a report is submitted or a document within one of the medical journals is written? Is someone on an ongoing basis watching that that co-ordination occurs? It's not specifically dollar accountability, but progress accountability. I wonder if the minister could comment on those two areas.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if it's true that scientists or doctors do hoard information until they're ready to release it. I can only relay my understanding of the situation, and that is that it is shared.

In addition, we've made reference several times today to the role of the evaluators who are funded each year to evaluate the programs. Then, of course, there are the two different kinds of programs. One is the treatment aspect of it, the clinical types of programs that are carried on by people treating people. Those are ongoing, and certainly that information is shared, built, and added to every day, every time another patient goes through a particular program.

In addition, of course, there are publications, papers, and presentations. A 10-page list of them is in the last annual report. There really is a continual and continuing flow of information with respect to the work being carried on.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, for clarification that I think the committee should have from the minister, if I may speak.

First, I'd like to comment on the comments the hon. Member for Clover Bar made. I'd like to acknowledge, underline, and agree with the vast majority of those comments. In general, they're very accurate and properly stated.

But I'd like the minister to clarify just one point. I was rather surprised when he said that this particular vote would not — would not — result in any major breakthrough. My understanding is that it's not only applied cancer research but pure research, working either separately or in combination, but usually in combination, and any one of them working together, as a matter of fact, could result in a breakthrough in cancer treatment. I realize and admit that pure research is the significant and

central area where a breakthrough is likely to occur. But applied research in combination with pure research can result in a breakthrough, because this area is wide open for a lot of research and application, and the application itself may show and demonstrate a treatment and cure that otherwise wouldn't be possible only under pure research.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I guess I should bow to the doctor's advice on that. He would certainly be more qualified to comment on that than I am. The description of the program is applied research, and I think it's emphasized in there and in the description of the various elements that a great deal of the fund is for direct treatment in the clinical atmosphere of patients with various kinds of cancer, for purchase of the most up-to-date equipment, and for renovations to buildings for that equipment. That constitutes a great proportion of the applied research program. I would have to admit that it's true: it's possible that what the hon. member said could happen. But I didn't want to request the votes on the basis of that as the prime thrust or objective of this program.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

Agreed to:

2 — Applied Cancer Research \$4,628,000

3 — Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and Specialty Services Facility

MR. SINDLINGER: Are you allowing me to make a comment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you wish to comment, that's quite in order.

MR. SINDLINGER: Just a quick one, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the facility. I would ask what the completion date is for that which remains to be done.

MR. RUSSELL: Well, it's essentially complete, Mr. Chairman. This is one that has come in on budget with no problems, other than those related to construction slowdowns because of work stoppages. There's some landscaping to be finished; there are some pieces of equipment to be purchased. Until October 1982, \$3.5 million is estimated to be expended. I have a projected cash flow in front of me. It starts out in April 1982 with \$300,000 and goes through each month up until September 1982, when they estimate \$1 million and October 1982, when they estimate the final \$1 million.

The building is operational, and it's mainly the kinds of things I mentioned that remain to be completed. Beyond that, I can only say it's a very small portion of the total contract.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and Specialty Services Facility is going to receive a number of dollars with regard to the grants. After we had such a lengthy discussion on the centre in Edmonton, I think the same concern would prevail.

Again, I was wondering whether the minister has put some special person in place to monitor what is going on; that is, put some extra management procedures in place

so that someone is not putting change orders in a drawer somewhere. I'm sure the minister is right on top of that kind of thing. Other things may be happening that we're not totally aware of. Could the minister comment on what new things are put in place for accountability? I think that's most important in the whole thing. I'm sure the items in the budget, in terms of importance and necessity, certainly would be in that category when we look at the responsibility that would be taken by the Foothills general hospital.

In terms of this Legislature, as to how we are accountable, how can the minister be on top of the job and assure himself the funds are spent where they have been allocated? I know that's a very difficult job. As I mentioned the other day, we're asking the minister to be in 20 different places at 40 different times. It makes his job most difficult. But even in light of that, I guess the responsibility is there, and some mechanisms should be there. I'm sure, after the experience in Edmonton, that management procedures were likely changed to assure the minister that nothing can happen in the same way.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of project that a person like myself likes to get up and comment on, because it has come in exactly within budget. Each year the implementation committee and Treasury Board have reviewed the forecasts at inflation rate and have applied the inflation factor to be used against the outstanding dollars. That's been checked historically, and each of the six years of this project, it has been right on.

One major change order did come to the government for renal dialysis space and a reallocation of psychiatric space, which involved the existing building as well as the new one. That was approved and carried out with respect to the funds that were allocated. Again, I'm happy to say that all the indications are that this project will come in within the amount of funds approved by this Legislature.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, that's excellent to hear that. As I mentioned the other evening, I know from the minister's experience and training that the minister would be right on top of that kind of thing.

The other question I raised is: even though the matter did come on budget and all looks good in terms of the auditing and meeting the budget objectives, are there any changes the minister has made in terms of monitoring what is going on during the year? Or is that responsibility still left totally with the board, as it was in terms of the special hospital here in Edmonton? Did any arrangements or procedures change due to what happened here in Edmonton? Has the relationship changed, not in a negative sense, with the Foothills hospital since then?

MR. RUSSELL: No, it didn't change, Mr. Chairman. There's quite a difference. The Foothills hospital is really in the final weeks or months of a construction period that's gone on some six years, whereas the MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre is really part way down a construction period that will probably range over a decade. I think it's fair to say that the only thing that did occur as a result of the things that were revealed at the MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre was that extra care and attention were taken by the groups already in place: the construction management team, the implementation committee, and the board. But they were really almost finished. They were not on schedule, but they were within budget. The schedule slippage was due to a city-wide construction strike that really was beyond the control of the board.

The nature of the problem was slightly different, and the progress of the project was far more advanced. I think that's the reason for it.

Just by way of interest, the board of hospital district No. 93, which is building a major addition to Rockyview hospital in Calgary, advised me that they've got the same construction management team under contract to do the Rockyview addition as carried out the Foothills addition. That's just a little interesting sidelight, but they do have an excellent record on this project.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I note that in the annual report, the description of this particular project indicates that it will be a referral centre for southern Alberta. I would just ask the minister if there is, in effect, a similar facility for northern Alberta at this particular time. Would contemplation be given to ensuring there is a comparable facility in the northern part of the province, to provide the same service?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, the corresponding facility in the northern part of the province is the existing University of Alberta hospital, in conjunction with the W.W. Cross Cancer hospital. There's also a request pending in front of the department for the expansion of the Cross hospital at the present time.

MR. SINDLINGER: Just an incidental question, Mr. Chairman, as an aside to the interesting sideline that the minister referred to earlier. The project management team which is being employed for the Rockyview project is the same as the one that applied for this one. Is that an independent project management team of private contractors, or is it from the hospital boards?

MR. RUSSELL: No, it's from the private sector, a commercial construction management team, Cana Construction.

MR. SINDLINGER: I was just wondering, Mr. Chairman, since they had done such a good job, especially in comparison with what had occurred at the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre, if the minister would care to identify them, giving credit where credit is obviously due.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. One of the purchases here is specialized equipment, and equipping and furnishing the facility. The minister mentioned the renal dialysis unit. I'm sure there is specialized equipment there. I'd be very interested in knowing whether there's unique equipment there that is only in Canada. I also asked this question with regard to the children's hospital. The equipment in the children's hospital that I referred to, as I remember, was also located in one or two of the states of the United States, but beyond those it was only Alberta that had that equipment. We have the Mayo clinic in terms of children's hospitals here in Alberta. I think our University hospital in Edmonton is going to qualify for the same kind of status at a point in time.

Do we see the Foothills hospital receiving some of that specialized equipment? As I go through the estimates, and as I recall the study of the general expenditures, we do some unique things in Alberta. Each hospital may be co-ordinating its needs. I'm sure through the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care someone is riding herd over this kind of purchase so that we don't have a duplication of equipment in Edmonton and in any other

place in the province. The minister indicated that as far as he knew with regard to facilities, specialized equipment for children, there was no overlap between Calgary and Edmonton. Here we have the very same kind of situation with regard to cancer treatment, cancer care. We are putting in specialized equipment.

Two questions: one, is it co-ordinated to the satisfaction of the minister; two, do we see either the Foothills provincial hospital or the University hospital becoming the number one leading facility with regard to care of cancer patients? Will we have one more unique than any other in the province of Alberta, or is it our intention to try to balance the growth of care between Edmonton and Calgary?

MR. RUSSELL: The objective is to try to balance the growth and keep those two facilities approximately equal. This project, for example, is unique in that it is a joint undertaking between the boards of two provincial hospitals. There are actually two facilities involved. The Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board built and equipped the Tom Baker southern Alberta cancer treatment facility, and the Foothills hospital board built the addition to the Foothills hospital. In addition, a provincial lab is included in this particular project. That's balanced in northern Alberta by the W. W. Cross hospital, run by the same Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board, and by the new MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre. The objective is to keep them approximately equal, but a lot depends on the people who will come to them.

For example, Mr. Chairman, there's no question. I think, that cardiac surgery is far ahead in northern Alberta at the present time because of the pioneer work done by Dr. Callaghan. If there's another doctor of his calibre in some other discipline, one or the other facility might shoot ahead in so far as progress and treatment are concerned.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman to the minister. We've focussed our attention on building these unique types of facilities in Edmonton and Calgary. That means that all persons living outside of those areas, by their own choice, out in my constituency and Medicine Hat and other places who require that kind of unique service . . . I have an example of a person who was receiving treatment, but at the same time it was very important for his psychological attitude and emotional needs that he return home every weekend. The problem was that the costs become very significant. Because there was a certain mental health need there for the person to go home and be more emotionally secure by doing that, I wonder whether we've considered payment with regard to the costs of that particular patient in the extended care program. It's very obvious that the person living in Edmonton and Calgary can get in his car and within 10 or 15 minutes be at the centre and return home again. The difference for the person who may live out at Bonnyville, Vegreville, or in Grande Prairie is an expensive type of arrangement. I know we're all responsible for our own health costs, but there is an inequity there. I know it isn't directly related to the vote, but it does relate in the sense that maybe in future planning for cancer care, we could build up regional areas as well as the two central areas of Edmonton and Calgary.

MR. RUSSELL: No doubt that will happen as the population expands in other regions. I was going to mention the hostel beds included in this project, because

they partially respond to the situation raised by the hon. leader. The children's hospital is looking at this as well. They are built into the MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre and will allow patients and their families to stay in non-hospital beds under the jurisdiction of the hospital at much cheaper rates than would be applicable in the hospital itself. The other programs being emphasized, of course, are the day hospital or outpatient facilities, and the day services that go along with those.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to ask the minister a question with regard to the old clinic facility alongside the Holy Cross hospital in Calgary. Could the minister indicate what that facility will be used for now? Will it be utilized as a health centre of some kind?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, we've approved funds for a master plan for renovations of the Holy Cross hospital to be undertaken. They're now doing that. That space will be addressed in that plan.

Agreed to:

3 — Southern Alberta Cancer Centre
and Specialty Services Facility

\$3,500,000

4 — Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 4 is for \$80,966,000. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition indicated just a few minutes ago, this vote has been in the committee several times before and discussed quite extensively.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, there was one important question the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo had asked me about what appeared to be a conflict of figures. In studying his question afterwards, I believe what he was doing was totalling the votes appropriated in previous years against the estimated cost of the project rather than the cash flow. In many projects, particularly in this one because of its lost time, there are considerable lapsed appropriations. So a lot of these funds, something like \$60 million, will have been voted twice by this Legislature. I believe that's the disparity the hon. member was referring to.

MR. SINDLINGER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I confirm that that was the methodology I employed, adding the total votes. Certainly, if there had been lapsed appropriations, that would reconcile the difference.

Since this is the last vote in terms of Hospitals and Medical Care, I just wanted to make two observations. One is in regard to what the minister has classified or termed the horrible thing that happened at the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre in regard to the way the project got out of control. I believe the minister used the illustration of the project manager at the time approving changes without really having the authority to do so, and compounding the problem by taking those approvals and putting them in his desk without putting them through the proper channels so they could be identified and stopped before they got to the point where they did become a horrible thing.

I think we have learned a very important lesson from this particular project. It is simply that there has to be some sort of control or checking mechanism in place, not only for the hospitals but for every heritage fund project, to ensure that the money appropriated for a specific

purpose does in fact go for that purpose. This is just one case in which we have found out that hasn't really happened. It may be that with further digging we could find other instances as well.

It's very obvious in some cases. To use an extreme example, if money has been appropriated for railway hopper cars and after the expenditures we never saw them, it would be obvious it hadn't gone there. In other areas one can look at, irrigation for example, the government doesn't have direct control over the funds expended. The money is passed on to an autonomous agency or body. That's what happened in this case. The government was responsible for funding the project, yet it didn't have the concurrent authority to ensure it was expended in ways intended or in the most efficient manner. In terms of agriculture the same thing can happen. Under the irrigation programs, about 86 per cent of a particular program in a special area, I believe, came from the heritage fund. The area in question had to come up with the other 14 per cent. The problem in those cases is the same as that which occurred in this one: once the funds have left the hands of the government, the government no longer has the authority to ensure they're properly used.

I think if we're going to learn a lesson from the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre, it should be that for all these programs, especially these major capital projects of the heritage fund, where we're not talking about a few hundred thousand dollars — and in many cases, we're not talking about a few million dollars, either. Over the lifetime of the projects, we're talking about hundreds of millions of dollars. AOSTRA is a good example: at this time we're talking about almost \$1 billion. I think we must take great pains to ensure that we do have adequate accounting and control mechanisms in place to ensure that the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, or any other minister in the government, never has to come back and say, yes, a horrible thing happened here, but we've taken steps to ensure it doesn't happen again. That should not happen again.

The second observation I'd like to make with regard to these votes for Hospitals and Medical Care is that they've been very informative with regard to the work that's being done in the special areas of concern. It might have seemed that the comments the Member for Clover Bar was making a few minutes ago were frivolous and at times not entirely related to this particular vote. But there were things he said that had not occurred to me before when considering these numbers. One is that there is a deficiency in the area of public awareness. When he was talking about cancer, the incidence of cancer, what causes it, I think the prime thing that struck me that I wasn't aware of before in a very cognizant sense was that steps can be taken to prevent cancer, rather than its being just something that strikes you through a virus or something of that nature, and if you have it, that's it.

With regard to something like cancer. I can see that as well as there being a worth-while expenditure for hardware, facilities, and research, it might be worth while contemplating a program which would disseminate what is already known about cancer to the people of the province and make them aware that there are certain things they can do to minimize their chances of contracting cancer throughout their lives. I don't want to say that we should develop a huge campaign in terms of creating a public demand, but rather just advise the population of what is in place now and what can be done about these things. I know that's always a suggestion with regard to

everything. Whenever anyone has a problem or any subject area is discussed, it's always said, let's educate the people. But this is one area where I think that would be very worth while.

One cancer statistic that was pointed out to me is that about 10,000 people die of cancer every day across the western world. On the other hand, if 10,000 people every day died of the flu or smallpox or something like that, that would be considered an epidemic. There would be a great deal of alarm. It was noted that that alarm should also be considered for something like cancer.

Mr. Chairman, in making a final observation on these expenditures for Hospitals and Medical Care, it's my opinion — notwithstanding the financial problems we've had over the last few years with that Health Sciences Centre in particular — that they're good expenditures. I think they demonstrate a great deal of foresight on the part of the provincial government. I look forward to the years ahead when I and my children and everybody else can benefit from those developments that occur because of the action taken by the government on these things.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to conclude with just a few remarks, too.

One, in terms of the four votes here, I appreciated very much the information the minister provided in this Legislature. I think we've had a good examination of the estimates before us. I was very impressed with the very clear decisions the minister made with regard to the Walter C. MacKenzie centre and the fact that we were assured, after investigation and questions — we got off to a little bit of a shaky start when we raised questions the other evening. I thought we were going to have to push and pry. Then all of a sudden, when the real information came out, the minister had done his job and all was accountable.

I recall my first speech in this Legislature, after I took over the responsibility as House leader. That responsibility, I said, was twofold. One was to do everything I could to determine whether the government had taken financial accountability and, secondly, administrative accountability. Now, in the many hours we have spent with the minister, I'm convinced from the evidence provided for us that there is a good job going on. I think the minister should be complimented for that. That's part of our role, too, on this side of the Legislature. We have to be fair. When we feel there is something wrong or information is a little short, we have to sound unreasonable. But hopefully unreasonableness can be paralleled with being determined to try to do our job.

I would like to suggest this to the minister, though, after our finding out that information. One of my concerns about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is that, in terms of the capital projects, it is some \$400 million this year, and with last year, we're close to \$1 billion. I am very concerned that the government has not deliberately assessed and analyzed the regular administrative bodies or the regular staff establishment of each department to see what adjustments should be made to look after the accountability of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. In terms of even the Minister of Environment, I find the minister saying, my deputy and senior officials are looking after the responsibility of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. They are doing it as an added job, not as a special assignment. I know the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has said to us, my senior financial experts are watching for accountability, doing all of the financial tests necessary. But they're doing that on top of the

financial tests they are applying to the general revenue expenditure, which is a massive job in itself, particularly in Hospitals and Medical Care, a very massive job when we talk in terms of establishing global budgets each year. I know the department officials spend hours and hours in negotiation and discussion and giving advice to the various hospital jurisdictions across this province: an ongoing, heavy responsibility. On top of that we place the accountability for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. That's a most difficult kind of thing.

We've suggested in this Legislature, and by a Bill I've introduced in the Legislature, that even the Auditor General should have a special person assigned to audit the various Heritage Savings Trust Fund committees. I'd also suggest to the minister to influence his colleagues so that someone, an administrative expert or whatever he may be, could look across the government and should do — I hate to say a "study". That bothers me, because often that becomes a problem in itself. But someone with administrative understanding and good capability could look across the government, look at mechanisms and means by which two things could happen: one, that the co-ordination for the accountability of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund would take place; and two, that each department would have more specialized persons accountable for the various allocations of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Just from a very casual ... it isn't casual; in terms of our questions. I guess we've ferreted deeper into the administration of this government. But from my observation, there isn't a special emphasis on the accountability of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It becomes an appendage of responsibility to a number of senior civil servants in this government.

The example the minister gave us in this Assembly, the work done with the W.C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre and the lessons learned, would be good input to better co-ordination of that accountability system with regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Either informally or formally, I'd appreciate if the minister would follow that through. I think that would be a good contribution to the accountability of this fund.

Agreed to:

4 — Walter C. MacKenzie Health
Sciences Centre

\$80,966,000

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, under Hospitals and Medical Care, I move that votes 2, 3, and 4 be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we have some direction from the Acting Government House Leader?

MR. RUSSELL: I move that the committee rise and report.

[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 requests leave to sit again:

Resolved that from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1983, for the purpose of making investments in the following

projects to be administered by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care: \$4,628,000 for applied cancer research, \$3,500,000 for the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and Specialty Services Facility, and \$80,966,000 for the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, just before moving that we call it 5:30, I am going to indicate the House

business. It's the intention for the House to sit tomorrow evening in Committee of Supply, deal with the votes under Energy and Natural Resources that are the responsibility of the hon. Mr. Miller and, if time permits, return to occupational health and safety.

I move that we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:20 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]