

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Thursday, October 26, 1978 2:30 p.m.**

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure this afternoon that I introduce to you and to members of the Assembly the Premier's 4-H award winner for 1978. Andy Hart was selected earlier this year from 129 4-H persons from across Alberta and was presented with an award by the MLA for Innisfail at that time.

This afternoon, together with his parents, he had an opportunity to be congratulated by our Premier and spent some time visiting in my office as well. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask Andy Hart and his parents to rise in your gallery and be recognized by the Assembly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 74****The Partition and Sale Act**

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being Bill 74, The Partition and Sale Act.

Mr. Speaker, as you will very well know, much of the law with respect to partition and sale in this jurisdiction is to be found in three old English statutes: 31 Henry VIII, 32 Henry VIII, and 31 and 32 Victoria. I say that because if the bill I am now introducing is passed by this Assembly, it will have the effect of making those three old English statutes no longer effective in this jurisdiction.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is the government's response to a recent report from the Institute of Law Research and Reform on the partition and sale matter. There are some special provisions in this bill which confirm the government's intention with respect to The Planning Act and partition orders, as evidenced by amendments to The Planning Act in this Assembly in the spring of 1976.

[Leave granted; Bill 74 read a first time]

Bill 77**The Hospital Visitors Committee
Amendment Act, 1978**

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 77, The Hospital Visitors Committee Amendment Act, 1978. The purpose of this bill is to change the name of this committee from the Alberta Hospital Visitors Committee to the Alberta Health Facilities Review Committee, and to clarify that this committee will accept and investigate complaints from nursing

home patients in Alberta regarding the care or operation of the nursing homes.

[Leave granted; Bill 77 read a first time]

Bill 263**An Act to Amend The Election Act**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. Clark, I would like to introduce Bill 263, An Act to Amend The Election Act. This bill places a limit of \$1 per voter on the amount that can be spent by a party and the individual candidate of that party during an election campaign.

[Leave granted; Bill 263 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file three copies of the agenda of the first ministers' conference to be held in Ottawa October 30 to November 1, 1978, as agreed upon between the federal government and the provinces.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 35, I'd like to table in the Legislature the first annual report of the Public Service Employee Relations Board.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I have the very real pleasure today to introduce 44 grade 9 students from the St. Augustine high school in the Calgary Egmont constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers Herbert Morrison and Dennis Mooney, and by their bus driver Don Robertson. I'd ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 60 grade 9 students from the Ellerslie junior high. They are accompanied by their teachers George Rice and Linda Smith, and by their driver Ken Schiewe. They're seated in the public gallery. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****First Ministers' Conference**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my first question to the Minister of Federal and Inter-governmental Affairs. It's with regard to the agenda presented to the Assembly earlier. Could the minister indicate whether Alberta has expressed satisfaction with that agenda, or does Alberta at this point in time see that other items should be added?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, we're satisfied with the agenda at the moment, on the basis that it would permit discussion of all the various elements we think

important within the eight or 10 headings of the agenda.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wonder if the minister could comment on the agenda with regard to the topic of distribution of powers. The Prime Minister has indicated through the media and on television that he is not prepared at this point in time to give more powers to the provinces. His position seems very fixed. How does the minister foresee the discussion with regard to that matter under those terms?

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member asking the minister to anticipate that discussion and to prophesy in this House what it's going to be?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to reword the question, does the minister see enough flexibility and openness within the framework of the agenda for Alberta to present its point of view on that particular item?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes, we see enough flexibility to enable Albertans to present the point of view particularly as found in the paper *Harmony in Diversity*. We would hope that that openness and flexibility are manifested on the other side of the table as well.

Taxation System

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my second question to the Provincial Treasurer. It's with regard to proposed tax cuts in Canada. I wonder if the minister could indicate at this point in time that the province of Alberta has pledged itself to co-operate with the Canadian government with regard to tax cuts specifically to enhance and boost the Alberta economy, and the Canadian economy as well.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, Alberta's general position has been that there ought to be restraint on the part of governments in Canada with respect to expenditures. We have also expressed the view that tax cuts will provide a needed stimulus to the economy.

Of course Alberta would not be opposed to actions by the federal government to restrain its expenditures or to have tax cuts, providing they are applicable across the whole nation. Our objection has been actions by the federal government that have had a greater impact, an adverse impact, in Alberta than they have had throughout the nation. Any objections hon. members may have heard me make to the federal action in those areas have been related to that form of discrimination.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. The indication I have from your answer is that Alberta is willing to co-operate as long as it's equitable across Canada, and I can agree with that point of view. But can we as Albertans, in co-operation with any kind of federal tax program, foresee any types of cuts in the Alberta portion of the income tax?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman does have a fascinating way of phrasing his questions. He knows that governments, either provincial or federal,

for very obvious and time-honored reasons, do not comment prior to budget night on specifics of tax cuts.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Certainly I know the minister does a lot of planning. At this point in time is the minister considering any, for consideration of Albertans?

MR. LEITCH: One has to admire his tenacity.

AN HON. MEMBER: If not his sagacity.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, as I have said on a number of occasions, the taxation system in the province is always under review. It's a continuing process.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the minister. I am sure we will be waiting with bated breath for the proposed tax cuts before the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the Provincial Treasurer indicate if the government of the province has been doing any studies on the new economic theory in the United States that reduction of personal and corporate taxes will, in essence, increase the funds that governments receive in taxes because of the volume that's generated?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I've always regarded with some scepticism the theories that one can reduce taxes and thereby increase taxes as a result of increased business activity. I'm aware of those theories but, as I say, I look on them with some scepticism.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the question was: is the minister or his department doing any studying? I was not worried about his scepticism. I was wondering if Treasury is doing any economic, in-depth studies on this new economic theory.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, there might be a difference of opinion on what are and what aren't in-depth studies. Of course the department is always monitoring any theories or suggestions about taxation levels on the part of government. But as to any specific in-depth study on the proposal the hon. member refers to, we do not have one under way at the moment.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, for clarification. Could the Provincial Treasurer advise the House if Alberta currently enjoys the lowest provincial income tax of any jurisdiction in Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member's ministerial announcement has been duly noted.

Film Industry

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism. It involves the possible film industry in

Alberta. My first question is: what progress is being made in the film industry in Alberta?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, in 1975, I believe, something like \$3.5 million was generated in direct revenue from productions made in Alberta. In '76 there were about six major feature films. Of those, *Why Shoot the Teacher?* and *Wolf Boy* were indigenous Alberta productions, and the amount of money was something of the order of \$4.7 million. Last year there were four major feature productions in Alberta. One of those was *Marie Anne*, which was an indigenous Alberta production. The estimated value that year was about \$4.1 million in direct revenue. In addition to that, with all commercial and other types of films being produced in Alberta over a year, the estimated revenue is approximately \$25 million per year.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Are we getting reasonably close to the time when we could have a major film industry in Alberta?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will recall that we undertook a study last year, which I believe was tabled in the House in May. Since that time we have heard from an organization in Calgary that plans to develop a studio of some magnitude, initially spending something of the order of \$100 million. It's called Tri-Media Studios. It's to be located outside the city of Calgary, and it is to take advantage of the unique opportunity in the area. The temperature of the Calgary area happens to be perfect for developing film and maintaining cameras, supplies, and so on. That is now under way, and I suspect that within the next few weeks or days an announcement will be made by that firm.

MR. TAYLOR: That's wonderful news indeed, Mr. Speaker. My supplementary question would be: what is the Alberta government involvement, if any, in this major studio?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that we have tried very hard to be instrumental in developing this kind of facility in Alberta, as has the Canadian government in its own inimitable way. We have not supported this venture in any financial sense. We have given it what support we can from our department and provided information we have at hand.

I think the question really is: are we involved financially in the operation of this organization? At this time there has been no application for funding to the Opportunity Company or otherwise.

Lamb Processing Industry

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate the status of the Innisfail lamb plant? Have there been any offers on the plant as yet, or is anyone actively engaged in purchasing it?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the plant is being operated under the ownership of the Agricultural Development Corporation. The operation is going well. At the present time two different parties are in the midst

of negotiations with officials of my department regarding the possibility of purchasing the plant.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate whether the plant is operating at a profit at this time?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the plant is not operating at a profit, although the situation is considerably improved from what it was when we undertook to purchase the operation and operate it. In a short time I will have the auditor's report with respect to the operation of the lamb plant by the Agricultural Development Corporation over the period ended March 31, 1978, I believe. I'd be prepared to provide that to the hon. member.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister indicate if products from other animals are being processed at the plant, or just sheep?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge just lambs and sheep are presently being processed at the plant. But there are plans for some diversification of the operations. I hoped we might be in a position to dispose of the assets to someone in the private sector before that was undertaken. But during the course of this winter, under the ownership of the Agricultural Development Corporation, some custom work on block beef or things of that nature may be carried out.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Are the sheep that are being processed here entirely from Alberta, or are they being brought in from neighboring jurisdictions?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, we bring lambs to the plant from British Columbia and Saskatchewan, and from time to time from as far away as Manitoba, in addition to purchasing all the Alberta lamb we possibly can. On occasions during the course of the last 18 months at least, we have purchased lamb in the U.S. and brought it to the Innisfail plant for sale to customers they've developed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. I'm sure the previous Minister of Agriculture did a great in-depth study on the number of lambs available and the plant capacity. My question is: does the minister have the information available as to the increased number of sheep in Alberta we would require to make the plant operate at even close to full capacity?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, there are close to enough lambs in the province now to allow that plant to operate at full capacity, considering as well those brought in from neighboring provinces where it's economical to do so. But you have to recognize there are other buyers in the market place, and the plant cannot be expected to purchase 100 per cent of the lambs that may be offered for sale in Alberta. I do know that, had the decision not been taken to develop and build that plant, the people who are involved in the sheep and lamb industry in this province would not have had nearly the marketing opportunity they've had over the last three years.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. That was a fine political speech for the minister's white elephant. Is the minister in a position to indicate the studies or discussions that went on between the private packing plants in the province as to the sheep volume that could be handled in those plants without building a new plant?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I guess the hon. member is not knowledgeable about the situation the lamb producers and sheep farmers in this province found themselves in before the building of that plant. Competition with respect to the purchase of those lambs was simply not a factor that allowed them to get a top market price and expand their herds. That's the whole basis for our getting involved in what was indeed a pretty high-risk business, that being one part of the total effort we were trying to make to bring the sheep industry in this province to a position we think it should be in.

There are other things involving programs in the Department of Agriculture: the ewe lamb retention program, freight programs to assist them in moving the product to the plant, and so on. The plant development and building was one part of that. But as I said, it's been successful. As a matter of fact, we do have increased numbers of lambs coming onto the market in this province. I think it's a result of the efforts to assure that they have a place to market their lambs.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I'm not defensive at all about the fact that we've done something that's of value to a group of people who have been trying for many years to help themselves. Now they've got an opportunity they didn't have previously.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a final short supplementary to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Legislature, or does he have the information available as to the amount of money that's been put into the plant — the loss operation? [interjection] I'm just asking if he's in a position to have that information. Don't get so touchy, Horner, on one of your white elephants.

Is the minister in a position to indicate, or does he know how much public funding has been expended on the plant in Innisfail?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I don't have those figures off the top of my head. Once again, all I can say to the hon. member is that in my opinion the cost/benefit ratio to sheep farmers in this province is a plus for us.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will one of the conditions in the sale agreement be that they will continue to slaughter lambs at the Innisfail plant?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I made that commitment to the sheep producers of this province when I spoke to their co-operative in Innisfail some months ago, before we assumed the operation of the plant. I've made it in this Legislature on one or two occasions. But members must recognize that there has to be some limit on that, if indeed we did sell the plant. On any sale we might make, it's my intention to try to tie the operation of the plant to a continuing of lamb

slaughter for some period of time. How long that will be depends on who might purchase the plant and what kinds of negotiations we can conclude with them.

Hydrogen Sulphide Emissions

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment, and it deals with the high level of hydrogen sulphide in the air in the Redwater area. Can the minister indicate if the studies done by his department indicate that in fact there have been excess percentages of hydrogen sulphide in the Redwater area?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question today, but I'll take it as notice and report to the member.

Electrical Power Generation

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, my question arises out of the agreement between the provinces of Manitoba and Alberta to undertake a feasibility study into the possibilities of swapping natural gas for hydro-electricity. I would like the Minister of Utilities and Telephones to inform, if he can, how that study has progressed and if it is complete. If it is not complete, when might it be?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, the study itself has to do with the possibility of the flow of electric energy among the four western provinces. At least at present, the study has no component in it with respect to the exchange of natural gas, although that matter has been discussed. As hon. members will all know, we welcome additional markets for gas in Canada as elsewhere. The study, presently under way, is strictly on the interprovincial relationship from British Columbia across to Manitoba. We're paying a share of the cost, and we contemplate that in early 1979 we should have the results of that examination.

MR. STROMBERG: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. If these studies show it is feasible to bring in Manitoba hydro at a cheaper rate than perhaps what is produced here in the city of Edmonton, would this have an effect on the decision by the ERCB in regard to the Genesee plant?

DR. WARRACK: No, Mr. Speaker, I think not. I think the proportions and the timing involved would be such that it would not have a major impact on the timing of Genesee, or Sheerness for that matter.

MR. STROMBERG: One last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate how much hydro might be expected from Manitoba? What do they have for surplus or what could they supply us with?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, the study would need to identify that. In addition, there's some possibility that plans on board by Manitoba Hydro might or might not go forward depending on the outcome of the study and therefore affecting the possible amount of electricity that could be moved between provinces from

Manitoba Hydro. In any case, that's a matter of identification by the study that's being undertaken.

First Ministers' Conference
(continued)

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Inasmuch as the forthcoming conference on the constitution will be probably be as important as the Victoria Conference, I would like to ask the minister if he will undertake to make the arrangements to obtain a complete set of videotapes of the conference, and have a set for the Legislature Library of this Assembly for historical perspective and knowledge?

MR. HYNDMAN: I'll look into the matter, Mr. Speaker. I don't know whether it should be in black and white or color, but I'll give it both considerations.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Supplementary to the minister. Is the intent that the conference be totally televised across Canada? Will all the sessions be open? I notice on November 1 they mention "open session" but there is no indication whether other items are open or closed.

MR. HYNDMAN: My understanding, Mr. Speaker — and indeed the request of this government, which was agreed to — was that all the sessions be open. Therefore the opportunity is there for all of them to be televised if the major networks wish to televise them. At this time I don't know their plans with respect to nation-wide broadcasting. The agenda item does refer to one session in camera; that is the working lunch of the first ministers on the Thursday. But it is my understanding all other sessions are open, and such arrangements as are made by the media would therefore be available to them.

Oil Sands Environmental Research

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment, and it involves the environmental studies on tar sands. Has the hon. minister been advised by the federal government that there will be a withdrawal of funds that were formerly allotted to this study?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the federal Minister of State for the Environment stating their intention to do that. We regard it as a proposal and have responded as such, because the program is covered by a 10-year federal/provincial agreement, with a review at the end of the first five years; also a clause that stipulates one year's clear notice to the other party no sooner than the end of the fourth year if one of the parties wants to withdraw. Against the background of that agreement, we've had to treat as a proposal the federal minister's letter of notice of intent to withdraw next April, because it certainly abrogates the contract in at least two important ways.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Has the government received any declaration from the Canadian government that it will not break the

agreement, or at least live up to the provisions of that agreement?

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Speaker. It's rather difficult to correspond through the mail these days. My letter has gone in response to the federal minister along the lines that I mentioned, that we regard that as a proposal, and one that's unacceptable to us. I haven't heard back since that.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. What effect would the withdrawal of half the funds for these environmental studies have on the studies themselves?

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm disturbed about the proposal to withdraw for two reasons. The financial aspect is roughly \$2 million a year. It's a \$40 million study over 10 years, to be cost-shared equally. Alberta had agreed to act as the banker and then bill the federal government for its share at the end of each fiscal year.

But I think more disturbing than the financial aspect is the responsibility that's involved, in that the development of that energy source is deemed to be in the national interest. As my colleague the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources has said, it's not really right that Alberta should bear the whole share of social and environmental problems to get that resource developed in the national interest. So we're disturbed about that aspect as well.

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary to the hon. minister. Would the withdrawal of these funds have a serious effect on wasting the money that's already been spent on these studies?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, in a way that's a hypothetical question, because I now have the department drawing up proposals as to how Alberta may finish the study by itself in the event circumstances force us to. I don't think there's any way that we would want to abandon or terminate the study at this point; it's too important. And I think that in many cases what the hon. member has suggested would happen, that a lot of the work that's under way would have been in vain.

Automobile Exhaust Emissions

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of the Environment and deals with exhaust emissions from automobiles. My question stems from the recent study done in Edmonton where it was found that only 25 per cent of vehicles tested for environmental officials met environmental standards. In light of these statistics, can the minister indicate which areas of jurisdiction are the responsibility of the province, and which of the federal government, in the control of emissions from automobiles?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think the legislative control as to any manufactured device that might be applied to the vehicle would be a federal responsibility, for the obvious reason of transportation across borders. In fact, they've started to enter that field. The provincial responsibility, I think, rests with making our local citizens aware of what automobile emis-

sions are doing to the urban environment, and urging people to try to keep their motors tuned and to maintain good practices in that regard.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate if any more drastic measures are going to be taken, that there can or will be prosecutions if pollution goes over a certain level?

MR. RUSSELL: Well, I think the matter of prosecutions would be a very difficult one to handle, Mr. Speaker, and it's one we haven't really looked at seriously to date. Quite frankly, the level of awareness people generally have about what automobile emissions do to the environment, certainly in the two metropolitan centres in Alberta, is discouraging. The program which we ran last week in conjunction with Environment Canada went a little way, I think, toward indicating to people how easy it is to make improvements in that regard.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate what monitoring of pollution levels goes on in some of the major traffic routes in the major cities?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There are permanent and portable monitoring stations throughout each city, particularly in the heavy traffic areas. Some of you may have noticed the portable ones driving around the cities — the little blue and white Alberta Environment huts with the equipment in them. We get reports on it each year, and constant monitoring is being done.

DR. BUCK: A last short question. Can the minister indicate if there is any legislation or regulation in place that prevents the removal of pollution control devices from automobiles?

MR. SPEAKER: There's been a great deal of latitude in some of the questions and answers this afternoon, but I really don't think we should use the question period for the purpose of having ministers read out what there is in regulations, or finding what the law is for hon. members.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, then a supplementary question. Is the minister aware that there are any regulations that prevent the removal of pollution devices from automobiles?

MR. SPEAKER: That's really the same question in a slightly different guise.

DR. BUCK: Does he know or does he not know, Mr. Speaker? And will he tell the Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: Whether he knows or not is not relevant to the question period.

DR. BUCK: Tell us anyway.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I know.

DR. BUCK: If he knows, will he tell us?

Indian Reserves

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to either the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs or the Minister Without Portfolio responsible for Native Affairs. It has to do with the Enoch development west of Edmonton. Has either of the ministers any information from the federal authorities about what they are doing with that proposal in front of them now?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge there is no recent correspondence from the federal government. Some weeks ago, perhaps even some months ago, we devised and put forward to the federal government and to the various developers a series of options and alternatives, indicating that if one of them were chosen we hoped the developments, which we think are valuable, could move ahead. But to my knowledge there has been no reply in the last number of weeks. I will check and advise the House and the hon. member.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Supplementary to the minister. Would one of those proposals be the possibility of municipal status for the Enoch reserve?

MR. HYNDMAN: Not exactly, Mr. Speaker. There are significant legal complexities with respect to the place of the federal government in the reserve and the development on it, insofar as there are prior rights, and the Indian Act applies. Of the options put forward, though, we thought that general approach might be a possible solution to enable the development to go ahead, which we as a government would certainly like to see.

MR. KIDD: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, related to the same general question but in a slightly different context. Has the hon. minister had any correspondence or does he have any information related to the developments that have gone ahead, such as Redwood Meadows in the Sarcee Reserve?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I've had no recent correspondence on that matter.

Subdivision Regulations

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the minister had any response from municipalities or individuals with regard to Section 20 of the subdivision regulations, which restricts any country residential subdivisions within 5 miles of any town or city with a population of over 5,000?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, that particular section of the subdivision regulations is not new to the April 1 revision. We always have requests to the Provincial Planning Board, now the Alberta Planning Board, to waive that section. The regulations themselves allow for it, providing that a reasonable kind of development can take place close to the urban area. The reason for the section, as I'm sure the hon. member is well aware, is to prevent the continuing encroachment on the urban area so that the expansion of the urban

area in this very dynamic, growing province of ours into the rural area would be precluded.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary to the hon. minister, and a very short explanation is required first. Some cities, not many, object to trucking firms and that type of thing taking a whole lot of land inside the city areas. In cases like that, does the Provincial Planning Board look with favor on having such an industry outside the city within the 5-mile radius?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, that would generally be the focus of a regional plan, whereby the municipalities that would participate in the regional plan in terms of devising land-use criteria for within, without, or on the fringe of the community would have an opportunity to voice their priorities and concerns. In my estimation there would be an opportunity in most general plans for very large pieces of property to be set aside for just that kind of industrial activity — pipeline, trucking companies, et cetera. But it would be up to the local municipalities and would generally be the focus of a regional plan.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

148. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question:

- (1) How many abortions were performed outside of Alberta on women normally resident in Alberta in the year (a) 1975, (b) 1976, (c) 1977, and (d) to July 31, 1978?
- (2) What is the total amount of money paid for the abortions in question (1) by the Alberta health care insurance plan?
- (3) How many of the said abortions were performed in (a) United States, (b) in other parts of Canada, and (c) elsewhere?
- (4) Did the Alberta health care insurance plan pay for any abortions carried out in Alberta on women who were not residents of Alberta during the years mentioned in question (1)? If so, how much was paid for same, and how many such abortions occurred?

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

219. Moved by Dr. Buck:

Be it resolved that this Assembly urge the government to introduce measures to ensure co-ordination of the use and management of all renewable resources in Alberta.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in rising to start the debate on designated Motion No. 219, I would like to say that in a time of escalating development of non-renewable resources, I think it's very apropos that we, the members of this Legislature, look at some type of overall co-ordinated planning mechanism, or at least co-ordinated thought towards the development of non-renewable resources. I will be speaking on the motion rather briefly, but I hope it will stimulate some

thought, debate, and input.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the government members will not just tell the Legislature: we are doing that; don't worry, everything is under control. I feel the topic is very important and should concern all of us. So it's really a privilege to bring this matter to the attention of the Assembly. How we integrate the planning for the proper use and management of renewable resources is, I believe, a very important issue to the people of Alberta.

In preparing for this time this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, it occurred to me that very few, if any, members of this Assembly would disagree with the general principle of the resolution. Probably all of us would be in favor of that. Perhaps members of the government side would make the argument that this government's already using the principle of resource management planning. I'm sure we will hear a few platitudes. They would say this debate is really redundant. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that such an argument is not so.

Just for the purpose of the debate this afternoon, let's look at a number of rather prominent issues of resource management in Alberta in the past few years to see just how much co-ordination there has been in the management of renewable resources and the planning of the development of those resources. I commend the government for the decision it reached with respect to the proposed Dodds-Round Hill coal strip-mining project. The argument there was really the mining of plains coal versus the use of that land for agricultural purposes. As hon. members remember, this decision took place only a couple of years ago. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the government's decision on that issue did not become evident or focussed until after pressure was exerted by the people in that area to tell the government to just wait.

MR. JOHNSTON: That's participatory democracy.

DR. BUCK: The Minister of Municipal Affairs says, that's participatory democracy. But I also remember the Premier of this province saying that no power group will run this government or this province.

But as the former minister, the hon. Mr. Yurko, said, to delay the mining of the coal in that area was a wise decision. I believe it was a wise decision that prime agricultural land in the province should be used for the production of foods, cereal grains, and all related food matters.

Mr. Speaker, co-ordinated resource planning involving the landowners, the government, and the users of the resource, the corporation planning, the planning with the environmentalists would have expedited the decision-making process without an actual confrontation of people versus government — people with their own government. Then the government would not have to say, we backed down in the face of mounting pressure.

But let us have a look at the Red Deer dam issue. This is a demonstration of a decision that was exactly opposite to the Dodds-Round Hill decision. Nearly as much pressure was brought to bear upon the government to reverse its decision . . .

MR. TAYLOR: That's baloney. Read the record.

DR. BUCK: My hon. Tory friend from Drumheller can say, that's baloney . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Okay. Read the record and tell the truth.

DR. BUCK: The hon. member can make his speech. We'll be looking forward to it.

MR. TAYLOR: I will.

DR. BUCK: We'd like to see the Tory position on the Red Deer dam issue. I would like to say, for the hon. Member for Drumheller, that in all the information I could gather and look at . . . Possibly, Mr. Speaker, the discussion should have occurred in this Chamber, under the Public Affairs Committee. If there was anything to hide or worry about, that discussion could have taken place in this Chamber. As my hon. friend the Member for Drumheller well remembers, the discussion and the decision about the Bighorn Dam was made after public scrutiny in this very Chamber. Why the difference? [interjections]

MR. TAYLOR: It was made before and retained. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is entitled to be heard, and any hon. members who wish to take issue will also have their chance to be heard.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, there was a very basic difference. Some hon. members say the decision to build the dam was made before. Fine. The government, in its wisdom or lack of wisdom, with the information it had available said, we will build the Bighorn Dam. But the government did bow to environmentalists, concerned Albertans, to have a hearing in this Assembly. After that hearing the government still decided the decision it had chosen to take was the right one. But we will never know if the decision made in the Red Deer dam issue was the right one, because that information, both pros and cons — that debate did not occur. The public input did not occur in this Chamber. That is the major difference.

Mr. Speaker, I've heard some reference to the residents of the area surrounding the Red Deer dam as being extremists or fanatics. I suppose that's only an accurate description of some people who will be dispossessed of their home and livelihood. If that is going to happen to some people, I suppose they are going to become extreme. But surely a full-scale effort toward co-ordinated renewable resource management could have eliminated the hard feelings and almost irreparable damage to the people in that area.

The government's general activity in respect to implementation of restricted development areas, greenbelts, et cetera, without the regard for public input that this government likes to talk so much about, are further examples of a lack of co-ordination in the planning process. Basically what I'm arguing, Mr. Speaker, is that the planning process is not sufficiently integrated, that the decisions made by governments and by large corporations are made without this framework of an integrated study of all the problems involved.

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff seems

to be failing to understand what I'm trying to say. Basically, Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to say that we do not seem to be starting at ground level and saying, let's look at the entire picture. What we seem to be doing in resource development is saying, this is an industry that's going to go into the area, let's see how we can make that industry less polluting, less damaging environmentally. We don't seem to have an overall co-ordinating look at the entire picture. That is what I am trying to say to the House and to my hon. friend across the way, the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Mr. Speaker, I've had the opportunity to read an article, that I think is very, very timely to the discussion on this subject. It is by E. William Anderson, a range management specialist and resource planner for the soil conservation service in Oregon, and a consultant in resource planning for the province of British Columbia. I suppose government members will say that because he happens to work for a true conservative government in British Columbia rather than a quasi-conservative government in Alberta, this will bias my thinking. But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Anderson initiates his discussion with a relevant disclosure: range and wildlife management, soil science and other resource disciplines are unquestionably more advanced today than ever before. Despite this advance, much of it introverted, there's considerable public dissatisfaction with the conduct of certain resource programs. People who feel their interests are being short-changed are forcing major program alignments. This leadership is asking that the whole environment, including the society of man, be taken into account in pursuit of resource programs.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Anderson points out that much resource planning is being carried out in isolation. That is the point I am trying to make to the hon. member. Resource planning is being carried out in the isolation of just its context. Foresters are being criticized by those . . .

MR. ASHTON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Member for Clover Bar keeps referring to the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff as not being able to understand what he is trying to say. I'd like to point out that none of the members can understand what he is trying to say; he shouldn't single out one member.

MR. TAYLOR: He doesn't understand himself.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I can certainly understand why the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell couldn't understand. I realized he would have a problem. But I know my learned friend from Medicine Hat-Redcliff is starting to understand the problem. When you have a built-in bias that you think everything in Alberta is being done so greatly without — you shouldn't question it. You know, don't question us, we have all the answers. Mr. Speaker, that's not why we're here as representatives of our people. We're not just here to say that the government has all the answers. Nobody is that smart, not even my hon. friend the Member for Edmonton Ottewell. Nobody's that smart. I'm sure our concern should be with what happens to people, to the land, to the water, and to the air, when we go into developing massive projects in this province.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the example I'm going to make, foresters are being criticized by those who insist that forests have values beyond the production of trees. We're not just getting timber. These critics do not necessarily object to cutting trees; they object to the methods used.

This and other examples of similar criticism seems to emphasize the real need for resource disciplines to work together with resource users. There's absolutely nothing to be gained, and a great deal to be lost, by acting unilaterally. Now I know, I'm looking forward to government members telling us, everything is being looked after; we have the Department of the Environment and other departments. But are these departments fully co-ordinating? That is the question. Examples of unilateral action and its effects on people include highway departments building roads at the least possible cost, often disrupting neighborhoods, landscapes, and farmland, and resulting in enormous social disadvantages. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to relate an example of that very point, of what happens when we, with our experts, decide to go kitty-corner across farmers' land because we have taken our computers and our experts, our pens in hand, and decided that to go from point A to B, at the square of the hypotenuse rather than around, we're going to save X number of dollars over X number of years. But what have we done when we have used the process of expropriation to go kitty-corner across miles of farmland?

My hon. friend the Member for Sedgewick-Coronation knows what that does to a farm when you're trying to farm all these little triangles. We know what happens when a power company goes kitty-corner across arable land because it's going to save X dollars and X miles of high transmission line. It's quite a game trying to farm around some of these triangles and corners, all in the name of economies. We don't seem to worry too much about the disadvantages and the effect on people in the area.

Or how about engineering agencies which construct dams to provide hydro-power, irrigation, or flood control that often cause drastic and adverse changes in major waterfowl habitat and fish migrations? At the very same time, fish and wildlife agencies are working to enhance fish and wildlife production. So here, on the one hand, we dam a river and put the fish ladders in — we now put them in before we find we've lost millions of dollars in fisheries; fortunately we are finding that out — but at the same time, we spend millions of dollars on fish hatcheries and pheasant production. So, Mr. Speaker, we just have to have some way of tying all this together. Individually we can't do a great deal to stop bureaucratic segregation, but it helps to recognize that this is a problem and that there are ways to overcome it.

Planning on a co-ordinated level can best be defined as a process through which decision-makers gather facts and consider alternatives to lead up to action, including studies, evaluation, and responsible selection of existing alternatives concerning future courses of action. Those involved in the planning process — and that really includes most of us — should be aware that there are both rational and irrational reasons for and against change. All sides of the issue must be considered. I know we are all human and experts in our field; it's very difficult to have more than tunnel vision if you are an engineer involved just in your given field.

Mr. Speaker, all sides of the issue have to be considered. It's noted that with objectivity in dealing with the renewable resource planning issue, facts provide the best answer to some of these irrational objections. These facts must be provided by professional and non-professional planners and must have the support of the wide majority of the public if they are to be acceptable. We talk — my hon. friend across the way talks about participatory democracy and involvement. But many times the people in the province are suspect of us as politicians, because in many cases they seem to say to us, it's just tokenism. The Red Deer dam issue was, I think, an indication of that tokenism.

Mr. Speaker, one interesting and thought-provoking section of Mr. Anderson's article deals with land-use planning. This same expert says that such planning requires a good deal of attention to public input. One must admit that there was considerable public participation in the Land Use Forum in Alberta. I know many of the hon. members of this Assembly took part in that discussion. However, if one assumes that the Land Use Forum report was one document used in developing our new Planning Act, one must ask just how much attention was paid to the public participation and public recommendations when the planners worked out that planning legislation.

Planning resources must entail a program which recognizes planning with people, as opposed to planning for people. There is a very, very major difference. It's only reasonable to assume such planning will involve citizen participation. Total citizen involvement is often impracticable and impossible; naturally we can't have everybody involved. Citizen involvement often consists of government or an agency conducting a sales pitch; naturally if you're trying to develop something, you're going to tell the involved groups that that's the way to go. That's a natural, normal bias. I can cite several examples of this type of involvement in Alberta: it's the quality of citizen involvement more than the quantity. That's fine. In most cases individuals involved in resource management should be those directly affected by the alterations in life style which may be the result of such resource development.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot discount the fact that risks are entailed in public involvement in renewable resource management decisions. Certainly there are some extremists, and I would say some people are trying to gain publicity or have a narrow axe to grind. We're not exactly sure if the Berger commission really served the purpose it was meant to serve. On those hearings, I'm sure many people were there with genuine, legitimate concerns. Other people had an axe to grind. Fine. But at least there was the opportunity to participate.

Mr. Speaker, up till now I've spoken almost entirely about renewable resource management planning. Now I'd like to talk a little about co-ordinated resource management planning. I make no apologies for the reference I used to Mr. Anderson. In the article I looked at the principle, the objectives of co-ordinated resource management, are basically very simple. These objectives really zero in on one compatible use of renewable resources to bring about improvement of the resources, and at the same time protect and enhance environmental qualities. This plan involves all the ownerships and interests in a given region,

dovetailing all these into a program which avoids unacceptable conflicts. What it really does is bring into play the legitimate roles of government, industry, development agencies, environmentalists, local citizen owners, and occupants.

Mr. Speaker, let's just pause for a moment to look at the hearings that will be reconvening in the Cold Lake area in early December. I am sure the Minister of the Environment can indicate to us what studies have gone on in that area as it relates to the situation right now, or a year ago. I believe the experts have a term for it, "base-line study". A base-line study — we see the situation as it is in that area right now: the people, the different ethnic groups, the farming community, the fish and wildlife, the entire area as it is now, because we have to look at an area as it is now to see what we are going to do to that area after we drop a massive industry into it.

I would like to know from the hon. minister and the government what funds are available for the people making interventions: citizens groups, fish and game groups, native groups. Is it going to be a story of the little man with no funding, no expertise backing him up, versus professional people, government people, and resource development people with millions, and hundreds of people as back-up? Mr. Speaker, I believe we must all ask ourselves these questions before a final decision is made on the development of that project.

I'm sure some hon. members are going to say that I'm against resource development. That is not so. I am in favor of resource development, but we have to know all the answers before we go ahead with these resource developments. I believe we've probably made some mistakes in Fort McMurray. I'm sure the people who live in that area would be the first to tell us some mistakes were made in the infrastructure, the social impact, the social problems involved when you dump a massive project such as that into an area. So if we've learned anything from Fort McMurray, let's make sure we don't make the same mistakes in Cold Lake. That's basically what I'm trying to say to members of the Assembly. If we've learned something, let's make sure we don't make mistakes in the new project.

Mr. Speaker, another area of concern in the hearings to be held in Cold Lake is that there isn't really any agency left any longer to really act on behalf of the environmentalist and the conservationist. Because when this government in its wisdom got rid of the Environment Conservation Authority, it really didn't leave anybody to try to balance the scales. It took away that balance, the genuine concern, the genuine sounding board for the environmentalists, the concerned little guy, and the conservationist. We the people of Alberta lost a very important balance in the question of resource development. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that in years down the road all members of good conscience will say this government made a drastic error when it got rid of the Environment Conservation Authority as originally established, because that authority had the independence, the expertise, and the ability to call people in to try to balance the scales.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the hearings that will go on in the Cold Lake area, we will have to look at the entire picture and co-ordinate the management of our resources. Having been in government, I know we

have many agencies in government. But I think the most difficult task is trying to co-ordinate these agencies so we can have a multi-usage of areas where we are going to develop resources.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say to the hon. Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife: how extensive has the study been? What input has been received from the people in the minister's area as it relates to what will happen in a very highly productive game area — a lake that could be very highly productive as far as fish go. What input has the minister had from his own people, when really we have very few people in the department working for the taxpayers, be they game wardens or environmentalists.

I know the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife can have his pat answer and say, well, the opposition is complaining about the increase in the civil service. You know, that's starting to become the pat answer now. We can't hire any more people. You opposition people are making so much noise about the increase in the civil service. I say, give 500 of their Tory appointees jobs as fish and game officers and put them to work and make them earn a dollar. But, Mr. Speaker, that is the type of problem. Those are some of the small problems, the social impact. Many people feel the plant going into Cold Lake is a fait accompli. Maybe it is; maybe it isn't. We'll be looking forward to the hearings as they progress.

Mr. Speaker, this integration, this co-ordination, is not just an easy academic exercise. It's a challenge, especially to the government, that we can have all these social agencies, management, corporations, environmentalists, and all people involved in the decision-making process.

I was a little bit stunned by the statement of the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources that this will not be another Berger inquiry in Cold Lake.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have to remind the hon. member that he has exceeded his time.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I will finish in 30 seconds, with your permission.

MR. SPEAKER: It's not my permission; it's the permission of the House.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: Thank you, hon. members and Mr. Speaker.

What we're saying is that it should not be that wide-ranging. I think that is an error on the part of the government. I think the hearings should be as wide-ranging as we can possibly have them, so that we can have all the cards laid on the table, all the information before us. Then we can co-ordinate the land usage, the socio-economic impact in that area, and the economic impact and the dislocation of farmers, of people. When we have all this information, we the members of the Legislature, and the government in its wisdom, can make the decision in view of the public.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who moved this motion made reference during the course of his remarks to the fact that I appeared to be

puzzled, or did not appear to understand what he was saying. In commencing my remarks, I wish to assure him that he is indeed correct, for a number of reasons.

First of all, I'm puzzled that this motion would be designated by the official opposition for debate today, and puzzled indeed that it appears under the authorship of the Member for Clover Bar. I rather thought that this type of motion much more appropriately came forward from the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. [interjections] There is a good deal of co-operation — I know there has to be — between the official opposition and the socialist party, but I didn't think the co-operation extended quite so far as it appears to.

Mr. Speaker, I think the motion bears repeating for all of us to consider what it really says:

Be it resolved that this Assembly urge the government to introduce measures to ensure co-ordination of the use and management of all renewable resources in Alberta.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if that isn't the most socialistic, authoritarian proposal advanced in this Assembly by a so-called free-enterpriser, my name isn't Jim Horsman.

DR. BUCK: What did you say your name was?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, as I told one of the ladies the other day, my name is Jim Horsman, and I have no intention of changing it to Jim Horsperson to accommodate some of the people in the feminist movement.

MR. HYNDMAN: I know your problem. [laughter]

MR. HORSMAN: That's right. The hon. Government House Leader, the hon. Mr. Lou Hyndperson. Well, we digress, do we not?

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of countries in the world, I think, that have adopted the program proposed to us today by the hon. Member for Clover Bar. I can think of two, Russia and China, that come to mind just like that. Indeed, under the communist regime China has attempted a number of five-year plans that would do exactly what the hon. Member for Clover Bar is advocating in this Assembly today. Therefore I must speak against the motion as it is worded in the Order Paper.

Integrate planning for co-ordinated resource development: don't those words ring in your ears? Integrate, plan, control, big civil service . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Big Brother.

MR. HORSMAN: Big Brother, Chairman Walter. [interjections] Well, I can assure the hon. member that I do not share his enthusiasm for all these big things he proposes.

I was puzzled as well, Mr. Speaker, to have this hon. member who sits opposite and on many occasions urges fewer civil servants, less government expenditure, less control — what happened to him? He quoted extensively from a writer, Mr. Speaker. May I suggest to him that he's much better when he does his own thing, because he usually has some common sense. But today in this debate he has urged upon us . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: He needs a new speech writer.

MR. HORSMAN: A new speech writer. Well, maybe. He's adopted a new philosophy in recent days, to put a motion like that on the Order Paper.

I didn't know what he was going to say, Mr. Speaker, so I wondered if he was referring — when he talked about renewable resources, I assumed he was talking about agricultural products, perhaps the greatest renewable resource the people of this province have. I wondered if in "control and integrated planning for co-ordinated resource development" he would include such things as a marketing board for the cattle industry. Surely that would fit within this proposal, wouldn't it? By this government introducing a measure, a cattle marketing board, for example, "to ensure co-ordination" — and it would do that — we would be able to co-ordinate John Smith's cattle production in southern Alberta with Henry Jones' cattle production in central Alberta, and so on. That would co-ordinate the use and management of that very valuable resource. Did the hon. member suggest that in his motion? Is that what he has in mind? I wonder. I can assure him that he would meet with a considerable argument on that subject by his colleague from Little Bow and probably the member sitting beside him today, from Bow Valley.

You know, that's exactly the type of thing socialist governments bring about. That's exactly the type of thing the hon. member supposedly opposes as a "true" conservative. It seems to me that what he really did was chose the opportunity to rehash old debates that have taken [place] in this Legislature: the debate on the Red Deer dam, the debate on Dodds-Round Hill. There was abundant opportunity to debate those matters. And he chose to bring up RDAs and so on. Then I'm most puzzled that he then went on to discuss public participation in the planning process for the development of a non-renewable resource at Cold Lake. I must say that he lost me there as well.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure he did his best to give the point of view of the Social Credit Party. If I can summarize it, it is simply this: more control, more planning, more co-ordination, more civil service, more bureaucracy, more, more, more. Well, I think it's time that the people of Alberta understood that this is their proposal and their program. Within a few months, I understand, the people of Alberta will have the opportunity of judging whether they want that proposal or program. I think the answer will be clear and unequivocal: they will not. A further example of the intellectual bankruptcy of the Social Credit Party — the "socialist credit party", it seems to me. That term was used earlier in this Assembly, and certainly on this particular occasion I think it's wise to bring it forward again. Mr. Speaker, I think we can reject this call for further interference in the lives and activities of the people of Alberta, who are concerned with their own lives and the way they are developing them.

Mr. Speaker, as he spoke I wondered whether his first name was Tim or Walter. [interjections] He said I was puzzled as he spoke; I agree. He said I didn't understand. Well I understood what he was saying well enough. But I'm puzzled to think that he is really the same Walter Buck, the Member for Clover Bar,

who we know and love as a true conservative. I wonder indeed.

DR. BUCK: There's quite a few in this House.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I know there are others who wish to join in the debate. [interjections] No doubt they will have additional words of advice for the direction the hon. member appears to be taking on his path to socialism and state control.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Drayton Valley, followed by his neighbor the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

MR. ZANDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hoped you would recognize the difference.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be a little more kind to the hon. Member for Clover Bar than was the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff. When we're dealing with the environment, and in particular with dams, the destruction that is caused . . . The hon. member also said that when the Bighorn Dam was contemplated, there was consultation, debate, and what have you, in this Legislature. Had the hon. member — and I know he means well — been there 10 years previous, I wonder if we would not have the total destruction that exists today on the Brazeau Dam. One doesn't need to know about conservation or the environment. It is a devastating construction of a dam that occurred through the Social Credit regime in 1959 and thereafter. Not only did the people of this province give to the utility company a long-term, almost interest-free loan to cause this total destruction of 30 miles of waterway that's polluted with logs and trees, and will be so for the next 100 years . . .

DR. BUCK: That's exactly what we're talking about.

MR. ZANDER: I know the hon. member was not in this House. While he was speaking, I was thinking: had he been here . . . It has to be unheard of for a government to cause such devastation to proceed. Since the construction of that dam, the people of this province have paid out millions of dollars for the continual removal of debris in that reservoir and in the canal. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the Solicitor General's work force has been in that area for years trying to remove the eyesore that exists.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke to a tourist from south of the border who goes there every year and has been doing that for the past four or five years. He said, how could such desolation happen? Such beautiful countryside completely destroyed. Not only the destruction of the countryside, but the tens of millions of board feet of lumber still there. You are not safe to go boating. It's a beautiful spot to those who have never seen it, but I'd advise all hon. members to inform anybody who goes there to take two boats. I suppose you could say the hulls should be made of steel at least, because you can hit those submerged dead-heads which are floating in the water.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we as a government heed what the hon. member said. I believe that we use this Legislature to debate in what manner we're going to destroy the environment in search of energy,

in whatever form it may be. Just last year in my constituency the announcement of the West Pembina oil find was made. It stretches over a large area. But I have said it, and I'm saying again — and I know restrictions are placed in the paths of those who want to go out in search of energy — that that destruction cannot continue in the manner being done now. I know some of these areas are sensitive and are restricted by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Should we destroy the beauty of our countryside to create a surplus in search of oil, gas, and coal? I'm thinking primarily of the Genesee project — a farming community that has been there for over 60 years.

That is the reason I asked the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources whether the Energy Resources Conservation Board has already come to the end of its deliberation on the project. I know that if we want to have energy, we will have to give and bend. But I hope, in the interest of the people there, Mr. Speaker, that we will recognize it is a farming area, and that if we have to go in, that we do what we have to do so that the people will be adequately compensated for the damages. My hope is the reclamation will be such as is occurring now at Wabamun. I'm very pleased with it. If this can be done, and we can come back some 20 to 30 years from now when the reclamation is over, this farmland can become good agricultural land if it's properly handled.

It may be that the opposition is always crying that we have too many civil servants. But, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to do what we have to do as a government, surely we can't do it without bodies. They must be there, and we must recognize that fact.

Some of the industries in search of oil, gas, and coal have done a wonderful job. They have done a magnificent job in their reclamation, and I think we should give them a pat on the back for it. But I think we must hold the line somewhere. If not, we could end up in the manner that the Brazeau Dam ended up.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to make a few comments on the motion by the Member for Clover Bar. About halfway through the member's remarks he said that probably the members of the government would make the statement that he was opposed to resource development of the province. Well I'm going to say that, because within his remarks the inference was there.

Look at the various things he talked about that have happened in Alberta in the last 10 years. If the member had his way, we would have no resource development here. We look at the Dodds-Round Hill decision, the Red Deer dam decision he brought up, and the Brazeau Dam brought up by the Member for Drayton Valley. These are all developments that have taken place to enhance Alberta; some of them have gone and some haven't.

I think the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff set forth the perspective and the thought of our government on the motion put forth by the Member for Clover Bar. The Member for Clover Bar wants more programs, but to initiate these programs you'd have to have more civil servants to co-ordinate them and put them in place. This is exactly what we're trying to get away from. Members of the opposition and other people are saying we don't need more civil servants,

and I agree with that. We don't have to have any more programs come forth, such as he proposed today.

The Member for Drayton Valley indicated we should use the Legislature for all our environmental debates. I don't agree with him on that, because you have a Legislature right now of 74 members and in 1979 or whenever the election is held, it will be 78, taking away the Speaker's seat. You'd have 79 different points of view. So I think we have to have our various co-ordinated groups in the province to make our environmental thoughts known and let them work.

When we're talking about renewable resources, we can look at the situation west of Edmonton, such as the power plant development proposed for the Keepphills area. If other groups in the province would set up, as did the people in the Keepphills area — which is called COKE, Committee on Keepphills Environment. This group of men and women from the Keepphills area has worked with various government departments, Calgary Power, and other interested groups to co-ordinate what they want to take place in the area. If other areas of the province, such as Cold Lake, Genesee, maybe Sheerness, would work in that type of unison with other groups, you would not have the outcry as we've seen with the Dodds-Round Hill and Red Deer dam issues.

Being that this is Agriculture Week, I was going to stress my remarks around the renewable resource of agriculture. Before I get into that, I would just like to share with members of this Assembly and the Member for Clover Bar — and it's evident that his speech writer and other research people for whom we contribute thousands of dollars into their coffers to do research for them didn't do a very good job, because we have three departments right now that have a co-ordinated service. Number one, the Department of the Environment:

This department, aside from its program management, has at least two agencies which involve coordination and of which Alberta Agriculture has representation. They are the Natural Resources Coordinating Committee and the Conservation and Utilization Committee. In addition the Land Conservation and Reclamation Act establishes coordination vehicles for the reclamation of disturbed land which may have been agricultural in nature prior to its use in industrial development.

Another department that has co-ordination is Municipal Affairs. The Planning Act of 1977

... establishes the Alberta Planning Board and Regional Planning Commissions which are involved in co-ordination of renewable resource development on private lands.

Number three, Energy and Natural Resources:

The Public Lands Act provides the basis upon which Energy and Natural Resources plan and co-ordinate the development of crown lands. The Coal Conservation Act provides for input through the Preliminary Referral System for coordination of concerns with respect to renewable resources as they relate to surface mining in the plains area.

So we have lots of services in place right now to actually look after what the Member for Clover Bar is asking for. I don't think we need all the other types of

agencies he wants to put together to try to co-ordinate these things. He talks about the loss of autonomy by the ECA. I think that the new agency is now working just as well as the old one did. It's in place and working well.

This being Agriculture Week, we have in place many programs that are beneficial for the farmers in our area, and they are co-ordinated mainly through the Department of Agriculture. We have our policy of distribution of trees and shrubs, where farmers in the province may ask for trees and shrubs to be used as shelter belts and so on to enhance the farm operation. The one main project for agricultural land that has really taken on is water management for irrigation use. This is co-ordinated through Alberta Environment, and Agriculture. It makes funds available through our various irrigation committees in southern Alberta. There's a pamphlet here that I would urge members to obtain and read. I think it has a lot of useful information in it that could be taken back to the people of Alberta, especially in the north, to show what the provincial government is doing to enhance the agricultural industry in the southern part of the province, mainly through the capital division of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund.

Surface rights is a concern to many of the farmers in Alberta. We have put together The Surface Rights Act. It works quite well to allow the farm population of Alberta to determine what rights they have. In co-ordinating all this, we could use the Farmers' Advocate as an excellent co-ordinator between oil companies, power companies, and the Alberta farmer.

Mr. Speaker, I see we've come to the end of the time on this particular debate. I have some other remarks to make, so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The debate, of course, is automatically adjourned by the lapse of time.

head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS**
OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill 218
An Act to Amend The Jury Act

MR. TAYLOR: I have great pleasure in moving second reading of Bill No. 218, An Act to Amend The Jury Act. First I'd like to deal with what the bill will actually do. The present bill, which was passed prior to 1955 and was carried through in the *Revised Statutes of Alberta, 1970*, reads in 7(b) as follows:

No person is qualified to serve as a juror. . . who is affected with blindness . . .

That's the important part. Then it goes on:

... or deafness, or who is a lunatic, idiot or imbecile, or who possesses any other physical or mental infirmity incompatible with the discharge of the duties of a juror.

The first comment I'd like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that this bill should have been amended a long time ago, because it is very unfair to blind people. It's a relic of the antiquated thinking when blind persons were not considered capable of living a normal life or taking part in normal activities. The same sort of

attitude existed in regard to the retarded and the physically disabled a few years ago, and the present government can be proud of the record it has in endeavoring to change that thinking, in giving people who are born with impaired physical or mental facilities an opportunity to develop them to the greatest possible degree and to live a normal life.

I think the first part anyone notices in this particular section is that it lumps blind persons with, as the act says, lunatics, idiots, and imbeciles. I was speaking to a blind person, and he said he objected very strongly to the legislation as it reads today. He is an educated man. He's completely blind, but he's doing a capable job and holding responsibility. Here he is in an act that lumps him in with people who are idiots or imbeciles. I'm not making light of idiots, lunatics, or imbeciles. They are in a category where they can't assume responsibility, and deserve every bit of help we can give them. But to lump in the same sentence as these a person who is capable of going through university and winning a university degree, is grossly unfair. That's the first thing I'd like to have changed.

You might say, why don't we take out those who are deaf also, and I gave that some thought. But I thought that perhaps we should move one at a time and not try to do the whole thing at once. If the blind can be taken out of this particular section, the next thing would be to take out the deaf, who are in a similar but not the same category as those who are blind.

My next observation in regard to the amendment we are asking the House to support is that blind people desire to be fullfledged citizens of this country. No longer can blind people be satisfied with doing jobs that are in a very restricted category. The day is gone when capable blind persons are satisfied with employment of a menial nature. Many are entering professions, and the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, the CNIB, is doing a tremendous job in training blind people to take on responsible jobs. I'm utterly amazed at what some of these people are doing today.

In Alberta we have about 24,000 blind persons. Those who are qualified and want to serve as jurors and have the opportunity to serve on a jury should not be denied that opportunity. * It's wrong to categorically deny this right to a person simply because he is blind. Someone may say, well, is a blind person capable of doing the job, even if he wants to be a juror? I say he is.

Let me give you one or two illustrations. In the town of Strathmore there is a blind man by the name of Mr. Archie Klaiber. He sat on the town council in Strathmore for 15 years. Those were the days when they didn't have four-year terms. He went through a number of elections, and he led the poll in at least one of those elections. I spoke to the man who was mayor of the town at that time, and to his wife. The comments were that this man more than pulled his weight on that town council, that he had tremendous perception. The mayor's comment was that this man was his right-hand man. He was known to be astute and sharp, and one of the brightest people on that council. He has tremendous perception. Now if a man can do all the things required of a councillor and still retain the confidence of the people so they elect him and re-elect him and re-elect him, surely that would indicate that he could also serve well on a jury.

This same man was recently in the gallery, and I had the pleasure of introducing him and his wife to this House last spring. Those who spoke to him must have been aware of what he gained without sight from the debates that were going on in this House. The questions he asked as we had lunch were simply astounding. He got more out of those debates than many, many people who had eyesight, because he listened to every word. Nothing missed him.

Later he was in my office and I was describing the office to him. On my desk I have six or eight horses that were given to me by a Canadian of Chinese origin at Edson, when I had the pleasure of declaring his restaurant open. It was the Year of the Horse. I believe there are eight horses, all in different positions. Mr. Klaiber said to me, could I feel the horses? He said, I'm interested in what you're telling me about them. So he took each horse, and just by feeling the legs he told me what that horse was doing; whether it was lying down, getting up, or running. Tremendous perception.

That's only one man. He served on a council for 15 years, and probably the only reason he didn't continue is that he moved out of the town and went on a farm. I recently went to his home when I was going through Strathmore and, Mr. Speaker, do you know what he was doing? He was changing a carburetor, something I couldn't do with my eyes. He was changing the carburetor. He does everything that any other farmer does. A tremendous illustration of a what a blind person can do. He refused to let it get him down. He said, I want to play my part as a Canadian citizen in every way just as if I had my eyesight. How many more among these 24,000 blind people in the province are like that? So I say it's wrong to categorically deny to blind people this right, this act of citizenship, to serve on a jury.

Again, how do you define a blind person? Let's use the definition most governments use; that is, those who see at 20 feet or less what others see at 200 feet are recognized as blind. You don't have to be completely blind. Those people too are being categorically denied the right to serve on juries.

When it was established in 1918, the CNIB had two major objectives and functions. The first one was to rehabilitate the blind; the second was to find ways and means of preventing blindness. The rehabilitation of the blind has been tremendously advanced since 1918. The organization has had tremendous success. It has established schools where they can learn practically any trade. Many have gone through universities and have gotten degrees. We have doctors and lawyers who are blind. Strange as it might seem, we permit a blind lawyer to defend a person before the courts but say he can't have any part in deciding the fate of a person who appears before a jury. It's just inconsistent. It's a relic of the old times, and it needs to be changed.

Our blind people are making a tremendous contribution. Those who are qualified and who want to serve on a jury should not be denied the opportunity to do so. The CNIB is training blind persons for the most complex careers. They're doing a good job and winning the support of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to labor this bill. It simply says that if we take blind people out, they will have the same opportunity as others to appear and to be chosen or not chosen for a jury. I suggest that

*See p. 1594, right

blind people who are willing and capable should not be denied this right. Let's give our blind the opportunity to exercise full citizenship, including the right to serve on a jury.

I have great pleasure in moving second reading of this bill.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, I too would speak on Bill 218, An Act to Amend The Jury Act. I believe my support of the blind people in this province has been amply demonstrated by my bringing before this Legislature The Blind Persons' Guide Dogs Act. I think you've heard me speak on a number of occasions in their support. I would certainly like to see all the blind people in this province take their total place in society if possible and practical.

For the particular purpose the Member for Drumheller speaks of, that they serve on juries, it's just possible that blind persons have developed skills that are far superior in certain areas to those with sight. They might prove a real asset on a jury. However, from the totally practical side, there are many areas in a court trial where the blind person would experience a great deal of difficulty.

Much of the judicial process depends on credibility; that is, the credibility of the accused and of the witnesses. We used to have a saying that there were three sides to every case: the prosecution, the defence, and the truth. The objective of all courts is to arrive at the truth in any hearing. I think it's almost imperative that the persons giving the evidence and the persons on trial be viewed in an attempt to ascertain their credibility. However, as I said a moment ago, it's just possible that blind persons have certain abilities and skills that will permit them to attain this assessment without their sight.

However, there's another area to the court trial which is even more important; that is, the examination of exhibits. As the hon. Member for Drumheller pointed out a moment ago, there are many objects that blind persons are able to examine, identify, and describe much better than a person with sight. However, most of the exhibits you will find in a court trial are photographs and charts. Of course, they're unable to assess these.

In my own particular portion of law enforcement, for a number of years I was associated with identification; that is, the presentation of fingerprint evidence, where it was necessary to explain to juries how to arrive at an identification of a fingerprint impression. In fact, I thoroughly enjoyed jury trials. I really looked forward to them. I always sought the permission of the court to go down to the jury box and show the exhibits right to the jury. I would give them a short course on how to arrive at an identification, explain the basic types of fingerprint patterns, how to trace various patterns of the fingerprint. In a very, very short time, I would see that that jury had arrived at their own identification, not through my words but doing their own examination. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that once that jury had arrived at their own conclusion, it was very difficult for either counsel to shake them from their conclusion.

I would humbly submit that it would be very, very difficult, if not impossible, for a blind person to be able to assess this type of evidence. I believe it has been suggested that charts of this nature could be produced in braille. I don't know. I would have to see

this.

Of the 24,000 blind persons in the province, whom the hon. member speaks of, I realize a number are not totally blind. They are blind according to the definition of the CNIB. Many persons in this particular classification or category have sufficient eyesight to view articles at very, very close range and might be able to perform the task as described.

However, in summary and in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, although I have total sympathy with the lot of the blind persons and have attempted to promote their lot on more than one occasion, I don't feel it is entirely practical for a blind person to serve as a jury member.

MR. KIDD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate on this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Member for Banff, would all those in favor please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

[Motion lost]

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I was just rising to my feet to tell the House a few more stories about Archie Klaiber from Strathmore, who was mentioned as a great Albertan by the hon. Member for Drumheller. Archie Klaiber is a close friend of mine. He has been an extremely successful cattleman. The story I like is that he's the best judge of cattle and of cattle weight, although he is blind. He has won many bets that by feel alone he can guess the weight of cattle within 20 pounds. He really is an exceptional Albertan.

I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. minister, would all those in favor please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

[Motion carried]

Bill 223

An Act to Amend The Amusements Act

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in moving second reading of Bill 223, An Act to Amend The Amusements Act.

First of all, I would like to advise members of the Legislature exactly what this bill would do if passed. The first thing it would do would be to change the definition of "amusement". At the present time the definition in the act says:

"amusement" means a contest, dance, entertainment, exhibition, game, performance, program, or show;

The definition the new bill would give to "amusement" reads as follows:

"amusement" means a contest, dance, enter-

tainment, exhibition, game, performance, program, show or other display or device provided for the diversion of the public, including displays or devices produced electrically, electronically or mechanically or by any combination thereof;

The change in the definition is designed to bring into the meaning of "amusement" some of the death games we now see in some arcades and game rooms.

Next, the bill adds a number of sections that would do the following: the minister would have the authority to order any amusement referred to the board of censors. If the minister referred a game or amusement of some other type to the board of censors, the board would then study that and decide whether it would permit or prohibit the said amusement. During the time the board of censors was considering it, the game or amusement could not be carried on, displayed, or operated. The amusement must not be operated until the censor board gives a ruling on it. The board of censors could permit the operation, prohibit it, or permit it for adults only. If it did, the game would have to be played or operated in a room to which those underage would not have access. Then the bill says that if it is permitted by the board, the minister would issue a certificate stating that it is approved. The bill gives the Lieutenant-Governor authority to make regulations if same are required.

Now I'd like to say a few words in connection with the reason the bill was brought in. The Canada Safety Council magazine, on at least two occasions, carried stories outlining Death Race. This was also raised in this House in question period about April 15, 1977, at which time the hon. Attorney General made some comments about this type of game. Death Race is one in which a boy, girl, man, or woman is able, in one minute, to see how many pedestrians he can kill. The more he kills, the better player he is. The authority to censor games such as Death Race, which "entertains" by the simulated killing of human beings is something I believe we don't need in arcades or the places where our young people gather. There are also a number of variations of Death Race involving methods of killing or maiming as many simulated persons as possible within one minute.

Perhaps some hon. members will say, well, this all done in the spirit of fun; no young person is going to do that in real life. We find that perhaps the majority of young people would look upon this simply as a game with no carry-over into regular life. But let me bring to your attention a story that occurred in Chicago and which was outlined in the Canada Safety Council magazine. They had this type of game in one of their arcades. On August 11, 1977, the media of Chicago reported that a man used a .22 calibre gun to kill people in the arcade for kicks. One death resulted, plus some wounded. That arcade had been playing these death games, and the man decided he'd go for the real thing. You might say he was unbalanced, and I suppose he was partially unbalanced. But that is the danger. Who can tell what effect this type of thing is going to have on anyone's mind — balanced or unbalanced? Sometimes we hear that people do certain things. As a matter of fact, in the United States the defence of some people who carried out brutal killings has been that the boy, girl, man, or woman who did it had watched a television program where this same thing was done. He decided it could be done, without being caught by the police in

some cases. That defence was used by learned lawyers.

A government official had told the editor of *Safety Canada* that Death Race was no more dangerous than a shooting gallery. When someone raised the complaint about this arcade in Chicago the comment was, it's no more dangerous than a shooting gallery. Well, one person lost his life on that account and some were wounded.

I wish that any type of game, movie, or television could be carried out without having deteriorating or bad effects on the minds of human beings. But we have to be practical; it just isn't so. They do have a bad effect. With all the entertainment and all the types of games possible, we surely don't need a game that's going to suggest to young people that killing the maximum number of pedestrians in one minute makes him a hero.

When our young people get to the age where they apply for a driver's licence, we surely expect that person to be responsible and to drive in a responsible way. With that type of background, the thought will occur to young people: this is a game I played in the arcade; now I have a chance to play it in real life. Maybe it's only going to be one out of 1,000, 10,000, or 100,000. Even so, it's one too many, because the damage he may do to the life of another certainly cannot be calculated in dollars and cents.

There are other games along with Death Race; it's not just the one game. Games similar to television games can now be purchased and are becoming popular in some parts of this continent. A coin gains the player 60 seconds in which to drive an electronic car in such a manner as to collide or kill as many moving gremlins as possible. The gremlins represent pedestrians. Varying degrees of success gains for this player in this electronic game the titles of Skeleton Chaser, Bone Cracker, or Expert Driver; expert driver if he can kill the maximum number of these gremlins or simulated persons in a game.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest we don't need this type of entertainment. When there's a chance at all of it damaging the thinking of a young person, I'm all for getting rid of that particular game. The arcade people can make lots of money out of the other games. I went through two of the uptown arcades in this city even today, and I was happy to find that these have been taken out, are not being used, and they still have lots of patrons there.

This is a matter of concern in more than just Alberta. It's a concern to Canadians. At least two members in the House of Commons — Mr. Gordon Towers, the PC member for Red Deer, and Mr. Schellenberger, the PC member for Wetaskiwin — have dealt with this on the floor of the House of Commons. I was disappointed in the answer of the Hon. Jean Chretien, when he was asked to stop this type of thing from even coming into Canada from the United States or any other country. His comment was that he couldn't do anything about it unless it was banned in the other country. Since when are we taking our standard of morals from what goes on in certain parts of the United States? We're a distinct nation, and I felt terrible to find a cabinet minister suggesting that we can't ban anything in this country because the United States hadn't banned it. In my view that doesn't make sense at all. I was very happy to hear another cabinet minister in Ottawa, who is now no

longer in the cabinet — Mr. Macdonald, the finance minister before he left — say that he was prepared to look at stopping the importation of this type of game into this country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we look at our newspapers day in and day out, and we see people committing terrible crimes. We say things about the damage being done, about the destruction, the horror being committed, and so on. I suggest that we try to prevent the thought from ever getting into the minds of our young people who may not be as strong in mind as the majority of young people. If we stop the thought from ever getting there, we don't have to worry about it being germinated.

One other point I would like to mention, Mr. Speaker, is that there are a lot of wholesome things to be done, wholesome games, wholesome sports. Let's concentrate on those, and not do this type of thing that's suggesting that [you're] a hero if [you] can kill a number of people in one minute. Too many times that is the indirect advertising and the indirect games and the indirect effect of games. Many times we talk about smoking or using drugs, yet in how many movies and television programs — sometimes even newspaper ads, but mostly on television and movies — do we see the hero; he became a great hero, he just did a wonderful thing. The first thing he does is drink a bottle of liquor, smoke a cigarette, or take some drug that's not supposed to do him any damage.

Well, this indirect type of thing does not do our country any good, and I suggest that we start by doing away with these death games that encourage people to kill pedestrians. The slaughter on our highways is bad enough, far too bad. We need to be encouraging people to drive with care, with respect for the other person, and not with the thought entering their mind that they become a hero, an expert driver, if they're able to kill a number of simulated human beings in a game.

This bill isn't going to correct everything I'm talking about, but it's a start. I hope the hon. members of this House will support the bill. If we don't, who knows the damage this very game, Death Race, might have on some boy or girl in this province or in this city. I urge hon. members to support the bill.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I shall begin by commending the hon. Member for Drumheller for raising this subject. Whatever the outcome of the bill before us, it's certainly performing a public service to draw attention to this particular problem. The method we decide for dealing with the problem is of less importance than the fact that the dangers have been so graphically described by the hon. member. As so often happens, he has raised what I consider to be a very important subject.

I also was concerned about the killer games in pinball arcades, and last March began to address myself to the problem. I was concerned because so many young people in the last two or three years spend many of their leisure hours in pinball arcades. On March 21, I wrote as follows: concern is being expressed by the public and police at games in amusement arcades which depict the killing of people by simulated weapons or by running them down with a car. So far as I know, we haven't yet developed the pornographic peep show which is prevalent in the United States.

That was referred to the Department of the Attorney General for an opinion on the best way to tackle the problem, and the legal opinion we got from the civil law section was that The Amusements Act route was perhaps not the best. Even at that time it was proposed that perhaps Section 29.21 could be amended in some way for the control of the machines. The conclusion was that it was sort of mixing apples and oranges; that that act was designed for a different type of amusement, in particular films, and that the best way was to go via The Municipal Government Act.

I'll just read a little extract from a very long legal opinion: furthermore, a reading of the entire act indicates that the various mischiefs it attempts to deal with do not include the particular problem of killer pinball machines. Under existing legislation the proper authority to deal with this problem appears to be the municipal level of government. Under Section 117 of The Municipal Government Act, municipalities are empowered to pass by-laws for the following general purposes:

- for the peace, order and good government of the municipality,
- for promoting the health, safety, morality and welfare thereof, and
- for governing the proceedings of the council, the conduct of its members and the calling of meetings.

The specific authority to prohibit amusements which are contrary to the public interest is conferred by Section 228(1) of the act:

The council may pass by-laws licensing and regulating all places of amusement, entertainment or athletic contests of every kind and description and may by by-law prohibit amusements, entertainment or athletic contests as considered necessary in the public interest and may provide for penalties for breaches of any by-law passed under this section.

And then he goes into some case law which demonstrates that the municipalities have this power.

My next step was to refer this to Mr. MacDonald, the chairman of the Edmonton board of police commissioners. I wrote to him in this fashion: I have been concerned about the trend towards simulated violence in pinball arcades, which are now frequented by youngsters in increasing numbers. Although the games at present in use in Alberta are not as alarming yet as those reportedly common in the United States, it would seem prudent for good government to take notice of the possible harm arising from lack of control. I have examined current law in regard to provincial jurisdiction, and it seems evident that this area is one which would be best regulated by municipal by-law. A legal opinion is attached. Would your commission please be so good as to consider the subject, and if your conclusions are that it would be wise, make suitable recommendations to your city council.

They did make this inquiry and considered the subject, and Chief Lunney wrote to the police commission, which resulted in their saying that as of the present time the particular type of machine does not constitute a problem in the city of Edmonton but that they will continue to keep an eye on it.

Chief Lunney says that he sent out a couple of detectives to survey the situation here. They visited

six pinball arcades at various locations in the city and were unable to find any of the aforementioned machines in evidence. In fact, on speaking with the operators of several of the arcades, they had no knowledge of such machines. He gave a list of the arcades he went to.

Further inquiries were carried out at three distributors of pinball machines within the city. The particular game was known to the management of these firms and is described as a driving game in which the player drives a vehicle at a sticklike figure, and if the figure is hit it disappears and is replaced by a cross. The game is called Death Race, and was found to be distasteful by both these companies and was not purchased for distribution.

One of the companies, however, found they had installed one of these machines in a smoke and joke shop in Edmonton at the end of 1977. However, they removed it in January 1978, and it was placed in the Psychology Department of the University of Alberta for testing. It's since been removed from there, and it's claimed that it is not known where it is now located. The management believed there was one other machine of this type somewhere in the province but didn't know who owned it or where it might be located. Anyway, the chief of police concluded by saying that from this report he had to recommend that it was not a problem in Edmonton and there was no need for regulation at the present time.

However, I think it's proper to draw this situation to the attention of the public and particularly of the other local councils in the province in case it emerges there, and to point out that they have complete power to regulate such things under The Municipal Government Act.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to add a few comments about Bill 223, An Act to Amend The Amusements Act, and I would also like to commend the hon. Member for Drumheller for bringing this very important matter before this Legislature.

I've had a considerable number of calls, on two bases, from constituents concerning these machines described by the hon. Member for Drumheller. First of all, they believe it has a very ill effect on children and, secondly, that it contributes to absenteeism from school, a matter which I brought before this Legislature about a year ago, Mr. Speaker. I see that the Calgary school board is also concerned about the same problem.

Speaking strictly to the bill. There was a very interesting study in 1968, called the President's report on obscenity and pornography. Incidentally, pornography also includes violence, and in my humble opinion violence is a much more harmful facet of the obscenity and pornography study than are obscene photographs, which I'm sure many members would enjoy.

The 1968 study indicated that no great harm accrued from the display of photographs of obscenity and violence. However, more recent studies give a much different picture. We've had a good number of cases within the last couple of years where direct violence is ascribed to exposure to violence. I don't think there is any question that the human animal is very prone to imitate or emulate what he sees in pictures, on television, and in movies.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you of a rather interesting experience we had while I was serving with the

Calgary force a number of years ago. There used to be a television program on Sunday nights. I think it was called California Highway Patrol. A man by the name of Broderick Crawford was the star in it. One of the scenes showed burglars concealing their burglar tools between the grille and the radiator of the car. Well, much later that night, after the 11 o'clock shift went on, two of our fellows stopped three well-known local criminals, searched the car for goods and tools, and immediately lifted the hood and searched in the area between the grille and the radiator. The criminals said, "What in the world made you look there?" They said, "Well we watched California Highway Patrol also".

MR. HORSMAN: Did they find anything?

MR. LITTLE: Yes they did. They found burglary tools, and we did secure a conviction in spite of the earnest efforts of their counsel. [interjections]

MR. HORSMAN: Justice was done.

MR. LITTLE: Justice was done.

As I stated a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, later studies would almost indicate that the report of the President's committee was entirely erroneous. A recent study stated that by the time a child reaches school age he has viewed 15,000 deaths on TV or these other forms of display. I don't think there's any doubt that they will be inclined to imitate many of these acts. The earlier studies indicated that the child possibly became immune to violence. I think the later studies indicate that the child becomes immune to the consequences of his act rather than to violence itself and, as I suggest, it has caused a great deal of grief and anguish, and actual violence and death.

I would like once again to compliment the Member for Drumheller. It would almost seem, Mr. Speaker, that there is a conspiracy between the member and me to look after the morals of this province. I deny that. But I do compliment him for bringing this important issue before the Legislature, and I hope it is given consideration.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in debate on Bill 223. I looked toward it with some misgivings, because I had felt very strongly about the position of the Member for Drumheller on Bill 218. Indeed I felt not only ready to support it, but indeed wanted to support it. Somehow or other the debate got terminated, and I wasn't given that opportunity.

However, Mr. Speaker, I feel a little different about Bill 223, and I'd like to explain why I don't feel I can support it. I'd like to bring to the members' attention, first of all, the motivation of the Member for Drumheller in sponsoring the bill. I, along with many members in the House, have great admiration for the Member for Drumheller. Indeed, I think his record is known throughout Alberta. Throughout Alberta his reputation is known for justice, fair play. Seeing, on the one hand, that the laws of the country have been ignored by the governments of our nation for many years, he's doing perhaps the next best thing; that is, attempting in some way to introduce prevention with regard to criminal violence in our society. Many of us are aware of the role of the Member for Drumheller

in assisting and training young people. Indeed, I believe he's had a strong influence in seeing that the parts of our society that tend to be going contrary to what our forefathers had intended — the extremely high rates of divorce in the province, the breakdown of the family unit as the basis of society, the tremendous increase in the number of single parents. Here I sense he's saying, look, for heaven's sake let's do something to try to assist our young people in staying away from the Solicitor General's Department, and not becoming involved in areas of conflict with the law.

The Member for Calgary McCall has pointed out very clearly and rightly the influence of the electronic media on the lives of our children. I'm sure it's well known that a youngster entering school today at [age] 6 has been exposed to more teaching by the television than that youngster is going to be exposed to in the next 12 years of formal schooling.

However, Mr. Speaker, I approach the bill with misgivings from this point of view: as a matter of principle, I've always opposed the role of government, whether by legislation or regulation, in trying to influence in an ever-increasing way the mode of conduct and the way we live in our society. I feel very strongly that other agencies within our society, such as the school, the church, and the parents, have that responsibility. I feel very strongly that there shouldn't be censorship at all. I happen to believe that censorship does things to the inquiring mind by shutting out information that should perhaps be available to citizens, who I believe have the capacity to make up their own minds. So it's with misgivings that I choose not to support the bill.

The proposed amendment to the act implies to me yet another level of bureaucracy and licensing which, whether or not you agree with the principle of censorship, is an additional consideration. I find — and, alongside the Member for Drumheller and others, I'm certainly a novice at this business — that surely there comes a time when governments should stop trying to govern citizens who should be governing themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the intention of the Member for Drumheller is not as simplistic as some of us would like to imagine, that here is a way we could stop a current problem or indeed put a lid on it. I think the message runs much deeper; that is, he's waving a flag to us that we be more aware of the trends toward criminal violence in our society.

I've read some very interesting information recently, and I'd simply like to mention it in the context of Bill 223. It seems that we in the western world have more incarcerated people per capita than anywhere else. Within our correctional institutions in Alberta alone we have a very high number of young people who have been there many, many times. A study recently completed by a doctor at the U of A indicates that, I think, 85 or 88 per cent of all youngsters 16 to 18 in conflict with the law indeed have been analysed — if that's a good word — as having learning disabilities. If these were identified at an early age, when entering school, many could be looked at with a view to changing attitudes which result in incidents which end up with the Solicitor General or indeed juvenile courts.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying I commend the member for his intentions. I think I under-

stand his motivation, that with the laws of this land that have been on the statute books for many years were not, for whatever reason, enforced; where warning after warning by the member in many ways that we have to do things within our society to make people not only obey the law but indeed to change the life style so they can comply with the law ... I'm sure I recognize another way the member is trying to bring to our attention: for heaven's sake wake up, so we can make this a better society.

However, Mr. Speaker, because it bothers me by touching on an area I believe citizens should be doing for themselves, in principle I have to speak against the bill.

Thank you very much.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to endeavor this afternoon to break a silence I have imposed upon myself due to certain problems I have acquired in the last two weeks, but which I was advised by three young ladies this afternoon, have added a laryngitis. I understand it's a desirable quality. We'll see.

Mr. Speaker, in rising this afternoon to speak to the proposition contained in Bill 223 — namely, the extension of certain types of amusements to the purview of the board of censors — I think it's important to note several things.

First of all I'd like to commend the hon. Member for Lethbridge West. In his contribution to the debate this afternoon I think he put the problem very squarely before us. On the one hand we have a potential in our society — in fact it exists in certain areas, but I gather from what the Solicitor General has said that we don't have it yet in Alberta to any degree. Nevertheless there are certain types of games, certain types of amusements which portray a form of violence toward human beings, violence I cannot condone and that I would hope most persons could not condone.

On the other hand the hon. Member for Lethbridge West has clearly expressed his point of view that the individual in certain areas has the responsibility to make his own decisions. That is a proposition I also subscribe to. That is why I say he has, by his contribution, clearly put to us the dilemma: how much control versus how much individual decision-making. The problem is even more acute when we know that the problem which has been raised today by the hon. Member for Drumheller is mainly attractive to those who are very youthful, if not juvenile, and therefore who are at a very impressionable age.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to express a concern very directly. In doing some checking on what seems to be happening in terms of the changes in the direction of crime, I found that in the first eight months of 1978, in the city of Edmonton alone there were 11 assaults daily. That doesn't mean very much unless you're one of those persons hit over the head or otherwise assaulted. In that time frame as well, there were either 22 or 24 attempted murders, which I suppose one can say is an aggravated form of the first type of crime. That number of attempted murders is exactly twice the number for the same time period the preceding year. So I think it's important to keep in perspective that we have a pretty rough world out there at certain times of the day and in certain areas, and they're not that far from all our homes when

we're living in the city of Edmonton.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, in view of that problem we already have in society, regardless of what we attribute the violence to, whether it is lack of self-discipline, lack of training in the home, lack of moral and religious development in the home and community, wherever we ascribe the difficulty and the failing in our society, we have a problem, and the problem is growing, not decreasing. It seems to me then that the hon. Member for Drumheller has done a good service to the Assembly. Whether we agree or not with his proposal to control is another question, but that he chooses to highlight the issue and brings it to our attention is, I think, important indeed.

I must at this point commend the Solicitor General. It's very comforting, reassuring, and helpful to members to know that he too had noted the potential problem and had checked to determine the data on the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I detect my speaking time is going to run out on me, and I am simply not going to be able to continue. Let me restate my personal position this way: I share the feeling of the hon. Member for Lethbridge West that the area we're dealing in ought to be the right of the individual to make a decision. In other words, each one of us ought to be mature enough, to have the ethical background, to have the moral fibre not to be influenced by these games, and to make sure our children, our dependants, are likewise not influenced by these games. However, I think that in view of what we know of society, we are being a little altruistic in that approach. So I suggest to hon. members that this proposition is worthy of support.

In view of the remarks by the Solicitor General that there may be better avenues to go, I would like time to hear further from him, his department, or the Attorney General, if it is the responsibility of the Attorney General, to indicate which other avenues might be more fruitful to us in the Assembly in terms of trying to deal with the potential problem. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Solicitor General has the matter under surveillance, if I may use that expression, and that the matter has been brought to our attention here today so that all members will be aware if there are any developments in their communities, I beg leave to adjourn the debate, and hope that when the debate is next undertaken we might hear from the Attorney General on proposals he might have which might be more suitable and offer a better approach to this matter than is contained in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, in begging leave to adjourn the debate, I would again like to commend the hon. Member for Drumheller for bringing it to our attention.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion to adjourn debate by the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place, would all those in favor please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

[Motion carried]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 5:30 p.m. and the Assembly adjourn till 8 o'clock.

[Motion carried]

[The House recessed at 5:18 p.m. and resumed at 8 p.m.]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS** (Second Reading)

Bill 63

The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1978 (No. 2)

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, as I said on first reading, this bill amends several acts of this Assembly. One is The Highway Traffic Act with respect to completing some of the amendments we should have been able to do last spring, but were unable to do, with respect to traffic provisions involving provincial parks and, particularly, the responsibility of the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. An amendment to The Municipal Government Act provides for the consolidation of by-laws by municipalities. There are consequential amendments to The Provincial Parks Act arising out of amendments to The Highway Traffic Act and the new Summary Convictions Act passed last spring.

There are further consequential amendments to The Summary Convictions Act, again arising out of matters dealt with last spring which unfortunately we were unable to deal with at that time, having to do with the civil recovery by municipalities of penalties and clarifying the default judgment provisions with respect to specified penalties. Finally, an amendment to The Trustee Act simply substitutes the Alberta Securities Commission for the Attorney General, which is a jurisdictional shift that should have been carried out some time ago when the Department of the Attorney General was responsible for the Alberta Securities Commission which, of course, is now the responsibility of my colleague to my left.

Therefore I move second reading of Bill 63, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion carried; Bill 63 read a second time]

Bill 64

The Provincial Court Act, 1978

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I really am quite proud to stand in this Assembly on this occasion and move second reading of Bill 64.

The jurisdiction of the provincial court, as we have generally known it, has been found in at least four statutes of this Assembly: The Provincial Court Act, The Juvenile Court Act, The Family Court Act, and The Small Claims Act. This bill is nothing more than the repeal of those acts and the introduction of a new Provincial Court Act accommodating the previous legislation.

I think it will in fact simplify the legislative process and put all the previous separate courts under one house, which I think we have always known as the provincial court of Alberta. We have spent some time looking at the small claims procedure in the provincial court and believe that we have simplified and streamlined it somewhat. This House will recall that we

have made considerable efforts in the last two or three years with respect to the administration of justice, primarily in the provincial courts. I believe this represents yet another initiative in an attempt to simplify and streamline our court system.

Henceforth the several courts will be known as the provincial court of Alberta. It will have several divisions, and at least for the moment they will be: the criminal division; the civil division, represented by small claims; and family and juvenile divisions. There is a provision in this act which allows the Lieutenant Governor in Council to provide for further divisions. For example, I would contemplate that a traffic division may be assigned in future.

I think it is fully consistent with the movements of this House in past years to vest in, for example, the district court or indeed the trial division of the Supreme Court total jurisdiction on all matters coming before that court. Henceforth we will be appointing judges of the provincial court, and it will be up to the individual judge and the chief judge of that court to determine in which particular division the individual judge will function.

It may not have great public appeal at the moment, but as I said earlier, I think it does represent a significant streamlining and consolidation of the administration of justice which, I'm sure, inevitably will touch the lives of many citizens in a positive way.

[Motion carried; Bill 64 read a second time]

**Bill 71
The Statute Law
Correction Act, 1978**

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, The Statute Law Correction Act, 1978, represents a very sensible and, I think, reasonable approach by both the government and the members of the opposition to correcting those errors, omissions, and oversights in a bill that are perhaps inevitable in human organizations like government, where we have found in reviewing our legislation that there are indeed incorrect references, errors, and omissions. I'm very pleased to say that it has been my practice in the past few years, and I'm sure it will continue, to circulate drafts of this act to members of the opposition in advance of entry into this Assembly, to indicate to them that what is proposed by the government is simply that: to correct errors and oversights, and not to deal with any significant policy before this Assembly.

I therefore propose to move second reading of Bill 71.

[Motion carried; Bill 71 read a second time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask for unanimous leave of the Assembly to proceed to committee study of bills 63 and 71, notwithstanding the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[On motion, the Assembly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole]

**head: GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Committee of the Whole)**

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of the Whole Assembly will now come to order.

**Bill 63
The Attorney General Statutes
Amendment Act, 1978 (No. 2)**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 63 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 71
The Statute Law
Correction Act, 1978**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 71 be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. MCCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the following bills and reports the same: bills 63 and 71.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

**head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS
(Committee of Supply)**

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will now come to order.

ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVINGS TRUST FUND
CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION
1979-80 ESTIMATES OF
PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

**Development and Improvement
of Alberta's Transportation Facilities**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you have any opening remarks?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, it's my intention to make a brief statement relative to two matters, first of all the question of the terminals at Grande Prairie and Lethbridge. The special committee will be aware that we made available to them the copies of the agreement between Transport Canada and the province of Alberta. Because of the way in which it developed, it's our view that it would be better if these two terminals in fact were not funded out of the heritage savings trust fund but out of general revenue. It would be the government's intention to do that, having regard to the fact that once we finalized our agreements with Ottawa, these two projects do provide a return on investment of a substantial amount after 1981, in the order of 8 per cent amortized over 25 years. Therefore to prevent any so-called leakage of the fund, it would be our intention to fund these from general revenue.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I can let the committee know that both terminals are coming along well. We expect they would both be operational in the spring of 1979, having regard that it may take some time in the spring to complete some of the ground-side facilities, particularly in Lethbridge where the old terminal has to be removed before we can put in the parking lot. In any case, that is a decision relative to those two terminals, having regard to the nature of the capital division and the fact that they are going to give a substantial return on the investment by the province.

I just might say a word relative to our intentions for this year. The following areas are intended to be dealt with. We don't feel we'll run into that particular problem because Grande Prairie and Lethbridge are rather unique in that they are federal airports and will be operated by the federal government. Any costs that will be allocated to us in those two airport terminals will be related to the question of subsidization of third-level carriers perhaps relative to the office space or counter space they might occupy, and ordinarily that would be funded out of the operational budget of my department.

The other four terminals are in good shape and, outside of Grande Cache, should be completed in the fiscal year we're talking about. In Grande Cache we have some weather problems, and we're still working on it at the moment. We expect, though, that the latest completion date for the terminal building in Grande Cache, which is funded out of the capital projects division, will be June 1979. The others will be completed later this fall: Edson in November, and Pincher Creek in the first week of November. Whitecourt is now completed.

The areas we contemplate developing in '79-80 are Red Deer . . . I might just say that Red Deer was scheduled for this year, but because of the delays in finalizing the agreement with the federal government

— we had to work with a couple of departments of the federal government, and that just complicated the issue. In fact the property belonged to the Department of National Defense, and MoT was involved as well as the federal meteorological service. However, it would be our intention in Red Deer to restrict the terminal building to the actual terminal functions, and as such we would not get into the same difficulties we had, if you call them difficulties, in Grande Prairie and Lethbridge.

In addition to that we will be considering new terminals in Peace River and Medicine Hat; some negotiations have to go on relative to those two. We will be building a terminal on leased land at the Cold Lake air base at Medley to provide a civilian air terminal for the scheduled service that's now operating into the Medley base. In addition, we will be constructing terminals at Rainbow Lake, High Prairie, Camrose, and Swan Hills. These will be sized according to the needs of the particular community, and of course the priorities relative to how these are chosen are related to the question of scheduled services, isolation and/or emergency health care needs that might occur in the area.

Mr. Chairman, very briefly, those are our intentions for the coming year, and that is our decision relative to the problem we found after we'd put these into the estimates a year ago. That was prior to our completion of the negotiations with the federal government. Perhaps we negotiated too well, and it took some time to finalize that agreement. But in fairness, we think these should be withdrawn from the capital projects division and financed out of general revenue. The impact on the communities will be no different. We will get the modern, up-to-date air terminals that those two cities need so badly, and at the same time, in the longer term, there will be a return to the province of fairly substantial amounts.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to either the Minister of Transportation or the Provincial Treasurer. This is the first time I've heard anyone say that we negotiated too well with the federal government. But noting the change the government has now decided to make, I would be very interested in the technique that will now be used to, if I could use the term, take something out of the capital . . . Really, what we're doing is taking something we approved a year ago out of the capital projects portion and now we're going to put it back into the operating budget of the province.

What's going to be the procedure? Will it be an order in council, then a special warrant arrangement? Just how will it be done?

DR. HORNER: I think we'll have to do some checking, but I would suspect it's as the hon. leader suggested.

MR. CLARK: Really, fellas.

MR. NOTLEY: Well, we could be fairly easy about it as long as it's done, eh?

MR. CLARK: A little money here, a little money there.

MR. NOTLEY: A million here, a million there. You know, what the heck.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could put a couple of questions to the minister with respect to our whole

project here under this appropriation. Mr. Minister, you indicated that these additional terminals were going to be linked to third-level air carrier service. Is there an intention at this stage to have a regular flight from Edmonton to Camrose? Is that something in the plans, in the works, as far as that community is concerned?

I would also ask another question. The minister indicated that in the terminal buildings we might be looking at a form of subsidy to third-level carriers, in the form of office space. I wonder if the government has clarified its position on that matter. Are we going to be providing free office space or shielded office space to third-level carriers? What will be our position on that matter?

Then, Mr. Chairman, I notice that the Whitecourt terminal is finished. It's also my understanding that Wapiti has applied or is going to apply for a Grande Prairie-Whitecourt-Edmonton run. Where does the government sit on that particular application? Does it have the active support of the provincial government at this stage?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, I'll take the last question first, the question of Whitecourt. We would see Whitecourt being one of the important communication centres in northwestern Alberta, and we would certainly endorse Wapiti's application. My understanding is that it's an extension of their Grande Prairie/Grande Cache/Whitecourt routing as opposed to Grande Prairie-Whitecourt direct. But I have some meetings scheduled with Wapiti, and we'll finalize that particular matter.

The question of the use of terminals as an indirect subsidy, if you like, to the third-level carriers: I think that is a reasonable proposition, particularly in the initial stages of the start-up or in maintaining service in areas that would ordinarily perhaps not be viable without that kind of subsidization.

In the case of Lethbridge and Grande Prairie, I think it's a matter of modification of what MoT tried to do in Calgary. We don't want to get into that particular hassle. We feel the province, in being involved in this, has some responsibility in that area.

The question relative to scheduled service into Camrose: we think it's becoming a substantial financial centre in the farm credit area and that down the road there will be a possibility of scheduled service into Camrose, particularly going south to service that particular item.

The question of Rainbow Lake and High Prairie: of course there is scheduled service in there. The question of Swan Hills: it's a very modest terminal to provide completion of the agreement with the two major oil companies in the area that they would provide a standby plane at all times for emergency purposes.

MR. NOTLEY: If I'm not mistaken, I believe it was in 1974 that Mr. Peacock, when that gentleman was Minister of Industry and Commerce, tabled in the Legislature a paper on transportation, and he dealt with this business of third-level carriers. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we could ask the minister to outline what advances he sees in this area in the province. As I recollect Mr. Peacock's paper, they were looking at possibly moving into Drumheller, possibly Brooks. I would be a little less than honest if I didn't indicate a

parochial interest in Fairview. But obviously some places go without saying. Going into Cold Lake is going to be fairly crucial and a good business proposition, and that's already operating.

MR. CLARK: We're saving that one for PWA.

MR. NOTLEY: Are we saving Cold Lake for PWA? But what is the government's timetable at this stage for providing incentives and assistance to third-level carriers to go into some of these other communities?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, very frankly, in our earlier attempt to expand third-level carriers in the province perhaps we were a little bit ahead of ourselves relative to airport construction and the navigational aids required to have a scheduled service into some of these areas. I hope we're at the stage now where we have very materially expanded the airport network, both provincially owned and community owned, throughout the province. Provided we can continue to have the co-operation of the regional MoT, who provide the navigational aids, we should be able to expand that third-level service. As I mentioned to the committee, we're working now on how we might be able to do that, including not only the question of terminal subsidization but the question of buying a certain block of seats on a run for a period of time and declining. Because I think these things have to be done in that way, so that if it's going to be a viable service in three years, fine, you need some help in those first three years; but it should be a "use or lose" proposition.

That applies to places like Drumheller, Brooks; yes, Fairview, Rocky Mountain House, Whitecourt and Edson on the west side. A scheduled service is now operating into Pincher Creek. We would expect major developments in Lloydminster, and at the moment we are negotiating for land for a new air strip in the area, out of our operational budget.

As far as Cold Lake is concerned, when I mentioned Medley, that's the exact name of the base. This year we will be completing an airport at Cold Lake in which we'll take off the small aircraft that now use the base, in accord with our agreement with the Department of National Defence, in that they have allocated one runway and the control tower facilities to civilian aircraft. Of course Gateway is now servicing that particular route. Our project here will be to provide the taxiway and aircraft ramp with a modest terminal for civilian use at Medley.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The minister has mentioned that the funds for the Grande Prairie and Lethbridge airports are going to go back into general revenue. The reasoning, as I understood it, was that a very good agreement was made with the federal government, and there was a possibility of a return of around 8 per cent. For that reason it's going back into general revenue. Are there other reasons beyond that, or is that basically the reason? Is that not a good enough return for the heritage fund? Is that what you're saying, or are you saying we can do better with the money left in the heritage fund, or general revenue can handle it, or spend it — we don't need the interest. Is that what the minister is saying? I didn't quite follow that.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, I'm saying that if the hon. member will look at the heritage fund act he will see that the capital projects division is to be used for projects that will not provide an immediate return to the province, but are in the long run a benefit of the province. I think it could be rightly claimed that if we allowed this to stay in the fund, the payments from the federal government would come back into general revenue; therefore, we would have some difficulty in . . . Really, it's sort of half way between the investment division and the capital projects division, and for that reason, so that there isn't any leakage of the fund, it's being withdrawn and will be funded out of general revenue.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I have no difficulty at all understanding that that capital projects division, which is 20 per cent of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund, is to be invested in such a manner that it's for the social and economic benefit of Albertans and, as such, does not show a dollar return. Obviously it couldn't stay in there, because of the nature of the deal you made with Ottawa. I think it's pretty nice when anybody can get the best of Ottawa.

I'd like to pursue a couple of points, Mr. Minister. First of all, I'd like to say it's just marvellous when you think that we in little old Alberta, with 8 per cent of Canada's people, don't have the traditional department of highways within a government; we have a Department of Transportation. As you've said in the past, air policy is so important to a province such as ours that's bounded on all sides by land. In the three and a half years I've been here, some of the things I've seen take place in air transportation I think are truly remarkable. I can't help but mention the role the Member for Macleod has played with regard to airports throughout Alberta. Unfortunately he's representing you in Munich or somewhere and can't be here. But I fly up from Lethbridge on Time Air every week. You know, you don't really go very far in the air until you see some of the results of the Department of Transportation in terms of airport development. I think that's really remarkable.

When I look at the proposed projects at Lethbridge and Grande Prairie, I guess the uniqueness is the first thing that attracts me. I don't suppose a precedent has ever been set in the country where a province has been able to co-operate in such a positive manner with the Department of Transport in getting this type of agreement, where the Department of Transport owns those airports, those air terminals. For those who have been in Lethbridge, they haven't changed very much since 1943. I'm sure Grande Prairie has been no different. I think it's remarkable that that's been done, particularly in view of the lack of co-operation with Ottawa in other areas.

Mr. Minister, in looking at the plans of the terminal, I'm intrigued that it's 12,000 square feet, which is about seven or eight times the present size. But more importantly, the apron capacity is capable of 737s, which indicates to me that some long-range planning and good thought has gone into this, maybe not just from the point of view of PWA but indeed perhaps from the point of view of Transair, in which it appears Ottawa was very insistent that the Alberta government become involved.

Mr. Minister, when I look at the amount of beef that comes through the packing plants in southern Alber-

ta, I can't help but think that boxed beef is the potential for shipments, and not by rail, because within Alberta the area of authority over rail is non-existent. So that leaves trucks. Trucks have difficulties getting across oceans. So looking at it, I get kind of excited about the potential of the Pacific Rim countries and Japan and the very direct benefits — and we don't have to worry about Crow rates when we talk about the potential. All this has come about as a result of Alberta Transportation.

So I'm extremely encouraged by what the department has done. I'd like to ask you a couple of questions, though, and give someone else an opportunity. I expect, in view of the fact that this year has been a very rainy time in southern Alberta . . . Indeed, it seems that since we announced \$200 million from the heritage savings trust fund would go to southern Alberta, it hasn't stopped raining. Thank heaven we didn't announce \$500 million, or we might have had a flood.

I land there every week, and I'm amazed as I see the terminal going up. But as to timetables and scheduling, I don't know whether it's on time. I heard you mention that spring '79 opening, which is very encouraging for those who are politically inclined. Is the construction on schedule, Mr. Minister?

There was some static in southern Alberta about the procedure for the construction. As I understand it, the Grande Prairie and Lethbridge air terminals are very similar, so a general construction manager makes a lot of sense. I understand Poole is looking after that. I guess I'd have to ask: do you know of any difficulties they are experiencing with regard to construction of the terminal in terms not only of the time, but of using the local depository system at the, say, Lethbridge Construction Association?

Finally, the impact it will have on third-level carriers such as Time Air. Time, as you well know, is Canada's largest third-level carrier. It's a success story in itself, with 14 flights in and out of Lethbridge daily. When you look at places like Thunder Bay, Regina, and Saskatoon, which have two flights daily, I think it impresses people about the potential we have in southern Alberta relative to air transportation, and I think Time has done an excellent job. So I am keenly interested as to whether the arrangement, because it's with the Department of Transport which is a federal jurisdiction and the capital funds have gone in from the province — therefore the lease is between the province and the federal. That indicates certain implications. The Member for Spirit River-Fairview asked if there is provision for subsidy if necessary. I don't know whether that's even necessary. Time Air has 65 per cent loads, I guess the largest in the nation.

Finally, in terms of office space and freight facilities, there has been a fair degree of criticism that third-level carriers just cannot carry the potential capacity of perhaps 1 million pounds a year in freight to southern Alberta. I am encouraged to know that, first of all, the runway and apron facilities are strong enough to allow larger aircraft, but more importantly, that the terminal would be large enough to store that.

I wonder if you could respond, Mr. Minister, to those points and a final one. There is about a 25 per cent difference in floor area between the Grande Prairie and Lethbridge terminals, and I suspect maybe the jet service into one area versus the other might

be a factor. I'd appreciate if you'd comment on those points.

Thank you.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, just let me briefly talk about the construction progress. The excavation of course is 100 per cent complete; the reinforced concrete, 95 per cent; structural steel, 95 per cent; mechanical and electrical rough in, 25 to 30 per cent; and the metal and concrete roof decking are also 100 per cent complete. Framing in wall systems is beginning now, and we expect that to be closed in so inside work can be done during the winter. The underground lines are 100 per cent completed, as are the earthwork and the concrete, for all intents and purposes. Completion of the ground-side facilities will have to await the removal of the present terminal. So as I say, we expect it to be operational in the spring of 1979.

Relative to the tendering, first of all we put out requests for proposals to a variety of people to be project managers of the two terminals, and the low bidder on that was Poole Construction. From then on we supervised the tendering and, after a little preliminary problem, we used the depository in Lethbridge. I think I left with the committee the summary of tenders that are available. Naturally I can't assure that local bidders will get the jobs in these cases. It's a competitive tender. I can say, though, that certainly in mechanical and electrical work and in some other specialized areas as well local bidders were successful in being the low tenderer. In fact on occasion in certain areas there were no bids from local contractors. However, I think that where there were it was strictly a matter of tendering. I don't have any problem with that. I think that's the way it has to go, and I leave that entirely up to my senior management people who are very knowledgeable and able in that area.

The question of the sizes of the two terminals in fact does have something to do with the question of the amount and kind of traffic that's going through both of them. I might say the only difference is about 5,500 feet on the main floor. The top floor is identical to Grande Prairie's. The basement is the same as Grande Prairie's in the amount of square footage. The other important concept of the design we've chosen is that it can be expanded without too much difficulty insofar as the main floor is concerned, and in Lethbridge's case an additional 6,000 square feet could very easily be put on the top floor. It's designed to do that. I expect that will be the way it will end up once we really get going.

I have tabled the agreements, and the agreements specifically provide for the matter that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview raised. We have some say of course, but we'll have to pay for our say relative to whether we subsidize the counter space for the air lines using those two terminals.

I think I've tried to answer the questions the hon. members asked. I might say that we've had exceptional co-operation from the advisory committees in both Grande Prairie and Lethbridge that we set up pursuant to the agreement to look at the plans, and have their input to the preliminary plans. These agreements are unique in Canada, and one of the reasons it took six months to get them finalized was that uniqueness. We didn't have too much of a problem with the western region of MoT, but once

they got down to Ottawa they got buried in innumerable little niches. We had to keep prodding to get them along. That's the reason we couldn't make that decision I announced earlier tonight.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just before you put the question, I want to pose to Dr. Horner the same question my colleague did. To the Minister of Transportation: there's no reason other than what we've heard here tonight on this strange transfer — taking the project out of the capital projects portion and putting it in the general revenue of the province. I wouldn't want there to be any reason you'd feel we hadn't given you the opportunity to explain every last detail as to why this change is being made, in light of the fact that it's just come to the surface this evening. So if there's any other reason at all why this is taking place, we'd expect to hear about it right now.

DR. HORNER: My hon. friend knows me well enough that he surely would, if there was any other reason.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the Deputy Premier. That's why I phrased the question very clearly, Dr. Horner, so that in a year's time you wouldn't be able to come back and say, I didn't have the opportunity, I wasn't asked the question. Obviously from what you tell us tonight there's no other reason at all.

DR. HORNER: Absolutely none.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to commend the minister on the success of the airport development program in the province, particularly the development of the Pincher Creek regional airport in my constituency of Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

We've now seen Time Air flying out of Pincher Creek on a scheduled basis two times a day. It has been very important for our area. The development of the new terminal there has been well received by the citizens, and it's going to serve their needs in the longer term.

The airport development projects of this province are certainly moving forward, and I think that's an important part of our plans for economic diversification. Scheduled air line service is an important factor when industry looks at locating in an area. The development of these airports and third-level carrier service is bringing Albertans closer together.

Agreed to:

Transportation

1 — Airport Terminal Buildings

\$5,300,000

Developing and Producing Canadian Content Educational Resources

Education

1 — Alberta Heritage Learning Resources

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you have any remarks on this topic?

MR. KOZIAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Tuesday evening I had one of the pages distribute a copy of a brochure which gives a thumbnail sketch of what's taking place under this project. I would hope all members have one before them. If any don't have the

benefit of this pamphlet, I have additional copies on my desk, and we can make arrangements to ensure that they are distributed.

In just a few words the brochure gives a pretty good idea of the nature of the project, Mr. Chairman, but as often on many of these projects there's "the rest of the story", as we so often hear on radio. I want to tell you something about the rest of the story that doesn't appear in the brochure itself. For example, in the first project, the Alberta heritage books for young readers, we expect 432,000 books to be produced; in the second project, 360,000 books; in the third project, 62,000 books; project four, the atlas, [110,000] copies. So just in those four areas, almost 1 million volumes. If you put those volumes on bookshelves in a library, you would need 8 miles or 12 kilometres of shelving to be able to accommodate all the books that will be produced under this project of the heritage savings trust fund.

The projects are coming along fairly well on schedule, Mr. Chairman. We expect that the first will appear in the classrooms of the province in January or February of next year. That would be the flora and fauna kit, project 4.3, containing 620 35 millimetre slides, study prints, et cetera dealing with the flora and fauna of the province.

After that we expect distribution of the relief map beginning in February of next year and over the following months. The next project which will begin appearing in the schools will be the Canadian content social studies kits. We expect that four of those will be available, again approximately in February 1979, with 12 additional kits being made available to students over the next 10 months.

In April 1979 the third project, Alberta literature for senior students and adults, should be completed and available for distribution. The second project, western Canadian literature for youth, should be available in September 1979; the junior atlas sometime in the fall of 1979; and the first project, Alberta heritage books for young readers, approximately a year from now, December 1979.

I did want to say, Mr. Chairman, how pleased I am with the sterling efforts of the many people involved in the production and publication of this exciting project under the heritage trust fund. We have the advisory committee, under the chairmanship of our former Lieutenant Governor, the hon. Dr. Grant MacEwan, working very hard in providing advice on titles. We have members of the steering committee; the project director Dr. Ken Nixon, who, by the way, is with us in the members gallery; together with some of the managing editors of the projects and others involved in the development and completion of the project we have before us.

As I indicated, the project will provide a number of books. Of course the majority will be in the English language. However, we are providing for some books in the languages now being used in our school systems as languages of instruction. For example, in project 3.0 we will find one volume in Ukrainian and one volume in French. We will have the flora and fauna kit available in French in addition to English, and certain other materials, recognizing the fact that we have other languages of instruction in our schools which would benefit from materials in these languages. All these things, Mr. Chairman, lead toward meeting the needs of our students in terms of know-

ing more about themselves, Alberta, western Canada, and Canada.

I should also point out that although the benefit here is primarily for students, other benefits flow from the project. We expect that the vast majority of the work in development of these projects will be done in the province of Alberta. Some exceptions, of course, would be where publication rights require us to use publishers and printers outside the province. However, in projects 1.0 and 2.0, for example, we expect work will be done in the province of Alberta.

So we see benefits that go beyond just the written, printed, and picturesque word — if I may use that phrase — that will appear in the classrooms. Benefits accrue to the business people and the workers who produce projects of this nature right in this province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't think there's any question that members of the committee support all the principles contained in the Alberta Heritage Learning Resources Project. Any emphasis on teaching the history of our own province, region of Canada, and Canada for that matter, is certainly a desirable addition to the education system.

I would ask the minister, however, if he could be just a little more specific while we have him here today. We know that Dr. MacEwan is a very able chairman of the advisory committee, and I think that was an excellent choice. I think I recall making that suggestion at some point a few months ago. I'd like the minister to outline the other members of the committee. Then with respect to each of the projects, I believe mention is made here of the relationship with both school trustees and the teachers' association. How are both these organizations plugged into the process of designing each of these projects all the way through 1.0 to 4.3?

I'm particularly interested with respect to project 4.1: Canadian content social studies kits. Could the minister outline a little more about how we're developing that particular project? Obviously in any of these areas that involve such things as Canadian content and interpretation of history, it's rather important that we make sure there is a good balance in whichever committee is doing the work in developing the guidelines.

So I wonder if the minister could take a few minutes to perhaps go into a few more of the technical details as to how the process operates.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the first question raised by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, the composition of the advisory committee, that's under the chairmanship of Dr. Grant MacEwan. In addition, there are many members whose names I have before me, and whose names appeared in a news release when the committee was established. Unfortunately I may not have the complete list before me, so rather than miss someone out I'll see if I can get a complete list to the hon. member. I say this because I have before me a list of all those who attended a particular meeting, and because of an absence on that occasion or because of the addition of technical personnel, I thought I'd rather be correct in providing the hon. member with that information than list those before me.

The particular project the hon. member was

interested in, the Canadian content social studies kits, 4.1 — 16 kits, four of which I believe would be available in about February of this year, with the rest in the following months. Mr. Chairman, this is an outgrowth of work that has been in place for some time involving school jurisdictions across the province. Not only the jurisdictions, but in many cases outside personnel like parents, in addition to school trustees, teachers, and students, would be involved in providing the benefit of their knowledge in the development of these kits. So each jurisdiction may find that one method is more suitable than another. But you have this input. Again, I can't provide the hon. member with a list of the jurisdictions of the specific projects, because I don't have those at hand, that being fairly detailed information. But if the hon. member is interested, I could provide that subsequently.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just pursue. Really, what I'd like to have the minister explain to the members of the committee is the process of deciding who will take part in each *ad hoc* committee. Is that something that is decided by Dr. MacEwan's advisory committee? I would take it that that would not be the function of the advisory committee.

So we've decided we're going to have the Alberta heritage books for young readers, western Canadian literature for youth, et cetera. Okay, how do we decide who does the work? What route is taken by the people managing this project in order to make sure they contact people who have expertise and ability in each of the disciplines that are required? For example, do they sit down with the Alberta School Trustees' Association and say, all right, we would like your suggestions on projects one, two, three, four, et cetera? Do they sit down with the Alberta Teachers' Association? What is the linkage with the Department of Education? That's really what I'm getting at. Or do we have a group of civil servants working in the Department of Education who in fact are doing much of this work on their own? The mechanics of establishing the *ad hoc* committees and the function of these committees interests me.

MR. KOZIAK: The first committee — the advisory committee the hon. member referred to, under the chairmanship of Dr. MacEwan — provides advice on titles, not on mechanics, not on the actual production. Much of that production work, or the advice on production, would be provided by the steering committee and by the *ad hoc* committees. The *ad hoc* and steering committees have input from the various disciplines, including departmental officials, the expertise from Public Affairs, Alberta School Trustees' Association and Alberta Teachers' Association representatives. So it's not strictly an in-house production, although the direction of course comes from Department of Education officials in terms of certain functions in the normal sense that other budgetary expenditures of the Department of Education might be carried out.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify in my own mind, what we have is a situation where department officials are basically providing the initiative, setting up the meetings, structuring the meetings, establish-

ing the guidelines. What we then do is go to other groups of people and invite them to participate in the *ad hoc* committees as they feel they can. Would that be the route? Along with that question, what role do these other groups play? Are they in a position to be able to qualify, to reject, to change the guidelines? Quite frankly, we're talking about a lot of subjective things here, not objective things. Flora and fauna can be fairly objective, but getting into Alberta history is a very subjective question. That's really what I'm getting at. To what extent is it an in-house operation; that is, controlled within the framework of the department? And to what extent do these *ad hoc* committees have an ability to set their own guidelines?

The minister mentioned the Alberta School Trustees' Association and the ATA. I presume that in addition we would be making some contacts, would we not, with the universities, at the various faculties of education? Surely if we're looking at Alberta history, would there be any direct link with the history sections of the faculties of Arts and Science at the three universities?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I misunderstood the initial question. I was of the impression the hon. member was talking about the supposedly physical aspects, the production of the ultimate projects as opposed to the content that goes into those projects. From the last comments I heard, I gather the hon. member is more interested in the content than in the mechanics of the physical reproduction of these projects.

Of course in that respect we rely upon the expertise available at the university level and elsewhere. The steering committee plays a very, very important role in this respect. There are representatives of certain expertise, be it literature or history, on the steering committee that provide that type of background of knowledge which makes the choice profitable.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, who is responsible for choosing the steering committee? Is that the director of curriculum? In other words, I look at this chart on the back page — "Minister of Education". But I'm sure the Minister of Education isn't going to sit down and decide that it's going to be professor Joe Blow in the Department of History at the universities of Alberta, Calgary, or Lethbridge. I'm sure the minister isn't going to be doing that. Who selects the steering committees to make sure we have the disciplines balanced and a balanced approach in having input from skilled people?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Chairman, members of the steering committee are appointed by me on recommendation from department officials, recognizing the areas the hon. member refers to. The *ad hoc* committees are strictly appointments at the departmental level.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, one or two questions to the minister.

First of all, as has been indicated, you certainly couldn't have found a better chairman. Even though he's always viewed by some in the context of history, I've never met a more contemporary man than the hon. Grant MacEwan, and I would hope that in project 2.0 there would be some way we could relate

some of Grant MacEwan's history in those heritage books. I think it would be so appropriate, because anybody who has heard of or read Grant MacEwan's work — I can't think of a better legacy for the children of Alberta, if that could be done.

DR. HOHOL: I'll write that.

MR. GOGO: Would you? Maybe the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower is volunteering to write it. [interjections] I wouldn't pretend to be in a position to judge what the content is.

But in numbers, you mentioned the sum would be a million volumes for \$8 million, not counting the flora and fauna kit. That has to be a pretty good buy in anybody's language. That's less than \$8 a volume. You take the authorship, the number of people, the printing costs: I think that's a pretty good deal. And when you consider that certain people in Alberta — the hon. Provincial Treasurer will be synonymous with the heritage fund, the Premier with provincial rights, and the Minister of Transportation with the jet age. I think it's a great honor to you, Mr. Minister, that you'll be associated with the heritage learning resources project.

I have two questions, though. One: we have about 45,000 retarded youngsters in Alberta. Certainly Dorothy Gooder school in Lethbridge and other schools in Alberta have maybe 100 or 200 youngsters. It would be kind of exciting, Mr. Minister, if it could be arranged that books set in large print like we have in our local libraries, if the cost wouldn't be that prohibitive, would be available to some of these school children who have learning disabilities. They're retarded children, and you get 16-year-olds in the grade 2 and 3 levels. I think that's an area that could be very exciting, if you could accommodate that.

The other one is — if you look at the pamphlet under project 2.0, where you say in the last paragraph:

The content will be selected mainly from existing works, and organized according to themes. Reading levels will be appropriate for Grades 7, 8, and 9.

I think that's fine. But I get a little disturbed when I read the next paragraph; that is, that they would be set up in the junior and senior high schools. I guess I'm wondering about the back-to-basics exercise where we get grades 7, 8, and 9 in the senior high schools. Maybe that's not intended that way, that you have grades 11 and 12 reading that material. I guess the question really is: is it by intent that you put grade 6, 7, and 8 books in the senior high schools?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Chairman, I think it becomes difficult to provide projects of this nature for specialty purposes, although it's something that could be considered for the future. You mentioned large print; I suppose that could also be used for those who are categorized as legally blind. In other words, small print would not be legible but large print would. That might be a consideration for the future; however, we haven't accommodated that in this project.

I suppose, though, there are aspects of the project that would be useful in many of those cases; for example, the kits that have filmstrips, 35 millimetre slides, and tapes. I'm sure these students would

benefit from those aspects of the project.

The question of the distribution of project 2.0: there's a realization, of course, that the reading levels will be at that approximate level, the junior high school level, but the distribution is in fact going to be to junior and senior high schools. At first that might seem incongruous. However, one should recognize that not all students in high school necessarily can read at the levels they have reached. Some of those students in high school are in a vocational diploma area, and rather than English 10, 20, and 30, they may be taking English 13, 23, and 33. I feel those volumes at that level would be useful for those students as well.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, with regard to project 3, there is an indication that there's going to be a collection of literature on the history, geography, and people of Alberta. Will the history be comprehensive or rather piecemeal? I look at Alberta's history and some of the literature in certain areas, particularly biographies on some of our earlier and more recent leaders of the province of Alberta, and there are not any biographies written on some of them. For example, yesterday in the Legislature I mentioned a fellow by the name of Haultain; there are books but no actual biography written on that person. Mr. Manning, who led the province for a number of years, Mr. Aberhart, Mr. Rutherford; there really isn't material on some of the things those men proposed in the province of Alberta and some of the actions that took place. How do you intend to fill that gap in the literature in the province of Alberta?

MR. KOZIAK: Project 3 will not have any original writing. In project 3 we will take titles of existing books written by western authors about Alberta and western Canada and will be reproducing those titles in a set. That is not new material but existing material that's compiled in a volume set that can be placed in each school.

Project 2 will also be relying on existing materials to a large degree, but won't be in the same form, in that you might have vignettes of certain events that would be put together in that project.

Project 1 would be the area where you would have some original work, but that would still leave gaps. There is no doubt that in these projects we won't be covering all the province's history and that more will have to be done in the future. However, I think that by taking this route we will at least have something, will have made the first step, and will know where the spaces are, so that in the future the opportunity will exist to go further and perhaps work toward a comprehensive history of the province, bringing into account the present unwritten histories of many of the important people who have made the province what it is today.

Agreed to:

Education

1 — Alberta Heritage Learning Resources

\$3,888,000

Kananaskis Regional Recreation Facility Development

Recreation, Parks and Wildlife

1 — Kananaskis Country Recreation Development

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you have any remarks on this subject?

MR. ADAIR: Yes, I'd like to start off, Mr. Chairman, with a bit of an update as to what has taken place in Kananaskis Country and maybe to reaffirm exactly what Kananaskis Country and Kananaskis Provincial Park in fact are. I think we have had some difficulty at times trying to ensure that there is a differentiation between the provincial park within the Country. The park itself is roughly 190 square miles, the Country around 2,000 square miles. The plan will be to see the development over a five-year period of some 3,000 overnight camping sites accessible by vehicle, 1,000 day-use sites, 450 miles or 750 kilometres of back-country trails, special user facilities, and a number of other activities and trails that will be provided for the activities.

The dedication ceremonies took place in September. At that particular time we had already completed 35 overnight campsites. The budget involved in this particular allotment of funds for this year will see further development of those within both the Country and the provincial park. Of course we're going to be involved in continuing the project of the park itself, the trail systems within the park: back-country and cross-country ski trails as well as bicycle trails. The alpine village concept — the development of the proposals that will eventually go to the private sector is under way and by the middle of 1979-80 should be ready for providing to the private sector for proposals to review and bid on.

The road program is certainly one of the more important ones down there, and through the Department of Transportation a tremendous amount of work has in fact taken place to date. A fair sum of the moneys included in this particular project go to continuing that road work, the upgrading of the existing road system, some small changes in alignment, and the like.

Now in the Country itself one of the areas we have been working on and will continue to work on is the snowmobile areas in McLean Creek and Sibbald Flat, along with some work in Waiparous and Cataract Creeks, two areas just outside Kananaskis Country but involved with the opportunity for the snowmobiler as well. The hiking, equestrian, bicycle, and cross-country trails, the overnight camping and day-use facilities — basically the concept is to have a controlled recreation area around the park, still the concept announced in October 1977. In '79 we're hoping to focus on roughly another 185 overnight camp sites and 200 day-use sites accessible by car.

When we get down to the golf course, which is also in Kananaskis Country, approximately 12 of the first 18 fairways have been cleared, and right at the moment that is going along very well indeed. We are most pleased to have a gentleman by the name of Robert Trent Jones as the golf course architect working on that particular project, with personal supervision as well.

The appointment of the advisory committee headed

by Bryan Targett of Calgary, along with the other members — possibly I should go over just who they are. The vice-chairman is Mr. Bill Milne of Calgary; the gentleman from Canmore, Patrick Byrne; from Edmonton, Sandy Fitch; again from Calgary, Miss Margaret Hess; Terry McDonough from Calgary; Richard Wambeke from High River; and Fred Wilmot from Calgary. So there's a pretty good representation of both southern Alberta and the rest of the province on that citizens' advisory committee.

Right now they're looking particularly at projects along the line of the Fortress Mountain project and the proposal before government at the moment, and they will be making recommendations to us, through me and to the ministerial committee, who will then be following that up through cabinet. We have asked them to look at a number of other areas right away, and one of them was the equestrian trail system. If you're familiar with the area west of the Fisher Range, we asked them to take another look at that area as to whether there might be some changes or adjustments we may make in the planned trail systems.

The managing director is a gentleman by the name of Mr. Ed Marshall, out of Calgary. He's responsible for the over-all program co-ordination and liaison with the ministerial committee, as well as working very closely with the advisory committee. That's working very well indeed. We have a gentleman by the name of Mr. Bob Mitton in the department who works with the advisory committee, the managing director, and the other seven departments involved in the project along with my department. Again, keeping in mind that the entire plan was to have completed the entire Kananaskis Country project in five years — and that involved the development of the park itself, 190 square miles, along with the 2,000 square-mile total for the Kananaskis Country controlled recreation area around that — that is moving reasonably well. We had some difficulties with weather this summer. We are anticipating almost a catch-up if it stays the way it has been going right now. Then we'll be moving into the plans for the '79-80 period, as outlined in the budget at this point, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KIDD: Mr. Chairman, since a great proportion of this park — not all, but a great proportion — is in my constituency, I'd like to make a few comments. Of course I'm delighted that this very important development is taking place, and I compliment the minister on the efforts he has made in this regard.

Just a few comments that I think are important. I think it is extremely important that we never lose sight of the fact that this park is for the people. We're not establishing the park — and I know this is not motherhood — just so we can establish a park. The park is for the use of people. In that regard I know we have had a great deal of representation from a number of people, particularly snowmobilers. Among others, I have taken a great deal of flak from the snowmobilers, but they are some of the people using recreational facilities. I don't know whether fitting into a five-year plan and getting it going so quickly without regard to anything else is as important as being flexible as we go. I think that's what the minister has said, and I would like to reiterate: we established this park and we're flexible; we don't know all the answers to start with in a new thing. It

is an extremely new thing, and we fit the requirements of the people who are going to use it as we go along.

In that regard, I think of course we want to preserve the fact that I could go and take my skis and there wouldn't be any noise. That's fine. I want to do that; a great many other people want to do that. But in this society a great number of people want to snowmobile. I think we have to make these adjustments as we go along. We have to do it in a very flexible way and not be inflexible. Quite frankly, I think we started off in the right way, a pretty damned inflexible way. Maybe that was the right way to do it. Maybe it was. But I think we will adjust to those things, and I'm making a plea particularly for some of the other things that don't make any noise.

Traditionally a horse trail came down from Mud Lake and across the Evans-Thomas flat and through the area. Maybe we could be thinking about having a few camping spots and having that trail preserved. It's pretty hard to prove that horses disturb game. I know that's an area game goes through. Mr. Minister, all I'm saying is, let's preserve, number one, the fact that we are building a park for people and that we need the flexibility to change and adjust to conditions as we go along.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WOSTENHOLME: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to express a few thoughts about Kananaskis Country and Kananaskis park. The hon. Member for Banff, the Banff Kidd, and I have it within our constituencies. What he doesn't have in his is in mine, and I'm very interested in it. I would like the minister to answer some of these questions. Possibly they may not be within his jurisdiction, but anyone who has grazing rights within Kananaskis Country at present is not subject to losing them. I hope that hasn't been changed.

I'm told by the residents there that a seven-mile portion of road between Highwood House and Longview is going to remain gravel. Has the minister any idea when that might be paved, or if the story is correct?

Regarding snowmobiles, I'd like the minister to tell us if any changes have been made since last winter. A snowmobile club had the occasion to outfit me with a snowmobile, all the clothing and so on. We took a trip from Highwood House to the summit, where the out-of-bounds sign was, and turned around and came back. With all due respect to those who are setting the regulations, I was told to watch for signs of game along the trail, and the only game signs I saw were rabbit. At that particular time a person couldn't have done any damage if they had gone off the trail, because you simply couldn't get anywhere. You were stuck with the snowmobile.

I would like to see snowmobiling on that particular trail, possibly for a couple of months, particularly around Christmas. The snow will be deep then. No damage will be done. I'd like to make that as a representation to the minister and his department.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose a question to the hon. minister. Can he assure this Assembly that the professional golf course being built will truly be a public golf course seven days a week,

and that access to the golf course will be on a daily basis, on a first come, first served basis, rather than on some system of annual passes, or annual privileges, assigned in some unknown manner at this time?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, maybe I could get to your question, hon. member, along with the others that were raised by the two members adjacent to Kananaskis Country itself. There's no question about it, Kananaskis Country and the park is for people. I think we can even broaden that a little further and say that it's basically going to be for individual or family activities in the outdoor recreation area. There's no question that when we initially set up Kananaskis Country, we were attempting for the first time to go into a new concept, to try to lay out what we thought was best.

One of the reasons we have the advisory committee on stream is to adjust with us any of those changes we may have in place, and I think there is some flexibility in there. The hon. member, as well as one of the good members of the equestrian area, or the trail packing area, has met with me on a number of occasions. If you recall my earlier remarks, I mentioned we had asked the advisory committee to look at that to see if we could make some changes in that area, particularly with the existing trails.

On the grazing question raised by the hon. member from High River, there's no question that we have had a number of meetings with quite a number of the grazing people in the areas involved in Kananaskis Country. On behalf of my colleague the Associate Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, I'm sure we can assure that there will be no cut-out or removal. Certainly there may be some adjustments. If there are adjustments, they will be in concert with those good people we have in fact talked to.

About the seven miles of road, I'm not just sure. When I'm finished I may ask Dr. Horner, the hon. Minister of Transportation, to respond about the seven miles.

Snowmobiles: where are we this year that may be different from last year? We had a number of meetings over the summer with members of the task force and the snowmobile association about what we are in fact doing and getting some recommendations from them. We are still having some difficulty with them, because we haven't changed the position relative to the park. Under The Provincial Parks Act snowmobiling is not allowed in provincial parks, and that still remains. But certainly from the standpoint of adjustments either within McLean Creek or joining up to Cataract Creek or making longer trail systems, we are working with them on that. I haven't the latest report from those who are involved with them, but I can tell you that the trail system as it's structured right now looks like it will probably be some 275 miles at the end of this year — snowmobile trails that will be in a position to be groomed and ready for snowmobilers. So that's a major improvement over what we did in fact have last year.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar questioned about the golf course. It is a public, family golf course. The Kananaskis golf course in Kananaskis Country will be that. As a matter of fact, one of the areas we are having the committee look at is the fact that on the other golf courses that presently operate

in the mountain scene — that's Banff and Jasper — you pay for 18 holes. We were going to be having nine hole fees. In other words, the person who only wants to golf nine holes — whoever that may be, individually, collectively, or otherwise — will be able to do that. Along with that, of course, we have looked at an attempt to provide a facility that will cover the kinds of points you raised, an opportunity for everyone to golf at any time without the line-ups that have been experienced at other golf courses. With that in mind we are moving to 27 holes, each nine starting from the clubhouse. You can individually start a group out. If you have a company tournament on an 18-hole course, they could be there. I say that in the sense that it might be our radio station having a golf tournament for the staff. But there would still be public access for all the people of Alberta at a fee that should be manageable by all. That is the idea behind the development of the golf course itself.

MR. YURKO: To clarify this point again. My concern, Mr. Minister, is whether or not annual passes of any form or type will be given out, or whether or not reservations will be able to be made by certain parties well in advance, with golf passes for two or three weeks a year. This is what I'm asking. Or will it truly be a public course on a first come, first served basis? For example, the public courses in Edmonton are run on a first come, first served basis.

MR. ADAIR: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what it is. It won't be a membership or an exclusive type. It is a family golf course and a public golf course.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister mentioned that the park was going to be for family operations. That, along with a number of other things, makes me wonder why there is a complete prohibition on snowmobiles in provincial parks. Snowmobilers are citizens of the province too. Where it makes sense there is no difficulty in carrying their judgment on that, but to say there is no snowmobiling in any provincial park at a time when nobody else is using those parks just doesn't make sense. You can't carry their judgment on that, because it doesn't make sense. You can't carry your own judgment on it. I wonder why the hon. minister is sticking to that idea.

There are a number of provincial parks — we can name them if necessary — where there is no activity whatsoever in the wintertime. The snowmobiles couldn't do any damage if they wanted to. And they don't want to. They simply want to use it, and we're alienating the good will of scores of Albertans because we just can't carry their judgment on that particular item. If there's some reason a snowmobile shouldn't be in a provincial park, if it's interfering with somebody else — well, snowmobilers are reasonable people. They may not like it, but they'll accept it. But when you simply say, no snowmobiles in provincial parks and that's it, like it or lump it, snowmobilers aren't accepting that. I can tell the hon. minister they won't accept that, because it just doesn't make sense. I think our policy should make common sense.

One other thing about the Kananaskis park: I'm wondering if the hon. minister has arranged for any crossovers. People from my constituency go into that area from the Longview area with their whole family

and go north, as I outlined last year, right up to Banff National Park. Again, it's beautiful scenery. As the hon. Member for Highwood mentioned, there's no damage being done. They're not interfering with anybody else. It's too far away for the skiers. We're making a lot of families angry because we simply won't give them reasons why they can't do that. We're simply saying we have a prohibition. That's not carrying their judgment. I would strongly recommend to the minister that before these rules are made, somebody go up there in a snowmobile and look at this, as the hon. Member for Highwood said he did. The people down there will even equip you and take you up if you wish to go. But I found, even in the Longview-Black Diamond area when I was there this summer, that people were still angry with the government over the policy of that provincial park, because the prohibition doesn't make sense. As I said before, we're alienating the good wishes of many people, and that can get pretty serious if it continues.

It's not the idea of the government, I know, because the policy of the government is to make these available for everyone. Snowmobilers use these parks when nobody else is using them. There's snow there; they're not interfering with any of the vegetation. I don't know how they're interfering with any wild animals. They're certainly not chasing them. These expeditions of 40 or 50 families in snowmobiles going up to spend a couple of days in Banff and then going back again is tremendous. It shows that snowmobiling has been a family recreation, and for many of our people it's made a holiday in the winter time possible. These are the people who can't afford to go to Hawaii, Florida, and so on. They want to stay right here and enjoy our own beautiful scenery. Let's make our policy sensible so that they can enjoy the beautiful scenery we have in this province.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just respond to the hon. member. There's obviously a difference of opinion between the hon. member and myself relative to provincial parks. We've discussed that at some length and haven't really come that much closer together on that particular point. I think what we've been trying to do — and the difference or the flexibility in there is the fact that within the eastern slopes themselves there are roughly 25,000-plus square miles of Crown land that can have developed snowmobile trails.

I've said quite a number of times that I eventually hope to see a snowmobile trail that could go almost from the Montana border to the B.C. border west and north of Grande Prairie, excluding the small areas that in fact are provincial parks and that already are excluded by the act and have been for some years. But having said that, that means that by working with the association themselves, the task force, or whoever it may be, we can develop those trails they are using. I haven't mentioned the private land they use right now to a great extent.

I guess the problem I as a minister have had is that when we announced Kananaskis Provincial Park, we actually closed out the Smith-Dorrien valley, that one particular valley. One of the reasons we delayed the announcement for some time was so we could put in some alternatives for those particular snowmobilers. Last winter was a reasonably good snowmobile season for them. We did have some difficulties with

them, but we have had quite a number of departmental people meet with the organization and the task force, the two groups together. The Hon. Dallas Schmidt and I have met and will be meeting, I believe on November 4, with the snowmobile association in Red Deer.

So there are many areas of flexibility in developing trail systems for snowmobilers on Crown land in the eastern slopes that will be exciting indeed. They'll have warming facilities, parking facilities, and the other likes if we can work those particular details out, and I think we can.

Crossover trails: if I followed your point on crossover trails, you're talking about crossing over into B.C. or over some of the ranges?

MR. TAYLOR: Into Banff National Park.

MR. ADAIR: Into Banff? Yes, the future will have some connecting trails that may go into — I'm not sure of the name of that park in B.C. There's a park just over the border, in B.C. and Banff, that will have some connecting trails eventually for the back-country backpackers. So they will in fact be there, and I can assure you of that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I think we've just heard another bunch of garble from the minister. It's disgusting. If there's any one reason we should go to the people of this province, it is the example of answers that are given by that minister. We are just getting the advice and information from the bureaucrats, not from leaders in this province. It's totally disgusting. There isn't a decision that minister has made. In parks, none. About Kananaskis Park: who designed that park? The bureaucrats. Why can't we have some flexibility in what's going on? The minister is incapable of making decisions about the park. That's the problem before us.

We talk about a Kananaskis Country development that is for the people. There is no way you can respond to the people if the minister of the department is not listening. That's the way it is.

The poor snowmobilers, the groups that have worked, have tried to be responsible, to make representation, have done that to the minister, to the associate minister of lands. They sit in the meetings.

When we met in Government House, I remember the minister shaking his head about things, not really understanding some of their presentations, but saying, well, we can't do it, we haven't got that in our plans.

Here we have the meeting on November 4 or November 3 at exactly the same position they were at that time. They're being totally misled. If he believes his bureaucrats are right why doesn't the minister say, we're not doing anything because my civil servants told me not to do anything, and that's the reason for it?

The minister smiles smugly because he thinks he may be a minister after the next election. Well let's hope the Premier has some sense in making that judgment for the next time around, because certainly there are other capable people sitting in this Legislature who can make some decisions for the people of Alberta.

The minister hides behind the parks act and the regulations, that we can't have snowmobilers there.

Well I'm sure a majority of people in this Assembly — if the amendment or the idea were brought before us, we could discuss it. I'm sure it would receive our approval, so there is flexibility in the provincial parks of this province, in planning, in utilization. But under the ground rules as they stand, there isn't.

I feel the minister is just not taking his responsibility and responding to the needs of Albertans, particularly in that area. There are responsible people in the snowmobilers' associations who would help to police the trail up to Banff, between the Highwood junction. They'd work with you. You could audit what they do. If the trail is abused, the area is abused, they're prepared to pay the consequences. But up to this point in time the minister, in his methods of indecision, has not been prepared. They are going to recognize, I'm sure, at this point in time that he's not listening and is playing a game with them, not being fair. The minister has indicated that all that area south of the Highwood junction is for snowmobilers. Most years there isn't even adequate snow in that area, so how can he recognize that as the area for snowmobilers?

I think he should do a little listening to the snowmobilers of this province and people in general, because that's where the problem begins. This isn't the only instance in the administration of the minister in this Conservative government. I certainly feel that the inadequacies there can bring us ... If there is any one argument I can use in the next election that is of benefit to me, it's the administration that's come forward in that situation.

I hate to be so direct about it, but at this point in time, for all the millions of dollars — over \$24 million being asked for at the present time — that's a lot of money being handled by the bureaucrats rather than the policy-makers in this province. And we are the policy-makers. We are attempting — the hon. members for Banff, Highwood, Drumheller, and I'm sure there are others who will be speaking — to give the minister some direction. Why? He doesn't listen anyway.

MR. NOTLEY: Hear, hear.

MR. ADAIR: Unfortunately that works both ways, Mr. Chairman. Because although I've had some differences of opinion — and by the sound of it, may have continued differences — with the hon. member, I had said earlier that we have worked with an advisory committee. There is a ministerial committee which sets the policy and then has the administration administer that.

Now, we talk about snowmobiling, and you talk about indecision. I have some difficulty with that particular word when I have said very clearly that as far as the provincial parks go, there is no indecision. The act says no snowmobiling, and there will not be any snowmobiling in the provincial parks. But in that 2,000 square mile area around the park — I'm speaking now of Kananaskis — every effort will be made and has been made to work with the association. I might say there was an inference there that possibly I had inferred that they were not responsible people.

If he might turn around so I can look at him ... That's a little better. Then he won't have to have that shaggy-dog look on his face when I get back on that. But these people are very responsible ...

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I don't appreciate that remark. The minister is unable to answer the question, and he has to start making inferences about people. He can cut his own hair if he's worrying about my hair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps we can get off the personal aspects of this. Perhaps you would withdraw that remark about the shaggy-dog look, Mr. Minister. It's unnecessary.

MR. ADAIR: About the shaggy dog? I'd be happy to —withdraw it. Pop up and down. I may have had the wrong inference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carry on with your address.

MR. ADAIR: When we're talking about responsible people, there is no question indeed that the snowmobile association, the task force, or the people we have met with on many occasions relative to Kananaskis Country, the eastern slopes, or whatever it may be — we've had some really good discussions with all of them. As far as attempting to set up . . . In this particular case I referred to some 275 miles of new trail development for snowmobilers in Kananaskis Country, not counting what may be developed in the eastern slopes, which is outside my purview. But certainly we have explained, and I think we have discussed with them and certainly with the president on a number of occasions, and with the chairman of the task force. We've had some differences of opinion, and that's not that bad. That's healthy when you can sit down and discuss very openly the kinds of questions we are asked, and when we are asked why, attempt to try to explain that. Now I think we have done that.

The particular system — the bridges, the trails, and the grooming equipment now on purchase for that — is a major move forward in the area of providing snowmobile trails in much better condition than they have been in the past. Not very many trails were developed previously by this government, and we're now moving into that area with them.

There was an interesting point made earlier when we started looking at the fact that very few snowmobiles were registered in Alberta, although there may well be at that time some 55,000. That is changing; they're working. They have already indicated to us — "the/" being the snowmobile association — that they would like to work with their own people to rectify the fact that if they are not snowmobiling on private land they would then be registered, so we could then work with them to provide trails on Crown land in the province of Alberta, particularly in the eastern slopes, and primarily as I relate in this particular question to Kananaskis Country. It in fact is happening.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a couple of comments, though it may not relate directly to the item in the estimates. I don't believe blanket statements about a lack of flexibility should be made, because my experience in the two provincial parks in our area is that there's been adequate opportunity and the citizens and advisory groups have been encouraged to be involved in the park planning. I don't think it's fair at all, nor is it correct, to make

blanket statements about the parks department or the minister being inflexible.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Mr. Minister, very specifically, what snowmobile opportunities are there going to be for people in the Kananaskis Country area this year? Don't come back and tell us you're going to give them that same area you gave them last year, directly east, because the snowmobile people have told you, your officials, and that task force at least 10 times that there simply isn't snow in that area generally until January. What area is going to be available?

MR. ADAIR: Cataract Creek to the south, McLean Creek to the east, Sibbald Flats to the northeast, Waiparous to the north.

MR. CLARK: Isn't that the same area they had last year? Isn't the McLean Creek-Sibbald area the area to the east where the snowmobilers have told you, as I said, at least 10 times, there simply isn't enough snow, especially early in the year. Now what have you done about that? [interjections] I don't expect you to make any more snow, but I do expect that you'd be a bit more sensible in opening some areas that traditionally have had a good depth of snow.

Mr. Minister, I should point out to you that I was out to Kananaskis Country prior to the official opening this year. I spent a day there. I asked numerous officials working on the project out there if they could show me any place where damage was done by snowmobilers. Now I may just have struck a very unfortunate day, but I didn't run into one person who could show me any examples. In fact they basically said, we don't know why this action has been taken either, other than that once it became a provincial park it had to stay within existing provincial park policy. But I emphasize the point that not one of your own officials could show me any area where supposedly damage had been done. If you've got some areas, let's hear them. Tell the snowmobile people.

MR. ADAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. There was no reference to damage being the cause/ effect, if you want to use that, of any exclusions. We're attempting to do two things in Kananaskis Country: provide opportunity for everyone, be it the bicyclist, the backpacker, the snowmobiler, the snowshoer, or the cross-country skier, to in fact pursue that outdoor recreation of his own pleasure and choice without interference, in essence, from any other group.

McLean Creek is one of the areas where, for a couple of years, when we had very little snow in all of Alberta, not just in that particular area but even up into the Peace River country where I come from, there were some problems. Now the development of those trails and that snow in there — that was the snowmobile area basically for most of the snowmobilers of southern Alberta prior to their moving further west to Smith-Dorrien. It may not in fact be as good as Smith-Dorrien, but having placed that in the park and having it come under the park purview . . . Now if there's inflexibility, I guess that's the area where it is. We are attempting to provide within the park that opportunity for citizens, without any interference from what may be a recreation that involves — and

I'll include the other ones — either the four-wheel drive units, the motorcyclists, or the snowmobilers, but we're going to be working with them to provide opportunities in the Country. That, Mr. Chairman, is flexibility.

MR. CLARK: With all due respect to you, sir, that is anything but flexibility. Mr. Minister, if you had said you were going to phase this in over two or three years and had some trails groomed and some places that would have taken the place of the Smith-Dorrien area, that would have been flexibility. But what happened was that all of a sudden somebody got a vision and, with the help of a bunch of planners and park people from Ontario, Kananaskis Country developed out of this vision. Late last fall you then made these regulations. You set up the park. Candidly, I don't think the government even understood what you'd done to the snowmobile people until the problems developed on the scene.

Mr. Minister, I'm sure that last fall, this spring, or even now had you brought some legislation that would give you some flexibility to phase that in over a two- or three-year period of time — that's the kind of flexibility we're talking about here tonight. But this all happened late last fall. In fact I well remember a meeting at Red Deer. Several MLAs were there, and one of your cabinet colleagues told the snowmobilers that they had all the eastern slopes to snowmobile in. Unfortunately someone hadn't told him that there were trees in the eastern slopes, and that's the problem of shutting people out of the area they have been using in the past — the problem of trails.

If you want an example of being flexible, Mr. Minister, that's the way you should have gone about it. You could still go about it that way and not interfere with the legitimate recreational desires of other groups, be it cross-country skiers, or with wildlife. Your own wildlife officials have told you that with some modification in the trails that were being used previously, there would be little or very little problem as far as wildlife is concerned. That could be done if you really believed in this idea of flexibility. And you wouldn't have had the problem you had last winter and likely are going to have this winter with the very same group.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I don't have very much hair, so I don't worry about the shaggy-dog effect. But I do worry about this policy. It says in The Provincial Parks Act that snowmobiles can't go into provincial parks. Laws should reflect the thinking of the people. I would challenge the hon. minister to carry the judgment of people who are snowmobilers and non-snowmobilers as to why you should not have a snowmobile in some provincial parks. There are some that you couldn't think of letting snowmobilers in, and you can carry their judgment. But where they just can't do any damage, where there's nobody else, and where it's sensible for them to be — and then you say, you can't go in there because the law says you can't go in. The law can be changed, and that is the point that many people are making to me. I can't carry their judgment, because I don't believe it myself when I look at some of these parks. There are others where you wouldn't want them to come within a mile of the provincial park. It just wouldn't make sense.

I want to reiterate that we're causing a lot of bitter-

ness at the ground roots that's going to flare up. People aren't accepting this. I was at the meeting at Red Deer too, where there must have been 300 or 400 people, and the undertone of that crowd about the things where you can't carry their judgment was very, very bitter. I think the hon. Attorney General would tell you that. That is the point I'm trying to make to the hon. minister. Let's have someone look at the provincial parks. If it's sensible for them to go into them, take it out of the act and say, subject to the discretion of the minister. Make it possible if it makes sense for the snowmobiles to go in there. If it doesn't make sense, there's no difficulty in carrying their judgment.

There's just one other point I'd like to make. One or two American states are now capitalizing on the snowmobile industry. This industry is now bringing a few hundreds of thousands of dollars into businesses in this province. It's a good industry. Quebec has profited to the tune of a great amount of money, because they've encouraged snowmobilers to come into their parks and snow areas, and so has Colorado. We're missing a tremendous opportunity to have another thriving industry at a time of year when most other industries are slack.

With the beauty of our mountains, through the snowmobile industry we could have people coming from all over the western United States with their snowmobiles, enjoying the scenery, and doing no damage. I would ask the hon. minister to take a look at this complete exclusion, this blanket prohibition of using any provincial park, whether it makes sense or not. I think our laws should reflect the thinking of the people. If we can carry their judgment, there's no difficulty. If you can't carry their judgment, well, I'll tell you there's an underground current that will cause trouble in the future.

MR. DOAN: I must take a stand on this, because I happen to be a snowmobiler. I really find it difficult not to support them sometimes. I attended a meeting in Red Deer — I think it was '71 or '72 — with the hon. Clarence Copithorne, and we spoke to 150 there that evening.

Here's our government spending upwards of \$40 million in due time, and it's going to be a shutout for snowmobilers. I think this is just a little difficult to explain to your ratepayers at home. This is one thing I do get a lot of flak on at home — snowmobilers. I think it should be eased up a little, Mr. Minister. Anyway I would like to see you give it some consideration.

Thank you.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, as long as we're speaking of Kananaskis Country, because we're getting into some of the other areas — I've had to try to explain some of the flexibility we're attempting to work out with the snowmobiler.

There's no question about the industry; it's lucrative and has done well in the province of Alberta. I think the snowmobilers have enjoyed a tremendous amount of opportunity. Working with the groups — and I speak not just as a Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, but with the other ministers who are directly involved — the opportunity, for example, to change at their request the position of snowmobilers in The Off-highway Vehicle Act that is being looked at and is

being carried out right now. My hon. colleague Dr. Horner may want to elaborate a little on that.

MR. CLARK: How's that going to help us at all?

MR. ADAIR: If I may, please. Just so we've got things fairly clear, the fact is that we have some 25,000-plus square miles of eastern slope opportunity to develop trails with the snowmobilers, for the snowmobilers, and not at the exclusion of others. I think we have to take into consideration that we're going to be dealing with all activities on the eastern slopes at some stage. The opportunity for possibly another Kananaskis type, or two more of them, is certainly there on the horizon if this particular project works, and we see no reason why it won't.

But having said that, and in the particular issue of, say, one park, the largest provincial park we have now in the system is Kananaskis Provincial Park, at 190 square miles. That 190 square miles is the portion covered by The Provincial Parks Act. Now that's not written in stone. There's no question that that could be changed. What I'd like to do is look at those other alternatives within Kananaskis Country and leave the snowmobile out of the parks — as it already is in The Provincial Parks Act — until such time as we've exhausted all other avenues in those other areas: in the controlled recreation area of Kananaskis Country, in the entire eastern slopes which, as I have said, is roughly 25,000-plus square miles.

Certainly there are trees in Kananaskis Country. I have a little trouble with the inference that trees were the problem outside and not inside. They're both the same kinds of trees and the same size. And the trails basically are there. Basically there are more trails in the eastern slopes themselves that have been used by snowmobilers. We would like to work with them to find out which trails they would like and which trails they would like us to assist in fixing up to provide the warming huts, parking facilities, and other things that go with it. We are beginning to do that.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I represent a constituency that per capita probably has as high a number of snowmobiles as any constituency in the province of Alberta. It seems the focus of attention tonight is on an area of 195 square miles in the eastern slopes known as the Kananaskis Provincial Park. Certainly in terms of a mountain snowmobile experience there are a number of trails outside Kananaskis Provincial Park, extending over an area about 120 miles south of Kananaskis Provincial Park to the Waterton Lakes National Park. There is plenty of snow in that area, and not just early in January. There is some snow down there right now, as a matter of fact. I'd like to welcome snowmobilers from throughout Alberta to come down to the Crowsnest Pass area, the Castle area, to snowmobile during the winters. There is plenty of opportunity there, plenty of trails, and there is excellent scenery.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to respond to that. [interjections] Well, okay. The hon. member should read some of the briefs and submissions and meet with some of the groups of snowmobilers who indicated for a number of years that snow

was not available in the region mentioned. The Castle area, where the ski hill is, had to close down a few years ago because of lack of snow. So I don't think the general comment of the hon. member really applies.

But to the minister: the concern I have is that in order to use the trail, as I recall, between Highwood Junction and into Banff, you have to go through the Kananaskis Park area that is outlined. I believe snowmobilers would have to go a distance of something like 15 miles. What they've requested is to mark that 15 mile trail so snowmobilers stay on track and are then able to proceed up to Banff and travel on that — I guess it would be a north-south route in that manner. Now if the legislation is kept as it is at the present time, there is no flexibility. Is the minister willing to consider just that kind of concession?

In the last meeting I had with the snowmobilers, I believe in the spring session, they indicated to me they would like to go with an experimental project of that kind on the trail to see whether they could meet the requirements of the park, meet the needs of other groups who wish to use that recreational area, and co-operate to the greatest extent. But to the present time the circumstances that have been presented by the minister — the answer is no, it just doesn't seem we can do that. I think their request is reasonable in that manner. I'd like the minister to comment on that portion of the trail and whether he would be willing to try that.

MR. ADAIR: I'll try again, Mr. Chairman, to point out the fact that if it is presently in the park, the flexibility is not there in Kananaskis Provincial Park; in Kananaskis Country, yes. We're prepared to look at all the other areas there. We have the advisory committee. We can suggest that they come back to us with some alternatives.

I would certainly take a look at the suggestion of my hon. colleague from Highwood. The possibility of a month, six weeks, two weeks, or whatever it may be, is certainly worth looking at, and I'm prepared to do that. I'll get back to you. If you would be kind enough to give me a note as to what it is you have in mind in total, I'd certainly look at that.

But presently — and I've said it again — I guess that's where it appears there may be indecision. I don't think it's indecision. What we have tried to do is say very clearly from the outset that the park would be out of bounds. Having said that, how can we work in the Country, or in the balance of the eastern slopes either to the north, to the south, or to the west of Red Deer, or wherever it may be, with you snowmobilers in the province who have the right to have some of those areas? They have not had the opportunity to snowmobile in parks for some time; that's a known. It was known prior to the announcement of Kananaskis Provincial Park. It's known now. Again, that's talking about the park, not the Country.

There are many opportunities in the eastern slopes. The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest pointed out some other areas where there are snowmobiling opportunities. We'd like to look at all of them. They're outside my purview in that particular area, but as a committee we would look at them as well. One of the reasons we delayed the announcement of the Kananaskis Provincial Park was to ensure we had alternate sites for snowmobilers in place

before we made the announcement. That was why Waiparous was named, outside Kananaskis Country, and Cataract Creek to the south.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, in that consideration did the minister consider that for 15 years snowmobilers had been camping, going on family trips from the highway junction up to Banff? For 15 years they've been using that trail, and I've never heard of any severe environmental or other kinds of problems. Displacement of game — families who live in the area told me they saw no problems. The game in the area co-existed with all those snowmobiles. I understand 3,000 to 4,000 of them are there at one time.

As I understand it, the snowmobilers are willing to tighten their ground rules and just have a trail through the park on an experimental basis. Is the minister willing to consider that? I'm not sure at the moment — maybe the minister can advise me — is the rule with regard to snowmobiles not being in parks in regulations or in actual legislation? If it's in regulations, with the Deputy Premier here, one meeting would take care of an order in council in a hurry, I'll tell you. I'm sure the Deputy Premier understands the rumbling of the grass roots. I don't think you understand.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The park is set up by regulation, right?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, the exclusion of the snowmobiling is by regulation, yes.

MR. CLARK: Then, Mr. Minister, by your own admission, you said it wasn't written on stone. Why can't you relax the regulation or exempt that portion of the park for four or five months this winter? You can do that.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, I guess it comes back to trying to build a house. We can take the basement out from under and see what happens if we haven't got it half-way up. You've got a program where we are in fact working on a five-year basis accelerated to provide a major new outdoor recreation opportunity for the people of Alberta, and the families of Alberta, be they individual or otherwise. Certainly that's what we're attempting to do. Until such time as we've got that part basically in place, working in the Country, which is the flexibility we have there — and I appreciate the hon. member raising the question and shaking his head, but in the same sense that flexibility is there. We're prepared to meet with them or any other group relative to any of the other ones. But when it comes to the park in relation to all the 52 parks we have in place, at the moment I'm not prepared to change.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. It's unfortunate that you couldn't watch the television in this area a couple of hours from now and re-examine those answers you're giving, Mr. Minister. One, you generalize about flexibility; secondly, you generalize about our trying to do the things the people want, doing all these things for people. Three thousand families on snowmobiles — or they represent that many families — what about them? What about

considering this simple little thing, the possibility of driving through the corner of the park?

You're just saying, no, that's not the way we want to do it. But I think you should reconsider what a lot of people in this province are saying at the present time. Your own members are telling you that. There's a message there.

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Chairman, I get the feeling that we're hearing points of view being expressed and that the points of view of many people in my constituency aren't being expressed. I personally make no apologies for the fact that snowmobiles are excluded from provincial parks, and I commend the minister for the stand he has taken.

I suggest to those members who are saying they should be listening to the people that, although I respect the point of view of many of the snowmobilers in my constituency, they should listen to the rest of the people also. I would suggest they come door-to-door with me and ask the people what they think about it. I think you'll find there's overwhelming support across this province for the position we have taken.

However, in saying that, it's been said over and over again here tonight that Kananaskis Country is for all the people. That's exactly what the minister is doing. Kananaskis Country has received a lot of planning in that regard. Opportunities are there for every type of outdoor recreation, and the minister has explained very clearly that facilities are being provided for snowmobilers.

I support that, and I support even more facilities for snowmobilers. These things are coming, but I think we have to take into consideration what all the people want. There have to be opportunities there for everybody. That's what the minister is doing and I support him 100 per cent.

Thank you.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. In light of the kinds of answers we've had this evening, can you give us a detailed breakdown of how the \$24 million is going to be spent this year?

MR. ADAIR: I'm not sure what the reference, "in light of the answers" was, but I'll attempt to do that for you. These are rounded off, if I might. Instead of \$3,998 million, it will be \$4 million. In the major projects: Kananaskis Country, \$4.8 million; the golf course, \$1.9 million; the alpine village concept, \$1.1 million; the regional road service, \$10.2 million; the utilities for the park and the area, \$1.5 million; planning and administration, \$0.75 million. That comes to \$24.3 million.

MR. CLARK: The first one was \$4.8 million. What are you going to do with that \$4.8 million?

MR. ADAIR: Smith-Dorrien/Highwood day-use area, \$100,000; special user facilities, \$290,000; park visitor centre, \$500,000; interpretive facility at Highwood, \$95,000; Boulton Creek campground and store, approximately \$1 million; back-country trails and campsites, \$450,000; facility zone trails, \$100,000; staff accommodation, \$860,000; park water system, \$343,000; Inverlake day-use area,

\$200,000; Mud Lake campground, \$30,000; and the Canyon Creek campground, \$30,000.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Minister, do you happen to have an extra copy of that?

MR. ADAIR: No, I don't.

MR. CLARK: Perhaps you could get one. Could you?

MR. ADAIR: I possibly could. It's one I've had made for me. If you'd like my writing . . .

MR. CLARK: I could be prepared to have a look at it.

Then perhaps you'd explain the \$1.9 million for the golf course and also what kind of timetable you're looking at there, who's doing the design work, when you expect it to be finished, and the studies you had done to indicate how many days of the year you can expect people to be able to golf in that area.

MR. ADAIR: I haven't got all those questions in that order, but I'll attempt to answer them. If I've missed one, just let me know. I'm sure you will.

Presently in the Kananaskis golf course itself will be the clearing; the work on the topsoil in the area so we have that on the fairways — and that involves the earthwork that moves the topsoil in and begins to shape the greens — the drainage area involved in that; the greens, tees, bunkers, traps, and waterholes; the irrigation and pumping system; the bridges and flood-control program; utilities, roads, and fences; and other miscellaneous equipment. That basically covers the golf course. Hopefully it will be opened mid-1982. That's what we're aiming at right now, if the weather is on track so we can carry it out. Robert Trent Jones was the golf course design architect.

AN HON. MEMBER: His background?

MR. ADAIR: I haven't got it with me right now, but I can provide it. He is world renowned, has been heavily involved in golf course design all over the world, just recently signed to do the first golf course in Russia, and is in the process of finalizing one in the Middle East. One of the first golf courses he ever worked on as a young architect was the Banff course here in Alberta. I believe he has worked on something like a hundred and some golf courses in all of Canada, not just in the province of Alberta; certainly a most qualified man to provide that service to us for the golf course.

Did I miss some questions?

MR. CLARK: Perhaps, but we can go back over *Hansard* tomorrow.

Mr. Minister, can you indicate to me how far they're bringing in the topsoil? The reason I ask this is that it's been drawn to my attention that we're going to be hauling topsoil for the golf course some 50 to 60 miles. Is that right?

MR. ADAIR: No, that's not right.

MR. CLARK: Where is it coming from?

MR. ADAIR: The immediate area of the golf course site itself. I don't mean to sound facetious, but it would be probably within a half mile of the region of

the actual site itself. Do you want that in yards, inches, or . . . No, a half mile of the actual golf course itself. At one time we were anticipating we would have some troubles with topsoil. That has not materialized.

MR. CLARK: And the weather?

MR. ADAIR: I'm sorry. What?

MR. CLARK: How many days are you going to be able to use the place?

MR. ADAIR: I have that information. I don't have it right with me at the moment. I'll get it for you and respond.

MR. BRADLEY: I'd just like to comment on the remarks by the hon. Member for Little Bow, with regard to the question of snowfall statistics in the Castle area compared to a comparable area in the Kananaskis Country. The mean winter precipitation in the Castle River valley happens to be 34 inches of rain, or approximately 340 inches of snowfall. The average snowfall statistics for the Fortress Mountain ski resort are 305 to 457 centimetres of snow, perhaps a little bit less than the 340 inches in the Castle valley.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, that's fine to give the statistics on a mean average, but one year varies from another. That's the statistic I'm interested in.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Minister, you said the golf course would be finished in '82. What did you say the total cost would be?

MR. ADAIR: The total cost of the golf course as outlined for 27 holes will be roughly \$4.5 million.

Going back to your question about the number of user-days, it's estimated the average number of rounds that can be played per season is 20,000-plus. That's taking into consideration the somewhat higher elevation but the longer periods of direct sunlight in that particular area. Then taking a 5 per cent loss off that, that still comes to 20,000-plus rounds of golf.

MR. CLARK: What is the anticipated operating cost for the course each year?

MR. ADAIR: It's anticipated approximately five years down the road from the golf course going into operation it will carry itself. Initially it may have operating costs between \$115,000 and \$300,000.

MR. CLARK: So we're looking at 27 holes, \$4.5 million, possibly 20,000 18-hole rounds a year, if I can use that term. It's being designed by this Robert Trent Jones, and you'll get us the information as to where he's from, what fee we'll be paying him, and where his head office is.

MR. ADAIR: Yes. I think his head office is in Trenton, New Jersey. Is that not right? His sub-office is in Calgary, Alberta. I'll have to get you the other figures on the exact costs; I don't have them at my fingertips. His fee is \$365,000 or \$385,000.

Agreed to:

Recreation, Parks and Wildlife

1 — Kananaskis Country Recreation

Development

\$24,316,000

Farming For The Future

Agriculture

1 — Farming for the Future Program

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, members will recall that in April of this year I announced the formation of the Agricultural Research Council of Alberta. After its formation, Mr. Chairman, the council spent a great deal of time reviewing the priorities with respect to agricultural research to be carried out under the farming for the future program and developed a fairly comprehensive set of guidelines and terms of reference with respect to the program, copies of which will be provided to all members of the Assembly.

During the course of the summer months, a large number of applications have been received by the council. Each application received has been allocated to one of eight program committees structured under the Agricultural Research Council for review and recommendation by those program committees to the council. I should point out that the chairman of each of the program committees is a member of the council.

In that regard I have to express my thanks and appreciation to the producer members and others on the council who have taken a great deal of time in terms of working on the program committees, particularly throughout the last three months. Those producer members, if members will recall, are Lud Prudec of Bow Island, Mel Richards of Olds, Walter Van de Walle of Legal, Clare Anderson of Barrhead, Gerry Hachey of Falher, Johnny Vos of Keg River, and of course the MLA for Lloydminster and me, who might be considered as producer members as well.

Mr. Chairman, the situation at the present time is that I had hoped, during this discussion, to be able to indicate the number of applications that had been approved by the committee. Unfortunately we have not had an opportunity to finalize the applications which have been received at this time. However, the committee is meeting all day next Wednesday, November 1. I'm hopeful that at that time we will be able to conclude our discussion and, shortly thereafter, make announcements with regard to a number of research programs that are being carried out.

I'd like to just indicate briefly where we're at in terms of applications. We have eight committees, the first one being the cereal and oil seeds committee that reviews applications that we feel fall into that category; we've received 29 applications. Under the forages committee we've received a further 29 applications; under special crops, four applications; under the beef and dairy cattle committee, 27 applications; under poultry, sheep, and swine, six applications; under processing, transportation, and marketing, 33 applications; under land use and soils, 24 applications; and under apiculture and entomology, five applications; for a total of 157 different projects which have been submitted to the farming for the future council for review and consideration. I hope members can appreciate the fact that because of the

extensive number of projects that have been submitted, we're required to take a little longer in terms of sorting them out, placing them in priorities, and making judgment decisions on them.

The only other thing I should say in concluding, Mr. Chairman, is that I do not expect that we will allocate the \$2 million for the current fiscal year. I rather expect that the amount will be somewhat less than that, perhaps half.

Bear in mind that most projects coming to us are from three to five years in duration. So if in fact we were to approve, say, \$1 million this year for funding of projects that begin shortly, in effect we are committing not \$1 million but \$5 million to the program if it is of five years in duration. There's no doubt we will probably be in a situation in year three of the program where we will catch up on the funds that may not be allocated in the first year and may have some variations in terms of the \$10 million over five years, in that it will see its heavy use period in probably the third and fourth years.

Mr. Chairman, if there are some questions I would be pleased to try to answer them. Those are my comments with regard to the program.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just one brief question to the minister. Mr. Minister, I take it that as soon as the projects are agreed upon you'll get copies to all MLAs of which projects have been approved and the expectation and purpose of each.

Mr. Minister, would you also just briefly outline to us the question of co-ordination. The minister will recall that in the past I have raised this question of co-ordination between the federal research institutions, namely Beaverlodge because initially you talked about this being primarily aimed at northern agriculture research, also the universities, and the agriculture research trust that's been in operation for, I guess, 12 to 15 years in the province.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, yes, as soon as I can I'll try to provide a list of the projects which have been approved. I don't want to prejudge what the committee is going to do on Wednesday, November 1. I am hopeful we can conclude some discussions, but it may be that I will have to call the committee back for another day before we can finalize that. But if the Legislature is not sitting, as soon as those approvals are made I will undertake to let all MLAs know.

If one reviews the terms of reference we have developed, I think you'll see that we've taken a great deal of trouble to try to be absolutely sure that we don't get into an area of duplication, where we're simply wasting our funds, you might say. As well, we have considered the matter of this farming for the future dollar fund replacing other funding that might normally be carried out by the federal government or the universities. I have been very strong with all those organizations in saying that this is not a fund for you to replace something you want to cut out of your budget. I have said to the federal Minister of Agriculture and some of his staff, and indeed to the dean of the faculty of forestry and agriculture of the University of Alberta: we're not here with this fund to replace dollars that you want to take out of research and put into something else. So to the best of my ability I'm trying to control the kind of thing that could happen there.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, just one quick question to the minister. Is the private sector still involved with the Alberta Research Council, as it has been in the past on a contributing base? Is it still involved with the Agricultural Research Council on a contributing basis, as it has been in the past? Or because of the funding we're putting in have they dropped out of the picture?

MR. MOORE: Well, this is a new committee involving these funds. We have representation on the farming for the future Agricultural Research Council of Alberta from the Alberta Research Council. They are represented on the committee; they're at every meeting. We know what they're doing. Indeed it's possible that some of the projects being carried out will be carried out by the Alberta Research Council.

MR. PURDY: I think the minister is not getting the drift of my question. Grants that come to the Alberta Research Council for distribution on various projects are funded by the government and by the private sector. So much comes in from the private sector to put moneys into that. Is that still the method, as it was years ago? Even last year I think money from the private sector came into that.

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member may be confusing the Alberta Research Council with the Agricultural Research Council of Alberta, and I had some misgivings about using that name. I'm not aware of the method of operation of the Alberta Research Council in terms of how they

allocate funds or do projects. I'm only aware of their relationship with the Agricultural Research Council that administers the farming for the future program. They have a member on our Agricultural Research Council simply to assure that there isn't duplication of persons asking for funds or research being carried out by them in some other agency that we might allocate funds to.

Agriculture

Agreed to:

Farming for the Future Program	\$2,000,000
--------------------------------	-------------

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress on the same, and requests leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 10:33 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]

