

way in an area where the slide is not occurring, and we just recently had to go to expropriation.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister provide some insight as to what the schedule of development of this important section of road will be?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in January we applied for the routing for expropriation. There were five farmers involved, and the five objected. As a result of that, an inquiry officer was appointed. The report from the inquiry officer has just been received; I've not even had a chance to read it. It ruled in our favour, and we will be proceeding from there. That would mean that if we're fortunate, we would have access to the property by September or October, and we may be able, if we get close enough to that, to have a fall tender for work early in the spring of 1993 with the idea that the bulk of the work would be in 1993.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Avonmore.

Sexual Abuse

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are to the Attorney General. Much attention has been focused on the sexual abuse of vulnerable clients by health care professionals. The College of Physicians and Surgeons task force recommended that the Attorney General initiate legislation which would require that the appropriate regulatory body be immediately informed when charges are laid against a physician or health care professional. Will the Attorney General now commit to reviewing this report with the view of bringing forward such legislation?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I believe the final report relating to this issue will be out in June, and I'll be delighted to receive the report and take those considerations at hand.

MS M. LAING: My second question is to the Chair of the Council on Professions and Occupations. Recently a self-styled psychologist was convicted of sexually assaulting a vulnerable young client. This trial points to the need to protect the public from unscrupulous and unethical health care professionals. Will the Chair commit the Council on Professions and Occupations to looking into these matters and not simply dismissing them as a matter of buyer beware?

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Speaker, the Professions and Occupations Bureau has been in consultation with the Psychologists Association and with the AG's office. We're trying to come up with a solution in regards to this issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Jasper Place.

Bow Valley Development

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of the Environment has recently acknowledged that he exempted from environmental review the Canmore golf resort headed by Hal Walker, his PC constituency president, a company properly known as CADCO. Recently exemptions were granted on the Three Sisters project for lands known as Canmore 75 within the town boundaries and also on some of the golf course lands. That by the way includes such PC cronies as Bill Dickie and Frank King. There's a third project in the area owned by Don Cormie.

I'm not sure if he's a Tory or Liberal crony these days. That one's not under review because the proposal's not complete. [interjection] The Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark says that he's not a New Democrat. You bet he's not, and you're not either, thank God. Anyway, we were promised a comprehensive review, but it seems that there are a lot of holes involved in this review. I'm wondering if the Minister of the Environment is not concerned that with everything that's happened in the last three years, this sort of half-baked, piecemeal approach will result in numerous lawsuits and possibly another federal environmental review at the end of the day.

MR. KLEIN: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not concerned at all. I think that we have put in place a process that is as pure as it can possibly be, and that's the Natural Resources Conservation Board. It's an exceptionally good process.

With respect to Canmore Alpine Development, Mr. Speaker, I think I've got to set the record straight. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place is talking about a fine gentlemen, one of the finest gentlemen to walk the face of the earth, which is a lot more than I can say for this individual.

MR. McINNIS: Sooner or later he's going to have to decide whether he represents his PC president or the people of Alberta. He's going to have to make that decision.

I don't know how he can call it a pure process when this project's exempted, half of that one's exempted, that one's not included, and public hearings on the Three Sisters project as well as the Kan-Alta project, headed by another group of Tories, Norm Kimball and Jackie Parker among others, will proceed in June without any representation from downstream water users in the city of Calgary or a group of people in Canmore who are concerned about coal mines under the ground there which may subside. In view of the fact that these decisions on intervenor funding were made by the NRCB in conflict with the previous rulings in the Swan Hills case, I would like to ask the minister if he's prepared to discuss with the Chair of the NRCB what criteria are being used to make intervenor funding decisions, or is he bent on a quick approval process regardless.

MR. KLEIN: The NRCB, as the hon. member well knows, is a quasi-judicial body that has the authority to adjudicate intervenor funding. With respect to the Kan-Alta proposal, that has been advertised for a NRCB hearing. With respect to Three Sisters, that is going before the Natural Resources Conservation Board. With respect to Canmore Alpine Development, that project was initiated in 1986, long before the NRCB was a notion. The proponent played by all the rules of the day. This member would have that proponent go back and be subjected to rules that were put in place long after he received all the permits and the necessary regulatory approvals that were required at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Bovar Inc.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Swan Hills joint venture with Bovar Inc. has guaranteed a 12 to 16 percent profit to Bovar and has cost Albertans \$171 million since 1985. Why did the Minister of the Environment fail to invoke the provision in the agreement that the terms and conditions of the agreement with Bovar shall – not maybe, not perhaps, but shall – be subject to review on or about June 30, 1989? Where's the review?