

Standing Committee on The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act

Tuesday, October 7, 1980

Chairman: Mr. Payne

9:10 a.m.

MR CHAIRMAN: Good morning, gentlemen. I'd like to bring to order this meeting of the select committee. Perhaps we could begin with a scheduling comment. We have previously agreed, in addition to meeting today, to meet all day next Tuesday, October 14. Several of you have quite correctly observed that even meeting all day today and all day Tuesday may not be enough time to complete our review of the recommendations. Donna has canvassed a number of you, and it appears that the afternoon of Wednesday, the 15th, is open to many, but not all, committee members. Unless there is a large and significant reaction otherwise, I'd like to suggest that perhaps we meet at 12:30 on Wednesday, October 15, for as much of the afternoon as possible. I would think that if we make good progress today and Tuesday, the 14th -- at which time, incidentally, I hope to have from Western Management Consultants their final report -- we could then meet for perhaps four or five hours on Wednesday, the 15th, to discuss what remaining recommendations there are, as well as matters arising from the Western Management Consultants' report. Is that agreeable?

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Good.

MR R CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I would want to remind you, though, that I had indicated to the committee earlier that I wanted to have Mr. Trynchy back before the committee. It may well be there would be some recommendations following that, so we should try to build it in as soon as we can.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Incidentally, I have contacted Mr. Trynchy's office. Of course he is away on the central Alberta cabinet tour, but I'm attempting to obtain from the office, even in his absence, the materials that were indicated would be available to us today.

MR BORSTAD: What time are we meeting on the 14th?

MR CHAIRMAN: At 9 o'clock. That will be a full day, 9 to 12 and, say, 1 to 5.

I would suggest we commence, hon. members, with one recommendation in Part II we were not able to deal with on the last occasion we met, in view of Mr. Knaak's absence. Mr. Knaak is in the chambers today. I would like to ask him to speak to his recommendation, Part II, No. 8, Re Information.

MR KNAAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The reason for phrasing it in the manner I did -- well, first of all, I think it's important that if we have information provided to us by a minister, it be provided in sufficient time to analyse it thoroughly, so there is no misunderstanding that if we have had information we have had adequate time to review it and ask questions based on that information. If in fact information is brought to us the day of the meeting, it's difficult to make a proper assessment of that information, yet the public

is under the impression that we had the opportunity to scrutinize and ask questions based on that, which of course is not the case.

The second part is that I don't think that under the Act the minister has an obligation to provide additional information to the annual report. So it's a minister's judgment of whether or not the committee will require additional information to adequately make an assessment of the information in the report.

Trying to balance those two points, the suggestion I have made is that if a minister is going to provide documented information, written information, it be presented to the committee one week prior to his attendance, and if the information has come late, that his attendance be postponed or that we just forget about the information.

MR CHAIRMAN: I neglected to indicate to members of the committee two typographical errors in the typed version of the recommendation before you: under "Therefore it is recommended that:" it is "All documented" of course, not "documentated"; and in the final line, it's not the postponement of "Minutes", but the "minister is postponed." With those corrections, then -- Mr. Clark.

MR R CLARK: I'm rather agreeable to the sentiment that is involved in the resolution. But it seems to me we should not put ourselves in the position of saying we will not consider information unless it's available to us one week. I think to have information in our hands earlier is a courtesy that I would hope most ministers would extend to the committee. I believe, Mr. Chairman, you've been asked by the committee to make that known to ministers.

But I think it would not be best to commit ourselves to not considering information that came even later than the one week. I would prefer to leave it as we have now, with you indicating to ministers that we would like information one week ahead of time.

MR CHAIRMAN: By implication, Mr. Clark, what you're suggesting is an amendment that would delete the concluding sentence of the recommendation.

MR R CLARK: Really, my preference would be that we simply defeat the idea and leave it as we have now, with you taking the responsibility of letting the ministers know.

DR BUCK: I have a question for Mr. Knaak, Mr. Chairman. Was it the intention, Mr. Knaak, of the section to be what is proposed minus the last two or three words? That the information be available a week before: did you intend that this information not be used unless it were available a week before?

MR KNAAK: The general intent was to put some pressure on the minister to be timely. The committee may remember that the Chairman has asked ministers before to get information in on time, and in fact ministers have not properly responded to the Chairman's request. Because of that, I worded it a little more strongly, so that if in fact the minister does not get it to us in time, we have the option of asking the minister to postpone his appearance. That's basically the idea.

MR PAHL: Mr. Chairman, I do support the sentiment but, as I recall speaking to it when it was first presented, I think we run the risk -- if the minister can't satisfy our time requirements, we'll get no information. In that sense I would like to propose that we put it in as a recommendation, but soften it considerably so we don't run the risk of losing the information. I would suggest that the amendment be made on the second line, "All documented

information . . . made available by a Minister should be distributed to the Members at least one week prior to the Minister's appearance before the Committee." I would delete the last sentence, in sentiment with Mr. Clark's thought.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now have an amendment, proffered by Mr. Pahl, that would see the word "must" changed to the word "should", and the last sentence deleted.

MR NOTLEY: I think the amendment is a reasonable approach, because it would be a very serious mistake for us, in any way, shape, or form, to lock ourselves into a situation where either there is a postponement -- which is difficult when you're working our agenda for hearings -- or, alternatively, not taking advantage of information which is made available. I think it would be a very silly thing if we have information made available and we say, we're not going to do it because we didn't get it in a week's time. I think the amendment makes the point which should be made, that we want this information ahead of time if possible, but doesn't tie us in to closing the door to additional information.

MR CHAIRMAN: Question on the amendment. Those in favor of the amendment suggested by Mr. Pahl? Clark, Notley, Buck, Bradley, Oman, Borstad, Pahl, Stewart, Appleby. Those opposed? Mr. Knaak. The amendment is carried.

Those in favor of the recommendation as amended? The same voting pattern.

MR KNAAK: Mr. Chairman, you didn't ask me to comment on the amendment. I'm surprised at Mr. Notley suggesting a watchdog; he's more like a watchpuppy.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm not entirely sure that's an appropriate comment to make.

Moving then to Part III, Recommendation 1, Block Funding for Highways: Mr. Notley, please.

MR NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this is essentially just a restatement of points that have been made before by previous committees. I think it is self-explanatory. I think this would be the third year, in fact, that a recommendation of this nature would be going forward from the committee, should it be passed.

MR BORSTAD: Could I clarify a question here? Are you talking about the heritage trust fund, Mr. Notley, or about general revenue?

MR NOTLEY: Basically what we're doing here is the same kind of proposal we've already had a precedent in following, Mr. Borstad; that is, whether the funding comes from the heritage trust fund, through the capital works division, or whether it should be a process of government -- and I think we discussed in 1978 and 1979 whether we should be making recommendations of this nature. We decided in past years to do that.

Personally I would see some funding from the capital works division going into our highways program, because I think that is a reasonable investment. Proper transportation facilities in the province are crucial, in my judgment anyway, to the long-term diversification of the province.

Just to answer your question: basically all three years we've discussed this proposal, we've got into the same sort of discussion as to whether it should be heritage trust fund or a recommendation to the department for normal capital operating.

MR CHAIRMAN: With that clarification, Mr. Borstad, did you wish to comment further?

MR BORSTAD: I could go along with it if we were talking about a general type of recommendation, would probably be coming out of general revenue or surpluses, but I don't think I could go along with it out of the heritage trust fund. I think it's very similar to last year. We had the response. If it were just a general approach to government, to get more money allotted and block funding, I could agree with it.

MR CHAIRMAN: The recommendation is ambiguous on that point, because it uses the passive: "... reaffirm its commitment to capital investment for the construction of ...". It doesn't specify the source of that investment, probably intentionally so.

Any other comment on Mr. Notley's recommendation? Those in favor of Recommendation Part III, No. 1? Mr. Notley, Mr. Clark, Dr. Buck. Those opposed? The remaining members in the chambers. The recommendation is defeated.

Recommendation Part III, No. 2, Northern Rail Transportation: Mr. Notley, please.

MR NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, again this is a recommendation that was put forward by the committee in 1978; then, somewhat modified, put forward last year. I brought it back in the 1978 form, but I would certainly have no quarrel with the recommendation that was presented last year:

That the Committee reaffirm its 1978 request that a full scale study of the cost-benefits, interprovincial implications, and feasibility of rail links and rail line upgrading in northern Alberta be undertaken and funded by the Department of Economic Development.

When the Minister of Economic Development was here, you may recall the testimony when I put the question to him on where things sat on this. I was given the answer that it was something that could perhaps be put on the agenda of the joint cabinet meeting between the two provinces. The answer from the Provincial Treasurer indicates that a study was undertaken by Stanley and Associates, of which I have a copy. This study really turns down the proposals for rail links, but it does so almost exclusively on the basis of grain transportation. Frankly, we wouldn't be building any rail lines in this country if we were basing them totally on grain transportation, with the present rate structure -- which is a different issue.

But the question of whether or not there should be rail linkages, in my judgment, has to go somewhat beyond the transportation of grain. That's a very important aspect; no question about it. But in northwestern Alberta, we have all sorts of other potential development, all the way from iron ore -- which is just a matter of five or six years away, we're told by the Research Council -- to timber resources, to oil and gas. So there is a very substantial potential for development in the region.

I would like to see the committee either re-recommend the recommendation of last year, which I believe would go a little further than those four specific links and look at other links in northern Alberta too, or the one that I have before us. For the sake of debate, I would move No. 2. If anyone wants to amend it, so be it.

MR PAHL: Mr. Chairman, could I clarify what Mr. Notley would like his recommendation to read now? Are you proposing some deletion?

MR NOTLEY: Mr. Pahl, I had originally proposed the wording just as it is. If you recall, last year the wording was amended to -- and I have no quarrel with

that wording. My specific motion that I presented is on the basis of the original wording.

MR PAHL: Thank you, Mr. Notley. I certainly support the importance of transportation as an important key to the economic development of our province, particularly the northern area. Having an interest in this area, I did refer to the study completed by Deloitte Haskins & Sells of May 1980. My understanding was that it wasn't totally restricted to grain. I think the Kaybob-Valleyview route would have some resource development implications beyond grain.

Inasmuch as the study was done, I think the points proposed by Mr. Notley were well taken, and I would support the recommendation if it were to read verbatim to last year's request, so there is a continuing review of the feasibility of transportation links throughout northwestern -- in fact, all of northern Alberta.

MR CHAIRMAN: Am I to interpret that as an amendment?

MR PAHL: Yes. I would propose amending it to read verbatim to last year.

MR NOTLEY: Perhaps a motion for substitution would be more -- because we do have the recommendation. I would certainly agree to that.

MR PAHL: The motion, then, would be to substitute the recommendation as written, to the recommendation of last year.

MR CHAIRMAN: Anyone care to speak to Mr. Pahl's substitution recommendation?

MR PAHL: Shall I read it?

MR CHAIRMAN: Please.

MR PAHL: The substitution would now read:

That the Committee reaffirm its 1978 request that a full scale study of the cost-benefits, interprovincial implications, and feasibility of rail links and rail line upgrading in northern Alberta be undertaken by the Department of Economic Development.

MR CHAIRMAN: Those in favor? Those opposed? It appears to have been unanimously carried.

Recommendation III.3, Alternative Energy Research: Mr. Notley.

MR NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, Recommendation III.3 is, again, an area we have discussed in some detail before in committee meetings in past years as well. I think the proposal is really self-explanatory. In my judgment Alberta is in a very fortunate position at this juncture, to be able to take the lead in alternative energy research. That doesn't mean that for many, many years ahead we're not going to be largely reliant on non-renewable resources in energy development. But at this juncture, getting a start . . . When one sees some of the developments that are taking place elsewhere in the world, or even some of the modest efforts in other provinces in Canada -- Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan, for example -- I would argue that Alberta is a place where we should be taking the lead. That of course includes the various types of alternative energy.

Solar energy, from information I've received, is really somewhat more practical than many people may think, because of the hours of sunlight we have in this part of the continent.

In any event, the proposal has been made before and I make it again.

MR CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak to this recommendation, as I have in the past. I certainly am supportive of research in this area, alternate energy, solar and wind. But as I have stated previously in the committee, we presently have allocations from the General Revenue Fund and the Alberta Research Council for research into these areas. Also we have the energy resources research fund, which has dollars allocated in this area. I think research is very worth while, and it's presently being funded from general revenues. That's appropriately where it should be funded from. Increases in funding should come out of the General Revenue Fund, and the debate should take place in the normal budgetary process.

So I'm supportive of research, but I can't support this motion to fund out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any other comment?

MR NOTLEY: I would just respond that Mr. Bradley's point that he could support the research but he can't support it as an investment from the heritage trust fund is a little difficult to follow, because we've already committed heritage trust fund money to major energy-related projects, research projects. Not too far from the town of Peace River, we have well over \$60 million in a massive research project in conjunction with Shell. We've made money available for the Farming for the Future program under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

So, Mr. Chairman, the suggestion that somehow alternative energy has to be funded from general revenue while non-renewable energy could be funded from other sources, in my view is just a very questionable proposition. If you can argue that we can put heritage trust fund money into non-renewable energy research -- and we've done that collectively as a committee; no one has ever quarreled with the AOSTRA program -- surely the same argument can be made that we should be putting money from the heritage trust fund as an investment into alternative energy research. I just don't think the argument that it should be part of the operating budget of the province in one area when it isn't in another applies. We have a precedent of making trust fund money available for research. That's proper, that's as it should be. We're an energy producing province. We want to remain as the energy capital of Canada. In order to follow through on that we have to be consistent.

The other point I would make is that one of the advantages of heritage trust fund money going into alternative energy research is that we could focus it and give it a higher profile than it has at the present time. We saw, in the testimony this fall, from the Alberta Housing people for example and other avenues of government that are engaged in little bits and pieces of alternative energy research, that there really isn't much focus to what we're doing in the province, not nearly the focus that there is, for example, in oil sands technology. I'm not suggesting that we're going to run out and dig up a couple of hundred million dollars. But in my judgment, we certainly can do more by providing a little more focus to our efforts. Making an investment from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is, in my judgment, consistent with that proposal.

DR BUCK: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I would like to support the motion. If the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is supposed to be a fund for the future, then we have to start thinking into the future. Therefore when we're looking at renewable sources of energy, we have to recognize that some of these things are in the future and for the future. Therefore that would be consistent with the philosophy of the fund.

MR BRADLEY: Just to get back in after Mr. Notley, I think my point is that we have existing programs in which we are investing money in alternate energy research, through the Alberta Research Council -- their solar and wind energy program. We also have had funds allocated from the Canada-Alberta energy resources research fund in the areas of solar and wind energy again; also looking at energy from chemicals from wood. I think there are a lot of dollars in the energy resources research fund which can be allocated in this area. There are existing programs, and I do not see the need, at this point in time, to start a new program. Any enhancement of these programs can come from enrichment to the existing program in the normal way.

MR MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Bradley has made most of my points. I would add, though, that as far as a higher profile, I should point out to the hon. member that we purchased a site in southeast Edmonton this year for approximately \$11 million for the Research Council. They are in the process of planning and developing new facilities, which will cost upwards of \$100 million. So I think that's a fairly high profile. Our mandate and our long-range plan is to look at solar energy, biomass, and all these other items that are mentioned here. But the primary emphasis has to be on the present resources we have. Our biggest difficulty is going to be getting people. I'm glad the recommendation this committee made last year about a scholarship program will help alleviate that situation a little. Of far more concern to us now is getting well qualified people than getting the necessary funds.

MR CHAIRMAN: Mr. Notley, did you wish to summarize?

MR NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the question really is how we're going to fund this. No one quarrels with the fact that in any kind of alternative energy research the Alberta Research Council shouldn't play a major role. Surely they should. No one denies the fact that there isn't some money available under the Alberta federal program that Mr. Bradley alluded to, that came out of the 1973 talks, I believe.

But the fact of the matter is that you could argue the same sort of thing with respect to oil sands research too. But because we felt that it was sufficiently important, we have made an investment from the heritage trust fund. That's appropriate. I have no quarrel, as I say, with the mechanism -- at least part of the mechanism; I want to go a little beyond that -- being the Research Council. But we want to ensure that sufficient funds are available.

There is another aspect to this, Mr. Chairman. In a sense, we might just as well deal with 3 and 4, because I think they are really tied together. As a person who believes there ought to be a good deal of public ownership, I would argue that this is one area where you can have significant 'privatization', if I could use that term, of the industry. Some of the best proposals that have come up, in the United States and elsewhere, have been individuals who have just shown their own initiative, their own experimental know-how and what have you. It seems to me that what we have to do is provide not only incentives for the kind of controlled research that you're going to find in the Alberta Research Council, but incentives for individuals who are going to be doing this sort of thing as well.

This is why I think, Mr. Chairman, that recommendations 3 and 4 basically are tied together. I guess you either accept the principle or reject it. I think renewable energy development is sufficiently important that we should be making the commitment, and that includes the higher profile, not only the kind of thing Mr. Musgreave was talking about through the Research Council, but also demonstration projects that involve the private sector, including the very small private sector of individuals.

MR PAHL: Mr. Chairman, I think the points made by Mr. Bradley and Mr. Musgreave I'm in accord with. I do feel that there is an interconnection with 3 and 4. I think it's worth pointing out that some 22 government departments are involved right now in energy conservation projects, in co-ordination with the Department of Energy and Natural Resources.

I think also that the points made by Mr. Notley are absolutely correct. I think it's important that the province of Alberta set priorities, focus their research in both the type of research that is undertaken and the timing of that research. I think our responsibilities with respect to our province, Canada, and those countries that we will, in the future, probably export energy resources to, would be to set those priorities in the direction of unlocking the energy contained in the tar sands and perhaps our vast coal deposits, before we get into what has to be, quite frankly, me-too technologies, when you're dealing with the use of solar energy vis-a-vis such places as Arizona or Mexico. They not only get the hours of bright sunshine, they get it at angles that are considerably more effective for capturing that energy.

The other point that is worth mentioning is that there are things going on out there in the private sector, such as HUDAC, in co-operation with several government departments. The Housing and Urban Development Association of Canada has a row of demonstration houses at Ellerslie, with energy-conserving factors in them, renewable energy systems, and a considerable degree of innovation. One of the main problems with their innovative technology -- and a lot of it is imitative or me-too -- is that it's all pretty price sensitive. There is a limit to how much we can achieve because the private sector will not be able to join along until there is some sort of demonstrable return. So until energy resources become more appropriately priced, we won't get the involvement of the private sector.

So in the interests of setting our priorities, where we can do the most good for our province and our country, I would suggest that these recommendations tend to downplay the very considerable effort that is going on now and are, if anything, premature, in the sense that they really don't reflect an immediate priority of this government.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion? Mr. Notley, in view of your comment and that of Mr. Pahl as to the comparability in principle of recommendations 3 and 4, would it be agreeable if I called for a vote on both?

MR NOTLEY: Yes, I would think so. Mr. Chairman, just in closing the debate, I think the point Mr. Pahl made when he concluded his arguments about the position of the government at the time, obviously that's what it is. But I would just counter by saying that if this province is really serious about the long-term energy potential -- and I'm not as pessimistic as Mr. Pahl about the limitations of solar energy; of course we're looking at other types of alternative energy as well -- now is the time to emphasize, underscore, expand, and not just through the Research Council, not just through the limited private initiatives that have been taken, albeit very encouraging, and private initiatives undertaken by a number of individuals. I've had



representation -- I sure other members have as well -- from groups who made the case, and made it very well, that we have to have a bigger investment in alternative energy. We even had, two years ago, an excellent recommendation from Unifarm on this question of alternative energy.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, both recommendations 3 and 4 would give the profile, not denigrating the limited work that has been done -- I think it's fair to say "limited" when one looks at the total investment in various type of energy research, alternative energy, has been limited but certainly worth while. The fact that some worth-while work has been done does not negate the equally important fact that a good deal more worth-while work can and should be done if we're going to retain our position as leader in the energy field as a province.

MR CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of recommendations Part III, nos. 3 and 4? Mr. Notley, Dr. Buck. Those opposed? The remaining members in the chambers. Recommendations 3 and 4 are defeated.

Recommendation III.5, Equal Opportunities Investments: Mr. Notley.

MR NOTLEY: I wonder if I could ask that No. 5, because in a sense it is misplaced -- it should go along with Recommendation 6 in Part V, the Human Resources Research Division. It really relates to investment in human resources. It would probably fit more appropriately there.

MR CHAIRMAN: We'll defer it, then, until we come to that section.

Recommendation III.6, Edmonton Calgary High Speed Rail Link: Mr. Notley.

MR NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, Recommendation 6 is another one of the recommendations we have dealt with over the years as well. But I think it is a recommendation that, I would argue, has a good deal of merit. There is no doubt at all that with energy prices rising -- and Mr. Pahl made the point about a more appropriate energy price. I think sooner or later we're going to see that; I suspect sooner, notwithstanding some of the shoals of the next two or three months. There is no question that energy prices are rising.

I think Alberta has an obligation to show some leadership in energy-efficient transportation. One of the ways in which we could do that is by developing a high-speed rail link between our two major cities. It's rather sad when one looks at the decline in rail service. People can argue that the Dayliner hasn't been very successful. But, good heavens, when you find that the service -- and it has been some years since I've been on it. But the service was just so dreadful and the time so long, that people have been encouraged to find other means of travel between the two major cities. If you look at some of the high-speed trains in Europe, Japan, and other parts of the world, they are extremely successful. For the relatively short distance between Edmonton and Calgary, high-speed passenger train service on a regular basis, especially as energy prices rise, would be a very clear signal to other Canadians that we are not only interested in higher oil prices, but are interested in proper conservation methods and in moving large numbers of people as efficiently as possible.

With those comments, I move the recommendation.

MR CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Knaak.

MR KNAAK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if Mr. Notley has any estimation of what the cost would be of such a high-speed passenger service, and what fare rates would have to be in order to recover that cost. Or is there some intention

that the government subsidize the cost and that the passengers not pay the full cost of the passenger service?

The first question: is there an estimate of cost?

MR NOTLEY: I have sort of ballpark estimates, but I think that would be rather questionable. What's needed here, Mr. Knaak, in my judgment, would be a full-scale, comprehensive study of the costs. There are a lot of imponderables. Of course, against that one has to look at the costs of what we're going to have to do with Highway 2 as well. So I wouldn't want to mislead the committee that we have those figures; we don't. But I think that the government should get as much information as possible.

On the question of whether it should be a subsidized figure, I would say, Mr. Knaak, in answer to that: subsidized at least to the extent that we subsidize our highway transportation. I don't think you can argue that we should have unlimited public subsidies to the motor car and not prepare the same kind of general approach when it comes to energy-efficient transportation. If one were to force every driver going down No. 2 highway to pay the capital cost of No. 2 or the costs of twinning No. 2, we would find that would have quite an impact on the cost of travelling between the two cities.

So in answer to that question, Mr. Chairman, I would say that an appropriate public policy is not to discriminate against one mode of transportation as opposed to another, and that if we are in fact substantially shielding the motor car, we have to be prepared through the same capital commitment to be equal when it comes to energy-efficient transportation.

MR CHAIRMAN: With that clarification, did you wish to comment further, Mr. Knaak?

MR KNAAK: The only other question I have, then: if there is going to be a subsidy and its supposed to be a Crown corporation, whether it still would be appropriate for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund to get involved, or whether it's envisaged that the government, outside the trust fund, should be involved.

MR NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, there are all sorts of options here in terms of who would operate it. A Crown corporation -- of course it would not be the first time that a proposal from my seat has been amended in committee. It's quite conceivable that one might delete "Crown Corporation" and put in CPR or whatever you want. I would think that a Crown corporation would be the way to do it. It might even be a Crown corporation that is owned by PWA. Since we're already in the airline business, we might want to branch out.

What I'm more interested in -- and I would hate to get us bogged down in that particularly item -- is the concept of high-speed passenger service between the two major cities, linking where possible with our light rapid transit systems in the cities. I think that's the fundamental point. Other aspects of it -- who should operate it, and so on -- I think would be prejudging at this stage.

MR PAHL: Mr. Chairman, I might just shed some light on the question Mr. Knaak asked Mr. Notley. There was a 1976 study done by the Department of Transportation that, at that time, indicated that a 180-mile an hour bullet train approach would cost half a billion dollars, in 1976 figures. I don't think they calculated the human costs of 180-mile an hour trains approaching level crossings. That is the first point of information I want to make.

The second thing I want to say is that certainly I support the concept, but I think it's premature inasmuch as a study is in place that the Department of Economic Development is doing. I think this motion, as now presented, would prejudge that. The study, first of all, will address interim improvements to the traditional service, such as track alignments, better road crossings, extension from Strathcona to downtown Edmonton, and such improvements. The second stage of the study that the Department of Transportation is doing would look at the possibility of establishing a high-speed passenger rail link between Calgary and Edmonton, employing the concept of downtown to downtown services. As I understand it, the study will look after factors such as consumer demand, co-ordination with other department methods, rights of way, twinning, and government fiscal involvement.

So I would suggest that this motion is, in effect, prejudging, and it would be ill-advised on the part of the committee, without having the benefit of this study, which I'm sure we will have within the year, at least interim progress. So I would suggest that the committee think about -- in fact we've discussed it in a positive way, but I would not support the recommendation because it goes much beyond the level of information that I think this committee has to make that sort of judgment.

DR BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I cannot support the recommendation. I guess it's consistent with Mr. Notley's political philosophy, and it should be consistent with what the present government has been doing. It's not consistent with my political philosophy.

MR KNAAK: Mine either, Walter.

DR BUCK: Then maybe you should do what Mr. Sindlinger does: show some guts and say that, Peter -- publicly, I mean.

Mr. Chairman, number one, the cost would be prohibitive and, number two, you have to have a density of population before you start going to this kind of people movement. I agree that we do have to look at more efficient movement of people in a distance such as this. But when we look at the good old socialized British rail system, I'll tell you, I just don't think that that's very efficient. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I'd say at this time that I cannot support the proposal, because of the reasons stated.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Pahl has given quite a great amount of information here which changes my thinking about this resolution. I do know that when Dr. Horner was the minister in charge of transportation, he was doing some investigation along these lines and was quite enthusiastic in fact about obtaining the right of way and making some use of it. But I think at the present time, if these studies are going on, perhaps in another year or two we could be considering some recommendation along these lines. But at the present time, I think it would be premature.

MR KNAAK: Mr. Chairman, listening to Mr. Notley's response initially, I can't see that this has a place in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I'm certainly open to the consideration of a high-speed rail link study, which is now being conducted. But I would surely like to see the feasibility and if in fact the costs, in a total sense, would be less than the air bus we have now.

MR NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, when Mr. Knaak had asked me about the question, there was the study, that Mr. Pahl indicated, of half a billion dollars. Of course there was some argument over that, as to how valid that figure was. What I would say to members of the committee, first of all, is that there is going to

be a very substantial capital cost. But I don't think we can just dismiss it on the basis of that capital cost, because we're going to have to look at very substantial capital costs whether we like it or not. Highway No. 2 is a very, very costly highway. When we have the provincial Minister of Transportation in here last year telling us that the upgrading of roads is going to cost us \$1.8 billion in the province, and when we look at the possible expansion of making Highway No. 2 into an eight-lane highway, none of us in this committee would suggest for a moment that that isn't going to have astronomical capital cost implications. That's just a factor when you're dealing with moving people between two major centres of approximately 600,000 or 700,000 people.

I would just restate a couple points. "... consideration be given to purchase of Canadian Pacific Railway's interests . . .": this is a proposal that was made, formally, to the Western Economic Conference in 1973, by Mr. Peacock on behalf of the Alberta government. Walter is correct when he talks about the closet socialists, because that was formally made by the government in 1973. I'm sure the members of this committee would want to be consistent with Mr. Peacock's forward-looking approach. Just to rub that in a bit, without overdoing it, it was made formally. And I think it's a good concept, the government's purchasing the rail beds.

The other point is that we have to get on with the job of looking for -- seriously looking for, and appearing to be seriously looking for -- energy-efficient modes of transporting large numbers of people. I think, Mr. Chairman, that's as important, in terms of the way in which other Canadians look at Alberta, as it is in the immediate issue itself. Too often, and unfairly perhaps, other Canadians have the view of Albertans as being just gas burners who think there is no tomorrow. A commitment to this kind of link would, I think, go some distance to overcoming it.

I can't imagine anywhere else -- if we can't make it work between Edmonton and Calgary, with the populations of the two metro areas, I doubt that you are going to make this sort of thing work anywhere in Canada. With that in mind -- and I would agree. Four or five years ago, when the study came out and the price of gasoline was 50 cents a gallon, you couldn't make it work. But the price of gasoline is not going to be a dollar a gallon five years from now. We're looking at a totally different situation. The economics of rapid transit and rail transportation are just one hundred per cent different than we saw in 1976 or the late '60s. We just have to begin making the commitments now.

I'm glad to see that studies are under way, but I see this kind of recommendation, rather than being inconsistent with those studies, as essentially being a reinforcement of the need to get on with the job.

MR CHAIRMAN: Ready for the question? Those in favor of Recommendation III.6? Mr. Notley. Those opposed? The remaining members in the chambers. The recommendation is defeated.

Recommendation III.7, Urban Land Banking: Mr. Notley.

MR NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that on philosophical grounds I'll have all sorts of support on this one. Might I just suggest to members that we have a good deal of land banking in rural areas, and it works very well. I have been to some of the projects in my own constituency. I've had a number of quarrels with Alberta Housing over the years. But the land banking program that they've developed has been extremely useful for those municipalities that have gone into land banking with Alberta Housing.

The real question here is not whether we have land banking, because there is a program through Alberta Housing now, but whether we are prepared to expand that to deal with land banking in the larger centres. I realize that a land

banking program itself is not going to solve all the problems. If you have the inflationary spiral in land prices around the urban areas, it doesn't make any difference whether you bank the land. If you're paying \$50,000 an acre for the land, they are still going to be expensive lots by the time you finish.

But I would argue that land banking ahead of time is not going to produce miraculous differences, but will at least bring down the costs somewhat. One of the more successful initiatives of a major city and a government working together was the Mill Woods project in 1970, I believe, where both the city and the Department of Municipal Affairs put together a package that made it possible to buy substantial amounts of land -- sure, at high prices, but not at as high prices as if it has been a piecemeal proposition. I think that has had a positive impact on land prices in this city. Certainly land banking in Medicine Hat has had a positive impact in keeping prices down. I can cite some of the smaller communities in the province, too, where it has had a positive impact -- not a miraculous impact.

I think that is a point to make: you're not going to have any open sesame, easy approach. Land prices being what they are today, it is still going to be a very expensive proposition. But it is one method, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, where we can hedge, if you like -- and hedge may be the best word to use -- some of the inflationary costs.

MR MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I don't understand the reference to the Mill Woods project. As I understand it, I think there was an initial investment of approximately \$6 million by the provincial government and CMHC in that project. I don't know what the other contribution by the city of Edmonton was. But the primary purpose of that scheme was to ensure that there would lower prices in the Edmonton area, and certainly not contribute to the increase. Yet the city of Edmonton, if I recall, a couple of years ago -- we were having great difficulty with them because they wouldn't release the lots because they didn't think they were getting enough money. Greed knows no bounds. It doesn't matter which side of the fence you're on. If you think you're going to make an extra buck, you're going to.

I was chairman of the land committee in the city of Calgary. It appalled me that the atrocious prices we were charging for land that we had taken back by way of people who had failed to pay their taxes. Ten, 15, 20 years later, we were making huge amounts off this land.

So, frankly, I think land banking -- you know, today you're not going to bank unless you spend hundreds of millions of dollars to try to lower the price. To suggest we could do that and affect the price when money is costing between 14 and 20 per cent, escapes me.

Similarly, I question the wisdom of making comparisons that it works in rural areas. Obviously the reason it works in rural areas is that the huge demand isn't there. Sure, you can look at land in some areas that is cheaper, but it's pretty obvious why it's cheaper. They point to examples: the city of Saskatoon is always given as a good example of how successful land banking is. They always conveniently forget to advise you that the reason they had such a good banking system there -- and, by the way, it is not now working like it used to -- was that they were able to get thousands of lots that were ceded back to the city because of non-payment of taxes during the depression years. After the war the city of Saskatoon suddenly had a lot of surveyed land within the city boundaries, and everybody said, my, what great forethought. The forethought was prospering on the misery of all those people who had owned that land way back when, spent money developing it, then were unable to sell it.

So there is no way that I could support this, for two reasons: one, the huge costs -- and, as Mr. Notley said, the land is only part of the costs. When you're paying a hundred dollars a day for laborers and your materials are running like they are today, and the huge costs that are being put up by municipalities for off-site services, an increase of 20 and 30 per cent year by year -- to suggest that land banking is going to have some effect on values of buildings in our communities is not into perspective of the total picture. To me it's just a band-aid approach to a very difficult problem.

MR KNAAK: Mr. Chairman, in addressing myself to this recommendation, I want to point out that, especially in the urban areas, the primary cause, in my view, of the escalation of land prices is partly of course the increase in demand and very rapid growth, but from the supply side the problem is that municipalities, in particular the city of Edmonton, have had a policy which one might call contiguous development. In fact developers are forced to sit on their land until the services and zoning have reached their property, thus not permitting by way of regulation the competition between and among the developers.

The second influence in restricting the supply of lots is sometimes the regulatory difficulty with our own Department of Environment and its co-ordination with the city's planning process. The third one, which has been eliminated now, is the difficulty in what one might call front-end financing for the services, either by the municipality or the developer.

What I'm suggesting therefore, is that speculation is not the cause of the high land prices. It appears that way because land developers, unfortunately, have to sit on that land, because the city won't leap-frog at all, notwithstanding that developers may be anxious to get their lots on stream. In fact the supply of land is limited not so much by the developers' willingness to get the lots on stream, but by the expansion process. In that context I might say that it is likely that the growth of the cities and towns around Edmonton may have had some downward pressure on the prices in Edmonton.

Nevertheless, I do see in some situations a beneficial impact of the government of Alberta owning a land bank, so to speak, as a release valve. Should in fact exceptional pressure develop on lots, these lots would then come on stream quickly. We already have a land banking program, which is fairly significant. But as Mr. Notley correctly pointed out, with the exception of the Mill Woods program, it has now been primarily in the rural areas. What I would suggest, therefore, is perhaps a compromise, an amendment to delete all parts of the resolution after the number \$25,000. The word "urban" should be removed too. In other words:

That consideration be given to the enlargement of the land banking program beyond its present annual value of \$25,000.

MR CHAIRMAN: Mr. Knaak has recommended the amendment of Recommendation III.7, with deletion of the word "urban" and deletion of all after the figure "\$25,000,000". Would anyone care to speak to the amendment?

MR NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't oppose the amendment at all. I think the essential point is there.

MR BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to the principle of the recommendation and, I suppose, the amendment too. I would like to preface my remarks with this statement. I have nothing against the land banking program that we are presently involved in in the province. I think it has done a lot of good throughout the province and it's an

excellent program. But I guess I'm going to get into this debate on this particular recommendation, and probably two or three that are similar to it that deal with Alberta Housing Corporation or Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation, the Alberta Opportunity Company, or the Agricultural Development Corporation. In terms of the nature of the programming under those specific corporations, which are funded by debenture from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, any changes in those programs should properly be debated in the estimates under those departments, in the normal budgetary process. That's where we discuss those programs, that's where we put the subsidies in on a lot of those programs, and that's where the responsibility lies in terms of those corporations and their programs: in the normal budgetary process under those departments.

In this particular recommendation, and several others, I find we're getting into debates that should properly be held in the estimates and not in this committee. Therefore, I would oppose this recommendation, on the grounds that it should be debated in the budgetary process, in the estimates in the House in the spring, and not before this committee.

MR PAHL: Mr. Chairman, while I think that the amendment was an agreeable one, I think the necessity to land bank is there -- not, as the total recommendation would do, in effect to circumvent the development process and those people who wish to participate in an economic way. I think it is also worth saying that land banking is not a perfect answer to all our problems. Certainly the Mill Woods case had its pluses and minuses. On the minus side it provided a ready subsidy to the first-time buyer in the area, and a lot of those subsidies were turned into quick profits. The case could perhaps be made that somebody gained inordinately at public expense. On the other hand, a lot of people were provided with housing in a period of time when Alberta was going through some very rapid growth. Without the land banking system, there is a very good question as to whether the housing system would have been able to meet the needs of as many people as it did in that period of time.

So, without suggesting that land banking is the panacea for all our problems, and without subverting the total system by saying that it gets rid of all the bad things in unbanked situations, I would support the amendment proposed by Mr. Knaak.

MR BORSTAD: I support the amended motion, because I saw what it did for the city of Grande Prairie in land banking. It does work if it's worked properly. So I could support the amended motion.

MR KNAAK: I certainly have the same concerns Mr. Bradley expressed, about our getting into departmental programs. In a sense, I'm not sure whether this one is intended to mean that expanding Alberta Housing program. In making this amendment I certainly like to reserve my own right, Mr. Chairman, to bring up the same point that Mr. Bradley has just raised in other motions. As you may recall from last year, we had considerable debate on the question whether the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee can delve into programs when in fact it's a block funding approach on a commercial basis by the fund. I hadn't actually addressed myself to that point before Mr. Bradley raised it, but I certainly support him in that argument.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'd like to call the question. Those in favor of the amendment proposed by Mr. Knaak? Those opposed? It's opposed by Mr.

Musgreave and Mr. Bradley, and is therefore carried. Did you wish to close debate on the recommendation itself, Mr. Notley?

MR NOTLEY: The only point I would make is that we certainly have, as a heritage trust fund committee, the right to make recommendations in an area where, in fact, we are making a very substantial investment from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. We are not getting into the budgetary process. If we were saying we were going to increase it from \$25 million to \$40 million or \$60 million, then Mr. Bradley's point would be well taken. But we're not. We're saying "enlargement of". Alberta Housing and the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation get a substantial portion of their debentures, if not all, from the heritage trust fund. This is the kind of recommendation that is not inconsistent with the budgetary process.

MR BRADLEY: If I may respond, I really think that this type of expansion of programs -- the only place where we allocate funds for the land banking program is in the estimates in the spring, not from this committee. That's when we allocate those funds for a land banking program. I just stand on my point.

MR CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of the recommendation as amended? Those opposed? With the two opposing votes from Mr. Musgreave and Mr. Bradley, the recommendation as amended carries.

I've been asked to defer debate on recommendations 8 and 9 until Mr. Clark returns to the chambers. We will then proceed to Recommendation III.10.

MR NOTLEY: On a point of order. Is there any intention of having a brief recess this morning?

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm at the direction of the committee.

MR NOTLEY: I wonder if I could suggest that. Could we have a 10-minute recess?

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll rejoin at 10:30.

*The committee recessed at 10:20 a.m. and resumed at 10:45 a.m.*

MR CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Clark, in your absence this morning we were able to get through Part III up to and including Recommendation 7. If you're prepared, Mr. Clark, we'd like to proceed with Part III, Recommendation 8.

MR R CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The recommendation basically is this: that funds which are allocated from the capital projects division and directed to research programs should be used exclusively for pure and applied research. I raise the recommendation, Mr. Chairman, in light of the points made during Mr. Russell's presentation to the committee, when it became quite obvious, I think, to all members, that certainly a sizable portion of the funds were being used on acquisition of equipment in hospitals; that, albeit, a portion of them were being used for research, but I had the very definite impression that a portion of these funds were being used as rather B-budget funds, when hospitals couldn't get the kind of equipment they perhaps felt was needed in some



areas. So we find quite a portion of this money going into equipment that certainly the prime objective of which was not pure and applied research. That's why I make the recommendation, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: I take it those comments you have made, Mr. Clark, would apply to (ii) as well?

MR R CLARK: Yes, (i) and (ii).

MR PAHL: Mr. Chairman, I believe that at the time the question was raised, it was a fair one and certainly well supported by the whole of the committee. In fairness to the minister, I also think he responded back to us with, in effect, a correction in the arithmetic and the breakdown, which was lumped. I supported the concern raised by the majority of the committee, and I think the response was fair and adequate.

I really fail to see where that legitimate concern and, I think, appropriate response would try to put the conduct of research programs into a purely impossible situation. It is very difficult to draw that line all the time. I think we would make a tragic mistake by putting such a bureaucratic shackle upon research. So I would urge that the motion not be supported.

MR R CLARK: In responding to the hon. member's comments, I want to make it clear that, one, it's not a matter of the arithmetic -- albeit the arithmetic was wrong; that has been straightened out. I for one became very concerned when the people from the department were there, and I think if we go back and check the record of the discussion that morning, it was acknowledged by the officials there that, yes, a large portion of this money was being used to acquire equipment which was, yes, used for research, but also used -- I got the impression -- far more as equipment that was needed in the hospitals for the ongoing operation of the hospitals.

I think it's extremely important that funds which are appropriated for research don't end up being used as another means to get equipment that is seriously needed for hospitals. I'm not questioning the need for the equipment in the hospitals, but I question very seriously the idea of appropriating funds from the heritage fund under the guise of research. We're finding out that this, in my judgment, becomes another way to get badly needed equipment in hospitals. I say that call on money should come from the General Revenue Fund of the province. Let's not give the impression that all this money is going into research when a lot of it is being used to acquire equipment.

MR NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think Recommendation 8 cuts through right to the bare bones of the demarcation of heritage trust fund versus capital money. We had discussions earlier this morning about whether we should have alternative energy research, and various members said, well, it's already being done from the operating budgets of various levels of government -- the Alberta Research Council, other departments of government -- so therefore we shouldn't be doing it from the heritage trust fund. I think what resolution 8 is saying here is that after arguing this matter for three or four years now, let's say once and for all what the ground rules are. Let's make it clear, so that we don't have this endless debate on what is an acceptable heritage trust fund investment in research and what should be a call on the operating budget

of the province. As long as I've been on this committee, since 1977, we have been thrashing this thing back and forth.

I was concerned, as I think other members were, with the consideration of the discussion in committee when the minister advised us there was, at best, a fairly tenuous connection between research and some of the investments in hospitals coming under the heart and cancer investments of the heritage trust fund. It seems to me what we're doing here, in the recommendation Mr. Clark has put forward, is laying down the rules, in probably the clearest form. I would be the first to admit that some of the recommendations that I have made would not really fit this category, because I have been operating over the years in the same kind of attempting to reconcile shades of gray, that I think has been where we've all been at, frankly. But Mr. Clark's recommendation forces us to come to grips clearly with how we're going to be dealing with research funds. In that sense it shouldn't be shuffled aside as being overly bureaucratic and entrapping people in a bureaucratic approach. It's something that this committee has to judge. It's probably one of the more important recommendations we have, because on the basis of its passage or rejection will, I think, rest a lot of the subsequent discussion over research funds. Some of the arguments which have been used in other proposals, which government members have used to vote down other proposals -- if we vote down this, they won't be able to use them anymore. Then we're saying, it's open season; it's going to be a matter of judgment on each particular case. But what Mr. Clark is saying here is that there is an objective way that you can distinguish research funds. If we accept that, I think we have set a very important precedent.

MR OMAN: Mr. Chairman, I look at the resolution particularly -- well, (i) and (ii), which make up the body. When you talk about "pure and applied research", and then "Never be expended to supplement budgets for services more appropriately . . .", I think it would be impossible to go into any research program where there wouldn't be a gray area, particularly if you go into applied research, as to whether or not it might have been funded by the General Revenue Fund. I think the general policy of the fund, as it applies to research, does fulfil the intent of this motion already. But I don't think you're ever going to get away from the fact that there are times when you overlap into actual operating areas. If research is being effective, I think it's going to overlap into operating areas.

MR CHAIRMAN: If the Chair could be permitted a question of Mr. Clark. Mr. Clark, although I'll phrase it with argumentative language, it's not to make an argument; it's because of a principle perhaps behind a principle. Let's assume that we have a hospital that has a recurring interest in a very costly, complex piece of equipment that can't otherwise be justified, either because of cost or because of an as yet not fully developed need or demand for that piece of equipment. Yet the research medical staff of that hospital determine that that particular piece of equipment would be useful not only, in your phrase, in pure research, but also applied research, and on that grounds the equipment were obtained.

If the intent or spirit of your recommendation were implemented, what would be your response to the non-research side of the hospital making periodic use of that equipment, as opposed to making an application to

obtain it through the normal GRF process, feeling that it was either too costly or was, for some other reason, not justified?

MR R CLARK: I think the very basic question, Mr. Chairman, becomes: where did the initiative come from? In the case you've laid before us, it has come from the research people, hasn't it?

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, but a suppressed initiative on the other side that can now be vented with the availability of the equipment.

MR R CLARK: But the application initially would have been through the channels of the group that made the judgments. You see, what I fear and see is happening . . . I was extremely concerned when the minister indicated -- and the young lady who was there with him who is in charge of research; and I don't recall the exact figures, but it seemed to me it was about fifty/fifty, if I remember correctly -- and pretty readily admitted that a number of applications come to the people as a result of hospital equipment budgets being turned down, and to get around that we'll think in terms of some research that can be done. That's why I draw the distinction, Mr. Chairman: where is the initiation from? Frankly I think the department of hospitals should be pretty concerned about checking from, let's say, the hospitals operating budget and their capital requests, as opposed to requests coming from the same hospital for a research project some time later on. I hope that helps you.

MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's useful, as I wrestle with that one distinction. The other distinction I'm wrestling with of course -- and it's only because of my ignorance of the field -- is the distinction between applied research and applied use. I appreciate that in the former, applied research, one would use a piece of equipment to acquire research data from which new methodology, new techniques could be developed. But in the process of doing that, I suppose, there would be circumstances where it could be used in an applied way that isn't really research, but just to get a job of healing or a job of medical work of some kind done. It's just a difficult and fuzzy distinction for me, personally.

MR R CLARK: I think it is for all of us, Mr. Chairman. But you have to go back to the initiation. I'm sure there isn't a person on this committee who would say that if you have the equipment there, it shouldn't be used in the healing process. But to me I become very concerned about this idea of really B-budget approach. That came through very clearly to me the first morning. To members of the committee: remember that we had the minister and the person who was responsible for research, the young lady who was sitting at the table across the way from us. Those are the people who are making the decisions on a day to day basis. So it wasn't a matter of people who weren't totally informed.

MR CHAIRMAN: Does anyone else wish to participate in this debate?

MR BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this particular motion, as Mr. Clark has said, came out of the discussions with Mr. Russell, the minister of hospitals. I support what Mr. Oman has said. I think it's fairly difficult in this particular area to be able to only utilize this equipment, if it's needed for research, to utilize the equipment only there and not have it also utilized, if it's needed, by the fact that

it's there on an ongoing basis for some other procedure in the medical field. I think, as Mr. Pahl put it, this would put quite a bureaucratic shackle on research. I don't believe I could support this recommendation.

MR CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clark, did you wish to conclude debate on your recommendation?

MR MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if Mr. Clark would support the motion if we deleted the second part of it? Pardon me. Would Mr. Clark approve of deletion of the second part of the motion?

MR R CLARK: I'm sorry, Eric. I missed the significance of . . .

MR MUSGREAVE: The motion would read:

Funds from the Capital Projects Division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund that are directed to research programmes be used exclusively for pure and applied research.

MR R CLARK: I could accept that, if you want to make that amendment.

MR MUSGREAVE: I'd like to move that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any comments or discussion of Mr. Musgreave's proposed amendment, which is the deletion of (ii) in Recommendation 2?

MR STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I'm wrestling with a great lack of knowledge. I fail to see how we could expect the hospitals that have been designated as research centres, and use the wording "Be used exclusively for pure and applied research", when I think it's almost a foregone conclusion that money that is expended on equipment is ultimately going to end up, in some instances, being used for purely treatment of patients, where you couldn't justifiably say that it's done for research. I fail to see how they could ever comply with the letter of the law under the wording of that recommendation. I just don't think it's possible.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I certainly have some apprehension about that word "exclusively" being included in the resolution. I'm always concerned about tying something in or trying to pin it down to certain parameters. You put it down in black and white and say, this is it. Then you find yourself in difficulties because a judgment decision has to be made as to whether . . . In this case it would be exclusively for pure and applied research. I would be very concerned about having that word there, or the resolution as it is suggested to amend it.

MR CHAIRMAN: I certainly wouldn't wish to influence debate, but I suppose another adverb that would take care of that would be "primarily".

MR R CLARK: I was just going to respond to Mr. Stewart and Mr. Appleby and say I, too, suffer from lack of understanding in the area. What has happened to us, it seems to me, gentlemen -- or, to be the least argumentative as I can possibly be, what appeared to be happening, at least on the morning Mr. Russell and his people came to the committee, was that in light of no firm direction from someplace, a sizable portion of the funds that I, at least, thought were going to heart and cancer research were not being used primarily

for that purpose. I think, Mr. Chairman, you used the word "primarily" -- I don't have any problem if we want to put "primarily" in rather than "exclusively". It just seems to me that this committee really has to look at itself if we're not going to attempt to give some pretty firm direction there. If we want to put in "primarily" rather than "exclusively", I can live with that. If we go too far down this road of trying not to pin ourselves down, we really end up just going all over the place. Then it's just like jelly, isn't it?

MR CHAIRMAN: We now have before us Mr. Clark's recommendation and, in effect, two amendments, the one proposed by Mr. Musgreave that deletes (ii), and the one implied by Mr. Appleby perhaps changing the word "exclusively" to "primarily". Any discussion of either amendment or the recommendation itself? I'm trying to combine debate here.

MR MUSGREAVE: Could I change my amendment to "Be used primarily . . .". Could I incorporate Mr. Appleby's into mine?

MR CHAIRMAN: Sure. Any discussion? Okay. Those in favor of the amendment, which is replacement of the word "exclusively" with "primarily" and deletion of (ii)? Mr. Notley, Mr. Clark, Mr. Oman, Mr. Borstad, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Appleby, and Mr. Musgreave. Those opposed? Mr. Bradley, and Mr. Knaak. The amendment carries.

Those in favor of the recommendation as amended? Those opposed? It's carried, with two dissenting votes, cast by Mr. Bradley and Mr. Knaak.

Recommendation III.9: Mr. Clark.

MR R CLARK: Mr. Chairman, this deals directly with the Kananaskis Park and Kananaskis Country area, and it may well be that the recommendation will be withdrawn after Mr. Trynchy comes back to the committee. So I'd like to hold that until he has appeared before the committee again.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Recommendation 9 will be deferred.

I'd like to apologize for another typographical error. Mr. Borstad had in fact sent me two memoranda dealing with the same recommendation. This was inadvertently treated as two separate recommendations. Would you care to speak to that and clarify the situation, Mr. Borstad?

MR BORSTAD: I would like to let No. 10 stand and only remove "mountain"; just make it a "major recreational park in north central Alberta".

MR CHAIRMAN: I take it we're to treat No. 11 simply as background or preamble type of information to Recommendation 10?

MR BORSTAD: I was just going to say that No. 11 be deleted, because it should not have got in. My secretary sent the one out first.

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Borstad. Could you repeat the amendment to No. 10?

MR BORSTAD: Everything remains except "mountain": a "major recreational park in north central Alberta . . .".

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. Did you wish to make any other opening remarks on the recommendation?

MR BORSTAD: No, I think the motion is pretty straightforward. We have built one in southern Alberta. I think the north central part of the province should be in the same fortunate position.

MR OMAN: For clarification, Mr. Chairman, are both "mountain"s to be excluded?

MR BORSTAD: It would have to be.

MR CHAIRMAN: Was the answer yes, Mr. Borstad? Delete both references to "mountain"?

MR BORSTAD: That's right.

MR MUSGREAVE: Just a minor point. I think it should be "access to an outdoor experience similar to that available in Kananaskis Country." Kananaskis Country is not an experience; Kananaskis Country is a geographical area.

MR CHAIRMAN: I agree with that syntactical observation. Perhaps the Chairman could fine-tune that at report preparation stage, assuming this one carries.

MR BORSTAD: All I'm trying to do is get the park. You can tune it however you like, as long as you leave the substance there.

MR CHAIRMAN: Mr. Knaak, would you care to respond to that very fine thought?

MR KNAAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to speak in favor of that recommendation. With the exceedingly rapid growth of the Edmonton and northern Alberta areas generally and the overflow generally in the park, the Jasper region, it seems to me it is time to move. There are few better places to invest the capital portion of the fund than in a park-like setting, which in fact has major intangible, yet very significant benefits to the population that resides in an area that's accessible to the park. We don't have one in northern Alberta. We don't have one like Kananaskis Country for the people of Edmonton or Grande Prairie. I think it's time we looked at an early start in the development of such a proposal.

MR NOTLEY: I'm glad that Mr. Borstad eliminated "mountain", because if we are going to talk about a mountain park and providing access to the people of the Peace River country in the same way we're providing access to Kananaskis, then as a committee we're going to have to be prepared to recommend an awful lot of money, and spend an awful lot of money. I suspect Kananaskis would be rather modest by comparison, by the time we get through putting a hard-top highway down from Grande Prairie to that mountain park. At the risk of sounding a little parochial, I know there are many roads throughout northwestern Alberta that would have a somewhat higher priority than what would be essentially a tourist road, at very significant cost.

I do agree with the concept of a major park. I do not think we want to tie it to a mountain park, however. There are differences between Kananaskis and a mountain park north of Hinton, as the Premier implied the other day. Kananaskis is relatively adjacent to Calgary; it's within fairly easy driving distance. A mountain park north and west of Hinton would be three and a half, four hours distance from Edmonton. As I say, to make it possible for Peace River residents to use it, it would very, very costly. I think the concept of a major recreational park is a good one, but it needn't be a mountain park. There are other alternatives closer to the city of Edmonton, which should be explored by the Department of Recreation and Parks as an alternative.

So the proposal as amended, I think, is okay. The only thing I would say, Mr. Chairman, is that it seems to me that I would have some concern with everything after the words "north central Alberta". In other words:

That consideration be given to an early start on development of a major recreational park in north central Alberta.

If we leave in:

which would give the citizens in central and northern Alberta, access to an outdoor experience similar to Kananaskis Country.

there's not much point in taking "mountain" out, because basically we're talking about the Kananaskis experience. What we want to do in parks planning is to be a little less tied to the mountain format, to allow the parks people to keep in mind our objective of a major park adjacent to the metro area here and for northern Alberta use, which may be a mountain park, which may be a park in the parkland area, which may be a park north and east of Edmonton. Some of the most beautiful park potential anywhere in the country is in the lakeland area. But let's have it set the goal of a major recreational park, but not tie it to the mountain setting.

MR CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, we now have before us an amending motion from Mr. Notley which, in effect, would delete all after the first reference to Alberta, bearing in mind also the earlier deletion of the proposer; that is, the reference to the word "mountain". Any comment on that amendment motion by Mr. Notley?

MR BORSTAD: I should say that the reason for taking "mountain" out of there was because of some of the discussions that went on in the committee here previously about the cost of roads. That was one of the reasons for deleting the word "mountain". If you look at the second part of the motion, I was also talking about the lakeland area, which is not necessarily in this motion now. So I could agree with that, if it were deleted after "north central Alberta".

MR CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR APPLEBY: What would the wording be?

MR CHAIRMAN: The amending motion from Mr. Notley is simply a deletion of all after the first reference to Alberta. In other words, it would now read:

That consideration be given to an early start on development of a major recreational park in north central Alberta.

Those in favor of the . . .

MR R CLARK: Before we do, I sense the committee is going to support the idea, and I plan to support the idea too. There are just two comments I want to make. It would just be a plea to my colleagues on the committee who sit in the government: not judging the Kananaskis thing, but for goodness' sake, let's do proper planning on the thing. With passing this resolution now, we'll have lots of time to do it, so we don't get involved in the kind of situation we now find ourselves in.

MR CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of the amendment? Those opposed? The amendment carries unanimously. Those in favor of the recommendation as amended? Those opposed? The recommendation as amended carries unanimously.

Recommendation III.12 of course has Mr. Sindlinger's name beside it. Mr. Musgreave approached me recently, to indicate his interest in speaking in support of that recommendation. I suppose it's somewhat unusual to proceed with debate of a recommendation whose proponent is not in the chambers, but then that absence also derives from unusual circumstances. With that -- Mr. Musgreave.

MR MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I had spoken to Mrs. Jeanette Pick, who is the president of the Alberta nurses' association. She advised me she had talked to Mr. Sindlinger, but she was also approaching other MLAs. After seven years on the Calgary General Hospital, she is aware of my interest in the nursing profession.

The points that the nursing association made and which are incorporated in this -- first of all, they are already convinced that there is a need; however, they're willing to accept the motion as it stands. If the committee approved this motion and if the government supported it, she would agree that the first basis should be to identify the need. But the important thing she was making was that when the \$300 million allocation for medical research was made, an important part of anything of this nature that comes out is that while new technology and new medicines may be developed in the cure of illnesses, the very important part of the whole system is the nursing care after the event. It was her feeling that the advanced technology in medical research is certainly a step forward, but unless other health needs are researched as well, the advance would not receive its greatest achievement.

Another area which is related to nursing care but not to medical research particularly is in the care of pregnant mothers, for example, and children in early childhood. Again, she says there is a need for research, to try to determine why there is so much child battering and things of this nature, which, again, possibly would be assisted if some research were taken into the problems that develop, particularly in pre-natal and post-natal care.

With those comments, I am prepared to support the motion.

MR KNAAK: First I have a question, then I have a comment, Mr. Chairman. Maybe I could ask Mr. Musgreave what he means by nursing research, and how that would differ from other professions that are related to the medical profession, other than the medical profession itself.

MR MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, to me nursing research is exactly what it says. It's research into the methods of nursing; secondly, the length of time, for example, that people are confined to hospitals -- these kinds of things that would come out of research into . . . Right now another member of our committee is in the city of Montreal studying the hospice system, which is a system whereby people who have terminal illnesses are sent to a particular hospital, that exist primarily in Britain. They are treated more in the nature of psychological care than, say, by drugs and medicines. But it is nursing as such. The field in Canada hasn't been explored as carefully as it might.

MR KNAAK: Assuming we went into this nursing research, and if they reached their objective of going into research, what would be the result? In other words, assume you were successful at your research. What would you end up with? I know what you end up with when you're successful in medical research.



You prevent or cure diseases. But what happens when you are successful in nursing research?

MR MUSGREAVE: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you're successful in achieving healthy people much quicker. For example, it was found out during the war that when people became seriously injured, there were so many of them they had to kick them out of the hospital. They found out that if you get up and start walking around you are much healthier than if you laid in bed for weeks on end. Similarly with pregnant women. When they had a baby, they used to lay in the hospital for two weeks. Now they're up within a day. These are the kinds of things that would happen.

What I'm saying is that you're going to be healthier sooner, you're going to reduce medical costs, and you're going to be back in society as a productive person that much quicker.

MR KNAAK: Thank you, Mr. Musgreave. Now for my comment, Mr. Chairman. If one reads the recommendation carefully, it's recommended that "consideration be given to funding a research project that would identify and assess the need for" undertaking nursing research. In other words, you want a research project to determine whether it is worth going into a nursing research project. I certainly support the concept of medical research that would relate to the nursing profession. But we have established a \$300 million medical research program. I think Mr. Musgreave, in answering my question, identified that the nursing research is really a component of medical research, maybe a sub-branch of it. I suggest that a \$300 million medical research fund -- and the directors of that fund should give serious consideration to exploring the possibility of spending some of that income from that fund in the kind of research Mr. Musgreave related. It's not a separate part of general medical research; it's a sub-component of it. For that reason, the suggestion from this committee might be that the \$300 million medical research fund we've already established look into the area of examining nursing research.

MR R CLARK: The point I want to make to Mr. Knaak is: Mr. Knaak, I find myself in the unaccustomed position of agreeing with you. But the problem is that the Premier indicated during second reading of that bill that nursing research would not be seen as an area in which that money would be allocated. That's why the wisdom of Mr. Musgreave in supporting Mr. Sindlinger's resolution is appropriate.

MR MUSGREAVE: Perhaps I should comment. Unfortunately, Mr. Knaak is right on the problem -- not unfortunately, but he has hit on the problem. The unfortunate thing is that the medical profession and the way the thing has been established is oriented away from the very problem that is concerning the nursing profession. There's going to be considerable pressures on the medical research foundation to do all sorts of studies and things of this nature. We can tell them what we think they should do, but in the meantime, if there is need there -- and as far as assessing the need, in the opinion of the nursing association the need has already been established. What they're saying is that if you don't accept our feelings about it, fine; conduct your own study and we're convinced you'll come to the same answer. Then possibly you'll fund the research program.

But Mr. Knaak is absolutely right; it should be part of that fund. But as the hon. Leader of the Opposition pointed out, that was not the opinion of the Premier when he introduced the fund.

MR NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think we have a number of problems. I support the principle of the recommendation, but as I recall the debate last fall -- and we can check *Hansard*. But it seems to me it was made very clear that once the foundation is set up, the government and politicians, including the esteemed members of this committee, are not to be telling the foundation what to do, and that we want in fact to make it a medical research foundation which is independent. So we're proposing here to say, notwithstanding what we said last fall about the independence of that foundation, we think you should do X, Y, and Z this year, and next year it will be A, B, and C. It seems to me that creates some problems which we had better think about before we pass it, and think it through clearly.

The principle contained in the recommendation by Mr. Sindlinger I certainly endorse. I think a research project in the area of nursing is well worth while. I note as well that "consideration be given to funding a five year operational project". This is somewhat similar to the concept I suggested, and we'll get to a little later on, in the human resources research division. In this case we're talking about nursing research, but there are other kinds of projects that we could cite. Mr. Musgreave talked about battered children, where in fact you could make a case. I'm not sure you couldn't make that case more clearly by sort of dealing with the issue of whether we should have a human resources research division or not, and that under such a division would come proposals such as this one, with respect to nursing research, with respect to research in the areas of modern life and the problems of burgeoning population, et cetera.

I raise those points as a matter of caution, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that just simply saying to the trustees of the endowment fund that we'd like you to consider this, is somewhat inconsistent with what I recall the debate to be last fall.

MR PAHL: Mr. Chairman, I support the recommendation. I think it's well considered, inasmuch as it doesn't irrevocably commit you to a long-term effort if the shorter examination is appropriate. The reason I support it is because I think that with a large emphasis on medical research and the capital efforts that go into it, we tend to forget that the delivery of health care is a total system. If we let parts of the system run down, we won't be as effective as we might be with smoothly functioning parts of the whole system. So I would support it as a reasonable counterbalance to the emphasis we're placing on funds to other areas of medical endeavor.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I find the wording of the resolution somewhat confusing, but I suppose that's understandable when you look at the source. However, I think we're hung up here in some respects as to what will come out of the \$300 million research program. If this could be covered under that, well and good. But there is no reason such a resolution could not be passed by this committee. The direction in which it continues from there would be another matter. Personally, I don't see any need for the latter part of the resolution at all, indicating the five-year operational project, and so on. I think that would have to come out of the recommendations that whoever developed the project would come forth with. I would suggest we could have something along the lines:

It is recommended that consideration be given to funding a project that would identify and make recommendations regarding the need for and ability to undertake nursing research in Alberta.

and leave it at that.

MR R CLARK: Mr. Chairman, could I ask Mr. Appleby a question? He had some difficulty with understanding the proposition before us. When he mentioned the "source", was that the source of the author or the person who read it just then?

MR APPLEBY: The source as indicated there.

MR MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that I could support that motion of Mr. Appleby.

MR CHAIRMAN: Mr. Appleby, could I ask you to repeat your amending motion?

MR APPLEBY:

It is recommended that consideration be given to funding a project that would identify and make recommendations regarding the need for and the ability to undertake nursing research in Alberta.

MR CHAIRMAN: The phrase, "make recommendations regarding", would replace the word "assess"?

MR APPLEBY: Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN: And where would the period then come?

MR APPLEBY: At the end of "Alberta".

MR CHAIRMAN: Just to make sure we're clear, committee members, Mr. Appleby's amending motion would result in this recommendation:

It is recommended that consideration be given to funding a project that would identify and make recommendations regarding the need for and the ability to undertake nursing research in Alberta.

Any discussion of Mr. Appleby's amending motion?

MR BORSTAD: We're actually going to set up a project to discuss a project, then, are we? We seem to know that the need is there already. If we used "It is recommended that consideration be given to funding nursing research in the province of Alberta." You could go on with the last one or you could leave it off. But that way it's specific. We're not setting up a study to study another study.

MR KNAAK: Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with Mr. Borstad in simplifying a complex concept here, a research project to identify whether research is required. But at the same time, my earlier point was that, as far as I'm concerned, medicine is an integrated subject. If you start breaking it down into sub-components, you don't get the results in practice that you might otherwise get. In other words, I think nursing research and medical research are one and the same thing, and that nursing research is a component of medical research.

Notwithstanding that, this government has passed an Act and the Premier has made a statement as to the effect. If in fact we as a committee would like the government to reconsider its approach and the possibility of integrating nursing research into medical research as one package, we should do that. I have a pretty strong preference for all research relating to medicine, even if

it's a sub-component of it, being under one board, as we have under the medical trust fund, rather than breaking up medical research into sub-components and having different areas going in different directions, and possibly duplicating and not integrating to the extent that would give you effective results.

So I have no difficulty with Mr. Borstad's suggestion, as long as we also make the suggestion that consideration be given to having the nursing research as part of the total medical research. If we don't do that, I feel we should first assess whether it's worth while to separate out nursing research; in other words, to have someone look into that, to see whether it makes sense to have a separate body to study medical research. If the committee feels that they don't want to lump this into the \$300 million medical research, then I prefer this motion to remain the way it was originally amended.

MR OMAN: Mr. Chairman, I missed a bit of the original discussion. If I understand what the nurses want in this regard, I think there's a bit of frustration among the nurses with regard to their role in the whole medical picture, and I think this is what they would like clarified. They feel, I think, that they could be doing an awful lot more, with the education they have, rather than being continually under the medical doctors' direction in the care of patients. It's also their feeling that it would also be cheaper, as far as medicare is concerned, if they were given a substantive role and authority, particularly in bedside treatment. I think these are some of the areas they have concern about. I think that's a legitimate area that needs to be expanded upon, and I'm not sure it is being researched in any areas, whether in North America or the world. I would be inclined not to accept the idea of studying a project.

MR CHAIRMAN: Any other discussion of Mr. Appleby's amendment?

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I think we have a great deal of difficulty here as a committee in discussing this particular resolution in all its aspects, because we are not really informed as to what the general project, the \$300 million project foundation, is going to cover. I'm not too sure that we're in a position to make a balanced judgment of this resolution at all at this time, until we have further information about that. If nursing research is going to be included as part of that, fine; but if not, we should proceed with some sort of resolution along these lines. I'm not too sure we can proceed with it right now.

MR MUSGREAVE: I think that's a very good point. I will take it upon myself to consult with Dr. Bradley, who is the executive director of that foundation, then come back to the committee later on. Would that be acceptable?

MR CHAIRMAN: I'm in the hands of the committee on that one. Mr. Musgreave has suggested that we defer further debate on this recommendation until he has had a chance to obtain, in behalf of the committee, clarification of the question of nursing research as a component of future programs intended by the medical research foundation.

MR KNAAK: I have no problem with deferring the motion. The question before the committee is: should the \$300 million medical research consider including nursing research as a sub-component? The question is: should it? We as a legislative body are entitled to make that recommendation.

The second question is: are the officials or the managing body now intending to do that? That's a different question. It seems to me that either way it

doesn't affect what we're going to recommend, except if we recommend that they should include nursing research and they are already planning to do it, fine; it's just superfluous. But just because they say they don't want to do it now, we can still recommend that we can do it.

But I have no objection to postponing it. I'm just not sure whether it will resolve our problem.

MR R CLARK: Might I ask Mr. Musgreave: when doing that checking Mr. Musgreave, would you check out the question of the statement made last year that this would not be the area; and, secondly, this question of this committee of the Legislature or anyone else giving direction to the research group. I recall, during committee reading at one stage last year, someone made the point, rather clearly, that this research group wasn't to be battered around by various groups trying to impose their will upon them. Would you check that out too, Mr. Musgreave?

MR MUSGREAVE: I'll do that, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: We have a tabled recommendation, then. When do you think you might be back to the committee? This afternoon or next Tuesday?

MR MUSGREAVE: I'll try it for next Tuesday.

MR CHAIRMAN: I will untable it Tuesday, October 14. We appear to have committee agreement on the tabling.

Turning, then, to Recommendation III.13, the Kirby Centre recommendation from Mr. Sindlinger. I have not been approached by any committee member regarding this particular recommendation. Does anyone care to speak to it?

MR R CLARK: Mr. Chairman, my initial reaction is that I'm sympathetic to what is being proposed here, but I haven't done any basic research on the matter. I am sympathetic to Mr. Sindlinger's proposal here.

MR PAHL: I guess I have to confess to dealing from the same level of information. It seems to be rather a departmental sort of effort. I can't quite see where the fund enters into it at all and would, I guess, be surprised that it wasn't referred to the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care directly.

MR NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think we are all at a loss because we don't have the proponent here to argue the case. Are any other members in a position to -- have they consulted with their colleagues so perhaps someone could give us a summary? I think the idea of the centre is a good one. I'm not entirely sure it's something we should just shuffle off on to the department, because it seems to me we're also talking about not only a multiservice and a resource facility but, even as I read it -- and I may be misreading it -- the concept of some research component in terms of what we might do for our seniors.

At first glance I find the proposal quite attractive, but we do need to have a little more information as to what exactly Mr. Sindlinger is getting at here. Obviously such things as the \$1 -- we have no way of knowing of. I don't think that's necessarily important to the resolution either. But it seems to me that I'd like a little more expansion on the concept, from some of the Calgary members perhaps.

MR OMAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe the centre is in contact with Alberta Housing over a number of projects related to this. They were talking about building a condominium complex on that same property if they could get it.

MR CHAIRMAN: The Housing Corporation?

MR OMAN: No, I think the Kirby Centre wants to do it in connection with the Housing Corporation, with the idea that we would donate the land to them. I think the concept is too vague at this point. It's being pursued, I think, through other areas, with the Minister of Housing and with Alberta Housing. Therefore I think it will come up through the ranks. Inasmuch as we don't know enough about it at this point, it would be well just to table this motion at this point.

MR STEWART: Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that we don't have the proponent for this resolution, I would recommend that it be tabled until such time as some member of our committee feels they want to sponsor the resolution and bring back more details.

MR CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have a recommendation from Mr. Stewart, that this recommendation be tabled until an individual member of this committee assumes sponsorship for it.

MR PAHL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we should, where we are in a position to debate the resolutions or take up sponsorship where there is some prospect of the proponent either coming back or appearing before it, but in fairness this could go on a long time. I would resist being forced to table this motion if there is not a representative here at the moment who wishes to carry it forward, because I think it leads to some scheduling problems. Perhaps it's not unfair to vote on it, but I would recommend that it not be tabled but be dropped.

MR BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was going to recommend that it be tabled until such time as someone comes forward to sponsor it, so I go along with Mr. Stewart and Mr. Oman.

MR APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I don't think it really would be fair to drop it completely at this stage, because some members certainly have expressed support and sympathy for the resolution, yet also indicated a lack of background knowledge and information about it. I think we can table it and if, in the future, someone wants it brought back, they could so move.

MR PAHL: On the basis of the arguments presented, perhaps I could recommend that Mr. Stewart's recommendation be accepted if we, say, tabled it until next Tuesday. If at that time no one has responded in a sponsorship form, I think it would then drop from, if you will, our order paper.

MR CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of the tabling motion, which is that the recommendation would in fact be tabled until next Tuesday, at which time the Chairman will determine whether we have a sponsor? Those in favor? Those opposed? The tabling motion carries, with one dissenting vote from Mr. Bradley.

Inasmuch as it's 11:47 and we've now concluded our examination of Part III, perhaps we could adjourn until 1 o'clock, at which time we'll resume our discussion of Part IV. Thank you.

*The meeting adjourned at 11:47 a.m.*