

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Tuesday, August 1, 1989 8:00 p.m.

Date: 89/08/01

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

## head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members of the committee, it is now . . . Order please. If members of the committee could take their places in order to get the committee launched on its evening's activities, we are here to consider the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects division estimates for the departments of Occupational Health and Safety, Advanced Education, Recreation and Parks, Public Works, Supply and Services, and Energy.

The Occupational Health and Safety estimates are to be found under Executive Council at page 17 of the book, and I would invite the hon. Minister of Occupational Health and Safety to say a few words in introducing these estimates.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, I think I had a point of order, if I may.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I apologize to the hon. Minister of Occupational Health and Safety. I had forgotten an undertaking made to the Associate Minister of Family and Social Services, who wishes to rise on a point of order concerning an entry in *Hansard*.

MR. WEISS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I apologize to the Assembly and to the hon. member for interrupting him.

Mr. Chairman, in *Hansard* of July 24, 1989, page 972 in the estimates for the Department of Family and Social Services, I note that in my exuberance I had erred, and it did read, "at an annual cost of some \$2.4 million," with regards to a program. I wish to correct that error and state that it was some \$360,000 in this year's budget to cover a caseload of some 25, with a projected budget of some \$2.4 million to provide for expanded services.\* I apologize to the Assembly for the error that I've created. If I've caused any hardship, I certainly would hope that we'd have the opportunity to correct it.

Thank you.

head: Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund  
Estimates 1989-90

## Executive Council

## Vote 1 -- Occupational Health and Safety Research and Education

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Occupational Health and Safety.

MR. TRYNCHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did want to make some brief comments in regards to the estimates before us. First of all, I'd like to introduce in the gallery the chairperson of the Occupational Health and Safety Council. Would you stand

\*see page 972, left col., para. 6, lines 10 and 11

up, Maureen? She's accompanied by some other members of our staff.

To get into the estimates, we have delivered to your desks a couple of documents that are there for your perusal with quite a bit of the information in them. But let me just try to point out what it is we do with the heritage fund program. The grants that we provide from this program are research/education. The heritage fund has now been in its ninth year of operation, and we've had over 165 projects funded. This program is pretty unique in Alberta, and it's probably the only one of its kind in Canada. We produced from that document a number of materials that are handed out, such as handbooks, videos, reports, workbooks, guidebooks. The types of projects that we try to direct our attention to are solution oriented, things where there's a high priority of problem areas in respect to fatal and serious injuries, things within small business, the oil and gas industry, chemical hazards, and of course the taxi industry. We just announced yesterday a very positive program in respect to that profession.

Most of our research goes to educational programs. Just to give you some examples, the occupational health nursing certificate program: since we've started, enrollment in that program has gone up by over 800 percent. We have trained some 16,300 workers in H<sub>2</sub>S, and we've also provided training to union representatives. Since the initiation we have trained over 220 health and safety representatives from 25 unions. We have provided funds for conferences, and one of the noteworthy conferences was the Banff roundtable that was chaired by our chairperson of the Occupational Health and Safety Council, and that was held in conjunction with industry, labour, and government. It's the first of its kind in Canada, was held in Banff, and we expect to hold more of those.

Mr. Chairman, the question was asked of me once: who do we work with in regards to what we do? I just wanted to very quickly suggest that we work where we can with industry; we work where we can with labour, postsecondary institutions, hospitals, safety associations, cities, municipalities, and a number of other associations. So when we ask our people to designate funding, the kinds of things we're looking for are high-quality research and educational programs that would provide immediate impact in the work force, something that would be sooner than later, programs that would lead towards accident reduction and prevention and solutions as quickly as possible. We have provided a number of things for industry. Examples are: we have some five videotapes available on welding techniques which have received national and international recognition. We have videos and training material in forestry, oil and gas, utilities, construction, manufacturing, and transportation. We have provided guidebooks on disposal and recycling of chemicals. We have done some research on flame-resistant clothing for the industry, just to name a few of the kinds of things we do.

So the question has been asked: where is all this material available and how do we access it? Well, the material's available in our Occupational Health and Safety library. It's also available in the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety. It's available with the Alberta Federation of Labour. It's available with industry safety associations and in a number of cases with scientific journals.

Just to give you some numbers in respect to the number of applications that we receive and the committee that reviews the applications and approves them for funding, we've received

some 481 applications that have been submitted to us, and of those, 41 percent have been approved, a total of about 170. Of those 41 percent that have been approved, 51 percent have been on an educational basis, 46 percent on a research basis, and 3 percent have been for conferences. Forty-five percent of all the projects are diverse and can be used in more than one industry, which is a benefit and a very positive move. Nineteen percent benefit the oil and gas industry, 7 percent construction, but the important figure is that 78 percent of the projects benefit the entire province.

Just to give you an example in the H<sub>2</sub>S training program. We've had 23 fatalities in 1976 to 1987 and 120 lost-time claims; two-thirds of these have been in the oil and gas industry. Mr. Chairman, we are moving very quickly with reports, findings, and things to reduce that. In respect to safe work practices, there have been 26 fatalities from '76 to 1987, some 11 years, in the trenching business. We now have produced four trenching videos that are very beneficial to that.

These are just a few examples, Mr. Chairman, of what the Occupational Health and Safety research funding is used for. There are many more. I'm sure that some of the members will have questions, and I'll be glad to answer them as we proceed through the evening.

Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Chairman, in the hands of a government that was really interested in protecting the health and safety of workers in the workplace, an investment of this magnitude, of some \$1.38 million in research and education, I think could really be very commendable. But when we get research that shows occupational hazards and the problems that are facing workers in the workplace, that's simply not enough. We can't stop there. It's a responsibility of government to look at ensuring that safe equipment, safe practices are mandated so that all workers are protected and benefit from the research that's developed.

I have to say, Mr. Chairman, that I for one am not impressed with this government following up from the research and education component to the action and enforcement component. I think we've got to do that. We can't simply hope that employers are going to be good corporate citizens and responsible and do the right thing, because we know, as a matter of fact and a matter of history, that that is just not often the case. There are a lot of employers who are a lot more concerned with their bottom-line profit figure than they are with safety for their workers.

We've got all kinds of examples. We have most recently -- in fact, just yesterday, Mr. Chairman, the minister announced his new program for the safety of cabdrivers. That's a step in the right direction, but why didn't he go the full route? Why didn't he make sure that all cabdrivers are going to benefit from that initiative? We spent some \$140,000 on that program for cabdriver safety, and yet the minister doesn't know whether or not all the cabdrivers in the province are going to be put through that training program. He's not prepared to insist that they are.

I would suggest that's the kind of leadership we need. Once we've identified a problem, we've identified some components of a solution, we've got to make sure that all the workers in that particular field or that industry have the opportunity to benefit from that protection, from that research. We can't simply say,

"Well, here's a video and a workbook, and let's hope that some people use it and look at it," and go from there. In the case of cabdrivers, we had some 10 cabdrivers in the last number of years that were killed on the job. Many others were attacked and suffered a variety of violent incidents. I think for the government to simply say, "Well, we've done this 30-minute video, and we've developed a workbook, and now we're going to wash our hands of it; we're sort of going to say please, please, please, cab companies, do this program with your drivers," just is not acceptable, and it's certainly not leadership.

We could use another example, Mr. Chairman, in the industry, for example, for meat packing. Now, I didn't see in this year's outline of research projects any one that was particularly geared to the problem of repetitive stress syndrome, but that affects a number of workers in this province, particularly, for example, in the meat packing industry. Yet, while there has been much research done by many people in this field of repetitive stress injuries, and particularly by unions like the United Food and Commercial Workers, who represent workers at Gainers and the other plants . . . They have identified that by the use of different kinds of knives they could reduce the repetitive stress injury problems that their members face in meat packing plants. Yet meat packing plants would rather have people use just one knife rather than four, five, or six for specialty operations.

That's just another example, Mr. Chairman, of the fact that just because we know there is a problem and even though we know from our experience and research what some of the solutions would be, that is not enough. We've got to move beyond that to ensure that we have proper leadership and proper enforcement. We've got to make sure that when we've identified solutions to some of these workplace injury problems, we in fact go to the next step, the step which is crucial, and that is the action and enforcement step.

Another example of that particular problem, Mr. Chairman, is the field of asbestos, and I made a reference to that earlier. We've got now, due to research done in Alberta and elsewhere, a lot of information that shows the kinds of problems associated with asbestos and the kinds of techniques and procedures that are required to handle that material with a minimum of risk. Yet in Alberta what have we got? We've got a code of practice . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I'd ask members to take their seats if at all possible.

MR. GIBEAULT: We've got a code of practice, and we don't, unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, have regulations from this government that say: this is in fact the kind of equipment you have to use; you must use respirators; you must use all the equipment and the protection that will make sure that asbestos workers don't come down with asbestosis. Okay?

So, Mr. Chairman, that's the kind of concerns that we have here. We're all in favour of research and education. That's very, very important, but it's going to be useless unless it goes that next stage, and that is the action, the enforcement, the implementation stage. We simply cannot be paying out a substantial amount of money on research and education and take the approach that this government has taken, and that is, to their friends in industry: "Please. We've identified some problems, and we really want you as good folks to implement this program with your workers. We hope you can do that without too much inconvenience to your profit margin." That's the approach the government here has taken, and that is totally unsatisfactory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I first want to commend the minister for this particular program. It reminds me of an old saying, an ounce of prevention is a pound of medicine.

AN HON. MEMBER: Kilogram.

MR. WICKMAN: Okay, kilogram.

Mr. Chairman, if there's one particular area when we talk in terms of prevention that we have to be concerned about, it is this particular vote. If anything, in terms of talking about trying to reduce an expenditure, I would be saying more, more, more, again looking at prevention as an investment in the long run.

Mr. Chairman, there are numerous examples of the various types of occupational-type injuries that benefit from this particular program. We can look, for example, at the changing types of injuries we see in the workplace. More and more are related to the effects of poisonous gases, poisonous vapours, repetitive motion, as had been mentioned earlier, back injuries, and so on and so forth. Some of these areas I don't believe are being covered sufficiently as far as research or educational purposes are concerned. But there is one in particular.

First, I want to thank the minister for responding so quickly on a matter that I sent to him very recently, on information that had been sent to the former MLA in Edmonton-Whitemud. That was then sent to me, and I did send it to you, Mr. Minister. I received the response from your office that you're going to review it in detail, and you'll get back to me on that. I'm looking forward to receiving that reply.

But I do want to read some of the stats that I've gathered into the record, and this is going to relate to the problem of back injuries. Now, the documentation I have: in 1987 the WCB stats indicate that there were a total of approximately 58,000 claims; 13,700 were related to back claims. That's 23.5 percent. When we talk in terms of permanent disabilities, there were 2,456; 718 of those were due to back injury. That's 29.2 percent. Then, when we talk in terms of the funding that is allocated from this particular program and we look at the various categories, toxicology, for example, received well over a million dollars, 43.73 percent of the research dollars; the occupational health Chair 9.48 percent; firefighting 9.15 percent, and so on down the list. At the very second-last item, the second-last item to receive the smallest amount of funding on a percentage basis is related to the research/educational funding allocated out of this program to back injuries: 1.68 percent. I stress that: 1.68 percent.

Now, let's compare that with some other stats that I've gathered. When I look at a more recent report of the Workers' Compensation Board, I see that in 1988 back problems accounted for almost 15,000 of the 62,000 new claims that were reported and placed in category by parts of the body. When we talk in terms of the disability awards that were approved in 1988 by parts of the body affected, related to the back were 964 out of a total of 3,003. That's well over 30 percent. Keep in mind as I read these figures that we talk in terms of 1.68 percent of that budget allocated into that particular area. Even the Millard report, some of his references that he's made:

Back injuries accounted for about two-thirds of the cases, and frequently were preceded by several other back

injuries, which may have resulted in several operations.

He's talking in terms of two-thirds of the cases. He states:

Since so many workers reported back injuries, comparisons were made between this special group and [other] respondents,

which he analyzes very carefully. Then he goes on to state that back injuries in Alberta account for an average of 23 percent of all time-loss claims, 27 percent of the disability pensions awarded each year, 33 percent of the current long-term cases, 44 percent of the current long-term cases for more than four and one-quarter years. From 1985 to 1987 back injuries in Alberta hospitals and related health care institutions represented 44 percent of all injuries.

He goes on. He says:

Since back injuries cause so much pain and suffering for the injured workers and are so costly to employers, every effort should be made to find more effective treatment.

Now, this is a report that was commissioned by this government, and it stresses the time lost because of back injuries. Again, I've got to refer to that 1.68 percent. Mr. Chairman, I'm stressing this particular category in the entire program because I think it is of such a severe consequence and it is not being given the attention it should be given.

Again, I'm going to go back to an earlier reference: the ounce of prevention is a pound of cure or a pound of medicine, whichever expression we want to use. We look at that as an investment, an investment in terms of savings to the Workers' Compensation Board, savings to the employers. Possibly, if there were more research, more education done in the area of back injuries, we wouldn't have somebody like Terry Spencer out in front of this building at this particular time. We wouldn't have the dozens and dozens of claims that are now in front of the Workers' Compensation Board being appealed, that are related to back injuries. It is the most difficult category that the Workers' Compensation Board has to deal with.

Mr. Chairman, to you, Mr. Minister. I plead with you to reassess the allocation of the grants under this particular category and give a fair allocation to applicants who want to do research, who want to do education, that is related to back injuries. In conclusion, I would certainly hope that you will review that written documentation that I sent to your office and that you will find it meaningful and that some good will come out of it. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a very useful program. However, I would like to note that one of things that has struck me as I've gone through life is the amount of waste, and this is no more true in the area of writing and literature than anywhere else. Duplication and waste are indeed part of the role of publication, and publications, as often as not, sit on themselves gathering dust. I think it's reasonable to assume that much of the research and the writing that's been done in this particular area under this particular program is no different from any of the other rules of life that I'm sure have been part of the minister's observation as well. I know it's been said by other members, not only this year but in preceding years, but again it just seems so obvious that there's the potential for much of this investment to be wasted unless we have the follow-up of putting it to use. This means to ensure that it's being used for education, and it's being used in particular for purposes of en-

forcement. So I would ask the minister whether in fact he has satisfied himself that there is a concerted program. That means that there's somebody responsible, somebody who you can pass the buck on to whose responsibility it is to ensure that this stuff is getting out to the workplaces and to the people who are responsible for those workplaces, where it will have some impact.

Now, I'd like to comment on several areas that are pet projects of mine and that I've been quite interested in. Some three years ago I was approached by some people in Calgary who were very interested in workplace safety. They brought a concern that I'd not heard raised in the community before. In fact, it's been an area that has virtually been ignored in the province of Alberta to my knowledge, although there are a few provinces that have done some very minor work in this area, particularly Saskatchewan. But it has been recognized as being a very important area in Scandinavia and other parts of Europe. That relates to those who work in establishments, usually sales establishments, sometimes supermarkets, sometimes department stores, usually women, where they are required to stand on the job, often in the same spot or the same area, hour after hour after hour. That is tremendously hard on the body. It creates a lot of problems with respect to back injuries and foot injuries and foot problems.

I've had this checked out. I've had research done. I've had a lot of work accumulated with respect to the Scandinavian countries in particular. I've talked to union representatives, and there seems to be very, very little push in this province, indeed in this country, to deal with this particular area. Usually the people who work in this area are those who are somewhat disenfranchised in the sense of not really being in a position or not being of a nature to get out and be pushing their interests. The unions seem to have been neglecting them for whatever reason.

In the programs in Scandinavia there are rules. There are strict regulations which require there to be seating arrangements. There have to be rests that people can sit on, things that are quite proper that may just improve the quality of life of the people who are involved in there, reduce the injuries, save costs to the whole of society in respect of workplace injuries. So I would commend this particular area to the minister; indeed, I think it's beyond research because I think the research has been done in other areas. The research is really that of researching our conscience and our awareness of this forgotten constituency and attempting to do something to come up even partially to the standards that have been recognized in other parts of the country.

The discipline, by the way, is known as ergonomics. I'm not sure what the derivation of it is, but it relates to posture and stress and so on and what one can do in that area. So I would urge the minister to have his staff look into that area and see whether or not we could provide some regulations and some assistance for many workers who have one of the very hardest jobs in society, and that is of standing on their feet all day every day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could I encourage members to stop some of the private conversations so that the member can be heard and the minister can understand? Order.

MR. CHUMIR: Order.

Finally and very briefly, I would urge the minister who is responsible for this area to take an interest in the problem of smoking in the workplace. I'm going to give notice here now

that within the next short while I'm going to be presenting a rather comprehensive private member's Bill with respect to smoking in the workplace, but I search in vain for a champion on that side of the House. I know, though they are not champions, there are those who are interested; there are those who are supportive. But what we need is a champion, one champion to move this along. Let's get us somewhere, maybe into the late 1970s, perhaps the early '80s, maybe, hopefully, even into the late 1980s. So I would urge the minister not simply to get involved in some research as to what's being done here in the province of Alberta because, really, the research has been done. The case is in; it's time for action; it's this minister's responsibility. He can go down in the hall of fame, at least my hall of fame, if he does something.

Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. It's fairly short. I would make a suggestion to the minister, though, in helping my colleague from Calgary-Buffalo. I understand the government is considering free needles. If they could take the nicotine intravenously with the free needles, they could all get their kick without bothering any of the rest of us by exhaling the residue. It's just one of the things I thought I'd toss out to the minister. He would indeed go down in history. You can see it now: introduced these free nicotine needles.

To get off the frivolities a bit, I wonder if the minister could answer how much of the research money spent is on farm safety? I'm not thinking so much of the recognized areas of the tractor turning over and explosions and so on and so forth, but the recent data that has come out in the last few months that shows that lymphatic cancer, or what they call non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, is two to three times as common amongst farmers as it is in any other area, in particular farmers who have sprayed 250 or more acres. This is a study that surveyed, actually, 70,000 farmers, so it's not one of small amount.

Also, while we're on the herbicides, we have a herbicide now being used that they're talking, actually, about expanding into the forestry area from farming areas, and they're looking for permission to go ahead with that. Obviously, Mr. Chairman, the use of herbicides and the long-term effects to people are becoming a great deal of concern.

The last bit is one of the resolutions passed early this year by the Women of Unifarm. They felt that the research into the chemical use and the implications of health to farmers was not being done here, or at least if it has been, it hasn't been passed on. The education, they say, of the medical and health community in diagnosing and treating agriculture chemical poisoning is much needed, because apparently, according to this other survey done in the U.S. and another one in eastern Canada -- and they use it as background -- a lot of pesticide poisons and herbicide poisons are diagnosed as flu in the early stages. So there's a feeling that the medical fraternity is not alerted enough to herbicide and pesticide poisoning and also that possibly the government could do more than it has been doing into research on how you spot this poisoning early and maybe educating farmers and agronomists and forestry people on how to use it and what to watch for in symptoms.

Thank you.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether it's worth while for me to stand up when I can't hear much in here with everybody having their little visits. I'd like to tell the people up

above here in the galleries that it's not always like this. I hope you can hear clearly up there.

I would like to bring to the minister's attention, Mr. Chairman, the situation that happens within the power companies in this province. That's the fact that these people, well-trained linemen, journeyman linemen, who have generally a great safety practice within the electrical systems, must go out at night on power calls, search out problems, and sometimes work all night after working all day, and work all night alone. Yet no pressure seems to have come upon those power companies to send any assistance out there to help them. If a person were to fall off a power pole or be injured in some way, which can happen very easily in the middle of the evening or in the inclement conditions in which they must work, there'd be no way for them to get to their vehicle to call for assistance, and sometimes it would take many hours before somebody would be visiting those areas.

I'm sure the minister is well aware of one Lorne Lemay in the town of Whitecourt who was working for TransAlta Utilities, and a pole broke off. He landed on the back of a truck and lay there for some time before he was even found and has been in a wheelchair for more than four years now. The young man of 21 with a young family just lives in limbo. I would hope that the minister would look into situations in this particular field. Because they do strive to make sure that there is a good relationship and very short power outages. Many of these linemen will work sometimes 18, 20 hours a day, four hours off for sleep and back to work again and quite often have to go out alone in the dark of the evening and through lightning and thunderstorms. I just wanted to bring that to the minister's attention, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The Minister of Occupational Health and Safety.

MR. TRYNCHY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'll start in reverse order. To the Member for West Yellowhead. I appreciate what he says about the power companies and their hours of work. I shouldn't have to tell him what they do because he comes from that profession. I think that's something that the industry and the employees have to work out themselves. I appreciate what he says about power outages and storms. As a matter of fact, on Thursday at my farm, in the middle of the night, 11 or 12 o'clock, the lights went out; the transformer on my pole was blown out. When I got up in the morning at 7 o'clock, three people from TransAlta were out all night, since midnight, replacing four transformers, and I was the last one at 7:30. So I know what he's talking about.

In respect to Mr. Lemay at Whitecourt, he should be aware that the pole he fell off was not a TransAlta pole. He was working as a volunteer on the rodeo grounds, a pole that had been abandoned for years. He's right on that maybe we should do a little more checking when we climb those poles. It's a terrible accident that happened, but it was an accident that happened on a volunteer basis at a rodeo grounds and not on a TransAlta pole. I'm sure he's aware of that.

In respect to Westlock-Sturgeon's comments, research on farm illness in regard to herbicides. I can appreciate what he's saying because as a farmer myself and using herbicides, we tend to get carried away and not use a mask as often as we should. It seems, "Well, that little bit of fumes isn't going to hurt us." I've sprayed with it myself and my neighbours, and I tell the people on the sprayers to use a mask and be more protective, wear rub-

ber gloves, and they say, "Oh, heck, we only do it once a year; it's not going to hurt." So how do you enforce that? What do you do? I appreciate the enforcement aspect of it. How do you go around to every farm and do that? I think the Department of Agriculture and, possibly, the Department of the Environment should play maybe a larger role in respect to identifying the cans, putting on the containers of these chemicals just exactly how dangerous they are and sort of have the farmers read it or be educated by the person that sells the chemical. I think that's a step in the right direction.

I've read where the Saskatchewan government had done research in respect to farmers that have cancer in respect to use of chemicals. The percentage of farmers obtaining cancer or showing up with cancer is far less than the ordinary person. So it's not true that the farmer is more susceptible to cancer in the industry than anybody else. I'll follow that up and make sure that's factual.

The Member for Calgary-Buffer. I'm surprised and maybe a little disappointed. He's an advocate of people's rights: do what you want. Then he tells me to be a champion and stop smoking. You can't have it both ways, member. Either we support the people's wishes, or we make a stand. If the hon. member would stand up and say, "No smoking for everybody, regardless whether it's right or wrong," then maybe I would take it forward. I don't know if I want to be that champion. I don't smoke, and I'd like to see no smoking, but I appreciate the wishes of the other people.

He goes on to say that there's a waste of publication. Yet as I listened to the hon. member, he wasn't sure where. He didn't say any specifics. He says it gathers dust. Well, my information is that our publications, our research have not gathered dust. They're circulated as widely as we can throughout the province. If there's something gathering dust, if he can be specific, I'd sure as the devil try to correct that. If he wants me to put somebody in charge so they can pass the buck, I don't believe in that. If somebody has to take the responsibility, I believe it should be the person in charge. I would never consider passing the buck on to someone else.

I appreciate what he's saying about employees working in one spot. I guess that goes for us, too, sitting here for some hours in one spot. Yet -- I'm going to ask the protestors out here someday, whom I've talked to on a daily basis, just about that. They sit there for 12 hours a day, and they don't have any ill effects. They're sitting on cement, and they've got backs and all this kind of stuff, and I'm just wondering: maybe I can learn from them, by being in one spot too long. But I'll have to ask that question.

The Member for Edmonton-Whitemud has made some good points, and I appreciate and respect that prevention is step one. It's got to be that. He read a number of figures in respect to back injury, and I have those figures here. That comes from our doctor friend that wrote to me and wrote to the hon. member, and I've written back to the hon. doctor, and yet he hasn't taken up my suggestion that he meet with people to review what he's talking about. So I hope the hon. member sees the two sides of it. We have a back injury research program under way by the same doctor, and it's on its third year, and he's asked for an extension.

I guess the difficulty is that there isn't a doctor that I'm aware of -- and I talked to one last night specifically on this -- that can diagnosis a back injury. It's unreal. You just can't pinpoint it and be positive. If somebody goes to the doctor and

says, "I have a backache," and they say, "Ouch" when the doctor presses that certain spot, you can't verify it. You can't say, "No, you don't have a backache." So it's touchy, and I respect his concerns because I have those too, and I'd like to see something come forward in respect to back injury. I'm working with some people now to see if we can get a program through the heritage fund that would really move us forward in respect to back injury. We've got some information coming from the United States with some research there that might help us in that respect. I have no difficulty in saying that we should have more funding for back injuries because it seems they are the biggest percentage of our worker compensation claims. I want to compliment the Workers' Compensation Board for implementing this program three years ago. It's not finished. It will be done in about 1990 or 1991, and hopefully from that research we'll move a step forward.

The hon. member mentioned something about the gentleman Mr. Spencer. I just have to say this to the hon. member, and he might want to pass it on to Mr. Spencer. I met with him yesterday. We had two options available for Mr. Spencer: to go before the appeals commission and the rehab services. He rejected both of them, and I asked him why yesterday, and I guess he said the same thing that was in the paper, that I had him set up. I don't understand what he meant by that because I don't set anybody up. It's available to everybody.

I'm concerned about the people that say to me that they can't get answers. That's not right because if they come to me and . . . The member's not here, but the NDP in my estimates sometime before mentioned that they had many, many concerns in regards to workers' compensation, yet since that day I've received two letters requesting help. Now, if there are hundreds of people asking for help, where are they?

AN HON. MEMBER: We'll send you a hundred letters.

MR. TRYNCHY: Just a minute. You can have your say when you get up. I have not received any letters except two and one from the hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud. So don't give us that. If you have a concern, my door is open. You can walk in if you want to. You can write a letter, give me the person's name, and I'll get you the facts. Do that, because I've never received a letter from the hon. member there that's shaking his head. But if you have concerns, get them to me. That's what I'm there for, but don't just toss out, "We have hundreds of concerns, but nobody helps." You're not doing your constituents a favour by not getting that information to me. [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order in the committee.

MR. TRYNCHY: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands can write me a letter, and I'll respond to it. I appreciate her concerns. But do that. Get it to me. Don't be afraid of me. That's the process. If you have a concern and you can't get an answer, get it to the minister, whoever that person may be. I can assure you, as long as I'm minister, you'll get an answer.

Pardon me?

MS BARRETT: You'd never get any sleep. You'd be working 24 hours a day.

MR. TRYNCHY: Well, maybe I don't need any sleep. But why doesn't the hon. member try me? The Member for

Edmonton-Mill Woods says carry through on research, and I tell you that is true, we are going carry through on research because research is just the start. My meetings today and last week were: "Okay; what's the follow-through? You can't just stop at research."

Somebody mentioned that the files gather dust. I don't accept for a minute his comments that the employers are only interested in the bottom line. I challenge him again. Go talk to the employers in his constituency, and talk to them, because they're not interested. As I've traveled the constituencies -- and I've traveled quite a bit, and I'm going to do more -- I talk to the employers. They're interested in safety, very much so, and if we can help them, we will.

He says a taxi industry report should be mandatory. You know, the government didn't do that report. We funded it for the taxi industry. They did the report, and if they should ask for it to be mandatory, I would consider it. Certainly it's a good program. It's a good program, and why should we have to make it mandatory if it's positive for the industry? I talked to them yesterday, and I said, look, you've got to make it work and if you want to make it mandatory, talk to your civil government leaders. The city of Edmonton can make it mandatory before they issue a licence; so can the city of Calgary; so can the town of Whitecourt; so can the town of Hanna. Let them do it. Why does the NDP want government to be the policeman of everybody? Can't we do something on our own?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order. I would remind the hon. minister that we are dealing with a certain specific estimate, and I don't know whether it really extends to the limit that the minister has taken it.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, you're probably right on, but I don't think you are because you allowed the member to insinuate and make innuendos about the taxi industry report. I'm only responding. I've gone too far. I'll abide by your decision and slow down.

Mr. Chairman, again the government didn't make the video. It was made by the taxi industry. As I rode to the meeting yesterday with a taxi driver, we talked about it, and the taxi industry as a whole is pretty receptive to it. Let them make the move whether it should be made mandatory and ask those questions. Who are we trying to protect? The NDP want a policeman in every industry which, I said before, is 62,000 industries, y e t . . .

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Citation.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, you're going to have to give me a second to find the citation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Four eleven.

MR. WICKMAN: Four eleven.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister may continue u n t i l . . .

MR. TRYNCHY: Until he finds the citation, I'd like to conclude.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it quite clear to all the members here that I'm concerned about safety in the workplace re-

ardless of where it's at, whether it's the taxi industry, the meat packing industry, the oil industry, farmers, the whole gamut. I'm interested in seeing injuries reduced as much as we can do, but it can't be government saying, "You must do it." It's got to be industry working with us, the employers working with us, and, of course, the employees co-operating.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud has a point of order?

MR. WICKMAN: My colleagues are just finding the proper citation, Mr. Chairman, b u t . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the meantime, I'll recognize the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was down in the library for but a brief few moments. When I came back up this place had suddenly erupted into a hothouse of debate. I walked in and the minister said, "I challenge," and I need to take up that challenge. I believe that the minister said, "You've got problems with the Workers' Comp Board; you send that stuff to me."

Well, I'll tell you about my experience with his predecessors, and I'm about to predict my future experience with this minister. That is that when I send those things to the minister, they get put in a big pile and completely ignored by administrator after administrator, and eventually if I'm lucky, the file gets back to Workers' Compensation one more time, and somebody says, "Well, I'm sorry, but you know, the rule doesn't allow this and such and such doesn't allow that."

The minister says that there's no such thing as political interference in this process. I beg to differ, Mr. Chairman, because it was his predecessor, in fact, who ran direct political interference on what was supposed to be an independent insurance agency by ordering it to cut its own budget back by \$20 million. They did it on the backs of injured workers. They ought to hang their heads in shame. And he hasn't restored that funding to the Workers' Compensation Board.

So, by God, tomorrow in caucus, I want to tell this minister, I'm going to meet his challenge. I'm going to advise everybody in the Official Opposition New Democrat caucus to take every one of their workers' comp cases and outline every inflexible rule and every shortcoming of that entire mess that this minister says he's so proud of and send every single one of them to him. I hope he works 24 hours a day trying to keep up.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, you know, to challenge me because of my predecessor I think is just s o m e w h a t . . .

MS BARRETT: You're not responsible for him. The rules say that. It's okay.

MR. TRYNCHY: Well, no. But, Mr. Chairman, if they have a concern, please bring it to me, but don't give me t h a t . . . I won't say it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Has the hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud got his citation?

MR. WICKMAN: Well, yes, but I wish to speak, too, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well then, hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud, I'll perhaps add you to the list, and you can make the point when you're speaking. Will that be satisfactory?

MR. WICKMAN: Oh, I thought you had me on the list from before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'll move along with the list then, and we'll have the hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to return to the vote. I know we just had a moment of excitement. I note that one objective of this program is: "to promote the health and well-being of Albertan workers through improved working conditions." I think all sides of the House would agree that if industry and workers are co-operative in their working together to work towards better safety conditions, everybody would like to see government as unobtrusive as possible, but that's not always the case.

I could cite the oil patch as an example where there have been a number of serious accidents over the last few years and quite a large number of deaths. We know that those deaths have been caused largely by inexperienced workers. We know that's a condition of the industry itself. There have been a lot of lay-offs in the industry, and people, for the most part, would prefer to have long-term secure jobs, so a lot of the well-trained employees have found work elsewhere, and the crews are often made up of green employees. That's part of the condition that leads to accidents. The other part of the condition that seems to lead to accidents is that with a large surplus capacity of drilling rigs and service rigs in the province, there's a lot of competition for contracts, and companies are undercutting each other, and they're forcing their crews to work at impossible rates and under very difficult conditions.

Compounding the risk in this industry is the fact that a lot of wells are now being drilled into sour gas zones, and all we need is a well blowout of a sour gas well close to a city like Calgary. I might point out that a lot of wells are being drilled immediately to the north of Calgary, around the Balzac area and to the northeast of Calgary. As well, we know that the Caroline field is essentially a sour gas field. It's completely essential that crews in that area are highly skilled and seasoned. So I would like to ask the minister to what extent he's meeting that objective of the program that I quoted at first, which is: "to promote the health and well-being of Albertan workers through improved working conditions," through the expenditures of dollars from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of additional comments. I respected what the minister had said up to a certain point, and then he tended to stray. The citation I had intended to use was 459(1) that talks in terms of straying off in debate, but he had concluded his debate, so that no longer is of reference. When he got into sort of attacking the New Democrats -- I'm not saying they don't deserve it, but that wasn't the appropriate time to do it.

The minister's remarks that pertain to workers' compensation. I ask you to bear with me because it's the minister that raised the whole question of the Workers' Compensation Board

and not myself. I just made passing reference to Terry Spencer. But, Mr. Minister, I say to you -- and I'm very, very serious about this -- in my constituency I have about 14 files that pertain to workers' compensation cases. Now, these are active ones.

MS BARRETT: That's all?

MR. WICKMAN: These are the active ones that we've gathered in a matter of two months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Through the Chair, please.

MR. WICKMAN: I say, Mr. Chairman, you allowed the minister to start this, and I just want to kind of respond and explain by my point of view w h a t . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I'm not complaining about anything except the fact that the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands and you seem to be having a private conversation.

MR. WICKMAN: She is. I'm not speaking with the member right now, Mr. Chairman.

MS BARRETT: And I'm not listening to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, my colleague to the immediate right, I know in his office he has numerous complaints. I can look at any of the members here, and I'm sure the New Democrats have great numbers of them as well. It is very, very frustrating.

I can give you one that I dealt with just very recently, Mr. Minister, and it really disturbed me. It involved the situation of a fellow who had made application -- in fact, I'm his representative -- for a settlement on a partial disability. I was given assurances that if he agreed to a reassessment, if the reassessment indicated his condition would not deteriorate, he would receive his award. I was given that assurance. I went back to that individual. I said . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but quite frankly these individual cases of maladministration in the Workers' Compensation Board really aren't relevant to the educational process that we're studying in tonight's estimates.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to educate the minister. Doesn't that count? Just bear with me for a couple more minutes, Mr. Chairman.

In any case, Mr. Chairman, I was given the assurances that if the reassessment was fine, he would receive his award. A few days later somebody from the board phoned that individual and said: "The reassessment is off. We decided you're not going to get the award." I phoned the person back who had made a commitment to me. I said, "What's going on here?" They said, "Somebody higher up, a medical adviser in the department, has decided a reassessment is not needed." One hadn't been done for three years, but a reassessment is not done. They recommended no award, because the person's condition, he feels, is going to deteriorate. Yet he would not allow reassessment. It doesn't make sense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I've been fairly lenient. I really must insist that we stick with the vote now. I'm sure the minister will be prepared to discuss this with you on a private or individual basis afterwards. But I think it's asking a lot of the committee to ask them, you know, to participate in this negotiation or representation.

MR. WICKMAN: Workers' compensation complaints. I think we're serving every member in this House, because we a l l . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, order. The minister has said that he will respond to your concern on another occasion, but this is not the occasion to do it.

MR. WICKMAN: Okay, Mr. Chairman, I will conclude on the note that I take the minister's earlier indication very seriously, that he will welcome any concerns that we have that relate to his particular department. I would hope that he means that seriously, that he will try and resolve them and not simply refer them over to the WCB for an appeal mechanism.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of questions here this evening to the minister. First of all, it's been the custom, as I recall, having been a committee member here for some time, that at least in the past the former minister in bringing these estimates before the committee, circulated a copy of all the projects funded by this program over the past year. I found that information interesting. It gave a good idea to all of us just where the money was going and how it was being used. So I'm a bit mystified that it's not here in front of us this evening, and I would hope that the minister would give us an undertaking that after this evening he will go back and get that document and circulate it to all members of the Legislature. I think it would be helpful, and it would help ensure that the questions for tonight would stay on the topic, Mr. Chairman.

Point number two is something that I've spoken to a number of limes in this Legislature at this time of the year when the committee reviews these estimates, and that has to do with research into the problem of what's come to be called sick building syndrome. I won't go into a lot of detail about that tonight, Mr. Chairman, other than to say that as part of its recommendations of July of this year, the report of the Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Act made a recommendation, recommendation 6,

That a study be done under the occupational health research and safety heritage grant program to analyze the effects of recycled air in airtight office space on employees, with a view to reducing incidence of influenza, et cetera.

I'd like the minister to take a moment or two to respond to this particular recommendation. I see his hon. colleague next to him is smiling broadly. He will recognize the wording, having been the author of that recommendation in committee.

I would also note committee recommendation 7, Mr. Chairman, that a study be done under the same program . . . And the recommendation goes on:

on the use of alcohol and drugs, including prescription drugs, in the workplace and the effects they have on safety, absenteeism, and productivity in Alberta.

Again, a recommendation made by the standing committee



to this minister for this vote. It would be valuable to the committee's deliberations tonight if the minister would give us his response to these particular recommendations.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have one brief question. Mr. Chairman, I understand that this is a term program; that is to say that it has a horizon and that that will be within a year or two. Could the minister please indicate what his plans are for this program beyond this year, whether or not he foresees continued funding for it into the future, and if so, for how long? In answering that, I would ask that he keep in mind that given the difficulties with the Workers' Compensation Board, I believe he is wrong to diminish the number and magnitude of these problems, because in fact of all the problems that we deal with in my constituency office, the bulk, the greatest number, are Workers' Compensation Board problems. Could he please, in answering my question, keep in mind that there are huge problems in dealing with this government's ability to deal with workers once they have been injured, and at the same time, to discontinue a program that looks positively at ways of reducing injuries on the job would seem to be a tremendous contradiction. I would ask that the minister please continue to advocate this program and give me some indication of what success he believes he will have in continuing the program in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Occupational Health and Safety.

MR. TRYNCHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In respect to Calgary-Forest Lawn's questions, yes, the oil patch has a number of injuries, and I will be meeting with them shortly. I think the hon. member is familiar with the upstream report done by the industry. I want to know where they are going with it and why they are not moving as quickly as they said they would. You know, it's hard for Occupational Health and Safety to tell the industry you can't hire this or that person. I appreciate that some of the experienced workers have gone on to something that's more stable, and we expect that. But, as he said, green employees -- probably you shouldn't call them green employees, but uneducated employees that need some training. So possibly what we should be doing is making sure they have their training before they get on the drilling rig floor and get injured. So I'll be asking some questions in respect to the upstream report, and hopefully we'll get some answers.

In respect to the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud's workers' compensation concerns, I would ask him to bring them back. This is not the forum for it.

Calgary-Mountain View, the document on funding: I don't have that, even for myself, but if it's available, I'll see if I can get it.

The sick building research: I'd ask the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services to probably put that on his agenda, because most of the buildings we operate out of are under the jurisdiction of Public Works, Supply and Services.

The last question was research on drugs and alcohol, et cetera, in the workplace. I just wonder how we would do that. Would we be moving into the jurisdiction of individual rights?

What do you do to a person when they walk to work in the morning? Do you ask them if they had a drink before they went to work, or if they've taken drugs? I don't know how we would fit in, as Occupational Health and Safety. But if the hon. member has some suggestions on how we might be able to implement that, I'd certainly be interested in his views and the views of anybody else who might give us some suggestions on how we could reduce that if it is a problem. I can appreciate what he's saying.

The Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark wanted to know when the program ends. Yes, it's a 10-year program. It's been extended, and the present program will end in 1990-91. The question was asked: will we continue funding? I'm having a review done on exactly where we've come from, what we've done, and why we should continue. Hopefully, with the amount of research we've done and if it's positive, and I'm sure it is, and if there's more research to be done, I would like to continue. But that, of course, depends on budgetary issues and of course the support of the members of this Assembly, all of them. He suggested that he has a number of workers' compensation problems. Again I say to him, you can bring them to me at an appropriate time. And he should be aware that it's not the government that runs the Workers' Compensation Board; it's the Workers' Compensation Board that runs that. And they are . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Come on. You funded it. You appoint them all.

MR. TRYNCHY: Just a minute. We don't fund the Workers' Compensation . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Hon. minister, I really would suggest that we stay off the subject of the Workers' Compensation Board, or we're never going to get through these estimates tonight.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I think you're right. The hon. member has made some statements that aren't factual, and we'll get to them later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes. I just wanted to remind the minister if he could put it on the Order Paper or draw up an answer to my question. He touched on everything before that I'd asked except the percentage that goes into agricultural research. I'm hesitant, Mr. Chairman, to infer that his memory is probably not good enough to know what the percentage is, because last time I remarked about his memory, he sued me for libel. But I'm interested if he would remember to drop me a line or file somewhere what percentage of the total budget is devoted to agricultural research.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, that should be in the report before the member, but if it's not, if he would write me a letter specifically asking for whatever he's seeking, I'll get back to him; yes.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to ask the minister as well if he might do what his predecessor did in past years, which we certainly appreciated and which he hasn't done tonight here for us. That is to provide us with an itemized list of

all the projects that were financed by the fund in the last year, indicating the allocation for each specific proposal.

MR. TRYNCHY: The Member for Calgary-Mountain View asked the same question, and I said if I have it, I'd provide it. I don't have it myself, so I don't know if it's available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Assembly ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 -- Occupational Health and Safety

Research and Education \$1,380,000

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

[Motion carried]

### Advanced Education

#### Vote 1 -- Clinical Research Building

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next item for consideration by the committee will be found at page 9 of the book.

The hon. Minister of Advanced Education.

MR. GOGO: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. As hon. members know, the heritage fund was created some 14 years ago with the specific purpose of doing various things. Perhaps one of the most exciting was the matter we're dealing with tonight, the capital projects division of the heritage fund.

The vote we're dealing with tonight is the Clinical Research Building at the University of Alberta, requesting approval of the committee, Mr. Chairman, for some \$3.5 million. I would point out that the clinical research building was a project of Alberta Hospitals and Medical Care, now the Department of Health, in 1987. However, because it was to be built on the campus at the University of Alberta, it was recommended that it be handled by the Department of Advanced Education and, as a consequence, was transferred to this department in 1987. It's interesting to point out that this will be a facility consisting of a series of bays and lab modules, very similar to the nine-storey building, the medical research building, handled by the heritage fund for medical research. This building, this project, Mr. Chairman, will be occupied by those very same scientists who participate with the heritage medical foundation.

The details, Mr. Chairman: it's 79,000 square feet; it's a very large building. To date those members who are on campus or visit campus will note that the building is all closed in. It simply remains to have the finishing of the laboratories. The dollars involved: some \$17.6 million, the majority of which has been spent. This will conclude the project for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects division of Advanced Education. The completion should be on schedule this November, which is just about two years from the time it started.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would attempt to answer any questions hon. members have, and certainly encourage them to support this very worthwhile project at the University of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just actually have one question, and that is: to the minister's knowledge, is the amount of money that has been handed out so far and the amount that's scheduled for expenditure this year in tune with the state of construction? In other words, does he anticipate any cost overruns in this construction?

MR. GOGO: A good question. The answer is no, we do not expect a cost overrun, Mr. Chairman. We expect it to be on time and in budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-McKnight.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This will probably be the shortest comment of the evening. I have no questions. I was going to ask for a few details, but the hon. minister has provided them, and I certainly support this vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just one question, really. The minister correctly says that the building is closed in and should be open in November this year. But the \$3.5 million is presumably to be spent between March 31 . . . Oh, is this from March 31, 1988?

AN HON. MEMBER: Eighty-nine.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, true. But it says, "Total Actual Expenditure to March 31, 1988: Nil." I'm not quite clear. Is this \$3.5 million being spent in this fiscal year up to November? In which case it is a large sum, and just to say it's completing laboratories and so on is hardly enough detail, I would have thought, to tell us really what it's all about. I mean, it's a very creditable project and it's a boon to the university and so on, but perhaps the minister could be a little more explicit as to the \$3.5 million presumably spent from March 31 this year to November.

MR. GOGO: The amount requested, Mr. Chairman, is the '89-90 budget, which is this year, which will see the completion in November of 1989. The \$3.5 million approximately -- \$3.532 million to be exact -- will really be utilized for the interior of the building with the completion of the laboratories, et cetera, these modules that I referred to.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure whether I should be asking this, but it fits into . . . I'm sure many people in the House have received a publication called *Folio*, and in it the chairman of the board of governors of the university and the vice-president complain that the grant system to the university is being kept at a figure considerably less than what the university is able to raise. They're talking about \$24 million for each of the universities of Edmonton and Calgary over a 10-year period. That's being matched by their own funds. The university feels that they've raised much more funds than now Advanced Education is willing to match. In other words, they broke an agreement with the university. I was wondering how that ties into this clinical research building. How does this clinical research thing of \$3.5 million fit in with the commitment of \$2.4 million which supposedly was capped? Have we got two different funds here? I just don't understand what goes on.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. member; he is confused. June 12 saw the estimates of this department, with the comment so ably made by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona regarding the endowment incentive fund, which is a totally separate issue from the matter before the House. I take note, hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, of your concern about the endowment incentive fund, which is entirely a separate matter. This is funded from the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and this vote tonight, assuming it will be approved, will see the completion of that commitment made by the government in 1987.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the House ready for the question? Sorry. The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: One short question, and that is that this is an admirable edifice that we're funding, but I'm wondering why we're spending such sums of money to put up these splendid buildings when we don't have adequate funding for re-equipping. I'm thinking, in light of what I've been hearing from the universities, that once we equip this building, in five years when equipment starts to wind down and the furnishings start to wind down, we're going to be left with a very fine edifice but not the internal workings to keep it up to date and to do the job. So I'm wondering whether the minister can give us some of his observations on where he sees us going insofar as keeping this as an effective, working edifice over the life of the building, in light of complaints that we've been hearing that the government's policies with respect to re-equipment funding are woefully inadequate.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I'm not too sure how I should answer the hon. member's question. He raises a legitimate concern with regard to the formula funding question of the postsecondary system with the institutions -- won't quarrel with that -- which is to replace equipment, do maintenance and site work, and so on, which is an entirely separate issue from this. I would hope and I feel very confident that when the government, with regard to its commitment through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, puts a building up on campus, along with it would go the moral commitment -- indeed, perhaps more than moral, Mr. Chairman -- to see that because this is going to be used by the scientists with the heritage medical foundation, it will not only be kept up to date but I think will actually reflect the state of the art with regard to scientific research in all of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the House ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 -- Clinical Research Building                      \$3,532,000

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

[Motion carried]

### Recreation and Parks

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are three votes to be considered under this item, and they commence at page 21 of the book.

The hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks.

DR. WEST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased tonight to present the estimates for the Department of Recreation and Parks for the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects division. If you look back in history to the mandate of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, which was to build on Alberta's basic strengths, to enhance the quality of life for all Albertans, and to lay a foundation for future generations to enjoy and also a backstop to the financial stresses in the economy of the day, I believe that the votes here tonight are good examples of how the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is being spent in exactly those ways.

If you look at page 21, you will find that there are no sums to be voted in vote 1 for Kananaskis Country Recreation Development.

In vote 2 we're asking for \$4 million in one of the areas that our department has been very active in in the last few years, the Municipal Recreation/Tourism Areas. This program was designated in 1986-87 as a five-year program to deliver moneys to municipalities, some 41 constituencies and to date some 163 different projects in many municipalities throughout Alberta, to deliver \$100,000 of capital funds to develop recreational areas or areas for tourism, areas such as those created around lakes, small parks, ball diamonds, pure recreational areas or pure tourism areas. It delivers some \$300,000 to each of 41 constituencies over that period of time. To date we have delivered some \$10 million out of a \$13 million project. These areas have been very well received. They have a tremendous amount of local input. A lot of volunteer hours are spent on them, and a lot of personal input by municipalities to make them a success. As a result, they carry out of the General Revenue Fund a \$20,000 a year operating grant for 25 years, which ensures throughout Alberta that these will be maintained for generations to come, again something that stands in the direct mandate of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund investments.

In vote 3 we're asking for \$1 million this year in another very successful program, Urban Park Development. The first phase of this was some \$86 million spent through five communities in the province of Alberta. The first ones were Red Deer, Medicine Hat, Lloydminster, Lethbridge, and Grande Prairie. These were so successful in developing greenbelts and places for people to have an outlet they otherwise wouldn't have had in an urban setting that phase 2 was developed to which, during the throne speech, \$82 million was committed over the next 10 years to develop urban parks in nine new communities -- Fort McMurray, St. Albert, the county of Strathcona, Camrose, Leduc, Airdrie, Fort Saskatchewan, Spruce Grove, and Wetaskiwin -- as well as a continuance of urban park development in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary. This year we're asking for \$1 million, \$900,000 of which will be spent in the planning consultation for the development of these parks in future years. There is no money being allocated to the exact capital development this year. All of the \$900,000 goes into planning; \$100,000 then goes into supplies and services and wages in order to administer the new program to these 11 communities.

Two-thirds of Albertans, when this is through, will enjoy within an urban setting the luxury that is enjoyed in those first 41 constituencies that I talked about in rural Alberta: having their greenbelt and their park right at their doorstep, something that is very important in the highly stressful technical world that we live in today.

I am requesting these sums in vote 2, \$4 million in vote 3, and I ask all hon. members to support this vote.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to see the minister responding to many of the needs of Albertans, especially in parks and recreation. I'm sure that all Albertans will hope that Kananaskis is now totally developed with \$224.613 million. It's unbelievable to me how that money could be spent there, but being one Albertan that has never visited, I guess I am in for an experience when I go there.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's very costly, building those mountains.

MR. DOYLE: It may be too expensive for me; I don't know.

The one question that the minister I'm sure is going to have to address in the years to come is that of the amounts of dollars that have been spent in park development and tourism/recreation development in southern Alberta versus northern Alberta. In vote 2, Mr. Chairman, the \$4 million allotted to Municipal Recreation/Tourism Areas is a major increase for development of parks.

MR. CHUMIR: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo is rising on a point of order.

MR. CHUMIR: My apologies to the speaker, but I note that the minister who is now leaving the Chamber has just lit up, and it's been brought to my attention that we have a surprise discovery of the rules here. Rule 331 in *Beauchesne* states:

While members are entitled to refresh themselves with glasses of water during debates, the consumption of any other food in the House is strictly forbidden. Smoking has never been permitted in the Chamber.

S o . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I think this point has been raised before, and *Beauchesne* in that instance is applying to the House of Commons in Ottawa and not to the convention that has been developed in this Chamber.

The hon. Member for West Yellowhead.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, the \$4 million that has been requested out of the Alberta heritage trust fund for Municipal Recreation/Tourism Areas is a major increase, but it's certainly a necessary increase for this program. Even West Yellowhead has benefited in this project in the past, and it's well appreciated, and hopefully we'll be seeing more funds coming in our direction. The total amount is now, as the minister indicated, close to \$10 million, and I believe he said it was going to \$13 million. Perhaps he could inform the Legislature how many more years this program will be going. One of the great things about this program has been the fact that the municipalities or the associations that have requested funding from this program have had operating funding. That's something that many people fall flat on their face on once a project is completed and no money left for operating.

Urban Park Development, Mr. Chairman, I will perhaps leave for other speakers. I see no unfairness with this, but I would like to advise the minister that I think the time has come

that more money is spent -- and all fair-minded Albertans will, I'm sure, agree that as they travel through Alberta, they note in northern Alberta the very few dollars that have been spent on parks, tourism, and recreation facilities in comparison to southern Alberta. I would hope that in the future we will be addressing these situations and supplying fair funding to the total of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask several questions concerning votes 2 and 3. Could the minister please provide us with an indication of the criteria used for determining the approval of Municipal Recreation/Tourism Areas grants? Could he please indicate as well for Urban Park Development, vote 3, what the criteria for selection and approval are? Could he please indicate what the relationship is between the urban park development program in his department, vote 3, and the Capital City Recreation Park program in Public Works, Supply and Services? Could he indicate whether there is some shift in that program from Capital City Recreation Park funding to Urban Park Development in vote 3, as this is a new program or appears to be a new program? And could he please indicate, if that is the case, what is his proposed schedule for funding the Capital City park extension in Edmonton, giving me and constituents in the west end, as well as generally the residents of Edmonton, some indication as to what his schedule for completion of the Capital City park extension in Edmonton would be?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to direct my comments to the Municipal Recreation/Tourism Areas portion of the estimates that we're looking at tonight. I want to share with hon. members some of the work that has been done within the Taber-Warner constituency and, indeed, to further allude to what will happen. And then I do have a question I would like to pose to the minister at the end.

I was pleased that we were able to see the very first grant under this program used on an irrigation lake partway between Coaldale and Taber. Stafford Lake is a unique irrigation lake in that it is really a middle lake. There is a conflict between the irrigation farmer and the boating recreation enthusiast late in the year as the lake is being drawn down for irrigation purposes, and therefore we find that in order to get one's boat into the water, you're going through quite a muddied beach area that some weeks or even in some cases days earlier was part of the lake and is now part of the beachfront. That does cause some consternation between the different uses. Stafford is unique in that there is a check coming into Stafford on the upper end from Chin Lakes, which is a major irrigation lake, and there's another check on the lower end of Stafford which goes right into a canal. Therefore, the level of Stafford Lake, a six-mile long, half-mile wide lake, can be maintained to within a six- to eight-inch fluctuation. So it's ideal for the recreation enthusiast as well as its purpose as an irrigation body.

It was through the foresight of the St. Mary River Irrigation District that we saved this body of water in the first place for development. We were able to use \$100,000 for the development of a recreation area on Stafford Lake. That is administered

by the town of Coaldale and is an extremely popular site in southern Alberta.

A couple of years ago we saw the redevelopment of a small park north of Coutts called Gold Springs park. Again, a group of volunteers formed into a society, took an area that had been developed some 22 years earlier as a park. But because there were no operating dollars and because there wasn't ongoing maintenance, we saw vandalism increase and, over a period of time, conditions at the park deteriorate, so that when the society took over they were really starting from scratch. And they've done an absolutely marvelous job. I had the opportunity just Sunday of this week to go with my own family and some friends and have a picnic there, and we were so impressed with the work that's been done. And again, it's through this particular program that we saw first the capital dollars put in place and now the operating dollars to maintain that.

We have a couple of other exciting projects coming up. Inside the town of Taber there is a beautiful park that was developed during Canada's centennial year. The town argued that they really didn't need dollars for an urban park; they needed dollars for an indoor pool to build within the park. And we were able to get approval for that project. It's the first time under this program that dollars will be used for an actual building within a park setting, so we're quite pleased about that one.

We're working hard on the development of a Milk River atrium centre to be part of a complex built by the town that will house the town offices, court facilities, and dental office, and that, again, is an exciting concept. The last one is one we're working very hard on, again with the town of Coaldale, and it's the birds of prey sanctuary. It's a 67-acre park project that's being planned. There will be a 22-acre lake within the park, and a portion of that area would be set aside as a park.

I mention these projects because they all have one thing in common -- and I'm really coming to my question to the minister -- and that is the importance of the operating dollars. Now, I know that in some areas around the province smaller projects have been approved, so that there are \$50,000 capital projects with \$10,000-a-year operating grants. The projects I've listed are all \$100,000 projects and all would qualify for the \$20,000-a-year for 25 years of operating capital. While the operating dollars don't come from the heritage trust fund -- they come from general revenue -- they are an integral part of this program. So the question I'm putting to the minister is to gain some assurance that it is his intention that we will continue with this program, that we will continue to honour our commitment to municipalities on the operating side. Because it's one thing to build a facility; it's quite another to operate it. We've been working hand in hand with municipalities and volunteer groups on the building of these centres across the province. We've got a commitment in place now on the operating, and it's my earnest hope and desire to see that commitment continued and maintained so that, indeed, these projects can reach their full potential.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn, followed by -- I may as well go through the list as I have it -- Calgary-North West, Edmonton-Jasper Place, and Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My questions are actually in line with the questions asked by the Member for

Edmonton-Meadowlark, and they have to do with a need that exists in my own constituency for two park developments, one that I've described at some length to the Minister of the Environment that has to do with the Western Irrigation District canal; the other is a park in a community that is represented by not only myself but another member of this Assembly. We've been working together on a project to try to get a park off the ground.

With respect to vote 2, who makes the application with respect to the implementation of that program? It's not clear who makes the application. Could a community association, for example, make an application under the implementation of that program, and what would be the maximum amount for any one individual application in a given calendar year? That's not spelled out, as well. I wonder if the minister could be specific about those questions. I would gather from looking at vote 3 that it's only a municipality itself that could make an application for a grant under that program, and is that correct or not?

DR. WEST: I'll answer a few as a catch-up. I'll start with the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn's question directly. As I indicated in my opening remarks, there are 41 constituencies designated under this program outside of the urban areas, so in answer to your question, you could not apply for the MRTA within the city of Calgary. In vote 3, any city designated over 10,000 population now is included in the urban parks program, and it roughly comes out on criteria to about \$300 per capita. The municipality is responsible for establishing the plan, hiring the consultants, and carrying it through, although we do give infrastructure help to them through our department and the staff with the urban parks program.

To the Member for Taber-Warner. I'm really pleased that he has identified the potential of this program. The idea of the \$20,000 was to ensure that the investment of the heritage fund dollars was protected for generations to come, so that these areas would be maintained, kept up with replacement and maintenance, or the deterioration of these would take place. He asked the question: this is a 25-year program, and a commitment to deliver the \$20,000 is there under the guidelines of the program, notwithstanding anything that is unforeseen to the province of Alberta. Fiscal management is always a concern. To stand here and project 25 years into the future on an absolute basis would be a little bit remiss in my responsibility. But the commitment is there, and to the best of the ability of Alberta to ensure that destiny, it will be carried through.

The Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark has brought up a few areas. In vote 2 he asked: what is the approval process? Of course, the 41 constituencies -- the municipalities within those identify sites that they would like to spend the moneys on. They fill out an application form and send it in to the Ministry of Recreation and Parks and to the department. The MLAs are consulted and are instrumental in working with the municipalities and the organizations. That agreement has gone forward, and if the application fits into the guidelines set out as far as where the moneys are spent, then the approval is given by the minister and it flows through into that year's designation. As I say, there are 41 constituencies, and the member represents part of the city of Edmonton and of course wouldn't apply to the MRTA. In vote 3 you would, and of course the project you're talking about, the Capital City park, was funded some time ago as a separate entity in the province of Alberta, and at the present time carries an operating fund of 5 percent of the capital of some over \$2 million that was spent at that time to the city of

Edmonton. The \$800,000 under Public Works, Supplies and Services will be addressed by the minister of that department when the estimates of his department come up, as that relates.

As far as the extension of the Capital City park, the mayor has identified, along with the recreation and development department of the city of Edmonton, some \$48 million projected to upgrading the extension of the Capital City park. Part of the new urban park program will include the city of Edmonton, and it will be delivered over a 10-year period. We will address operating expenses in that as we proceed. The city of Edmonton, of course, will put in its own dollars, too, in a process over that same period of years. So that addresses that.

West Yellowhead. Kananaskis Country -- you identified a tremendous asset to this province. You did have the figures fairly accurate, and those are not disputable. The total expenditures were \$225,000,068.30. I don't know how we came up with that 30 cents, but...

AN HON. MEMBER: On a postage stamp.

DR. WEST: It might have been the last postage stamp; that's correct.

You've got to understand we get over 5 million visitor-days into that park a year, and I went through that when we were doing the estimates on the General Revenue Fund. It is at capacity on days like this in the summertime. If you're not there early on the key weekends, you will not be able to find a campsite in that 1,640 square miles. That is remarkable, and 80 percent of those are Albertans using that facility. On a projected per capita basis -- projected over the years ahead for the enjoyment of future generations -- you'll find that those sums have been well spent.

The regional road program, the development of roads within Kananaskis Country. So that you can get a balance to what was spent on the park infrastructures, the road infrastructure was \$121,329,000.40. So the infrastructure costs to develop roads for 1,640 square miles were very significant, and I think Albertans appreciate that.

As far as southern Alberta versus northern Alberta, I'm addressing two votes in this Assembly tonight, and that statement is not credible, that there is more spent in southern Alberta than northern Alberta on these projects. For example, if you look at the MRTAs, you will notice that there are 163 of them designated to this date, and I would say the majority of those are north of Red Deer. If you look at the urban park situation, the first five that were designated, Lloydminster, Grande Prairie, and Red Deer, centre, were three of those. If you go to the next phase of the urban parks program and have a look at that, if we want to take north versus south: Edmonton, Fort McMurray, St. Albert, county of Strathcona, Camrose, Leduc, Fort Saskatchewan, Spruce Grove, and Wetaskiwin. I would ask you to read *Hansard* and see what you said about unfair proportions between north and south, because it doesn't add up when it comes to the second phase of the urban park development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to address vote 2, the MRTAs. As I understand, these grants will be going to municipalities outside the major cities of Edmonton and Calgary. The increase here is a 100 percent increase, from \$2 million to \$4 million, and my concern is simply this, Mr. Minister. I understand there were some commitments made to

CRC grants within the cities of Edmonton and Calgary on a per capita basis. They were originally \$12 per capita and have been cut back to \$10 per capita. I believe I'm correct to say that the commitment to CRC grants was made prior to, perhaps, any commitment in the MRTAs. The suggestion I would make, then...

DR. WEST: Point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister is rising on a point of order.

DR. WEST: Relevancy to the estimates. I don't want to correct the hon. member, but the CRC grants are General Revenue Fund. I would trust that we're not getting back into the estimates of Recreation and Parks under the General Revenue Fund.

MR. BRUSEKER: What I am attempting to do is challenge and give the reason why I'm challenging the estimate of \$4 million. The reason why I'm challenging the estimate of \$4 million is that if suddenly we can have an extra \$2 million kicking around, then perhaps what the government should be doing is addressing the commitments that were made initially. Notwithstanding the commitment that has been made by the minister to maintain the total dollars over the length of that program, there are a number of people in a variety of constituencies, my constituency included, that have made commitments on the basis of an understanding they received from the municipality and on the basis of an understanding they received from the minister.

So what I'm saying is that if all of sudden we have an extra \$2 million, as seems to be indicated in vote 2, then perhaps it should be reduced in vote 2 and the \$2 million can be spent elsewhere. Now, I understand that as opposition I'm not allowed to make that suggestion, but I would suggest that perhaps the \$2 million that we had estimated last year could be maintained for the 1989-90 fiscal year. Therefore, I would speak against vote 2, and perhaps we should deal with cleaning house, which seems to be something the Premier has mentioned as something that we need to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to say a few words about Urban Park Development, vote 3. It's certainly the case that the Capital City park has been a wonderful thing for people who have the ability to take advantage of it, especially those who live in the downtown area and the east end of town, especially the northeast part of town. It's an all-season type of facility which is used by all kinds of people. You can see people hiking at various speeds, jogging, and running; there are cyclists on that path from time to time. People enjoy nature in their own way. In fact, I think some of the ministers here from other parts of the province have taken advantage of that thing as well. There are historic sites, there are athletic facilities, there are golf courses, there are all types of things that people can take advantage of in the east and the northeast part of town but not, unfortunately, in the western part of the city. I don't say there's anything wrong with the people who designed the park; simply that it's past time that we considered extending that facility into the west end of town to serve people who live and visit in the constituencies of Edmonton-Whitemud, Edmonton-

Meadowlark, Edmonton-Glenora, and Edmonton-Jasper Place as well.

This does have some history. My understanding is that the city of Edmonton first proposed expanding the park in a westerly direction round about 1986, and that that's where the \$48.6 million figure the minister referred to came from. Since that time I believe the city invested a fair amount of money in planning and design. In fact, I've seen a big design document that gets right down to facilities: specific plans for a number of different picnic sites and shelters and trails heading up the various ravines, the Valley Zoo area, Hermitage, and Fort Edmonton. They've also broken it down into various chunks -- I suppose combinations and packages of things that they've made various efforts with the government to try to work some type of a cost-sharing arrangement so that the thing could be moved along. The reason I'm outlining some of that detail is to indicate that in respect to that particular project I don't know that there's that much planning that needs to be done. I think it's to a point where you could say yes or no, or you could say, "Let's go ahead and construct these things," or what have you.

I'm a little concerned that perhaps the existence of vote 3 within these Heritage Savings Trust Fund estimates indicates an end to the commitment to the Capital City park program. I suppose we'll get into that a little further when we get to public works. But what appears to be the case is that that's being rolled into this urban parks development program, for which the throne speech promises \$86 million over a 10-year period: \$300 per capita. The minister said that operating funds would be addressed; as we go along the city would contribute. I think the question that was raised when the minister's main estimates were up is a valid one. What is the time frame for completing this work? I mean, is the government prepared to accept the \$50 million expansion plan which covers the westerly expansion of the Capital City park or not? Is it whatever happens to fit within this program, or is that what you're going to figure out by spending the million dollars over the next year?

In any event, there are quite a number of people in the west end who would like to know the intentions in respect of development of the Capital City park in a westward direction, and maybe this information would help the minister to frame a reply which would be of use to people in that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of points. Earlier reference has been made to the expenditures pertaining to the southern portion of the province versus the northern portion of the province. I can recall seeing a great deal of documentation by various credible groups that substantiated very clearly -- of course, it did include the major recreational development projects down south, including those--that there was a very, very clear distortion of funding heading south of Red Deer in comparison to north of Red Deer. The fact I recall -- the Member for West Yellowhead and the Member for Edmonton-Glenora as well were part of the group that made application for dollars to initiate additional tourism and recreational facilities in the northern part of the province. I'm not sure whatever became of that application; why the provincial government chose not to approve it. Maybe that could be addressed.

But I do concur with statements that are made that there is a need for major recreation/tourism facilities in the northern part

of the province. I would say to the Member for West Yellowhead that it would be unreasonable at this particular point to expect it to be developed in that particular constituency, but there are other constituencies in the province that could be looked at very favourably.

Reference was also made under vote 2 to the Municipal Recreation/Tourism Areas and the additional \$2 million and being able to divert those funds instead to previous commitments that had been made. I realize it's not part of this particular vote, but there is that connection in that we're talking in terms of similar amounts. I would have preferred to see that \$2 million used to fulfill previous commitments to municipalities under the CRC program as well.

The last point I would raise falls under vote 3, and that's the Capital City park. Now, if we look at the entire document, we see the Capital City park, the expenditures up to date broken off into a separate category. The responsibility falls under Public Works, Supply and Services. As to why it's been chosen to budget it that way, I'm not sure, and when we look down the road as to whether further expenditures -- if there is an extension or when the extension does take place, if it's going to fall under Recreation and Parks or under public works, again I'm not sure. But in any case, it does give me an opportunity to address it. That particular project, the \$48 million plan that has been referred to, has a great deal of support by the city of Edmonton. The previous mayor supported it. The present mayor supports it. I believe all members of city council support it. I had anticipated a few months back, in fact, that there would be an announcement that would see the development of this park, of the extension that would allow for access to link up to the entire river valley, at the same time, though, respecting the wilderness aspect of that particular portion of the park.

From my latest discussions with members of Edmonton city council, any type of commitment by this government -- even if it's over a time frame of six, seven, or eight years, whatever the case may be -- to demonstrate that they are indeed committed to extending the Capital City park would certainly be welcomed. It would be welcomed by residents in the entire southwest area of the city. I realize we're not going to get it in the budget this year, but it's something the minister could take into consideration for future years -- for next year or the year after, whatever -- to give deep, deep consideration, serious consideration to including funds to allow that extension to proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first is on vote 1. I know there's no money involved, but I was wondering -- it refers to Kananaskis Country, and I know the minister has been most co-operative with me when I talk to him about different projects, in particular for the disabled. There is the William Watson Lodge at Kananaskis. I was wondering how much it's being used and whether it's up to full use. If it is up to full use, maybe we should be thinking of expanding it. It's unusual to have the opposition suggest expanding something, but I was just wondering how the William Watson Lodge in effect is working out. Is it a good idea? If it's a good idea, maybe we should do more of it.

Vote 2. Maybe the minister could explain it to me, because I have some towns in my riding that would love to get a swimming pool. I'm just not sure, from what I've seen -- grants going out to swimming pools here and there -- whether swimming

pools that are built in conjunction with an educational institution like a high school or a college qualify for more money than the ones built as is mentioned here: recreation/tourism. Pools can be quite a tourism attraction, so I was wondering if the minister had time to maybe elaborate on how some of the towns in my riding could go about advantaging more money to build swimming pools in view of the fact that there is an increase of \$2 million in the budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks.

DR. WEST: Yes. Just a quick review of some of the questions. Calgary-North West brought up CRC as it relates to a commitment. The commitment was there, as I've discussed before: some \$200 million that was committed. The commitment of MRTA funds to the 41 constituencies, the municipalities there, is something that is very, very welcome throughout the province. I'll certainly take the member's concerns forward in my discussions with them to see if they would have appreciated a cut in the MRTA versus the continued commitment of the CRC grants over the length of the fund. But I'm sure you can discuss that also with your colleagues.

The Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place brought up concerns about the Capital City park and its continuation over the next few years. All I can say is that there are and have been tremendous commitments in Edmonton and there will continue to be commitments. I think of the Fort Edmonton complex. I don't know the exact figure, but several million dollars were spent on that project. I think at the other end of the Strathcona Science Centre and the park there, along with the ski hill. I could go on and name many, many projects, but as was stated before in my preamble, the commitment to Edmonton as well as Calgary and the other nine urban communities stands: over the next 10 years some \$82 million will be delivered. This year we're asking for a million for planning. If the plans are in place, that's a decision the city of Edmonton can make: not to go any further but to submit those plans, awaiting the capital moneys. So if there's conflict there, the municipality will take the responsibility for that.

Again, I'm not getting into a south versus north Alberta. There are tremendous infrastructures in place in all areas of this province, roads and what have you, that can't be tallied on a flow chart to say plus or minus. I think Albertans over the last decades have been served very, very well by this government in all areas, and I for one am not going to stand here and start pitting Albertans against each other, as has been insinuated here tonight.

I had answered the Capital City Park. It keeps coming up to Public Works, Supply and Services. There is \$800,000 designated there. The reason for that is that there were commitments made to land purchase, and I'm sure the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services will allude to that in his discussions. Again, I stress \$82 million is committed to the urban parks program over 10 years.

William Watson Lodge. To the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, that's an excellent program. I visited it recently. We expanded last year from 40 units to 80 units. It actually probably has the capacity to house close to 100 people. It's a tremendous program, and as I stated in the other estimates, I would like to see that expanded in the northern part of this province, perhaps in another development. It certainly serves disabled and senior citizens of this province very well and gives them an op-

portunity to a good exposure to Kananaskis Country. This year Public Works, Supply and Services will spend an extra \$85,000 upgrading the entrance and that to William Watson Lodge, a further commitment to that. I might add that families that are accepted at William Watson Lodge only have to pay \$3 a day for the extra family members, which is a tremendous commitment on behalf of all Albertans to ensure that these people with a disabled individual within their family can join the individual at Kananaskis Country in William Watson Lodge without the economic devastation of high cost of housing. Three dollars a day for every member within the family.

As far as how you may access pool funds and development, our department is always willing to sit down with any municipality and discuss how that could take place. As well as following this, I will make sure the member gets information from the other departments as it relates to colleges and educational institutions and the endowment funds and what have you in relation to the funds that go into pools and those facilities and municipalities they have those in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to make some comments about the \$4 million and the \$2 million. The minister erroneously pointed out that I was suggesting we cut this. I did not make that suggestion. What I suggested was to hold the line at the \$2 million that was allocated last year in the 1988-89 estimates. The reason I was bringing it up that we maintain the \$2 million that was presented last year in the estimates as opposed to doubling it this year, which is certainly a substantial increase, was that if the \$2 million were used in the CRC grants this year, then money in subsequent years that had been allocated to CRC would later become available because it would not be spent and could be then in turn applied to the MRTAs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, hon. member. I let you go on about the CRC before, but the CRC is a general revenue item and has no relationship at all to the capital division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It really is not subject to argument. You can't, take away from the heritage fund and put into the general revenue. I'm sorry; I can't allow you to proceed on that line of argument any further.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am certain that each member of the Legislature received a proposal which I received concerning the development of science centres in this province. The proposal has been presented by Jim Gray of Calgary, and I believe it has a good deal of merit. It would in his estimation promote a culture of science that would be a context within which our young people would be encouraged to pursue science research kinds of careers. But it also has implications for the recreational/tourism attractiveness of our urban and other centres. The minister referred to the Strathcona Science Centre and his department's support of that in the past. Could the minister indicate whether the science centre proposal of Mr. Jim Gray would be the kind of proposal which might be considered favourably under this heritage trust fund allocation? If not, is he considering funding it from some other source, or is there some other source in government that currently is considering funding it?



MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks.

DR. WEST: Yes, I'll just answer Edmonton-Meadowlark. It's actually under the department of culture at that level, but I would say that I'll discuss this with you outside the House. It doesn't actually apply to these votes tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Assembly ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Agreed to:

1.1 -- Project Co-ordination	--
1.2 -- Major Buildings, Facilities and Utilities	--
Total Vote 1 -- Kananaskis Country Recreation Development	--

Total vote 2 -- Municipal Recreation/Tourism Areas	\$4,000,000
--	-------------

3.1 -- Program Support	\$ 100,000
3.2 -- Urban Centres	\$900,000
Total Vote 3 -- Urban Park Development	\$1,000,000

DR. WEST: Mr. Chairman, I move the votes be reported.

[Motion carried]

### Public Works, Supply and Services

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 1, Capital City Recreation Park, is to be found on page 19 of the book.

The hon. Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. There are two estimates in this book, one on page 19 and one on page 20. The one dealing with Capital City Recreation Park is for a request for \$800,000 to assist the city of Edmonton in the purchase of some needed lands to complete this park. The second item has to do with an expenditure for the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre of \$1.6 million. That will cover the remaining project modifications and landscaping to complete this project. This should be the last year the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre should be appearing here in the estimates of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The question remains to be answered as to what is the future of the Capital City Park program. I take it the minister says that this \$800,000 meets commitments that have already been made, consummates deals that are already inked. What about the remaining development to be done under the Capital City Park program? Is that program now terminated and everything shuffled under the urban parks development program of Recreation and Parks, or does it continue? Is there more development to be done under this program?

MR. KOWALSKI: The answer to that question was laid out in the 1975 agreement between the city of Edmonton and the prov-

ince of Alberta when they designated and determined the size of Capital City Park. What we are into now is really the final years of the completion or the conclusion of the park based on that 1975 agreement, which was made very, very public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I didn't put my hand up, and I can't even think of anything to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I apologize.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister know what in fact the \$800,000 is for in the Capital City Recreation Park? I mean, he says he expects it's for the completion, but it is of particular interest to my constituency, and if he has some details, I would appreciate it; if not now, then later.

On vote 2, Mr. Chairman, again this is something of particular interest to my constituency since it's a major edifice within it. I wonder again if the minister has particular details of what the \$1.6 million is for. There are several things that come to mind that need attention. The first is the helicopter landing facility. There was a sort of temporary place on the field south of Corbett Hall which was vetoed eventually by the Minister of Transport, so there is no regular helicopter landing place for this facility. There was talk of a pad being installed on top of the parking lot. I wonder if that is within the \$1.6 million allotted.

Another question concerns the status of the old wing, the 1956 wing, of the University hospital. That was saved. There is some great question as to whether it really -- I mean, everyone approved of it's being saved because it seemed such a shame to knock down such a relatively modern and substantial building. But it has stayed in that condition for two years now, and I wonder whether any part of the vote is to do something about that building, either to fix it up or knock it down or otherwise to convert it.

There was a further concern about the drains throughout the building not being adequate. I presume that was remedied some time ago, but that is a further concern.

Yet another concern is the position of the psychiatric wing on the fourth floor, which has resulted in a number of alterations to the fourth floor to prevent demented patients flinging themselves off the galleries. Do we know if that alteration is complete?

The last point is that I've heard it said that there is some difficulty regarding the LRT extension -- there is a station to be built at the health centre, Mr. Chairman -- and it will interfere with the children's hospital. Now, that isn't exactly the site. That's not on the Mackenzie health centre site, but it's part of the University hospital. The LRT station is scheduled to be at the Walter C. Mackenzie health centre. So I wonder whether any part of the vote is in connection with the arrangements that will have to be made to connect up with the station within the next two years.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, there was a series of questions asked. I'll respond to them in the order in which they were asked. The hon. gentleman asked first of all: what were the dollars under Capital City Park for? They basically are to assist the city purchasing 25 small parcels of land here, there, and what have you, in total an area of some 42 acres that will pro-

vide for right-of-way to complete the trail systems and the like. That basically is what it would arrive at to assist the city in financing that.

In terms of the dollars that will be provided for the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre, the \$1.6 million, they're essentially provided to cover handrail alterations within the hospital and landscaping to complete the project.

The subject matter of the wing and the safety and security of patients with certain mental disabilities: there is a protective screen being installed, but it will not be funded for under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund estimates. It will be funded for under the general revenue estimates and the allocation to the hospital in that regard. I believe the drains have been taken care of, resolved, corrected. The question of not the 1956 wing but the 1950-57 wing is a matter that remains under review. The uncertainty, what its future will be -- there's no actual decision made one way or the other on should there be demolition or no demolition. That's a matter that continues to be reviewed. When that decision is made, in all likelihood the funding for it would come under the General Revenue Fund budget rather than the estimates of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. And that decision is to be made.

The question of the helicopter pad is one I'd have to get back to the hon. gentleman on. I simply don't have that answer in front of me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Assembly ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 -- Capital City Recreation Park	\$800,000
Total Vote 2 -- Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre	\$1,600,000

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would move that votes 1 and 2 under Public Works, Supply and Services in the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund estimates be reported.

[Motion carried]

## Energy

MR. CHAIRMAN: The final item for discussion this evening is to be found on page 13. There are two votes, Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority and, vote 2, Renewable Energy Research.

The hon. Minister of Energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. ORMAN: That was a nice try.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have, as you've pointed out, two votes this evening in the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. With regard to the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority, which is vote 1, I want to point out two things to the members: first, a notable change in the manner in which dollars are spent in terms of where the dollars are coming from, and just a brief comment on some of the things the authority has been doing over the last couple of years.

Firstly, in terms of context to the numbers, there has been a change, as hon. members will note. Dollars that historically

have flowed from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund are now coming out of general revenue. I should point out that in '87-88 AOSTRA's budget was \$51 million, and it was about 50-50 GRF and HSTF. In '88-89 it was about 75 percent GRF, 25 percent Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and '89-90 is about 86 percent and 13, 14 percent in favour of GRF. This vote today sees the end of quite an historical appropriation of funds for a fairly significant venture that has been very advantageous for the development of heavy oil and oil sands in this province.

I should point out that over the last 16 years that AOSTRA has been receiving dollars from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, they have benefited significantly from multiyear agreements. The flexibility that the trust fund has given AOSTRA in terms of entering into multiyear agreements for field pilot projects -- and a good example is the Peace River in situ pilot project with Shell, where there's been an investment of \$75 million over the years and it has now progressed to a 10,000 barrel per day commercial operation. The flexibility in AOSTRA as a result of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund has also allowed them to attract specific funding for projects that traditionally find it difficult to attract industry participation. This has led to a number of successes and to some commercially licensed projects in the province. A good example is the Tasiuk process, which was initiated totally by AOSTRA and is now on the leading edge as a new alternative to oil sands technology.

Also, Mr. Chairman, heritage funding has permitted research in universities and through the Research Council and has been involved in programs that provide the foundation for future technological innovations. Additionally, there has been enthusiastic support shown by the industry over the past 15 years that has led to an accumulation of \$1 billion of banked technology in the province. We are now seeing interest worldwide for some of the very interesting initiatives that have developed out of AOSTRA.

Mr. Chairman, just briefly, with regard to vote 2, Renewable Energy Research, I want to begin by saying that this is a textbook example of how an MLA can come forward with the support of his community and his constituents and, with some hard work and a dog-on-pant-leg approach, can move an initiative forward to the extent that this initiative has been moved forward. I refer to the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. The Heritage Savings Trust Fund estimates allow for \$500,000 for 1989-90 to provide funding for the first year of a seven- to 10-year initiative for solar, wind, and renewable energy initiatives. I'm very interested and excited about the prospects this initiative brings forward. It meets our diversification objectives in alternative sources of energy. It can and potentially will provide an important contribution to this particular part of the province of Alberta.

The Premier and my predecessor, Neil Webber, had set up a renewable energy advisory board in the community, and they provided some recommendations. We then followed up with an interdepartmental task force, the departments of Energy and Transportation and Utilities. They have reviewed the recommendations of the community group and have come up with a series of recommendations that total five. We have not finalized our arrangements with the community group, but we will, Mr. Chairman. We'll be bringing forward some recommendations to my colleagues, and hopefully this project will move forward in a way that matches the objectives I set out earlier and provide a different perspective and different approach to energy in the province of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With respect to vote 1, as a member of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee, I had the opportunity to visit the Underground Test Facility near the Syncrude plant. I must say I was very impressed. This, of course, is an experimental project that's financed under the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority. What it is looking at is a kind of underground steam injection technique for extracting heavy oil and bringing it to the surface. But it's a project that doesn't result in the environmental scarring associated with the other two major plants in the area. So I have a question to the minister: just how far along is that research project in terms of it going beyond a research project and having companies actually embrace this technique and use it for commercial purposes? How far are we away from seeing the likelihood of that?

With respect to the funding for these programs, I'll note that there seems to be some general concern in the industry that projects funded through this program tend to favour large companies as opposed to smaller companies. Maybe that's understandable in terms of the mandate of AOSTRA, which is a program that's aimed at recovery and processing of petroleum from oil sand deposits. Perhaps only big companies can get involved in those kinds of activities; I don't know. But it does seem that is a concern, and I'd like the minister to perhaps touch on that. It may make some sense, by the way, in today's age, given what's happening out there in the conventional sector, to have similar programs for helping and encouraging the development of the remainder of our conventional oil basin. But that's another issue that isn't properly under the vote.

I've had some difficulty trying to reconcile the way that money is spent, and partly the difficulty stems from the fact that there is a transition from spending for AOSTRA from money coming out of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund to money coming out of the General Revenue Fund. The problem is in part complicated because I think AOSTRA prepares its report on the basis of the calendar year, whereas our other estimates are based on a financial year that ends on March 31. But, in any event, looking at their statement of revenue, the amount of revenue from the General Revenue Fund for the year ended March 31, 1988 -- now, this is from the annual report of AOSTRA -- is set at \$1,325,060, which doesn't seem to me to square with the estimate contained in the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects division estimates for '88-89, which is set at \$4.25 million. I don't know if the minister could attempt to reconcile that.

The general question here, though, is: how far along are we in terms of making this transition for funding AOSTRA from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund to funding it out of general revenues? In the future is all the funding going to come out of the General Revenue Fund? If so, I think that's a good move. I think we fund too many projects out of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund that more properly should be funded out of general revenues. In fact, I think the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund should just be used for the purpose of direct financial investments, and any other type of funding should be shown clearly in department expenditures.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, with respect to vote 2, the wind power question. We're pleased that the \$500,000 has been set aside for various research projects in this area. I don't think the

hon. Member for Pincher Creek can take all the credit for that because certainly we on this side of the House and our party pushed for that kind of research funding since I was first elected.

AN HON. MEMBER: Before that.

MR. PASHAK: We've brought it up repeatedly and even before that, I understand from my colleague. Probably before that, maybe going back to time immemorial, I don't know. That's one comment.

The second comment, though, is that I think there is some concern among the small power producers that again this money might be disproportionately allocated to large firms, and those smaller companies that are really into innovative research might not get their share of that funding. Perhaps the minister would address himself to that question as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to be very brief. [interjections] Well, Nick gets over here to speak for 30 minutes at least two or three times.

I'd just like to restrict myself to the philosophy of the source of funding, some of the issues which have been raised by the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn. I think I understood the minister to say this is the last year that AOSTRA will be funded through the heritage fund, and I'd be very interested as to the philosophy of why the funding has been shifted increasingly to general revenues over the last few years and why now, finally, the government is going to implement what I think would have been the sensible thing right from the beginning, and that is to have this come out of general revenues like other comparable types of projects. At the same time, as we're going to be eliminating AOSTRA funding in the heritage fund, we find to the contrary in vote 2 a new program now being funded through the heritage fund. I don't question the program; it's again the philosophy of the sourcing. Why is it that when we're eliminating AOSTRA funding as a burden on the heritage fund, we're now setting up a new program of expenditure in terms of the renewable energy research under the heritage fund instead of funding that through general revenues, as would seem to me to be very sensible?

Get in here, Nick.

So those are my questions.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the renewable energy research program is going forward, and although some credit has been given to myself this evening, I'd also like to extend credit to the southwest Alberta renewable energy advisory board, chaired by Dr. John Rottger from Pincher Creek. Under his guidance and leadership, they've come up with some excellent recommendations, and I'd like to have that particular advisory group acknowledged. I should also note for the hon. members opposite that I have in fact been pushing this particular initiative since I was first elected in 1975, which I think predates most of the members opposite. We're very pleased in the community to see this initiative going forward, and we're looking forward to the benefits, not only to the local area but to Alberta and, we believe, to making Canada an international leader in terms of this alternate energy technology and research.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for West Yellowhead.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I only would like to address vote 2. I appreciate and applaud the government for supporting the New Democrats and the Member for Pincher Creek in putting money forward for wind and solar power, but we're dealing with renewable and alternate sources of energy. I would hope that the minister would seriously consider the great potential for geothermal energy in this province. There are masses of it throughout the eastern slopes of the Rockies and especially in the West Yellowhead riding. Various studies have been done, in excess of \$100,000, and many, many documents have been compiled, yet the government has not taken any interest in developing the geothermal. Of course, we have Miette Hotsprings within our riding, and there are various other hot springs throughout western Canada. There's great potential for developing the geothermal throughout the total province, but especially in the western area. I would surely hope that in the future the Minister of Energy would pay as much attention to geothermal as has been paid to wind and solar power. It's a renewable resource, it's environmentally clean, and it has a life expectancy long beyond any members of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to speak against vote 1, AOSTRA, because one of the things that has bothered me for some time that's been connected with the hydrocarbon industry is the gradual -- not gradual; it's almost accelerated -- rate at which the ownership of the oil businesses come under the multinationals and foreign oil companies. If one examines the maps of who owns the heavy oil reserves and also the tar sand reserves, it runs well over 90 percent now to the multinationals, if you put Petro-Can in amongst the multinationals. To me, giving money to these corporations to help them do research is sort of like sending money to the Bronfmans to tell them how to make whiskey. It's certainly giving the rich money to do more research on how to pillage and take out the resources of your own country.

But worse still, although it mentions AOSTRA does keep sort of a string on it for commercial use, my connection in the past in the oil business is that there is a great deal of leakage from AOSTRA through to the multinationals, who in turn then are using that technique around the world to develop heavy oil and oil shales, which are akin to this in other parts of the world. So I've never really bought the idea that the large oil companies of this world need taxpayers' dollars to help them find out how to get oil out of the ground. I've always assumed -- not assumed; I've worked with them and I know they're probably some of the most technically and scientifically advanced people in the world as an industry. It does not make sense to put out millions of dollars each year to help them do research. It would be akin to the federal government voting Toyota tens of millions of dollars to help them learn how to build cars, because I think the leakage is away and I don't see where we're getting value for the dollar.

Now, I know people say -- well, they know somebody who has a brother-in-law who has a cousin who has a friend that works for some company that gets an AOSTRA contract, but I think, all in all, it runs into rather penny ante compared to what

the major corporations are getting. I think particularly in these times when we're having trouble making money to get by for the women's shelters or to different educational institutions, it's really a sad commentary on this government that they can find \$5 million to put into producing a product that's of surplus around the world, a large part of which we ship to the U.S. anyhow, and research is by the major corporations of the world, many of them with budgets that come awful close to the Alberta government's.

To move on to vote 2, which I would certainly support, but vote 1 I don't like. Vote 2 says promote "particularly solar and wind in the southwest region," Mr. Chairman. Now, I know that hailing from down in southern Alberta there is a lot of wind and a lot of solar energy, particularly in the last 15 years since the country went PC. Nevertheless, I think that some of this research could well be extended in renewable energy right across Alberta. Why it was restricted to the southwest region I think is just being a little bit -- oh, I don't know what the right word for it is -- patronizing, I guess.

AN HON. MEMBER Parochial.

MR. TAYLOR: Parochial. That's right, yes. Here we have the minister for public works, who's out there begging up the only fishing stream we have left. He came up with the right word, though. When he's not destroying the Crowsnest River, he is pointing out that the southwest region is parochial. Certainly I think renewable energy research should go right across Alberta. One of the questions I'd ask the hon. members would be why they have restricted it to that area and why not -- this, of course, overlaps into the public utilities area under the hon. Member for Peace River. I believe this government is very much under the thumb of the privately owned utility companies in Alberta, who are doing everything they can to undermine independent power. Because renewable energy, by the very nature, in most cases will be handled by a lot less capital investment probably than the huge coal steam plants we have now.

So I'd feel that vote 2 should be enlarged and vote 1, Mr. Chairman, should be voted to zero. In fact, why not take half of vote 1 and give it to renewable energy, thereby increasing it by five times, and put the other half back into developing some of the capital works that we need around the province? We just heard the Minister of Recreation and Parks mention how well the William Watson Lodge is used by the disabled in Kananaskis. Wouldn't it be nice to use some of the money that we're now throwing away on AOSTRA to do a William Watson equivalent for the north? We could even name it, Mr. Chairman, after the Energy minister, which would give him a sort of vicarious thrill.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or Pincher Creek.

MR. TAYLOR: Or Pincher Creek. It would certainly be, to me, a much better use of the taxpayer's dollar than putting it into AOSTRA.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly feel vote 2 fits well within the objects of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund when it was first set up. I don't think we should ever forget the

importance of oil and gas to the Alberta economy. With the discovery of Leduc in 1949, this province grew at a rate much more rapid than neighbouring provinces. You compare the population of Saskatchewan and Manitoba with Alberta, and you'll find that Alberta is equal to the two of them combined. The number one difference is clearly oil and gas.

Now, the people who set up the Heritage Savings Trust Fund believed in part that they would be acquiring assets which were in some way as valuable as what was being sold, the oil and gas reserves of the province. What I wonder really is, you know, whether the Minister of Energy is the person in the government who thinks about the long-term future of this industry. Probably he ought to be, more so than any of the others, because it does seem to me that the conventional oil and gas industry is slowly but surely winding down in our province. The nature of it is that you can't forever dig up nonrenewable resources or pump them and sell them on world markets. So, you know, the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority was developed in part to keep the stream going, to keep the industry moving from conventional oil and gas to a much larger resource base; I wouldn't say unlimited, I wouldn't say renewable, but I would certainly say a much larger resource base. The evidence of the commitment to that process is there in the \$400 million spent to March 31, 1988, which admittedly is winding down, but still it's there.

Now throughout the world people are coming to realize that our planet is experiencing a warming trend throughout. Part of the problem is of course with the ozone layer, which has been destroyed by chlorofluorocarbons, but also the combustion of hydrocarbons clearly contributes to that. It's kind of a one-two punch. The phrase "greenhouse effect" was coined to describe a situation in which the heat can't escape and just builds through the combustion of not just oil and gas but coal as well. I do wonder, under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, whether this government is considering the importance of the greenhouse effect, of global warming trends throughout the planet, on the future of the energy industry. It does seem to me that oil and gas companies have been slowly transforming themselves into energy companies and looking at other types of energy, other methods of supplying energy, even going into energy conservation in a big way in order to preserve their business and to plan for the day in which selling oil and gas in ever-increasing quantities is not going to be their future. They recognize that, and it seems to me that the Alberta government, as stewards of the oil and gas resource and in fact the energy resources of our province, ought to be thinking in the same way.

Clearly, I applaud the \$500,000 to be invested from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund in renewable energy research, but the description of the dog and the pant leg is kind of a chilling notion of what's going on here. I mean, if we're talking about an MLA who is obtaining some funds for a constituency operation, I think that's a good thing as well. But I'm not sure that it comes anywhere near addressing the type of challenge that we have -- looking at potentially winding down the combustion of hydrocarbons as a source of energy and moving to other sources of energy in what, really, the Department of Energy, the Minister of Energy, and the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, which is supposed to be, at least in part, a vehicle for taking all of this oil and gas wealth and investing it and securing our future -- whether we are looking at something considerably more substantive than a \$500,000 program.

In fact, what is the scope of this program? Is the province

really looking at tackling the question of how we move in an orderly way from oil and gas dependency into other types of energy? Geothermal was mentioned, along with wind and solar. I just wonder if the minister would take a moment -- I know it's late -- to address his role in that process and how the Department of Energy is looking to that day when oil and gas is less important in our economy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to say to the minister that I've resolved the problem of reconciling the annual report. It's just that the drop in revenues is so substantial in such a short period of time.

In any event, I do have one further question that I meant to put to him and it is: how successfully is the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority augmenting its income through its sales of technology and patents? I notice that there are over 70 some-odd patents that are under the authority of AOSTRA, and that in the financial year ending 1988 AOSTRA realized some \$1.325 million in technology sales. Are they working at trying to enhance sales of technology so that they move in the direction of self-funding, for example?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Energy.

MR. ORMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to respond to some of the questions that have arisen this evening. I appreciate the hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn's interest in the Underground Test Facility, and he and I had an informal discussion about the importance of this particular project. So he knows, as he indicated, that this is a very interesting project, and it's using wells drilled from tunnels into the limestone below the oil sands. This is an example of a project that would not have gone ahead -- to the question for the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon -- if AOSTRA did not take the initiative, because the risk was too high and the interest was not there by the industry. Now we have six companies that are participating in this, together with Canada Energy, Mines and Resources, and there has been an approximate expenditure amongst the parties of some \$56 million.

The key to this project has been hit on the head by the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn, and that is that it reduces the environmental impact. If there is anything we want to do with the new generation of oil sands facilities, it is reduce the environmental impact. Each generation that comes along substantially reduces the environmental impact of the previous project. So we've moved from Suncor to Syncrude, now to OSLO, and hopefully we can get to a commercial stage with the Underground Test Facility.

The other question that was asked was why the majors are involved. I think it was brought up by a couple of members. Well, firstly, because the capital investment is so intensive and it is the major companies that have that capital to invest in these types of projects. But it does beg another point, and it is a good one. And that is that it was suggested that the map showed that the majors had held oil sands leases. Well, I can tell the hon. members here tonight, as I have told the Canadian Petroleum Association, that it will be extremely difficult for companies holding oil sands leases to roll them over in the early part of the 1990s without substantial commitment to development, because there is interest from around the world and from smaller compa-

nies that would like to bring forward a pilot project and put it to work in the oil sands and because the lands are so tightly held by the majors, that can't happen. So we will be revising our oil sands leasing policy for that very reason.

I can say today that it's the intention to continue funding out of general revenue funds, phasing down through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I think the reason is -- and I think it was brought up by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place -- that when you embark on new initiatives, it's an appropriate place to start from. But when AOSTRA gets to the level that it is now, and it's entrenched in terms of our commitment to the work they do, it is then time to move it out of this and into conventional funding. It may be that the Minister of Energy standing here 10 years from now will be making the same case for the solar/wind initiative. Hopefully, that's the case.

On the solar/wind side, Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn, we will be balanced in terms of the size of the people, the industry; it's going to be open. We're starting off with a relatively new concept. As it develops and flourishes, there will be more people who will be able to access the funding that would be available under this particular vote.

Member for Calgary-Buffalo, I think I answered the question on the funding aspect, the ongoing nature of it. It could be that the solar/wind initiative sometime in the future comes into GRF out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

West Yellowhead brought up the point of geothermal. I'm open to the idea. The reason we've responded to the solar/wind initiative is because it came forward as a recommendation from the community. If the hon. member knows of individuals who are willing to put together a project and bring it to my attention, we'll give it full consideration.

Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, I think I answered your question on oil sands, on the land holdings. I have a light concern with the hon. member. I answered the point. The example I gave just now on the Underground Test Facility would not have happened if it weren't for AOSTRA. This is very exciting in terms of the nonenvironmental impact, if we can bring this to an economic point.

We do participate in the rights and the patents, and we do get licence income from the joint efforts that we have with the industry. Our funding over the years has been about 50-50; AOSTRA has been about \$496 million and the industry has contributed about \$444 million over the years. We share the technology and the licensing fees worldwide and on a basis commensurate with the amount of dollars that are put into the project. I think that's very appropriate. This is a fine example of how industry can work together with government and develop new ideas, new technologies to the benefit of the whole province. I am shocked that there would be a suggestion that we vote this down to zero funding. It's overwhelming, the success of AOSTRA and the importance to the province of Alberta. There are more oil sands reserves than there are total reserves in the Middle East, so if we can continue to develop in the manner we're talking about, it can't help but affect positively the province.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place -- I appreciate his comments on global warming, and I would daresay that everyone in this Assembly shares the concerns about SO<sub>2</sub> emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. We have a responsibility to explore alternatives. This province is resource rich in the conventional hydrocarbons, and I believe that we

have a responsibility to take royalty dollars from that and look at alternatives. I agree with him on that particular point. It's a concern worldwide, and the concern has really developed to a pitched peak, I think, just within the last couple of years. So we will look at future initiatives.

AOSTRA. I agree with the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place; the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is the place to look for these initiatives, and we will continue to do that on a regular basis.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Assembly ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Agreed to:

1.1 -- Oil Sands Technology and Research	\$3,151,000
1.2 -- Conventional Oil Enhanced Recovery	\$2,000,000
Total Vote 1 -- Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority	\$5,151,000
Total Vote 2 -- Renewable Energy Research	\$500,000

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move votes 1 and 2 be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

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

Resolved that from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1990, for the purpose of making investments in the following projects to be administered by:

Executive Council: \$1,380,000 for Occupational Health and Safety Research and Education.

Advanced Education: \$3,532,000 for Clinical Research Building.

Recreation and Parks: \$4,000,000 for Municipal Recreation/Tourism Areas, \$1,000,000 for Urban Park Development.

Public Works, Supply and Services: \$800,000 for Capital City Recreation Park, \$1,600,000 for Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre.

Energy: \$5,151,000 for Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority, \$500,000 for Renewable Energy Research.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the report, does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Those opposed? Carried. adjourn instead.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it would be nice to move Committee of the Whole for consideration of Bills, but I move we [At 11 p.m. the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]

