

[Chairman: Mr. Kowalski]

[2 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to another meeting of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee. Members will recall that when we last met last Thursday afternoon, we had begun a very intense review of recommendations that were on a document assembled to that date. For the benefit of all committee members, I would simply like to review one more time the status of the first 19 recommendations we looked at.

The committee reviewed recommendations 1, 2, and 3, tabled recommendation 4, reviewed recommendations 5 and 6, tabled recommendations 7, 8, and 9, reviewed recommendation 10, looked at recommendation 11 but it was to come back with some reworking of some words, and looked at and reviewed recommendations 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19.

As we assemble today, we had indicated the other day that we would continue the process of looking at recommendations 20 through 42 and, time permitting — committee members agreed the other day that if we had to go beyond the hour of 4 o'clock we would go beyond the hour of 4 o'clock and work towards a time frame of 5 to 5:30. At the conclusion of the committee review of recommendations through number 42, it would be our intent to go back to pick up those that had been tabled and look at the one that had to be reworked, which is recommendation 11. Concluding that, we would go back through recommendations 1 to 42 and have a vote on each one of them, and hopefully conclude this afternoon with the resolution of what recommendations would be contained in the report.

Time will determine where we will be at any stage this afternoon. I sense that that is the understanding of all committee members. There seems to be no disagreement.

At this point in time we'll go to recommendation 20. The approach taken the other day was that the chairman of the committee would read them into the record, and then we would determine how we wanted to deal with them.

Recommendation 20:

That the committee recommend that a cap be placed on the amount of nonrenewable resource revenue placed in

the trust fund and that such money be used instead for the general revenue programs of the government.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Chairman, in some informal discussion we've agreed to drop recommendation 20. It will be blended in with recommendation 39, coming up later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation 20 has been withdrawn by the mover.

Recommendation 21:

That the committee recommend that in those instances where significant amounts of trust fund money have been invested in debentures, shares, and other securities of private-sector corporations, the government endeavour to obtain a seat on the board of directors of such corporations so as to ensure that such investments of public dollars are well protected.

MR. GURNETT: I think it's fairly straightforward, Mr. Chairman. The purpose of it is to put the fund in a position where it would have some ongoing insight and knowledge about what was happening in organizations where it had a significant investment. It specifically came out of our discussion with the Treasurer over the movement from the heritage fund to general revenue of the \$5 million debenture that was held with Canadian Commercial Bank. In view of events since then, I continue to think it's a good recommendation.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this motion is the worst kind of intrusion into the private sector I've ever seen brought forward. Are we trying to encourage or discourage private enterprise and private decisions? I think a motion such as this indicates that we in government distrust the private sector and their decision-making. On top of it all, I don't see how government directors being included would change the decisions made by the board of directors.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I urge that they have a figure in there instead of "significant amounts." What's significant to me may not be significant to Mr. Gurnett and vice versa. So it's really very hard for me to support the motion as it's written at the present time.

Are we talking about \$1 million as a significant amount? If we are, then obviously if you look at the portfolios we hold, there are considerable amounts of money in there. You'd have directors going on boards and off boards as these amounts are shifted. I have trouble understanding what "significant amounts" means, really.

MR. GURNETT: In response to the final comment, I suggest that I'd be happy to put a value on it that came out of our discussion. The concern about putting it on initially was that a figure like that may change with circumstances. Certainly, I'm not thinking it would relate to every place where there was some investment of hundreds of thousands of dollars. So it's looking at places where there are major investments of millions. I'd be open to suggestions about how we could define "significant".

I wasn't by any means trying to encourage an incredible amount of meddling in the operation of private business but rather to say that where the trust fund chooses to have a significant investment of money, for whatever reasons, we have that window to know what's happening and to have information. I tend to agree that maybe one person representing the trust fund wouldn't be able to swing decisions, but having a person there would mean that in an ongoing way we were kept informed and weren't taken by surprise two weeks before an organization may find itself in serious trouble.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm having some real difficulty with this at the outset. I'm trying to remember the amount of investments in each of these various corporations, be it by share or otherwise. I think Syncrude is probably the largest, with 16 and two-thirds percent. In the other areas, where there's an investment of a share or a security, other than where you're propping up something, I believe we're limiting it to something in the order of 4 percent, which isn't a great deal in relation to the overall investment of the corporation.

I have some difficulty suggesting that we put people on a board of directors in the private sector. As far as I'm concerned, there's a place for government and there's a place for the private sector to do their business. Usually government makes it so rough on the private sector in any event that putting another board

member into some of these corporations is just going to be another intrusion into the ordinary running of that corporation.

If there's a member of the government or someone who wants to buy a share and get elected to the board, I think that's a different situation. I'd have no problem supporting an area if a person could get himself elected to a board, but that's another area where a person would have to make himself such a profile that he could get elected.

We see the return on the investment each year, or at least I think there are some recommendations in here so we can see the return on that investment each year, by the increase in value of shares, the payment of dividends, and what have you. I think that we are able to review that on an annual basis, either through the Treasury or, if necessary, we can probably get some of that information here. So whether you have a board member there or not, you're still going to get the same information at the end of the line, and that investment is protected by the annual or quarterly report that may be issued or offered by any corporation we have an investment in. I think that's our check and balance. We don't need to put a government person on any of these boards. Let the private corporation do their business in the normal fashion, and I'm sure we'll be better off for it and probably make more money through it than through more intrusion by government members or government people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments forthcoming from committee members before we ask Mr. Gurnett to conclude the discussion? Mr. Gurnett, have you anything further?

MR. GURNETT: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation 22:

That the committee recommend that a private-sector consulting firm be engaged to undertake a thorough review of the management and investment practices applied to the fund, that the terms of reference for the review be drawn up by the trust fund standing committee, and that their report be made public.

MR. GURNETT: I think that's a partner, in a

sense, to some of the other recommendations, particularly recommendation 5 we looked at, that involved the idea of public hearings. This simply says that people specialized in reviewing something like this would review it and, again, that that information would be made available to people so that recommendations that may come out about directions the fund should take would be available for open discussion and consideration.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I feel that we have checks and balances already in place. We have the Auditor General, the legislative review committee, our own committee, and this is another one outside of that. I really feel that we're going overboard. The next thing we'll probably see is that we'll have a legislative committee set up to review the independent assessment. You can go on and on. I don't think we gain anything. I think we have sufficient in place now with the two groups I mentioned, the Auditor General and this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments forthcoming from committee members before we ask Mr. Gurnett to conclude the discussion?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Gurnett. In terms of the total review, would we be looking at all four divisions of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? Are we looking at the investment division? For example, possibly there could be some merit in terms of the capital works division. But my own preference, in terms of the investment division — I know I'd certainly support the motion on that basis.

MR. GURNETT: Yes. As it says, to look at both the investment and the management of the fund comprehensively.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any additional concluding remarks you'd like to make with respect to this recommendation, Mr. Gurnett?

MR. GURNETT: No. That's fine, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation 23:
That the committee endorse the suggestion advanced by the northern Alberta Association of Municipal Districts

and Counties and recommend that a drainage rehabilitation and expansion program be established similar to the irrigation rehabilitation and expansion program now in place.

MR. GURNETT: I hope that the committee will heartily support this recommendation, Mr. Chairman. Over the years difficulties have developed in some areas of the province because the amount for the cost of drainage projects is not as generous as it is with irrigation projects, and so projects have tended to be small and isolated. I would see having a program similar to what's done with irrigation, offering the opportunity to have a comprehensive, large area approach to dealing with drainage. As a result, I think it would be done much better and, in the long run, more efficiently than it's going to be if it continues to happen the way it does now.

As I noted in the recommendation, something very similar to this has already been suggested by the northern Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties. They see the problem firsthand themselves as they go about their regular work, and I think we would do well to support the recommendation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in favour of the recommendation, as well. In southern Alberta we have certainly seen the many benefits of irrigation rehabilitation and expansion. I know from as recent as last week, talking to a person who is very skilled in the area of drainage and the effect of salinity on the soil, that a program at this time would certainly enhance and preserve thousands of acres in northern Alberta from that disaster. We are attempting to do something about salinity in many areas in southern Alberta. The problem is there. We've farmed the land for many years, and it certainly has had devastating effects. Now we're trying to reverse what we've done over a long period of time. I think that some of the new land in northern Alberta that has been cleared and is now being farmed — certainly, if we could deal with drainage at this time, we would deal with salinity and avoid the problem before it starts. So it certainly could be preventative in nature.

MR. THOMPSON: I'd just ask a question on this. When he says "similar to" the irrigation

and expansion program, are we contemplating having drainage districts somewhat similar to irrigation districts? I think that's pretty fundamental. I don't see how it can work unless you do have something like that, and I'm not so sure they want to go that far. I'm asking the question: are you proposing that they set up drainage districts similar to irrigation districts?

MR. GURNETT: Yes. I agree with you that that's probably how it would have to operate. So when I say "similar", I mean not only organizationally but also, of course, in the proportions for funding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments forthcoming from committee members before we ask Mr. Gurnett to make his final comments with respect to this recommendation?

MR. GURNETT: I have none.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Recommendation 24: That the committee recommend that a \$200 million endowment be provided for an agricultural research foundation which would provide a similar commitment to agricultural research and development as has been made to medical research by the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Chairman, in some discussion earlier, Mr. Hyland and I developed an alternative recommendation. It kind of combines aspects of this and recommendation 11, that we looked at last week, and has new wording. Would it be appropriate to withdraw this one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think that would be appropriate. So you'll be giving us new words for recommendations 11 and 24?

MR. GURNETT: Yes, and it would be a single recommendation only at that point.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, could I get on the speaking list here? I have a similar resolution. While it mentions agriculture, it also mentions base sciences and engineering. I think the intent, though, is the same, to provide another research foundation modelled on the medical

research foundation. I wonder if the two gentlemen would entertain consolidating all three recommendations into one research foundation, perhaps with agriculture and the biological sciences being the target. The reason I say biological sciences . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cook, just a second. Would you mind . . .

MR. COOK: It's recommendation 4.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation 4?

MR. COOK: It could be consolidated with the other two recommendations that are being discussed now.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask Mr. Gurnett, and perhaps Mr. Hyland and Mr. Cook, with reference to recommendation 24 do you envisage that \$200 million endowment umbrella encompassing all dollars now spent by the public, in all universities and the Department of Agriculture, that now go to research?

MR. GURNETT: My response is that I imagine there would still be a certain number of research projects that the Department of Agriculture was involved with peripherally. Especially the new wording that I'd like to suggest would make clear that this was the new form of the Farming for the Future component, which is where most agricultural research is now happening.

MR. GOGO: I wonder if, when Mr. Gurnett pursues this, he could advise the committee as to how much money is in fact now being spent by the public of Alberta in agricultural research, so the committee could consider that in the context of the recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurnett and Mr. Hyland, you're suggesting that we have new words. Perhaps you would like to read those words into the record, so we'll know exactly what it is we're talking about, and then we'll be best guided in knowing how to deal with Mr. Cook and Mr. Gogo.

MR. GURNETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, a good suggestion. The recommendation is:
That the committee recommend that the

Farming for the Future program be operated, beginning in the 1987-88 budget year, as an agricultural research foundation modelled on the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research, with a \$200 million endowment and that there be a close working relationship between the research recipients and farmers or on-farm demonstration projects in a great percentage of the program.

So, Mr. Chairman, it doesn't address Mr. Gogo's question. I don't have an exact figure of how much research outside of Farming for the Future is funded by Alberta Agriculture, but it does present a recommendation to deal with agricultural research in a significant way.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, a debate on a similar resolution was sponsored in the Assembly. The number I have in my memory is that \$13 million is the total agricultural research expenditure done by universities, federal government, and provincial government on an annual basis. To be quite honest with you, I'm not sure that the \$200 million should replace that, because at a 10 percent return on the investment what we're doing is increasing research in agriculture by a factor of about 50 percent.

I think the question a lot of us have to ask is: should a base industry like agriculture be treated in the same way as energy, which has had AOSTRA, with \$400 million, and the medical research foundation, which now has an endowment of \$450 million, \$300 million initial capital and \$150 million interest income which has accumulated? Should agriculture be treated in the same fashion as medical research and energy? I guess Mr. Gogo, coming from Lethbridge, would have to wonder whether agriculture is sufficiently important to the economy of Lethbridge that it ought to be treated in the same way as those other base industries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a reworded recommendation 24, which will replace recommendation 24 and recommendation 11. My difficulty is that I do not have those words in front of me. No other member has identified a desire on their part to make additional comments on this matter.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I haven't had a chance to suggest to my two learned colleagues on this topic whether or not they'd be willing to include the words "biological sciences" in the phrasing. The major benefits for agriculture are not going to come from new seed drills or methods of applying fertilizer; rather, they're going to come from genetic engineering, from fermentation technologies, from those kinds of biological sciences that, frankly, are going to result in major technological leaps. Applying fertilizer in a new and novel way might give you an increment of a half percent greater efficiency, but developing a new strain of animal or plant will perhaps give you an efficiency gain of 50 percent.

So I'd like to ask if my colleagues would entertain a friendly amendment...

MR. MUSGREAVE: I've got an unfriendly one.

MR. COOK: ... with the two words "biological sciences" being inserted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cook, you need not have anyone's permission. If you wish to move an amendment to the motion, you can certainly do that.

MR. COOK: If it were concurred in by my two colleagues...

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't know that. I'm sure your colleagues would not be able to answer that until they knew what the amendment was.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my friend Mr. Gurnett and my other friend Mr. Hyland would signify either their acceptance of the idea or their disapproval.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure that that's something that may be dealt with in the context of the meeting we have now. I'm sure it can be dealt with, but the reason an informal meeting was scheduled for 1 o'clock this afternoon was to allow members to address themselves to exactly that kind of scenario. Perhaps we might hear from Mr. Nelson and then get back to Mr. Gurnett and Mr. Hyland on this.

MR. NELSON: I'm having some difficulty with all these various agricultural situations, Mr. Chairman, not insofar as I don't agree that we

need to examine and proceed with everything we can do that will affect positively the renewable resource in this province, which is agriculture. We all know that agriculture is going through a tremendously difficult time now, albeit because of weather conditions, market conditions in the world, the various circumstances with pricing, their input costs, and so on.

What we're doing here right now is trying to put a band-aid on a wound that needs more than a band-aid. The government has announced many programs to facilitate the different circumstances in our farming community. Certainly, there are different ones, depending on whether you're growing grain or you're in hogs or cattle or whatever the case may be.

Quite frankly, I think what we need to do is, in conjunction with the Minister of Agriculture and the government, develop an overall plan and program which can be funded or assisted by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I am getting a little concerned about all these piecemeal and band-aid approaches to agriculture, and this is certainly one of them. Even with respect to the Farming for the Future program that's already in place, I'm starting to become a little bit concerned that that is not doing what it was intended to do totally and whether we're directing those funds correctly or not.

I think what we need to do as a legislative committee is look at an area of recommending to the government that we develop jointly an overall program that we could recommend funding to, albeit as an endowment fund or a straight dollar input from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Certainly, we need to have an overall program that's going to heal or at least try to heal the wound that is there rather than patch it up with a whole bunch of band-aids, because it's not going to work. I think the farming people would certainly agree that healing the wound is in their best interests, and that's what they would like to see rather than this continued band-aid approach.

So my suggestion is that we take these recommendations for agriculture, put them all in one bag, and go to the minister and the government and suggest that we come up with an overall program, with the utilization of Heritage Savings Trust Fund moneys to assist the farming community on a long-term healing project rather than another band-aid approach.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Nelson has made a very good case for why this recommendation is before the committee. It's very specifically an attempt to move away from the short-term, year-by-year basis for research. The purpose of it is to give it an independent stability for the same kinds of reasons that the medical research people spoke so highly of what's happening there. It allows for planning on the long-term, developing programs that will run over several years.

I fully agree that agriculture overall in the province needs a complete, planned approach if it's going to be as healthy as it possibly can, but the finance for research is one component of that overall plan. The overall plan for agriculture is something that the minister and his department would develop. The purpose of this recommendation, which has to do with funding and the trust fund, would be that they could know that as they looked at the research and development component of an overall provincial program for agriculture, that was adequately supported with funding.

Many other components of a comprehensive program for agriculture in the province don't relate necessarily to funding under sort of trust fund type specific programs; they relate to an overall approach, as has been said. That's something that I think goes beyond what we deal with here, but we can begin or at least provide a strong piece of support for that process by supporting this recommendation, which puts research, at least in this province, on a very new foundation than it has had, through the use of the endowment and a foundation that has security over the years to depend on funding.

My concern about Mr. Cook's suggestion about biological sciences is a smaller one. It really simply relates to the fact that I'm vitally concerned that it be understood we have this major commitment to agriculture, in this case to the research and development side of agriculture in the province. So although I recognize that much of the research that takes place in faculties of agriculture and in agricultural research centres is, in fact, research in various areas of the biological sciences — the Alberta bee developed under the Farming for the Future program is a good example of that — nonetheless, I feel it's important that the foundation would be called an agricultural research foundation, really for

the very case that Mr. Cook made about how vital agriculture is to the future of the province. I think, by and large, people would understand what we were doing more clearly if it was indicated that it was for agricultural research, regardless of what kinds of research really happened, recognizing that much of that research would be biological sciences' pure research.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to suggest to the gentlemen involved in the resolution that rather than pegging a \$200 million endowment fund, the committee recommend a similar amount of funding as AOSTRA has received, which is \$450 million, and the medical research foundation, which received an initial endowment of \$300 million but, with interest income, has risen to \$450 million; that the agricultural and biological sciences research foundation be given the same level of funding as the other two major research projects that the fund has embarked on, namely AOSTRA and the medical research foundation, since agriculture is such a base industry. Frankly, I think "biological sciences" really ought to be inserted, because what we might end up with is simply a focus on trying to find new ways of applying ammonia fertilizer. Although that may be very important, the gains in agriculture are not going to come from that so much as from new technologies, genetic engineering and fermentation technologies, and in basic biological sciences.

Mr. Chairman, if my friends would consider making a political argument, and I think it's pretty potent right now, that agriculture ought to be treated at least as well as energy, that agriculture ought to be treated at least as well as medical research, then we ought not to peg \$200 million but, rather, we ought to tie agriculture — because we might increase the funding for medicine, we might increase the funding for AOSTRA, and agricultural funding ought to be treated in tandem. Agriculture is as important as any other industry. If AOSTRA is going to have a greater investment, if medical research is going to receive greater attention, agriculture ought to receive as much attention. Rather than getting into an argument about whether it's 200, 210, or 250, I think we just say, "This is a moving target, and as anything else becomes important, agriculture does as well."

MR. NELSON: Chairman, just a couple of further comments. I'm starting to get a little concerned also with regard to the amount of possible duplication of research and development. First of all, Vencap has put together a deal with an organization that's going to spend some \$17 million over three to five years with the end result of helping the farming community. Of course there is a profit motivation there, which is commendable.

At the same time, when we're talking research and development, I'm just wondering how much money is actually needed for research and development, considering what the research should be for and what the development may be. Just having a very quick discussion with my good friend Johnny Thompson, there are certain areas that research can develop for farmers and certainly better strains of grain, better animal husbandry programs and, as already mentioned, the development of a bee that may suit the climate we have here. But the bottom line is that the farmer could probably teach us all something, including some of these so-called experts and what have you from universities and some of these researchers. I'm sure that if some of this research is done and given to the farmer, he will make it work if he feels it can work.

I'm a little concerned that we may be funding the wrong area in some degree, but I reiterate that I think the goal should be to put all this together in a package and work with the minister and the government to obtain an overall package for the farming community, so that they're not working in a nervous environment all their lives and they can expect certain activities under certain conditions as policies of a government. I think that should be the aim we should all be working forward to, not this continued band-aid approach.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, in the past the federal government has more or less assumed the responsibility for agricultural research. It's my perception, right or wrong, that every time we put a dollar into it, it's one dollar the feds take out. I really have problems thinking that we're going to gain many yards that way, because if we put, say, \$20 million a year in, I'm sure the feds will be cutting the budget of the research stations in Alberta down at least some. I have real problems understanding how we can work — I certainly

wouldn't want to see provincial research stations put up side by side with the feds. I have real trouble understanding just how this would basically add to what's going on at the present time. If we could do that, fine. But if we're just going to turn around and supplement the federal budget on agricultural research, then I would have problems.

MR. HYLAND: I can agree with what Mr. Thompson says, and I'm sure all members remember some of the comments I've made in this committee and in the Legislature about the concern with the federal government pulling out on the amount of money they're spending on agricultural research in Alberta and elsewhere.

We also heard from the minister that he had assurances from the former minister and is seeking assurances from the present federal Minister of Agriculture to maintain agricultural research funding at least at the level that it is now. I guess no matter what we do, we couldn't guarantee that they would stay at that level. That's part of the reason I was concerned, initially, at the five-year extension that — agreeing with the recommendation of a foundation of some type, so there is a continuation of at least some agricultural research going on constantly rather than funding it so that some projects that may take longer can be started and carried through.

The other aspect I was after was that there needs to be a closer contact between the researcher and the ultimate user, so the research isn't just something that sits on the shelf and wonders if it works but rather that it's part of his research. He has to get out and prove that it works, using on-farm demonstration projects in a greater way so he can see, indeed, if his research is true and accurate. The farmer or user can then see if it works on the land and how he can use it to best help his situation.

In commenting on Mr. Cook's recommendations, we now have an agreed change to the recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sure all committee members are waiting in anxious anticipation to find out what these new words are. Currently we have a recommendation that has been read into the record. What is the change?

MR. HYLAND: I think I'm going to let Jim read

his own writing to make sure we get it right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now have a third revision to recommendation 24?

MR. GURNETT: If you're ready, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm ready. Are the committee members ready?

MRS. CRIPPS: Agreed.

MR. GURNETT: The wording would be:

That the committee recommend that the Farming for the Future program be operated, beginning in the 1987-88 budget year, as an agricultural and biological sciences research foundation modelled on the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research, with similar funding to that given AOSTRA and the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research, and that there be a close working relationship between the research recipients and farmers or on-farm demonstration projects in a great percentage of the program.

So the changes, Mr. Chairman, just for those who don't have them in writing before them, are that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we should get a copy made. It would probably be helpful.

While we're getting a copy made, perhaps we could move to Mr. Kroeger.

MR. KROEGER: This will be a new experience for me, Mr. Chairman. I think this is the first comment I've made since you started this wonderful process.

While you're getting the copy made — you did say "copy", not "coffee". I find it interesting, on the research side and with the genetics, the biochemical, and all these wonderful terms we're hearing, and I think we all know that there's a new corporation that has just moved into Calgary, with funding to the amount of about \$18 million to do some of the things on a commercial basis that we're now talking about doing.

The interesting thing that goes with it is their estimate on a long term in developing seeds — and I think they were aiming at canola specifically — of a potential of \$200 billion, and

they've started this process. I think we should be a little careful that if we get into this sort of thing, we don't go into a duplication thing or discourage the private-enterprise thing that's already launched.

Mr. Nelson isn't here. To go the route of the foundation, I would hardly call that a band-aid kind of thing. That would be an ongoing process, I suppose expanding what Farming for the Future means now. There wouldn't be any patchwork to it, and it would be carefully thought out and a continuous process.

I can support the concept of a foundation to continue this. I'm not sure how rapidly we want to increase the funding to do it, because Farming for the Future is doing the on-farm kind of thing now, and it works well. We can expand that, but whether you could reasonably expand that to \$20 million a year, I'm not sure, always keeping in mind that now we have a commercial venture doing that very thing.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I did a bit of research before I put the resolution on the "order paper". I went out to the Alberta Research Council, of which we have the distinguished chairman, Mr. Musgreave, with us on our committee.

In his shop he has a gentleman by the name of Dr. Gerson. About three weeks ago I spent the afternoon with Dr. Gerson. He tells me — and in my reading had it confirmed other ways — that the Japanese, Germans, and now the Americans as well are starting to realize that this area is far more important than electronics in terms of the impact it will have on the economy.

Dr. Gerson gave me one simple example of how we might benefit agriculture and forestry. Most of us are familiar with peas and legumes and the nodules that are fixed on their roots. They fix nitrogen naturally, the nitrogen fertilizes the plant, and it's stronger and grows better. In his shop, he has bugs which will do this for any plant, nitrogen-fixing bacteria that he will develop for any given crop.

For example, it's his hope we could develop a strain of bacteria, with enzymes, that you could inoculate whole regions with — perhaps like the Peace River block — simply by flying over at high altitudes and dusting the whole area. By doing that, you would then fix nitrogen naturally for the forests and the land and significantly boost the productivity of the area

without having to use expensive input costs for fertilizer. It would have a dramatic impact on reducing the cost of farming in Alberta.

What my colleague says is true. BioTechnica has developed a strong program. But its niche is so narrow that there is a lot of work yet to be done, and a lot of this is very speculative. We have to work . . .

Dr. Gerson was talking about another crazy idea, perhaps. You could genetically manipulate the genes of a cow: take the genetic material from a superior type of sheep that produces a fine-quality wool, take that quality out of the genetic material from the sheep, inject it into the genetic material of a cow, and develop a strain of animal that would give you both beef and wool.

MR. HYLAND: Have you ever tried to hold a cow down and shear it?

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure those kinds of woolly ideas are well worth exploring. Those are the potential breakthroughs that we can really look forward to that may well have a dramatic impact on the agricultural economy. The danger is that if we don't do it, somebody else will. We will be uncompetitive in the marketplace because someone will go and do it and then we won't be able to compete.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I'm very taken with the Member for Edmonton Glengarry's — not imagination . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Woolly ideas.

MR. GOGO: No, not woolly ideas, although I am curious what we would do with milk in wool cartons.

I'm very impressed with the thinking he's put into this. Who Dr. Gerson is, I don't know. Obviously Mr. Musgreave is responsible for Dr. Gerson. I'd like to hear from Mr. Musgreave, not as to the reliability but the seriousness that's gone into this. Is it practicable? Because I think Mr. Cook, quite frankly, has put something exciting on the table.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, you may remember my remarks earlier. I felt we should fund an agricultural research foundation with \$200 million, period. I am still of that view. All the good things that my hon. member to the

right of me says are true, but under Dr. Gerson we are just now establishing a department in biotechnology at the Research Council. We've installed a 1,500-litre fermentor. We are hiring expert people to run this department. As a result of these arrangements, we've even had to terminate some of the staff we had on board because they weren't able to be fit into the new programs.

One of the difficulties we find at the Research Council is that it's wonderful to come up with all these new ideas and programs, but we have great difficulty finding the technical people to head them up. So I would say that for now we should stay with the \$200 million funding.

I was going to point out that one of the anomalies of that resolution is that it says: funding similar to the Alberta medical research foundation and to AOSTRA. The funding of those two agencies is very different, so the resolution itself has a problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What Mr. Bubba is circulating now is a copy of recommendation 24. My understanding is that in this new spirit of political ecumenism, it's being submitted by Messrs. Gurnett, Cook, and Hyland. It is the only recommendation 24 now before the committee. The other two versions have gone. I'm going to throw one in the garbage can and cross out the other. So the only recommendation 24 we have before the committee is the one that has now been presented.

Would there be additional comments or discussion that members would like to have with respect to recommendation 24 before we ask the consortium of three members to sum up the debate on it?

MR. THOMPSON: My problem gets back to what Mr. Musgreave said. My perception of these research funds is that what happens is that the establishment that is already sitting there, on their 35th strain of barley, is obviously the one — you don't have the new people here at the present time. I think most of these funds will get absorbed by the establishment that's in place now, by going back and reinventing more new barley or whatever. From my point of view, I have nothing against this resolution, but I think it really needs some background in there, that if we are striking out

in new areas, we make sure that that's what we do instead of just recycling what's been going on for the last 40 years.

From my point of view, I think we should really underline the biological science research end of the thing more than the applied part of seeing if we can come up with a new-style swather. I think it's an area that's just beginning to come over the horizon, and if we are interested maybe we should specify a certain part of that endowment going to certain areas. This just says, give them a \$200 million endowment and hope for the best.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments or questions from committee members before we ask the group of three to sum up? Shall we go in the order, then, of Mr. Gurnett, Mr. Hyland, and Mr. Cook? Is that the appropriate way for me to deal with this?

MR. GURNETT: In bringing together a few of the loose ends of the interesting discussion we've had, I would just say that of course the purpose of a recommendation like this is to send forward an important idea. Doubtless, there would be further defining and detailing of the actual operation of a foundation like this, but the purpose of this recommendation is to make clear that there needs to be that stability and long-term commitment to research that the foundation would make possible and make clear that there's that commitment to a close tie-in between the practical and the theoretical. We don't want either/or. The recommendation very clearly indicates a situation where both things would be continually monitored and kept in view.

As far as the danger of wasted money and duplication in research, if it was, as the recommendation says, modelled on the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research — there you have a group of reputable experts in the area who are looking at proposals and making sure that they are sensible ones to make an investment in. As it stands now, if we sent it forward, the recommendation still leaves room for some details to be worked out but puts a number of very definite conditions in place to give the research a structure that we could generally have quite a bit of confidence in, that would allow us to move in a visionary way into some brand-new areas and at the same time would guarantee that we didn't lose sight of the

fact that it has to be of some use on a day-by-day basis to people who are trying to farm now.

MR. HYLAND: When the Alberta Foundation for Medical Research was started, I don't think we had the so-called experts in the province prior to that endowment fund. They've moved in since and participated and hopefully discovered some new things. Somewhere in the white paper that was brought out some time ago we maintained about becoming a centre for research in Canada, and I believe it said something about the importance of agriculture in future years in the province. I think this follows that. If the people aren't here, which they may not be, if the opportunity presents itself, I think there are definite possibilities that they will come.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, this resolution has mixed parentage, so it's a bit messy. Some might call it sort of a bastard resolution. I wouldn't characterize it that way pejoratively, but that may be a fair comment.

I think members of the committee should also recognize that this idea would be refined further in the legislative process by the Legislature and by Executive Council. I think what we're doing is signalling to the Assembly and to Executive Council -- there are really two messages -- that agriculture is at least as important as energy and medical research and should be treated with a similar level of funding. To make that point, AOSTRA and the heritage medical research foundation have been specified, so that we realize that the two funding mechanisms for those two base industries are the examples to be considered. Both of them have received about \$450 million over the last little while, in either interest income and capital or actual expenditure.

Secondly, the message the committee will be delivering is that biological sciences are worth investing in. Yes, we're going to have to do some pioneering, as we did in medical research. Quite frankly, for my friend from Calgary next to me on my left, I would dare say that five years ago there was almost no medical research of any significance done in this province. Today we are becoming world class. We'll have to do the same pioneering. If biological sciences are worth investing in and dramatic breakthroughs can be expected, Alberta should be assisting its farm community

with this base technology so Alberta agriculture can compete in the long run.

Those are the two messages, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A few minutes ago I asked Mr. Gurnett, Mr. Hyland, and Mr. Cook to sum up the discussion and debate with respect to recommendation 24. Since that time, Mr. Musgreave has caught my eye.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have a couple of questions with regard to the last two sentences. When we speak of "research recipients" and "farmers", farmers can be recipients, can they not?

MR. HYLAND: But . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: But they're not necessarily that way.

MR. HYLAND: Recipients could be the professor doing it or the -- yes.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Right. In the other part of the sentence, what we're really saying is that we want the on-farm demonstration projects to receive the greater percentage of the funding from the program. Is that what we're really saying?

MR. HYLAND: We were trying to find a way to put more emphasis and more importance on the on-farm things that were useful.

MR. R. SPEAKER: So they should receive the greater percentage of funding from the program. Is that what you're saying?

MR. COOK: No.

MR. R. SPEAKER: We're not saying that?

MR. HYLAND: No. This was the trouble we had in trying to decide how to say it.

MRS. CRIPPS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have Mr. Musgreave to hear from.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, our floundering around makes the point I raised earlier. We should simply recommend that an

agricultural research institute be funded with \$200 million, period, and not try to make the rules and regulations. We have about a \$75 million research centre in southern Edmonton that will be opening in the next three or four months, and one of the main components of that is biological research. We now have the Research Council working with Farming for the Future and the Department of Agriculture. I think all you're doing here is muddying the waters. No. I think agriculture is important enough that it should have a research institute founded similar to the medical one. Let's just say that and not get into all this other stuff. That's my recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect, you want to have a recommendation put in there? We're now on discussion of recommendation 24. I take it that all members who want to have input with respect to recommendation 24 have now had input. Recommendation 24 is this sheet of paper, not to be confused with the other two earlier versions. I just need one other additional clarification so that we can keep this in as orderly a fashion as we might.

Do I take it, Mr. Hyland, that recommendation 11, which you advanced last week, will now be withdrawn?

MR. HYLAND: When we get to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When we get to it.

Mr. Cook, can I have your attention, please? Do I now take it that your recommendation 4, which was tabled last week, will now be deferred or withdrawn?

MR. COOK: Withdrawn, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll come to that. Just so I have a few little notes here so we can try to get this.

Let us now move on to recommendation 25: That the committee recommend that an investment be made in a major park in the north and west of the province, so that similar recreational opportunities are available to northern Albertans as are available to southern Albertans in Kananaskis Country.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Chairman, this is another of the recommendations that I was looking

forward to negotiating with Mr. Cook at 1 o'clock. I don't have any changes that I can indicate we're ready to make at this point, but because it has a lot of similarity to another recommendation, it could perhaps enjoy some small revisions.

The basic point the recommendation is trying to make is that there need to be well-designed recreational facilities that are within reasonable travelling time for people in the northern part of the province as are available in Kananaskis to those in Calgary and other areas of the south.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I have a problem when we seem to want to split Alberta in two. What one part gets, the other part wants, whether it's crippled children's hospitals or parks, without regard to what is in place or the need. Alberta is one province, and I'd like to see it kept as one province, not split into two.

The other point on this one is interesting because of all the months and many lines of print in the paper that the opposition brought forward against Kananaskis Country -- the terrible waste of money, the white sand, and on and on: it was the most terrible thing that ever hit here and the biggest waste of money the heritage trust fund ever saw. It's interesting now to see that it wasn't based on the white sand and on dollars. It was based on location. It just happened to be in Kananaskis Country and not in northern Alberta. So I'm glad to hear that they are now coming out with their true colours and indicating that Kananaskis Country is okay; it was only in the wrong location.

Having cleared that point, I say I'm all for parks. But it's a major capital outlay. I look at northern Alberta, and as I said in my opening remarks, I support northern Alberta and southern Alberta. I view Alberta as one. We have Jasper park and Elk Island park, very well-used and well-located parks, to serve northern Alberta. I wonder if we shouldn't give serious consideration to this motion when we look at the billions of dollars that we're talking about. This isn't just a few hundred million.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Chairman, the point I was going to make has been well made by Mr. Moore. I just fail to see where we're going to stop as far as this me-too. If northern Alberta gets something, southern Alberta has to have it;

when southern Alberta gets something, northern Alberta has to have it. It's going to be a never-ending process. We're going to end up with two sets of facilities, one in the south and one in the north, without any thought being given as to ultimate utilization and all these other considerations that come into practical evaluation of an investment. I just want to put that on record.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, prior to the meeting I had some discussion with Mr. Gurnett about the use of "southern" and "northern", and I know what he's trying to get at. I don't know how he would change it. I have the same concerns that other members have. Perhaps we should be thinking in the way of the suggestion of one of the ministers before us; perhaps we shouldn't be looking at another mountain type of park. If we're looking at recommending a park, we should look at a park that's outside the mountains. It's not as if southern Alberta has a mountain park and northern Alberta has to have a mountain park. It would be that one type of park would be in one part of the province and another type of park would be in another part of the province. We should look at it that way, that it's a park for all Albertans and not just those from the south or those from the north.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I'm quite sympathetic to Mr. Gurnett's suggestion. I just assumed that it would be out of the capital projects division. As a person from an area of the province that doesn't even have a four-lane highway, however, I would be concerned if the committee were to proceed with this without the benefit of the recommendations of such groups as Alberta Fish & Game, the Wilderness Association, and particularly the citizens of the province.

I'm very sympathetic to the idea. If Kananaskis is what everybody says it is, and I've no reason to think it isn't, why not utilize that opportunity? Quite obviously, we're not in Saskatchewan. We should make use of and take benefit from the natural beauty we have. I say with respect to Mr. Hyland that there's something about the majesty of mountains that does a lot for parks. However, not knowing the cost, Mr. Gurnett, it is my view that it would be essential to have some idea of the people who want it in terms of the vested interest groups: are they assured of the safety of their

interest? Secondly, the view of most Albertans: would they want another park?

Quite frankly, I think it's a great idea, Mr. Chairman, if those matters could be satisfied to the committee.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to endorse Mr. Gogo's comments, not to repeat them. I'd just add that in making this recommendation, we also have to put into perspective the economic problems of the province and some of the more immediate things that people face at the present time. I'm sure people would assess this idea in terms of that. If we put a major northern park in place and neglected some of the basic things in the agricultural industry at the present time, I'm sure they wouldn't accept that priority. But I think placing this before us is an excellent idea.

Tourism, the third largest industry in the province, has a vast potential in this province that we haven't even touched. This could be a very major component of a tourism program in the province of Alberta, an excellent component. I can see drive-through and drive-into Alberta tourism programs that would bring a major portion of the American citizens through Alberta. We as Albertans haven't even exploited that to any extent yet. So this type of idea would certainly be supported in light of that observation I now make.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I also support the proposal, but since Athabasca is the geographic centre of the province, maybe we should call it "central" Alberta. I think that would encompass exactly what you mean in terms of your motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As a point of interest to amplify what Mrs. Cripps indicated, Amber Valley, which is located a few miles south of Athabasca, is the geographic centre of the province of Alberta. From time to time there are a number of individuals in Alberta who believe that anything north of Red Deer is really northern Alberta. From a purely scientific basis, I suppose northern Alberta would begin about 75 miles north of Edmonton. In fact, that would be correct. The Athabasca-Barrhead-Westlock area would be central Alberta, from a purely scientific, geographic point of view.

Are there additional comments before we ask Mr. Gurnett to conclude the debate?

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, my resolution 9 is very similar to Mr. Gurnett's resolution 25.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's been tabled, Mr. Cook.

MR. COOK: Yes. I'm only observing, Mr. Chairman, that they're very similar. I can support resolution 25. If it's passed, I suppose resolution 9 would be redundant. So I would observe to committee members that if resolution 25 is passed, we would not have to deal with resolution 9.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm afraid we won't have the luxury of dealing with them in that manner, though, Mr. Cook. Resolution 9 will come up for a vote before resolution 25 will.

MR. R. MOORE: If we pass it, we'll leave this one.

MR. COOK: I suppose that's true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurnett, would you like to conclude the discussion on this matter?

MR. GURNETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I want to re-emphasize, in concluding discussion, that the purpose of the recommendation is absolutely not to create a sense of division and of a north and south in the province. It's simply to recognize the geographical reality of the size of Alberta. To use a typical example, I think of us, with fairly small children, and Kananaskis really is two long days' travel away for us. So it's not that there's any sense of them and us. It's just that this recommendation recognizes that for a lot of people there are some distinct advantages in having another high-quality recreational facility.

I would like to suggest a couple of small changes that may make that clearer and easier to accept for people in the south. Is that appropriate?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you'd better do it now. Give the committee members your changes to recommendation 25. If it doesn't change the intent of the recommendation, it would be acceptable.

MR. GURNETT: I hope it simply makes it easier for all of us, regardless of where we live

in the province, to understand the intent of the recommendation. It would say:

That the committee recommend that an investment be made in a major park in the north of the province so that well-designed recreational opportunities are available in northern Alberta as are available in southern Alberta in Kananaskis Country.

So we're not dividing people nor are we attempting to duplicate everything in two places.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments with these proposed changes? Perhaps what we could do is have a copy made of that, and we'll have it circulated to all committee members this afternoon. That would be recommendation 25, which would now be amended.

Committee members, recommendation 26: That the committee recommend that an occupational health and safety centre be established, which would co-ordinate and improve provincial research, treatment, and advice regarding occupational health and safety.

MR. GURNETT: I think the recommendation is quite straightforward, Mr. Chairman. There's been discussion in connection with some other recommendations about the need for new attention to occupational health and safety. A centre like this would serve a number of purposes, both in day-by-day attention to it and in making sure that research was not duplicating other research or otherwise being inefficient.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, we already have an occupational health and safety research and education program as an eight-year trust fund program. There is \$3 million allocated to it. This is an excellent program, and it's apparently doing the job. The one good part about it is that it works with the private sector, labour, educational institutions, and other researchers. So I think we're adequately covered in this area right now by the heritage trust fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments or questions from committee members before we ask Mr. Gurnett to sum

up? Mr. Gurnett, is there anything else you want to add to 26?

MR. GURNETT: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation 27:

That the committee recommend that a serious commitment be made to improved pediatric treatment and research for northern Alberta by an immediate investment in a northern Alberta children's hospital.

MR. GURNETT: In support of this recommendation, which is probably one of the most discussed ideas in the province or in this area at least, I simply indicate that the purpose of the recommendation is certainly not to eliminate pediatric beds from all other hospitals but to provide a place where research and more specialized kinds of children's medical problems and situations could be dealt with, particularly the need for an environment for children that have chronic illnesses. There's a lot of recognition that they need, in a sense, a complete environment that is adequate for them. So this is not attempting either to duplicate or to take away from hospitals that have pediatric departments, but to guarantee that we have a very specialized facility for these situations.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Chairman, the same problem arises as with having another park. What are we going to do with the children's beds that a northern Alberta children's hospital will empty in other hospitals located in northern Alberta? It will just create pressure for further duplication of facilities in Calgary. For example, now we get a northern Alberta children's hospital in Edmonton; then Calgary will want the Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre built in Calgary. There's no end to this me-too. We must have facilities in other parts of the province. When we start to consider the allocation of resources, which unfortunately are limited, there is no bottomless pit to the amount of money that can be spent. The fund has limits to its resources; the province of Alberta has limits to its resources. We have to give careful note of the allocation of resources to put them to their highest and best use. Since we already have a very adequate facility in the children's hospital in Calgary, I fail to see the

acute necessity of one in northern Alberta.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not exactly in agreement with Mr. Zip on a concern about hospital beds being emptied out. I have a concern that in our present facilities in Edmonton we have children's sections not being utilized. I understand from the minister of hospitals that we are running at about 50 percent below occupancy. They're very, very expensive to maintain. We have very expensive capital and operating costs for hospitals in the province. When we aren't utilizing our present beds, I find it difficult, even though this is a very, very good motion, to support the building of another freestanding facility. If there is a need, I think we should all be behind it.

I know it's a very, very popular cause here in Edmonton, politically and otherwise. It comes up all the time. Politically it may be a good thing in this area, but for the province and the taxpayers to build and recommend such a thing when we aren't utilizing the present ones is not being very, very responsible in the use of the funds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments from committee members before we ask Mr. Gurnett to sum up?

MR. GURNETT: That's good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Recommendation 28:

That the committee recommend that a human resources council be established and that it receive its financing from the trust fund. Such a council would be broadly representative of the human services community in the province and would undertake independent assessments of service systems now in place as well as make recommendations regarding unmet or inadequately met needs.

MR. GURNETT: I hope the recommendation is straightforward. Its purpose would be to guarantee that organizations and services were able to operate as well as possible, that duplication was avoided, and that unmet needs were able to be more clearly identified and action taken to meet them and basically to oversee, co-ordinate, and facilitate in this area that otherwise can very easily become unfocussed or things can be missed.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I think we already have very competent individuals in locally elected and appointed councils and boards and commissions working in this area. I don't really think the role of the trust fund is to be putting money out there as a watchdog over social services. I think we are way out of the area this fund is for. I just can't relate it to the mandate we have for the trust fund. You have various watchdog situations within the civil service. We have the family and community support services playing this role as a communication link and observing how all these programs are working. They're a communication link in every community. They're doing an excellent role out there. I just think this whole recommendation is out of order for our area here.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I attended a meeting -- it must be a year and a half or two years ago -- of a group very similar to this. It's a volunteer group that basically brings together people from a variety of social service agencies, and they work on a consultative basis. They receive their funding basically as a volunteer organization. I think the function is largely being met now by volunteers involved in social and community services, the only difference being that it doesn't receive any funding from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I'm not sure what funding it would require other than what is being received now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments coming from committee members before we ask Mr. Gurnett to sum up?

MR. GURNETT: I think the advantage of having some kind of overseeing is widely recognized. As has been mentioned, often it will happen in a voluntary way in a community or region that there starts to be an effort to do something like this. The purpose of the recommendation is to make sure that the effort to do that and do it adequately provincially is supported with whatever funding it needs. Note in the recommendation that "independent assessments of service systems" is also part of the mandate of a council like this -- not only to co-ordinate and make sure everybody is aware of what everybody else is doing, but the service provided by the council would be a little broader. That would also involve more

expenses. But I think the fact that there's continually an effort by people working in the human services areas to somehow co-ordinate and communicate with each other is evidence enough that we should support going about doing it as well as can be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation 29:

That the committee recommend that a worker co-operatives program, similar to the program now in place in Manitoba, be established here, which would provide financial and logistical support for the establishment of enterprises owned and controlled by the employees of those enterprises.

MR. GURNETT: I believe that co-operatives have a very good future. Because they have some particular challenges and needs, they need to receive support so they can put roots down and begin to be established in the province in as healthy a way as possible. The purpose of this recommendation is to assure us that there would be adequate support in place for the development of a greatly extended worker co-operatives movement in the province. They wouldn't necessarily have to try to fit within other kinds of programs or avenues of support that may exist; there would be something that took particular attention of the particular needs and goals of co-operatives.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, from the comments on my sides here, I anticipated that I was expected to jump in. First of all, I cannot support in any form the particular recommendation that's before the committee. The whole philosophy of the business community, the business climate, private enterprise, and what have you is self-initiative. We've become such a social state within this Confederation of ours that we're destroying a lot of self-initiative to the extent that I don't know that we're even going to be able to step backward and recreate that self-initiative.

I guess we have to commend President Reagan in the United States for his bold statements, his bold initiative in encouraging private enterprise, freedom, freedom of speech, et cetera. I certainly commend and respect him a great deal for that initiative. It's brought pride to the United States, individual pride.

Certainly, there are hardships there. But in Canada we always seem to want to go to this co-operative, that social program, or whatever the case may be. Quite frankly, the guy who ends up paying for the whole shot as a rule is the middle-income guy or the small businessman who is out there trying to make a go of it without too much government support, believe me.

Now we want to use the heritage fund to assist setting up some type of co-operatives to go out and possibly compete with the poor guy that's been out there busting his guts trying to make a living through a recession. He's had virtually little opportunity to make a great deal of money, in any event, through that recessionary period. Now we're turning the corner, and we're coming to an area where some of these people will start to make a few bucks. So what we're asked to do is dump in with some government money, set up some co-operatives to create jobs or whatever the case may be — I don't know — to compete. Obviously, it's going to be an area of competition to the private sector, to the guy that's had to go out and finance his own business, to the groups of people who have maybe developed their own co-operative attitudes by going out and financing their own business.

Let's face it. You could determine people that go into business in partnerships as co-operatives if you wish. They're sharing in the profits of an organization and sharing in its development, but they're not asking governments for a whole pile of handouts. Chairman, as soon as we start continually interfering in the area of the private sector of developing initiatives and developing the business climate, we are only damaging the long-term health and welfare of the business community, be it large or small. For my money you can take government out of those guys' lives, and they'll be the happiest people in the world. Not only that, they'll probably create more jobs instead of wasting their time filling out government forms and all this other stuff. They'll probably create more jobs, more confidence, and more health and welfare in the community.

We don't need any more co-operatives; we've got enough of them now.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, this is again one of these recommendations that I question

whether it even relates to the trust fund or should be considered under the trust fund mandate. I have a very good background in co-operatives, and it is my understanding with co-operatives that it was people doing things for themselves. Here we have a motion asking us to take heritage trust fund money and the government and do it for them. I find that very difficult to work with what co-operatives really stand for.

However, we already have in the small business area in government very competent business counsellors available to all these types of employees or small businesses to assist them in setting up business and in long-range planning. It's already there in regional offices within reach of any citizen in Alberta, and I don't see why we would even consider using heritage trust fund money to duplicate what we already are paying out of general revenue and doing a heck of a good job with.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Lacombe has again pre-empted to a certain degree what I was going to say and said it for me. But I was kind of curious. I'd like to add to this that when the original Soviets were organized — the word "Soviet" in a sense implies a worker-controlled and -run type of economic organization, which is probably what this "establishment of enterprises owned and controlled by the employees of these enterprises" really means. It's going back to the early days of the Bolshevik system in the Soviet Union, when the concept was that the workers would control everything and run everything, and they ended up with a centrally controlled and highly bureaucratized system.

MR. R. MOORE: I knew we'd get the communists in here sooner or later.

MR. ZIP: It's curious how this is worded. My problem with worker-controlled and -owned enterprises using government money is the fact that if they fail and mismanage their money, they can always run back and use political pressure on the government either to give them more money or to forgive their debts. The taxpayer is the ultimate loser in this type of process, which is exactly what has happened under the communist system. The people themselves absorb all the mistakes of the bureaucrats and the people that run the

economic system for them.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I have an idea that I'd like to float before the committee, and it kind of ties into this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with recommendation 29.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Rather than set up a workers' co-operative program, I would like to suggest that we concern ourselves with the unemployed in our province and that we set up an entrepreneurship program: if you've been out of work for at least six months in the province of Alberta, we'll send you to school to teach you to be an entrepreneur. We've got lots of facilities in which to do this -- NAIT, SAIT, our universities, the community colleges. While you're going to school, we're going to pay you a minimum of, say, \$300 a week. When you finish the school, we're going to give you a minimum of \$25,000. You are now an entrepreneur, you're going into business, and we're going to supplement that with operating money for at least a year. That would cut our unemployment rate in half. We'd have more people doing more things in the province of Alberta than all these other wild schemes that have come forward.

This program is in effect in Great Britain right now and is working. It is actually getting people that never dreamed of having their own business out of being unemployed and into being productive people in the community. It gets them off the UIC roles, gets them off social assistance, and gets them being productive people within the community.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nelson.

MR. NELSON: On second thought, I think I'll pass. I don't really want to stir these guys up. We've got enough socialists around here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any additional comments that committee members would like to make with respect to recommendation 29 before we ask Mr. Gurnett to sum up?

MR. NELSON: I'll wait until he sums up, and then I'll tell him.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Chairman, I'll just sum up in connection with recommendation 29 rather

than comment on Mr. Musgreave's recommendation. I want to simply emphasize in conclusion that the very purpose of the recommendation and a program such as this would be to support the personal initiatives of groups of people around the province who have ideas and have possibilities to develop worker-owned and -operated businesses. So without spending a lot of time disassociating the idea, as I hope the differences are obvious from the record of the Soviet Union or whatever, I simply think the recommendation should be looked at on its own as a relatively inexpensive way to provide some support to groups of people in this province that have ideas and could create successful businesses in the province and perhaps have a little less chance of hurting themselves and others if they fail. Because of the support they got here, they would have a better chance of succeeding. It would be both technical, logistical support, as is suggested, and financial support as necessary, but we're not talking about massive giveaways and free lunches for them, just helping them to take their initiative, their idea, and make a success of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members of the committee, we might want to stop and take a break for a couple of minutes to let you get the seventh-inning stretch, or whatever the heck it is, and then we'll come back. I'm correct, I trust, in assuming that committee members are prepared to go to 5 o'clock this afternoon to continue this process.

It's also becoming very apparent to me in the Chair that it's highly unlikely that we're going to finish this process this afternoon. So we're going to have a dilemma that we're going to have to deal with a few minutes before we adjourn, and that is that we have a proposal for a tour of southern Alberta next week. I have to make the suggestion to committee members that the priority must be with the items we have here right now. It seems to me that we're coming back next week at some time to continue this discussion and final voting on this, but I'll leave that with you. I'll bring it all back to you a few minutes from now when we reconvene. About five minutes, and then we'll be back.

[The committee recessed from 3:37 p.m. to 3:42 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, ladies and gentlemen, we might reconvene. Mr. Musgreave, before you depart, we might first of all spend a couple of minutes looking at an additional date. I know Mr. Gogo has just indicated to me -- the phraseology he used is just excellent -- that it's amazing how all of us who apparently receive stipends because this is considered a part-time job are not going to have one heck of a dilemma finding out when the next date is that we're going to be able to meet. But quite clearly, I do not believe we can conclude this before 5 o'clock this afternoon.

I know, hon. members, perhaps because it's traditional that we meet for two hours at a time -- and there was basically a reason for that that we all agreed to a number of years ago -- we are simply going to have to book some additional time with this. The best I can do at this point in time is recommend a date and see what your response to it is. If it's not appropriate, then we're going to have to spend a few minutes trying to find when that next date is. But this is an item of some significance. I was going to recommend Tuesday the 24th and, if need be, Wednesday the 25th. I just put that up as a recommendation.

MR. NELSON: Of course, as you've already indicated, we had Tuesday and Wednesday booked for the tour to southern Alberta with regard to the irrigation program. I'm just wondering. If we were to come up and do a full day here on Thursday rather than consider two half days or whatever the case may be, we should be able to conclude this on Thursday if we work from nine till noon and then again from one till four or five, whatever takes. It's an eight- or nine-hour day; it's no big deal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What you're suggesting is that we look at Thursday, September 26?

MR. NELSON: Yes.

MR. R. MOORE: I want to second that, if that was a motion, because it is an excellent idea that we come up here and work both morning and afternoon and complete it on Thursday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thursday the 26th would be okay?

MR. GOGO: I agree with Mr. Nelson and, if

necessary, part of the 25th. If it comes down to a single date, I would endorse the 26th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments? Does that cause anybody any problems?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. I have Leg. Offices that day at 10 o'clock. But I'd probably be in there less than an hour, so I think I could make the combination.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I take it, then, that the approach will be that I will schedule meetings of this committee on Thursday, September 26, from 10 o'clock to noon and from 1:30 to 4:30 for the time frame?

MR. HYLAND: Ten till noon and one until whenever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So ten till noon and one till ... Mr. Gurnett.

MR. GURNETT: Just to complicate it a little more, Mr. Chairman, if there were any possibility of putting more time into the morning -- I, at least, am supposed to go to this AUMA thing in Jasper later that day. Obviously, all of us have things like that. But I would not be opposed to beginning at 9 o'clock, for example, and having a longer morning.

MR. GOGO: To Mr. Gurnett. Are you required there on the 27th or the 26th?

MR. GURNETT: The 26th.

MR. GOGO: I'm going out on a plane on the morning of the 27th. If you're going -- only because of transportation. Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then how about 9 o'clock, September 26? That's when we'll begin. We'll go from nine till noon and, if necessary, from one to four.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those are the times we would be talking about: Nine till noon and one to four. Ann, you will notify all the members and make the necessary arrangements for such.

While we're on that subject, perhaps we could

just clarify one other item. Some time ago we had a discussion with respect to those members who might be interested in undertaking a tour of irrigation facilities in southern Alberta. Mr. Hyland was asked by me, and endorsed by committee members, to look at a possible agenda for such a tour. He has had such an arrangement outlined. He's going to circulate it now. The dates say Monday and Tuesday, September 23 and 24. That should read Tuesday and Wednesday, September 24 and 25.

The question I want to ask first of all is: how many committee members could make it at that time? I would like to inform committee members that I will be unable to join the tour. How many committee members are planning to attend and participate in the tour?

MR. THOMPSON: On the 24th and 25th?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The 24th and 25th. There would be Mr. Nelson, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Gogo, Mr. Moore, Mr. Zip, and Mr. Hyland. So there would be a minimum of six members. Miss Conroy, would you be attending as well? There will be seven persons. Mr. Hyland, I think it would be very much in order to proceed with it. Would it be endorsed by the committee if I were to ask Mr. Hyland to be the spokesperson from the committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Miss Conroy will assist you, Mr. Hyland, in any arrangements with respect to that. So the tour will be on. Mr. Hyland will be the leader. If my schedule changes by Monday afternoon, I will join, but that doesn't negate anything.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, could I make a comment? In view of the current situation with the Progressive Conservative leadership in Alberta, I would suggest you call Mr. Hyland the chairman and not the leader. I don't want to ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hyland will assume the role of chairman.

MR. GOGO: I don't want other people upset, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a sensitive point I guess

we have to be cognizant of. Okeydokey.

There will be the question of how several members will arrive at Medicine Hat. It seems to me that on the basis of the six that have now identified themselves, that should not be a problem, other than for Mr. Moore, who would ..

MR. R. MOORE: I will go out of Edmonton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You would go out of Edmonton, sir. There is an airplane departing at 7:30 in the morning.

MR. HYLAND: I have the schedule, if I could go over it for a minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, the schedule is set up so that it starts at roughly the same time that Time Air gets into Medicine Hat. You can catch that from either Calgary or Edmonton. The departure is set for the 5:30 Time Air flight out of Lethbridge going north. So if Ann and I know, we can make those arrangements on the airplane.

MR. NELSON: Could I ask a question? Are you going to make the arrangements and book the flights, or are we going to do that ourselves?

MISS CONROY: I assume I would make the arrangements and do the bookings.

MR. HYLAND: Yes. You'd probably have to pick up your own ticket.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You'd be going from Calgary right to Medicine Hat. Probably you'd be joining the same flight that comes down from Edmonton.

MR. NELSON: You have to book those things fairly quickly, because they run pretty full.

MR. HYLAND: Not the back flight from Medicine Hat.

MR. NELSON: But from Calgary to Medicine Hat.

MR. HYLAND: Yes. The return is the key.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's great. So there will be at least seven members of the committee going, including Miss Conroy. Super.

Perhaps we could go now to recommendation 30:

That the committee urge the government to establish a program which would have as its mandate the thorough cleanup of the waters of the North Saskatchewan and Bow rivers as well as other polluted or unsafe Alberta river systems.

MR. GURNETT: I think it's straightforward, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NELSON: Chairman, I think the suggestion here is a pretty good one. However, I don't know that the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is the correct tool to use for that. First of all, I think it's an area where general revenues have to be used, and secondly, in conjunction with the polluters of the water, being the municipalities that are actually doing the polluting, it has to be a joint effort co-ordinated by the Department of the Environment, I would expect, using general revenues and not specific funds out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

A little while ago we had a motion that we cap this fund, and then we had a whole bunch of them saying spend, spend, spend. So if you cap it and then spend it, ultimately you've got nothing left. Maybe that's the desire of the NDP; I don't know. Certainly, it would be a heck of a tool to replace the heritage trust fund with taxation for the citizens or a deficit budgeting situation for the province, neither of which is satisfactory.

So before we start capping on one end and spending on the other, I think we'd better examine a program that we can achieve without deteriorating the trust fund to the extent that it's going to cost our future citizens and children considerable dollars in taxation when we really don't want to do that.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Nelson touched on one area. I think it's an area that everybody supports. There isn't any question that people support the need to keep our rivers clean and unpolluted. However, is it the heritage trust fund's area to be in? We already have excellent co-operation between the province, the municipal governments, and the

private sector. They're the three game players that are involved. It's an ongoing thing that is created presently, and it should come out of general revenue. It's not one that should be related to heritage trust fund dollars.

Every time we hear something about a river being polluted, it makes big news in the media and people get worked up over it. I can look back over the last year at the Edmonton water. With the final analyses and when it was thoroughly checked out, they found that it wasn't that bad after all. It was worked completely out of proportion by the media.

We have existing environment programs out there, and I feel that they're sufficient. Those programs are funded out of general revenue. Anything in cleanup of rivers, which is an ongoing thing, should come from our ability to generate that revenue through present taxation sources, not out of the heritage trust fund. That isn't what it was set up for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments forthcoming from committee members before we ask Mr. Gurnett to sum up?

MR. GURNETT: In summing up I would remind us of a quote from the beginning of the Provincial Treasurer's annual report on the trust fund. He says:

Jobs are being created and jobs are being sustained by the Heritage Fund's capital project investments.

When we recognize that there is an existing problem such as the condition of rivers in Alberta, I think it's legitimate to look at a recommendation like this, in which the trust fund is a participant. The recommendation doesn't isolate that all funding to support this project would necessarily come from the trust fund. Good points are made in pointing out that industry and municipalities would have a role to play as well.

There's no question that the expense of doing this job properly would be very large, but the benefits would also be significant, in jobs created and a safer environment for the future. So I tend to feel that it's still a legitimate recommendation for us to look at. It's very general as it is here before us. If it went forward, certainly many of the things that have been addressed by the speakers before me would be detailed as the actual format of the clean-up project was developed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation 31:

Inasmuch as foreign importers of Canadian coal presently import coal from various sources and custom blend that coal and inasmuch as many Canadian coal users import specific coal types from the U.S. rather than blending from Canadian sources and inasmuch as present Canadian coal sources including Alberta sources offer a wide variety of coal which could be blended to meet all Canadian requirements, that the committee urge the government to press the federal government for immediate discussions regarding the possibility of trust fund investment in a joint federal/provincial effort to establish a Canadian coal blending industry.

MR. GURNETT: The purpose of the recommendation, Mr. Chairman, is to put forward an idea that involves a fairly large expenditure and something that would give very large benefits if it were successful. The details aren't necessarily worked out, but the recommendation would at least begin a process that would have significant benefit for Alberta and, in this case, for Canada as a whole.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I reiterate that I wish Mr. Martin were here to explain what he's getting at. But forget the preamble and get down to what the recommendation is:

That the committee urge the government to press the federal government for immediate discussions regarding the possibility of trust fund investments in a joint federal/provincial effort to establish a Canadian coal blending industry.

I doubt very much if the Heritage Savings Trust Fund should be used in this effort. In the first place, although coal mining is an important area in Alberta, this is basically a federal responsibility, because obviously more than one province is involved in the thing. I wish Mr. Martin were here to explain how he can recommend that the heritage trust fund be used in a joint federal/provincial discussion and for us to recommend the use of Heritage Savings Trust Fund money in this type of project. This is so far past anything we've ever recommended or discussed before that I wish Mr. Martin were here to explain his point of view. From my point of view this is not in the jurisdiction this

committee works in.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I find it very difficult to approve or disapprove of this resolution for lack of information. I did take note when Mr. Gurnett said it depends on a very large expenditure of money. We're talking about a very large expenditure of money from the heritage trust fund, with so little on the need for it and the cost/benefits. I find we're talking about something up in the air, and I can't even consider voting for a thing without having a lot more background information. I think we'd require that before we go ahead. It could be a very good motion, but at this point in time I can't support it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments?

MR. GOGO: Chairman, Mr. Martin is not here. Perhaps Mr. Gurnett could comment. We have an energy component in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. My understanding is that coal is, indeed, energy. Should that not be considered in that context, within the energy component of the investment in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? It seems to me that that's where that belongs, as opposed to spreading the whole thing out into a new project.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments forthcoming?

MR. ZIP: Mr. Chairman, various studies of the economics of coal transportation and coal blending, which I don't quite understand, because coal blending means various things depending on the end use — the problem is basically an economic one. Overcoming the distance factor between the source of coal supply in Alberta and the prime users in Ontario, which is far closer to comparable supplies of U.S. coal — much shorter distance — is basically an economic problem that rightfully belongs to the private sector and the companies that are supplying and using the coal. I feel that it is out of the realm of this committee and the heritage trust fund to get involved in what would essentially end up being the subsidization of the cost of transporting the coal over such a long distance. This question of transportation costs has to come into the picture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments forthcoming before we ask Mr. Gurnett to sum up?

MR. GURNETT: Very quickly, Mr. Chairman, there would be a lot of detail necessary to understand everything that's being talked about, but the main point has been touched on by Mr. Zip. That is that right now in eastern Canada there is a heavy dependence on imported American coal. At the same time, Alberta has significant coal resources that could be earning an income for the province. There's an environmental advantage as well, in that the Alberta coal would be far cleaner, and the problems with acid rain being experienced in a lot of the North American continent would benefit if Canadian industry were making much greater use of Alberta coal than the coal that's now being imported from Pennsylvania, for example.

So the recommendation is that there be a very definite effort to see if this can be pursued and a coal blending industry created in Canada. Certainly, the technical and financial aspects of it would be dealt with and addressed as those discussions went on. The recommendation in no way suggests that something would be proceeded with if it were impractical and unrealistic. It's just a recognition that Alberta would benefit from the possibility of having greatly increased markets for its very good coal, and this would start the process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation 32:

That the committee urge the government to move immediately to begin completion of a northern rail link to British Columbia using trust fund moneys as necessary. Improved market access and the linkage of northern Alberta by rail with the massive Tumbler Ridge coal development will be especially crucial for northern economic development.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Chairman, this is another project, such as the river cleanup, that has very significant job possibilities but would also make a long-term economic contribution to northern Alberta. Agriculture costs could be greatly reduced if there were a rail link that would allow tying into the British Columbia rail system as well. So it's a project that people in

northwestern Alberta, at least, are very interested in. Again, it's a project that probably has costs involved that are such that it would need special assistance in funding in the short term. I think its long-term benefits for the economy of northwestern Alberta would be significant.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Gurnett, has the Northern Alberta Development Council made a recommendation on this, or is it on their agenda the first week of next month at their conference in the north?

MR. GURNETT: I don't remember seeing it on the program, and I'm not sure about the Northern Development Council specifically in the past. I know that in the spring, when I asked about the entire project in budget estimates in the Legislature, Mr. Planche indicated that some studies exist about the feasibility of a project, but I don't know where they originated.

MR. GOGO: Chairman, inasmuch as it deals with northern Alberta, and Mr. Weiss chairs that committee, I as a committee member would be interested in the views of NADC before I discussed it any further.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I think the federal government would certainly like this motion. The area of that rail link is an appropriate place for federal involvement. They'd love to see some of our money go into it, and they'd withdraw what they were going to put in, if they ever were. I know it's a very good thing for the northern economy; we have no arguments with that. It's a good thing until we really examine it. I find it difficult to justify this rail expansion while rail abandonment across the province is an issue. We're talking about expanding over there while we're trying to deal with rail abandonment throughout the province. I think it should be left to the federal government. He should be lobbying them, and the thrust should come from them. It helps northern Alberta somewhat, but it certainly helps northern B.C. a lot more. So it's an interprovincial deal and falls within that area.

Before I could support such a thing, I'd like to know the environmental and long-term economic effects. We should have a study to

let us know what we're recommending. Again, it's one of those sorts of motherhood things. It's great to recommend it, but there are a lot of things to go in before you recommend something. Maybe you're not in touch with reality, with the mandate of your organization and the economic facts involved.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of concerns on this. I wonder what effect the announcement Mr. Planche made three months ago about containerization will have on this. Maybe the same thing can be accomplished with those new freight rates that were negotiated. Maybe it will help put additional pressure on CN, because at the time of the announcement, at least, I don't remember their being signing partners. I thought it was CP that had signed the agreement. I wonder if Mr. Gurnett has considered that.

Secondly, as I remember, the Tumbler Ridge thing was an extremely expensive railway track. There is a part of it that's so steep, through tunnels and that, that they had electric engines or something. When that's built just for carrying coal, I wonder how other stuff is going to move through those kinds of situations and if indeed — and I could be all wrong — the tunnels are big enough for ordinary box cars or hopper cars and if the grade is such a percentage slope that it can even take other stuff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional questions from committee members before we ask Mr. Gurnett to sum up?

MR. GURNETT: I will try to get some information regarding NADC's stand on it and get that to members as quickly as possible. The recommendation isn't indicating that we would link with Tumbler Ridge but that the building of the rail link to join the British Columbia railway system would, by virtue of being built, then link with Tumbler Ridge as well, because the line there also joins into the BCR. That's all that's involved with the Tumbler Ridge part of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation 33:

That the committee recommend that a trust fund investment be made in the construction of a safe and modern high-speed train system linking Edmonton and Calgary.

MR. GURNETT: I think members have heard Mr. Martin speak a number of times in support of an idea like this. It's simply here again as a project that could create employment possibilities in the province at this point in time and, at the same time, accomplish a job there's probably a need for in the years ahead.

MR. NELSON: First of all, Mr. Chairman, this is premature. If the hon. member and other members have been listening and reading, I think they will understand that this is not a new initiative, that the hon. minister, Mr. Planche, has been working on this project for some time, and that in fact considerable dollars have already been expended doing feasibility studies and what have you. I think the course has been set to the extent that examination of this has already been triggered. I would not necessarily support moneys being put out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund for it but certainly an examination with the minister, who has already been working on this quite diligently, maybe in a supportive role in his continuing that examination, and that sometime in the future, when the feasibility studies have been completed, wherein they might determine whether there is a possibility of having some kind of return on an investment made as against the very low return we now obtain on the highways, which is something in the order of 18 cents a mile over the life of the highway. We should not recommend this at this time but have the members and the Legislature work with the minister to encourage him to pursue the feasibility of this high-speed train.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, the link between Edmonton and Calgary in the transportation corridor is one of those subjects that keeps coming up, and it's a very necessary thing. We've just done away with one, the VIA Rail system that went down there, which was the first venture in that. We found there was no demand for it. Maybe it was a little unsafe. It got a lot of bad publicity, but it was still there. I think we have to do a lot more research into the use and the cost factor before we make recommendations involving the heritage trust fund in such a project. We've talked of \$200 million into research projects and those sorts of things. When you go into high-speed train development, you aren't talking about \$200 million; you're going into huge

amounts of money. I think it's a little premature to recommend heritage trust fund money be used in this area until we get all our research studies back, as Mr. Nelson spoke about, and know exactly what we're looking at. The one thing I always question with this high-speed link is that I don't know how you have high speed when every town from Wetaskiwin, Ponoka, Lacombe, Innisfail, and Olds will want it to stop there.

From a political area and from a financial thing, I think we should wait with this recommendation. It's premature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any additional questions or comments from committee members?

MR. GURNETT: In summing up, Mr. Chairman, I would just say that the recommendation doesn't put a particular date on it. The purpose of the recommendation is that by making it we would be recognizing the importance of the idea and indicating that its contribution to the economic base and to transportation in the province is significant enough that, as necessary, it would be supported by the trust fund. Certainly, no one is going to go out and start building the railway because we make the recommendation, but our support for it is a statement of the priority or importance we attach to the project.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation 34:

That the Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act recommend that the Public Affairs Bureau be encouraged to consider developing a series of informational films or videotapes on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, available to groups who wish to use them, complementary to the informational pamphlets available now at many locations in Alberta.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I think it speaks for itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to conclude the discussion?

MR. HYLAND: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation 35:

That the occupational health and safety heritage grant program expand its mandate to encourage funding to postsecondary institutions such as SAIT and NAIT or other trade institutions to teach occupational health and safety to students before they are in the work force rather than not have them taught at all.

MR. NELSON: Chairman, I guess the reason for me to identify this is basically that ... The program is running reasonably well, as I understand it. However, there are areas of improvement that may be encouraged, in particular for those people who are attending trade institutions and being taught an occupation or a trade that will put them out into the work force that may have some greater risk to it than another type of occupation.

This recommendation is not going to cost any money. The money and funding is already in place. As the minister indicated when he attended the committee, they have not spent the moneys that have been given to them and will not expend them over the time frame the program has been developed for. I think it is much better to offer some training or educational participation in the classroom at these trade institutions prior to the workers' getting into the mainstream so they are at least aware of the hazards that may face them out there and more aware that their safety and that of other workers is primary to the site they're working on.

I think we should encourage the use of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund moneys that are now being offered to the occupational health and safety heritage grant program, and we should expand that mandate and ask the minister to provide funding in this area. As I said, it does not cost any additional moneys; they're already programmed in that area. I encourage the support of the committee.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask Mr. Nelson a question. I assume this is not being done now. Mr. Nelson, I hear that those who sit in front of word processors and other things have experienced problems, and if that's not being looked after in terms of exposure to those things, would you see that coming in? I don't want to infer that you're only talking about brick and mortar or mechanics. I just wonder, because I certainly agree with your suggestion.

The other comment I'd make is that when you use the term "other trade institutions," I presume you're talking about the community college system, because to my knowledge that's where it goes on.

The final comment, Mr. Nelson, in the final sentence of your recommendation — this might be editing only — instead of "before they are in the work force rather than not have them taught at all," would you consider "before they enter the work force" period? I have some sensitivity there, I guess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional questions or comments from committee members before we ask Mr. Nelson to sum up?

MR. NELSON: Chairman, the comments made by Mr. Gogo are certainly well taken. The ideal here is certainly not necessarily ... If the other area he's outlined requires some teaching or some ability for the students to be aware of circumstances that may be dangerous to their health, certainly the recommendation can be expanded to deal with that, either here formally or when we recommend to the minister at a later time.

I've used the term "postsecondary institutions" and have only exemplified SAIT and NAIT. Others can certainly be considered, depending on where you really want to take it and where the concern is.

If he wants to edit the words that are there, I have no problem with that. But generally speaking, the intent is to have this taught in postsecondary educational areas so the individuals coming into the work force have at least had some background on safety and health.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have a wish to change or amend this, or should we go with it as the wording is?

MR. NELSON: Basically, Mr. Chairman, I have no difficulty with the wording. If Mr. Gogo has some suggested changes, I have no problem.

MR. GOGO: I make the suggestion, Mr. Chairman, in that the government now funds some \$885 million in the postsecondary system of this province, including SAIT, NAIT, and the community college system. I don't know what's meant by trade institutions. I assume that if it's going to be in those areas funded by

government, it should probably read: "such as SAIT and NAIT or community colleges." Again, I think it would be better to say "before they enter the work force" rather than have it read as it is. But I'm not uncomfortable.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to change the terminology "or other trade institutions" to "other community colleges that teach occupational health and safety," and remove "rather than not have them taught at all." That's no problem. The meaning and intent are still there, and it's solid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Might I offer a suggestion, Mr. Nelson? If all members would look at the phraseology, you could just modify it by crossing out some words. Might I make this suggestion? Where you have in the first line: "that the occupational health and safety heritage grant program expand its mandate to encourage funding to postsecondary institutions," cross out "such as SAIT and NAIT or other trade institutions" and say, "to postsecondary institutions to teach occupational health and safety to students" period. It's redundant to say "before they're in the work force." If they're in school as students, obviously it's going to be before they're in the work force.

The recommendation would read:

That the occupational health and safety heritage grant program expand its mandate to encourage funding to postsecondary institutions to teach occupational health and safety to students.

MR. GOGO: With respect, Mr. Chairman, the Lethbridge Community College alone has 5,700 students, and many of them are in the work force. I think I recognize Mr. Nelson's intent. He wants to reduce the pain, suffering, and cost of those who are ignorant of hazards. I'm sure that's his objective. When we amend this, I think we want to make sure it's in concert with his intent. I don't know whether he agreed with you.

Mr. Chairman, if I could offer a suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

MR. GOGO: I would agree to work with Mr. Nelson to reword it, if it could be brought back

at the end of the day, or if Mr. Nelson . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could do that and then bring it back to the committee. So you'll rework that, Mr. Nelson.

Recommendation 36:

That funding be provided to develop the Powderface Trail and campsites in Kananaskis Country as required or on an as-needed basis.

MR. NELSON: Chairman, there's a lot of discussion about the development of another park, which is certainly a very expensive although commendable undertaking, as we've seen in Kananaskis. However, whilst we have a park that we've expended considerable money on — we've put a tremendous infrastructure on the periphery of the park plus the infrastructure that's been developed to date within the park — there is one area, and that's the Powderface Trail.

Each and every one of us received a package from the minister and his party on the date of his attendance at the committee. The Powderface Trail is shown on the map, and those of us who went on the tour a year ago had the opportunity to travel up that trail in a bus that, considering the weather condition of the day, was not too bad. The Powderface Trail is somewhat important to the further development of the park insofar as developing further campsites. I'm told that at least two additional campsites can be developed within the park, but the Powderface Trail would have to be developed prior to that happening. Unless you have a four-wheel vehicle to get in and out, at certain times of the year, either through rain or snow, there is no opportunity at all to use that trail.

My recommendation is that we further develop Kananaskis. Considering the amount of money that has been placed in the development of that park to date, as I understand it, the amount of money requested would be minimal, if you can call \$10 million minimal. But at least it would enhance the park and complete a project that has had many hundreds of millions of dollars placed in it. It would also add additional campsites for Albertans and their friends to use in the future, rather than their being turned away, as they are presently, because the campsites are full, especially during the summer months.

I would encourage the committee. This is the second time I have put this forward. I did it last year, and it was not carried forward. However, I think it's time to carry this forward and also create a few jobs out there.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I support this motion. The finishing of that trail would connect two very important areas of Kananaskis Country: the Bragg Creek area and the main Kananaskis Country, where the golf course is located. Presently, you have to go back out onto Highway No. 1 and go around to get into either section, no matter whether you're in the Kananaskis golf course area or the Bragg Creek area. This would make a circle road and make the connection so that both areas could be utilized by people travelling, and a lot of people could make that circle as a holiday. It's a very necessary link that's missing in that area of development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments forthcoming from committee members? Mr. Nelson, any additional comments?

MR. NELSON: No, I think it's been said, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation 37:

That the committee recommend that consideration be given to the establishment of a social sciences research foundation with specific concerns for research into alcoholism, aging, pain control, and palliative care, and that the foundation be modelled on the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, as members may recall, last year we dealt with a similar recommendation, which included, at the suggestion of Mr. Musgreave, one-half of our population: women's issues. As I explained earlier, that area concerning women is now the matter of a special area of government under one of our ministers.

I think we should have reached a turning point, with health care costs in this province now approaching over 25 cents of every budgeted dollar. In my view we have to put some heavy emphasis on prevention to reduce

health care costs, particularly regarding inpatient treatment in hospitals. I view this recommendation as the beginning of something fairly strong in terms of research in preventative medicine. It would touch the lives of many people who, in my view, today suffer from many problems. Frankly, I don't believe we see pragmatic research into these areas.

The other comment I would make is that it is my observation that the medical research foundation, which is doing tremendous work in terms of what I believe is pure research, does not address this area of citizen needs of today. Therefore, I recommend that to the committee.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'd like to support this motion because I agree with Mr. Gogo that palliative care, the process of aging, and particularly pain control are very real health hazards to a great majority of our population. I don't believe we do nearly enough to investigate either the causes or the cures for these ailments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments from committee members? Mr. Gogo.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I think it's been explained.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation 38:

That the committee recommend a new scholarship be established in the Alberta Heritage Scholarship Fund to be known as the E. Peter Lougheed Scholarship for Excellence in Social Studies and, further, that \$5 million be added to the \$100 million fund established in September 1980, whereby the income generated be awarded to students attending Alberta universities.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very important area. As I said earlier, it seems that we have a tradition in naming things after the deceased, so I suppose there's a bit of sensitivity, but we all know the emphasis Mr. Lougheed has placed on the area of social studies. It's not only being reviewed but recommendations are being made to the Assembly by both the minister and a special committee established in this area of education. I think it would be a meaningful way of encouraging students in Alberta to pursue the

social studies area. It's purposely intended to read "Alberta universities" so that they would in fact attend the three or three and a half Alberta universities.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like your guidance with the last half of the last sentence, "whereby the income generated be awarded to students attending Alberta universities." Is it implicit that that's only for those who win the scholarships? I had some trouble with that language.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My understanding of the wording of it is that it's very implicit that, in essence, what you would like to see is that \$5 million be added to the \$100 million indemnity fund and that that \$5 million be invested. The interest earned on that \$5 million would then be used to sponsor students who would win awards under the E. Peter Lougheed Scholarship for Excellence in Social Studies, and it would be simply for those students who had made application and had been accepted for an award.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments forthcoming from committee members? Anything more to add, Mr. Gogo?

MR. GOGO: No, that's fine. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation 39:

That the integrity and value of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund be maintained by retaining the investment earnings in the fund,

and we have an addition of words here, but the fund be capped and all future resource revenue be used for general revenue funding.

This was as a result of a notice that was given to me prior to the initiation of today's meeting. That notice was given by Mr. Speaker. I understand, Mr. Gurnett, that you were involved in that discussion with Mr. Speaker.

MR. GURNETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I had another recommendation that stood as number 20 that basically said the same thing as the last half of Mr. Speaker's recommendation, so recommendation 20 was dropped and that small change in wording in 39. May I address the recommendation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just one point of clarification. Would this motion be in the names of both Mr. Speaker and Mr. Gurnett?

MR. GURNETT: I guess. Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. GURNETT: I would like to speak in opposition to the recommendation. To my mind, the first part of recommendation 39 is addressed much more accurately and carefully by what we have as recommendation 12, whereby there's a very definite mechanism suggested to start putting the investment income back into the fund. If we agree with the concept of the first part of recommendation 39, I think we should use the mechanism that's suggested in recommendation 12 instead.

The reason I had recommendation 20 there is that I think this whole idea of capping the fund needs to have discussion here. We need to share ideas about it. However, since it was mentioned by somebody earlier in the afternoon that perhaps my intention was that no new resources would come into the fund and that what's in there would all be spent, I want to make it clear that I don't support the concept of capping. I think it's important that we look at it because of the public attention to the idea, but I personally think we should be continuing to put resource revenue into the fund, perhaps even increasing the percentage of resource revenue that's now going in, trying to recognize the finiteness of that resource revenue and the need to have a fund that has a long-term future and that will be around for a long time. As it looks like the number of projects we are interested in is probably going to make full use, year by year, of whatever happens with investment income going in, I think we need to consider continuing to put resource revenue in so the fund is growing and has resources to cope with situations we can't really imagine at this point but that may be part of Alberta's future.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like a little clarification. I thought Mr. Gurnett was joining Mr. Speaker in the motion, but he seemed to be speaking against the motion. Am I clear that you're against capping and that you feel the heritage trust fund should be maintained and grow?

MR. GURNETT: To clarify, Mr. Chairman, yes. As I said, I made recommendation 20 and supported joining it with recommendation 39 with Mr. Speaker because I think the concept should be talked about by us. If a majority of members here felt that a recommendation to cap the fund and not put further resource revenue into it was acceptable, then it would go forward. But I do not support that idea. I think we should continue to put resource revenue into the fund.

MR. R. MOORE: I find myself agreeing with Mr. Gurnett on this. We can't cap the fund. That fund must be maintained. We can't allow the devaluation of it. We're counting too much on the revenue that it generates. We have too many excellent programs out there that are funded through it. If we cap it, inflation alone will devalue it. Then we'll have to turn to taxation or cutting programs, and I'm opposed to either. We have the best programs in Canada for our citizens. They're well accepted. They're being funded very adequately out of the revenue this fund has generated, and we can't allow it to devalue in any way, shape, or form.

If we allow it to devalue, if we cap it, then we have to turn to the taxation area or go into deficit financing like the federal government, which has taxed future generations for these programs. I don't think we should do that. We can carry our debt with less than 1 percent service cost the way the present system is, and we should maintain it. If we cap that fund and start funding other things out of it, we will find that our debt servicing costs will go up or our taxes will go up or we will cut programs or a combination of all three. I don't think there is an Albertan anywhere who would support any one of those three alternatives.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, this recommendation strikes at the very concept of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, that a certain amount of the nonrenewable resources were to be set aside for future generations instead of our spending it as we got it. We owe future generations a certain amount of the fund. We started out with 30 percent. We've gone down to 15 percent. I would be surprised if in my lifetime we would ever get back to 30 percent. If we cap the fund, even for a set time, I would be very surprised. We would always find

reasons for not putting money back into it. The basic concept of the fund originally was not only that it help Alberta through the rainy day but it was basically set up as a savings fund for future generations. We're starting to gnaw away at that concept. There's no way at all that I could support this recommendation.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, it's interesting that the two members of our committee from the opposition have put this forward. I think it is a tactical way to try to have a legislative committee comment on an idea that was proposed by one of the leadership candidates. By having done that, hopefully they'll mousetrap the probable leader of the government. I think that's the intent of the motion. My hon. friend feigns innocence, but I think the smile on his face speaks louder than the words he has on paper.

Since this is really an attempt to try to embarrass the government, I think we ought to tread very carefully. We ought to consider what the intent of the motion is, who is proposing it, and why they're proposing it. I think it's very skillful on their part, and I have to compliment them. However, I hope my caucus colleagues would perhaps take the example of the hon. Member for Drayton Valley on an earlier sensitive motion and move to table this to some point in the future so that after careful, considered, and deliberate consideration in caucus, we can come to some sort of consensus as a party and as a government before our friends in opposition try to mousetrap us and force our hand.

I point out to my colleagues that some caution ought to be exercised here and, at the same time, compliment our opposition colleagues, who are being very skillful and somewhat devious in proposing motions they then disclaim because they don't believe in but want on the agenda to force us to take a position.

MRS. CRIPPS: Just a comment, Mr. Chairman. I basically agree with Mr. Thompson. I also agree with the comments made by the Premier, that any basic change in direction of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, since it was a mandate from the electorate that the government put forward, should go before the electorate for a change in direction of that mandate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further comments on this recommendation? Mr. Gurnett, would you like to sum up?

MR. GURNETT: In summing up, maybe I can repeat that I think it is important that a committee like this, that's charged with making recommendations related to the fund, should give serious consideration to the idea. In the process of dealing with these recommendations, I'm confident that we'll all do that, regardless of what our partisan affiliations might be, and that the decision we make will be a statement about what we think should be happening with the revenue going into the fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just an off-the-cuff statement. Do I detect that there's been a falling out on the arrangement arrived at between yourself and Mr. Cook earlier this afternoon? Scratch that from the record. Having said it, I just wanted to throw a moment of levity. No sensitivity, Rollie.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like the meeting to note, looking from the government benches toward the speaker, that the right half of the House is not in total unanimity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I certainly hope no member of the committee will be oversensitive to my most recent useless statement.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, if we pass all of these recommendations, we don't need to worry about the fund anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation 40:

That the scholarships awarded from the Alberta Heritage Scholarship Fund be awarded on an individual basis only and that groups and organizations not be eligible for scholarship awards.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, this is another recommendation that doesn't cost any money. Basically, my perception is that the Alberta Heritage Scholarship Fund was set up to aid deserving individuals to further their education. I have noticed that in the last year there's been a certain deviation from that by at least one selection committee, to where they have awarded Haultain scholarship awards to the Alberta Ballet Company and to the Robin

Hood -- I don't know whether it's a company or what it is. I personally believe scholarships should be awarded on an individual basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Additional comments?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask Mr. Thompson about the Jimmie Condon athletic award. I don't have my material here. Are there not either team sports or -- I'm trying to think of a sport that takes two people. Obviously, there are lots of them, we know. I'm wondering if you would preclude a sport that's presently receiving it that requires two people as a team to play.

MR. THOMPSON: Are you talking about ping pong?

MR. NELSON: How about synchronized swimming?

MR. GOGO: Synchronized swimming. The Member for Calgary McCall raised a good point. I spoke to this last time with regard to certain groups like the Robin Hood people. I recognize and support the intent of Mr. Thompson. Supporting Mr. Thompson's motion, of course, would preclude a group of four people on a team that qualifies under the athletic scholarship award. I wonder if that's been thought out.

MR. THOMPSON: If you want me to respond to that, Mr. Chairman, I would basically say that these awards should still be based on an individual effort, not on a team effort.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Additional comments?

Recommendation 41:

That the Alberta Opportunity Company be placed into the portfolio of Treasury Branches and that the Treasury Branches' mandate be changed to include the area of lender of last resort, which will be guaranteed by the provincial government.

MR. NELSON: I sense the enthusiasm of the committee.

MRS. CRIPPS: Sorry, Stan. I just don't believe in it.

MR. NELSON: Now that I've had my

lighthearted episode, Mr. Chairman . . .

I believe that in many situations the Alberta Opportunity Company is not offering the services to the fullest extent that it might. The discussion earlier by Mr. Musgreave regarding handouts, I guess you could call it, to people to start their own entrepreneurial activity was such that -- I certainly feel strongly that we shouldn't be handing out money to anybody on a give-away basis. We should have some opportunity of return of that. However, if certain types of security are available, the Alberta Opportunity Company has been set up as a lender of last resort to offer that opportunity for individuals or companies that wish to borrow money.

I also believe the Treasury Branches are there to assist Albertans, maybe not to the same extent or in the same context that the Alberta Opportunity Company was set up to do. However, it is my belief that we can save a lot of money if we change the mandate of the Treasury Branch to include that area of last resort, based on the fact that the Treasury Branch is supposedly a bank. They have been developed by the government of Alberta, and the opportunity for people to attend that particular organization is certainly a lot easier than attending the Opportunity Company, as they have branches throughout the province.

I'm not going to try to develop the scenario as I see it as far as the function of administrating the bank and the Opportunity Company as one unit, because I could be here for quite a while outlining a program of an administrative situation and also a management circumstance that I think can be achieved by amalgamating the two functions. We can still keep the whole thing decentralized, as is presently the case.

I sense again the encouragement of the committee. If I carry on for the length of time that I probably could in discussing this issue, we could be here for a long time, and it may be redundant. So maybe we'll just open it up to other members for discussion or take it to the vote. I am certain the members already have their minds made up, and we'll just take our best lick at it from there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be comments forthcoming from committee members?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I think this

recommendation has some merit. Mr. Nelson said he didn't want to get into the details, but would he look at a separate division of the Treasury Branches under the overall administration of the Treasury Branches? Basically, we have Treasury Branches in almost every town and city and village in Alberta. I think it would save a lot of money if you could work under one roof instead of two or three roofs. So I think it has some merit, but I'm not expert enough in the financial field to give you any direction in just how you'd set this up, Mr. Nelson.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, just briefly, if I may. Certainly, the administration would all come under one roof. The thought here is to have an organizational tree. The Treasury Branch would operate as one administrative function, but on that tree would be an organization that would take over the function of the Alberta Opportunity Company. If we found that a person was coming in as a borrower of last resort, a loans officer or the branch manager would pass the portfolio on to that wing of the bank with a recommendation, positive or negative, and that wing of the Treasury Branch which would authorize the loan of last resort could say yea or nay based on the facts as presented. The number of branches the Treasury Branch has throughout the province would certainly give rural people in particular considerably more access to the lending function that is presently there through the Alberta Opportunity Company.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Additional comments forthcoming? Mr. Nelson, would you like to sum up?

MR. NELSON: No, Mr. Chairman. I think that's sufficient.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've now arrived almost at the time when we agreed to adjourn. I would like to . . . Mr. Nelson?

MR. NELSON: I've got the wording on that motion regarding occupational health and safety. Mr. Gogo has kindly assisted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's recommendation 35, if you'd make this correction.

MR. NELSON: I'll read it fairly slowly:

That the occupational health and safety heritage grant program expand its mandate to encourage funding to postsecondary educational institutions to teach occupational health and safety to students.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's basically the same wording I recommended, with the addition of the word "educational".

MR. NELSON: Okay.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, it's hard to judge how long it will take, but there are — what? — a couple of recommendations left and one to read in from Mr. Cook.

MR. R. MOORE: There is one left.

MR. CHAIRMAN: More than one, and I was going to sum up so we'll know exactly what the status is.

MR. HYLAND: Okay. I just wondered, but I don't suppose it will take just a few minutes to get them all done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's completely at the wish of the committee.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it's possible to read additional recommendations into Hansard now. Then they're in Hansard when we come back another day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next recommendation would be recommendation 42 by Mr. Gurnett. A little earlier this afternoon Mr. Gogo circulated a piece of paper which I would number recommendation 43. If you'd like to read it into the record now, Mr. Gogo, please proceed.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

That the committee recommend the establishment of a water resources institute at the University of Lethbridge and that \$5 million be allocated from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund to provide an endowment fund for this purpose.

Speaking to it very quickly, this recommendation is made in view of the fact

that the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund and the government of Alberta are spending significant moneys in irrigation upgrading, expansion, and building off-stream water storage in southern Alberta.

dutiful attention to your responsibilities today, and I bid you adieu till next Tuesday or next Thursday.

[The committee adjourned at 5:05 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: When we reconvene next Thursday morning at 9 o'clock, this will be the order of business. We will go to recommendation 42, then recommendation 43, and then we will go back. My understanding is that we will be informed next Thursday that recommendation 1 will be withdrawn. We've already dealt with recommendations 2 and 3. It's my information that we will be told that recommendation 4 will be withdrawn. We've dealt with recommendations 5 and 6. We have to deal with the tabled recommendations 7, 8, and 9. We have looked at recommendation 10. Recommendation 11 has in essence been withdrawn. Recommendation 12 has been reviewed, as have recommendations 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18. I have an indication here that recommendation 19 is going to be withdrawn as a result of another recommendation we amalgamated it with. Today we started with recommendation 20.

So the order of business next Thursday will be to finish the committee review stage of these recommendations we've talked about. Following that, we will go to the third reading, if you wish, of each of these recommendations, beginning with recommendation 1. After the chairman, or it may very well be the committee member, reads the recommendation into the record for the last time, there will be an opportunity for brief questions. Then we'll immediately have a vote on that one and go on to the next one. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYLAND: Now that we've changed so many of them, maybe by the time we start our irrigation tour Miss Conroy can have a list.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hansard will be available by Monday, I think. Miss Conroy will be asked to put together a document that has the wording of all 43 recommendations in order, and then we'll just have to deal with them one at a time.

Anything else in terms of business or clarification? I thank you very much for your

