

[Chairman: Mr. Kowalski]

[2 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I think it's essentially the time to hold our regular meeting. This afternoon we'll be meeting with the Minister of Transportation to discuss that item of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund report that deals with his funding and responsibilities.

I might point out that last Thursday a number of members of the committee were present to go out to Pine Ridge Forest Nursery. If there are members who did not have an opportunity to go that day, I certainly encourage you to contact Miss Conroy, who will put you in contact with the officials who administer that program for us. I'm sure they would be delighted to see you attend at some future date. I think it would be well worth your while to see some 35 million or 36 million seedlings under way.

Mr. Moore, welcome. In the annual report of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, there is a small section on page 17 which relates to a subject item, Airport Terminal Buildings. The last fiscal year, 1983-84, really marked the completion of this project, which began a number of years ago. This afternoon we request from you perhaps an overview in terms of your evaluation of the success of this program, particularly in the last year. Then we'll turn it over to questions from members of the committee. So welcome again, and if you have opening comments, please proceed.

MR. M. MOORE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps just a few opening comments. As is indicated in the annual report, the program has been responsible for the construction of 18 airport terminal buildings since its inception in the 1978-79 fiscal year. It might be useful to indicate where the airports are located: Red Deer, Hanna, Peace River, Medicine Hat, Medley — that's at the Cold Lake air force base — Rainbow Lake, Swan Hills, Manning, Camrose, High Prairie, Drumheller, Brooks, Lloydminster, Fort Vermilion, Wetaskiwin, Edson, Grande Cache, and Pincher Creek. The program has been concluded. That doesn't mean we have abandoned or concluded the construction of airport terminal buildings. We are still continuing to do a certain amount of work in a couple of different ways through the regular budget of the Department of Transportation.

We have a grant program where we provide up to \$25,000 on a one-time basis to a community that has an airport, to construct their own airport terminal building. That's been very effective for the smaller airports where they don't have a lot of traffic but nevertheless need a building to provide a focal point for their operations, offices, restroom facilities, and a stopping place for pilots and passengers alike. That's the major way in which we are providing airport terminals at the balance of the 85 airports in Alberta that are either province- or community-owned in Alberta.

In addition to that, at some provincially owned airports, we have a need for new terminal construction of quite a lot larger magnitude. If it is done, it would be done out of the department budget. The most notable example would be High Level, where there has been a volume of passenger traffic, with both PWA and now Time Air, that

exceeds what is the norm in most of our communities of that size, largely because it's a gateway to a very large oil and gas exploration area in northern Alberta. So Mr. Chairman, you may see that if the occasion demands it, we will be expending funds on airport terminals from the regular budget above and beyond the \$25,000 grant.

In terms of what we did in the actual year under question, the 1983-84 fiscal year, the annual report indicates that there were funds spent at Peace River, Lloydminster, Wetaskiwin, Manning, Fort Vermilion, and Red Deer. In fact almost all of the dollars were spent in Peace River and Wetaskiwin. The Peace River terminal is now completed and open, but the official opening will be in early September. The cost for the total completion of that terminal building is in the neighbourhood of \$2 million. The Wetaskiwin building is under construction and very near completion. I guess it is completed — just some finishing touches. At Lloydminster we expended some \$30,000 during that fiscal year for a reservoir for water supply. Finally, there were no expenditures in Red Deer. I guess there was a proposal for some, and that's why it's included there. But in fact there was nothing spent there. Very, very small amounts in both Fort Vermilion and Manning — just completing terminal buildings that had been constructed in previous years. So the major two during 1983-84 were Peace River and Wetaskiwin.

On balance it's been a very successful program. There's been some criticism of two or three areas where it appears that the terminals might have been overbuilt for the existing traffic. I think I explained last year that the plans that were approved and the construction that occurred was based upon a growth potential that didn't materialize. One example is Lloydminster, where there has not been very much traffic. Once again, members will recall that that was constructed at a time when it was thought there would be major and significant developments in the heavy oil area. They didn't occur. More recently, certainly since I was last before this committee, a major announcement has been made with respect to the Husky upgrader. Beginning within the next six months or so, that terminal will probably see a significantly greater use than it previously has. So those are the kinds of things you need to contend with, the ups and downs in the economy.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think there's anything further I can add with respect to the program, except to say that were it not for the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and for the concept of the fund itself, which was put in place by this Legislature some years ago, most of these 18 communities would not have an air terminal facility. So it's unique to the province of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Moore.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I guess this is going backwards. First of all maybe I should ask if all the activity of constructing terminals within the province over the last couple of years has been developed through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I guess I should really get right to the point. I'm referring mainly to whether the two in Warner and Milk River were developed through this program.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, this program refers to the construction of terminal buildings and has never had anything to do with the construction of airstrips or airports. No funding has been provided through this program to either of the two airports in question. It's for terminal buildings. If those two airports were to receive funding from our government for terminal buildings, they would receive it under the program of a \$25,000 grant to a community to construct its own small terminal building. I don't recall whether or not those two communities have applied. But if they did, they would both be eligible for that grant, as would some 60 other communities throughout the province.

MR. NELSON: Thank you.

MR. GOGO: Minister, first of all I tend to agree that High Level is probably not only in need but in great or dire need of a terminal. I wonder, though, if you could explain to the committee. I think there's a fair amount of confusion. For example, I understand that Lethbridge airport and maybe Grande Prairie airport are under different jurisdictions. I think they're federal airports, yet we have terminals there. Could you advise the committee how that came about, how we built terminals at MoT airports or facilities?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, as members know of course, I wasn't minister at the time the first arrangements were made, but I will describe them to the best of my knowledge and hope that I'm not in error in any way. Negotiations were originally carried out with the federal government for the construction of a new terminal in Grande Prairie. That's a federal airport, federal property. Those negotiations resulted in a decision that we would construct a new terminal there and utilize funds from the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. After the terminal was under construction — or built; I'm not sure of the exact time frame — and when arrangements were finally made with the federal government for the construction, the arrangements resulted in an agreement whereby the federal government repaid the capital construction costs to the province. Because the capital projects division isn't utilized in a way in which it gets a monetary return, the costs of that project were then shifted from the capital projects division over to the regular budget of the department, as I understand it.

Later on, the same arrangements were entered into in Lethbridge, where the province funded the cost of the building and the federal government was repaying the cost over a period of time. We then offered to do the same thing in Fort McMurray, but the process of negotiations dragged on for a couple of years. My understanding is that finally the federal government has now made a commitment that they will build a new terminal at Fort McMurray without our financing it on the front end. So those are the two anomalies on federal property where there was some tie to the heritage fund but in the end result no funds were used.

The other one that is sometimes questioned by people is the Medicine Hat terminal, but Medicine Hat airport is a municipal airport owned by the city of Medicine Hat. A new terminal building there was funded from this program and is on the property

owned by the municipality of Medicine Hat.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Minister. First of all, I don't want to be critical of the terminal buildings. I think they're very high-class buildings. I understand that the cost was greater than an acute care hospital, over \$100 a square foot. I wonder if that's in any way related to the fact that it came out of the heritage fund as opposed to the departmental budget. The heritage fund project under the capital cost division couldn't show a return, and you made reference to your department perhaps looking at doing it in the future, as opposed to the heritage fund. The implication there is that your department could do it and get a return. I don't know if that was the intent of your statement, as opposed to that perhaps if your department did it, it would be less costly. My question is, is that a reasonable observation?

MR. M. MOORE: No, there would be no difference in the cost. In fact the same people and the same staff in the department are responsible for constructing these buildings under this program as they would if they were under the regular department budget.

The observation I made with respect to Grande Prairie is that because we were finally able to arrange a repayment of the costs of constructing that terminal over a period of years, it then didn't fit with the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund because the capital projects division is designed to accommodate programs that don't return a monetary benefit to the fund. They have to show an economic and social benefit. So it was just moved out of the heritage fund and funded by the regular department budget.

MR. GOGO: This is the final comment. I think they're a credit to the province and certainly the municipalities in which they're located. If government continues to pay grants and lower taxes, they're well appreciated by the municipalities, regardless of how many people use the terminal.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I think part of my question has been answered. We've outlined what we've done for — what was it? — 18 airstrips in the province, but there must 40-plus other community strips out there. Can you outline the program more than in the answer to Mr. Nelson? Is that under the trust fund, or is what you're doing for terminals for the other airports separate from departmental budget?

MR. M. MOORE: There are 85 municipal and provincial airstrips now identified throughout the province to improve, upgrade, or construct new, and there are only about four that haven't been constructed thus far. So we'll say roughly 80 airports need some kind of terminal building. There are 18 that were funded under this program. There are a number of others that for a variety of reasons had a pretty good terminal building. Most of them were terminals where the Alberta Forest Service had a pretty substantial operation in terms of fire fighting. An example would be Whitecourt. Edson was funded under this program. There are several others, most of them farther north, where we had a pretty good terminal building previously.

Then there's another group of perhaps 50 or 55

airports where they had either no terminal building or a very small, poor, inadequate one. Those are the ones we're funding with the maximum \$25,000 one-time grant. That program was started by my predecessor Mr. Kroeger. I think it was funded \$20,000 in the initial year, and a couple of years ago we increased it to \$25,000. We've provided grants in that area to just over 20 communities for the construction or improvement of an existing terminal building.

If we keep to the same amount of budget, we have budgetary provisions to handle all the rest of it within the next two fiscal years. In fact in this particular fiscal year, I've been able to accommodate all the requests for airport terminal grants. So I think it's fair to say that if we stay on the schedule we're on, by the end of 1986 every community will have an airport terminal adequate to serve its needs. The exceptions would be two or three locations like High Level, where there's a high volume of traffic and the existing terminal building is inadequate because of the high volume of traffic. In summary, Mr. Chairman, I believe we'll be in excellent shape for terminal buildings by the end of this program a couple of years from now.

MR. HYLAND: My second question relates to LRT funding. Does the minister see any change in the stance on funding of LRT in the cities out of the heritage trust fund, capital projects division?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I guess the member is talking about a new capital project under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Members will recall that at the present time we're in the sixth year of a six-year program of capital funding of urban transportation: LRT, arterial roadways, major continuous corridors, and so on. For example, the existing funding this year provides \$137 million of capital. My only comment is that if we are to retain a level of spending on urban transportation of about that magnitude in a regular budget of the department, I would not see any need for setting up a program in the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I see by the report that this is the final year and marks the completion. Are you satisfied that there would be no further requests from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund under this program?

MR. M. MOORE: No, I'm not satisfied there won't be any further requests. There have been requests, and there will continue to be.

MRS. CRIPPS: For terminal buildings?

MR. M. MOORE: But I am satisfied that the requests for terminal facilities can be adequately met under the department's regular budget without the necessity of a continuation of this program under the capital projects division, because we've done all of the major ones. In my view the only one where some new terminal facilities of any magnitude in terms of actual costs are required is High Level.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay. That adequately answers that. I want to go back to the Minister of Recreation

and Parks and the discussion we had on Kananaskis Country. At that time, we mentioned the south leg of Highway 43 going into Kananaskis Country. I think it's 43 — 40 or 43.

MR. M. MOORE: Highway 40.

MRS. CRIPPS: Forty. I beg your pardon — Highway 40 on the south end of Kananaskis Country. When we left the discussion with that minister, I wasn't sure whether that was out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund or out of Transportation. But I do want to encourage the completion of that, because I believe there's a vital link to southern Alberta that's missing. Certainly from the tourist's point of view, from people coming up across the border, I believe it's important to complete that link.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I didn't necessarily come prepared on highways, but I always bring a road map with me just in case. Highway 40 was constructed into Kananaskis Country to the junction of Highway 541, which comes over from Longview, with Heritage Savings Trust Fund dollars from the capital projects division. From that point on, to where it terminates on Highway 3 in the municipality of Crowsnest Pass, it's a forestry trunk road, identified as Highway 940. Is that the section that the member is urging . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: That's the section, yes.

MR. M. MOORE: We presently do not have any plans for any major upgrading of the balance of that highway, either with regular department funds or with Heritage Savings Trust Fund dollars under the Kananaskis Country program. But I should advise that in that same area, not too far to the east of Highway 940, or the forestry trunk road, is Highway 22, which runs north from Highway 3 to High River and hence into Calgary. Both Mr. Bradley and Mr. Alger, the MLAs on either end of that Highway 22, have been strongly supportive of upgrading it to a paved standard prior to any major expenditures on 940. So we are proceeding on a north-south alternate that's not very far from 940.

In fact there are some 12 miles under base course construction from Highway 3 north this year, and just last week we called for tenders on the reconstruction of some grade from Longview south, where there is an older narrow grade, in preparation for paving it in future years. So we are doing some work along there. The forestry trunk road will have annual improvements of a minor nature, but nothing major is planned at the present time.

MRS. CRIPPS: I expect that all MLAs along Highway 22 would concur with Mr. Alger and Mr. Bradley as to the desirability of paving it all the way up.

MR. MARTIN: Just a follow-up if I could, Mr. Chairman, on some of the previous questions. It is my understanding that we would not be bringing you back next year to this committee, that there is no money left in terms of the airport terminal buildings. The reason I'm asking — you mentioned that Red Deer was down but they did not spend any. Is it possible that there will still be some more money coming out of the heritage trust fund to finish up

these projects, or is this the end at this time?

MR. M. MOORE: Red Deer was actually constructed in the period 1980-81 at a cost of \$1,898,604. I don't know why Red Deer was listed as one of the terminal buildings that might have had funds expended in 1983-84. Manning was listed too, and expenditures there were \$50. So I presume there were some outstanding bills or something to pay from completing the project. But Red Deer is completed, and there will not be requests for additional funds, at least from this program.

As a matter of fact, this program ended at the end of the 1983-84 fiscal year. Because of construction delays, Peace River was not completed. In fact there is some \$500,000 that was asked for but not expended in Peace River. Part of that is accounted for by the fact that the project came in on tender a little lower than expected, which was good news. The other reason is that it wasn't completed by the end of the previous fiscal year. This year some funds are going into Peace River from the regular budget of my department, because we had terminated this program and didn't want to add some moneys just to complete a project. So that was done out of the regular budget.

As far as I'm concerned, the program of developing terminal buildings from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, capital projects division, is complete. I will not be requesting that we have an additional program in future years, but I don't know what this committee or someone else might request.

MR. MARTIN: To follow up, I guess you don't get the privilege of coming to see us next year. The question leads into that; you perhaps answered it with your last statement. But on the drawing board — because obviously there is a lot of planning of capital projects for years ahead — are there any thoughts by this minister, from this department, of any future capital projects, maybe not next year but something that may be in the future, two, three, or four years down the line, that he may be advancing to come out of the capital projects division of the heritage trust fund? Any thoughts for the future in this area?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I think the question largely relates to one's philosophy about what the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, capital projects division, should be doing. It's obvious to me that if the airport terminal building program had to take its place, with rural MLAs in particular, in terms of waiting until funding was available over and above secondary road surfacing and all kinds of other projects — primary highways and new resource roads — we probably wouldn't have built very many or any airport terminal buildings.

In my view the Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects are designed specifically to do things you wouldn't normally do with the departmental capital budget. Irrigation, the Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre, airport terminals, Kananaskis Country, Fish Creek Provincial Park: all of those things would be difficult from a budgetary point of view to place ahead of something else and get them done. From that context I think that most of what we are now doing in the Department of Transportation in terms of building secondary highways, primary highways, completing our airports,

airstrips, and so on, are things you could normally expect to do out of a department capital budget. So from that point of view, particularly as long as we're able to maintain the level of expenditure we have at the present time, I don't see us expending new dollars on the traditional things the Department of Transportation now does in the province.

Now let's just move briefly from there and talk about transportation per se. There are lots of other initiatives involving transportation that one might think about that we could do from the capital projects division. It may be things like transportation of grain or pipelining of commodities. There are all kinds of other innovative transportation things that might well suit the capital projects division. They're not the sort of road building things in my department, and I leave it to the imagination of the committee about all the things that could occur. The Prince Rupert grain terminal has, if you like, a very large transportation component to it because it is a grain terminal built in an area where we have transportation facilities to get to it by both ocean and rail. So there are lots of things like that that I can think of that could be part of the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, but I think they are all sort of new and unique and different from things we're presently doing in the department.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up with a last question. I appreciate your explanation. I think it makes good sense. There are certain ongoing expenses that have to come out. But I take it that while there may be a lot of ideas at this point, there's nothing specific your department is pursuing that might fall in this area outside the budget, that might be appropriate. I take it that there's nothing on the drawing boards at this time.

MR. M. MOORE: I don't believe there really is in the Department of Transportation. There are a number of initiatives relating to transportation that are presently being considered by the Department of Economic Development and the minister there, that might appropriately fit the capital projects division.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Minister, you mentioned this \$25,000 grant from your department, which has nothing at all to do with Heritage Savings Trust Fund. But after having mentioned it, possibly I could go into that a little bit. A small dirt strip was built at the Del Bonita border crossing point by the Flying Farmers of Alberta and the Flying Farmers of Montana to allow them to use their planes and come in and cross the border there instead of going to Lethbridge. They're not a municipal body, but if traffic warranted it, would there be any chance for those people to get a grant of \$25,000 for a terminal building if they wished one?

MR. M. MOORE: Where is the strip located, Mr. Chairman?

MR. THOMPSON: Del Bonita.

MR. M. MOORE: Which side of the international boundary is it on?

MR. THOMPSON: It's dead on the international

boundary. It's on the 49th parallel.

MR. MARTIN: Twelve thousand five hundred.

MR. THOMPSON: I don't think they're going to ask for it. I was just wondering if you could give a grant outside of local government, if the traffic warranted, if they asked for it. I know it's very speculative.

MR. M. MOORE: We've identified some 85 locations where we've either built or made commitments to build a new or improve an existing airstrip, and that is not one of those locations. The present criteria for handling the \$25,000 grant applies only to those locations, so it would not apply under the present criteria we're using.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will there be additional questions forthcoming from committee members? After Mr. Thompson attempted to get a grant of \$25,000 for an airstrip almost in the United States, I must say that he used every option to let his imagination go this afternoon. That certainly doesn't fall within the game plan as I can understand it under airport terminal buildings. But good try, Mr. Thompson. Will there be additional questions from committee members?

If there are none, Mr. Minister, I would like to address one. It deals with a philosophy that I guess basically comes out of this white paper, Proposals for an Industrial and Science Strategy for Albertans. I know that several committee members tried to pin you down here this afternoon to see what new kinds of projects you might be coming forward with in asking for draws on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund — certainly the overall level of transportation and some of the examples you talked about, Prince Rupert as an example, why the Heritage Savings Trust Fund component is in there, and the Transportation involvement as well.

The white paper suggests that it may very well be a positive strategy for Alberta in the period 1985 to 1990 to in fact take a more active interest. As I recall, there's a phraseology in there that might even be "equity interest". Are there any thoughts forthcoming from Alberta's Minister of Transportation on what type of initiative might be placed on taking a greater equity position, say in such national institutions as the Canadian Pacific railroad, to provide more Alberta direction with respect to the transportation of grain in both Alberta and western Canada?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, first of all I don't think any discussion with respect to what Alberta would do in terms of equity involvement in transportation facilities or transportation entities would necessarily relate to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund or to the capital projects division. So if we're having a discussion generally about how we would get involved, I believe that the comment which is important in the white paper is made to stimulate discussion as to what role people see for the government of Alberta in the whole field of transportation, in addition to what we're now doing. We build highways, we license vehicles and people to run on them, we collect gasoline tax if the need is

there — at the present time we don't have a tax — and that sort of thing.

In railways we've been a bystander to some extent over the period of time since we joined Confederation. We haven't taken an active role. The question is, if we want to enhance economic opportunities in western Canada, in Alberta, do we need to take a more active role? Is it so important that we have adequate policy with respect to rail transportation, particularly to the west coast, that we be more involved than we've been in the past? I think that reference in the white paper to equity ownership is a reflection of a desire to at least get some expression of opinion from the public as to whether or not we should be more involved.

If we're going to grow economically, provide jobs for the 2.3 million people that now live in this province, and have an economic future that's at least equal to if not better than those people who live in central Canada, I personally think we have to be more involved in transportation infrastructure than just roads and highways. We probably have to take a more active role. If we can't play a more active role in terms of regulatory and legislative areas because many of these areas are under federal purview in other provinces in terms of railways and ports, maybe we need to play a more active role in terms of the actual ownership and building and operation.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I think it's a question that is timely to ask. Hopefully those in our business and community organizations who think about it will think on the basis of what they believe is right for the future of our province rather than some philosophical idea that government should or shouldn't own something. I think it was very effective for us to have an ownership role in Pacific Western Airlines from 1974 to 1984. The direction the airline went and the economic benefits that occurred with respect to the province of Alberta were significantly greater than what might have occurred had the ownership gone some other direction. Then we were successful, as you know, Mr. Chairman, in privatizing the airline once we felt the direction had been completed and was solid. So I think we have a great role to play in transportation. If it takes equity ownership to do it, we ought to be seriously considering how that's applied.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, the white paper has a sentence I want to read to you. It says:

New initiatives need to be developed to provide for a cost sharing between industry and government in the building of new roads and highways to serve the job creating resource sector particularly for the forestry, oil and gas, agriculture and coal processing industries.

Several committee members have asked you, would there be a possible further draw requested by you as Minister of Transportation from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund for some of these so-called "new initiatives" that need to be developed to provide for a cost sharing between industry and government, et cetera? Would you see those new initiatives being handled by your department without a draw on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? I'm concerned about what the anticipated request level might be through the 1985-86 and 1986-87 fiscal years with respect to the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings

Trust Fund.

MR. M. MOORE: Yes, I would see those handled by the regular department budget, because there's such a great variety of arrangements that can and will be made. We're doing a lot of that right now, but as the white paper says, new initiatives need to be developed. For example, we have had requests for the development of a resource road into a resource area north of Slave Lake, then from there east to Fort McMurray. There are a number of companies operating in the area. Normally, where there are no substantive communities involved, we would say to them: if you want to go in there and build a gas plant, explore for oil, or whatever, you build your own road. But when you get several companies involved, it gets a little complex as to which one should have the licence of occupation, which one should collect fees, and so on.

Proposals in that area, one by Union Oil, have been made for us to come in and cost-share the development of this road, form some kind of corporate entity that would be owned partly by the province and partly by the companies involved, and then eventually have the province take over the road. Those are the kinds of new initiatives we could be looking at, but they're complex enough in terms of paybacks, returns, and operating costs of the highways that I wouldn't see them fitting into the capital projects division. I think they would be better under the regular budget of the department.

There are other things. Most recently I've been negotiating with Procter & Gamble forest pulp mill company in Grande Prairie, who are hauling chips very long distances from the High Level and Slave Lake areas into their pulp mills. There are enormous cost savings to be obtained if they can haul heavier weights, longer and higher loads. They've been able to accommodate our engineers' requirements with respect to load limits in both summer and winter by additional axles and the proper axle spacing. The only matter that's left is the weights they want to haul over certain bridges. We identified a cost of \$2,360,000 to upgrade bridges on the line from High Level to Grande Prairie and from Grande Prairie over to the B.C. border. We're now negotiating a cost-sharing arrangement where they will pay part of the costs of upgrading those bridges in return for being able to haul heavier weights. We would pay part of the costs because there's a benefit to other road users as well.

Again, that's not the kind of thing that would sort of fit the capital projects division, because there's a payback and so on. Those are all important things in the white paper that we need to be doing, but I don't think that particular one at least would be a request to the capital projects division.

MRS. CRIPPS: Going back to the Alberta inland container port plan, is that a matter of a lot of red tape, or is it a major expense to locate such a facility anywhere in Alberta?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I don't feel that I'm able to respond fully to that. Mr. Planche, the Minister of Economic Development, is responsible for that project. There's no doubt there are a lot of implications to it, because you're dealing with all kinds of authorities — the railways, the ports, the

ocean shipping companies, and so on — when you start dealing with containers that are going to move around the world. But that's an area I would prefer to leave for the minister who's directly responsible for it.

While we're on that subject, though, Mr. Chairman, I just might say one thing, and it's this. You were asking about new and innovative things that might involve the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, capital projects division. That particular project is one. If the feasibility of this inland container port can finally be worked out and it's a go, and the project, the physical facility here in Alberta, costs X dollars, it may well fit the capital projects division. That would be something new, unique, and different that wouldn't necessarily provide a dollar return to the fund but certainly would provide an economic one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will there be additional questions coming from committee members? If not, thank you very much, Mr. Moore. I'm not sure we'll be seeing you next year as this program has now terminated for all intents and purposes, unless of course you will be coming back to us requesting confirmation of a new funding proposal you might have. Only time can determine that. So thank you very much, sir, for your frankness and your direct responses to the questions at hand, and best wishes.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask Ann to circulate three documents to you that have been provided to us by the Hon. LeRoy Fjordbotten, who will be the next minister before us. He will be here on Tuesday, August 21. The three documents are titled Agricultural Research, On-Farm Demonstration Project, and the other one is the progress report for the Farming for the Future program to 1983 and early 1984.

I have only one other little notification I'd like to share with you. We currently have the Hon. Hugh Planche, Minister of Economic Development, scheduled to appear before the committee on the morning of Wednesday, September 5. There is some difficulty with Mr. Planche's schedule, and he has requested whether or not his appearance might be rescheduled from that day to Thursday afternoon, August 30. We have a meeting on the morning of Thursday, August 30, with the Hon. Fred Bradley. I wonder if that would be a great difficulty with committee members to reschedule Mr. Planche to 2 p.m., Thursday, August 30. No great difficulty? We'll attempt to do that then. We'll confirm all of this in writing next week. Thank you very much.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, would it not [inaudible] be a difficulty? Because we have a boundaries commission hearing that day, and I'd like to sit in on that Economic Development thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The absence of one member would not be a difficulty to the committee, Mr. Kroeger. I appreciate that your presence would be very sorely missed by all committee members, and the contribution you might want to make at that time would be very much missed. As you know, we always have this blasted difficulty with scheduling.

MR. GOGO: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, as this is a public meeting, the redistribution committee could come over and attend this meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next week we'll be meeting with LeRoy Fjordbotten on Tuesday, August 21. Wednesday, August 22, will be Bill Diachuk, Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation, and Thursday, August 23, will be the Hon. Dave Russell, Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care.

Would there be additional business that committee members would like to raise?

MR. HYLAND: I move we adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. If there's an administrative form you'd like to fill in, kindly come up and we'll take care of that.

[The meeting adjourned at 2:48 p.m.]

This page intentionally left blank.