

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Friday, November 6, 1981 10:00 a.m.

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 78

Petroleum Incentives Program Act

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 78, the Petroleum Incentives Program Act. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the principal purpose of this Bill is to establish a fund from which we will be making the petroleum incentive payments we undertook to make in the energy agreement of September 1, 1981. The Bill also contains provisions whereby we will be able to get the information required to make an assessment of the amount of payments to be made, and contains provisions whereby that information would, in the appropriate circumstances, be kept confidential.

[Leave granted; Bill 78 read a first time]

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased today to be able to introduce to the Legislative Assembly some very special guests visiting the province on the Canada/France student exchange program. Nine students travelled from France on an arrangement to spend three months here in Alberta. A reciprocal arrangement has been agreed to, where the Canadian and Alberta students will travel to France and spend three months there as well. This is the first time for the Canada/France exchange program, one which I think is significant in terms of the understanding of language and culture between France and Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the students today are Valerie Rodriguez, Philippa Beck, Waiva Moore, Marie-Luce Feugier, Philippe Bonte, Nadege Ravaux, Florence Dalmau, Sylvie Pichon, Isabelle LeCharpentier and, of course, my daughter Carolyn Johnston. I would ask them to stand and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege this morning to introduce to you and to the House some 38 young grade 6 Albertans from Fox Creek. They've come a long way to watch the session this morning. They're seated in the members gallery, and I ask them to rise with their teacher and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise and introduce some guests this morning, the second time

I've been able to do this in my time in the Legislature. It is very appropriate that these students have come from Foremost, and two from Quebec, to be in the Legislature on such an important day as today, with the activities that happened in Ottawa yesterday.

I would like to introduce 29 high school students from Foremost, accompanied by their teacher Molly Stafford. As I've said, in that group are two exchange students from Quebec and two chaperones. I had the names all written down, and I thought I could do a really good job of pronouncing in French the names of the two girls from Quebec. You know, we all have this problem in this Legislature. We pack in mounds of paper, and it's never the right one. So, I ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the opportunity to introduce through you to the Assembly two distinguished members of the Calgary city council visiting us this morning, Alderman Brian Lee and Alderman Craig Reid. Would they please stand and receive the welcome.

head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Department of

Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'll start by filing with the Assembly the copy of the agreement reached yesterday in Ottawa among the nine provinces and the federal government, together with a copy of the amending formula for Canada. Copies will be distributed to all members of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, a truly historic agreement was reached yesterday in Canada, as nine provinces and the federal government agreed to guarantee Canada its own constitution. This agreement provides for the patriation of our constitution with an amending formula and a charter of fundamental rights and freedoms.

The Alberta position on all aspects of the constitutional debate was based around carefully considered and fully debated principles of constitutional change. Our position was outlined in Harmony in Diversity, a document now well known to the people of Alberta and to Canadians as a whole. Our adherence to these principles is shown in the constitutional accord signed yesterday.

It is significant to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Alberta amending formula is the amending formula now included in our constitution. [applause] This Legislative Assembly debated the amending formula, and the principles framed in that debate are now part of the basic law of our country. All provinces have equal constitutional status, and the existing rights, proprietary interest, and jurisdiction of a province cannot be diminished without the consent of the province.

Because of our long-standing position to provide protection to the fundamental rights and freedoms of the people of Alberta, we agreed to the entrenchment of a charter of rights and freedoms. To ensure legislative supremacy, we argued and received a "notwithstanding clause", which enables a legislative body to enact expressly that a particular provision of an Act will be valid, notwithstanding the fact that it conflicts with a specific provision of the charter of rights and freedoms. We agreed that a notwithstanding clause would have to be reviewed and renewed every five years by our Legislature

if it was to remain in force.

The decision of the government of Quebec not to agree to the principles of the package is most unfortunate. They could not accept the amending formula and certain parts of the charter of rights and freedoms. Yet, with nine provinces and the federal government in agreement, a consensus is clearly formed and we can move now with a Canadian constitution.

We have resolved a century-old Canadian problem here in Canada, among the governments of the provinces and the federal government. The past four days were an indication of how governments should operate to resolve questions of national concern without the threat of unilateral action or coercion.

I want to express our appreciation to members of the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, and to the Attorney General's Department, but in particular to my department, which has been involved in this debate for some time and certainly since the formation of the department in 1973. I believe the decision to form that department then, with a very broad mandate and with broad policy responsibilities, has now been reinforced by the decision we reached yesterday.

This is truly a significant day for our country, our province, and this Legislative Assembly. Canada will now have its own constitution founded on principles understood by the people of Alberta, as reflected through the resolution of this Assembly.

The Canadian federal system, as reflected in this constitutional accord, will be maintained.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [applause]

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Constitution

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Premier or the minister who negotiated and worked in terms of the constitution. I would like to say that yesterday in the Assembly, I endorsed the move and supported the fact that the Premier and the minister have worked with other premiers and the Prime Minister of Canada to reach consensus at this point in time. I mention that only in that I haven't responded directly to the minister today.

With regard to the charter of rights, could the Premier indicate whether, in terms of the negotiation and discussion that went on, there was a change in Alberta's stance with regard to the charter of rights? In reading the document *Harmony in Diversity*, there was a strong feeling that rights of Albertans should be protected by the Alberta Bill of Rights. Now we have supported the charter of rights entrenched in the new constitution. Is the province of Alberta able to support that position now because of the notwithstanding clause that is going into the constitutional document?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to respond. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition is aware, the document *Harmony in Diversity*, page 22, refers to the fact that after we came to office we as a government introduced our first Bill, the Alberta Bill of Rights and, secondly, The Individual's Rights Protection Act. The hon. Leader of the Opposition will remember that debate in 1972 when we discussed at length the notwithstanding clause and its significance and importance. So when we presented *Harmony in Diversity* during the fall of 1978,

we stated on page 22 that "The principle of legislative supremacy would be undermined." We did that recognizing that over the course of the debate we anticipated would flow, we had opened the opportunity to accept a charter of fundamental rights, legal rights and equality rights, proposed by the Prime Minister, provided legislative supremacy would not be undermined.

During the conferences on the constitution in 1978, 1979, and again in 1980 — my gosh, that's a lot of conferences — in discussing that matter, as the record of 1979 indicates, I raised with the Prime Minister the idea that to maintain the supremacy of the legislatures, the answer was to bring in a notwithstanding provision. In the documents that have been tabled, which I hope will be circulated to Members of the Legislative Assembly, there is an explanation prepared by the conference secretariat with regard to what a notwithstanding clause means, in the sense that we can pass a piece of legislation that states that notwithstanding the Canadian charter of rights, such and such will apply. It was our view, and we studied it very carefully in consultation with a number of other provinces, that to maintain the supremacy of the legislatures across this country and to avoid many of the defects of the American system, that was fundamental to our position at this conference.

When I first raised it with the Prime Minister at that '79 conference, as I believe I mentioned in my remarks in the Legislature on October 15, he took 24 hours of interest in the subject, then decided the next day that he wouldn't find it acceptable. Over the course of the last number of days, we continued to press it. Next to the issue of the amending formula, this was the second most important aspect of our position. We pressed it forward. We received the support of a number of other provinces. In due course, as the hon. leader is aware, it now appears within the final accord.

So the concern we state in *Harmony in Diversity*, that the principle of legislative supremacy would be undermined, has been overcome by the notwithstanding provisions. I think that's a very important step forward for the country.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in terms of the consideration of the notwithstanding clause, could the Premier indicate in a preliminary way whether legislation will be brought forward in the province of Alberta that would have this notwithstanding clause? Could the Premier indicate areas that would be under consideration for such type of legislation?

MR. LOUGHEED: That is an important question, Mr. Speaker. The answer is that there are none. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition is aware, we have this similar provision in the Alberta Bill of Rights. For 10 years now, we have not passed a notwithstanding provision. As I'm sure members of the Legislature are aware, we've considered it on a number of occasions but have not passed it. But it does provide that residual protection of the supremacy of the Legislature.

At this stage we have contemplated nothing at all, but we are conscious of the American experience. The judicial interpretation of the charter and the wording — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, if I'm going into too much length. The wording of the charter is somewhat different from the wording of our Alberta Bill of Rights, and it is possible that there could be some judicial interpretation — in any part of the country, frankly — which would not be in accordance with the views of this Legislature, as to

the appropriate social or other policies as we perceive them for the citizens.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier with regard to Alberta's position relative to the referendum. There was a very strong statement from the Premier indicating that the referendum could bring about divisiveness in Canada. In an earlier Legislature here, we had a referendum Bill and discussed the possibility of the use of referenda for certain purposes. I wonder if the Premier could indicate why the change of attitude, if there was one, and the circumstances surrounding that referendum discussion.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that point certainly requires clarification. When we introduced the referendum legislation last fall, we did it reluctantly and only for the purpose of a defensive position relative to the referendum provisions contained within the original proposal by the Prime Minister on October 2, 1980, relative to the amending formula. We felt we would have to have — or might need to have, is a better way of putting it — referendum legislation in this province, to ensure that if such a referendum situation occurred two years from the date of proclamation of the new Canada Act, we could respond in an effective defensive way. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition is aware — and I'm not sure whether I was asked this question in the fall or late last spring — the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and I advised the House that it was not our intention to proceed with that legislation at this time.

The position taken Wednesday on the referendum was very important. The Prime Minister had proposed that the provinces sign a document that concurred with two referenda, one with regard to the amending formula. To sweeten the picture, so to speak, he said he would put in the April accord and the Victoria charter, and it would be either or. But the vote would not be by provinces but by regions. If it were defeated in any one of the four regions, we would return to the deadlock position, as he described it, of unanimity.

We opposed that for three reasons. Number one was because we believe that referendum divides this country in a serious way. We believe it divides it even more if it is done regionally, and certainly we don't accept the idea that a referendum that ignores the position of the provinces should be counted. With regard to that referendum, we also felt that it would cause great tension within Canada.

The second aspect of his proposal was another referendum that had to do with the charter of rights, and that was an either/or situation. In our judgment, that either/or situation would again cause problems, perhaps very serious problems in the province of Quebec, but also in the rest of Canada.

So Alberta took a strong position in resisting Wednesday afternoon's initiatives by the Prime Minister to resolve the impasse through referendum. It wouldn't have changed the substance of his Bill one iota if we had signed that agreement, but it would have given legitimacy to our participating in the process and would have precluded us from taking any advantage of the Supreme Court of Canada decision and presenting our position before the United Kingdom Parliament, if we were forced to do so. So that approach by the Prime Minister was essentially defeated by the premiers.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier with regard to the final consensus where the province of Quebec, led by Premier Levesque, only allowed 10 governments to sign the agreement, and Premier Levesque was unable to. I wonder if the Premier could explain the situations where Premier Levesque disagreed. And where are the potential areas of future negotiations that could bring Premier Levesque into the consensus so that we have 11 governments as signatories to the agreement.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I spent quite a bit of time with Mr. Levesque yesterday morning, trying to convince him to sign the accord. As I understood it, and as he stated in his closing remarks in open, televised conference, he had two objections to the accord.

The first one had to do with mobility rights. He felt that mobility rights could be used by the federal government as the thin edge of the wedge in expanding into what the Prime Minister, in the summer of 1980, referred to as the powers over the economy, which would mean a very significant intrusion into provincial jurisdiction. In our assessment and in our legal advice, we in Alberta did not feel that that was a realistic concern of Mr. Levesque. Both in private discussions and in the meetings where the ministers and officials were in attendance, I said to Mr. Levesque that if that was his sole concern, surely, as we did with Newfoundland — and as the hon. Leader of the Opposition can see in the document now before him, we responded to the Newfoundland concern — we could have had wording that would have responded to the concerns of Quebec.

The second objection, which I believe was the major objection of Quebec as stated, was that if a province opts out, pursuant to the amending formula that Alberta presented at the discussions in Vancouver during the summer of 1980, financial compensation should be provided to that province. The Prime Minister and other provinces took serious objection to the view that a province, Alberta, could opt out and be compensated by the federal taxpayer for opting out.

We, on Alberta's behalf, had never argued that in the opting out we should be entitled to compensation for that. We take that as a matter of jurisdiction, not a matter of compensation. But in the events leading up to April 16, Mr. Levesque and his government argued that if they were giving up their veto, which was traditionally theirs under the proposed Victoria Charter, they needed to be protected by this fiscal equivalent provision that appears in the amending document the hon. Leader of the Opposition has.

I tried to argue with Mr. Levesque that the realities of Canada would make his concern really not credible, because I can't see a situation — and in his closing statements, the Prime Minister underlined this — where a province such as Quebec would opt out of a situation and fairness would dictate that compensation would flow, either by not taxing the citizens of Quebec or in fact providing compensation in some other way. And the Canada Pension Plan of the early '50s, I guess — maybe I don't have my dates right — was certainly an example of that. But I don't want to prescribe motives to Mr. Levesque; he simply wasn't prepared to accept that argument.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the hon. leader's final supplementary for the time being, followed by a supplementary by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, the hon.

Member for Edmonton Norwood, the hon. Member for Edson, and the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, in that order.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. At the conclusion of the conference, was there any type of strategy, plan, or suggestion by Mr. Levesque as Premier as to responsibilities he would take to try to go back and talk to his people in Quebec, then again have discussions with the Prime Minister and the Premier to try to reach an accord or consensus with Canada at the present time?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no indication was provided to me, either directly or indirectly, that that would occur. As I think I've expressed on other occasions in this Legislature, I've been concerned, as an outsider observing the referendum debate in Quebec in the spring of 1980, that many Quebecers thought the new constitutional proposals were going to provide Quebec with a new deal in Confederation and would strengthen their provincial governments, in relationship to being in a country in which they were a French-speaking minority and an English-speaking majority in Ottawa. The proposals Mr. Trudeau presented to Canada on October 2, 1980, even as amended, still do not have any significant shift of additional responsibilities or jurisdiction to the province of Quebec, with the understanding clearly across Canada that if it had done so, it would have had to apply to all provinces.

So I believe the Prime Minister will have to struggle with the dilemma that now exists in the country. I don't know how we in the other provinces can do more than we did to try to ensure that Quebec remained within the atmosphere of the accord signed yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

Might I just interject. It would seem likely to me that all members who have indicated their wish to ask questions would wish to ask supplementary questions in regard to the constitution. On that assumption, I would propose to recognize members in the ordinary way, and I would respectfully suggest that possibly the supplementaries be limited to two or, at the most, three per member. We have less than half an hour left in the question period, and of course it remains to be seen whether the Assembly might wish to extend that by unanimous consent.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question deals with Item 5 on the consensus, dealing with a future conference to deal with constitutional matters that directly affect the aboriginal rights of Canadians. In the course of the conference, what were the circumstances that led up to that agreement? Can the Premier give an undertaking that his government will sit down with the native leaders of the province at an early date to attempt to work out what one might see as an Alberta position which would go as far as possible to see that the government's position and the native people of Alberta would be on course, if I could use the term?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd refer that particular question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, just by way of clarification, first of all we don't have the final drafting of some of these sections, and how they will be handled remains

uncertain at this point. But on principle, in referring to Section 5 which the Member for Olds-Didsbury questioned, the following will be the rough understanding as I see it. First of all, the section with respect to native rights will remain in the charter. That Section 25 refers to the existing treaty and aboriginal rights. Those will not be changed. Those are transitional provisions.

Secondly, the section which provides for an agreement among first ministers to meet to deal with the question of aboriginal rights will continue, but instead of a two-year period we'll deal with a one-year period. Obviously, that will compress the objective of finding a resolution of the continuing problem of native Canadians here in Alberta, and in Canada in general.

I think it is fair to say that the reason this was left out of the first ministers' consideration was the clear position taken by Indian brotherhoods, provincially and federally, in a general way, that they objected to the way their non-treaty or aboriginal rights were being recognized in the current charter. With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, it was agreed that we find some way to accommodate their objectives, their problems, and their concerns. I think it's fair to say that the province of Alberta has always been willing to meet and discuss their positions with the various groups here in Alberta, and certainly will undertake to do that as well in the next year.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Premier. In his reply to one of the questions of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, he referred to the Supreme Court decision on the constitution. I wonder if the hon. Premier could perhaps expand a little with respect to the impact or role that decision played in bringing about the consensus with all members, bearing in mind that the Prime Minister had consistently taken the position that he had the legal right to act unilaterally, what aspects in fact brought about a change of his position, and the entire role of the decision of the Supreme Court.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that's a very important question. I think the very fact that in the opening statements the three parties — the federal government and the provinces of Ontario and New Brunswick — did not in any way mention the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada and that the other eight provinces mentioned it significantly, indicated to me and continued to indicate to me, as I mentioned in the Legislature on October 15, that the judgment was very strong and was weighing heavily upon the Prime Minister, in terms of reaching a conclusion that he would have to make some significant changes. I would say that the fact that the resolution was not concluded by the House of Commons or the Parliament of Canada prior to that judgment, as a result of efforts made by the Official Opposition party in the House of Commons, certainly was a very major factor in creating the pressures upon the Prime Minister to make the very significant modifications that were in fact made yesterday.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I have one further supplementary, perhaps for clarification. When the Premier dealt with the matter of Quebec's position with regard to the final amending formula and referred that Quebec had given up its veto rights as had been provided in the Victoria formula, does the hon. Premier have any assessment of whether — apart from having given up that favorable position — the amending formula will leave

Quebec in a poorer economic situation insofar as the position they now have, if there were a situation where they took a position of opting out, apart from the additional benefits that might be proposed in some new programming or policy? Would not agreeing to accept that policy leave Quebec in a poorer position than they are today, insofar as the structure now exists? Is the hon. Premier able to clarify that?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, that goes to the nub of the issue. Those are the two points of view. It's my view — because we've never argued for it here in this province — that if a province opts out under what's now going to be the amending formula, it opts out of recognizing that if there's an element of federal compensation paid for by the federal taxpayers of Canada, the province will have to, in due course in its Legislature, accept that reality.

The other side of the reality, however, is that the history of Canada in the past — I was just mentioning to the hon. Leader of the Opposition the example of the Canada Pension Plan. The other side of the reality quite clearly is that if a province opts out of a move by the federal government to increase its jurisdiction in a particular area and the province wants to sustain its jurisdiction in that area, it has to consider that it may find additional financial responsibilities to do so. That of course has been the argument the Prime Minister made: to provide financial compensation as part of the amending accord, you create a situation where people are almost encouraged to opt out. We have never argued for it, so we went along with it.

I think it will be the crucial debate that will continue in Canada, in Ottawa, and in Quebec, as to whether or not Mr. Levesque's concerns are realistic, in the sense they are credible. To the hon. member, Mr. Speaker: with the number of seats Quebec has in the Canadian House of Commons, frankly I can't see that that's a realistic concern for that province.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, in response to the very broad nature of the whole subject and the many issues that have already been brought up, could the Premier clarify to the Assembly the objectives of the government of Alberta at the conference? Perhaps, to avoid a very obvious second supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could he give any indication of the extent those objectives were realized by the government of Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that's been answered in part by the ministerial statement, and in part by my first question from the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I believe. I'll be brief by summarizing.

We had five objectives. That the constitution be made in Canada and not made in Britain. We've accomplished that. The constitution has the Alberta amending formula, which provides for the equality of provinces, no vetoes and no second-class provinces. Thirdly, that the constitution has in it a charter that provides for the continued supremacy of the legislatures. Fourthly, that the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada is respected. And finally, that the matters of constitutional issues are not resolved by way of referendum. Those were our objectives, and those objectives were met. [applause]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to either the Premier or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. It's a clarification of the re-

sponse the hon. minister gave to the Member for Olds-Didsbury, with respect to aboriginal rights. Am I to understand from the minister's answer that the agreement does not in any way alter sections 25 and 33 of the charter?

From the concern expressed by native organizations in the country, it's my understanding that in fact these provisions are not going to be in the accord. Provision 25 of the charter deals with:

any rights or freedoms that have been recognized by the Royal Proclamation of October 7, 1763; and
any rights or freedoms that may be acquired by the aboriginal peoples of Canada by way of land claims settlement.

Section 33:

The aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed.

In this Act, "aboriginal peoples of Canada" includes the Indian, Inuit and Metis peoples of Canada.

My question very directly, so there's no misunderstanding: does the accord remove sections 25 and 33, or will these provisions of the current charter of rights be in place?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, again I must give to my answer the condition that I have not yet seen the final draft of the charter of rights to which the hon. member is referring. But in conversations this morning with my deputy minister, who has been involved in the drafting of this particular document, it is my understanding that the reference to Section 25, under the general protection the Member for Spirit River-Fairview refers to, will in fact be in. I can't confirm whether or not the words are exactly the same. That is merely a transitional provision which provides protection to existing treaties signed by governments with various Indian groups across Canada. It is my understanding that that will be remaining in.

The difficulty is with part 2 of the existing proposition by Mr. Trudeau before the Canadian House of Commons, which deals with the other sections affecting aboriginal rights. Again, it is my understanding that that section, whether it be Section 33 or Section 34, will be removed. Mr. Speaker, we will then go into the process of attempting to find a way to redraft that section or deal in some other way with the recognition of what the native people consider to be their complaints with respect to the drafting of the current proposition for the House of Commons.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods.

MR. NOTLEY: Just so there is no misunderstanding, as I follow the minister, Section 25 will be in and Section 33 will be out. Is the minister or perhaps the Premier in a position to advise the Assembly of the reasons? The minister implied that there was concern about the position taken by the National Indian Brotherhood, and The National Indian Brotherhood is reported this morning as expressing concern over the decision. Did provincial or federal representatives see any other obstacles in Section 33 being retained in the charter?

MR. JOHNSTON: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I believe the section to which the hon. member is referring is Section 34 under Part 2 of the general provisions, but I won't equivocate. The section I think he's referring to reads:

The aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed.

If that's the section he is referring to, that section will be taken out of the current proposal before Canada right now. It will be supplemented or substituted in some fashion by an agreed section, depending upon what kind of input we receive from the various groups across Canada. As I indicated earlier, that will be done within a one-year period at a first ministers' conference, where the groups will be able to present their case. I can't give any more clarification as to the mechanics, and I make the very clear caveat that I have not seen the changed resolution.

I might just note that the proposition, as I understand it, will go by an omnibus Bill which will amend the existing resolution in the House of Commons. So you must allow us at least some time to get that copy in our hands before we can be more specific. Having said that, however, I think it is fair to say that the simple reaction, as clearly expressed by the Minister of Justice, was that in his view, the way the resolution dealt with the concerns of the native people of Canada was not adequate and that we should therefore find some other vehicle or method to achieve or accomplish what they thought would be equitable in terms of their recognition, and we have committed to doing that.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. It refers to the one-year time period in which aboriginal rights will be addressed and resolved. I wonder if the minister could assure this Assembly that all due consideration will be given to avoiding an artificial deadline and a time frame that will not allow the native peoples, particularly of Alberta, to have full consideration, and that we're not just chopping it off with an undue deadline.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, obviously, in communications the Minister responsible for Native Affairs and myself have had with the various groups here in Alberta, we have always held out the commitment to discuss constitutional positions with them. You might note that there was a bit of an eclipse there, when Mr. Trudeau moved unilaterally with his own resolution. It's difficult to follow up on that commitment, because there was not much to discuss if it was a fait accompli.

Now that we've got that back on the table, I can assure you — and I'm sure the hon. minister will agree with me — that we will agree to meet. We will set down a schedule, as we committed during the previous round of discussions on the constitution. We will try to find, in fairness, the position being expressed by the groups here in Alberta. In terms of the mechanism, these groups will then have the right to meet with the first ministers, and that meeting will be described within the charter itself. It will set out ways in which this meeting will take place. I can assure you that we will work, negotiate, and deal in good faith as we have in the past.

MR. BORSTAD: My question is to the hon. Premier. Quebec could not sign the agreement, which is very unfortunate. Will there be ongoing discussions to try to bring Quebec on side?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I can only elaborate to the hon. Member for Grande Prairie from what I've said in previous answers. I would certainly hope so. I do believe that that responsibility has to rest primarily upon the Prime Minister. It is the Prime Minister who has proposed a constitutional package that doesn't provide, in the judgment of the province of Quebec, an adequate improvement in their position in the Canadian family.

With regard to the two specific concerns raised yesterday by the Premier of Quebec, both with myself in private conversations and in public with his concluding remarks, I and others will try our best, in whatever ways we can, to convince the Premier of Quebec and his government to reassess their position and that they should be able to find themselves adequately protected from the concerns they've expressed.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary Currie, followed by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, whom I previously recognized and I apologize for having overlooked.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Thank you Mr. Speaker, most of my questions have been dealt with through supplementaries. However, could I ask the hon. Premier to clarify whether or not, with respect to Quebec, there are any provisions in the new agreement which would take away their jurisdiction or any rights they currently hold?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that's precisely the important point. Under the terms of the amending formula Quebec has, as this Legislature has, protection to assure that their existing rights — proprietary rights, jurisdictional rights; all their existing rights — are maintained and sustained and cannot be taken away from them without the concurrence of the National Assembly of Quebec. That's an important protection for them, as it was fundamentally important for us.

MR. WEISS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought I was being punished for reading last night. But I can see that may not be the case.

MR. SPEAKER: May I respectfully assure the hon. member that the Speaker has an exceptionally short memory. [laughter]

MR. WEISS: My reading is very short today as well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: On a point of order. Not to detract from the seriousness of our subject, but there is much precedent in the House for reading. I think the member's actions last night were very acceptable.

MR. WEISS: I'll leave that to the decision of the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Premier. I'm sure all Albertans are very pleased that the constitution has now been resolved, similarly as they were with the energy agreement. But unlike the energy agreement where Albertans could assess how it directly or indirectly affected them, would the Premier advise — when, after 114 years, we go to a new constitution — what it really means to Albertans, to me, and to others?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the only way to answer that question is what it means to us as Canadians. It

means we have a constitution that, in terms of its future, will not be determined by a parliament in another country. It means we will have a country which will be a federal system in which provinces are respected and in which provinces are treated equally. It means we will have a constitution in which the protection of rights we have in our Alberta Bill of Rights are extended across the country. It means we have a constitution that will sustain a system in which the people who live in the regions of the country, and not in the centre of the country, can be assured, through their elected representatives, that they will have a fairer and more equitable place in the Canadian nation. That's what it means to me. And that's what I hope it means to all Canadians. [applause]

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. What method of communication will be made to see that this message goes to all Albertans?

MR. LOUGHEED: Well, I don't know if I can answer that, Mr. Speaker. I realize that Albertans are very troubled, as we all are, by national economic concerns and the problem of interest rates. Perhaps it's a subliminal matter that really gets to the soul of a person rather than to the pocketbook. I just hope that Canadians within Alberta will, over time, understand what happened yesterday and its significance.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Premier and is related to the entrenchment of minority language education rights in the charter of rights, an action that many of the residents of the Bonnyville constituency applaud. Mr. Premier, my question with respect to this entrenchment is: what are the implications for Albertans in general, and for Alberta education in particular?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, our best judgment on that important question is that we've made such significant progress in this area over the last number of years that there will not be a significant change, and that we have moved forward with our best-efforts approach to assure that there are adequate facilities and adequate instructors for those who wish instruction in the French language, where:

... the number of children of citizens who have such a right is sufficient to warrant the provision to them out of public funds of minority language [education]
...

In answer to the hon. Member for Bonnyville, I believe that is being met within the province of Alberta today. If it is not being met, for our part we certainly will commit ourselves to providing the funds to meet the full spirit of that provision.

For those who are concerned because of the multicultural nature of our province, it's important to note that the resolution also provides that:

This Charter shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canadians.

That's Clause 27. I know the hon. Member for Bonnyville has the concern within his constituency of both the multicultural nature of our province, peoples of our province, but also the minority language instruction. That's our best judgment of it, and we believe it was an important step for this province to take.

MR. ISLEY: A supplementary question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Is it possible for the notwithstanding clause to apply to the minority language education rights?

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Speaker. We considered that, but it really doesn't follow that a notwithstanding clause can apply in that particular area or in two or three of the other areas. Not to be superfluous with regard to the matter, we looked at official languages; that's federal jurisdiction. We looked at the minority language instruction and said, you can't have a notwithstanding clause there. We really didn't feel that under the democratic rights which oblige us to have elections every five years, we could have a notwithstanding clause there.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Since it is so important to all Albertans and Canadians, at many times an agreement appeared to be an impossibility. Could the minister outline to the Assembly the circumstances leading up to the final agreement reached on the constitution yesterday?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, someday I may write a book about that. But at the present time I could summarize two or three points, which I think should be reinforced for the Legislative Assembly.

First of all, as the Premier has pointed out, the clearly and carefully established principles of constitutional change to which this Assembly and the province have agreed made it relatively easy for us to debate at all levels — ministerial, premiers and, of course, official — the real essence of what might be included in a new constitution for Canada. So in that sense, I think we could clearly and safely say that there were elements of predictability and certainty as to what our position would be and how it would emerge.

Again, as I think about it over the past few hours, having come out of that tense situation, it was interesting to note that obviously various provinces continued to present new positions. They'd present them at various times. They'd evolve, emerge, and debate and, to some extent, be cast aside. But it seemed to me that they kept coming back more and more to the principles which I think our province and, to some extent, other provinces agreed to. Selective items were being taken from the other positions and added to what seemed to be this consensus which was emerging.

I think our debate, our principles, and the leadership of our Premier clearly marked the success of this conference. Without any qualifications, I give a great deal of recognition and kudos to our Premier for the leadership he provided. [applause]

MR. SPEAKER: The time for the question period has elapsed, but I have indications from not only the hon. Member for Macleod but also two other members who wish to ask their first questions on this topic and two members who wish to ask a second supplementary on the topic. What is the wish of the Assembly? Do we agree on a fixed time, or just go until the subject is complete?

AN HON. MEMBER: Leave it open.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave it open. Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. On November 3, 1978, all members of this House agreed to an Alberta constitutional position as stated in *Harmony in Diversity*. Now three years later, nearly to the date, we have a constitutional agreement. How does that final agreement differ from the position the Legislature agreed on in *Harmony in Diversity*?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to summarize that question very quickly. *Harmony in Diversity* extended itself to a number of subjects, because at that stage we were discussing a multitude of issues of division of powers. It was decided and agreed to that we would come down to three issues: patriation, amending formula, and charter of rights. I'm sorry, I should add the question of equalization and, to a degree, resources, but not in a full way. Having got to that stage, the other matters that were discussed had been put aside, under the provisions of the proposed constitutional Canada Bill, for meetings of the premiers in constitutional assembly as part of the arrangements within the proposed Canada Act.

I presume the hon. member is asking: how does the *Harmony in Diversity* document — which, subject to correction, I did think had one dissent within the House — compare with the final result? The amending formula is really the same amending formula that is set forth in the document *Harmony in Diversity*. I just want to say one thing on that, Mr. Speaker. In the fall of 1976 when we debated that amending formula, and prior to it, I was the chairman of the premiers conference' and proposed that formula. We had support from no province; we were alone. Not one single province approved that basic approach set forth in *Harmony in Diversity* and today forms the amending formula of Canada. Not one single province; we started alone.

On the question of entrenchment of rights, I believe I answered that in the answer to the first question directed to me by the Leader of the Opposition: we met it, but we met it through the use of a notwithstanding clause. We did alter our position on the basis of the entrenchment of language rights in the sense that we have agreed to accept the guarantee of minority language education rights, as I answered the recent question from the Member for Bonnyville.

So to sum up, Mr. Speaker, with that one exception I have just now mentioned, the final result in those areas in which the Canada Act applies to *Harmony in Diversity* meet *Harmony in Diversity* as presented by this government and debated in the fall of 1978.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier. I think it has already been answered in part. With regard to the notwithstanding clause in the charter, the Premier has mentioned that it does not apply with regard to minority language education and democratic rights. Could the Premier clarify if the notwithstanding clause applies to any other parts of the charter? Could the Premier also advise the Assembly as to what exactly the five-year renewal clause means, with regard to the notwithstanding clause in the charter?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to. I'd refer the hon. member and other hon. members to the fact sheet attached to the documents circulated today. That document was prepared by the secretariat during the course of the afternoon. I believe it's accurate. It men-

tions the Alberta Bill of Rights there.

The notwithstanding clause applies to three areas of the charter: fundamental rights, legal rights, and equality rights, and those three only. The five-year sunset provision was a suggestion by the Prime Minister yesterday morning — I'd better choose my words carefully here — with a view of perhaps anticipating that it might not be acceptable to Alberta and other provinces that wished a notwithstanding provision. I fairly quickly told him that I thought it was a very good idea and should have been included in our own Alberta Bill of Rights in the first place.

What it means, because we did spend some time in clarifying it, is that if, say, two years from now we passed a Bill which said that notwithstanding the Canadian charter of rights, such and such will apply, from the date that Bill is proclaimed it only has a five-year duration. At the end of the five years, it would automatically lapse. The Legislature could renew it at that time, or it could allow it to lapse. I think it is a good idea, because it forces you to go back and look again at whether what you thought was so pressing and important in 1983 is as pressing and important in 1988.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier. We did have the opportunity to endorse the government's position on the constitution. I wonder if the Premier has given any consideration to letting this Legislature endorse, in some short method, the agreement signed yesterday.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I believe there is some merit to that. I just haven't had time to think about how, and the approach to it. I'd like to reserve the answer to have a discussion with the Government House Leader over the weekend. Perhaps we could respond to that suggestion on Monday.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to either the hon. Premier or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. It flows from the question from the hon. Member for Bonnyville, with regard to minority rights and education. Does the charter of rights in any way alter the rights and privileges of minorities to form separate school systems which presently exist in the province of Alberta under the Alberta Act of 1905?

MR. JOHNSTON: Again, Mr. Speaker, I would have to caution that I haven't read how these sections will emerge specifically. But I'm sure that it will give the commitment that it will not, and we'll confirm that in checking with the Attorney General's Department. It is my understanding now that it will not detract from the rights of the separate school system in Alberta.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. The Prime Minister is intending to pass the Canada Act prior to the budget coming down next Thursday. I wonder if that causes any concern to the province of Alberta, or the Premier, at this time.

MR. LOUGHEED: It has been causing me, and I would have thought some other provinces, considerable concern. I have not yet been able to understand why the budget was deferred until after the meeting of the provinces. I believe I did mention in this House a week or so ago that that caused me — and I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition — some apprehension. Unless there is a de-

ferral of the federal budget, though — and I'm not up to date on this — I would think that the nature of the revised or amended resolution would result in debate in the Canadian House of Commons that would extend after the budget. It will be interesting to see that, but that's our best reading of the circumstances as of today.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. It arises from some words found in the clause and section dealing with mobility rights, as found in the agreement signed yesterday. My question is very specific. Would Alberta be able to continue legally to initiate job opportunity programs that discriminate in favor of people who are identified as "socially and economically disadvantaged individuals"?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I can answer that question by saying yes, we will be able to protect that objective. The change in the mobility rights section in the charter was to recognize the problems that some economically developing provinces have, in that they would like to assure that job opportunities remain open to their own citizens. I think that's a fair responsibility which was quite important to at least three or four provinces. But to move around that test, we agreed that we would essentially take the mobility section and add to it a provision that the mobility section would apply until some measurement of economic activity, such as rate of unemployment or level of employment, could be confirmed.

None the less, that section will not prevent a province from undertaking affirmative action programs for socially or economically disadvantaged individuals, providing that some minimum test is met.

MR. KOWALSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister identify which government will identify those socially and economically disadvantaged individuals? Will it be the federal or the provincial government?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I imagine it will be done by the provincial governments, since in fact it is their responsibility.

MR. KOWALSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, again to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Would this clause dealing with mobility rights prohibit a province from initiating a provincial preference with respect to hiring employees for the public service?

MR. JOHNSTON: I would have to say that I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. Again, once you get into the words and the interpretation, it's left to the courts. I can't predict totally what will happen in terms of the interpretation, obviously. I think it's safe to say that at this point we would not expect any problems in the province of Alberta. Our position has been that we would respect the movement of people within Canada to job opportunities and, on top of that, we'd try to establish opportunities for these disadvantaged groups through our own affirmative action programs. So I don't see any conflict with what the province of Alberta would do. And with respect to the question of the member, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I don't see any problem at all with what the province of Alberta would continue to do, in terms of our approaches.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. It really deals with the issue of aboriginal rights, but the general approach of the government on the matter. In response to the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier indicated that the resolution would be coming before Parliament. Of course, as a resolution before Parliament, it's quite possible that amendments could be put to it. I'm also given to understand that the native organizations will be emphasizing their concern about Section 33 and asking that Section 33 of the original charter be reinstituted.

My question to the Premier is simply this: is the government's continued support for the accord reached in Ottawa contingent upon Parliament not reincorporating Section 33 of the charter?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how to answer that question. It was an accord which was signed yesterday. I don't believe there would be any prospect of altering that. I certainly got that impression from the Prime Minister. Representations may be made in Parliament on the point raised by the hon. member, but I would think our position would have to remain in the way the Minister of Federal and Intergovernment Affairs responded to it this morning, subject to any further consideration.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

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

ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVINGS TRUST FUND CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION 1982-83 ESTIMATES OF PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

Department of Recreation and Parks

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the minister any opening comments?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I have today — and I wish to have the pages now distribute them — Kananaskis folders for each member. As I've travelled the province this last year, I've been asked a number of questions in regard to Kananaskis. People are saying: what are you doing there; what is our progress; how do I see it helping Albertans? They ask me to provide to them in some way a story of what it's all about and what we have.

Let me begin with an update. I read my opening comments in my report to the House last year, and I noticed I made a commitment to bring the members up to date on what we're doing and on our progress. If I may, I'd like to start again from the beginning and suggest that I will try to review what has taken place from October 1977 to March 31, 1981.

If we go back, Mr. Chairman, we'll recall that on October 7, 1977, the Premier had a news release which announced an exciting new concept of recreation facilities and opportunities for Albertans. Its planning was that we would provide a modest beginning of some \$40 million —

in 1977 dollars, of course. This concept was unequalled in any part of Canada, something we had no experience to gather from, and no other plans even close to what was anticipated in Kananaskis Country.

The government proceeded to an approach to get all Albertans involved. They set up the Kananaskis Citizens' Advisory Committee, a group of dedicated Albertans chaired by Bryan Targett. This group has held discussions and interviews and received comments, suggestions, and concerns from all Albertans across the province. As a matter of fact, I met with them last Tuesday. They were at it again, very seriously trying to help and make sure Albertans were totally knowledgeable of what was taking place in the Kananaskis area. Our colleague the Member for Pincher Creek-Crownest represents the government on that committee. It's working very well.

We then moved to set up somebody who could be in charge of the total concept and hired a gentleman named Ed Marshall, the managing director. His responsibility is to co-ordinate and oversee the implementation of all policies handed down to him by government, which come up through the Kananaskis advisory committee, and other aspects. We then moved to make sure each and every government department was involved and set up an interdepartmental committee which included people from Transportation, Environment, Housing and Public Works, Public Lands and Wildlife, and Municipal Affairs. They were to review all reports to them from the Kananaskis Citizens' Advisory Committee and, of course, from anybody else who wished to present their views to them. The chairman of this committee is now Mr. Gordon Smart of Public Lands and Wildlife, Energy and Natural Resources. Just the other day they held their 100th meeting in regard to input to this government in planning, designing, and constructing Kananaskis Park. Again, I might say that we have there a devoted group of Albertans who take very seriously their work in regard to what's taking place in this great Kananaskis area.

We have since developed another committee of the deputy ministers of each department involved. This committee was formed in 1980, and their job is take all concerns the interdepartmental committee cannot agree on, try to agree on a consensus, and provide that to the Kananaskis cabinet committee, which a number of my colleagues are on, and which I share.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, let us go back to the beginning and look again, because a number of times I've been requested to lay out before the public what was started, where we're at, and where we're going to end. As I mentioned before, the concept was some \$40,520,000 in 1977 dollars. We've had some program expansions and additions, and inflation. Last year, when I stood before the House, we had a total package that consisted of some \$213,610,000 in 1981 dollars. I'd just like to outline for the record what that \$40 million in the original announcement was for. The proposed buildings, \$4,606,000; campgrounds envisioned at that time in day-use areas, \$10,389,000; trails, \$6,375,000; roads, \$10,652,000; the golf course, \$3,280,000; original utilities, \$4,308,000; fish and wildlife enhancement, \$575,000; Ribbon Creek alpine village planning, \$100,000; and miscellaneous, \$235,000. The total, at that time, for the modest beginning: \$40,520,000.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned that we started there and proceeded to expand our programs and have additions. As I mentioned, the amount in 1981 dollars was \$213 million. At this time, I'd like to outline what some of the additions were. They were remodelling of the forest ex-

perimental station buildings, landscape rehabilitation of construction sites; we added gravel for a number of roads. We provided an addition to the Kananaskis recreation centre. This is at the golf course site, which will include cross-country skiing and so on. Other additions were the 1981 Boy Scouts jamboree, the Ribbon Creek alpine village access and infrastructure, the Evan-Thomas recreation vehicles campground, and Bragg Creek information centre. We also added a redevelopment of the Boy Scouts jamboree site for future public use. We then included a user survey, and we did an inventory of potential ecological reserves. We had range improvement added for domestic cattle. Day use areas were considerably expanded. Fortress Junction service centre was another addition. The solid waste transfer station at Highwood and Sheep subregions; emergency services and capital works. We had additions of major signage structures, flagpoles, and lighting. And again, some planning and administration.

We then had a number of program expansions. We expanded the special user facility. That facility was opened by the Premier on September 22 — a tremendous asset to that part of the country and to our handicapped people wherever they are across this country of ours, I must say. We had some expansions at the visitors' centre within Kananaskis Park. We expanded the park administration centre to include Parks people, Transportation, Fish and Wildlife, and Forestry. The Bow Valley shop was expanded. The Elbow-Sheep administrative complex was expanded; the regional information centre. Parks and day use areas at Elkwood campground extension were expanded; the Interlakes camping and day use area. We had a large expansion in the trails in the snowmobiles area. This was necessary to fit our precautions in regard to environment protection, stream crossings, and a number of bridges. Hiking and horse trails were expanded. The bicycle trail was expanded. Of course, one of the largest and most notable items was transportation and roads. The golf course was expanded from 18 to 36 holes. Regional utilities was expanded. Fish and wildlife enhancement was expanded from \$575,000 to some \$7 million. Of course, the Ribbon Creek alpine village planning system was expanded.

Mr. Chairman, that brought us to the figure I mentioned. When we take those expansions and additions I have just outlined and the inflation factor from 1977 to 1981, and when we look at the statistics from Ottawa, we see that in this last year inflation in some cases has gone as high as 22 per cent. When we add that type of inflation to what we had in the last five years, it's not that dollars are not wisely spent. It's just that a dollar in 1977 did a lot more than a dollar in 1981.

On a number of occasions in my travels, I was asked about the golf course. They wanted to know the length of the season and the type of fees. I did some checking to find out if the length of the season was comparable to, say, Jasper or Banff. I found that we can expect the season will range up to 23 to 26 weeks, depending of course on the weather. We find we will have more playing time in Kananaskis than either Banff or Jasper because, overall, we have better sunlight conditions.

The question of topsoil was raised again this summer. Again, I must say that the topsoil for the golf course was found on the existing site and was not hauled in, as somebody in Strathmore said. Most of it was right on the site of the golf course. Some was hauled in by truck about a mile or two from Wedge Lake. Also the problem of elk was raised. Up to the last time I was at Kananaskis

— and I've been there four times this year — we found we have no elk problem in regard to the golf course, in the summer, spring, or winter. That's nice to hear.

Mr. Chairman, let me give you a status report on the golf course. The maintenance building facility is currently complete and in operation. The design of the family recreation centre, which will also serve as a centre for the golf course and, as I mentioned, cross-country skiing, is complete. The site has been cleared, and paving is going on for the parking lot. The building foundations are in place, and work is now proceeding with the structure. We anticipate that the construction of that building should be completed by August 1982. We now hear it may be ahead of schedule. I hope and understand that it might be completed by June. We expect that the building could be in operation by September 1982, the end of the golf season, and of course be ready for the start of winter recreation. Landscaping will begin in the spring of 1982, and we expect it to be completed by August.

On the course itself, holes one to 19 and hole 27 were seeded in July and August 1980, and are now playable. Holes 20 through 36, excluding 27, were seeded in June 1981 and, we expect and hope, will be playable by July or August of 1982. The driving range and practice greens were seeded in June '81, and will be playable by August 1982. Sand has not yet been obtained for the traps, but we expect to have it in place starting this winter. It will be in place by August 1982. Of course, as always, there is some minor clean-up work around the golf course, and that will take place this winter.

Mr. Chairman, I've been asked if we get value for our money through contracts. I want to give two examples, if I may. We tendered a contract for Boulton Creek clearing and grubbing. Our tender came in at \$118,000. It was felt that this tender was too high. Within Kananaskis we operate in one of two ways: through the tender route, through the private sector; and we do some of the work ourselves with our own staff. In this case, we estimated that the work should have cost \$45,000. Instead of going to tender, we did it with our own crews for \$45,400. That shows you just how effective the people in charge of Kananaskis have been.

Another example is with Alberta Transportation; a road contract was awarded for \$2,800,000. There were 10 bids in. The next one was \$2,800,000, the third one \$2,900,000, all very close, and I understand that contract came in under our estimate.

I just want to give a few examples of how our projects are proceeding and how we try to have our budget on target. The regional utilities project is one of the largest Kananaskis Country projects. It's estimated at slightly over \$14 million. It is approximately one-third complete, with contracts signed and approximately another one-third ready for awarding contracts. The project is proceeding extremely well and is expected to be completed right on budget, if not slightly under.

The Boulton Creek visitor centre was completed this summer under budget. The saving we've anticipated or have there will be used to develop a small outdoor eating area at the site, which was not on the original plan but has been suggested to us by the citizens' advisory committee. I'm pleased to see they recommended it. We hope to proceed with that. The Boulton Creek campground and day use area is now almost two-thirds complete, and we expect it will come in about \$100,000 under budget.

The Elbow-Sheep hiking and cross-country ski trails are just over a third complete. They also appear to be \$100,000 under budget. Wedge Lake — we're all familiar

with that — is now complete as a fish and wildlife enhancement project. Even though a day use area will be built at the site next summer, this project was completed approximately \$300,000 under budget and the saving resulted from the lake holding water without having to be sealed.

As I mentioned before, our savings are achieved in one of two ways: either our contracts from the private sector coming in on budget or slightly under, or in-house work we've done with our own crews, be they Forestry, Transportation, or Parks.

Mr. Chairman, some 96 Kananaskis Country projects have been reviewed this year, and I hope I'll be able to give you a progress report on each of them at the end of my comments. I looked through my notes last year and I had committed to do it, and of course I've been asked by a number of people, both my colleagues and other Albertans, that that should be there.

I was also asked again this year — and I'd like to put it on the record — about the Kananaskis subdivision. I want to state, as I did last year, that in all there are some 70 lots. These 70 lots are now up for lease renewal. It's my understanding that the Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife is proceeding with another 10-year lease, so I'm sure that will be pleasing to the leaseholders within the Kananaskis area. That area is not within Kananaskis Park. It's been excluded.

I might say, too, that there was some concern about the paving done in front of those cottages. Again, if I may, that was done on approval by local Improvement District No. 8. Those funds, some \$90,000, came out of ID 8 and were not part of Kananaskis funding or from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. As I say, this was done by the five councillors in ID 8, and I'm sure that was acceptable and appreciated by those in that area.

As I mentioned before, Wedge Lake is an area where we have taken some of the topsoil for construction of the golf course. There's still some topsoil not used, but we intend to use it in different areas. At one time, we anticipated to have Wedge Lake as a fishing area for the handicapped. We found that to construct the area for wheel chairs was somewhat difficult, so we've moved that site. We've taken some of the funds from there and put them at Mt. Lorette, or what I call the Oxbow fish ponds. On my last visit the area was paved, and it's just tremendous. It's stocked with fish. I've seen some people in wheel chairs, and they were successful in catching a fish. We will continue with Wedge Lake on a put-and-take fishery. We will develop a day use area around it, and as I said before, the water in the area is being retained, and that will be a successful fishery for all who visit Kananaskis.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned in my opening comments that we had some \$10 million allocated for roads. When I became chairman of the committee, we had a number of requests from the citizens' advisory committee and other Albertans who travel that area that we're not satisfied with the gravel, the dust. So we proposed an upgrading program of an additional \$103 million. It was approved, and I announced it here last year. That project was one of the highest and brought the Kananaskis project up in the amount of dollars spent. That program is ongoing. It will be completed in 1984-85. As the hon. members look at the maps, I'm sure they can see the roadways. If they have questions, I'll be pleased to answer them when my presentation is done.

I believe last year I announced that there were some 130,000 visitors to Kananaskis. I'm pleased that we've

had some [552,000] visits to Kananaskis Country this year, well over a 50 per cent increase from the previous year. These are estimates. I'm sure there are more than that by now. I think that speaks for itself, Mr. Chairman, with regard to how excited Albertans are to have a park and area they can truly call theirs.

Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased that the Kananaskis area was visited by the members of the heritage fund legislative committee. I understand that the members for Calgary Currie, Macleod, St. Albert, Spirit River-Fairview, Mill Woods, Little Bow, and Edson were there. I've received comments from my colleagues, some in writing, some verbally. I haven't heard from the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and I notice he's not in his seat. We've had some concerns. I haven't heard from the Member for Little Bow. When I made a visit to Kananaskis — and I was there four times this year — I took notes on what could be improved, or some concerns I had, and brought those to committee. I guess I can say that not having heard from those two members, they had no concerns, because as devoted Albertans, I'm sure if they had a concern they'd have gotten it to me in writing or at least talked to me about it.

Mr. Chairman, you all have a map now, and if you've looked at it — really what do we see as we look at this? I guess if we look at the front, the first noticeable thing is our heritage fund logo. When Albertans visit the park and receive this, they should know that it is being financed by the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. As we go through it, we can read a message there. I've got it down as the second important item: "A legacy for the future". I won't go through what it says on that page. I'm sure all members will read that as they go through.

The next thing we see, as we unfold it, is that it talks about recreation. As I mentioned before when I talked about the legacy for the future, it provides a recreation opportunity for every Albertan, be they young, somewhat older, active, or handicapped. Activities are there to suit every Albertan, regardless of their age, condition, or otherwise. It also talks about winter recreation in Kananaskis Country. The things that quickly come to mind are cross-country skiing trails, winter camping, snowmobiling, downhill skiing, ice fishing, and so on.

As you go down, you see the number of areas where we as Albertans can have a day out for camping. It talks about camping in 15 or 16 areas. Some 3,000 camping sites will be developed when Kananaskis is completed, with of course a number of group camps also. It talks about hunting where such game as elk, deer, black bear, sheep, and even upland game are available. It talks about hiking trails. I mentioned that a while before. It's interesting to note that we have well over 500 kilometres of hiking trails within Kananaskis Country.

There's fishing. I recall one of our colleagues who is not with us anymore, the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane, Clarence Copithorne, who sat on the front bench, telling a story in 1972, I believe it was: when you went to Kananaskis Country and you wanted to fish, you had to hide behind a tree to bait your hook, because there were so many fish there. [interjections] That's what he said, and I believe the man. I understand the fish are still there. With help from the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife, we're going to develop a truly exciting fish-rearing station within Kananaskis. We have well over 200 kilometres of equestrian trails developed. I'm sure they're enjoyed by those people who enjoy outdoor life on horseback.

Then of course, last but not least, our golf course has

been expanded from 18 holes to 36. As I mentioned just a few minutes ago, it will be ready for play next year.

Mr. Chairman, if members would look at their map, I'll just try to run through a few points on it. If we can start at the top where it says "Bow Valley Provincial Park", that's where we held our Boy Scout jamboree. Some 20,000 scouts from across Canada, and some from other parts of the world, were there for the first two weeks in July. I was there to take part in the opening, and all these young Albertans and Canadians, and other people from across the world, sitting there in their bright uniforms was just a tremendous sight. A truly nice warm day, and a truly fantastic jamboree for young people. I want to say that I appreciate and want to thank all those people — and I don't want to mention names, because if you do, you miss one or two — who helped put that on. That went without a hitch, without any incidents — just tremendous. I understand they're coming back in 1983 for the Boy Scout world jamboree. They tell me there'll be between 15,000 and 20,000 boys there again. We're looking forward to that.

As we move down the map somewhat, we get to Barrier Lake. This site represents one of our over 60 day use sites being developed in Kananaskis Country. There are 60 picnic sites and a boat launch in that area and, in addition, a hiking trail. As you look at the dotted red lines on your map, those are hiking trails, and you're able to follow the map as I go along. Then when we move down about two inches on the map, we get to the Mt. Lorrette fish ponds. I'm sure the members who have been there know what I'm talking about. There are five ponds within that area. We stocked two ponds and, as I said before, the trails are paved. People with wheelchairs and other handicapped would be able to use this and enjoy an outdoor day in Kananaskis Country. As we move down somewhat, we arrive at Ribbon Creek. Right on that ledge is where we have the development plan, and this is going ahead now with infrastructure provided by the provincial government to the boundaries of the area — that's water and sewer. The private sector is now tendering on the construction of this alpine village. In the near future, the Minister of Tourism and Small Business will be bringing forward the proposals.

We then move down to Evan-Thomas, the golf course under construction. As I mentioned before, it's a 36-hole tournament golf course with three tee-off areas, which will include the champions, the medium players, and what we all call the duffers. We move down and get to Wedge Pond. That will be changed to Wedge Lake. I never did like the word "pond". It reminds me of a pond on the farm back home when I was a little boy, where all the frogs played. I understand this one has no frogs and has fish. Next year we hope to call that Wedge Lake. I've made some comments on that. It will be developed into a put-and-take fish pond and a day use area will be constructed in 1982. Of course soil removed from that area is being used in a number of areas and will be used for any landscaping we have.

If we move down just a little further, right into Kananaskis Provincial Park at Mt. Wintour, we have the temporary visitors' centre that in the early days we used for our visitors. Once we have our new one in place — it will be officially opened next year — this will be a place for a ski lodge site, where we'll have cross-country skiing. It will be the staging area for some 85 kilometres of cross-country skiing which has been developed within that area. In the same area, just a little below that, we have the Kananaskis Provincial Park visitor centre. This

is the new centre we talked about, which includes a theatre, a lounge area, an information counter, and an area for interpretive displays and exhibits. The facility is now totally complete and in operation. We hope to complete the exhibits, and they will be in place by next July.

As we move down toward the lake we have the William Watson Lodge. This is truly a tremendous facility for our handicapped people. It consists of four fully self-contained duplex cabins, camping facilities, a central lounge, and kitchen facilities. The complex was developed for the use of physically, mentally, and socially handicapped, as well as their families. It was opened in September, as I mentioned. Some trail developments will take place during the winter to make it even more exciting for these people.

If we move down just a little further we have the Elkwood amphitheatre. I have been there, and it's an exciting place where we can have both movies and live performances. It seats approximately 500 people, and it's also been designed to accommodate handicapped people in wheel chairs. It's an exciting area, situated amongst the pines. When you sit there, you wouldn't even know the rest of the world is there. It's so quiet and so exciting, I'm sure, for the people who will be using these facilities.

We move down somewhat further, right next to the words "Lower Kananaskis" and we have the Elkwood campground. This is one of our four auto access campgrounds being developed in the provincial park. It will be a 140-unit, semi-serviced campground with two comfort stations, a pressurized water system, and a playground. The campground is now complete and was in use this summer. Plans are for the development of close to 2,000 auto access campsites within all of Kananaskis Country.

One of the last points I want to mention is at the top and to your right on the map: Sibbald Lake, Sibbald Flats, and Sandy McNabb campgrounds. This project includes the construction of a 100-unit campground at Sandy McNabb and a 110-unit campground at Sibbald Flats. This is where we will have the construction of two equestrian staging areas and one equestrian group camp.

We then move over to the right of the map where we see McLean Creek. This is a 170-unit facility designed to accommodate all-terrain vehicles, snowmobiles, and general campers. A day use area has been provided in this project. The camp ground is anticipated to be complete and operational early next summer. Trail development in the McLean Creek-Sibbald Flats area includes 134 kilometres of motorcycle trails, 110 kilometres of all-terrain vehicle trails, and 250 kilometres of snowmobile trails. Three hundred and forty-five kilometres of the above-mentioned trails are now completed and ready for use.

If you move down from there, Ford Creek is an area that will provide staging for the extensive hiking and equestrian trail system in the Elbow-Sheep area. It will provide 150 equestrian and general campground auto access units as well as a day use area. In addition, we expect to have a put-and-take fishery developed in the vicinity. Mr. Chairman, the Ford Creek campground is under construction and will be open in 1982. As I have mentioned before, the broken trails on the map show you our back country trails.

We intend to develop more of our exciting fish ponds, such as we have at Mt. Lorrette. Of course, we will continue to develop Wedge Lake. There will be another one at Sibbald Creek, one at Elbow River, and one at Grotto Mountain which will be accessible to disabled persons.

Mr. Chairman, this now brings me to our total budget, where we started and where we are today. In 1978-79, \$12,071,000 was expended; in 1979-1980, \$23,201,000. In 1980-81 there was \$31,609,341. This year by March 31 — we don't have the exact total figures — we estimate 1981-82 will be \$49,549,000, which brings the total expended dollars to March 31, 1982, to \$116,400,000.

I have been asked a number of times what the total operating costs of Kananaskis are from the start to where we are today. For the record, I want to suggest — and this is just the actual dollars spent by Parks operation, not the total Kananaskis; I'll give that in a second on another sheet. The total operating costs for Parks in 1977-78 were \$711,778. In 1978-79, the operating costs for Parks were \$1,098,976. In 1979-80, the actual costs were \$2,749,259, and in 1980-81 — and this is an estimate, it isn't precise — they were \$4,500,000. In 1981-82, we have an estimate again of \$4,400,000. Those are the actual costs of Park operations within Kananaskis country.

I would like to present the total figures for the members, because there are Fish and Wildlife and Alberta Forestry and Transportation in addition. In 1977-78 the total operating costs were \$2,131,591; in 1978-79, \$2,689,714; in 1979-80, \$4,857,400. In 1980-81 the total operating costs are estimated at \$8,614,911. I don't have the exact figure. And for this year, 1981-82, projected operating costs are \$8,905,488. Those are the projected operating costs and what has happened in the past.

Mr. Chairman, as I looked through my notes, last year I made a commitment to provide a progress report to this House. As I mentioned, we have some 96 projects. I'd like to go through that if I may, and provide to the members the status of Kananaskis Country.

Park radio-telephone system: total expenditures to March 31, 1981, are \$47,501. Completion to July 31, 1981, was 60 per cent. Two items I will give you now — anticipated completion date, and the total estimated cost of Kananaskis in 1982-83 dollars — should be very important to the members. That will be completed in the fall of 1982, and the total estimated cost in '82-83 dollars — the last figure will always be in '82-83 dollars — is \$180,900. Planning and administration: expenditures to date — and that's March 31, '81 — are \$2,653,653. It's 44 per cent completed and will be completed in the spring of 1986. The total estimated cost in '83 dollars will be \$8,554,800.

MR. SINDLINGER: Could you tell us what numbers you're giving us now, please?

MR. TRYNCHY: Well, they're not . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member please ask for a point of clarification and address the Chair. It makes it very difficult for the minister to hear any remarks, especially if the microphone is not on.

MR. SINDLINGER: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I didn't want to interrupt him formally. I just thought he might reiterate the numbers he's giving the Assembly now.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, the numbers I'm giving would not be within their files. If you look at the book, it's a breakdown of each . . . If you look on page 23, it will be in project co-ordination. Then I'll move to number 2, major buildings and facilities. That's the only way you'll be able to follow me. It will be within that category.

We're in category 1. That will probably be the best way for me to explain it. So those are the two items in category 1.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister indicated there may be 96 projects. Will there be 96 numbers we're looking at, just so I can lay it out on my paper?

MR. NOTLEY: There's not enough paper here, Peter, to get down all the information.

MR. TRYNCHY: Well, I'll be looking at 96 projects. They'll be looking at six different divisions. As I go through, I'm sort of breaking it down for the members. Once they have *Hansard*, they'll have the whole works. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to move now to major buildings, facilities, and utilities, which is item 2 in your estimates book. The alpine village planning, design, and engineering: total expenditures to March 31, '81 are \$703,340. It's 80 per cent completed, and the completion date is the summer of 1983. The total cost will be \$1,171,300. To continue, the alpine village on-site infrastructure: no dollars have been expended. It's 20 per cent complete. It will be totally completed in the summer of 1983, and the cost will be \$6,053,700.

Barrier Lake regional information centre: \$121,808 expended. It's 30 per cent completed. It will be totally completed in the summer of 1982 at a cost of \$568,000. The next one, bicycle trails: \$195,708 expended. They're 25 per cent completed, and the total completion date is fall 1984. The total cost will be \$1,841,400. Boulton Creek visitor service centre: \$529,047. It's 100 per cent completed, so we don't have to add anything to that one. The next one is the Bow Valley regional parks shop and administration/visitor building: \$659,259 expended to March 31, '81. It's 85 per cent complete. It will be completed in the fall of 1982 at a total cost of \$1,673,400.

Elbow-Sheep office, maintenance, and housing complex: \$1,905,233 expended. It's 100 per cent completed. Elkwood amphitheatre: \$177,589 expended. It's 100 per cent completed. I should correct that — the total cost is now \$228,400. Evan-Thomas recreation vehicle campground: \$10,621 expended. It's 10 per cent completed. It will be totally completed in the fall of 1983 for a total cost in '82-83 dollars of \$3,657,500. The family recreation centre: \$132,736 expended to March 31, '81. It's 20 per cent completed. It should be completed in total in the summer of 1982 for a total cost of \$2,596,200. I might say that that contract to the private sector was right on with our estimate.

The Fortress Junction service centre infrastructure: \$14,265 expended. It's 10 per cent complete. The total completion date is the summer of 1982, for a total cost of \$679,000. Kananaskis forest experimental station: no dollars spent, nothing completed. We anticipate completion in the fall of 1983, for a total cost of \$528,900. Kananaskis Provincial Park administrative operations centre and seasonal staff housing: \$1,425,739 is the total expenditure to March 31. It's 75 per cent completed and will be finished in the spring of 1983 for a total cost of \$2,320,700. Regional utilities: \$3,852,794 expended to date. It's 32 per cent completed. It will be totally completed in the spring of 1985 for a total cost of \$14,085,100.

Solid wastes transfer station: \$49,500 expended. It's 75 per cent completed. The total completion date is the

summer of '83, for a total cost of \$108,700. The special user facility, as I mentioned, was opened. It's completed now in total, and the total cost in 1982-83 dollars is \$1,842,800. Temporary visitor centre: \$191,000 expended. It's 80 per cent completed. It will be completed in total in the fall of 1981 for a total cost of \$237,000. Trout-rearing facilities — and this is the item I mentioned before, which will be taken forward by the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife — \$334,299 expended to March 31. It's 10 per cent completed. It will be totally completed in the spring of 1983 for a total of \$8,328,400.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we move to item 3, campgrounds, day use facilities, and trails. Back country trails in Kananaskis Provincial Park: \$767,353 expended to March 31, '81; 90 per cent completed; total completion date fall of '81, for a total cost of \$1,052,400. Barrier Lake day use site: \$106,320 expended. It's 98 per cent complete. It will be completed in the fall of 1981 for a total cost in 1982-83 dollars of \$251,300. Boulton Creek campground and day use: \$1,046,233 expended; 60 per cent complete; total completion date spring of 1982, for a total cost of \$1,935,500. Bow Valley Provincial Park: \$394,438 expended; 52 per cent complete. It will be finished in the summer of '83 — and that's one I mentioned for the jamboree — for a total cost of \$1,398,000. Bragg Creek Provincial Park: no dollars expended, no percentage completion. It will be completed by the fall of 1984 for a total cost of \$275,200.

Canyon campground day use and boat launch area: \$536,123 expended; 70 per cent completed; total completion in the summer of 1982 for a total cost of \$722,300. Eau Claire campgrounds: \$209,757 expended; it's 100 per cent complete; and the total cost is the same figure. Elbow campground: no funds expended, no completion to date. It will be completed in total by the fall of 1983 for a total cost of \$1,569,900. Elkwood campground: \$775,825 expended to March 31, 1981; 90 per cent completed; total completion date fall 1981, for a total cost of \$855,900. Elkwood campground extension: \$20,374 expended; 5 per cent complete; total completion spring 1983, for a total cost of \$1,378,200. Emergency services capital works: no dollars expended; no work done on it. It will be completed in 1983 for a total cost of \$1,817,800. Facility zone trails: \$236,756 expended; 100 per cent completed. Ford Creek campground: \$630,897 expended; it's 80 per cent complete; completion date is spring of 1982, for a total cost of \$1,176,100. Gravel for all projects within Kananaskis, ongoing: \$217,924 expended; 11 per cent completed. It will be totally completed in the spring of 1985 for a total cost of \$2,138,800. Group camping area within Kananaskis Provincial Park: \$97,222 expended; 20 per cent completed; completion date is fall 1983, for a total cost of \$614,300. Highwood interpretive facility: \$47,051 expended; 80 per cent completed; total completion date fall 1981, for a total cost of \$73,000. Interlakes campground and day use: \$259,594 expended; 33 per cent completed; total completion date fall 1982, for a total cost of \$850,200. Interpretive trails and facilities: \$27,695 expended; 2 per cent completed; total completion date fall 1985, for a total cost of \$2,567,200. Kananaskis day use program: \$170,644 expended; 6 per cent completed; total completion date September 1985, for a total cost of \$7,750,600. Kananaskis golf course: \$5,837,660 expended to date; 95 per cent completed; completion date spring 1982, for a total cost of \$6,830,300. Kananaskis-Spray Lakes back country trails: \$639,934 expended; 80 per cent completed; total completion date fall 1981, for \$1,100,100. Landscaping: \$15,408 expended to date; 2 per

cent completed; completion date spring 1984, for a total cost of \$3,259,100.

Major signage, entrance structures, et cetera, which I talked about before: no dollars expended, and it will be completed in the spring of 1983 for \$593,800. McLean Creek campground: \$599,808 expended; 70 per cent completed; total completion spring 1982, for \$1,433,900. Paddy's Flat, Beaver Flat, and Gooseberry campgrounds: \$338,730 expended; 95 per cent completed; total completion date spring 1982, for a total cost of \$999,900. Redevelopment of the Boy Scout jamboree site will be completed, no dollars expended, in the spring of 1982 — and I mentioned that before — total cost, \$164,600. The Smith-Dorrien-Highwood day use area: \$180,008 expended; the program is 65 per cent completed; total completion date spring 1982, for a total cost of \$309,300. Spray Lakes campground: \$69 expended; 1 per cent completed; total completion date fall 1983, for a total cost of \$84,700. A user survey we're doing: \$19,521 expended; 65 per cent completed; total completion date winter 1982, for a total cost of \$27,000. Boy Scout jamboree, 1981: \$712,123 expended; and that, of course, was 100 per cent completed.

We now move to item 3, foothills trails and primitive campgrounds. Bluerock campgrounds: \$77,394 expended; 40 per cent completed; total completion date fall 1984, for a total cost of \$620,800. Of course, these last figures are always in 1982-83 dollars. Cataract snowmobile areas: \$491,622 expended; 25 per cent completed; total completion date spring 1984, for a total cost of \$1,289,300. Domestic range improvement: \$7,000 expended; 11 per cent completed; total completion summer 1983, for a total cost of \$418,200. Elbow-Sheep equestrian trails: \$407,749 expended; 40 per cent completed; total completion date summer 1984; total cost, \$1,201,100. Elbow-Sheep hiking and cross-country ski trails: \$284,035 expended; 30 per cent completed; total completion date fall 1984, for a total cost of \$1,007,500. Ghost-Waiparous snowmobile area: \$493,691 expended; the program is 65 per cent completed and will be finished in the fall of 1983 for a total cost of \$852,900. Inventory of potential ecological reserves: \$10,531 expended; 100 per cent completed. McLean Creek-Sibbald Flats snowmobile area: \$254,391 expended; the program is 65 per cent complete; completion date spring 1984, for a total cost of \$662,000. North Fork campgrounds: \$44,117 expended; the program is 100 per cent completed. Pine Grove group camp: \$14,198 expended; the program is 40 per cent completed; total completion date is fall 1982, for \$266,100. Sibbald Flats-Sandy McNabb campgrounds: \$384,607 expended; the program is 75 per cent completed; total completion date spring 1983, for a total cost of \$1,202,100.

Mr. Chairman, we now move on to item number 5, which is the regional roads program. Alpine village access road: \$40,000 expended; 75 per cent completed; total completion date fall 1982, for a total cost of \$4,129,000. Powder Face trail, formerly called the Ford Creek road: \$19,610 expended; 10 per cent completed; total completion fall 1984, for a total cost of \$14,576,500. Highway 40: total expended, \$17,890,399; 85 per cent completed; total completion date is fall 1984, for a total cost of \$32,295,000. Highway 66, which was formerly secondary road 553: \$358,105 expended; it's 15 per cent completed; total completion date is fall 1987, for a total cost of \$12,901,000. Miscellaneous roads, internal park road surveys, et cetera: \$3,435,814 expended; it's 60 per cent complete; total completion date fall 1984, for a total cost of \$4,047,000. Road 103, Smith-Dorrien/Spray trail: to-

tal expended \$6,890,132; project is 30 per cent completed; total completion is fall 1982, for a total cost of \$16,822,000. McLean Creek, George Creek trails, formerly called the North Fork road: \$632,000 expended; 5 per cent complete; completion date in spring 1986, for a total cost of \$8,839,000. Secondary road 541: \$309,906 expended; the project is some 20 per cent complete; total project completed in fall 1984, for a total cost of \$17,933,000. Secondary road 546, the Sheep road: \$7,135 expended; the program is just starting; total completion fall '83, for a total cost of \$9,615,000. Secondary road 968: \$3,688,000 has been expended, and it's about 15 per cent completed; total completion date will be fall of '83, for a total cost of \$11,407,000. The youth hostel access road: no dollars expended; 5 per cent completed; total completion date fall 1983; total cost \$3,327,000.

Mr. Chairman, now I'd like to move to item 6, fish and wildlife enhancement. Big game winter ranges: \$33,993 expended, and that program is 100 per cent completed. Enhancement project manpower: \$71,953 expended; the project is 50 per cent completed; total completion date spring '84, for a total cost of \$227,300. Evan-Thomas brood ponds: \$61,900 expended; that program is 100 per cent complete. Fisher reintroduction: no dollars expended, 10 per cent of the program is completed; total program completion date spring '84, for a total cost of \$44,500. Grotto Mountain fish pond: no dollars expended; completed the fall of 1981, for a total cost of \$60,100. Kananaskis Reservoir fishery enhancement: no dollars expended; total completion date spring 1984, for a total cost of \$241,900. McLean Creek fishery enhancement: \$34,600 expended; completion date fall 1983, for a total cost of \$210,700. Osprey enhancement: \$2,023 expended; 90 per cent completed; total completion date spring '82, for \$11,300. Oxbow fish ponds: \$80,381 expended; that project is 100 per cent completed. Peregrine falcon: \$22,042 expended; the project is 75 per cent completed; completion date is fall 1982, for a total cost in 1982-83 dollars of \$93,900. Rawson Lake brood station: \$292,000 expended; completion date fall 1982; total cost \$22,900.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. TRYNCHY: I have about four items left. Mr. Chairman, it's very interesting. They ask the questions, and if you look at the Order Paper, the answers I'm giving today to this report are to the very questions the Leader of the Opposition was asking. The answers are there, and he's not even in the House to take them. I'm sure that puts the Member for Bow Valley in an embarrassing position.

Mr. Chairman, I'll continue with three or four items. The river otter reintroduction program is \$13,264 expended, and the completion date is spring 1983, with \$91,000 in total cost. Sibbald Creek fish ponds: no dollars expended; completion date spring 1982, for a total cost of \$188,700. Spray Reservoir fisheries enhancement program: \$25,387 expended; completion date spring 1981, for a total cost of \$235,800. Stream protection: \$27,350 expended; completion date spring 1984, for a total cost of \$110,100. Ungulate forest cover: we have no dollars expended; the program will be completed in spring 1984, for a total cost of \$560,100. Wedge Lake fish pond: 100 per cent completed; \$7,500 expended.

I just have three more items. Architectural motif: \$12,900 expended, and that program is 100 per cent completed. Design of small buildings: \$26,116 expended,

and that program is 100 per cent completed. Miscellaneous: \$562,286, and that program is totally completed.

Mr. Chairman, I've spent considerable time outlining what we have in Kananaskis. I guess there is a lot more we could say. It's an exciting program; it's an exciting project for all Albertans. I request that I have the support of the members. Thank you.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the minister a couple of questions with regard to the development of natural resources in Kananaskis Park? Are there going to be any restrictions on gas wells and development of resources in Kananaskis Park?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, yes. Within Kananaskis Provincial Park — the green section on your map — as in all provincial parks, there will be no development of minerals. Outside Kananaskis Country, that's a different story.

MR. MANDEVILLE: I understand that in putting in the power, they're going to use a special type of line for putting in the utilities. Could the minister outline just how they're going to do this?

MR. TRYNCHY: I'm not sure I got the full drift of the question, Mr. Chairman. When I was there on my visits, I didn't notice anything special. I'll take the question as notice, and if there is something extraordinary in regard to power lines, I'll get the answer back to the hon. member.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

Agreed to:

Total 1 — Fish Creek Provincial Park	\$1,546,000
Total 2 — Kananaskis Country Recreation Development	\$73,208,882

3 — Urban Parks

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, could I just ask a question on urban parks. Under the heritage trust fund, I understand they're going to be looking at parks for some of the cities, like Lloydminster, Lethbridge, and Medicine Hat. Could the minister indicate how he sets priorities on where these parks are going to be established, and what parks are going to be worked on in this coming year?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I outlined pretty well the procedure of how we arrived at the five parks last year. It was just to take the largest cities within the province that we felt should benefit from our urban parks policy, and we arrived at Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Red Deer, Grande Prairie, and Lloydminster, a total of some \$57 million in 1979.

All five parks are proceeding as scheduled as outlined last year. I understand that the first cheque from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund will be going out to Red Deer on the urban parks project within the next week. But all five parks will be commencing as soon as we can.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary. It's not really on the urban parks, Mr. Chairman, but as far as the regional parks in the province are concerned, is the minister anticipating using the heritage trust fund for setting up the regional parks he's announced? How does the

minister set the priorities as far as regional parks in the province are concerned, and how many of these parks are going to be set out to be put into operation for the coming year?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, none of our provincial parks are within the heritage fund. He might want to ask that in the question period, or else come and see me. Usually the way we arrive at a new parks policy is that we look at the province in total, and as we look at the map, we try to fill in the voids, the spots where there are no provincial parks and where the need is the greatest. Also I might say that the arm-twisting of my colleagues has worked somewhat in the past, and I'm sure it will continue to work. But as they're not within the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, I'd be pleased to meet with the hon. member and see what his concerns are.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, when the cabinet tour was in my area, the indication was that the province would be going ahead with the regional parks program. Are we going to go ahead with the regional parks in the province? I'm not thinking of the provincial parks we have now; it's the program for the regional parks that the minister announced.

MR. TRYNCHY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, when he spoke of regional parks I was thinking of provincial parks. I guess the term he should be using is "recreation areas". If that's what he's talking about, yes, we have some 90 applications. We have 10 recreation areas on stream. They're all through general revenue, not through the heritage fund. If I have the support of my colleagues in priorities, I hope we go forward with another 10 this coming year. Of course, we have a committee set up that picks the spots; and again, we try to pick the areas where there are voids, where there are no recreation facilities. These are the kinds of areas we're looking at.

Agreed to:

3 — Urban Parks	\$20,252,500
-----------------	--------------

MR. TRYNCHY: I move that the votes be reported, Mr. Chairman.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources is on his way in, if we can just wait a moment.

Department of Energy and Natural Resources

1 — Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, when I was last dealing with this vote, I was reviewing a contract. Rather than continue that review, I thought I would turn to another area, because when this vote first came up I was asked some questions with respect to management letters and wasn't able to respond completely at that time. I think I responded on the basis of my memory but said I would check. Since that time, I've been able to check with the Alberta oil sands research authority and have learned that the authority did receive what might be termed management letters.

Perhaps I should make a comment or two on that, Mr.

Chairman, because I'm not sure that everyone has the same understanding of what a management letter is. It would be useful for me to describe what I regard as management letters and what these letters really were. They arise in this way: the Auditor General's staff go into AOSTRA or into the department, as the case may be, and do a complete analysis of their financial reporting and their systems of control. After they've completed that, they have what is called an exit conference and discuss with the members of the department the various changes they think ought to be made in the control system and in the financial reporting. They normally confirm that by a letter.

So really, Mr. Chairman, what we're speaking of here — and this was the nature of the letters the authority received — are comments by the Auditor General as to changes in the financial statements and changes that might be made in the control system to improve its security.

I should make just one final comment on the nature of those letters, Mr. Chairman. During the course of the preparation and presentation of the Auditor General legislation to the Assembly, I was then the Provincial Treasurer and introduced that legislation. I had a number of discussions with the Auditor General at the time. In fact, I think we spent a month or more reviewing all the provisions of that legislation. There was no question that it was his view, and one I completely shared, that that kind of communication between the Auditor General and the members of the authority or the department, as the case may be, could not, in the public interest, be made public, simply because making them public advised everyone of what the control system was, how to circumvent it, and that was the last thing one wanted because that obviously makes the system less secure.

The mechanism for dealing with those situations was built into the legislation, because the system is that the Auditor General reports to the department, the authority, or the board, as the case may be, and makes recommendations for change. Now if those changes are made, that's the end of the matter. Alternatively, on occasions people in the department or the authority would argue with the Auditor General as to the necessity of the changes. Sometimes he changes his view after hearing that argument and alters his request. But in the event that the authority or the department did not implement the requests or suggestions of the Auditor General, and he felt they were critical or important, he then reports them to the Legislative Assembly in his annual report.

Mr. Chairman, I thought I should make those few comments about the nature of the letters the authority had received from the Auditor General.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make some comments about this vote, please, and also in regard to the last vote we took on Recreation and Parks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, there cannot be any more remarks made on Recreation and Parks. It's now been passed, and the committee has accepted the resolution.

MR. SINDLINGER: I didn't mean about the votes specifically. I'd like to identify a trend that's apparent not only in this vote but in the Energy and Natural Resources vote as well. I'd like to draw a comparison between the two, if I might please.

In general, I think the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust

Fund is a good idea. I think it's prudent to put away resources, abilities, if you might like to call it that, or opportunities for the future, especially in regard to a depleting natural resource. I think it's well that we bear in mind too that we're not saving all the money we're getting from energy and natural resources today. We're in fact spending 70 per cent of it and saving only 30 per cent. In general, I think the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is a good idea.

In particular, I think most of the projects we have here in the capital divisions section are a good idea too. Certainly this Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority vote is a good idea. But there has to be a certain definition to each of these projects, some parameters or guidelines for their implementation. Both this vote on AOSTRA and the vote on the Kananaskis project which we've just passed, in my judgment exemplify a weakness of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. In both cases, we had a project that started out with a lot less money than we're now voting on. In the case of Kananaskis Park, originally we were talking about \$40 million. In the case of Fish Creek Park, originally we were talking about \$8 million. In the case of this one, I'm not sure how much money we were talking about.

I'd like to go back to the original debates on this matter. One of the major concerns at that time was accountability. How can the government be held accountable for what it does with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I have in my hand now *Alberta Hansard* for April 23, 1976. The Premier is speaking, and he says that he wanted to turn his next segment of remarks to the matter of accountability or legislative control over the fund and over the government's investment of the fund.

The Premier pointed out that there were four ways that could be done. He said:

The first is the act each year with regard to the capital projects division . . . The second is the establishment under Section 13 of a select standing committee of the Legislature, which will have an opportunity to meet, have assistance, do the research, peruse the annual audited report, and in the fall session bring to this Legislature recommendations and comment, and review the statement and operations of the fund.

The third way the Premier said there could be accountability over the fund was in the Act, in Section 6(4)(a) on page 5. He said that that particular section referred to the Alberta investment division. Investments, he quoted:

" . . . shall be made in accordance with any directions contained in any resolution of the Legislative Assembly relating to such investments . . ."

[That is] through the vehicle of a resolution, the Legislature can direct the investment committee to not invest in something, to invest in something, or to divest an investment.

The fourth way the Legislature could hold the government accountable over the heritage fund was through the special Act of the Legislature each year which authorized in advance the allocation of 30 per cent of non-renewable resource revenue to the heritage fund.

Considerable debate centred around those four points. One I'd like to quote from is this . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. As Chairman of this committee, I have some trouble relating the hon. member's questioning and his remarks now, to Energy and Natural Resources, and more so to the vote I called on the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research

Authority. I would ask the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo to stick to the relevance of the subject, which is the vote I have called, the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority.

Before the member continues, may the Minister of Municipal Affairs revert to Introduction of Visitors?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have the privilege and honor of introducing to members of the Assembly the Member of Parliament for the federal constituency of Peace River, Mr. Albert Cooper, seated in the members gallery. Will you welcome him please?

head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Department of Energy and Natural Resources (continued)

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, the point I'd like to get at through this — and I'm going to come back to those quotations after I make this point — is the question of what we're being asked to vote for on this particular vote. If we look at this booklet, the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division, 1982-83 Estimates of Proposed Investments, it says that for '82-83 investments we're asked to vote for \$54 million.

Now first of all, in an aside comment, when this was presented to us by the minister last week, the minister was asked, what is this \$54 million for? The minister's response was, I don't know. Now I find it absolutely incredible that a minister can come to this Legislative Assembly, ask for \$54 million and, in response to the question what's it for, say, I don't know.

What goes on from that \$54 million is this: in response to the question, what's the total cost of this project, the minister went on and read a great number of things. At the end he finally came up with a number, that the total cost of his project is \$418.7 million. The minister isn't asking us for a commitment for \$54 million. The minister is asking us for a commitment of \$418.7 million. Expenditures to March 31, 1981, had been a little over \$128 million. The estimates from last year were \$41 million, which gives us a total of \$169 million. So in effect what the minister is asking us to do by voting on this particular number, this \$54 million, is to give approval not to \$54 million but to \$248,751,000. Now that's 4.6 times the amount the minister is asking us for. The total estimates of expenditure for 1981-82 for Energy and Natural Resources is \$138,174,452. What we're being asked to vote on and make a commitment to here is something that is almost two times the size of the annual budget for that department. Yet when the minister is asked, what's the \$54 million for, he says, I don't know. Read *Hansard*; he doesn't know.

In regard to this estimate, I'd like to quote from the Auditor General. The Auditor General has said:

Major capital construction or development projects embarked upon by the Province of Alberta usually involve disbursements of funds over a number of fiscal years. Once such projects have commenced, aside from any scope for trimming the project plan, the most practical course of action usually is to

continue these projects through to completion. In such circumstances, approval of funds for the first full year of a project is tantamount to a commitment to complete the entire project.

The Province of Alberta publishes its expenditure estimates annually. These estimates are the basis upon which the Legislative Assembly authorizes annual expenditure appropriations from the General Revenue Fund and the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

It would appear appropriate if, in addition to the first year's estimated costs, the estimated total costs to completion of each new capital project (or major phase of a project) were contained in the published Estimates of Expenditure. This practice would provide the Legislative Assembly with information concerning the full extent to which the proposed appropriations would commit the Province, rather than just the amount to be disbursed in the forthcoming fiscal year. In ensuing years, revisions to original project estimates could be disclosed in the estimates together with the accumulated costs incurred on the project and the balance as yet unexpended. A brief description of the scope of the project could be supplied with the original project estimates and, thereafter, brief details of changes to the original scope which resulted in such revisions to the original project estimates.

It is believed that increasing the budget information in the manner described above would enhance the suitability of the estimates as a basis for controlling disbursements on . . . capital projects at both the legislative and executive levels of Government.

In conclusion, the Auditor General recommended that:

. . . in the interests of improved accountability to the Legislative Assembly and more effective budgetary control, appropriation bills should be supported by more extensive financial information on major capital expenditure projects. This information should include details of the original estimated costs and scope of each project, cost and scope of revisions, costs incurred to the end of the previous fiscal year . . . expenditures to be appropriated for the [current] year, estimated . . . costs to completion and the total . . . cost for each project. This recommendation should not be interpreted as suggesting that the Legislative Assembly should approve other than the [current] year's expenditures on these projects.

Mr. Chairman, when I pick up this booklet — the '82-83 estimates — and see nothing in here but a request for \$54 million, it bears no semblance whatsoever to the Auditor General's recommendation that there be more than just \$54 million requested. It says there should be original estimated costs and the scope of each project; that's not in here. There should be cost and scope revisions; that's not in here. Costs incurred to the end of the previous year are here. Expenditures to be appropriated for the current year are here. The estimated cost to completion isn't here. The total estimated cost for each project isn't here. None of that information is here, and it's very critical, crucial information to have.

I think that when the government first introduced the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority, they had good intentions in regard to management control. And management control is what this is about, because when we look at the original Act — and I have the *Revised Statutes of Alberta 1980* — it deals with this.

It doesn't give an open-ended check to the Alberta government for this project, and I don't think the government should have an open-ended check for this project or any other project. Here's the Oil Sands Technology and Research Fund, Part 3 of the Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority Act, Section 19(4):

The aggregate amount of advances made to the Fund under subsection (3) shall not exceed \$100,000,000.

Now I recall the day this project was announced. It was called "project energy breakthrough", and \$100 million was a very substantial amount of money, a very significant amount. It was an undertaking welcomed by everybody. But the government, in its own wisdom at the time, recognized that you can't write a blank check for anything, that there has to be some constraint, parameters, or definition of actions the government can take. So in its wisdom at the time it said that for this particular project we're setting a maximum ceiling of \$100 million.

We're well past that now. We've already spent \$169,949,000, and we're asking for another \$248,751,000. We're looking at a total projected cost of \$418,700,000. Now why did the government set a ceiling of \$100 million? There is very good reason for that — management control purposes — because anyone managing a fund, when they know there is a limit to it, will base their daily decisions on that fact. When making a decision from day to day, the managers will be cognizant of the fact that they can't go on forever, that the decision they have today will impact on the total decisions they'll be able to make with the \$100 million they have. A very effective management control.

The second reason is that when the project is over there will be a method of measuring management performance. Just how well did the manager do over the year? In this case, the case of Kananaskis Park, one has to draw the conclusion that the government hasn't done very well in either category. In regard to day to day management, there's no guideline there. Look what happened with Kananaskis Park: a \$40 million original estimate, and the minister says, well, we had a problem with inflation. If you take an average inflation factor of 12 per cent over the years since that project was initiated in 1976, that project just goes up to \$70 million. But a few minutes ago I heard the minister talk about a total project cost of \$213 million. Sure, there was change in scope and in program as they went along, but what check or control was there on the management decisions to change the scope, to change the programs? I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that there was none.

I don't think that program was carried along by the minister. I think the minister was pushed along by that program, and those costs got out of control. Why did they get out control? Because there was no limit to them.

MR. TRYNCHY: Point of order.

MR. SINDLINGER: Is it a point of order, Mr. Minister?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The minister is on his feet. I would ask him to state his point of order, if he's on a point of order.

MR. TRYNCHY: I'd like to ask the member a question.

MR. SINDLINGER: I don't care to be interrupted at this point, Mr. Chairman, please.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I'm on a point of order, a different one. I'm obliged to raise it in this way because the House can't stop the clock while in committee, only in the Assembly. Therefore, I move the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolution and reports as follows:

Resolved that from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1983, for the purpose of making investments in the following projects to be administered by the Minister of Recreation and Parks: \$1,546,000 for the Fish Creek Provincial Park project, \$73,208,882 for the Kananaskis Country recreation development project, and \$20,252,500 for urban park projects.

The Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, 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.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as to Monday's business, I can't indicate whether or not the House will sit Monday evening. I will just recall that the Premier had earlier indicated that consideration would be given over the weekend in regard to the possibility of discussing a constitutional resolution. If so, I would be recommending that that be done Monday evening. As to Monday afternoon, the proposal is to bring forward one or two Bills for second reading, then return to Committee of Supply in the Department of Energy and Natural Resources.

[At 1:01 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]

