

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Monday, October 24, 1983 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table copies of the Public Service Employee Relations Board 1982-83 annual report.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table copies of the annual report of Alberta Treasury for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1983.

MR. SPEAKER: As required by section 45 of the Legislative Assembly Act, I have the honor to table Members' Services Committee orders 1, 2, 3, and 4.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, 30 grades 5 and 6 students from St. Augustine school in the Edmonton Whitemud constituency. They are well accompanied today, by their teacher Miss Laurie Pelkie; student teachers Mrs. Lorraine Lambotte and Mrs. Brenda Huntley; and drivers and parents Mrs. Levina Belik, Mrs. Annie Dunn, Mrs. Vera Fedor, Mrs. Carole Johnson, and Mrs. Jocelyne Marple. These students and teachers are in the members gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly a colleague, Mr. Walter Johnson, the Member for Saltcoats in the Assembly of Saskatchewan. I met Walter and visited with him on a trip to Prince Rupert. He is a former chairman of the agricultural caucus committee and is now the legislative secretary to the Minister of Agriculture. He is standing in the Speaker's gallery, and I would ask the Assembly to please welcome him.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you, and through you, 19 members from the Alberta Vocational Centre. They are new Canadians, and they are learning about Canada. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Scragg, and they are seated in the members gallery. I would ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, today in the public gallery I have two members of the Calgary McCall constituency, who are here to view the expressions of this House. I would like to introduce Jack and Margaret MacPherson, and ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, 45 grade 6 students from Warburg school. They are accompanied by Mrs. G. Meinczinger, Mrs. Louise Meinczinger, Mrs. Wanda Broadbent, bus driver Mr. Harregodts, and teacher Carolyn Meyer. I would like them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly,

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to indicate to you and to members of the Assembly that I have as a guest in the members gallery a young high school student by the name of Danielle Belley, who is on an extended exchange visit from the province of Quebec. Je voudrais dire à Danielle, bienvenue à Alberta. I would like to indicate that she is accompanied today by Mr. and Mrs. Arnott, their daughters Heidi and Shannon Arnott, and a friend, Rhonda Black. All are seated in the members gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the cordial welcome of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Olympic Facilities Development

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the first question to either the Minister of Recreation and Parks or the Minister of Tourism and Small Business and ask whether any commitments been made by the government of Alberta with respect to \$5 million to be spent on infrastructure development at Ribbon Creek next year?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, our heritage fund budget last year had in it some \$5 million for infrastructure at Ribbon Creek. Of course, that project did not proceed, and the funds are carried over.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister tell the House whether any of the proponents for the hotel construction in the Ribbon Creek area have indicated that the \$5 million being spent will be a condition of their participation?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, any of the proponents that are presently negotiating with the government of Alberta relative to construction on any parcels at the alpine village in Kananaskis Country have not been involved at all in any of that particular sum of money mentioned by the hon. member. That relates to what possibly would be final negotiations and anything that may in fact be necessary to improve that particular site as it's completed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Given the somewhat more pessimistic outlook, can either minister then outline to the Assembly what the government's position is with respect to that \$5 million? Is it indefinitely on hold, or is serious consideration being given at this point to that expenditure?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, in a short while we will be doing the estimates of Kananaskis, and I hope to bring that forward.

MR. NOTLEY: I am sure we will, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to put a further supplementary to the hon. Minister of Tourism and Small Business. Has any assessment been made of the connection between Ecosign Ltd. and the Delta group, with respect to the fact that both groups of companies

are connected with Matthews and Farwell in the snow-making business?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in any discussions relating to the proponent that would in fact be doing the master plan for the Mount Allan site within Kananaskis Country, the committee and I have taken into consideration all aspects of that project.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of the minister's answer of taking into consideration all aspects, is one of the aspects the government is taking into consideration the connection between one of the companies involved in the planning and a company that is actively engaged in the snow-making business?

MR. ADAIR: That point was made to us fairly early on by all the proponents that were involved, and those particularly relating to anything that may involve machine-made snow.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Then can the minister assure the House that as a result of this connection there is no danger that undue pressure would be put on the government, with respect to the feasibility of the entire Mount Allan proposal and the snow-making thereon?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, when the government gets to the point of tendering for the facilities that may be necessary to provide machine-made snow, it will be the normal procedure for going to the tender process.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The question is not what will happen in the tendering process; the question is whether or not in the planning process there is a danger of undue influence.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the fact that anywhere on the Eastern Slopes of the Canadian Rockies . . . The inconsistent snowfalls of history, I guess you could say, have been made known to us. One way of rectifying that and providing what might be considered some degree of consistency would be to have any project that would be involved in the Eastern Slopes go to the use of machine snow.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I might add that Mount Allan is one of the few mountains with a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. NOTLEY: I'd like to ask the minister if he would respond to the House concerning the application of the Stoney Band to construct the facility at Ribbon Creek. Could the minister advise what obstacles stand in the way of a start to negotiations with the Stoneys?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the main obstacle at this particular point is that I have not received any application from the Stoneys. I did have a meeting with two of the three chiefs on September 26, at which point we discussed their interest in both Mount Allan and the alpine village concept, because they are two separate proposals. At that time I expressed to the chiefs that if they were interested, they should provide me with a letter of interest and their financial capacity to get involved in either one or both of the projects, if that should happen, and that at the present time we were negotiating with a proponent for each of the projects.

Hog Processing Plant Closure

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and it's with respect to the decision by Canada Packers to close down their hog slaughtering operation. Could the minister outline to the Assembly what steps have been taken with respect to two major recommendations contained in reports paid for by the government of Alberta: the recommendation in the 1977 Harries report, with respect to the government bringing in new proposals for remodelling hog-processing facilities located in Alberta; and the recommendation contained in the 1981 Homer report, recommending the establishment of a Crown corporation called Alberta meats to act as a catalyst to open new domestic demand. What has been done about those two recommendations in two publicly financed reports?

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, specifically to those two recommendations, I don't believe there has been any action on that, but I'd be happy to check into it and report back.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the Department of Agriculture made any assessment of the capacity of Canada Packers to maintain its Edmonton operation, in view of that company's turnabout in its profit picture in the first six months of this year, a 77 per cent increase in profits?

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, specifically, the packing plant in Edmonton was a hog-killing plant. We have been aware for the past six months that they were studying the future direction with respect to that plant. As far as Canada Packers as a company is concerned, it has made a significant expansion in the province of Alberta over the past number of months, including a poultry plant here in Edmonton, French fries in Lethbridge, a new oil refinery, and a number of other plants, in addition to expanding their beef-killing operations in both Lethbridge and Calgary.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. What discussions were held with Canada Packers management prior to their announcement last week of the closure?

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I met with the vice-president of Canada Packers one day prior to the announcement, at which time he informed me of their intention to close the plant in February 1984.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What proposals, if any, did the government advance in an effort to keep the plant functioning?

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, there was no discussion, either from Canada Packers or instigated by me, as to what may or may not be done with the plant.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of a statement in *Alberta Hansard* on Friday by the Minister of Manpower: "this government believes, as I do, that it is the private sector . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. With great respect, an obviously unnecessary preamble. Surely the hon. member can come directly to the question.

MR. MARTIN: In view of the fact that he said government's role is to provide the stimulus, my question to the minister is, what stimulus is the government considering for the 350 packing plant workers scheduled for layoff at Canada Packers?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, that question should be directed to the Minister of Manpower. However, I would say that we already have well-established programs, and job creation certainly remains a priority for this government.

In the Canada Packers' press release on October 21, they stated clearly that they would be working as a company, together with Canada Manpower and Alberta Manpower, because we all have deep concern for those employees that will be out of work.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, does the minister have any information on the killing capacity in the province at the present time?

DR. BUCK: Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: That would seem to be a very broad question. I think it could obviously be answered that the minister must have some such information. If there are any specifics, perhaps the hon. member could go into them.

MRS. CRIPPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Did the minister have discussions with any of the companies, Canada Packers in particular, about the killing capacity in the province at this time, that would reflect on their decision?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I've had discussion with a number of plants about their concerns and the future direction they were going. But I might say that there are about 30,000 to 35,000 hogs killed in Alberta per week, I believe, and there is significantly more capacity than that within the system. So that judgment decision on whether or not they would continue in a time of overcapacity within the total industry would have to be made by each packing plant.

MR. McPHERSON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the minister have any discussions with Fletcher's Foods of Red Deer prior to their public announcement that they were going to be expanding their pork-killing facility to include a pork-butcher facility which would employ an additional 100 people?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I've had no discussion with them.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. I'm not sure: were there funds advanced — was it a loan guarantee or an outright grant? — to the Alberta hog marketing board in order that they could buy Fletcher's packing plant in Red Deer, in order to keep that going when Fletcher's were closing it down?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge there were no funds granted to the hog marketing board with respect to their purchase of Fletcher's. We gave them seed money in order to establish a stabilization stop-loss program for hogs, but the hog marketing board made their own decision on the purchase of Fletcher's plant.

University Entrance Requirements

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Will all postsecondary institutions in the province use the blended or combined teacher plus exam mark when considering grade 12 student applications for their programs?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, our information, which follows discussions with the universities, is that they will be using the blended mark. This is being communicated to the Alberta School Trustees' Association at the present time, since they have an interest in the question.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, just one supplementary question. I take it that the minister said "all". Would that include the University of Alberta?

MR. KING: Specifically, Mr. Speaker, the University of Alberta.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the Minister of Education advise us whether the colleges, as well, will be accepting the blended mark?

MR. KING: I'm not aware that this has ever been a question insofar as the colleges are concerned, so I can't answer the question definitively this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. But certainly my understanding is that the colleges will be using the blended mark.

Correspondence School

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Education. In light of the fact that we've had some teachers' strikes and some threatened strikes and the students will be writing departmental exams in the spring, what contingency plan does the minister or the department have in place to help these students, in case of a strike being called?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, in any jurisdiction that is struck, students from that jurisdiction have first priority upon application to the Correspondence School. So the Correspondence School will process on a priority basis any applications that come from students resident in the county of Lac Ste. Anne, that being the jurisdiction that is struck at this time. If any other jurisdictions are struck, applications from students in that struck jurisdiction will also be processed on a priority basis.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Can the minister indicate what the status of the Correspondence School is at this time. I've been told — and I hope it's just a rumor, Mr. Minister — that the school is having problems handling the applicants at this time. Will they be able to handle students in case of a strike?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. It is unfortunate that these strikes are occurring as the Correspondence School relocates from Edmonton to Barrhead. Nevertheless I want to take the opportunity provided by the question to commend the staff of the Alberta Correspondence School for the way in which they have responded to the challenge, and I believe that they will be able to deal with the applications in an expeditious manner.

DR. BUCK: A very short supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister in a position to indicate, or does he know, what the

waiting period is at this time for people who apply for correspondence courses?

MR. KING: No, Mr. Speaker, because it varies, depending upon the course and the circumstances of the student. In addition, I want to reiterate the point that we will deal with students from the struck jurisdictions on a priority basis. Therefore the turnaround time from a struck jurisdiction will be less than the ordinary turnaround time.

Education Financing

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Education. Can the minister advise when he intends to implement the recommendations of the Financing Schooling in Alberta report, in particular the recommendation that the province increase its share of education spending to 85 per cent?

MR. KING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can advise the hon. member. Some of the recommendations will be acted on within the Department of Education. Some of them will be recommended to my colleagues in cabinet, and the recommendation will be that they should be acted upon. At least one of them will be recommended against, and that is the recommendation just referred to by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

MR. MARTIN: Well, I'm surprised. My second question to the minister is a simple one: why?

MR. SPEAKER: Are we going to have a debate on funding now? Perhaps the question could be answered very briefly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Because.

MR. KING: If that's a condition of answering the question, Mr. Speaker, then of course I can't answer.

The recommendation is incompatible with one other recommendation of the report and incompatible with the long-standing policy position of the provincial government, which policy position is well known to my hon. colleague opposite.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise how many school divisions in the province are facing the prospect of strikes in the near future?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, since I do not sit at the bargaining table and since I don't purport to have a pipeline to the bargaining table, as some members may have, I cannot answer that question.

MR. MARTIN: Well, it's a surprising answer from the Minister of Education.

A supplementary question. Has the minister had an opportunity to study the effects of the 13 per cent tax increase on teachers' demands for increased wages?

MR. KING: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: Now that you've studied it, Davie, could you tell us what the assessment is?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, our assessment is that teachers in this province, as is indeed the case with the other citizens of this province, continue to be very, very fortunate compared to citizens in other provinces of the country. We do not face the

prospect, as do teachers in British Columbia, that they will be discharged from their teaching positions. We are not reducing the number of instructional days per year, as is happening in some provinces. We are not reducing the number of instructional hours per day. All things considered, in the economic circumstances of the day, we continue to believe that teachers are sharing the economic circumstances of the province on a fair and equitable basis with all the other citizens of the province.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. I hope they're properly ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MARTIN: In view of the numerous labor disputes involving education, has the minister reconsidered his publicly stated intention to provide a 2 to 3 per cent increase in educational grants next year?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, let us say that the Provincial Treasurer and I are jointly reconsidering my earlier prognostications that 2 to 3 per cent might be the range of the grant increase next year.

Provincial Budget

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier, and it's somewhat on the line of the questions that have just preceded. I wonder if the Premier could confirm that it is the government's policy that there will be no increase in the 1984-85 operational budgets of the government except in the departments of Hospitals and Medical Care, and Advanced Education. Has that been established as a goal in the '84-85 budgeting process that I understand is in motion at the present time?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I refer the question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, no decisions have yet been taken with respect to any of those grant areas. However, as I've indicated, if those who wish to do some planning over the next three or four months wish an indication — and a number have asked for an indication — at this stage, realizing that we haven't yet made final decisions, it would probably be realistic and prudent for them to plan for next year on the basis that there probably would be about the same dollars available in the upcoming year as there are this year.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. In terms of that policy, has the government established a hiring freeze with regard to the civil service across all departments of government, in line with that goal of the government?

MR. HYNDMAN: In fact, Mr. Speaker — as the hon. gentleman knows, as indicated in the budget in the spring — there is a reduction this year, which is ongoing and which will be achieved, the first reduction in some 70 years.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In terms of the goal of a balanced budget, would the Provincial Treasurer indicate at this time whether the balanced budget will occur without any further erosion or borrowing from the Alberta

Heritage Savings Trust Fund than those borrowings that are already occurring and that we're aware of in this Legislature?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think it's premature to make any observations on that point at this stage, some months ahead of the budget. I'd simply say that we have to live within our means. It will take several years to ratchet down the expenditures. As members know, we have a very large deficit, which we have to accommodate. So appropriate steps will be taken in a responsible way to move toward a better balance between revenue and expenditure.

Saddledome

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, and it regards the Saddledome issue in Calgary. I'd like to know why the summary of details for the Calgary Saddledome, including those areas that have been termed cost overruns, were not offered for public consumption at the completion of the report to the Saddledome development committee.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the Saddledome committee requested the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services to do a review. Public Works did that and provided the Saddledome society with the summary review, which I think the Member for Calgary McCall is referring to. They subsequently have acted upon most of the recommendations that were given to them, or are in the process of doing so. The project was completed, as the member knows, by the middle of October.

MR. NELSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Yes, it was completed, and it's very nice. There are a couple of areas that were of some concern, and I wonder if the minister could give some detail on these two areas that have impacted on the original cost of the Saddledome project, particularly in the area of the structure.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm wondering — and the hon. minister would of course know what information he has — whether we aren't getting into specifics that could be dealt with on the Order Paper. That's a suggestion I'm making, until we see how the hon. minister wishes to deal with the answer.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could deal with it quite briefly. In summary, there were essentially two reasons for overrun, and I'd like to deal with that also. One was of course the fast-tracking that was required. It was a fast-track project, and this was required in order to show good faith in terms of providing the facility that is going to be required for the '88 Olympics. The other factor really relates to the technology of the roof. It was originally estimated that this roof design would be more economical than a conventional structural beam design. As it turned out, it wasn't. But that's par for the course, if you like, in structural design.

As far as I'm concerned . . . You mentioned overrun, and I'd have to ask the question: compared to what? [interjections] Well, when you design on a fast-track basis, you have to come up with an initial cost estimate. Then you proceed with the design and you develop the thing as it moves along. Normally in a project, when you've done the design first and then do the cost estimation, you can expect to be reasonably close. The society may well have had an estimate that was that much over. I'm sure members then would have been upset with the under-estimation of the cost. But without trying to be flippant, it is difficult to get an exact measure of the costs when you first

undertake a project where you're proceeding with a fast-track design method.

The building will cost something less than \$76 million and, frankly, I think it's darned good value for the money. It's one of the best projects — in fact, it's the best project of its kind in the world. It's a project that every Calgarian, every Albertan, and all Canadians are going to be mighty proud of in the years ahead.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a supplementary question. In light of the fact that there is an existing coliseum in the city of Edmonton, which gives an opportunity for the people who are doing the estimating to compare with a building already in existence — and I believe this building was also built by fast-tracking — can the minister indicate what monitoring was going on in some department to look at what was happening in the Calgary situation, in light of the experience that we had here with the Northlands Coliseum? What monitoring was going on while the building was being built, to compare it to the Edmonton one?

MR. CHAMBERS: First of all, Mr. Speaker, in my view the Northlands Coliseum is an excellent structure, first class. And it was built some years ago, as members know. I think every one that has been built across North America — hockey arenas — is different, because it's evolving technology. That's good; that's as it should. I'm sure the Saddledome society looked hard at the Northlands Coliseum — in fact I know, they did — and therefore had that structure to compare with. But they proceeded with the Saddledome design and, frankly, I would invite the member to look at it if he hasn't seen it. It's a unique structure; it's a fine one. I'm sure it's just excellent value for the people of Calgary and this province.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. It just proves that it's easier to spend the taxpayers' money than your own.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the answers he gave the hon. Member for Calgary McCall, can the minister indicate if there will be any other studies carried out or is this it? We just pay the bill and bite the bullet. Is that it?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Calgary McCall referred to the summary that was provided by the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services. It was to help them, at their request; to give them this review, in order that they might achieve their objective of bringing in the project at the least possible cost and by October 15. Again, I indicated that they have followed most of those recommendations and are working on the others.

Subsequently the Saddledome society set up a performance audit review committee to do a total project review and audit. I understand that that will be produced and made public in due course.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a short supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary by the hon. member, followed by a supplementary by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, the Member for Calgary Egmont, and the Member for Edmonton Glengarry. Then we'd better get on with the list, because we're starting to run out of time.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a short supplementary to the Premier, and he can farm it out to whomever he wishes. What

monitoring or what executive committee is in place to make sure that for any of the facilities that are going to be built for the Olympics in the future, we will not have the same problem we had with the Saddledome? What mechanism is in place to make sure that for the taxpayers' share of funds that are being expended, we will not have the same problems we had with the Saddledome?

MR. LOUGHEED: Insofar as it's applicable, I refer the question to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, Public Works, Supply and Services provided the input requested by the Olympic Saddledome society. This society is comprised of—and I'm giving you an example here—people appointed by the city of Calgary; by the Olympic association, OCO; and by the province. I think the committee has done an excellent job, and I have great faith in them. When they requested Public Works, Supply and Services to provide some information, Public Works, Supply and Services provided that.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, and it comes back to the Member for Calgary McCall's question. The question specifically is, why was it not made public? It was public money. And who determined that the report would not be made public, the minister? Or was it at the request of the Saddledome committee?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the review that was done by Public Works, Supply and Services and given to the Saddledome society was made public.

MR. MARTIN: I will follow up with a supplementary question. I saw that public document. I'm talking specifically about the working papers those recommendations came from. Why were those not made public?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, when I came in today I noticed that the Member for Edmonton Norwood has on the Order Paper a motion for a return with regard to the working papers. Does the Speaker wish me to get into the debate on this today?

MR. SPEAKER: Under the circumstances, it would obviously be sensible to postpone the discussion until that motion comes up on the Order Paper. It won't take too long.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary.

MR. MARTIN: Is the minister going to answer that motion for a return?

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we could await the events.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, my last supplemental on the issue would be to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. Would the minister verify that part of the costing difficulties arose because the original testing of the soil conditions was much more positive than what the construction really did encounter when they started to excavate?

MR. SPEAKER: I have a little difficulty with that question. As the hon. member knows, the question period is intended for getting information rather than giving it. I know we've had

a number of examples, including earlier today, when that has happened. Under those circumstances, perhaps we ought to allow one more.

MR. COOK: I'll defer to your advice, Mr. Speaker. I was going to ask a good question as well.

MR. CHAMBERS: Sure, that contributed something to the cost, Mr. Speaker. So did the delay in the final site selection. But as I indicated, the major reasons were the fast-tracking—that always tends to cost more money—and, as it turned out, the technology of the roof. Again, I would like to point out that the term "overrun" is applied to a preliminary cost estimate. In my view, I frankly think that the \$76 million—or I hope something less than that—is darned good value for the money, in terms of that structure.

MR. NOTLEY: That's a nice opinion.

Home Care Program

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. In view of the concerns expressed by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care regarding rising health care costs in Canada, could the minister please tell us what studies he has done to examine the potential of home care as an economic alternative to using active treatment beds for extended treatment?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, we are looking at ways of economically expanding the home care program, keeping in mind, of course, the fiscal deficit times that we're in. We have had two studies done, and both reports, along with a press release, were made public on September 20. I'd be happy to file both those studies in the Legislature tomorrow. Both reports indicate that the expansion of home care services, as an alternative to institutional care, deserves close attention. So we have done those particular studies.

MRS. KOPER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister please tell us whether or not the 27 health units have been involved in establishing any of the policies or procedures with regard to home care delivery?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, we do have an ongoing, good working relationship with the Health Unit Association of Alberta. One of the reports I'll file tomorrow is the result of public hearings that were held in the province last year. So there was opportunity for input from health units and others at that particular time. The other study related to possible changes on the entry criteria for the co-ordinated home care program. So in terms of the time period from when the program first came into place several years ago until now, there have been a number of studies and a considerable amount of public input.

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Entrance to the home care program is presently through doctor's diagnosis and recommendations. Would it be my understanding that there's some consideration of developing social as well as medical criteria?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, that is an important question and one that the particular report, the Abt study, did address. There was a recommendation for a further expansion of the program from a medical entry point into a social entry point. However, one of the other studies indicated that we maintain the current

medical entry point but that in cases where individuals need support services that would enable them to remain in their own homes, those support services be considered available to them as well.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister indicated that he felt there could be an increase in the home care program. I wanted to clarify that for the House. Could the minister advise the Assembly whether the advice offered by the Provincial Treasurer today, that the same dollars will be made available, would be prudent advice for health units in the province, or is the government considering actively increasing the dollars available for the home care program in the next budget?

DR. WEBBER: In general terms, Mr. Speaker, for funding health units in the province of Alberta, the comments of the hon. Provincial Treasurer certainly apply as well. The question I was asked today was whether or not we were considering the possibility of looking at the program to see if there's some way of economically expanding it within the fiscal times we're in. In doing so, however, I think we'd have to look carefully at where the funds would come from. Certainly there isn't money for new programs, but I think we have to take a close look to see whether or not we may be able to move moneys from one area to another.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. What specific discussions are taking place between the minister's department and the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, with respect to the current hold on extended care facilities and the problems that is creating for the active treatment hospitals in the province, problems that might be in part alleviated by expanding the home care ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is the hon. leader asking what discussions are taking place between two ministers?

MR. NOTLEY: Perhaps I could put the question in a slightly different way, Mr. Speaker, and ask what government policy is now being considered to properly co-ordinate the two departments.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, in terms of co-ordination, there is an interdepartmental committee that is looking at not only the two studies I've referred to today but the Nursing Home Review Panel study. This interdepartmental committee will be making recommendations to both the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care and me, with regard to a broad and detailed view of these studies.

MRS. EMBURY: A supplementary, please, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you alluded to the fact that you were looking at alternative ...

MR. SPEAKER: Could the hon. member use the ordinary parliamentary form, please.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In reference to what he said regarding alternative means of funding, would the minister please advise the House if he has given any consideration to a charge, or an increase in the charge, to citizens that use the home care program?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I have not given consideration to that particular point. As I mentioned, we are having the

interdepartmental committee look at different ways we may be able to accommodate some of the needs of the home care program. We anticipate that they'll look at those alternatives carefully.

MRS. KOPER: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since some studies of late seem to indicate that the best place for recovery seems to be at home with one's family, could the minister please indicate to the Assembly whether there is any change in the demand for home care services?

DR. WEBBER: I don't recall the exact figures, Mr. Speaker, but there certainly has been an increase in the demand over the last few years. At the same time, there's been a significant increase in the amount of funding for the home care program, an increase from about \$10 million to \$18 million over the past three years.

I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that both reports I've referred to have indicated a great deal of satisfaction among Albertans with regard to the home care ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

Correspondence School

(continued)

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Education. It flows from the previous questions regarding students of a struck jurisdiction getting priority at the Alberta correspondence branch. In view of the fact that there are 19 divisions in dispute at this particular time, what contingencies are in place to deal with the flood of applications if several jurisdictions go on strike at the same time? How will they be prioritized?

MR. KING: If several jurisdictions go on strike at the same time, Mr. Speaker — and use of the word "if" recognizes a hypothetical situation — then it will not be possible for the correspondence branch to prioritize among those several jurisdictions. It is our sincere hope that the labor relations process, involving negotiation and mediation, will result in a number of contracts in these districts. Beyond expressing that hope, we can only say that in the event the hope is not realized, we'll do the very best we can.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. I hope too, but I ask the minister specifically, what contingency plans does the government have if this situation occurs?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, we have developed the best possible contingency plans. They are that insofar as humanly possible, we will deal with needs on a priority basis. The people who work for the correspondence branch are human, and I can't ask them to do anything more than that.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Might the hon. Member for Camrose revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

(reversion)

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly some 37 students who have driven in this afternoon from Bawlf, which is in my constituency. Along with them are their teachers Lyle Erga and Don Schielke and their bus driver Gerald Roth.

I might point out that in discussion with the students, they have brought me their concern that last month they had the opening of their new gymnasium. However, the Minister of Education did not supply a plaque for that opening, whereas six months ago he supplied one for Hay Lakes in my constituency. I promised the students that I would bring the problem to his attention and perhaps talk the minister into personally delivering the plaque to Bawlf.

Mr. Speaker, the Bawlf students are seated in the public gallery, and I ask that they now rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will please come to order.

ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVINGS TRUST FUND
CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION
1984-85 ESTIMATES OF
PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

Department of the Environment

1 — Irrigation Headworks and Main Irrigation Systems Improvement

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the minister any opening comments?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. With regard to the irrigation headworks and main irrigation systems improvement project, work has progressed this summer in a fairly orderly fashion. The majority of the work has been on the St. Mary River Irrigation District's main canal and improvements to it, and with regard to the headworks projects and canals in the Lethbridge Northern Irrigation District. In addition, the Crawling Valley reservoir in the Eastern Irrigation District has made significant progress.

When I last discussed the irrigation projects with the Assembly, I indicated that we had anticipated that this year we would be proceeding with the Forty Mile Coulee reservoir project and with the Badger reservoir in the Bow River Irrigation District. When the '83-84 estimates in the amount of \$91.5 million were brought before the Assembly, it was anticipated that in 1984-85 we would see an additional expenditure of \$109.6 million. In the interim, with directions received from the Provincial Treasurer and particularly in these times of deficit financing — and the estimates today indicate that we are seeking some \$60 million for this year — it was deemed that because of the overflow into the next fiscal year of projects already commenced, there would not be adequate funding to commence these two projects at this particular time.

I might state that with regard to the Forty Mile Coulee project, I have met with the St. Mary River Irrigation District board.

I discussed with them the scheduling of their project and explained the circumstances in which we now find ourselves. In those discussions, I indicated to the board that we would have to postpone that project for the next three years, in terms of being able to schedule it.

With regard to the Badger reservoir in the Bow River Irrigation District, I have met with the board and discussed the question of when their project might be scheduled. I might note that acquisition of land by the Bow River Irrigation District delayed to some degree the earlier implementation of this project. We do have under consideration the Bow River Irrigation District request for the Badger reservoir. At this point in time we have not been able to indicate to them specifically when we anticipate scheduling their project, but certainly it would be much earlier than the Forty Mile project in the SMRID.

With those opening comments, Mr. Chairman, I would be prepared to entertain questions.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the minister indicated that there is a reduction from \$109 million, as I understand it, to some \$60 million. The two projects mentioned, the Badger Lake and the Forty Mile projects, are being put on hold. Is that my understanding? For example, will some funds be allocated out of that \$60 million, or are there no funds available at all for the coming fiscal year in terms of the Badger Lake project? That's the one I'm most interested in. If there are some, how much could possibly be allocated to the Bow River Irrigation District?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated, one of the concerns we have, given the allocation of some \$60 million that's available for the '84-85 fiscal year and given the work that is proceeding and in progress — we are unable to schedule the Forty Mile Coulee project and the Badger project in the next fiscal year because of the ongoing commitment, which is a necessity because of the projects already under way in this fiscal year and which will require funding in the next fiscal year. We're reviewing very closely the progress of those projects and, as I suggested, will attempt to initiate the Badger reservoir project as early as possible. It would certainly proceed prior to the scheduling of the Forty Mile Coulee project which, because of the large capital sums involved, we don't anticipate will proceed until after the next three years are concluded.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. In terms of the Badger Lake project, has the Bow River Irrigation District approval to proceed with the purchase of the necessary lands for the lake site?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was advised, I believe mid-summer, that the Bow River Irrigation District had completed its acquisition of lands for that project.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. In the current year in the Bow River Irrigation District — and this relates to the use of the heritage fund in an indirect way — the water rates were increased some \$3 plus. The purpose of increasing the rates was to accumulate funds, in terms of moneys necessary in terms of the formula, so the district could contribute its portion of the funds to build Badger Lake. In the discussions the minister had with Bow River, was there any discussion with regard to a reduction in those rates or advising the board to hold the rates at a certain level for some period of time? Would some notification be given to the district that their rates at present should not be as high as they are because

funds won't be available for capital construction for some period of time?

MR. BRADLEY: No, Mr. Chairman, I haven't had any discussions with the Bow River Irrigation District specifically with regard to its rates. Our specific discussions were with regard to moving the project forward. There was some anticipation, as I indicated earlier, that the project would proceed this year. A final determination as to when the project would proceed has not yet been determined. We're reviewing our commitments and seeing whether or not we may be able to advance this project and give a more clear date as to when it may proceed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. At this point in time, though, in terms of the year 1984-85, there is a very clear no; there are no funds available for the Badger Lake project to proceed. Is that a correct statement?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the funds that are allocated for '84-85, and given the requirement for commitment to projects which were initiated this year in terms of ongoing contracts, as I have indicated, we could not schedule the project in '84-85. That was also part of the problem we had in proceeding with it this year: the commitments next year in terms of ongoing projects. Had we not seen the availability of funds for this project reduced, we may have been able to proceed with the project this year and carry over into '84-85. Is that clear?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, another question to the minister. The studies that are proceeding in terms of the South Saskatchewan basin are in progress. Future structures or determinations as to the priority of use of the water will most likely come out of these studies. Has the minister put a hold on any of those studies? Will those studies proceed as planned, and will the budget allocated for the studies proceed as planned? My understanding is that, somewhere down the road, the necessity of an expenditure from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is a must. If the studies are going to make recommendations that we can't meet from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, then maybe we should look at whether we stop the studies at this time or proceed as planned.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the South Saskatchewan River basin program, it has received its initial funding in terms of planning from the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. The present status of that planning program is that there will be completed by the end of November — I believe that's the target date — a series of scenarios or options with regard to management of water in the basin, looking at the allocations within the basins and how to best manage water in the basin, and at our apportionment commitments at the Saskatchewan border and how they might best be met from within the three basins involved in the study.

It has also been announced that the Alberta Water Resources Commission will be holding hearings specifically with regard to those different options and scenarios in the 1984 calendar year. So that's where that program is at this point in time. Any implementation of actual policy directions — I'm not envisioning whether there would be projects recommended out of that particular study; it's more in terms of looking at policy decisions I've enunciated — would come from the advice and recommendations to the government by the Water Resources Commission. Then policy announcements would be made.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the minister indicated that funding for the studies is from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

Could the minister update the kinds of moneys that were allocated in terms of the studies? Since there's a cutback in the amount of money available for capital projects, will there be a cutback in the next fiscal year in terms of those studies?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, it's envisaged that the estimates for the current fiscal year for water management planning studies with regard to the Oldman and the South Saskatchewan River basins are some \$475,000.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. In terms of the next fiscal year, what does the minister foresee?

MR. BRADLEY: An equivalent figure has been appropriated.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 — Irrigation Headworks
and Main Irrigation Systems Improvement \$60,000,000

2 — Land Reclamation

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Does the minister have any comments?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, in light of this period of deficit financing, we are looking at allocating some \$3 million in the '84-85 fiscal year to the land reclamation component of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, capital projects division. In previous years, we have allocated \$5 million, but we have not met the complete amount that has been appropriated.

The allocation is split between research in reclamation areas, which is being carried out, and land reclamation projects specifically. In past years we have looked at municipal garbage dumps, sewage lagoons, mine safety hazards, and reclaiming seismic lines: a variety of projects on either municipally owned or Crown lands. Attention has been given to reclaiming industrial activity prior to the introduction of the Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Act. One of the major priorities, which has been an ongoing priority since about 1977, is looking at the coal slack piles in the Crownsnest Pass. If the necessary land negotiations can be concluded, it is anticipated that that would be our major emphasis in land reclamation in the '84-85 fiscal year.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, during the course of this discussion, I'd like the minister, if he could, to bring us up to date, as a committee, on a report which apparently was undertaken by the minister's department, and I gather was released in the press several weeks ago. Rather than members of the committee having to evaluate the correctness of government policies on the basis of something that is leaked to the press, perhaps the minister would like to bring us up to date, first of all, on what review of these various reclamation projects has been undertaken from an environmental standpoint. It's one thing to pretty up a landfill site, but to what extent are we safeguarding the public in the immediate area so there is no seepage and no jeopardy to water supplies in communities that are adjacent to the sites?

Perhaps the minister could start out, Mr. Chairman, by identifying this report that one of the daily newspapers made considerable reference to, and sharing the details of the report with the committee before he asks us to vote him another \$3 million. More importantly, to what extent are some of the problems identified as a result of this study being corrected?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. leader is referring to a report prepared by MacLaren Plansearch Laval in

for Alberta Environment and Environment Canada. Is that the report the hon. leader is referring to?

Mr. Chairman, as a result of a concern which was expressed by the Canadian ministers of environment and resources — and I'm not sure of the exact date — the various environment departments across the country, in conjunction with Environment Canada, did an inventory on identification and verification of active and inactive land disposal sites in Alberta. Basically what they wanted to do was to document the different landfill sites in the provinces, identify those which may be problems in the future, and assess them in terms of priorities.

This initial report which looked at these sites had varying criteria involved in terms of identifying what might be considered a priority site. I'm not sure of the exact figure, but I believe somewhere in the area of 116 were identified as priority sites. It was a very initial and basic survey of sites. As I said, the criteria used sometimes indicated if there was a water supply within X number of blocks, feet, miles, or whatever. Various criteria were used. Was there ground water in the area? Those types of criteria. So this report has been a very useful document in terms of identifying some priorities for further consideration.

Phase two of the study is now under way. That is to follow up on looking at those landfills which were identified to see if the basic criteria — and in some considerations of the basic criteria, there was just a look through files, not an active look at the landfill site itself but just a look through this list of criteria to see which landfills might fall into this, for further investigation. So it wasn't a detailed review, a scientific analysis, or a direct monitoring of these specific sites. The follow-up phase to the study is under way. We're looking at the methodology of the original study and looking at particular cases to see whether they require further attention. When phase two is completed, we expect that it will identify any further follow-up which is required. If it is, phase three will direct itself to specific remedial actions, if they are required. I think that basically covers the report which the hon. leader referred to.

With regard to landfill or land disposal sites which were reclaimed under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund project, which is the appropriation we are discussing today, there are a number of criteria which have been looked at by this program in terms of reclamation of the abandoned dumps. First of all, a visual inspection was made to look at the soil types and conditions at each of the land sites. There was a review done to look at the presence of pesticides and chemical contaminants; a look at whether there were large car bodies, et cetera, in the landfills. Water table conditions in open trenches during the reclamation were looked at and, in general, the nature of the garbage that was in the sites.

If pesticide containers were present, they were collected and disposed of by the waste management branch. Car bodies were recycled, if there were sufficient numbers to warrant that; if not, they were crushed and buried in the particular landfill site. If a high water table was present, of course the method of reclamation changed to include a different type of reclamation, shallow trenching rather than deep trenching. Also, if the nature of the garbage in the site required that the installation of piezometers was necessary after reclamation, that procedure was looked at, so there could be ongoing monitoring of the site with regard to any potential problems that might develop by the nature of the substances in the site. I might also advise that in certain areas we are monitoring specific sites for methane gas build-up.

That is basically the review that is done prior to proceeding with the reclamation of a landfill to ensure that the environmental concerns are looked at.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the minister assure the Assembly that all funds are being directed for reclamation and research on areas that were reclaimed prior to the reclamation Act. Of course I am concerned that industrial users are not being subsidized by the taxpayer. My concern is, are they sharing in their responsibility? Have there been any offenders? If so, have they been prosecuted under the Act?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, our philosophy with regard to industrial landfills or reclamations, specifically under this program, has been to not assist with regard to reclamation of industrial properties after the implementation of the Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Act and specifically the amendments of 1973. So any industrial operation that is in existence today, after the proclamation of that legislation, is in fact required to take care of their own reclamation.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to the minister's answer about these sites. Where land reclamation has proceeded under the program we are examining this afternoon — the minister has indicated that we have a joint study that has examined landfill sites in the broadest sense, but I would presume that would also include some of the sites that have been cleaned up pursuant to this program. My first question is, how many of these sites, which we've cleaned up under the auspice's of this program, have now been identified as hazardous as a result of the study? My understanding is that there still seem to be some problems with some of these sites. You can clean up a site, you can plant nice grass on it, but if there are problems with the site with respect to seepage, et cetera, that can still represent a hazard. Can the minister give us a handle on just exactly where things stand in terms of the sites that we have presumably cleaned up under this program?

The second thing is with respect to the study itself. The minister indicated that the second phase of the study would be further identification. I would like to know what time frame we are looking at for further identification. Is this going to be simply a stall technique so the government doesn't have to spend any money in cleaning up hazardous sites for a year or two? The Provincial Treasurer has given us the word today: no increase in operating grants for other levels of government. So it's obvious that the brakes are being put on. Are we going to be carrying on a study until such time as we find some money again? Or is there in fact a time frame for completion of the second phase of the study? The question that flows from that — I presume from listening to the minister that the third phase is to undertake whatever work is necessary. I would like some indication of a time frame on that. The second phase time frame, and whatever work flows from that identification of hazards, I think would be useful as far as this discussion is concerned.

I just want to say one other thing, Mr. Chairman, in terms of offering comments to the minister. While this question of land reclamation deals with cleaning up eyesores and landfill sites, we have to give some serious consideration in the province to the multitude of local landfill sites that exist. There is a strong argument for a co-ordinated approach to regional landfill sites. Just to cite as an example the controversy that now exists in the north Peace, I would say that one has to be very, very careful about the location of a regional landfill site.

The minister probably knows — but I'm sure other members wouldn't be aware — of a dispute that is now occurring in the north Peace area over a regional landfill site for a number of communities. A gentleman has purchased some land several miles out of the hamlet of Whitelaw, and he would very much like to make that a regional waste disposal site. From his point of view, with the highways being what they are, that is

obviously the best place to put it, from an economic standpoint. The only problem is that it creates all kinds of difficulties for people in the area. There is at least some concern, not totally refuted by the evidence that I have seen — and I say not totally refuted deliberately — that over a period of time there could be seepage into that area, a basis of the Whitelaw Spring which is one of the few areas in the entire Peace where we have good quality, potable drinking water, as opposed to the dugouts which are the normal source of water supply for most of the area.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, the point that I want to make is that when we look at planning regional landfill sites, the Department of the Environment is going to have to be extremely conscious of where these sites are placed. I know that it's always a tricky issue when a regional landfill site is considered; nobody wants even a nice, beautified dump across the street or road. But I do think that if there are any possible dangers from an environmental standpoint, then we have to be doubly careful.

The proponents of this particular site have come to me and said: look, this is going to be a much better arrangement; we're going to have a person there to keep track of what's going into the landfill site. The problem of course is that the person isn't going to be there 24 hours a day. With more industrialization occurring in the province, the difficulty of a regional landfill site is that one never really knows what kinds of things are being dumped in that site unless you've got a very sophisticated, monitoring system. As I see these sites in the province, I don't think we can assure ourselves that in fact that is true around the clock. Obviously they're somewhat better than the old community dump; God knows what has gone into some of these dumps. But we have a long way to go in terms of providing safety, as far as the disposal of waste is concerned in this province. That's an observation I'd like to make at this time, Mr. Chairman, apropos of this estimate but in the larger sense, the minister's overall responsibility as Minister of the Environment.

But bringing it right back to the questions I've put to the minister, I'd like time frame estimates on the study and what commitments are proposed for action thereafter.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the observations of the hon. member with regard to the siting of landfills. I might note that the licensing of landfills is under the Department of Social Services and Community Health and that our department provides an advisory capacity in terms of the technical aspects relating to hydrogeology, soils' conditions, et cetera. Certainly it's very important that we ensure that landfills are properly located on the proper types of soils which will prevent the problem of leaching, et cetera, of the soils or type. I'm sure the hon. member is aware, as many of us are, that there are certainly difficulties in locating landfills, whether they be of a local or regional nature. But that's not really what we're here to discuss today; we're here to discuss land reclamation. I might say, though, that I think the approach that is being taken is appropriate in terms of the very careful review that is done before landfill sites are approved, to ensure that they meet these specific and tight technical requirements so that some of the concerns that we are trying to address with our reclamation approach and with the identification of disposal sites, which the province has initiated with the federal government to correct some of the problems of the past, don't take place in the future.

With regard to the number of sites that we have reclaimed and how they overlap with the identification done by the MacLaren Plansearch report, I don't have any specific numbers as to how many sites we've reclaimed and how they match up

or fit in with the MacLaren report. It might be noted, though, that a lot of the information which MacLaren used was in fact our Alberta Environment documentation with regards to sites and perhaps the preliminary information which we had. I note that some specific information that has been identified in the MacLaren report does not necessarily reflect what has taken place with regard to what the department has done.

What we are currently doing is letting out a contract this fiscal year to confirm the information which developed in the phase one report regarding the priority one sites. We also plan to re-evaluate the scoring system to ensure that there is continuity not only within the province but across the country with the federal government. When that report is complete, we will identify what follow-up action is required with regard to specific sites. So this is an ongoing program.

The initial commitment had a three-phase approach to it. We are now into phase two in terms of putting out a contract to confirm the information in the first report, because it was very preliminary in nature and the criteria used may have no grounds whatsoever in terms of actually saying that there is a problem with a specific site. If it was within a certain distance of a water course, et cetera, then it had a higher priority; if it was adjacent to a water supply, it may have had a higher priority; if it was adjacent to a population, it may have had a higher priority. So these are all the types of scoring systems which may not necessarily indicate that the site has a problem but would be an initial survey which would be followed up by a more in-depth review of those specific sites as prioritized by the first report.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 2 — Land Reclamation \$3,000,000

3 — Paddle River Basin Development

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the minister any comments?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think we explored the status of the project fairly extensively in the spring session. Perhaps an update at this point in time might be very useful.

I think it has been indicated — and certainly questions were asked during this session, initially in the question period, with regard to the Paddle and where we're at. At this point in time, actual construction is around, I believe, the 90 per cent completion stage. We had anticipated that if working conditions were appropriate, the major embankment would have been completed this fall. But as was outlined and detailed in the question period previously, because of certain soil conditions in the foundation, looking at the pore pressures and the amount of moisture, at this point in time it was felt that rather than completing the dam this fall, it would be prudent to leave that until next spring in order to allow the pore pressures to dissipate and the foundation conditions to stabilize. There had been some minor movements within the deeper soil foundation.

In terms of the actual design of the project, monitoring has been put in place to look at any type of movement with regard to the structure. As I explained in question period last Friday, with earth-fill dam construction, it is anticipated that there will be some minor movements. You have to monitor this very closely, and you have to pace the addition of material to the embankment and ensure that you are closely monitoring the soil condition. I think it's been well discussed in this Legislature that the foundation at the Paddle River dam site is of a complex nature which required this type of very close monitoring.

The approach the department has taken with regard to the construction of the project is one of initial design, of monitoring, as I've indicated, with a number of different types of

sophisticated monitoring, and modification in terms of the construction schedule and perhaps of actual design as you proceed with construction. I anticipate that construction will be completed next spring. Some additional work will be required in terms of additional fill material, particularly in the area of the conduit, but I do not anticipate that there will be a marked increase in the estimate of dollars that have been asked for before the committee at this point in time. If in fact additional dollars are required, I would be looking at a supplementary estimate in the spring, but I do not anticipate that there will necessarily be a large amount of dollars required to complete the project.

I think part of the increase will be because of the nature of the project. You are having to — I don't know if the correct word is decommission; I guess redeploy is a better word — bring the construction crews back on site and remobilize this equipment. So that would be some of the additional cost we would be looking at.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I'd welcome questions.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I rise to get in ahead because now that we're on Paddle River, I'm waiting with bated breath for the hon. Member for Barrhead. After we get through, I'm going to take down notes of his hour speech. So the hon. member can get in — we have a number of questions, but I'm so anticipating the speech that I'll only ask a couple or three questions and wait for the minister's return.

The minister talks about the costs; estimates went from \$18 million to \$19.7 million to \$37 million. The minister says he doesn't expect there will be many extra costs. I wonder if he could be a little more specific. I would suggest that it's likely to cost more now because of the hold on construction. Rather than say he doesn't think "much", can he try to give us an estimate of a budget at this specific time.

My second question in regard to that, Mr. Chairman: are we looking at major design changes? And can we get an estimate on how much more we'll have to spend on the engineering aspect of the cost? I ask that question in view of the fact that there have been stories — I don't know how correct they are, but I'm sure the minister can tell us about the shifting. I've heard various stories about how far it's shifted, but I won't get into that because the minister can probably tell us how serious this shifting problem is.

I guess the third question — they all tie together — that I'll ask at this point: is the shifting going to be more serious in the long run as well? What will this do to the cost?

So let me just sum up: the cost, the estimates, major design changes, the shifting — how much, and is there a danger of this in the future? Then, Mr. Chairman, I will sit down and wait with great pleasure for the hon. Member for Barrhead's speech.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, in response to the questions of the hon. member, the outside ranges in the preliminary estimates that have been indicated to me in terms of what might be the final figure, are that increased costs would be less than \$500,000. As I've stated, I think that the major additional costs will be in terms of remobilization, gearing back up again. As I say, we had anticipated that we would be able to finalize the construction this year. Additional work which is being done — and this is being carried out in the current fiscal year — relates to additional berms being placed adjacent to the conduit, which allows the flow of the Paddle River to pass through the dam.

Mr. Chairman, without getting into a great deal of technical background information as to what all this means in terms of

the foundation and the minor movements that take place in the foundation, and the movements that have taken place with regard to the conduit, which are basically two different subjects, I suppose that the construction of the dam has been under, shall we say, a review board made up of internationally renowned experts who have reviewed the design, in fact have reviewed exactly the best location to build the reservoir. They've reviewed the design, and they've had ongoing meetings with regard to the project since its inception.

As I've said, the basic philosophy behind the construction of this dam has been to look at design and monitor [it], because it's anticipated that in earth-fill structures, due to the soil conditions, the nature of the soils, there could be these types of movements in the construction stage due to moisture within either the foundation or embankment material. Basically, if you add more weight to it, I understand that pore pressure increases, which may increase the amount of movement. So you stop putting any more fill in place, and you allow these pore pressures to dissipate. There are several examples in the world of this type of earth-fill construction where it has been part of the construction technique that you anticipate that this may take place. You do all this monitoring which I have referred to. This monitoring has been on an ongoing basis. It was part of the project right at the start, because this is what you want to look at. These are some of the difficulties you have in terms of construction of this type of a dam.

We have this review board which has been monitoring very closely the site location and design, reviewing the project at different stages, and giving advice to our project managers in terms of how to proceed with the construction. So this has been under very close monitoring. As I explained in the question period last Friday, once the precautionary measure was taken to suspend any further placing of fill on the embankment within the foundation itself — the soil foundation, this type of complex layer — the movements stopped.

With regard to the conduit, without getting into a great deal of technicalities, movement of the conduit is something which is also anticipated in this type of construction. I believe that subject to checking, the Gardiner dam is a good example of what can be experienced. Construction is such that there are collars placed along the conduit to allow for expansion and movement. One of the things that has been found with our monitoring at the Paddle River dam is that the conduit has moved, as was predicted. As I say, there are collars in it to allow for this. But one of the things that we are doing to stop the movement of the conduit is to place this additional berming work at the upstream and downstream parts of the conduit.

Basically at this point in time, I'm advised that there is not any movement being measured at the site with regard to the foundations, the soils conditions there, et cetera. Once the application of the material was suspended, the movement ceased. I am advised that there is no further movement in the conduit taking place as a result of the additional berm work. In conclusion, I have been advised that the additional costs with regards to the project may be in the order of \$500,000, at the outside.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood would like to continue with his questioning, I can wait until he's concluded. I know that he's on a roll right now. Go ahead, I'll come back in.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you. I appreciate that. Just to clarify, so that I understand: because of the additional berms, you're saying that the cost is now another \$500,000. I'm just asking that as a point of clarification. If I understand the minister

correctly, the shifting now is not a problem because of the additional berms. It's not shifting, and you foresee no more shifting in the long run; the problem is now solved.

MR. BRADLEY: I guess I should indicate, Mr. Chairman, that, again, I don't have a great deal of knowledge with regard to this; I have to take the advice which I receive. I mentioned that we have a board of some very qualified people who review this. Earth-fill structures actually become stronger after they have been constructed. It's in the initial construction phase, when you have these moisture conditions that you have to allow to dissipate, that you have to watch very closely. But with all the monitoring equipment we have in there, it's anticipated that the dam will actually strengthen over time.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of questions to the Minister of the Environment. At the outset, I would like to thank him for the thoroughness of the explanation he just directed to the Member for Edmonton Norwood with respect to the current status of the Paddle River dam. I know that, unfortunately, there has been some misinterpretation with respect to what's actually happening at the dam site. By way of questioning last Friday and today, the Paddle River dam is a "go" project. I suppose one should refer to a little bit of settling much the same way one looks at the basement of a house that one builds. In the first couple of years, there tend to be a few cracks in the Gyproc, and that's a rather normal situation. When one considers the instability of the soil along the Paddle River, one can certainly expect that there would be a little pressing into the earth of the amount of dirt that would be found in nearly 100 feet of a dirt embankment.

My concern to the minister is the same concern that I raised to him several weeks ago when he appeared before the Heritage Savings Trust Fund select committee. It deals with the payment forthcoming to a large number — unfortunately, at this point in time, I'm going to ask the minister to clarify what the large number of people is who have not been paid for work they have undertaken on the Paddle River dam. It's my understanding that individuals and in fact some subcontractors to subcontractors, who have worked on the Paddle River dam, have not obtained compensation this year for the efforts they have provided to the dam. Needless to say, that has caused a flurry of questions with respect to that from people who live in the area and have worked in the area, and from other parts of Alberta. We all know that the Alberta government, through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, is providing the dollars for the construction of the Paddle River dam. It's very, very unfortunate when a contractor on the site, for a variety of reasons, suddenly finds himself in a position of not forwarding payments to those people who have worked for him.

My initial question is: can the minister clarify how many people have not received compensation? Can he tell me approximately how many there are? Secondly, what steps are in progress to ensure, as much as physically possible, that there will be payment forwarded to those individuals who have done the work?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the question which the hon. member is bringing forward. There are basically three contracts involved for which there have specifically been delays in payments going to either subcontractors or to people working for the subcontractors. I'm not in a position today to give the hon. member an exact number or details as to how many contractors, subcontractors, or local tradespeople and truckers are in this position, but they are numerous. I sym-

pathize with those individuals who have not yet been paid by their contractor or subcontractor.

Basically, there are three contracts involved. We have a contract with a major contractor on the project, Opron Construction. They had a subcontractor called Maio Construction; there was foreclosure on that company in February of last year, I believe. With regard to those specific outstanding claims, the matter is presently before the courts. Under the Public Works Act, there is provision for the government to handle these types of claims through holdback provisions. In this case, because the claims were disputed — that is, there was not agreement as to the amount between the major contractor and the individuals who were putting forward claims — the money was put into court. That matter, some \$470,000, I believe, is currently before the courts for their adjudication as to the validity of the claims. In this situation, that is the decision which has been arrived at.

There is another group — mainly truckers — has not as yet received payment, and they are also part of a contract with the major contractor, Opron, through a subcontractor, Tri-Alta. This is very complex, because the subcontractor has a claim against Opron, and the truckers who are employed by Tri-Alta have a claim against Tri-Alta. We are currently assessing those claims and, in terms of legitimate claims which are forwarded to us, we are prepared to pay the truckers involved directly from the holdback we have with the major contractor, Opron.

There is another contractor on site, namely Ellis-Don, who is constructing the spillway. They have a subcontract with a company by the name of BACE, and there are some outstanding claims against BACE. There is some dispute in terms of the dollars with regard to some of the claims coming forward on that contract, and we are currently reviewing what action we will be taking. I might note that we are governed by the Public Works Act with regard to resolving these claims. We are working as expeditiously as possible to resolve the claims, to determine legitimacy, and to determine the course of action which we should take: in this case, whether to put the money into court and allow the court to adjudicate what the legitimate claims are, or if we can legitimize the claims between the major contractor and the people who are doing the work, we would pay those dollars directly out of the holdback.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of clarification. With respect to the Tri-Alta group, did I understand the minister to say that the funds owed to what I understand to be self-employed contracting truckers, are going to be paid out of the holdback from public works?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, basically that is the position we're taking. Claims which have been forwarded to us and which we can determine to be legitimate, we will be paying directly out of the holdback.

MR. McPHERSON: Is it my further understanding that the Tri-Alta company's contract with Opron Construction is currently before the courts?

MR. BRADLEY: It's my understanding that Tri-Alta has, in fact, registered a claim against Opron.

MR. MARTIN: I'd just like to follow up on this, if I may, for the clarification of us all. There seem to be a number of problems, and the one that you talked about . . . My understanding — correct me if I'm wrong here, because it gets very confusing — is that the government is paying Ellis-Don, the general contractors. Ellis-Don is withholding payments to BACE Con-

struction because they say BACE was holding back on payments to their subcontracted truckers. BACE Construction says that Ellis-Don never paid BACE properly, so BACE is suing — am I correct? — Ellis-Don for \$1 million. If I'm correct, then I guess a couple of questions flow from that. Is the only way that that will be settled by court, or is there any other thing that the government can do to intervene, as the Member for Barrhead indicates that it is Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund money? Is there a way that we can save a lengthy court case, and make sure that people get paid faster? I guess I'm asking: can the government act as a mediator in this situation?

MR. BRADLEY: In terms of the contract, our approach is generally to direct the general contractor to resolve the claims against him. As I say, we're getting into the matter of contract law, this type of legal arrangement. There seems to be substantial differences with regard to the claims being made and the different positions of the parties. We haven't come to a final determination with regard to what course of action we will follow with regard to Ellis-Don, BACE, and the subcontractors and truckers involved in this particular claim. We are reviewing it, but our direction has been to the overall general contractor to resolve the claims.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, can I follow up on that? I understand what the minister is saying about contract law, and it does seem fairly confusing. I wonder how we got into this situation. Perhaps he could tell us how this happened, this discrepancy which seems to be \$1 million or so? Secondly, is the minister saying that there is then no way to save it going to court, which, as the minister is well aware, could drag on for months or years, if I know court cases? Is there nothing that the government, through the minister's department, can do to intervene, if you like, or have the Minister of Labour or somebody move in to see if they can solve this ahead of it going to court, because otherwise it will be there forever?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, there have been numerous attempts by the department with regard to a mediation, in terms of meetings between the various parties. As I say, we are governed by the conditions and terms of the Public Works Act, and where the parties to a dispute agree that there is a legitimate claim, we do have the ability to pay directly to the claimant. However, in cases where there is a substantial dispute, we are very careful in terms of which determination we might make.

In terms of the overall responsibility of government, when there is a dispute of this nature, given it's contract law, I suggest that it's more prudent that the final resort would be adjudication by the court. In these cases where there is a dispute, I don't think that we have the ability to resolve it and take a position between two parties as to what is legitimate, if it cannot be categorically proven.

MR. MARTIN: If I can just follow up on this, Mr. Chairman. We understand the players; can the minister enlarge on the dispute in this particular case dealing with the Paddle River? In following up, I guess, the minister is saying that at this point, because the dispute is so substantial, the government has done everything it can now, short of the courts, to try to resolve this. Is that what the minister is saying?

MR. BRADLEY: As I said, Mr. Chairman, we're still reviewing. I've explained that there are basically three contracts that are involved, and I've outlined the approach that we're taking in different aspects of those. They are basically between parties.

There are contracts between those parties, and those are the subjects of the claims.

MR. MARTIN: I have other questions, but what I'm specifically asking is: what was the problem; why did we get into this? The minister said it's ongoing; he answered my second question. But why are we having so much difficulty with the contracts here?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, there's a dispute between the parties to a contract.

MR. MARTIN: I recognize that, but I'm asking this question specifically: what is the problem? I recognize that there is a dispute, but I'm asking the minister what caused the dispute. Where is the difficulty?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, party A has undertaken some work, and party B is disputing the amount that party B owes party A for the work done.

MR. MARTIN: I'll move on to some other questions to the minister flowing from here. I'd like to go on to the proposed dam on the Oldman River that could come from the heritage trust fund, estimates of which the minister is well aware have escalated. In view of the problems that we're having with estimates for the Paddle River, where does that estimate now stand? The latest figure that I have — maybe the minister could correct me — would be up around \$168 million. I wonder what the cost/benefit ratio — or have we given up on the thought because of our experience with the Paddle River dam?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. The chair has some difficulty with that question, because we are on the Paddle River basin development. Any further questions?

MR. MARTIN: I was curious because I was trying to get from the flow of the Paddle, but you're right in terms of your interpretation. He wants to answer though.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If it's out of order to ask the question, I think it's out of order to answer it.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 3 — Paddle River Basin
Development

\$3,571,000

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

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I propose now that the committee continue in Committee of Supply. I've asked one of my colleagues to be here in order to present the estimates of the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care. If the committee would be willing to accommodate me for a few minutes, we'll have him here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We'll accommodate you.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

Department of Hospitals and Medical Care

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 — Applied Cancer Research \$5,194,000

2 — Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments?

MR. MARTIN: We're moving along rather quickly, and I'm sure the minister would like to give us an up-to-date report on the different phases: where we're at with phase three. When we talked in the heritage trust fund committee, a decision had been made. Perhaps we could ask the minister for an updated report, if you like, on the project.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, there's not much more to report than when I reported to the committee during our recent meeting. I understand the medical research trust is considering the supply of some funds for capital purposes to be used exclusively for research, and perhaps that would get us into phase three of the building. But at the time we're asking for approval of this vote we're looking at phase two, with the accelerated amount as indicated in the estimates.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, without getting into the dollar answer, have there been any changes recently? Can the minister give us an update on his best estimate at this time of how much we're looking at in terms of the finished product?

MR. RUSSELL: I've always had difficulty answering that question because of the effect of inflation. I can say that the project is within budget; that is, the revised budget that was struck after the hospital had the audit and review that caused the concern among members two years ago. They're within that budget, and the only unknown is the effect of inflation on the unspent or uncommitted dollars to date. So our best estimate is that the final costs will be \$423 million.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, if I might. I understand that there's been some comment, at least in my constituency, from people who have gone through the new health sciences building — at least the portion that's available — that there are fewer beds in this centre than there were previously in the old hospital. I wonder if the minister could give me some information relevant to this discussion of fewer beds, as to what other activities are expanded, so that I may better answer my constituents' concern.

MR. RUSSELL: That's true, Mr. Chairman. I believe the original bed count was 999. I think there will be in the neighborhood of 853 new beds, plus another 125 hostel beds. The old interns' residence is being renovated and turned into a hostel so that people requiring some medical or diagnostic and testing services, but who are able to look after themselves, will occupy hostel beds rather than hospital beds. This reflects quite a change in programming attitudes. That, combined with the accelerated programming in the outpatient and day surgery departments, will see quite a change in patterns of treatment in the hospital. So I guess the bottom line is that we like to believe that better and in fact more comprehensive services will be available to the northern Alberta part of our province with fewer active-rated beds.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, with the large expenditure of money going into this facility, maybe the minister could tell

us as to the areas, additional to the beds, that require all these moneys to assist in the development of this. For example, I wonder if the atrium area, a large area in the centre of this building, is there for the benefit of patients and the staff, or the exclusive use of one or the other.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, the particular design, of course, has been criticized in both the negative and positive sense on many occasions prior to this. I'm told that patients who have stayed in the newly opened phase one and enjoy the environment and facilities of that atrium certainly are very happy that it's there, that it is a superb environment. It's open to the public, to visitors, to staff, and to patients.

Going back to the early days of the development of the hospital, I asked about that feature in the building. Because it is a very large building with that number of beds — and you start getting into things like corridor lengths and lineal feet of exterior wall — in this case the architects and consulting engineers decided that, with that many facilities in it, it would be a very economical plan to build what we call the "square doughnut", put a roof over it, and treat what formerly would be exterior walls as interior space. Time will tell what the exact savings will be in operational costs, but that concept isn't limited just to the Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre. There are many buildings, office buildings, some smaller hospitals, and nursing homes that incorporate the same design feature.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The \$423 million figure — as I understand it, there are three phases. I'm just going by recollection at the present time. This would be the figure for phases one and two. Is that correct?

MR. RUSSELL: That's right.

MR. MARTIN: Just to come back then. I was asking the minister about phase three, and he was saying there's no new information. If I recall from discussion in the heritage committee, a project manager had been hired. I would just confirm that. And when will a decision be made about when phase three will be going ahead? I know we're dealing with inflation; when it goes ahead depends on the inflation rate. But what's the estimate now of phase three, if we do go ahead with it?

MR. RUSSELL: I can't give the committee what that figure might be because phase three would essentially be research space, and it would be research space essentially for the use of people that have been attracted to Alberta by the medical research trust grants and the environment and atmosphere that's creating. Some time ago we did go through quite a discussion in this Assembly about what research space was identifiable in the hospital, and of course it's built in throughout the whole plant. It's very difficult to go to a specific room or wing and say, this is our research department or division. So I have no way of telling it. Obviously the budget would be a function of a number of square feet that they decide they might want to fund. If the medical research trust doesn't want to fund that space, it may be that the regular dollars in the heritage fund would be asked to do that, and in that case, I'd be back to this Assembly asking for that approval. But as yet that's an unknown decision.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to follow up with, I guess — two parts to it. When is a decision going to be made, or what time frame are we looking at for a possible decision? And was there a preliminary estimate, and has that changed because of the involvement of the economy and all the rest of it? Was there a preliminary estimate of phase three, and has

that changed? Again, the question I really want to know is: when are we looking at a decision about phase three?

MR. RUSSELL: I hope that that decision would be made within the next few months. The board has put several proposals to us with respect to completing the linkage of underground pedestrian tunnels, research space, and perhaps building a link with one or two other facilities on that medical campus that's starting to develop over there. Because there are so many unknowns, I can only identify those things at this time and say that perhaps — and it's a remote perhaps — funding would be asked for some of those facilities. I should say that I'm not anxious to come here and ask for more funds for this particular project. I think it's gotten more than the lion's share of heritage dollars. It's true that when the facility is finished it's going to be a magnificent medical centre, but to the extent that we should consider phase three or four, it's very difficult for me to answer that at this time.

I can only say that I know the hospital board and the board of the medical research trust are having discussions now, with the possibility of their investing about \$30 million in current dollars in research space. Now if they don't do it, it's possible the board would come back to the government and the Legislature and ask for a replacement of those dollars. But I've now told the Legislature all I know about the situation.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Chairman, I was interested and encouraged to hear the minister's response to the Member for Calgary McCall in relation to perhaps an increased emphasis on day surgery and outpatients in hospitals, certainly as it relates to the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre. I suppose that would lead one to believe that that would lessen the per patient days in a hospital. The minister may correct me, but my understanding is that hospital funding is based on per patient day. If this shift of focus or new emphasis is on day surgery and outpatient applications, which I think is encouraging, could the minister comment as to whether or not this new focus is being considered in relation to hospital funding across the province?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, it is, even with respect to the hospital user fee program. Those changing conditions have been reflected so there are various charges for inpatient and outpatient services, and a desire to see more efficient use made of those spaces and not always link them to an inpatient bed, which has a very expensive ongoing cost to the public.

MR. R. SPEAKER: To the minister. As I observe the figures here, to complete phase two we would require, most likely in the fiscal year '85-86, a maximum of \$63 million. Does the minister see that project completed in that fiscal year, or are we looking at that \$63 million that's remaining at that point in time being allocated over two or three years? What seems to be the schedule? We may have covered that in our discussion a year ago, but I don't recall that. Will the project be ended, say, by the end of the fiscal year '85-86 and will the \$63 million be the last allocation of the Legislature?

MR. RUSSELL: I would hope so, but going by past experience I think there would be another fiscal year beyond then when there would probably be some wind-up and slippage costs. Essentially, the thing is due to open during that period. What the cash flow and payment pattern would be vis-a-vis the fiscal year is hard to tell this far in advance. I think we would need to go for a vote one fiscal year beyond their completion.

MR. NOTLEY: On the question of phase three for a moment, the minister indicated that the foundation would perhaps be looking at an investment of \$30 million. Do I take it then that that is a sort of initial ballpark figure for phase three? And beyond the research foundation, to what extent is there discussion with the University of Alberta on phase three?

MR. RUSSELL: The history of phase three goes back some time. The hospital board was always looking at additional free-standing research space. There were some proposals to renovate existing buildings adjacent to the new building on the campus. There was some talk at one time that there might be research space in conjunction with the other two hospitals on the site. At a later date, the possibility of the medical research trust funding some space came up. Now the only reason they would want to do that is in conjunction with their own programs and their own Act.

Members will recall that when the original \$300 million was set up by a vote of the Legislature, that was in the days of very high interest rates. That money was invested and, as a consequence, the capital base of the fund grew very considerably. That happened at a time which was coincidental to their start-up phase, so their payouts vis-a-vis research support by way of fellowships, scholarships, and stipends was relatively low. The net result has been that while the support of people is now accelerating, because the people are in fact coming in very encouraging numbers, they're running out of space for them. It's logical that they should be. In fact the Act says they should be housed at or near the major teaching hospitals and faculties of medicine in the province. That is why the foundation has been considering granting some funds from their expanded capital base in order to provide a physical shell for the researchers that are now establishing in the province.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. One of the concerns I have relates to our discussion in this Legislature with regard to living within our means, restraint, and other pronouncements such as that. In my past experience — and I'm sure this is the experience of the minister — in a facility of this size of some 400 million [dollars], most likely every two and half years we have to inject that kind of capital into operating that building after it is finally completed. I was wondering, in terms of longer term budgeting and also the completion of the building facility as a capital project, whether anybody is examining that question and saying maybe we can't afford the total completion of the building because once we have to start operating maybe we won't have the capability.

I know that sounds maybe a little cynical or negative in terms of the project. I think we all feel that the project should go ahead. In terms of modern health care, research, and various things that are going to happen, it will be a good facility. But is anyone addressing that question at this point in time? Or are all lights green in terms of the board itself saying, go ahead, complete it; in terms of the projected budget, you are on course, you're meeting your budget deadlines; we as a government are prepared to complete the payments of \$423 million to you; your facility will be completed? Then the question comes with regard to operating it. Let's hope that the economy is on an upswing by that time and things are back on course, so we don't end up with one-third of the beds closed because we can't afford to operate them. To the minister: has that question been raised? I am sure it has. But has someone seriously raised it?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes. A requirement of any capital project is that the board submitting the request for capital approval must give us some idea of their estimated operating budget. In this

case, because of the complexity and the scope of the thing, the board of the hospital and officials of my department are constantly reviewing this. In fact this year, because construction was a little slower and staffing was brought on at a later date through the fiscal year, strangely enough the hospital is estimated at this point to be ending the fiscal year with a substantial surplus. Those are the kinds of things that are very closely watched. But we are already looking at an annual budget for the hospital — which is only half finished — of \$130 million in ballpark figures.

I am glad the hon. member raised the issue, because I think it's important that the public of Alberta realizes what the scope of those figures are. It's \$130 million a year to run what's there now, and that's going to increase very considerably.

To answer your direct question, I believe that the resources of the province are there in sufficient quantities, whether it's natural resources or general revenues from other sources, to be able to keep that facility going.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 2 — Walter C. Mackenzie

Health Sciences Centre \$74,000,000

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

[Motion carried]

Department of Recreation and Parks

1 — Fish Creek Provincial Park (Development)

MR. NOTLEY: Just before we finish, this may be answered by the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. In the total of almost \$16 million to date on Fish Creek, could the minister tell us what the legal costs for the government were with a respect to the Mannix property and the differences of opinion over that, the final expropriation, and the long drawn-out legal proceedings that revolved around the expropriation of the Mannix property?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could become a volunteer with respect to that matter. I don't know what information, through his officials, my colleague may have. My recollection of the matter — and it was one I looked at — was that those legal costs have not yet been resolved in the sense of the parties taking them through the necessary procedures, either to agree upon them between counsel as being entirely appropriate in the circumstances or, if that can't be done, taking them through the taxing officer. In that sense, I believe it hasn't been resolved. It may well be that some information could be given even so, but I would have to check. I don't know what information my colleague may have.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just following that up, do we have any indication then as to what the final draw on the trust fund might be as a result of any finalization on this matter?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't have any data with regard to land purchase, because that's done by the Department of the Environment. The total cost of Fish Creek park itself is \$17 million. It's now completed, and all I'm charged with is the responsibility of the operations of it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, to the Attorney General. Do we have any preliminary estimates of the costs?

MR. CRAWFORD: I do not, Mr. Chairman, in the sense that I would be going entirely from memory, which I would not want to do. There would probably be some documentation available.

One of my colleagues has pointed out to me that the estimates of Public Works, Supply and Services may well be a time to raise the matter again, because both the Capital City and the Fish Creek Provincial Park items are there.

MR. NOTLEY: Just so we don't hold things up, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could give that as notice of question. We will bring it back back between now and when we get to that department. If the government could scramble and locate what information is possible, that would be helpful.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 — Fish Creek Provincial Park

(Development) \$200,000

2 — Kananaskis Country Recreational Development

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before we get swept away here with enthusiasm, the minister indicated in his cheerful way today in question period that he wanted to supply us with all kinds of information during the study of the estimates. So I would like to begin by exploring the question of the \$5 million for Ribbon Creek. Could the minister outline as carefully as possible to the committee what that \$5 million would be used for, what the present state of negotiations is with respect to the call on this department of this estimate? I guess we will have to deal with the Minister of Tourism and Small Business on the negotiations as far as the two hotels. Perhaps we might just start with the general question. Knowing that the minister is smiling and wants to give us all kinds of information, we can probably go from there.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, in our 1983-84 budget we asked for, and it was approved that we would accept, \$28,314,900 from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Within that forecast was some \$5 million for infrastructure for the alpine village at Ribbon Creek. Of course that did not proceed, so we have an underexpenditure of \$5 million, which has reduced our expenditures for this fiscal year to \$23,286,760. Within the request for our 1984-85 budget, we will be asking for — if I can get that figure, to be precise — \$4.5 million to continue with the infrastructure, if we move ahead with the alpine village construction.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the minister says "if". Before we approve this appropriation, perhaps he could advise the committee what the considerations are at this stage in determining the "if".

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, we just finished a meeting with the Minister of Tourism and Small Business reporting to us. The "if" is a lot sooner than we could anticipate. It looks, in all probability, that we will be moving ahead with A, B, and C this fiscal year.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, is the minister then telling the committee that to proceed with the commercial development is contingent upon our putting this \$5 million into place? I guess it's \$4.5 million, but so be it. Or given the tough times that the province of Alberta is facing at the moment, are any of the proponents prepared to take a risk with perhaps a more measured pace of our meeting this. Noting as I look through

these estimates that we're deferring all kinds of worthy projects all over the province, are we in a position to negotiate with these proponents to perhaps have this carried over a couple of years rather than \$4.5 million all at once?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, if the project is to move ahead, our obligations last year were identical to what we anticipate this year. To supply funds for water, sewer, power, propane distribution, roadways and all that would have to come this year. You couldn't space it out in two years unless the project was being constructed over two years.

It's my understanding, and the feeling of the minister reporting to us, that we will be moving ahead this year. If we do move ahead, we'll have to have these funds in place to cover our obligations which were committed last year and the year before and were never spent because the project did not move. I don't really understand how we could delay it for two years, unless the alpine villages were not constructed by the private sector over two years. If that happened, of course we could do it that way, but that's not the way I see it now. It's pretty hard to say that we can do it in two years if the project moves ahead. If it doesn't move ahead, we'll have the \$4.5 million underspent again.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, did I hear the minister indicate to the House that the government is about ready to conclude an agreement with the private sector on two smaller hotels plus a 150-bed hotel that the government's looking at? Perhaps we could be brought up to date in committee. I'm sure we wouldn't want to read this in the press. I'm sure that we'd want to have as much information before the fact, so perhaps the minister could bring us up to date on where things stand.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, B and C have been approved projects; A is in the works with the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, and he informs us that within two weeks time or thereabouts he'll have the answer, whether it's go or no go.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, there are many things we could discuss. We've had the discussion of toilets before, but we may want to come to those again.

I think the concern people right across the province have is that while Kananaskis is nice, they are worried about more money going into it. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I'm alluding to more money from the heritage trust fund going into the Olympics if we don't have some control over it. I know the minister said that this is not the case, and I hope this is in fact it, that we have control over our budgets in Kananaskis, that there won't be any more overruns because, as we well know, we cannot afford it at this time. But we've had many examples, of course, and people always refer back; the Saddledome hasn't given people a lot of confidence that we do have a grip on it. My question to the minister is: can he give us absolute assurance in this House that there will be no more money from the heritage trust fund going into overruns dealing with the Olympics at any time?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, funds for Kananaskis have never been involved in the Olympics. There are no funds in this appropriation for the Olympics to be held in 1988. I don't know how I can give the hon. member assurance, because we're not asking for funds for the Olympics.

MR. MARTIN: I'll try to explain it to the minister. It seems to people that we've talked to — many people are experts. The minister is well aware of the controversy about Mount Allan

and why we are moving in that direction, which surely has to do with the Olympics being in the Kananaskis. There is a connection there that everybody's well aware of, Mr. Chairman. The fact is that at some point, because we seem to be pushing towards the Kananaskis for at least part of the Olympic development, we may lose control, we may be coming back. The only question I'm asking the minister — if it's a simple yes, great, I'll be very happy — is can he give me assurance that no money will be used out of the heritage trust fund for Olympic overruns? Yes or no. It has to do with the Kananaskis because that's where we're pushing towards. Mount Allan's there, as the minister's well aware.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, it should be remembered that when we go to development of the Olympic structure, it is my hope and understanding that they will all go to tender. The tendering of these projects will be such that the private sector will become involved. I can assure the hon. member and all hon. members that none of the funds requested in this year's heritage fund, capital projects division, will be used for Olympics. Nothing is being used for the Olympics, and there's been no overrun. I don't know what the hon. member is getting at in talking about overruns, because we're not requesting any funds for the Olympics.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Is the minister saying to the House, Mr. Chairman, that there is absolutely no connection between Kananaskis, Mount Allan, and the money that we're spending here on the Olympics?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, we might be asking for funds for roads in this year's budget, and certainly we are. The roads can be used for the Olympics, but I wouldn't want the hon. member to tie a road that we develop today or next year, and that will be available for 50 years, to the Olympics. That can happen, because I think we'll be using the roads that were constructed four or five years ago for the Olympics, if you want to look at it that way. There are no funds in here that are tied directly to the Olympics.

MR. MARTIN: A final supplementary question. The point that I'm trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is the Kananaskis development, the money we've spent there already, and the fact that many people, including certain members in this House, would suggest that because of the money we've already spent in the Kananaskis, that's precisely the point. We're going to Mount Allan where there's some debate about snow and all the rest of it. Many other groups have said that there are much better parts in Banff National Park, for example. And the fact that we have an investment in Kananaskis already is why Mount Allan is being pushed. That's the point I'm trying to make to the minister. Certain people can see connections here. I'm surprised that the minister is pretending that there are no connections, because there are connections.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to leave the impression that I'm pretending. To my knowledge, there are no connections between the Olympics and Kananaskis Country. If Mount Allan is developed for the Olympics, and hopefully it will be, it'll be done separately through the Minister of Tourism and Small Business.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am certainly intrigued to hear this. Is the minister saying then that these proponents that are about ready to consider investing money in hotels in the Ribbon Creek area would invest their money in those ventures quite

apart from what is done with Mount Allan, that Mount Allan is in no way, shape, or form related, that there is no connection at all, that shrewd people in the private sector that have sharp pencils would say, no, no, it doesn't make any difference what happens, we'll take the Olympics to Jasper Park, it doesn't have any impact on us? Is that what the minister is telling us? I don't think so. I would be surprised if he is, because frankly I can't imagine anybody investing at this time . . . If there's evidence to the contrary, I'd welcome hearing it from both the Minister of Recreation and Parks and the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. But it would seem to me that there has to be some kind of link here between the site of a major ski operation, which will be there not only for the Olympics but after the Olympics, and whether or not somebody is going to invest some money in hotels.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, the question was asked: would we be spending heritage fund dollars for the Olympics? I said no. Surely I would hope that the private sector that will develop Mount Allan will not develop it for the 11 days of the Olympics. I hope they develop it because it's a recreation ski site, one that will be used for years. Certainly that's what we're working towards, a recreation ski site for Albertans. I think the Olympics is just a bonus. If somebody's going into Kananaskis Country to build something for 11 days, I think they're not very good business people.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, no one is arguing that. The question, as the minister knows, is not what will happen for 11 days but whether or not that particular site is the site for 11 days, and thereby an investment is made in a large ski operation which has to have some relationship to whether somebody's going to put a hotel there. Good heavens, I just can't imagine that people are going to be talking about two smaller hotels plus a 150-room operation unless there is something that is going to draw people there. That something, it seems to me, has to be the site of a mountain which will have in addition to the site ski facilities, hopefully — some of us are a little more optimistic than others about the skiing potential of Mount Allan, but let's put a favorable light on it for sake of this discussion — the added impact of being the location of the Olympics. So I don't see how one can separate Mount Allan from Ribbon Creek or from interest on anybody's part in the private sector in developing hotels. It seems to me they are inextricably linked. And if there's no ski facility go-ahead on Mount Allan, I would challenge the minister to document in this House on what basis people would then be interested in developing hotels in Ribbon Creek.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, long before Mount Allan was chosen by the Olympic committee and the Olympics internationally for the downhill or the recreation ski site, we had the proposals for the alpine village. Our obligation to those projects was infrastructure costs which we had in our budget last year. We didn't use them because the alpine village did not proceed. Sure, I think the recreation ski hill will be an added attraction to those who want to construct the alpine villages, and certainly that would work to the advantage of the contractor or the project developer. So I don't see any difficulty in saying yes, the alpine village will be a resort for both the golf course and cross-country skiing, an all-seasons program developed within Kananaskis Country, and the recreation ski hill, after the Olympics or before, is part of it.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, we want to give the minister ample opportunity to be very clear on this matter. So I would

ask him if it was not the case that we had already spent a substantial amount of money in terms of the Kananaskis development — and we could go back over the overruns there again — and that because we were into a recession we'd already had this money spent? Is this not the reason why Mount Allan is being pushed rather than other areas, even though it may not be the best site? I ask the minister: is it not the case that the provincial government wants it there because we've already spent a lot of money there? I think that's the bottom line, because people for the life of them cannot figure out why Mount Allan, in regard to many other places in the province, as the minister is well aware. I'm sure he's had delegations come in, the same as we have, and say this is ridiculous.

I guess we're suggesting to the minister that we're making another mistake. Maybe we're throwing good money after bad. That's the point we're trying to figure out here, because there seems to be no other reason for it. This is why the whole thing's tied in. It's tied in in everybody else's mind across the province but the minister's. The minister is well aware of this. Mr. Chairman, we're giving the minister an opportunity to tell us, because I think that's why we're into it. The fact is that we have a lot of money invested, therefore we're trying to push, if you like, Mount Allan rather than some other sites. I suggest that that's going to be a lot more costly in the long run, from the reports we get from people.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I think maybe we should go back to the beginning of how Mount Allan was picked. Let me assure the hon. member that it's not this government that's pushing Mount Allan. It never has and won't be. You have to go back to the beginning. The Calgary Olympic Development Association was to pick the sites, have them approved by the International Olympic Committee, and then have the sanction of the Alberta government. In this case, that's exactly what took place. As a government, we support their choice of Mount Allan for all the downhill sites. We support it, and we have that in writing. But we were not pushing it to take Mount Allan over another mountain. They found that that would be the one that could host all the events, and that's what they wanted. So let's not leave here thinking that I or somebody else in government told the Olympic committee that that's the site you have to go to. That's not the case. It was picked by them, supported by the International Olympic Committee, and supported by this government.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question then. Is the minister saying clearly to the House that there were no discussions between any of the ministers and the Calgary Olympic committee, in terms of the choice of Mount Allan, ahead of that decision being made? Is that what the minister is saying?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I can make it very clear. I can't speak for other ministers, but I know this minister did not talk to the Olympic committee and say to them that they must pick Mount Allan over something else; of that I can assure you.

MR. MARTIN: Okay, but can I just follow up? I accept the minister's word that he did not. Was there any discussion among any other ministers, specifically the Premier, that the minister is aware of?

MR. TRYNCHY: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman. Not at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is having some difficulty with the relevance of this line of questioning. It seems that we're

getting into a general discussion on the Olympic facilities when we should be discussing the Kananaskis Country recreation development. I would think that perhaps we could confine our questions more specifically to this particular vote.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. We might as well get to one of the issues at heart and in the minds of many Albertans, and that's the golf course itself: some of the rules that have been established at that golf course and the people that have the contract for the clubhouse. I'd like the minister to explain what contracts went out, what bids went out to look after that clubhouse. I understand Mr. Parker and Mr. Kimball of the Edmonton Eskimos and a person by the name of Getty are involved in management. I'd like to know what kind of submissions were made, how those bids were taken and how they were issued. That's very basic.

There are certainly some rules on the golf course that upset my constituents. At meeting after meeting as I toured across my constituency, they were interested in some other spending habits of this government, but they also said: look, I went to Kananaskis and couldn't go on the golf course with my good jeans that I'd paid 50 bucks for; they said they weren't good enough to go on the golf course. They said: how can a government take my money, build a public golf course, and then I have to go up there — and I wear jeans to everything. I've seen some of these fellows. They put on a nice sports coat, but they put on a pair of jeans to go to the local rodeo, local gatherings, the Calgary Stampede, or other formal functions. It's part of their dress. Then all of a sudden they find a place where their public funds have been allocated, the place where they were supposed to be able to relax and have a good time, golf at leisure, talk to their buddies, and really enjoy part of Alberta's wealth, and they are excluded.

MR. MARTIN: Enjoy the white sand and the toilets.

MR. R. SPEAKER: There are other problems too, but I think those are two that should be clarified in the minds of the public. People are saying: why that kind of exclusive club with public money? It's just not right.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, the first question was: who was the golf course management? I'd like to go over this for the members. A request for a proposal for operating Kananaskis golf course was advertised in various newspapers across Canada on January 10, 1981. We received [replies from] approximately 127 groups that responded to this proposal call. We had a golf course selection committee develop a short list of ten and six, and then they got down to two for potential operators. After a number of meetings, the golf course committee recommended that Kan-Alta Golf Course Management be the ones that would operate the golf course, and an agreement was signed on June 27, 1983.

In response to the dress code, Mr. Chairman, I guess there's a couple of ways you can look at it. I walked into a restaurant the other day and, as I opened the door, it said on the door: no shoes, no food. So I guess you can look at it both ways. Also, since July 22 I have received one letter in regard to the wearing of blue jeans, and that person was allowed to golf. I've never received one that said you couldn't golf with blue jeans, so I'm waiting for those letters. But I got one letter saying: I arrived there with blue jeans, and I was allowed to golf. That's the answer to that one.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, in terms of the request for proposal and the group that was selected in the final analysis,

could the minister indicate whether that was the lowest bid that was made with regard to that request for proposal? What were the qualities and the qualifications of this association that finally was able to have the bid in their favor? As well, who was on the committee that chose them? Were they personnel from government, from the private sector? Who were those people?

MR. TRYNCHY: I think I have the names here. I think the decision to go with Kan-Alta was, number one, that they had the best personnel available, the most knowledgeable people that can run a golf course. That was one of the main reasons for that. The golf course committee members were this kind of structure: David Kalinovich, Assistant Deputy Minister of Recreation and Parks, under our department, was the chairman; we had Tom Drinkwater, my ex-deputy minister of some time ago; Al McDonald, from Tourism and Small Business; Ed Marshall, the managing director of Kananaskis Country; and Keith Alexander, who I'm sure you're all familiar with, a pretty well known golfer. I think we had just a tremendous committee that reviewed a number of things. I might add that this contract negotiation took a number of months to make sure that we had the right kind of people that would give the kind of service appreciated by Albertans. I think they made a logical choice.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The key question was with regard to the lowest bid, and in terms of what that bid actually was, what type of rent we as a government are obtaining from that group. As well, I understand that Kan-Alta was registered as a company early in 1983, but prior to that was not registered as a company. Did that have any effect with regard to their proposal, or was that within the ground rules of the proposal — that they did not necessarily have to be registered until they were either chosen or the proposal they made was accepted as one that would be taken into final consideration?

MR. TRYNCHY: I'm not familiar with the name of the company, whether they had to be registered or not. In my mind, I didn't think that was something that had to happen. They were Albertans, and they were the ones that provided us with the information that they could do the best job. In regard to the lowest tender, we didn't operate that way. We went forward with a proposal of who could do the best job and, after a certain amount of gross profits, we would take a percentage. We asked that of all of them, so that's how we arrived at the figure of what should come back to the government after they paid their operating costs.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Could the minister just elaborate on that formula with regard to the returns to government and how it could have varied from one proposal to another?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I'd have to bring that back. I'm not familiar with the figures. It's in the contract. I wouldn't want to mislead the hon. members so, in order to be precise, I'd like to bring that question back and give the facts, if I may.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to encourage the minister, if I could, to maintain the policies that have been put in place for Kananaskis Country golf course, and to assure the House, at least to the best of his ability, that dress standards will in fact be maintained while this populism, if that's a word for it — that everyone in the world somehow or other has acquired a right of some kind or other to show up whenever or whenever they like in blue jeans — is one which we questioned

as members of the committee because we made an investment. I'd like to sort of put it in those terms, Mr. Chairman.

The government has made an investment in Kananaskis Country which will return its cost many times over to the citizens of this province over its lifetime. It will do that because it's a world class facility. I know that sounds very elitist. The minister knows what we're talking about, and I think he will help to maintain that world class. Reduced to the simplest terms, what it means, as opposed to the normal round of golf that you go out and play almost anywhere else in Alberta, is that you come away from Kananaskis Country knowing that you've had a memorable experience. In fact we set out to create it that way so that when it was finished it would be a memorable experience rather than just another round of golf. On a world-wide basis, the memorable experiences retained by people are those which are spent playing on what we call world class facilities.

World class facilities, by definition, have standards. They're maintained in a certain way in terms of cutting levels; the traps have certain characteristics — they're playable and attractive and economical because of that; and the dress standards are maintained so that one doesn't have the feeling that he's out playing on a field somewhere. There's a distinction between playing at your average public course, where a person can go out and do whatever he wants or dress in whatever way he pleases, whether it's cowboy boots, tank tops, cutoff shorts, or blue jeans with the knees out. You're free to do that almost anywhere there's a public golf course in this country. If you want to maintain a world class golf course which is going to attract people, golfers mainly, from all over the world to play at it, then dress standards are part of the code. That happens to exist not just in golf incidentally, but in tennis, cricket, and all kinds of other endeavors. It does, in fact, become a factor as far as golf is concerned.

I would like to encourage the minister to maintain the policy. The province of Alberta has invested in a world class facility. It has achieved that. The architect of the golf course has predicted that before time is through, the golf course may well be rated as one of the top 10 in the world. You simply don't create that kind of facility, that kind of investment, and that kind of return on investment from tourism by simply forgetting about the standards and letting the people roam all over the place in busted down blue jeans. It doesn't fit, and if people don't like that, then there is an alternative, and the minister has given his approval.

The people in the pro shop have available, at very reasonable rates, rental shoes, rental clothes, and very inexpensive replacements for the torn up jeans if they're required. So all the contingencies have been covered, and I would encourage the minister to maintain the standards of a world class facility.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I've got a speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: Save it for tomorrow.

MR. CRAWFORD: [Inaudible] the Minister of Transportation say that it is a memorable course, in that he shot the highest score of his life there not long ago. In light of the hour, if we can wait for the balance of the debate and the undoubted wit that's to come to us in the response I saw the hon. member getting ready to give the Member for Little Bow, I move the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

Resolved that from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund sums not exceeding the following be granted Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, for the purpose of making investments in the following projects to be administered by the Minister of the Environment: \$60,000,000 for irrigation headworks and main irrigation systems improvement, \$3,000,000 for land reclamation, \$3,571,000 for Paddle River basin development.

For the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care: \$5,194,000 for applied cancer research, \$74,000,000 for the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre.

I believe that estimates for the Department of Agriculture were passed, were they not?

MR. CRAWFORD: And reported the other day.

MR. APPLEBY: Oh, they were passed the other day. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions and reports progress thereon.

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, it's not proposed the Assembly sit tonight. It is proposed the Assembly sit tomorrow evening when we have the opportunity for a few more verbal drives and putts, and in the event that the estimates of the hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks are concluded, we would begin those of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources.

[At 5:31 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

