

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Thursday, April 21, 1983 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, I request the unanimous consent of the members to make a brief statement.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. STILES: I wish to set the record straight respecting comments made by me outside the House.

First, I apologize to Alberta's Jewish community and others who naturally have been gravely upset by the quotations in which I appear to have cast doubt on the reality of the horrors suffered by themselves and their kinsmen during the period of Nazi repression in Europe.

I am old enough to remember the end of the Second World War. I recall the pictures and the descriptions of the tragic condition of the survivors. I have no doubt that horrible atrocities were committed principally but not exclusively against the Jewish people. No one who had that experience can forget. I regret having left the implication that such events should be forgotten. On the contrary, they should be remembered in their stark, terrible reality so mankind can work to prevent their ever being repeated.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, with the continued concurrence of members, I might make a brief statement on the same matter.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the matter raised by the Member for Olds-Didsbury does not touch directly on the business of the House and deals with the expression outside the House of personal views concerning historic, international events not within the ordinary area of public business of a provincial government.

Nevertheless, the Premier, myself, and all other members of the government caucus, wish to completely dissociate ourselves from the views which were expressed outside the House by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury. It is our belief that there is no doubt that mass murder and genocide occurred in Europe during World War II and that the Jewish people were tragically persecuted.

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to draw the attention of the House to some distinguished visitors in the Speaker's gallery. Mr. Elyakim Gustav Badián is here from the state of Israel. Mr. Badián has used his considerable talents and education in the service of his country. He has a master's degree in business administration and is past chairman of the association of professional engineers of the state of Israel. He is a former city alderman of the city of Haifa and a former member of the *Knesset*. His tour

guide for his visit to Edmonton, which is included in his first visit to Canada, is Mrs. Chaim Pollack. I ask our two visitors to stand and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 238****An Act to Amend
the Highway Traffic Act**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce Bill 238, An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to place firmly into law in this province the requirement that all occupants of motor vehicles in Alberta be required to wear seat belts.

[Leave granted; Bill 238 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the response to amended Motion for a Return No. 167.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file with the Legislative Assembly copies of correspondence by way of telex between myself and the Hon. Monique Bégin.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file the annual report of the Alberta Heritage Scholarship Fund for the year ended March 31, 1982.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, grade 10 students from the Irma school in my constituency. There are three reasons they are special to me: one, they're from my home town; two, I've watched them grow up and know they will grow further to be our future leaders; and three, one of the members in the class is my youngest son, Doug, who is here to see his dad in action. Accompanying the students are teacher Elsie McRoberts, parents Mrs. Margaret Archibald and Mrs. Marian Fischer, and bus driver Alvin Valteau. They are seated in the members gallery. Please give these young individuals the usual welcome.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you and to members of the Legislature Dr. Don McCrimmon, who is sitting in your gallery. Don is a former member of this Legislature. He served in the last session as the Minister responsible for Native Affairs, and formerly served as Deputy Speaker.

Don, your many friends welcome you back. We ask that you stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 21 grade 6 students from the McKenzie school, located on CFB Medley. They are accompanied today by their teacher Mr. Paul Atwal, parents Mrs. McReadie and Mrs. Gleeson, and bus driver Mr. Perry. They're seated in the public gallery, and I ask that they rise and receive the welcome of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have one more group to introduce. It's also my honor to introduce to the House a member of the Bonnyville hospital board, who is serving as chairman of the building committee of the Bonnyville health centre. He is seated in the members gallery and is accompanied by his wife Kareen, his son David, and Jim Prosser, an exchange student from Addison, Ontario. I ask that they stand and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 23 bright and energetic students from the Pines community school in the constituency of Red Deer. They're accompanied today by Mr. Opatril, the principal; Mr. Atkinson, the vice-principal; and parents Mrs. San Vicente and Mr. Phelps. Our bright students are seated in the public gallery, and I wonder if they would rise and receive the warm, traditional welcome of this Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Human Rights

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the hon. Minister of Labour. But by way of a very short point of privilege, I would like to say, on behalf of my colleague the Member for Edmonton Norwood, that we appreciate the comment made by the hon. Attorney General today on an item that I think is very important as far as the people of Alberta are concerned; that is, clearly stating where the government stands on the tragedy that took place during World War II with respect to Jewish people.

I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Labour, in his capacity as the minister responsible for the Human Rights Commission, and ask whether or not the government would reassess the position with respect to a major public-awareness campaign to combat racism and anti-Semitism in Alberta, as recommended by the chairman of the Edmonton Jewish Community Relations Council. I recall the answer yesterday, when the minister indicated he was meeting with the chairperson of the Human Rights Commission. Will the minister recommend to the Human Rights Commission that this kind of campaign be undertaken?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, following up on the exchange yesterday in the question period, I think it would be important for me to make the point that, as we know in this Assembly, both the Individual's Rights Protection Act and the Alberta Bill of Rights have as their focus the equal treatment, the compassion and understanding for all human beings regardless of religion, ethnic origin, and several other characteristics. Most of the literature, most of the campaigning, most of the educational process which the Alberta Human Rights Commission undertakes, is undertaken in that manner, for the purpose of creating a general understanding and a general appreciation of the differences of individuals and the fact that those differences make one individual no less important and no less worthy of understanding and compassion than another individual.

While I am quite prepared to discuss the request with the chairman of the Alberta Human Rights Commission, I think we should reflect carefully to determine whether a general effort to create understanding for all may be more

effective in the long run than focussing on one group at a point in time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister with respect to the proposal from the Edmonton Jewish Community Relations Council. That proposal is not just a campaign with respect to anti-Semitism but to combat racism, which would affect all disadvantaged groups equally. Bearing that proposal in mind, will the minister give the House an assurance that this particular suggestion will be the subject of discussion and that the government would favorably entertain a budgetary request from the Human Rights Commission to undertake such a campaign?

MR. YOUNG: Again, Mr. Speaker, other than through the hon. leader's questions, I have not personally received the representation now being conveyed. So apart from the questioning now occurring, I'm not familiar with it.

I can and should advise that the Cultural Heritage Council has made some representation to me indirectly and that I have communicated with the chairman of the Alberta Human Rights Commission. We jointly agree — and, through my colleague the Minister of Culture, are in the process of conveying that agreement to the Heritage Council — that we would be most interested in having a discussion with them on the most appropriate way that they believe an educational process can be undertaken. And that is with regard to all groups, all religious beliefs, all ethnic origins, and all skin colors.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would also like to indicate, by way of trying to demonstrate the broad thrust the commission has undertaken, in keeping with the two statutes I have mentioned — the broad thrust as it is conveyed in literature prepared for school purposes and which is accepted as part of the acceptable teaching materials. These documents deal with those various types of religions, so there is a general understanding and a general respect which I think is essential to gaining respect and understanding for any individual religion or ethnic origin.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask another supplementary question, but I table for hon. members copies of a statement that was delivered to my office. I thought the minister had a copy, but I'll have copies for all hon. members.

My supplementary question is to the Minister of Education. Several days ago, the question was raised with respect to the teaching certificate of Mr. Keegstra in Eckville. The minister responded by saying that action is not normally taken until such time as there is consultation with the Alberta Teachers' Association. Can the minister advise whether he has undertaken any initiative in terms of discussing this matter with the ATA?

MR. KING: I have not taken any initiative to discuss the matter with the Alberta Teachers' Association. It is my understanding that there has been communication between senior officers of the department and the Alberta Teachers' Association or that there will be this afternoon, at least in part to ascertain whether or not the Alberta Teachers' Association plans to take any initiative in this matter. I am cognizant of the representations made earlier this week, that the Alberta Teachers' Association as a professional body is competent to deal with the matter and should be encouraged to. That was the thrust of the

representation I understand was made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

Grocery Market Industry

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It is with respect to the recent merger of buying and negotiating forces between Safeway and IGA, a matter that was discussed in the estimates. I ask the hon. minister what assessment the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has made of the impact of this merged buying power on the competitive position of independent grocers in this province?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the department has undertaken no such assessment. As you know, the combines Act is federal legislation. If there were complaints, I expect the federal government would undertake such an investigation.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Given the inadequacies of the federal anti-combines Act and the long time that is required to even investigate the complaint, has any representation been made by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to the federal government to move on this matter, in order to protect the competitive position of Alberta's independent grocers?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer for what sort of message might have been conveyed by the department or the former minister prior to my assuming the portfolio, but there has been no such communication since last November. If the hon. member believes there to be a major problem, I expect the hon. member to communicate that through federal members. But it may well be that our department should assess the situation and inquire from the federal government as to their position on it at this point in time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the department undertaken any study which would assess to what degree Safeway's own specially built Calgary meat processing and packing plant has had [an impact] on Alberta's other meat packing plants? In particular, what impact has been felt by those plants which still slaughter, process, and package pork products?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any studies, but I'd be happy to check into it and report back.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has the government given any consideration to the impact of what's been popularly described as vertical integration on the competitive position of producers — farmers who have to market their product — as well as competitors in the market place who have to compete at the retail level against large, vertically integrated operations?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, there are no studies that I'm aware of. However, we have had some discussion within the department, particularly about packing plants — and realizing that you have to have economies of scale, which makes you far more competitive — and

what would happen if we had fewer packing plants in the province. In addition to that, I don't believe there has been any discussion.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Is the department giving any consideration at all to following the initiative undertaken by this government in 1973 to negotiate a five-year consent decree with respect to the expansion of Safeway — a decree that was operative from 1973 until 1978 — given the very large size of the market Safeway enjoys in the province and the reasons being similar in 1983 to what they were in 1973?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether the hon. member's comments are absolutely accurate in terms of the conditions today being precisely the same as the conditions in 1973, but I'll certainly undertake to look at the matter.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has any definitive assessment of the share of the market been undertaken by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, especially the share of the market enjoyed by Safeway? In view of the fact that this information did seem to be available in 1973, has there been any independent evaluation of this information by the department in Alberta, or does the department rely on federal information?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, there has been no such assessment, and I'm not aware of whether federal information has been transmitted to us on the subject.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, could I supplement that last answer of my colleague, just to give a balanced view of Safeway's activities in the province. They responded very well to the previous Minister of Agriculture's request that they consider other than vertically integrated suppliers, so this government has been actively involved in talking to Safeway about their access to the market. Indeed there was a product show at Lake Louise about 14 months ago, where I think Safeway agreed to take product from every Alberta supplier, some of it into the international market, certainly some . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It seems to me that we're getting well beyond the scope of the question. I suppose there could have been some things in the questions which might have implied that Safeway might have too large a share of the market, but I think we're rather a long way from starting a debate on the subject.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. When she's looking at this particular area, would she consider investigating the prices in Alberta compared to other provinces, to indicate whether the domination of the market by this particular company has had any effect on the Alberta market place?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Member for Calgary Currie, who indeed raised a concern about this area when I was doing my estimates, I think it's premature at this point in time for me to undertake that precise an investigation, but we'll start.

Labor Legislation — Public Hearings

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Member for Drumheller, chairman of the Public Affairs Committee, is with regard to the submissions. I wonder if the hon. chairman could indicate the specific criteria used to select the participants in the hearings next week, so it is clear to this Assembly exactly what was and was not said to the participants.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, the criteria he's talking about are laid down very thoroughly in the notice that went out. I could read it. I'm sure he has it available; it's been in every paper. But if he wishes me to read it, I could read it for the record:

Notice of intention to present a written submission must be delivered to either Mr. M. Clark, M.L.A.

...

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I can read the thing. I have read it, and I've read the resolution. [interjections] That's not what I'm asking for.

I'm asking whether this chairman and the vice-chairman lived up to those criteria. My follow-up question is very definite. Are all the provincial labor groups that made submissions going to have the opportunity of making a submission to the hearing next week? Are all the private-enterprise groups and business groups that wanted to make a presentation being allowed to make a presentation to this committee next week? That's what I want to know. Were some decisions made which prohibit citizens of Alberta from making submissions to the committee next week?

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, the notice and Motion 13 laid down that we had four days and that there were 40 minutes per hearing. This allowed us 20 hearings. We have now selected most of them. We couldn't accommodate all of them. We are very fortunate that there was so much interest in this Bill from both sides that we were presented with 53 notices of intention. So there will be 33 people who will not take [part] in the hearings. The vice-chairman and I looked at the question of time and what is laid down in the motion.

MR. R. SPEAKER: It's unfortunate that this government thinks in terms of time rather ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. member, in his responsible position: did the chairman and vice-chairman consider coming back to this Legislature and requesting more time for the hearings? Is that considered, and is that a possible proposal?

MR. CLARK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Why not?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. member: why not? Secondly, in making the decision to disregard the submissions of some 33 members, why was it not done?

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I as chairman and the vice-chairman, the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar, looked at all 53 presentations. We selected the ones that

were more representative of a total government area and that were directly affected by the legislation. Of those, in our capacities as chairman and vice-chairman, we picked the ones we thought were most directly affected, were province-wide, and had the most reason for being in the hearings. We had four days. It's laid out in Motion 13 that we had four days and that there would be 40 minutes per hearing. We followed that to the letter. That's all I can say. We have made a commitment.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member. The guideline states very clearly that it will take into consideration groups that represent province-wide interests. Can the member indicate to this Legislative Assembly that no groups that represent province-wide interests, such as labor groups, have been disqualified from making verbal or written presentations to that hearing next week?

MR. CLARK: No, I cannot make that commitment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, if I can just supplement the response of the hon. member. Many of the labor organizations and groups belong to umbrella organizations, and those organizations that were requested to submit briefs and not appear before the hearing certainly have the opportunity to do so through their umbrella organization.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question. Could the hon. chairman indicate whether any of the human rights groups or organizations which represent broad attitudes of a provincial nature have been disqualified from making presentations to the Legislature?

MR. CLARK: For the record, Mr. Speaker, nobody has been disqualified from making presentations to the committee. Written presentations will be tabled at the committee level — the ones that have been informed they cannot take part in the hearings themselves because of the time restrictions. As far as the human rights committee is concerned, I would like the vice-chairman to supplement that, because he was the one who talked to those people.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, in compliance with the notice put forth in the paper, the chairman and vice-chairman were available last Friday and Monday morning to notify interested groups or organizations whether or not they would receive a hearing in advance of making their submission. We tried to be as helpful as possible to most groups. In this particular instance, we indicated that we welcomed a written submission but that the unlikelihood of their appearing before the hearings was there, and they were advised accordingly. This group chose not to make a submission, and that was their own decision.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the chairman indicate whether the groups that will appear before the committee represent provincial labor organizations only, or will other types of provincial organizations make presentations as well?

MR. CLARK: All representations that will be made in front of the hearing will be province-wide in scope, Mr. Speaker, and we have given priority to those most directly affected. The priority would be in the hospital and health field. If we had to make a choice — and we had to

set a priority — it would have to be those in the health field, who were directly affected.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. Member for Drumheller or the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar. It's with respect to provincial organizations in the bargaining field, the labor field, that are directly affected, versus — I think I picked up the comment from the vice-chairman about umbrella organizations. Can either the chairman or the vice-chairman assure the House that every union organization that is directly affected will have an opportunity to make representation to this Assembly, regardless of whether it is a member of the Alberta Federation of Labour or not? I refer specifically to one example, but example only: the Canadian Union of Public Employees happens to be a member of the Alberta Federation of Labour.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, if I could respond to that question. We've dealt with many organizations. I think it was the intent of the chairman and the vice-chairman, as set out in the motion, to deal with the various groups. We will be reporting back to the committee on Monday. Maybe we can deal with the specifics at that time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either hon. gentleman. So that members may have an idea of how those judgments were made within the criteria set by the resolution, what steps did the chairman and vice-chairman take to determine who in fact might make representation where a group was directly affected but was also a member of an umbrella organization? How were those choices made?

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, if I could respond. I think I effectively dealt with that in my previous response.

Mortgage Company Bankruptcy

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has the minister investigated allegations by the receivers of Dial Mortgage Corporation Ltd. that for more than a year before the company went bankrupt, the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs was aware that Dial could not meet its required level of working capital and took no action to correct the situation or protect creditors?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The matter referred to in the question is before the courts. The way the question was framed, it certainly dealt squarely with the issues being considered if that action proceeds to trial.

MR. MARTIN: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. It's public knowledge. I'm not asking about the merits of the case; I'm asking if the department knew this — that's all. I'm not asking about whether that was right or wrong in a legal sense.

MR. SPEAKER: It appears that we're dealing with what may well be evidence in the proceedings, and that has no place on the floor of this House while those proceedings are under way or pending.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Can the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs confirm that on

January 27, the day the province served a stop order on Dial's banker, the Royal Bank of Canada, freezing creditors' funds, the Royal Bank immediately withdrew money from Dial's accounts to meet overdrafts in Dial's operating account? [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think that by that question we've really escaped the sub judice rule, and it should be honored in the Assembly. Those are matters which could clearly be included in evidence coming before the hearing, before the courts, and shouldn't be dealt with here until after the matter has been concluded in the courts.

MR. MARTIN: Well, let me ask some other questions to try to get some information. Is the government considering legal action against the Royal Bank ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. MARTIN: With all due respect, this is not to do with this specific case. I'm asking if the government is considering legal action against the Royal Bank for possible contravention of the freeze order.

MR. SPEAKER: I must express my admiration at the adroitness of the hon. member but, with respect, I must also suggest that he hasn't really escaped from under the umbrella of the sub judice rule.

MR. MARTIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking if the government is contemplating a court action. It has nothing to do with the previous court action.

MR. NOTLEY: Answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: It would seem to me it's really too closely related.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. I'll come with another question then. Surely I'll get one answered. [interjections]

Is the minister in a position to inform the House — and I'm not asking about the merits — with regard to the status of legal action against the government over its alleged responsibility in the bankruptcy of Dial Mortgage? Where does it sit at this time?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of public record that a statement of claim was issued, and that's the reason the hon. member has gotten the answers he's just been getting.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Has it gone to court, then?

MR. CRAWFORD: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: I'm sure this one will be okay. In view of the precedent of the analogous Re-Mor bankruptcy in Ontario, has the minister considered the option of referring the Dial mortgage matter to the Alberta Ombudsman for a speedy and less costly determination?

MR. CRAWFORD: Once again, Mr. Speaker, it's well known that in the statute under which the Ombudsman carries out his important duties, he doesn't deal with matters that are before the courts.

MR. MARTIN: A point of order. There is a precedent. On April 8 the Ontario government sent this . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: This is Alberta, Ray.

MR. MARTIN: Even though it was in the courts in Ontario, they did refer it to the Ombudsman, and the Ombudsman came back with the award. I'm asking if the Alberta government is considering this, Mr. Speaker. [interjections]

MR. NOTLEY: The answer is obviously no.

MR. SPEAKER: I can't say that the question is out of order. It would appear to me that it's just been answered, though, that the government's view is that the Ombudsman's jurisdiction is excluded in regard to matters that are before the courts.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Then I ask the Attorney General, I guess — he seems to be doing all the answering — why it would be the case that they could do it in Ontario but we could not refer it in Alberta? [interjections]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in order that there won't be any doubt, despite the allegations of my willingness to respond to these questions so far as that's proper, I would have to point out to the hon. member that what provisions of the Ontario Ombudsman Act there may be and what provisions of the Alberta Act there may be, might bear some comparison, if the hon. member is saying that the practice in Ontario is a certain way which is different from the practice here. The practice here is not that way, because that's what our legislation says, as it always has since it was passed in the 1960s.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, then. Would you explain why it cannot be referred to the Ombudsman? That's what I'm asking for. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. [interjections]

MR. MARTIN: We still don't have the answer to that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will reflect on the question, I think he will realize that he is asking for a legal opinion. The question period isn't the place for that.

MR. MARTIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I'm not asking for a legal opinion. There is precedent for this being sent to the Ombudsman while it was in the courts. If it can be done in Ontario, I'm wondering what makes it different here? That's all I'm asking. It's not anything legal.

MR. JOHNSTON: You're wasting the time of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't want to debate this, but we're going to have get onto another topic. Surely it's been made plain that whatever may be the law under the Ontario Ombudsman Act may be one thing and what it is under the Ombudsman Act of Alberta is another. [interjection] Order please. If the hon. member wishes to make a comparison and get legal advice, he is welcome to do so.

Federal Budget — Capital Works

MR. ZIP: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Provincial Treasurer. Regarding the federal budget, did the Provincial Treasurer make any recommendations to the federal government as to specific capital projects for Alberta?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I suppose the question would relate to a number of projects. The single most important project on which recommendations have been made by a number of ministers — indeed by western premiers and certainly by this government — would be the western transportation initiative. That appears to be carried forward in the budget and involves something over \$3.5 billion, I believe, over the next four years. So that is an item on which representations have been made by a number of ministries in a number of forums over quite a few months in the past.

With regard to specific smaller federal capital projects, if we are talking about such items in Alberta as post offices, airports, or federal public buildings, of course it would be inappropriate for this government to make recommendations to Ottawa on those. The Members of Parliament for Alberta would — and I'm sure do — make regular and vigorous representations. The federal government makes its decisions and takes the responsibility for those decisions with regard to those kinds of federal capital works.

With regard to provincial capital works, those are listed in the province's agenda in the budget, some \$1.9 billion. This government has made those decisions; we take the responsibility. And in that area of provincial responsibility, it would of course be totally inappropriate for us to be inviting or suggesting to the federal government that any steps be taken from Ottawa that would distort the provincial government priorities and those of this Assembly.

Exceptional Children — Education

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. I'd like to know if the minister can indicate to the Assembly if the task force on gifted children will be tabled in this Legislature?

MR. KING: It wasn't my intention to table it, Mr. Speaker. Arrangements are being made to distribute it to all Members of the Legislative Assembly and, as I noted yesterday, it was released to the public yesterday afternoon. There is perhaps merit in tabling it with the Assembly. Given the fact that it is public information and widely distributed, I could at least file it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate if he's in a position to tell the Assembly how many pilot projects the minister or his department have going at this time, as to the programs set out for gifted children?

MR. KING: The department itself does not have any pilot projects under way. A number of programs for gifted and talented children are operating in various school boards throughout the province. They are, however, the result of the initiative of the school board and of teachers in that jurisdiction.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in these pilot projects for gifted children that are going on throughout the province,

can the minister indicate approximately what age groups we are looking at?

MR. KING: I'm aware of programs for gifted and talented children running right from grade 1 to grade 12. I should make it clear that when I say programs, that is sometimes as simple as the acceleration which takes a grade 1 pupil out of the grade 1 classroom for part of the day or part of the week and puts that child in with a grade 2 classroom. If the member observed that that's a very rudimentary kind of program for the gifted and talented, I would agree. I only wish to make the point that in one way or another, school boards are attempting to respond to the needs of gifted and talented children right from grade 1 to grade 12.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What flexibility do school boards have in responding to the needs of exceptional children?

MR. KING: They have extreme flexibility, on the one hand, in that there are absolutely no restrictions or parameters that originate with Alberta Education. On the other hand, they are restricted, in that appropriate support, however you may define that, doesn't come from the Department of Education. Activity depends upon local resources, local initiative, and local circumstances.

If I could add, Mr. Speaker, I should have made one exception to that. The educational opportunity fund, which originates with the provincial government, can be used to support programming for the gifted and talented, and in a few jurisdictions it is. As a matter of practice, however, in the great majority of cases it is used to provide programming for the disadvantaged.

NEED Program

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Manpower is with regard to the NEED program. I wonder if the minister could indicate what additional cost-sharing funds will come to Alberta from the federal government under the NEED program? Has the minister been advised of that figure at this time?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, the simple answer to the question is no. I had a telephone conversation with the hon. Mr. Axworthy this afternoon. He still has not got to the point of addressing the breakdown of additional funds or whether it will be an extension of our existing agreement. Discussions will be ongoing as soon as he's had a chance to assess it from his end.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Will it be the intention of the government to match the additional funds, whatever they are, that are going to be made available by the federal government out of the some \$280 million?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, that question will be addressed during the negotiations. At this point in time, I have no definite indication that the federal government wishes to put these into the matching pot or whether it would like to use them to double our Alberta youth employment program. It could be another opportunity.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate what percentage of the

projects submitted to the minister's office are being approved under the NEED program?

MR. ISLEY: As far as an exact percentage is concerned, I couldn't. If the hon. member is interested, I could tell him the number of projects that have been approved and the number of positions that have been created.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Under the guidelines of the NEED program, the purpose of the funds is to support regional economic growth and development in Alberta. I wonder if the minister could indicate the reasons behind supplying funds for golf course upgrading and expansion in the towns of Devon, Barrhead, Lac La Biche, and Grande Cache. How do those funds qualify in terms of the guideline of economic growth?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, the approval process is a joint committee of provincial and federal officials, with recommendations subsequently coming back. If the hon. member reads the guidelines a little more closely, I think he will realize how the projects fit.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate that those projects were approved by the minister and had his consent, as part of the economic growth development program of Alberta? Were they approved by the minister?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the context the hon. member is asking the question, the answer would be no.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will it be the minister's intention to support projects of a similar nature in other communities in Alberta?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, it would be our intention to support any projects that meet the guidelines, provided they are submitted and receive federal as well as provincial approval prior to the funds running out.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarity in this Assembly. Did the minister approve the four projects for funding golf course improvements in the respective four incorporated authorities I mentioned? Did the minister personally approve those projects?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure of the four he mentioned. I will have to check to see if there are indeed four golf courses. I can recollect golf course projects that were approved, and I did approve them, yes. But unless you want me to check the records, I won't say specifically which four.

DR. BUCK: Do you know what you sign, Ernie?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the hon. minister confirm clearly to this Assembly that approval will be given to golf courses for financial support under the NEED program?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the hon. member that the program was initially developed to create short-term job opportunities. Preference was given where it would provide some sort of continuous employment opportunities. At this point in time, no final agree-

ments have been signed, if that's what the hon. member is asking. A number of projects have been approved, pending final accounting and the cleaning up of certain details. Within the list of approved projects are some dealing with the expansion of golf courses, improvements to golf courses, community halls, park improvements, and a great variety of other things, including some plant improvements in the private sector.

MR. ALEXANDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Not the Mayfair, Keith.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, if the minister has not yet approved the funds which are to be used for upgrading or building golf courses, I wonder if he would assure the Assembly that he will hurry up and do so. [interjections]

MR. NOTLEY: The poor people from the Mayfair.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View has been trying to get into this.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. minister. Does the minister know how many projects have been approved for Calgary under the NEED program?

DR. BUCK: Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that on notice.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary.

MR. R. SPEAKER: For the information of the hon. minister, I have in my hands his press release of March 24, which has a list of approved projects. In that list of approved projects are the Barrhead golf club, the Devon golf club, the Grande Cache golf club, and the Lac La Biche golf club.

MR. MARTIN: I didn't know they were in trouble.

MR. R. SPEAKER: It's approved, and I want to know if the minister approved those personally as projects under the NEED program. If so, is that the type of project that will be approved, in terms of future submissions?

MR. MARTIN: They're in trouble in those areas.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have just checked my list here. Those four projects are among the 69 that have received initial approval, pending final accounting procedures. They will create — and many of them are designed for a May 1 start-up date — 518 jobs over a variety of time lines. Some of them are three months; some of them are six months. And yes, we are approving many community development projects under the new employment and expansion development program. If we're going to get into a debate as to whether or not developing a golf

course is economically viable, maybe the hon. member had better look at what tourism does for this province.

MR. SPEAKER: As far as the question period is concerned, we've reached the 19th hole. [laughter]

DR. BUCK: You mean it's time for a drink?

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Assembly agree that certain hon. members might revert — I think I have four requests here — to Introduction of Special Guests, starting with the hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks, the hon. Minister responsible for Personnel Administration, the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, and the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**
(*reversion*)

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to say welcome to Alberta and welcome to Edmonton to some 54 young Canadians, grade 9 students from Wildwood, Alberta, in my constituency. Twenty-seven of the students are from Almonte, Ontario. They are here on a student exchange, Mr. Speaker, and I understand that the Wildwood group will be going back to Ontario on May 17. I am glad to see these young students taking part in the democratic system and learning the laws of Alberta and, of course, our country.

They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Nichols and Mrs. Gatzke, from Wildwood; Mr. and Mrs. Souter, from Almonte, Ontario; and a parent, Mrs. Riehl, from Wildwood. I ask that they all stand and receive a warm welcome from this Assembly.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Banff-Cochrane — and on behalf of my colleagues the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the Member for Three Hills; the Member for Olds-Didsbury; and the Member for Drumheller — it is my privilege to introduce to you the reeve and a number of council members from municipal district No. 44 of Rocky View. Some people say that my eyesight is dimming; I also would indicate that there is a large column in the way, and I'm not sure how many of the council members are accompanying the reeve. But I believe Pete Morison and Don Edge are here as well. Would they please rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, in your gallery I see a distinguished visitor from the city of Calgary. Through you, I would like to introduce to this Assembly, Chief Commissioner George Cornish. Mr. Cornish has been with the board of commissioners in Calgary for at least 15 years, I believe, and has been chief commissioner now for about five years. I think he's outlasted all the politicians in the city. I'd like him to rise and receive the welcome of our House.

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, my former seat mate in Calgary city council, past president of the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, one fine alderman, and a good friend, Alderman Craig Reid.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

218. Moved by Mr. Purdy:

Be it resolved that the Assembly consider the desirability of legislation in Alberta to provide for the mandatory use of seat belts in motor vehicles.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, before I commence my remarks on this very important motion, I ask for unanimous consent of the House that this debate not conclude at 4:30 but continue until 5:30.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it the Assembly has agreed, even now?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: No one contra? It is so ordered.

MR. PURDY: When I started this debate today, Mr. Speaker, I felt compelled to wait about five seconds, not for the opposition members to quiet down but to say that the motion is about seat belts, and it takes about five seconds to buckle up when you get into your vehicle.

I have a keen interest in this particular motion, being a director of the Alberta Safety Council. I see that there are two members in our gallery today, Mr. Bob Neverkauf, who's the president and general manager, and Jim McCready, who's the president of the Edmonton Safety Council. I ask both gentlemen to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

As a member of the Alberta Safety Council, a number of my colleagues have asked me: what is the Alberta Safety Council? I would just like to read into the record what the Alberta Safety Council is:

The Alberta Safety Council is a non-profit, non-governmental, public service organization, founded in 1946 and incorporated by an Act of the Legislature in 1952. The Council's aim is to reduce injuries and fatalities due to accidents.

I have another interest in bringing this to the floor of the Legislature; it is my duty as a fireman and fire chief of a fire department west of Edmonton. I have seen enough death and carnage on Highway 16 and on our rural roads in the county of Parkland to make me bring forth this particular motion. It's not only in the county of Parkland or urban Highway No. 16 that this happens; it happens throughout Alberta.

I distinctly remember a case on September 29, 1982. We got called to a motor vehicle accident on Highway 16 at the Fallis corner. I took a young lady I knew very well out of that car. She left two small children and a husband. If she'd been wearing a seat belt, she'd be here to hear my remarks today. I recall a number of other accidents where people have needlessly lost their lives because they did not buckle up or just ignored the effectiveness of seat belts.

As an employee of TransAlta Utilities, we have said to our employees, buckle up. There are insignia in every vehicle. I think that leadership role the company started a number of years ago saved the life of one of our employees in 1981. He was travelling to work from Spruce Grove

to the plant at Wabamun on a very foggy morning. He ran into the back of a truck that was illegally parked on Highway 16 in the fog. Don was wearing a seat belt, and he came out of the accident to talk about it. He spent some time in the hospital, but the overlying conclusion that was reached by the police and other investigating authorities was that if he had not been wearing a seat belt, he would not be here today.

Mr. Speaker, my notes today are very comprehensive, and there are a lot of statistics in them, so I'm going to be referring to my notes more than I usually do when I'm making a speech in this Assembly. We know that in 1974 the federal government brought in legislation that all Canadian automobiles had to have lap and shoulder harnesses installed. Since that date, there haven't been very many provinces that have picked up legislation to make it mandatory.

The experts are in general agreement about the effectiveness of occupant-restraint systems. It is their feeling that seat belts reduce serious and fatal injuries by 60 to 80 per cent and moderate injuries by 40 to 60 per cent. One statistic shows that lives could have been saved in 50 per cent of fatal accidents. In Sweden, of 28,000 accidents revealed, not one person wearing a seat belt was killed in accidents up to 60 miles an hour. However, unrestrained passengers were killed at speeds as low as 12 miles an hour. Transport Canada studies in 1971 show that 90 per cent of 3,200 drivers and passengers killed that year were not wearing seat belts. It predicted that 55 per cent, or some 1,600 lives, would have been saved if occupants had been buckled up.

What about the province of Alberta? A survey was done on the use of seat belts, and the majority using restraint devices in vehicles are under the age of 5. I guess some people, the parents, do buckle their children in; that's at 24.6. The lowest range of people using seat belts is from ages 16 to 17. The next highest is the group from 30 to 34, and then it gradually falls off.

A number of publications have been put out by the safety branch of Alberta Transportation. One of them is "Keep them safe", and it shows how to belt in, how to use restraints for children, how to buckle up for the pregnant woman, and various things. Another brochure put out by Alberta Transportation is entitled "Do you want to triple your chances . . . of surviving?" I would commend some of these brochures to all members to read. Number four brochure is "Do you want to gamble with your child's life just to save money?" This is one the province has put out on child restraint. This is an especially worth-while brochure. I ask members to distribute this in their constituencies; get it out to young families so they may see it. The other brochure put out by the safety branch of Transportation is "Seat belts work". It's another brochure showing some collisions and so on.

In 1975, Mr. A. C. Shiels of the transportation centre at the University of Saskatchewan showed that the potential benefit of seat belt usage for those people fatally injured in car accidents would have been 55 per cent. Benefits would have been even greater in injury-producing accidents, because 35 people are injured per year for every person killed.

In September 1981, Alberta Transportation showed that 90 per cent of Albertans felt that seat belts saved lives or reduced injuries at least some of the time. Despite this feeling, an average of only 12.9 per cent of Albertans actually buckled up over the past four years. In 1977 an Alberta Transportation study on traffic deaths showed that 30 per cent of those killed would have survived if

seat belts had been used. An Alberta Transportation accident investigation team revealed that in 43 fatal accidents involving 58 deaths in 1977, 21 people, or 36.2 per cent of the total, would have survived if they had worn seat belts.

[Dr. Buck in the Chair]

Police officers investigating accidents in Alberta during the holiday period from December 2, 1977, to January 1978, in which 24 people lost their lives, 10 fatalities or 41 ...

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if the hon. member is reading his speech. Could you indicate whether that is permissible at this time, and under what section that would qualify or not qualify? [laughter]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Little Bow seems to be having a little problem. The hon. member who is delivering the address is only using the material for notes. [laughter]

MR. PURDY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did say at the outset that I'd be referring to my notes more than I usually do in this Assembly. Now where was I? I lost my notes.

During the period '78-81, it is estimated that if seat belts had been used by every Albertan involved in a motor vehicle accident, 64.5 per cent of the fatalities, 51.5 per cent of major injuries, 33.1 per cent of minor injuries, and 16.3 per cent of minimal injuries would have been reduced. In 1980 the Alberta Transportation safety branch revealed that seat belts would likely have prevented 272 road fatalities that year.

We have one colleague in this Assembly, the former Minister of Transportation, who was very supportive of seat belt legislation. He estimated that in 1980, of the 700 people killed in this province, 300 could have been saved if they had used seat belts. Estimates for 1982 indicate that 241 Albertans would be alive today if they had been wearing their seat belts.

The question that's asked of me is the impact of mandatory seat belt legislation on human life; what has happened with jurisdictions throughout the world and in Canada? I'd just like to share with hon. members some statistics and facts of what has taken place in some other jurisdictions. Thirty jurisdictions throughout the world have compulsory seat belt legislation which is resulting in a notable reduction in deaths and injury rates and savings of billions of dollars. Overall studies indicate that mandatory seat belt legislation has resulted in approximately a 33 per cent reduction in fatalities and a 25 per cent reduction in injuries. There are five jurisdictions in Canada that have seat belt legislation. I have figures for all except Newfoundland. Newfoundland only went to seat belt legislation in 1982.

British Columbia first enacted legislation in 1977. Fatalities in the first year were reduced by 12 per cent. Quebec introduced legislation in 1976, along with a reduction in speed limits. Although accidents in '76 increased by 15 per cent over 1975, fatalities were down by 16 per cent, and minor injuries decreased by 16.5 per cent. A news release put out by the past [president], I believe he is, of the Quebec safety council is interesting. They were on an open-line show, and he said:

Participants in the open-line programmes made it

abundantly clear that where seat-belt usage was concerned and the freedom to wear them (or not), their right to die in a car collision was far more important than the right to live.

This is one of the comments that they heard more and more in that open-line show that was held.

It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that one radio station in Edmonton, namely CJCA, on the Bill and Bill show — we had it the Bill and Bill and Bill show last Friday — did a survey last Friday and Monday. From my listening to the show and information that I've received back, about 65 to 70 per cent of the people who phoned in were in favor of mandatory seat belt legislation. That's quite a switch from a year ago, if we'd had a survey in this province.

Ontario introduced legislation in 1976, along with a reduced speed limit. Nevertheless, the fatality reduction figures that follow are primarily attributed to the seat belt use. In the first two months of legislation, there was a 35 per cent reduction in deaths and a 15 per cent decline in injuries. Over the first year, there was a 17.8 per cent reduction in fatalities, 185 lives were saved, and 4,772 fewer people were injured. This was one of the lowest levels of traffic-related deaths in the province since 1962. A further 8.7 per cent drop in traffic fatalities occurred in the second year.

Our sister province Saskatchewan introduced legislation in July 1977. The effectiveness of their seat belt law can now be truly judged, because they did not bring in a lower speed limit at the same time. From January to June of 1978, although accidents increased by 6 per cent, fatal accidents dropped by 29.2 per cent. Non-fatal accidents fell by 18.6 per cent. This resulted in a 37.7 per cent decrease in drivers killed, a 25 per cent decrease in fatally injured passengers, and 7.7 per cent fewer injuries. Over the first year of the legislation, there was a 10 per cent decline in accidents that resulted in a 19.5 per cent reduction in fatalities and a 9 per cent reduction in injuries.

The director of emergency services at the University of Alberta, Mr. J.M. Davidson — and I trust it's a man — in the *Edmonton Journal* of June 10, 1982: as director of Edmonton's busiest hospital emergency department, I am sick of seeing the waste of human life and the misery caused by the neglect of an elementary safety precaution.

Efforts have been made to project the results of mandatory seat belt legislation in the Alberta situation. A 1978 study by Alberta Transportation of 75 crashes in the province, in which 95 people were killed, estimated that 36 to 38 per cent could have been saved if they had been required to wear seat belts. The sad fact was that 72 per cent of those killed were under 30, an incredible waste of potential. Ten people who were injured in these crashes would have had their injuries significantly reduced if they had been required to wear seat belts.

What happens with our health care system in the province? What are the ramifications of ignoring the effectiveness of seat belts? Millions of dollars in hospital, social welfare, and police costs resulting from accidents fall back on the taxpayer. The cost of enforcing seat belt legislation would be offset by savings in health care costs and insurance premiums.

We only have to refer to the brief given by Dr. Irving, who was the president of the Alberta Medical Association in 1979. I would like to quote a couple of passages from his presentation to the Medical Association:

The Alberta Medical Association has long been in favor of legislation to make seat belt usage mandatory. When that legislation was not forthcoming, the

Association attempted to encourage the population to voluntarily wear seat belts in order to reduce the degree of injury and the risk of death in automobile accidents. Of secondary, but still a major, concern is the resultant reduction in the costs of health care necessary for the treatment and management of such injuries . . .

At annual meetings of the Alberta Medical Association, a majority of the members have consistently passed resolutions urging legislation for seat belt use. They conclude by saying the following — I'm not going to conclude with this remark, but I leave this thought from the Alberta Medical Association with hon. members:

If politicians are genuinely looking for economies in the health care system, this is one area where enormous savings could be effected.

A study was carried on in the Stockholm university in Sweden. The potential savings in health care costs, set against the cost of seat belt legislation, could be a projected gain of \$4 million. In Australia, where mandatory seat belt legislation has been introduced, there has been a reduction of 18 per cent in fatalities, 14 per cent in injuries, and 24 per cent in hospitalization. In provinces where seat belts are compulsory, the number of people in hospitals from motor vehicle accidents has dropped 16 to 29 per cent, despite a corresponding increase of the same percentage in the accident rate.

In Quebec, projections were made that seat belts would save 193 lives, leave 10,632 fewer people injured, reduce hospitalization cases by 2,505, which when multiplied by the average hospital stay of 12.9 days required for accident victims would mean a saving of 5,361 bed-days, calculated at over \$7 million. In Ontario, costs related to traffic accident injuries dropped \$2 million over '75 to '76, the year mandatory seat belt legislation was introduced. Furthermore, average hospitalization costs for those injured while wearing seat belts was \$228 as compared to \$419 for non-seatbelt users. British Columbia estimated it could save 148,620 hospital bed-days with a 50 per cent seat belt usage rate, a long-term saving of \$11.5 million over one year.

Transposing the results of mandatory seat belt legislation from other jurisdictions to Alberta, the Alberta Medical Association estimates that there would be a \$15 million saving per year in health costs alone. The former Minister of Transportation for this province, the Member for Chinook, estimated that in 1980 medical costs associated with Alberta traffic accidents could have been reduced by \$5 million and indirect social costs by \$25 million by the use of seat belts.

A number of educational campaigns have been carried out, and they haven't been very effective. The United Kingdom spent \$3 million on a five-year program. It increased utilization from 15 to 30 per cent in the first month, but then it fell to 20 per cent after eight or nine months. In 1968 and '69, the National Safety Council campaign in the United States, conducted over an 18-month period and costing \$51 million, left no seat belt law virtually unchanged in any state in the United States.

A \$450,000 advertising blitz in the fall of 1980, which showed ads of a pumpkin being hurled to the ground and a coconut being smashed under a metal weight to duplicate the impact of a body being thrown from a car or a head hitting a dashboard to convince people to buckle up when they drive, was declared a complete waste of money. Twenty-five per cent of the people surveyed said they had seen part of the program but were not convinced

to start using seat belts.

The Alberta Safety Council conducted extensive seat belt surveys in 1968 and again in 1974. In both cases, the usage rate was 18.4, despite an extensive educational buckle-up campaign that was carried out during this period. The province was also involved in the buckle-up campaign. The problem with such programs is that while they are commendable, they do not appear to change the attitude or behavior of drivers or passengers, only mandatory seat belt laws and police enforcement appear to make people buckle up. In Australia, for example, mandatory seat belt legislation keeps its usage rate at about 80 per cent with very little decrease over time.

We're going to get the counter arguments, Mr. Speaker, about why we shouldn't be using seat belts. When someone is thrown from a car, they stand very little chance of surviving. They do not get thrown clear. They either hit the pavement, get run over by another vehicle, or get hit by their own. It is safer to remain inside the passenger compartment of a vehicle rather than be propelled into the hostile environment of pavement, trees, or moving vehicles, where you cannot choose your landing spot. Research shows that the risk of serious injury or death is many times greater if a person is ejected. Ejection occurs in about 25 per cent of all fatal collisions and is one of the major causes of death.

You can look at it this way. If a person is driving down the road at 50 kilometres and runs into a parked truck or a stationary object, that vehicle comes to a stop within two feet. But the people not buckled up inside that vehicle continue at 50 kilometres until they find something to rest against, usually the dashboard or the windshield.

Then there's the argument about getting trapped in a car that's on fire or has gone into a lake or a slough. A study of 1,297 fatalities showed that 24, or 19.1 per cent of the total, burned in crashes: 19 people in heavy trucks and gasoline tankers, 3 in passenger cars, and 2 pedestrians trapped between exploding vehicles. Given these statistics, the odds are simply not in favor of going without a seat belt to escape such a rare occurrence, even if someone puts credence in the possibility of doing so. The second study showed that fewer than .5 per cent are involved in this type of accident. It went on to suggest that in any collision, it is better to be restrained, conscious, and relatively uninjured and so be better able to escape in case of fire or submersion.

Then there's the human rights cry: I shouldn't be able to be forced to wear a seat belt. I've heard: if I should choose to die in a car crash, it's none of the government's business — a clear example of how seriously twisted thinking is. Something is drastically wrong when people start insisting on their right to die as a reason to ignore safety law. People who make the argument that it's an infringement against people's rights, never complain about wearing seat belts in an airplane. They just buckle up because they're expected to.

Essentially the argument comes down to weighing the liberties of one person to drive unencumbered by a belt, against the other's liberty to remain free from physical injuries or financial burdens. Non-belted drivers constitute a threat to public safety and welfare, for they are not able to maintain control of their vehicles after an accident, and therefore present greater dangers to pedestrians and others. Highways are built with taxpayers' money and are public property. The government should represent the best interests of the public by seeing that it is used in a manner that contributes to public safety and

welfare.

There is already an elaborate set of laws set out regarding those who may drive and under what conditions. Seat belt laws would just be one more addition to the rules of the road, but it would be an addition that would save a number of lives. Non-seatbelt users impose a financial burden on our society, Mr. Speaker. Services of police, ambulance, and fire department personnel and equipment are required at accident scenes more frequently, and greater attention is required at hospitals from doctors and nurses.

I thought today — and I see there is a good representation by the press — we might have a full press gallery after the number of clippings I have here with me indicating that the press is now picking up on talking to the police: were the people killed in that accident belted in or not? I congratulate them for that. I think there has to be a greater awareness of the general public that that person injured or killed in that motor vehicle accident was not belted in or, the other way around, that person's life was saved because he was belted in.

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to conclude by talking about Saved By The Belt Club. This is a club that was put in place by the Alberta Safety Council in 1980. It is possible to supplement my personal experience with the testament of 115 other Albertans. That's the number of Albertans who have joined the Saved By The Belt Club since 1980. It is an organization made up of Albertans who have avoided death or serious injury in motor vehicle accidents because they were wearing seat belts.

The Alberta Safety Council has sponsored this and asks nothing more of its members than to convince others of the value of seat belts by sharing their experiences. The fact that these Albertans are still alive publicizes better than advertising campaigns that seat belts do work. Indeed the club members are living proof — and I emphasize — that seat belts save lives and reduce injuries in traffic crashes.

Thank you.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few very short remarks with regard to this matter because I know there are a number of people who wish to speak to the resolution. First of all, I want to say that I believe in seat belts. They are something that should be used by all Albertans when they drive a vehicle. I certainly believe in all the arguments in terms of what they do in terms of saving lives and safety, the benefits of seat belts used by drivers of vehicles and passengers.

I'd also like to say that I think there's negligence in terms of public buses that do not have seat belts. I've wondered many times why a public bus does not have a seat belt for a person to use or not use as the person sees fit, but they're not there; trains, the very same. Under the speed, the present conditions, I think that would certainly be of great benefit. But they're not in public conveyances such as buses or trains.

I hope that the government will allow for a free vote in the Legislature on this issue so each person can vote according to their personal feelings or their constituents' feelings. I hope the government has not made a decision in one way and that everybody has to be colored with the same brush. So I'd certainly recommend to the deputy House leader that that type of format is taken with regard to this resolution.

As I have said, I believe in seat belts. Two other comments relate to that. In my discussions with my hon. colleague and the introduction of his Bill today, we have

two different points of view. My hon. colleague from Clover Bar believes that it should be mandatory and, by legislation, all people should wear seat belts. I respect that point of view, and I know my hon. colleague will put that point of view forcefully before this Legislature.

On the other hand, I believe and have taken the position that the other position should be held, whereby people should have the right to decide whether they use seat belts. We have done some preliminary surveys and find that most people do not wear seat belts; for example, the people who drive into the parking lot of this Legislature. Sixty per cent of the people who drive through that entrance downstairs do not wear their seat belts; that's us, as members. We have done a survey in the last day or two. Sixty per cent do not wear their seat belt into the parking lot; 40 per cent do. I think that says something about our own attitudes towards whether we want to, we don't, or we want to volunteer. I know, as individualists, we'd hate to have someone force something on us. We'd have to force this rule on 60 per cent of us who go through the doors of that parking lot.

As well, we did surveys in downtown Edmonton yesterday, and indications there are that 60 per cent did not wear their seat belts yesterday morning. People were contacted in Edmonton Centre: 60 per cent said they did not wear their seat belts; 100 per cent of them had their vehicles equipped with seat belts. More than one person was doing a comparable survey, and the results fit into that pattern. The majority of people we talked to also said that they did not want it compulsory at this point in time; they wanted a choice as to whether or not they buckled up their seat belts.

As legislators, I feel that until the majority of the population is able to say, that's what we want — and I'd have to reflect the attitude of my rural constituents. I find a larger majority of them than, say, urban constituents want the freedom and the right to decide whether they wear the seat belt. Even in light of the arguments the hon. Member for Stony Plain has made — good arguments about saving money in terms of health costs, reducing the implications of the accident, the injury that occurs with the accident — people are still saying: I wish to make my own decision.

I guess there are other examples that support that type of thinking. In terms of alcohol, we still go on with the sale and consumption. People can make a choice when they reach a certain age. Many tests show that tobacco is harmful, that it costs us millions — and across North America billions — of dollars in terms of health costs, but we still let it happen. We don't legislate against smoking. We put an age limit on it. We continue to let that happen.

We find that people that chose to ride in the Corvair, a notoriously dangerous vehicle, continued to do that. We didn't legislate against that after Ralph Nader pointed out its inadequacies in the 1970s. We don't do those kinds of things. In terms of our thinking here, we could also legislate slower speed limits. We could bring the speed limit down to 45, and that again would save more lives. But we as legislators don't do that because people want to have certain freedoms and rights to make certain kinds of decisions.

I think we are still at that state of mind in terms of the general public of Alberta. I think that we should advertise. We should promote. We should encourage parents. We should encourage children through the schools; we should have driver training programs in the schools that encourage this. I think myself and my two children —

one will get his learner's licence at the end of this month; in October, my daughter gets her full licence. One of the things I've neglected, and that was brought very quickly to my attention by the hon. Member for Clover Bar — in teaching my children to drive and sitting with them, I've been very strict about certain fundamentals of driving. I've said, there are certain rules you do not violate. We have driven a number of miles together. But one of the things I have not done — and I'm starting this weekend because I've just neglected that responsibility — is ask them to buckle up their seat belt when they sit behind the steering wheel. I can assure this Assembly that that will be one of the new added rules of driving; when they sit behind the steering wheel, the seat belt is buckled up. I've been neglectful as a parent. I think that certainly can be remedied in my case, but maybe others in the province have to look at the matter in the very same way.

So public education is certainly one of the other approaches, not mandatory laws that force people into this kind of thing. In terms of their attitude and voting pattern on this matter, the majority of Albertans would vote in the sense of saying: leave it non-mandatory at this point. That's my feeling, even in light of these other warnings that we have. As a representative legislator, that's the position that I would have to take at this time.

My intention is to take another very intensive constituency survey on this subject this fall. I'm open to any kinds of suggestions with regard to the questions, even from the Alberta Motor Association or other representative groups in this province. At that time, I will again ask any kinds of questions of my constituents that are necessary and relative to this item. If I find a change in attitude, that certainly will place my presentation in this Legislature in a different light; I'm open to change as well. But as a representative M.L.A. I feel it's incumbent to follow that direction at this point in time.

I just wanted to put those remarks as to my position on the record at this time and, as well, impress upon the government that this matter should be put to a free vote. That free vote can demonstrate how you, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Clover Bar, can differ on a question, but still work in harmony in this Legislature. I hope that will set a good example to the government.

Thank you.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I would be in error if I denied that I don't know of accidents where, had people been buckled up, serious injuries or fatalities would have been avoided. Statistics show that, and I'm not about to question those statistics. However, I do know of several accidents where, if people had been buckled up, fatality or serious injury would have been caused. I can relate some of those to you.

One was related to me by some friends in Edmonton. A semitrailer detached from a truck and landed on top of a car with four people in it. The semitrailer immediately crushed the car to the road and, as it did so, the doors were forced open and all four people were thrown out with very few injuries. They were all released from hospital within minutes of being taken there. Had those people been buckled up, it's very doubtful that any of them would be alive now.

I also witnessed an accident on Highway No. 1 where a small car and a three-quarter ton truck pulling a stock trailer got into an accident. At the end of the accident, the truck and semitrailer were sitting right on top of the car. Luckily the passengers were thrown clear and, although they had some serious injuries, they were all alive.

I'm sure that had they been buckled into that car they would not have been alive.

Another incident happened last fall on the day of the election. A young lady driving a gravel truck lost control. It went off the road and rolled over. She wound up in a small space on the passenger side of that truck. When the accident was finished, she was alive and had very few injuries. Had she been tied into the driver's seat, she would have had very little chance of survival.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

I witnessed a gas truck lose control and upset on Highway No. 1. Of course the driver was burned inside the vehicle. We have no way of knowing: if he'd had the opportunity to be thrown out of that vehicle, even though he might have been unconscious, he might still be alive. Those are things that I know happened. I wonder why statistics were never made on this type of thing. I'm sure that if you were to enforce legislation on those people, having experienced something like that, their emotional point of view would be that they would pay almost any penalty rather than buckle up.

Mr. Speaker, we're told of the cost to medicare, and I don't deny that there is a cost to medicare because of the lack of use of seat belts. However, whether or not you buckle up your seat belt is a personal decision. It is also a personal decision whether you use alcohol or tobacco. I think we have some statistics that tell us that medicare contributes considerably for the health problems created by the use of alcohol and tobacco. We also make personal decisions about our own recreation and sports. Some sports are more accident-prone than others. To give you some examples: downhill skiing, rodeo, skidooring, et cetera are known to be more accident-prone than some other sports.

Mr. Speaker, I have been driving a vehicle since I was 16 years old. There's never been a claim made to medicare as a result of my driving a vehicle. As a part of my recreation, I do a bit of team roping. There have been two contributions by medicare because I've been team roping. So if you were to use me as an example, you wouldn't be legislating against seat belts, but recreation.

AN HON. MEMBER: That proves you're a poor team roper.

MR. MUSGROVE: Not necessarily.

Mr. Speaker, we don't have seat belts in our school buses, and there's no requirement. The number of accidents with school buses is certainly very low compared to other vehicle accidents, particularly fatalities or serious injury. Most of the reason for that is that there's a reduced speed for school buses. Maybe if we were to enforce a reduced speed rather than seat belts, that would be the answer.

I see a problem with enforcement of seat belts. Most provinces that have seat belt regulations — I'm not sure they all do — contribute something to people's insurance, and therefore have a financial incentive to enforce them. I can see a problem with enforcing seat belt regulations without some type of contribution and interest of that kind. British Columbia has compulsory seat belt regulations, and I understand that usage is in the neighborhood of 50 per cent. The Canadian average for seat belt usage is 44.9 per cent and, of all the provinces that have seat belt regulations, usage is 54.3 per cent. So there's really not a significant amount of use where they have enforce-

ment over non-enforcement.

I have a problem with making lawbreakers of people that otherwise follow the law. I know of several companies that say: if you work for our company, you buckle up. I've got no problem with that. That can be a company regulation, and I think it's a good idea. There are also some individuals who say: if you get into my car, you do up your seat belt. I know of other individuals who say: if you get into my car, you don't smoke cigarettes or cigars. I certainly believe that's their right.

There is a comparison to the use of helmets with motorcycles. There was court case in Calgary last summer where someone [challenged] the right of the courts to enforce the law on his individual right to wear a [helmet], and the individual won that case. I understand it's now under appeal, and I'm not sure where it's at. But we do run the risk of the courts ruling that we don't have the right to enforce seat belt regulations.

It's also compared to the use of life jackets in boats. Mr. Speaker, when I get into a boat, I put a life jacket on because I can't swim. But lots of people who are good swimmers drown because they don't have life jackets on. I wonder if we wouldn't have the same type with the use of seat belts, even though we had regulations.

Were we to put in seat belt regulations, providing we got a usage above some of the other provinces that have enforcement, the biggest benefactors would be our insurance companies. I wonder why insurance companies don't offer some financial incentive to people who do use their seat belts. To my knowledge, insurance companies have not had any input to this. All cars manufactured since 1974 have seat belts. They're there; people have a right to use them if they so desire. I really don't think we should be forcing on them the right to not use them. I think it's a decision they have to make themselves.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I'd like to compliment the Member for Stony Plain for bringing this in, even though it was our designation. I think the House is well aware of how my colleague and I stand on this specific issue. I'm not going to speak long, because I do want to hear where many of the government members stand on the particular issue.

The argument against seat belts always seems to be one of individual rights, and of course that's a difficult decision to grapple with. But I suggest when we get into individual rights, Mr. Speaker, what we have to look at is: where do your rights start infringing on my rights? When I hear the argument about individual rights, I suggest to people that if it can be proven at some point that seat belts saved one of their loved ones — a son, a daughter, or a friend — they would be very glad that this Legislature brought that in at that particular time, because it could have saved lives. I respect what the hon. members are saying. I know that you can go overboard with the individual rights arguments. But it seems to me that we see the costs and the things that are happening because people aren't wearing seat belts. If you are driving up my taxes, bringing in user fees, or causing medicare to go up, you're beginning to infringe on my rights. I think we have to look at this; it's clear.

I don't think I need to go into the figures. The hon. Member for Stony Plain did that and did it well. We've talked about the figures before. We know, for example, that the average cost of treatment for accident victims — and this was brought to the government through the hospital utilization report to the Minister of Hospitals

and Medical Care. When we're looking at saving money in the health care system, this can actually save \$419 for a non-seatbelt patient to \$228 for a seat belt patient; a saving of 40 per cent. The point that we make is that this is very significant. We'd be saving our medicare system millions and millions of dollars, because clearly car accidents are the main cost we have to face in rising health care costs.

The other point — and I think the Member for Stony Plain alluded to it, but I'd just like to make it clear. The analysis of Ontario's experience during the late 1970s, after compulsory seat belts were established, shows an average 15 per cent reduction in deaths, injuries, expenditures for physicians' fees, and time of hospitalization.

This is a humane law. It is time we in Alberta moved on it. Most of the other provinces have. I know some have gone to lower speed limits too, but I think bringing in compulsory seat belt legislation is at least a start we can look at. Not everybody is going to do it. I believe when they first start off the figures are that about 75 per cent of the people buckle up. I guess it depends how much you enforce it, and it gradually goes down to 50 per cent. My understanding is that around 10 per cent of the people in Alberta now buckle up.

So what I'm saying — and I'm saying it clearly to the Legislature here — if we want to have a vote on it, you've got my vote in terms of this Bill, and you've got my colleague's vote. But I think it's time we took a stand on it one way or the other, no matter how we felt about it. I'm encouraged that the government has decided to go to 5:30 p.m. I may be naive — I've been accused of always looking for the best in people — but it seems to me that maybe they're going to have a vote on it if they want to debate it for two hours.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the time for talk is over. If we believe in it or against it, it should be a free vote in this House right now so people of Alberta know where we stand. It's not always easy to stand up and be counted in terms of a controversial issue, but surely the people of Alberta have a right to know where we stand on this issue. Because of the publicity I've had through question period and through the media, I've certainly got calls saying that I was wrong. So be it; that's great. I'm glad to hear from the people. I've also had more calls saying I was right. If the figures of the hon. Member for Stony Plain are accurate — and I believe they are — I think most people would support seat belt legislation at this time.

But we can talk and talk and talk about it, and not bring it to a vote. In the meantime, while we're talking about it, it'll be another year or another year or another year that we're going to face more deaths, more injuries, more costs. I suggest that the time for talk is over. I'm going to be very interested. I'm going to be around at 5:30 because I expect that there is going to be a vote. I for one will be voting for the motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to take part in this important debate. I'd like to congratulate you for having introduced this very difficult topic, for having taken the bull by the horns and introducing a very strong position in this regard. My comments really lie in three areas, and I'd like to deal briefly with the argument for compulsory seat belt legislation, against compulsory seat belt legislation, and then what I believe to be a third alternative that I'd like to see this House consider.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are two undeniably strong

arguments for the compulsory use of seat belts, as outlined by the hon. Member for Stony Plain and others who've spoken since. The first is the mounds of statistics and facts which indeed do exist that indicate that seat belts save lives. It's my personal opinion that no person who objectively goes through that material — and I've spent some time doing that — can honestly say that more lives would be lost than would be gained by the compulsory use of seat belts.

The most recent statistics I have are 1982 statistics in Alberta where, according to the experts who evaluated them, of 380 accidents in which deaths occurred, 241 lives could have been saved. Indeed I suppose arguments can be made in each and every instance that different methods were used for that evaluation, but once you take all the material available throughout the world in this, I think it's very difficult to deny that seat belts, by and large, would save lives.

The other strong argument for mandatory seat belt legislation is that there are obvious increases in the use of seat belts in those provinces in our country that have initiated such legislation. According to the latest statistics I have again — and this differs slightly from other statistics that have been indicated here — 16.66 per cent of Albertans who drive use seat belts, which is considerably better than the 4 to 8 per cent that exists in all of those other provinces that don't have mandatory seat belt legislation, but which cannot compare to any real extent with the 46 to 71 per cent usage rates in those five provinces that have compulsory seat belt legislation.

With respect to the arguments for that legislation, in my opinion, less effective are those that deal with medical costs, not that the facts are any less astounding, not that they are any less correct. But if we began to use the argument that the use of seat belts should be compulsory because it would cost us less to deal with lives in hospitals, we would have to logically expand that to deal with cigarettes, alcohol, overeating, and any number of problems which indeed could be developed there.

The other less effective argument, in my opinion, is the one that says you are harming other individuals by not using seat belts because when the car is in an accident, the impact lets you lose control of that vehicle. There are some studies that give preliminary evidence in that direction, but from my observation of a number of those, I believe they are inconclusive at this point, though it could be a strong argument at a future date if researchers can be a bit more definitive in their approach.

The other argument that is used is that we've established a precedent. We've set in place mandatory helmet legislation. While this may be a strong argument in some directions, again I'd hate for that to be the precedent for legislation to govern every aspect of our lives, every aspect where we indeed should be determining the direction that we should go. Those are the arguments for compulsory seat belt legislation, as I see them.

I think there are two strong arguments against as well. They're much more philosophical, but none the less, in my opinion, equally as strong. First of all, it is the opinion of many of our citizens that individuals have a responsibility to deal with their own lives, to deal with the difficulties they would get into themselves, and that we as a government have already taken on far too much in terms of responsibility for the individual and making the decision for him or her in this community.

The second argument is really related to that. It is that this would establish the precedent I talked about earlier and lead us to make further legislation governing individ-

ual lives. Less effective again on the side of those against compulsory seat belt legislation, in my opinion, are those arguments, though eloquently made by the Member for Bow Valley, that indicate there are some accidents in which seat belts could cause more harm than good. I think that's a fact. That indeed has happened. But statistically — and that's the only ground on which we can base any law — an evaluation of the overall cases involved would show far and away more saving by the use of seat belts than problems caused by use of seat belts.

Mr. Speaker, this gives us some sort of deadlock: a strong philosophical argument on one hand and a strong factual argument about the lives of people on the other. To evaluate how this Assembly should deal with that question, we have to look at our role as legislators and why we're here. I suppose that definition differs for each of us to some extent, but I doubt that few of my colleagues would deny that we have a responsibility first and foremost to protect those individuals in society who cannot otherwise protect themselves. It's hard to define who those individuals are. There are always vague rules, roads to cross, and times change according to those definitions. But one of those groups in our society that we're responsible for are the children, the youth, the future citizens of the province of Alberta.

Indeed with respect to the seat belt debate, it is the youth of the province who have been harmed the most by not having child-restraint devices or seat belts. It's been the youth who have died the quickest, who have suffered the most. I could go on for some time with statistics, but just very quickly: in 1975 a survey showed that over 4,000 people under the age of 18 were injured in car accidents in Alberta, most of them not wearing seat belts. One hundred and forty-four were killed in that year. A University of Calgary study indicates that motor vehicle accidents are responsible for more infant deaths than all childhood diseases, including cancer, congenital malformations, pneumonia, meningitis, heart disease, leukemia, and cystic fibrosis. Indeed I think this gives us some guideline as to where we should go with respect to the legislation that should be looked at.

I believe we should very seriously consider establishing mandatory seat belt legislation for those people for whom we have the greatest responsibility and whom we have judged not able to make decisions for themselves. That is those individuals under the age of 18. If such legislation was established, we'd do a number of things. First, we'd begin to save the lives of those people who are being harmed most by non-use of seat belts. Second, we would educate the parents, who would see the need for using their own seat belts while being forced to buckle up their children. Third, and maybe most important overall, we'd create a generation of individuals who indeed would be used to wearing seat belts and would be used to dealing with that.

We see that the usage rates, while increased in other provinces with mandatory legislation, are still relatively low. I suggest that's because many of us — and the statistics by the hon. leader of the Independents that most of us, or at least people working in this building, weren't wearing seat belts when we drove in are indicative of that — believe in their use, but we haven't been conditioned to use them. I think legislation, which we should consider as a third option to the other two, that upholds the integrity of the right of individuals over the age of 18 to make decisions for themselves but carries out our responsibility to safeguard those people who can't make those decisions for themselves should be considered seriously.

In that vein, Mr. Speaker, opposed to the opinion expressed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, I hope we don't vote on this motion today, as important as it is. I hope members take the time to consider this option, and perhaps others that speak to both sides of the argument, and that we don't quickly move to look at a clear-cut, all-or-nothing situation which obviously many of our citizens would disagree with regardless of which side we came down on.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House seriously considers that option. Again, I congratulate the hon. member who sponsored the motion for bringing it forth today.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to participate in debate on Motion 218, your motion as Member for Stony Plain.

I think it's appropriate that this motion comes forward. In some of the estimates, we heard much discussion from the Leader of the Opposition regarding the necessity for seat belt legislation. Yet as I remember our rules, opposition members can have two motions on the Order Paper at any one time. If I counted properly, I notice that at the present time they have one, Motion No. 207, amongst all four. The remainder are government members' motions. Mr. Speaker, it took the courage of a member such as yourself to bring that motion forward. Then they designated it for today. I guess that in these instances we can say government and opposition can work together to bring a subject forward.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard arguments on both sides of this motion this afternoon. We've heard much discussion about it, especially from the Member for Calgary Currie, who spoke before me about how far government responsibilities should go and how they should affect our lives throughout the things we do. I guess that's the portion of seat belt legislation that concerns people. It's not that seat belts aren't a good device and that they save lives, but it's the imposition on one's rights and how far the government's responsibility should go toward infringing on those rights.

You hear all sorts of arguments in that regard, and admittedly some of them are extreme. But I think constant infringement on these rights leads to forms of government that we in Alberta, Canada, and the western world don't adhere to. That may be a far-fetched comment to make with respect to seat belts. But I think every infringement on rights builds up, and in society today there is beginning to be a reaction to these infringements in the moves that we make. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I'm not saying that I'm against seat belts. I'm saying I'm against mandatory seat belt legislation.

I would be less than honest if I said that I wore my seat belt all the time; I do not. I normally wear it when I remember to buckle it up, probably like most members of this Assembly, or obviously like 60 per cent of the people who . . .

MRS. EMBURY: You will wear it when your children get older.

MR. HYLAND: . . . work in this building and drive in through the parkade, as we heard from the hon. Member for Little Bow. I agree that it's a good idea. You should have the responsibility to protect yourself, but I think we as parents also have the responsibility to protect our children. My three children are in cuddle-seats the majority of the time when they're infants, and then car seats as they get older. As a matter of course, they are put in

there immediately when they get into the vehicle.

There are exceptions — and you often see them — around towns and close to home. That's where the majority of accidents happen. For example, when I get in my pick-up to drive uptown and I take my oldest son along, the car seat may be fastened in the Suburban, so he sits beside me on the seat or, on occasion, stands on the floor and, as kids do, leans on the dash to look out the window. But when we go on the highway, we put the seats in whatever vehicle we're using and put him in. I think that's the responsibility we should have.

The hon. Member for Calgary North West just said, you will wear them all the time when your kids get older.

MRS. EMBURY: Children.

MR. HYLAND: Okay, children. She is quite right. Even at the age my son is now, three years old, when he is put in his car seat and has to do up his belt, he suggests that his mother and father do up theirs. So it is working. In time I think there will be higher usage, just from training, of seat belts by those children as they get older.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent out, under the communications allowance, as have many members of this Assembly, questionnaires regarding various [issues]. One question was, do you favor mandatory use of seat belts? The answers I received were, no. In percentages, there wasn't a large number of these questionnaires returned. But I received a lot of comments from people I met through my pre sessional tours and through being in various communities throughout the year. They overwhelmingly suggested no mandatory seat belt legislation, even though a large percentage of these people use seat belts.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard of savings of \$15 million and upwards in health care costs directly related to the difference in treating accident victims, whether they had been wearing seat belts or not. I don't quarrel with those figures at all. They are probably accurate; maybe even low. But there are a lot of other things the health utilization study showed, and the number of accident-related treatments were a portion of it.

I would think a large portion of that utilization, too, is in problems related to alcohol. How do we treat that? We haven't attempted to outlaw the use and abuse of alcohol since prohibition days. Instead, we as government sell it through our Alberta Liquor Control Board outlets and periodically boost the price by sticking a little more tax on it. I have seen members of this Legislature on both sides of the House at receptions, and we participate — some of us too much, and some of us not as much as others. This participation throughout society causes large hospital and health care costs. Through the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, we have attempted to put forward the problems caused by the use of alcohol, the consequences of those problems, and what one should do. That has been fairly successful; nevertheless we still have the problem. I think that is similar to programs we have relating to the use of seat belts, where we are promoting their use and they are not yet mandatory in legislation.

Mr. Speaker, my constituency is in the southern part of the province. I can remember many stories told by my grandfather and other senior citizens of the area. The stories related to prohibition times. I tell you, there are some interesting stories about that time, when an attempt was made to cure a problem in society and many ways were found to circumvent that problem. I hope we will not have the same thing and have another law, related to mandatory seat belt legislation, that we can't enforce.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate that I am in favor of the use of seat belts — especially relating to children — the use of car seats, et cetera. I do that myself, as I have said. But I encourage members to reconsider and to vote in opposition to the mandatory use of seat belts.

Thank you.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly take part in the resolution we have before us this afternoon. As members of the Assembly know, this afternoon I brought to the Assembly for first reading a Bill on the mandatory use of seat belts. So my position on the issue is quite clear.

Mr. Speaker, there are not that many occasions in a politician's career when he really has to stand up and be counted. I hope his is going to be one, when we finally have the opportunity to see where the government members stand on this issue. We know where the former Minister of Transportation stands. We know where the Member for Bow Valley stands. We now know where Member for Cypress stands. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that if there will ever been an opportunity for this government to show the people of Alberta where their elected people stand, this is a great opportunity.

We look down our noses at the operation in Ottawa, but the Prime Minister of Canada at least had the intestinal fortitude to say to the Members of the House of Commons, let's have a free vote on capital punishment. All the members stood in their places and voted as their consciences dictated. Now this is an issue. All we have to do is take the polls that we've taken — and I'll be discussing this in more detail when we get to the Bill that I presented this afternoon. But this is an issue that should have a free vote. It is an opportunity for members to vote as their consciences dictate.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

It's quite incongruous to me, Mr. Speaker, that this government would pass the motorcycle helmet law and think that is different from the compulsory seat belt law. I know the hon. Member for Whitemud, being the extreme right-winger he is, would never say that we would want to bring in legislation that would force anyone to do anything. But we will be able to see where the member stands as the debate progresses and comes back.

Statistically, there are no counter arguments. Sure, we can cite cases where such and such a person may have survived had they not been wearing a seat belt. My wife is one of those people who would not have survived had she had a seat belt on, because a third of the car we were riding in was taken off, including the driver's seat where she was sitting. We did not have seat belts that time. She was pushed to the centre of the car and I was pushed almost out of the car. But that's still not reason enough to say that we shouldn't wear seat belts. Because statistically, seat belts save lives. It's just that simple.

Mr. Speaker, it will give us the opportunity to stand in our place. I know that you're going to lose a few votes if you stand and indicate where you stand. But that's why we are elected. We are elected to do what we think is right. We've heard from the government members about the great majorities they had. Well then, they shouldn't be worried about losing a vote or two.

MR. MARTIN: What's a few votes to them?

DR. BUCK: A few votes is a lot to the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood. But to most Tories, what's a thousand one way or the other?

It is an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to state what you think is right. So the members of the government side don't have to worry. What they should do is what their conscience dictates and what they think is right. That's why we are elected — not to worry about the fact that we may alienate a few people. We do that every day in this Assembly. Every day that we pass laws, we just hope that 51 per cent of the people think they're right. It's basically that simple.

Mr. Speaker, we have covered nearly all the areas that need to be covered. It is just going to be a matter of how we vote, if we get to vote. In summary, in the few words I have to say, this is an opportunity for this government to take the Whip off, let the members speak their piece, and go to a free vote. Because this is not an issue the government could fall on. It's not that the people of Alberta are going to say they are a good government or a bad government. It's not a non-confidence vote.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we should have more opportunities in this Assembly to have free votes. I would hazard a guess that 85 to 90 per cent of the issues that come up in this Assembly could be free votes. If the issue is so contentious that we cannot convince 51 per cent of the members of this Assembly to pass the law, maybe the bureaucrats had better take some of those laws back to the drafting table and rewrite them.

MR. SZWENDER: Just vote with us.

DR. BUCK: Just vote with us, says the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont. Well I want the hon. Member for Belmont to know that if he stood in his place and voted as his conscience and information indicated, there would be many times that he wouldn't be voting the same way as the government members.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, the issue is that simple. Will the members in this Assembly stand up and be counted? I know there will be people heaping abuse on my shoulders, but that's why we get elected. That doesn't matter one way or the other. That is their opportunity and right: to disagree and dissent. But if 51 per cent of my constituents believe that what I am doing, saying, and supporting is right, that's good enough for me. I don't think the members of the government caucus have to be worried. They should worry more about user fees than this coming to a free vote.

Mr. Speaker, the statistics, without any hesitation, tell us that more Albertans would be alive if they were wearing seat belts. The issue is clear. I beseech the Acting Government House Leader that he take the message back from this Assembly to his Premier and have the government indicate to this Assembly that they're willing to have a free vote.

Mr. Speaker, it's quite clear where I stand. I support compulsory seat belt legislation in this province.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the Member for Stony Plain for bringing this issue before the House. I'd like to remind us all of the very special wording of the motion. The motion clearly says that the Assembly should consider the desirability of legislation for mandatory seat belt use. It's important to understand how well that motion is worded.

The Member for Little Bow is not here, but this afternoon he remarked about school buses as one example. I

know that the former Minister of Transportation would perhaps comment on this at some time, and I know the current minister certainly would. But for the Member for Little Bow's information, a seat belt has to withstand about 2.5 tons of force when a vehicle stops. When you take the number of passengers in a school bus multiplied by the amount of force required for those seat belts, the anchors, and the support, very soon the bus itself needs to be totally redesigned. In fact the industry and safety officials have developed passive restraints in areas of public transportation. So legislation for seat belts is very hard to draft — yes, there are examples across this world — because of the fact that we have vehicle designs that differ, drivers as well as passengers to consider, front seats as well as rear seats, and so on.

Since 1979, Mr. Speaker, I've had the privilege of representing Banff-Cochrane. It's a mixture of urban and rural constituency residents, including not only residents of Calgary but three communities — Cochrane, Canmore, and Banff — farmers, ranchers, and two Indian reserves. It also includes Banff National Park and Kananaskis Country. I mention these because in our constituency we are well served by major transportation routes. Many, many visitors to Alberta and many Albertans drive to visit the scenic beauty of Banff. They use Highway No. 1, Highway No. 1A, or the series of highways that serve our province.

I'm fortunate to represent that area. It's a constituency not only welcoming visitors who drive, but a constituency that needs hospitals. Notwithstanding the recent remarks of the Member for Edmonton Norwood, there is a need for a hospital in Banff to replace the now outdated hospital. Part of the reason for the hospital requirements in Banff and Canmore is the carnage on our highways. It's not just the constituents of Banff-Cochrane who are in those hospitals or taken to the morgues. There are visitors from all over our country.

The carnage on our highways is a disgrace. Whether it's driver attitude, vehicle repair or disrepair, design of the roads, weather, dusk, sun, deer on the highway, or whatever, there are many factors involved. We know that. But I want to compliment the Department of Transportation, the various safety associations of our province, the schools, the A M A, and all the organizations and individuals who are doing their best to educate us all for the need for seat belts.

I appreciated the hon. Member for Little Bow remarking about the need to tell his children to wear their seat belts. But it's not what we tell our children; it's the example we set. Perhaps that's why, about three years ago when my good colleague the Member for Calgary Currie at that time proposed a private members' Bill which would have required that persons under the age of 18 wear seat belts, I took a different position and advised him. I have great difficulty with an approach that says, we should tell our children what to do but not necessarily set the example. In other words, it would be: do as I say and not as I do.

The effectiveness of seat belts, of saving lives, and of reducing injuries is proven conclusively. There are studies throughout the world that show that traffic-related deaths and injuries drop significantly when seat belts are worn, even though vehicle crashes increase or remain constant. The year that I looked at this, of 32 fatalities in Calgary alone in 1979, only one person wore a seat belt. In Alberta over 300 people died needlessly in traffic accidents, yet less than 20 per cent of our citizens pay any attention to all the evidence, all the efforts, all the educa-

tion, all the police, all the safety organizations that encourage the use of seat belts. Traffic deaths and injuries continue to mount, yet we're reluctant to recognize that because we do not have legislation making seat belt wearing mandatory, seat belts are not used by the majority of people in Alberta.

Perhaps they are inconvenient. How long did it take the Member for Stony Plain to put that seat belt on? Three or four seconds? Perhaps they're uncomfortable. Perhaps they're something to fear or to be hesitant about because of experiences, as the Member for Bow Valley mentioned. Perhaps we know of someone, as the Member for Clover Bar mentioned. We can all recall the former Member for Edmonton Norwood, who faced possible death. Yet when I spoke to her about this after her accident, I wondered if her husband and she had been wearing belts, whether or not he might have been able to control the vehicle after the first moment of its difficulty.

Two per cent or less of the deaths are due to fire or submersion. In Sweden a study of 29,000 accidents involving 37,000 unbelted and belted front seat drivers and passengers found that injuries and fatal injuries occurred at speeds as low as 12 miles per hour when the occupants weren't wearing seat belts. Yet there were no deaths at speeds as high as 96 kilometres per hour when seat belts were worn.

I went into the area very carefully. I read as much as I could during my first term, and I wrote to a number of police chiefs to ask for their views. I'd like to refer specifically to the chief of police of the city of Calgary, Brian Sawyer. In responding to my question as to how that department could recommend mandatory legislation and could enforce such a law, he advised me that this was a matter which had bothered him for some time. But he concluded that the evidence was so overwhelming that mandatory seat belt legislation does save lives and reduce serious injury that he supported it fully.

I wrote to him again recently and told him that when I had made my views public in my constituency, that I supported mandatory seat belt legislation, I received 11 letters. Of those 11, the overwhelming response was in favor of mandatory seat belt legislation, yet everyone who wrote took the time to write their personal views. So I said to the police chief, I wonder why I didn't have the uprising and the outcry that I anticipated. He said very simply, in a letter dated July 11, 1980:

People just don't seem to want to think about the subject. [But] it's my guess that if mandatory legislation was introduced, there would be a lot of public complaining for about three months and then the issue would cease to be an issue. And the number of ... deaths and injuries would drop significantly.

I've talked with people from British Columbia, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan who, as they arrive at our borders, remove their seat belts. I have seen my friends driving from Alberta on the Trans-Canada Highway put their seat belts on as they approach the other boundaries. It seems foolish; it seems insane on the part of those persons simply to wear or not wear a belt because of a law, but this is human nature. This is what happens.

With young persons, or with older persons, there is the matter of peer pressure. Peer pressure is very significant to young adults. If my buddy isn't wearing a seat belt, why should I? There are taxis, buses, and limousines, all without belts for the most part. Of course there's the situation when you drive with a friend and you don't know whether to ask the driver if you should put your belt on. Why should you ask? Put it on. But we tend to

look at the driver and follow his or her habits. If he or she wears a belt, then we may put one on.

On the other side of the coin, we have people saying, it takes time to buckle up; I'm only going a few blocks. Or, if my car flips, I'd rather be thrown clear than be crushed. Or, as a woman might say, I'm uncomfortable to put a belt on; I'm in my seventh month of pregnancy. The seat belt is inconvenient; it's a nuisance.

Finally many people say, we don't need legislators to tell us how to live or how to die. Well I believe that laws are enacted where the public good is greater than the individual hardship imposed by the law, and I do stand for mandatory seat belt legislation for all Albertans, and not just those under 18. But I recognize in this motion the need to consider how carefully that needs to be drafted and how it has to be designed to meet the needs of the varying body weights and locations of the people in the vehicle. When I did my survey, unlike the Member for Little Bow, I didn't find a division based on urban or rural backgrounds. I didn't find a division based on male or female perception, young or old, or different groups of people. I believe that I have responded and can continue to respond to every argument that's been made in my constituency, both pro and con. But I always return to the inescapable conclusion that it's important that we do this.

It's very difficult to inspire people, to modify actions they've been successfully carrying out for years, no matter what proof we show of the benefits of the law. It's doubly difficult to do this if it introduces inconvenience. You see, no one speaks out against an agency or the government if we do this as an education process. But if we talk about legislative compulsion, Mr. Speaker, then vigorous opposition is heard.

The arguments we've heard on the enforcement of seat belt use are based on physical grounds and perhaps moral grounds. Some people are opposed because they don't believe it's necessarily safe to wear a seat belt, and some because they believe the government should not impinge on their personal individual freedom, whether it's safer or not. For the actions that we alone wish to take for our own safety are entirely up to us, they say. Well, those people who don't believe that seat belts are effective and increase their safety are either refusing to accept the evidence or basing this belief on common misconceptions.

I talked a few moments ago about the statistics of being thrown from a car. Think about being thrown from a car. Think about a motorcycle driver and his or her passenger. We've had four deaths in this city very recently. Motorcycle drivers and passengers aren't belted in; they're dead. That's graphic proof of what happens when you're thrown. Another widely held belief is that being submerged, a belt will trap me. If you're conscious after an accident, and you're in that situation because your belt has kept you from being dashed about the car outside, you have a very good chance of getting out of that vehicle.

I believe that the refusal to wear seat belts in the face of this kind of evidence is simply an absence of reason. It is a proven fact now; it is no longer a theory. The use of a full seat belt significantly reduces injuries and fatalities in car accidents.

That brings me to the second point, Mr. Speaker, the second argument about a breach of civil liberties and more government interference. The basis of this argument is that the state has no right to interfere with an individual's actions if they affect only themselves. Well, should government force an individual to act in a certain way

merely because it is in that individual's interests? No. The government should intervene if the individual's actions interfere and harm the rest of society. The failure to wear a seat belt can directly cause physical, financial, and emotional harm to other people.

Seat belt legislation is not paternalistic. It's a very small restriction on individual freedom in order to protect the interests of everyone else. In a collision involving people in a car, where the car is a high-speed projectile, those occupants start to collide with each other because all the occupants start to move toward the point of impact.

I recall a case a few years ago involving my own son and three passengers in the car. In a head-on collision with a car being driven by another young man, the two passengers in the back seat not wearing seat belts were thrown violently forward, tearing the seat out of the front of the car and pushing both occupants of the front seat into the windows, the steering wheel, and so on. In a frontal collision, those in the front seat with their belts on are often hit by those in the back seat, who may not be wearing them. If you doubt my word, think of two heads colliding at 30 miles an hour.

Then there is the double accident, the second collision. I myself have been involved in an accident where a driver of a vehicle went through a stop sign and came across my path. I could not stop, and broad-slammed into the car. I saw the driver flung into the back seat of the car. I saw the car smash over a car across the street and into a store. Had there been any people on that curb, they would have been dead. Had the driver had a seat belt on, she could have controlled that car. So the second collision is another problem.

Another area of argument, that we affect others adversely by not having mandatory legislation, is financial. This is a result of our increasingly complex society, because all members of our society share in the costs of medical treatment. But not just medical treatment. There is emergency care, aftercare, social services, workers compensation, and so on. And seat belts, by virtue of their use, would reduce the number and seriousness of such injuries and reduce the costs of hospitalization, rehabilitation, and compensation. Because we increase these costs unnecessarily by not wearing seat belts. And not only that; we drain our scarce medical resources.

So if society is going to pay for these resources to restore an injured person, I believe it is obligatory for the individual to act with reasonable prudence and buckle up. It's not expensive, it's not extraordinary, and it's easy to do. You see, it's not the individual who's being treated unfairly; it is all the rest of us when someone is not wearing a belt and is in this situation.

Mr. Speaker, in our lifetimes, each of us in this Assembly has a 50 per cent chance of being involved in a serious car accident. Everyone in Canada faces those odds. One out of every 10 Canadians will be killed or seriously maimed in the next decade in a vehicle accident. In Alberta that means a city half the size of Edmonton or Calgary. How long can we afford this totally meaningless waste? I am very pleased that the member has brought this legislation forward, and I would support the proposal put forward by the Member for Stony Plain.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy this afternoon to have the opportunity to speak to this motion. I'm a seat belt user, and I have been for a number of years. But because I do something, I don't think I would necessarily expect someone else to.

Seat belt legislation works half of the time. There's no

question about that in the statistics. Seat belts save lives. They save a lot of money, and they are very helpful. In fact I have no doubt that on a couple of occasions, and one in particular, being strapped in, I was able to control my car a little better than I likely would have without a seat belt. I avoided an accident, or at least avoided damage to my car, because I stayed where I was supposed to be. We have a colleague in this row who was saved by the belt. It's pretty nice to be able to talk to someone who got into the Legislature and become an advocate of the use of seat belts, but not necessarily seat belt legislation.

I believe very strongly that children and those that are unable to protect themselves should be wearing seat belts and should be in these little basket containers. They're not roaming around the car and climbing over the back seat and whatnot for one thing, and the other thing, we can probably save a lot of lives. I used to get awfully annoyed at my family when we'd be driving down the road and they were all over the car. When the children were small, we had a car that didn't have seat belts. But many times I certainly wished we had some sort of belt in there to tie them down. [interjection] I used the back of my hand; I didn't use a belt.

Alberta is noted for a number of things that we like to brag about: no sales tax and higher speed limits. We also have one that I don't think we should brag about. That's free use of seat belts. Nevertheless, representing a rural constituency, if I were to go tell Mr. Macnab, a farmer friend in my constituency — and tougher yet would be to tell Mrs. Macnab — that they had to now start wearing seat belts, I'm afraid my days would be numbered. In fact they would be over in seconds. If you knew the Macnab family ...

DR. BUCK: Macnab would wear it.

MR. LYSONS: Brent, the old man? Only if his wife was sitting on him.

But we should be encouraging the use of seat belts, and we should be sending around a lot more the convinced they had in front of the Legislature. I think that convinced me, beyond any doubt, that seat belts helped. After you got slammed into that stop — and that was at seven miles an hour, I believe, or perhaps even less — there was no doubt in my mind just how much force your body could have. I used to have the impression that when we drove around — and I was a fairly strong fellow and could hold at least one behind me with my elbow — I was going to save their lives. But after riding on that convincer, there was no way I could hold any youngster over two or three pounds. It was not possible in any kind of collision at all.

But I don't believe we can legislate behavior. I don't think I would be very safe down home if I were to tell my friends, yes, I voted for seat belt legislation, and then go down to the coffee shop, as I do every Sunday morning, and all the young farmers sitting there ...

AN HON. MEMBER: I'll go with you, Thomas.

MR. LYSONS: You'll go with me? I heard something about you last night and I'm not so sure I want you with me. [laughter] We were talking about cowboys, and he just happened to be with a bunch of nurses that were more than cowboys.

AN HON. MEMBER: Back to the subject.

MR. LYSONS: Getting back to the subject, without strong legislation, there are a number of things we can do to protect people: turning the seats around in school buses so children sit with their backs to the front of the bus; having trains with seats the other way. I could never figure out why in an airplane you sit and look at the seat ahead of you. You can never see out the front anyway. Why not just have the seat turned around? Perhaps we could come in with legislation that would make it mandatory that young children, particularly those unable to help themselves, wear belts, but it's just not practical at this time for adults. I have no hesitation in facing my colleagues in this House, particularly the hon. member across the way who wanted to know how I stood on seat belts.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the hon. Member for Stony Plain for introducing this motion, and to add my observations on it. There is no doubt in my mind that the use of seat belts, particularly the way they have been improved in late-model vehicles, is a very useful safety feature in cars and trucks. Their use has reduced fatalities and injuries in motor vehicle accidents. I have had numerous instances brought to my attention where people in the same vehicle involved in the same accident had drastically different experiences. Those that wore seat belts had only light injuries; those that did not belt in were seriously hurt and required a long stay in hospital.

I encounter difficulties on this matter only in how best to effect a solution and to get people to use their seat belts. The problem of seat belt use is part of the far bigger problem of how people use motor vehicles and of their attitude towards safe driving. Every time one drives on our streets or highways, one encounters someone running traffic lights, ignoring stop signs, speeding, or committing some other serious traffic offence. For instance, only last night I observed a car directly in front of me turn a corner very sharply at high speed, almost lose control and then, for the next three blocks, weave from one curb to another, narrowly missing parked cars and approaching vehicles. Obviously countless people are not observing existing traffic laws, or only when police are around.

We can't have a policeman on every corner of every road and street and in every possible place in the province, so obviously a law requiring compulsory belting in cannot be enforced. Can we reasonably expect these people to respect one more law, a mandatory seat belt law, when they're already breaking existing traffic laws at every opportunity? This is piling laws upon laws. Surely those people who observe safe driving practices, drive with care, and pay attention to the condition of the road, the density of traffic, and observe what other drivers are doing, are not likely to get into an accident in the first place. And if they do, they are more than likely to be those who, through common sense, wear seat belts.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that somehow we are failing in a far more important area, which is safe driving. It is painfully obvious that the message of safe driving is not getting through to many people. I feel that this important area, along with the use of seat belts, should be addressed through intensified safe driving promotions to get people to drive safely. Since unsafe driving persists despite a whole book of traffic laws, one more law is not going to help if these bad attitudes persist. It is part of the same attitude people have towards smoking, booze, and narcotics. Everyone knows the problem these create, but unless

attitudes change people will continue to smoke, to get drunk, and to get high on drugs, no matter how many times they've had painful experiences with them.

How do you stop them? The long and short of this is that you can regulate people only so far. You can bring a horse to water but you can't make him drink. Beyond a certain point, Mr. Speaker, they have to help themselves. Safe driving and the use of seat belts is one area where people have to help themselves through positive attitudes, and maybe through incentives and education, not compulsion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of comments I wish to add to this debate. However, considering their length, I move to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the motion to adjourn debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, by way of advising members of the Assembly as to government business this evening, it is proposed that members re-enter the Assembly in Committee of Whole, where we will undertake study of Bill No. 7 on the Order Paper, and then proceed in Committee of Supply for consideration of the estimates of the departments of Recreation and Parks and Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I move that we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Before putting the motion, do members agree that when they reconvene this evening at eight o'clock, they will be in Committee of the Whole?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: If the members wish to change from Committee of the Whole to Committee of Supply, I'm not sure of any alternative but that they report to the House. It would be my assumption that the Committee of the Whole would report, and then the Committee of Supply would be called.

The House stands adjourned until the Committee of the Whole rises and reports.

[The House recessed at 5:30 p.m.]

[The Committee of the Whole met at 8 p.m.]

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

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

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

Bill 7
Department of Economic Development
Amendment Act, 1983

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there amendments to be considered on any part of this Bill?

MR. MARTIN: Could I just ask one question about the Bill. I think it's fairly straightforward, but I would like some clarification from the minister on (h), which says:

define, for the purposes of this section, undertakings and developments constituting projects directly beneficial to economic development.

Does that mean the department is now allowed to undertake projects that are not necessarily directly beneficial to economic development? Could I get some clarification on that point?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Chairman, we have used this prerogative sparingly under common law. Generally, it had to do with trying to balance opportunities across the province in terms of access and transportation.

One thing about providing a guarantee is that the people who are involved in accepting the guarantee must also be able to service bank debt. So as a rule, it's simply a bulwark or buttress to access funds for things like tertiary-level airlines to smaller communities and that kind of thing that is deemed necessary. It is an economic development tool only in the sense of providing services over a broad mosaic to the province. In specific instances, of course, guaranteeing a bank debt doesn't help because if they're in that kind of difficulty, they can't service the debt whether it's guaranteed or not.

So it is only an assistance to those that need some kind of back-up for providing a service to the community over the province.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. PLANCHE: I move that Bill 7 be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration and reports Bill No. 7.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have heard the report. Are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

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

Department of Recreation and Parks

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

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few brief remarks. I want to thank the voters of Whitecourt for giving me the opportunity to serve in this Legislature for the fourth time. I'd also like to thank the

Premier for allowing me to have another term at what I suggest is one of the finest portfolios in government. It's a portfolio that's my first love. Besides being that, you get the benefit of a number of things such as jackets, clothes, and all that. I really appreciate that.

I guess the most important thing about this job is that I have a chance to work with so many volunteers, people across the province who have devoted so much time to making things better for somebody else, people who have taken very few rewards but have passed on their sweat, toil, and labor to help handicapped people and in working with seniors. I think we should say to all of them how grateful we are for having the volunteers that we have in this province.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my thanks to my staff in the Department of Recreation and Parks. They have worked well with me. We have come a long way in the last four or five years. I want to go back and recall last October, just before the provincial election. I did some touring across the province and, while on these tours, I made some commitments. I made these commitments thinking I would not be back in the same portfolio, so I was hoping I would pass them on to someone else. But such is not the case. I might add that the commitments I made are ones we will keep.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, we have reorganized the Department of Recreation and Parks. We had a reduction in manpower, yet we will still provide the high-quality service that the people of Alberta so justly deserve.

With regard to programs, I would just like to briefly touch on a few of them. We have the recreation areas program. There are now 20 sites under development across the province; some are in operation. Hopefully, this year we will provide 10 more sites. This program provides for \$100,000 in capital and up to \$20,000 a year for operations. These are all done by community clubs, the private sector, town councils, and what have you.

Last year we took over some 68 highway campsites, and we are in the process of trying to evaluate how they should best be run. We are having some great success there too, in farming it out to the private sector and getting community clubs working at them.

We have shifted our emphasis this year from new park development to upgrading and redevelopment. We will be providing some 1,000-plus campsites across the province in 10 parks and over 720 day-use areas. Of course, we'll be completing Kananaskis Country golf course, and that should be open some time this summer. We are moving to privatize our planning, design, construction, and maintenance of parks in a number of ways. For the first time, we are also going to tender our grass mowing in a number of provincial parks. Also, our wood supply that we received from other sources before will now be tendered to be picked up by contractors in local communities.

I look forward to July 4 to 14, when we'll have the world scout jamboree in Kananaskis Country. Some 15,000 boy scouts from 65 countries across the world will be here, and I say it again, that'll be as it was last time. The World University Games will take place July 1 to 11 in Edmonton. As of today, when I met with the university people, I was told that 81 countries are now confirmed and that we'll have 3,900-plus athletes participating. We have now complied with our commitment of funds to the games. My understanding is they are moving along quite well, and tickets are moving as well as expected.

From there, we'll move to Calgary for the Western Canada Games, where the four western provinces and, I

hope, the two territories will take part. That will be July 31 to August 6, when we'll have 2,000-plus athletes from across the province. The 1983 Summer Games will be held in the county of Mountain View August 11, 12, and 13. There again, we'll expect well over 2,500 athletes from across the province. The Alberta Winter Games in 1984 will be held in the Crowsnest Pass on March 1, 2, and 3. My understanding is that they're planning well, there's a lot of enthusiasm, and we expect that'll be another success.

We are now in the process of trying to assess the bids for the Senior Games in 1984. I understand there are seven communities in the bidding: Rocky Mountain House, Medicine Hat, Fairview, Camrose, Grand Centre, St. Albert, and Red Deer. We hope we can arrive at a decision pretty quickly and make an announcement so we can start planning for those games.

Mr. Chairman, in this budget we have some \$5 million set aside for planning for the 1988 Winter Olympics. It's my hope that we'll move quickly with site selection and with a firm budget, so we can start construction this fall or next year and the sites and projects will be completed in time for practice before the Olympics are held. I have some concern that we have some delay in the federal government commitment. I'm hoping that will work out and we can arrive at a decision where both governments can work with the city and the group to get this going without delay.

Mr. Chairman, the last item I want to touch on is the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, just to give the members some idea of where they're at. You all received a copy of the financial statement. From April 1, 1979, to March 25, 1983, total funds into the foundation were some \$5.6 million. More than 320 grants have been approved and disbursed throughout the province, and the total amount of grants is just about \$4.7 million.

Mr. Chairman, I touched briefly on a number of items I thought were important for members to know, and I'm now pleased to be able to take any questions they have in regard to my portfolio.

MR. MARTIN: Just a couple of remarks and questions to the minister. I take it that when we look at Votes 1, 2, and 3. Vote 1, departmental support services, is up, and the other two are down. I expect that is because of the Olympic games, that for that reason they had extra staff. I just clarify that with the minister.

I have one other direct question, just a point of information. Community schools — for instance, I was in the Dawe school in Red Deer. Does money go from his department to education, or do any moneys that go into community schools come strictly through the Department of Education?

I would like the minister to comment on whether or not he sees a problem. There seems to be a fair amount of publicity, Mr. Chairman, having to do with the site of the mountains for the Olympic games, and with people resigning. We read in the paper that Mr. Read and people like him are resigning. I would like the comments of the minister. If he sees some problems there, what seems to be the problem? What seems to be the friction?

With those two questions, could I get the minister's comments, especially on the last part?

MR. WEISS: If I may, Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a few comments with regard to the vote, and particularly some information from the minister. I'd also like to extend a hearty thank you to the minister and the

department. For those in the Assembly who perhaps are not aware, 1985 will see the Alberta Summer Games come to the city of Fort McMurray in the Lac La Biche-McMurray constituency, and we look forward to that, Mr. Minister. In particular, I'm also pleased to say that we have a representative of the Alberta Games Council from our community. We welcome that representation, and it's nice to have that input from a local level.

I ask that the minister respond specifically with regard to the urban parks program. I can recall we reviewed it very extensively last year at this time, and I believe I have recorded in *Hansard* a commitment from the minister that he would once again review the needs for the city of Fort McMurray at this time; in particular, any expansion the program might embark on. If he recalls, the city of Fort McMurray was still under the New Towns status at that particular time and was not eligible for the program. Now that we have reached a population of some 35,000, we certainly believe we're not only supported by population growth but by the need and ever-growing demand.

I also encourage the minister to give us an update with regard to the mini-parks program, especially in the realm of expansion. I believe the program is very successful and encourage the minister and his department to review that for future needs in other areas as well.

I have a specific problem I'd like to relate through you, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, in reference to Gregoire Lake Provincial Park, referred to in the minister's recent annual report. The old saying that figures don't lie or liars don't figure is certainly represented by the statistics revealed in that report. I'm not going to deal with figures that can't be backed up or clearly supported, because of course these are figures submitted by the minister himself. So let's deal with facts.

The facts in this particular case reveal that 99,922 — almost 100,000 — vehicles used this park last year, with a camping capacity of some 140 stalls. The number of nights' use was some 5,528, and the number of camping nights was 20,348. I'd like to compare that to other areas. In particular, I might make reference to the fact that the average party size per use in the park was 3.7. Only two other areas in the whole of the province of Alberta — Dillberry Lake and Wabamun Lake — also had the 3.7 average.

My point to the minister is that areas such as Wabamun, and I might add that I believe the chairman would be very familiar with that area, have some 45,846 vehicles using that park, with some 319 camping-capacity stalls, which is more than double — and that's a poor mathematician to come up that it's more than double — and less than half the number of vehicles per use. In consideration of other areas such as Miquelon Lakes, near the Edmonton area, with some 67,000 vehicles and 292 stalls, keep in mind that those particular areas also have many, many other support areas in their proximity. In our particular case, Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize that we do not. We have nowhere else to go and no other parks or areas to use. I encourage the minister to open up other areas, lakes, and specific spots that would be available on the Clearwater and along the Athabasca.

Also at this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to once again raise my concern for the overall development of the Lakeland region, in particular the Lac La Biche area, where for some time we've been studying the particular region. We believe it has great growth potential, with particular emphasis on a Lakeland park. We find that people within that overall region are unable to use the

park for themselves because it's serving people from the Edmonton and urban areas. We certainly aren't complaining; we welcome them to come to the community. And we know why they come, because we think it's some of the best lakeland area in the country. My concern is, though, that with the over-utilization, we haven't gone on to develop the area. I certainly encourage the minister to take those particular plans off the shelf and once again revitalize them and, hopefully, give us some encouraging words in that regard.

With those few comments, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the response from the minister. But once again, I close with a very sincere thank you for his efforts through the department, the Alberta Games Council, and the support staff for looking to Fort McMurray to host the 1985 Summer Games.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make two or three comments to the minister. First of all, I'd like to congratulate the Minister of Recreation and Parks and his department on, generally speaking, an extremely well-defined effort in the development of the recreation and parks area in the province of Alberta. I think Alberta has become a forerunner in the development of recreation for the community. Of course, there are certain areas in Calgary that we like to think can use some additional assistance, which I would like to mention — also, some of those areas that have received some extremely good participation.

The first area is Fish Creek, which is progressing reasonably well. Of course, we in Calgary would all like to see that particular provincial park progress as fast as possible to enhance the recreation opportunities for the citizens of Calgary, as well as those south of Calgary in Okotoks, High River, and so on.

I know that the land in the Nose Creek valley is owned by the city of Calgary. We would certainly like the minister to discuss with the city some opportunities in this valley. It's 1,000 acres, and it's very difficult for the city to participate in totally. The opportunities for the province to assist in the north end of the city, in addition to the south with Fish Creek, would certainly be of some value and assistance to the many residents living in that north end. Nose Hill is of a similar concern to many people in the northwest, but the Nose Creek valley is of course very important from both an environmental situation and recreation. We would certainly like express our views that possibly the minister could assist us there.

I would like to give credit to the minister and his department for offering the many opportunities for Calgary to be able to participate in and represent the XV Winter Olympic Games. From the point of view of recreational opportunities, not only for the citizens of Calgary but for the citizens of Alberta, I think we need to be extremely proud of those people who were able to participate in obtaining the games for the city of Calgary, in particular the Calgary Olympic Development Association. Without the help of the province in the various funding activities, as well as the federal government — although we won't speak too loudly of the federal government. Certainly the positive opportunity the provincial government took when they initially said to go with the coliseum prior to the Olympics being offered to Calgary is a credit to the forethought of the Department of Recreation and Parks.

There is one area I certainly would like to mention, Mr. Chairman, and that is the area of sports. Although offering its citizens, through much community effort —

and in particular in the major cities through volunteer efforts — and a lot of funding through municipal grants, through the MCR grant program, Alberta is able to compete at a level that makes us competitive to provinces such as Ontario, Quebec and B.C. Even though the participation of those governments — and especially lottery funds into sports programs — is much greater than that of Alberta, I think we do extremely well.

I think it's very important, however, that we re-examine the proportion of moneys taken from lotteries and placed in areas other than sports so that we can encourage our youth, their development opportunities in the sporting and athletic areas. Whether it be team sports or individual sports, we as a government need to give more expertise, more funding, into sports activities. Being a sports person in many ways for most of my life — and I'm sure the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud would appreciate, as he has been an extremely good ambassador in the golfing world for Alberta, that if the government were to participate more in sporting or athletic endeavors, we would be able to participate on a better level with most provinces with higher population and more opportunity due to their funding programs.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we need to examine the distribution of lottery funds: where they are going and how they are being distributed. We need to examine the opportunities offered our young athletes, also some of us old guys who are senior sports. But certainly the opportunities for our young people to participate in the various sporting activities need to be re-examined so that we may be competitive in international as well as domestic sporting activities.

I wouldn't like to leave it at that, that the young people should have all the activity. Some of us older people like to lawn bowl or play golf. Certainly some expression should be given to the lawn bowling fraternity, which probably has one of the greatest fraternities in the world considering their numbers. It is thought to be a sport for older persons in Canada but is certainly a young person's sport, and we should be giving the lawn bowling community as such much more encouragement. It is a fraternity that can be utilized by both young and old, female and male treated as equals on a green. It is certainly an area we should endeavor to expand in.

Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to expand any further than that, other than to say that in my opinion the minister certainly has one of the finest departments in our government, one of the most humanistic departments, and does a job for the community unmatched in any other. I would just like to encourage again that we as a government, through the caucus and through the minister himself, encourage the additional funding of lottery moneys into the sporting community rather than some of the areas that are able to raise funds and participate on a profit basis, so that we may encourage our young people, and some of us oldies in the lawn bowling fraternity in particular, to proceed and take those opportunities of development.

Thank you very much.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, looking at the budget of the department, I see it's down about \$35 million, to \$100 million this year. I guess the major reduction is in financial assistance and acquisition of land for parks. I note from the annual report that there were some half a million vehicles in Alberta parks this past year. I don't know how many people that would represent, but that has to be the most aggressive provincial park system in

the country. I wonder if the minister could advise whether there's any overcrowding in certain parks as opposed to problems in other areas. I raise this because I recall that several years ago, we discussed the viability and possibility of a reservation system similar to what Parks Canada was attempting.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, knowing the minister's background in sport, amateur sport in particular, I want to raise a matter that I feel quite strongly about; that is, support to amateur sport in the province of Alberta. The Member for Calgary McCall has already raised the option that should be looked at; that is, the redistribution of lottery proceeds in the province of Alberta. I note that last year, for example, the minister's department provided some \$330,000 for athletic development, which came out to some \$600 per athlete. I'm a little curious as to what we mean by "athlete". Do we mean one who's competed at a certain level? Do we mean one who belongs to a certain association? It would be my view, Mr. Chairman, that \$334,000 is really very little when you consider that we have some 450,000 children in our school system. Obviously that's only about 80 cents apiece. I note as well that some \$189,000 was provided in fitness grants. I would like the minister to expand on exactly what is included in terms of fitness.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could give us an update on the MCR program. I have had reports that that program, through its generosity, has created other problems such as maintaining buildings that have been constructed in certain communities around the province as a result of increasing costs in operating. Would the minister give us an update?

Mr. Chairman, reference was made to roadside stops. I think it's a very important area, recognizing that more and more Albertans are unable to travel any great distance. That would be part of that. Part of it as well, I suppose, would be the development of the park system. People are travelling closer to home. So I think roadside stops become more important than ever. The minister made reference to it in his overview. Perhaps I didn't catch it. But I would appreciate it if he could indicate if he is taking them over from, for example, Alberta Transportation.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lethbridge East and I are deeply indebted to the minister with regard to the river valley park at Lethbridge, funded by the heritage fund. I think it's a welcome addition to the city of Lethbridge as a result of the urban parks policy, which I know the minister worked very hard to achieve. I am also pleased that in Lethbridge they have seen fit to add the museum into the river park development scheme. Again, it shows a government that listens.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there are two other areas. I think the Alberta Games Council has been the eye of envy from across Canada. I know the personnel involved — Mr. Gibb, Mr. Roelofs, and others — have been very instrumental in seeing that various games are staged throughout the province. But it would be naive indeed if we didn't recognize the board of directors of the Games Council, who are citizens prepared to spend time assisting in a very worth-while cause.

That brings me, Mr. Chairman, to the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation. I note that last year they received about \$1.25 million in terms of income. Of that, some \$450,000 went to sport. What concerns me is whether it goes to sport directly or whether it goes to a provincial organization related to sport. I think there is a strong need throughout the province of Alberta for as-

sistance to sport at a local level. I wonder if the minister would be prepared to comment on what his views would be if there were a distribution of funding on a per capita basis within constituencies, and whether his department has looked at that. The Member for Lethbridge East and I...

MR. MARTIN: Who's that?

MR. NOTLEY: Who's the Member for Lethbridge East?

MR. GOGO: ... find that we constantly have to rely on the citizens and the parents to come up with funds to get their children involved in amateur sports. It seems to me that if we're looking at some \$15 million in lottery funds this year — depending on what happens to 6/49 and many additional funds — I would see that as one area. However, I don't think that should in any way take away from the department with regard to the financial assistance they're prepared to give. If one adds up the financial assistance for last year, quite frankly, outside of the games, not that much went to the amateur sport level. I think that should be a priority of this government.

I guess the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation is at arm's length from government and is able to receive tax deductible revenues. Mr. Moser — I believe he is executive director — has been extremely helpful every time a community organization from my area needs some assistance. If they don't get the money, they certainly get good advice.

Let me close, Mr. Chairman, with the fact that I think Recreation and Parks is very popular with the citizens of Alberta. But I think there is so much more that could be done, particularly at the local level. I would strongly encourage the minister to lobby those members of the caucus to see that there is more funding directly to amateur sports.

Thanks very much.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I was going to compliment the minister on his major cultural/recreation facility development program, because it's been mentioned before. It's a program that's been in place for several years. I think many of us, especially in rural Alberta, are starting to take it for granted. But it really has done an awful lot out in rural Alberta to build up the sport facilities, and some cultural facilities too. I was also going to say a few words on the mini-parks. I have one in my area. It isn't completed yet, but the people down there really do appreciate it.

I've got one thing I want to bring to the minister's attention, and he may comment on it. That's this problem with ecological reserves. There's a growing feeling in southern Alberta that although they agree with the concept — there is nothing wrong with that — they are starting to get a reaction to the area being taken in. I hope the minister can give us a little direction on just how these are going to be set out and how large they are going to be. The Member for Cypress and I are both getting quite a lot of flak on this.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to rise to offer a few comments and ask the hon. minister a couple of questions. First of all, I congratulate him once again on his reappointment as Minister of Recreation and Parks.

Mr. Chairman, I guess I've been on my feet a number of times with respect to the Waskasoo urban park in Red

Deer. I made reference to it in my maiden speech. I referred to it on a couple of other occasions. The hon. Member for [Lethbridge] West made reference to the urban park in Lethbridge, and others have. It's a program in this province that I think was truly a stroke of genius, and one that is a most appropriate allocation of funds from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I happen to sit on the policy planning committee of the urban parks in Red Deer and, being in Edmonton this past three, four, or five weeks, have not been able to attend all the meetings I'd like to. It's almost scary when I do attend a meeting now, in the absence of being to one for three or four times, just how rapidly they are moving on the park in Red Deer.

Planning has been done on the Hooper equestrian day-use area, and I understand construction will commence this spring. In the Bower Pond/Great Chief Park area, which will be a multi-use, multi-faceted family recreational area, I understand construction will start in the spring. It's going to provide a very important stimulus to jobs in Red Deer this summer. Truly the Waskasoo Park, with all its components, is going to provide a very fine legacy for present and future citizens in Red Deer.

I have a couple of questions to the hon. minister in an area that's outside my constituency. I notice that the hon. Member for Rocky Mountain House is not here this evening. I'd like to make reference to the annual report and the Sylvan Lake Provincial Park. I notice the report indicates that approximately a mile of walking trails was constructed. A horticultural program was carried out, consisting of landscaping, two washrooms sites, seeding and grass, and planting 130 large trees and a variety of shrubs. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister is considering the provision of new launching facilities for boats in the Sylvan Lake area. The facilities now at Sylvan Lake are outmoded, inadequate, and very, very congested. I recognize we're in times of restraint. But I wonder if the minister could comment if there are at least any plans to provide new boat launching facilities at Sylvan Lake Provincial Park. It would also apply and be an important factor with respect to tourism in the central Alberta region.

I have another couple of questions or comments, Mr. Chairman. No doubt I'm going to display my ignorance on the subject, but I wonder if the minister could advise me who sanctions the sites for the Olympics in the Kananaskis area. I have never been clear on that. I wonder if it is the Calgary Olympic organization. If it is who I suspect it is, can the minister advise me if they have given any consideration to locating any facilities outside the Kananaskis area? I've had a number of representations from people in Red Deer with respect to the Canyon ski hill. I must tell you that I broke a couple of ankles on that hill. It is a very, very steep, long hill. It has 140 vertical feet.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's not enough.

MR. McPHERSON: I'm told it is enough to accommodate a slalom course plus a ski jumping course. The facilities are there; they would be prepared to provide them. I wonder if the minister might be able to pass a comment in that respect.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, having made that blatant pitch, I would like to compliment the minister on the excellent work he's performed over past years, and wish him well in his future responsibilities as minister. Thank you.

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise and participate briefly in the debate. I'd like to compliment the minister on the job he is doing, and particularly on his wardrobe. Lately his jackets have been displaying crests from various organizations. Whoever has been dressing him has been doing an excellent job.

I would like to congratulate the minister and the government for the Crown jewels of the government, Kananaskis park, and in particular the pride of Kananaskis park, the William Watson Lodge. I'm very familiar with the William Watson Lodge, since my brother is program director there and gives me regular reports on the minister. As such, I have assurance that he's doing his job extremely well. However, I know the park is still considered virgin territory. Its presence, is just being exposed to many people in the province, and I know use will expand.

I have a few concerns about Kananaskis park that maybe the minister could address and consider, if these have not been looked at. We know that a number of the 1988 Olympic facilities will be located in Kananaskis park. I wonder whether serious consideration had been given to the long-term plans or goals of the facilities that will be constructed for the Olympics, not just for 1988 but for future use, and whether there would be an ecological overburden on the facilities. Knowing they would have pressures on them for a short period of time, could they withstand human population over a long period of time? I know the hon. Independents have frequently brought up questions about Mount Allan and the slopes that will be available for ski activities during the Olympics. I wonder whether the minister has any further information on the usefulness of Mount Allan, due to some of the controversy that has been brought up in the press and also in this Assembly.

I think those remarks would be sufficient, other than, as we know, there are a number of facilities being planned or are already in place in the park: the golf course, a large boy scout jamboree this summer, and continuous campground construction. We know that the traffic is going to be increasing. There are the Olympics and other activities and games planned for the park. I just hope the minister will seriously look at the ecological factors for the park.

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the minister on his reappointment as Minister of Recreation and Parks. It shows the confidence our government has in you.

When I first heard the hon. Member for Calgary McCall mention that they would like to have more help for recreation and sport in Calgary, I was wondering if he meant the Calgary Flames.

I'd like to commend the minister on our new mini-park in Battle River. It's certainly a great attraction for our area.

In the past number of years, the MCR grants have been a great inspiration as well as financial help to the small towns and villages in my constituency. The people have built and are very proud of those fine facilities. With the economic turnabout we are experiencing on the income side and the 15 per cent increase in utility costs, the operating costs of these recreational facilities have become very burdensome. The utility and insurance costs are the largest expenditure in operating our facilities. These costs have increased approximately 15 per cent, while our net income in the rural areas is predicted to decrease about 15 or 20 per cent. This is almost an

unbearable change. I wonder if the Recreation and Parks Department has given any consideration to alleviating this problem. If there isn't, I would like to encourage the good minister and his department to give careful consideration to helping with these operating costs, possibly just until our turnabout cycle is completed and our utility expenses have become better balanced.

I understand that the MCR grants will expire in December 1984. As you are well aware, the planning and raising of funds for recreational facilities sometimes takes years. It could be very helpful to some of our villages and towns in their planning if you could tell us anything about the future plans concerning the MCR grant.

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Chairman, I also want to congratulate our minister and the fine job he did within the confines of the city of Calgary. Fish Creek is lovely. In fact at this point, it is crowded on the weekends on warm days.

I have one little question. Out on the east side of the city, there's a beautiful canal called the WID canal. It's on the edge of three of our fine constituencies there, just barely on the edge of Calgary McCall, the Hon. John Zaozirny's fine Forest Lawn constituency where I live, and my little constituency of Calgary Millican. I wonder if in the future, due to the very — we own the land now through our deal with the western irrigation development corporation. Also, we've got an awful lot of Alberta Housing Corporation housing there. We've got a lot of high density housing. We've got a lot of fourplexes, duplexes, townhouses, limited-dividend housing, and this type of housing. Do we have any plans to further upgrade in the next few years or the next few budgets? We've done some work: this lovely canal, of which we happen to own the banks. I wonder if the minister has any future plans for this lovely piece of provincially owned land, which I guess would come under the domain of the Parks and Recreation Department.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the discussion of the estimates for Recreation and Parks. I too want to congratulate the minister on his reappointment to this position and, as an individual born and raised in Edmonton and now representing the constituency of Edmonton Kingsway, want to thank him for the funds that have been allocated to our city. I'm sure I speak on behalf of many Edmonton MLAs when I thank you sincerely for the funds that have been given to the city; for example, for the development of the Capital City Recreation Park, which is a tremendous leisure facility, utilized yearly by thousands of Edmontonians.

Mr. Chairman, I too am aware of a number of grants that have been given to community leagues in the Edmonton Kingsway area for the development of parks and community halls. I want to thank you for those as well.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, the event of the year in the province of Alberta is Edmonton's own Universiade — Edmonton's own University Games, the World University Games — that has indeed stimulated world interest and has the involvement of many thousands of athletes from around the world. The University of Alberta and the many hundreds of volunteers that have been working with the Universiade organization receive our commendation.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could get the minister to please share with this Assembly some of the amounts of

funds the province has allocated for these games and some examples of where these funds will be spent. A supplementary in this particular area would involve the games preparation generally. Are they proceeding as planned? Are there any difficulties that one foresees for this tremendous world event that will be held in the first week in July?

My last question to the minister deals with Edmonton generally. Does he foresee the development of any other major recreational areas in the city of Edmonton's boundaries, hopefully in the near future?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I suppose it happened throughout the better part of rural Alberta that the counties went ahead perhaps five, 10, 15, 20 years ago and set up county parks alongside their lakes or rivers for benefit of the ratepayers. Mr. Minister, it worked well for quite a number of years. A ratepayer could take his wife and family out there on a Sunday or a church group, the brownies, or the scouts could meet. But all at once something happened with our provincial parks and the success of our provincial parks.

With Albertans now a little cramped in the pocket-book, they are not going out, as some of us do, to B.C. to fish, to pollute their lakes. They are now discovering Alberta, and the overflow from Edmonton and Calgary — and I mean it, the overflow — comes to Miquelon Lake. The capacity of Miquelon Lake Provincial Park in my constituency is 4,000 people. An extra couple of thousand come up there from Red Deer and Calgary, and they're turned away. So they move on down and keep going till — the Diachuks come out there — they pick up. They pick up our county parks.

So we go there with our kiddies and wives. Maybe we're going to have a weiner roast with our neighbors or maybe we're going to have a church picnic or a 50th anniversary. The place is full of Diachuks and a few other people from Edmonton. It's caused quite a concern. Are we as ratepayers of the county of Camrose going to subsidize the recreation of people from outside our district? I realize that we go to Kananaskis and to other parks, but surely on a Sunday afternoon we can have our privacy without having half of Calgary there. I really appreciate that the minister came out with this program last year, that we'd contribute \$100,000 to each county.

MR. DIACHUK: How much?

MR. STROMBERG: \$100,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: Too much.

MR. STROMBERG: Not for Camrose; it should have been double — and \$20,000 a year operation. Now we really appreciate Pete, Mr. Chairman. The minister came out to our constituency and with our reeve looked at our two recreation areas, Driedmeat Lake and Buffalo Lake, and agreed with the reeve that it would be \$100,000 financing. I think the minister has a tremendous program here. I hope he comments on the volunteer help, because somebody has to operate these county parks. Somebody has to clean up the garbage; somebody has to run the concession stand.

MR. DIACHUK: I thought you said they were volunteers.

MR. STROMBERG: They are. But I guess what bothers some of our Edmontonians there is they don't sell hamburgers or hotdogs there, they only sell lutefisk. That volunteer help, and the \$20,000 that your department, Mr. Minister, is going to grant to these community leagues ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. Member for Camrose please use ordinary parliamentary language.

MR. STROMBERG: Oh, I'll address him as Pete, then. The \$20,000 is certainly going to help, and we got our grant. I wasn't going to speak tonight, but when my colleague the member from the deep south, the Alabama of Alberta, stands up and starts knocking ecological reserves, that was just about enough. Gosh, I just can't understand why two members of this Legislature would be so concerned about taking out a township in southern Alberta of land that probably cannot support four cows to the quarter. And that's Crown land, owned by every man, woman, and child in this province. They don't own it in Alabama or Cardston or the other place down there.

AN HON. MEMBER: What other place?

MR. STROMBERG: Where does Alan Hyland come from? Seriously, Mr. Chairman, I think we dealt with the ecological reserves Act quite some time ago. I'm waiting patiently for the proclamation. I'm waiting very patiently for the board of directors that you will be putting on there to advise you of where these ecological reserves would be. I would really appreciate if the minister could give some indication of when one of the better Acts that ever came into this House will be passed.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to congratulate the minister on his reappointment. I think he's done a very good job. I would like to disagree with the member from Lethbridge who felt that the MCR programs had maybe caused some problems. They may have if the community is overbuilt, but I really think the results throughout this province that I'm familiar with have been excellent community recreational facilities.

Over the last two years, I've participated in four mortgage-burning ceremonies in my constituency, all on facilities that had used MCR program funding to help build them — Alder Flats, Winfield, Buck Lake, and the Drayton Valley legion. I'm really proud of those communities ...

AN HON. MEMBER: The legion?

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm not sure theirs was MCR, but they were one of the mortgage-burning ceremonies that I attended. They were pretty emotional ceremonies because in some cases a lot of funds were involved. I'm really proud, and I can re-emphasize the minister's statements about the volunteers who work with the Department of Recreation and Parks and in these communities to make this possible.

The increase in operational funds last year has really helped, and in all fairness I know that's the area the member from Lethbridge was talking about. I hope the minister will mention the recreational areas program. I believe the concept of recreational areas with only essential development is well accepted throughout the province. A lot of people have fairly elaborate, I guess, recreational facilities of their own and really only need minimal

recreational facilities provided.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I know the restraints in the budget have hit the Buck Lake park. Last year's support programs show that there was \$300,000 in planning, and I believe that planning is almost finished. I accept the need for that restraint, and I would just urge that the minister keep the park on the top of his list when we lift this restraint program.

Thank you.

MR. STILES: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to add my congratulations and good wishes to the minister on his reappointment and for the coming term that he will be serving as Minister of Recreation and Parks.

Speaking as a member representing a rural area, I'm not sure if my colleagues from the city ridings fully appreciate the impact on a small town in a rural community of having its new sports facility funded in part by dollars from this department. In the riding of Olds-Didsbury in very recent times, we had the unfortunate experience of the sports complex and several other adjacent sports buildings in Olds burning and having to be completely replaced. Such a task would have been virtually impossible in today's market place had the town of Olds been on its own in that regard. As it turned out, however, together with substantial donations received from all over Canada, and certainly substantial assistance from this department, Olds now has a new sports complex including hockey, skating, and curling facilities. In addition of course, as it is a multicultural facility as well as a recreational facility, it has ancillary rooms and facilities for other activities besides recreation.

A facility of this kind becomes a focal point in small communities such as we have in most of rural Alberta. Very few of these towns have the tax base or the population to support the kind of facilities that their brothers and sisters in the cities enjoy. It is an advantage to some extent for the young people of these smaller towns in the sense that there isn't the competition for time that the city facilities experience and, as a result, they get more time in them. On the other hand, in towns like Crossfield, where they're close to the city of Calgary, many groups from the Calgary area come out to utilize the facility there. So it's something that is shared and utilized on a constant basis with very little time ever wasted.

The main reason I rose tonight, however, is that this summer in the riding of Olds-Didsbury, we will for the first time in Alberta have the Summer Games sponsored and organized by a group of small communities in a county. The county of Mountain View has undertaken to put on the Summer Games this year, and the communities of Sundre, Olds, Didsbury, Carstairs, and Cremona will be sharing the responsibility of putting on these games. It will provide Albertans and people visiting Alberta with an opportunity to see small-town Alberta at first hand. This has not happened before, and it is a credit to the minister that it has been possible for it to be done this year.

I don't know if some of our members are aware of the hundreds of volunteers who are required to put on the Summer Games every two years, but it is a substantial number. The amount of work involved is also substantial. The communities of the county of Mountain View will be putting on the show this year on August 11, 12, and 13. It is an opportunity for all Albertans to venture into the south-central part of the province, see the golf courses, the availability of white water canoeing that still exists in the Sundre area of this province — which it doesn't in

many areas in North America — the parks, and the recreational facilities that we have in Olds-Didsbury. I would like to welcome all members to come down and participate.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to commend the Department of Recreation and Parks for the new facilities we got at Kinbrook Island in the Bow Valley constituency. They were certainly appreciated and much needed. We do have some concern, of course, about Dinosaur Provincial Park. Dinosaur Provincial Park is the home of the major dinosaur fossils in North America. At Dinosaur park, we have no fossils on display. We are into a program in conjunction with the Brooks Chamber of Commerce and, hopefully, with the addition of some land which is now being negotiated for, we will be able to establish a heat-controlled building at Dinosaur park where some of the fossils can be on display for the visitors.

We have specimens of fossils taken from Dinosaur park that are in museums all over the world. Generally, there's a little metal plate that says that these came from Dinosaur park, so many kilometres southeast of Brooks, Alberta. We have an influx of visitors every year to see the origin of these fossils. Unfortunately, when they get there, there is nothing for them to see except a mining program where fossils are being taken out to be moved to other places in the world. Hopefully by the end of 1983, we will have negotiated for the necessary land and set up a budget to have a heat-controlled building and an audio-visual place that will give the history of the dinosaurs in Dinosaur park so that visitors can enjoy the origin.

I believe they have recently discovered — some of the best fossils in that park were taken out in 1982. They tell me that the possibility of finding even better ones is still there. So by the time we discover the better ones, hopefully we'll have a place to keep them at Dinosaur park.

Thank you very much.

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the minister on his work and the work of the government in Kananaskis park. I think that is a real source of pride for the citizens of Alberta. I would also like to commend the minister for a department that took a cutback of 17.3 per cent and is still able to show a program that is meaningful to the citizens of Alberta.

With regard to Kananaskis Country, I must say that prior to November 2, the remarks that I received on the campaign trail about William Watson Lodge, in particular, were outstanding. This truly is a service that brings all the wonderful things about the mountains close to anyone. Anyone can go there; anyone can enjoy them.

I would also like to mention something about the city areas and the acquisition of land. I notice in the budget that that is down this year. I hope it's not forever. As the hon. Member for Calgary McCall mentioned, Nose Hill park is sitting there. I know that every effort is being made in high density areas to present places where people can go and find a little bit of solitude, a little bit of the life that they used to know. I do hope that will not be forgotten in future budgets.

One thing I am concerned about as well, in regard to the problems faced in having to cut back in your department, is the cutback in leadership in the cities. It seems as though very little is left for the leadership in the activities that we are looking at in order to keep people fit and healthy, and to avoid user fees. So I certainly hope that somewhere in the kind of gloomy picture, we may devel-

op leadership in the volunteer sphere, that the communities will come forth, leadership will emerge, and we will have something we didn't have before.

Two questions, Mr. Minister, through the Chair. First of all, regarding Universiade and the Western Canada Games, I guess I am concerned that two events of such magnitude could occur in our province so close together. I guess because of the situation of being based in Edmonton at this point, I am overwhelmed by the magnitude of Universiade, and I am a little worried about the Western Canada Games. When I look in the sports and fitness section, I see \$3.1 million to the World University Games, \$437,000 to Western Canada Summer Games, \$350,000 to Alberta Games, and \$40,000 to Alberta regional games. I wonder if there is any provision for support for the development of our athletes for 1988, specifically in the alpine sports.

I know that in Alberta we presently have a strength in this area, and I feel that in our preparations for the Olympic games we have shown excellent support for the capital costs. But I am particularly concerned about the alpine events. I understand that in the past years, there were 30,000. I see through the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation fifth annual report that there are extensive contributions to winter events, but again they're strictly for operational innovative projects that really involve capital costs and are not spent on the people kinds of things that will make Alberta outstanding in 1988.

Thank you, Mr. Minister, for all the work that you have done.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few comments during the estimates discussion of the Minister of Recreation and Parks. Perhaps I might just begin by raising some questions that my colleague, the Member for Edmonton Norwood, raised with respect to the Kananaskis project. I note also during the course of the contribution of the Member for Edmonton Belmont that a number of issues had been raised about Kananaskis, more particularly about the Olympic project and the Mount Allan site.

I've had a number of people approach our office expressing some real concern about the possibility that Mount Allan will be selected as the site for the Olympic games in 1988. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, while I've been through that area several times, I can't say that I know it well. But some of the concerns expressed to me by skiers in the Calgary area are that Mount Allan is not a particularly favorable site for Olympics competition. There's a problem with snow. It seems to me that if you are going to have skiing, one of the elements is having snow. A windswept area where you are going to have to get into snow-making strikes me as being a rather questionable, long-term investment.

The reason my colleague and I raise this is that it seems to me we have a very important responsibility, Mr. Minister, to make sure that the 1988 Olympics are not only something that we can be proud of as Albertans but as Canadians. I recall, and we all recall, the frustration, the controversy, and in a sense the lingering embarrassment that still surrounds the mismanagement of the Montreal Olympics. We all remember the famous statement of Mayor Drapeau that there could no more be a deficit in the Montreal Olympics than he could have a baby. It appears that some kind of immaculate conception occurred, and there was indeed a rather remarkable

transformation of one of Canada's most intriguing political characters. I would hate to see that happen to the Minister of Recreation and Parks.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that during the course of the minister's response this evening, we could be brought up to date on where things stand on the winter Olympics. We understand there are competing proposals. We gather that a number of companies are involved. A whole host of rumors are circulating. I think the minister should take the opportunity during the discussion of his estimates to bring this Assembly clearly up to date and put on the record precisely where the government stands in 1983 on the planning for the winter Olympics. To what extent has there been preliminary discussion of the Mount Allan project? We had reports carried in publications — publications very friendly to this government, I might say — that suggest that on one particular occasion the Premier himself indicated that Mount Allan had been the choice. Well, the Premier said in the Legislature that that wasn't so. If the Premier said that in the Legislature, I accept his word. But what is important is that we find out from the minister exactly what the process is. We've had people from southern Alberta say, look, the government is attempting to shift things to Mount Allan because of the Ribbon Creek development. I don't know whether that's true, Mr. Chairman. But I think the place in which we can discuss the development of the winter Olympics is in the estimates of the Minister of Recreation and Parks.

During heritage trust fund hearings on one particular occasion, in 1979 or 1980, as we raised questions about the cost of the Kananaskis project, I recall the minister sternly looking at the opposition and saying — and I think he was quite accurate — where were these questions when my estimates went through the Legislature? I want to say very clearly to the minister that one of the major matters I want on the record, so that we know precisely where this government stands on the winter Olympics of 1988, is a thorough report to the Assembly before we vote the estimates of the Department of Recreation and Parks. We may take a little time in that discussion. But I urge the minister to give us a comprehensive report and not just simply say that there are competing bids and that this is all going to be decided by the Olympic committee. As my colleague pointed out, Mr. Read, the father of perhaps the most pre-eminent skier in Alberta's history, has already quit.

Mr. Chairman, I want to know what's going on. I want to know what the problems are. I want to know what the process is. I don't pretend to come to this committee as an expert on what's happening on the winter Olympics in Banff.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY: Someone says "agreed", and that's quite correct. Unfortunately most of the members in this Assembly are not experts either. I think we need to know exactly where things stand. The government's position should be put clearly on the record.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want any confusion to be left in the minds of members of this committee, or Albertans for that matter, about the commitment of my colleague and I in the New Democratic Party to see this winter Olympics achieve the kind of success that is not only important for our province but for our country. This is an honor for our province and for Canada. But the only way in which we can live up to the assignment we've been given is to make sure that all the i's are dotted and all the t's are

crossed, and that there is no question that in the sense of Olympian excellence, the planning for the winter Olympics and the execution of the administration from our perspective of that entire project be undertaken with the same commitment to excellence. One of the most important things the minister can do in discussion today is to give us a thorough report so it's on the record as to where things are, what the options are for the mountains.

Some people from the environmental groups, as the Member for Edmonton Belmont pointed out, are very concerned about the impact of Mount Allan, especially the ecological implications and the mountain sheep in the area. Somebody said sheep don't vote. Perhaps so, although I sometimes wonder. But I won't get into that kind of discussion, because I want to be in a chivalrous mood tonight. I also want to underscore the importance of the issue, because we have received representation from people who are concerned.

One of the groups that came to us, Mr. Minister, and I say this quite candidly, wants to know where things stand. They are not able to get a handle on who's making the decisions. The whole scene is fraught with rumors. We have the resignation of the man who was the managing director, an eminent Albertan who was, I believe, director of the Banff school. He stepped down. We have all kinds of conflicting rumors. I don't know to what extent those rumors are correct, whether they're correct at all, or whether they are totally taken out of context. But I do know that as members of this committee, as members of the Alberta Legislative Assembly, we owe it to our constituents to ensure that those winter Olympics are conducted in a manner which will bring credit to our province.

Of course we realize there's a combination of federal and provincial responsibility, and the volunteers who are working on it. We recognize that full well. But I am asking the minister in his capacity as the responsible member in this Assembly and especially to this Committee of Supply, to take the opportunity to bring us fully up to date, and there may be subsequent questions that will follow from that report.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with several other items during the discussion of the estimates. As we look over the operation and maintenance budget of provincial parks in Alberta, I notice a reduction from the forecast of \$29,773,000 to \$29,591,000. At a time when even the most optimistic among us are predicting a 6 or 7 per cent inflation rate, I wonder to what extent we are going to be able to seriously commend to this committee a reduction of about \$200,000; not a large amount, but it is a reduction in operation and maintenance. I would guess that the sort of fixed costs the department's going to have to face will be rising in the current budget year. That being the case, I find it strange indeed that the minister is recommending to this committee a reduction, albeit a very modest reduction, in the estimates. I would like the minister to respond specifically as to the reason for that reduction. I would hate to see that we have budgeted for a reduction in the estimates and then have to go through the back door of getting a special warrant because we have mismanaged the production of the estimates. It seems to me that the proper approach is to ask in this committee why in fact there is a reduction in the operation and maintenance estimate for 1983-84.

The final point I want to raise, and I will undoubtedly raise it again during the estimates of the Department of Culture, is to put on record for the committee the really exciting potential, I think, of the Dunvegan area in

northern Alberta. I have to confess a certain conflict of interest because I live close to it. Dunvegan is one of the oldest areas in Alberta. It's now the site of a government campsite. We had the hon. Minister of Culture to northern Alberta last August, and she visited Dunvegan. The Department of Culture has commissioned fairly extensive studies, and a draft project has been developed by that department to restore the original fort that was built almost 200 years ago when Mackenzie went down the Peace River prior to going down the Mackenzie River in 1804, if my memory serves me correctly.

Mr. Chairman, while much of that is the kind of information I want to elicit from the Minister of Culture when that hon. lady's estimates come before the committee, I think that what we are looking at is the need to develop a comprehensive historical and provincial park in that particular area in the Peace River valley. I remember the now Minister of Tourism and Small Business meeting with the Dunvegan historical society in 1975 or 1976 and suggesting that one of the proposals of the department was the construction of a comprehensive provincial park that would include the component of history, which was very much a vital part of that area, as well as taking advantage of the scenic location. As the member for the area, I would not be at all embarrassed about arguing the case for proceeding. Other hon. members have done so in committee with respect to projects in their area.

We're talking about the development of tourism in this province. There are certain areas of the province that have a unique advantage from the tourist point of view, and I suggest that Dunvegan is one of them. I would like to know specifically what discussions have occurred with the Department of Culture this year with respect to the development of the Dunvegan project.

Mr. Chairman, those are the comments I'd like to make. Let me just conclude by saying again that my colleague and I are most insistent that we have a clear statement in the estimates from the minister on the planning process with respect to the winter Olympics. I think we would be totally not living up to our responsibilities as members of the committee were we not to raise these questions now. Who's to say what will happen a few months down the road; whether, when the Olympic people come to Alberta, they will look at the potential sites and say, do these sites measure up? Most of us as members of the committee are not in the position to know. One of the reasons we have a system of responsible government is that ministers are to be accountable to the committee. At this stage, I think Albertans have a right to hear from the minister a fairly comprehensive report on just what planning process is occurring at the moment as far as this important project is concerned.

I say this — and I want to underscore it in concluding my remarks — from the vantage point of being an Albertan who joins with people regardless of their political point of view, whether they be federal Liberals, provincial Tories, local Social Creditors, New Democrats, or whatever the case may be: we as Albertans are proud of the work of those people who were able to persuade the International Olympic Committee to choose Alberta as a site for the 1988 Winter Olympics. That being the case, the responsibility that weighs on us, it seems to me, is to ensure that the Olympian spirit we expect from the athletes be followed through in the planning, administration, and execution of that project.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I haven't been a politician very long and I haven't got much experience at this,

so I haven't any questions for the minister and I haven't any demands. But I have a few comments. My experience lies in the business world. I take a look at the estimates and am impressed with what I see. In the business world, we like to see production and the dollar cost for that production. When I look at the hon. minister's figures, we see that from 1981-82, he went from \$135 million down to approximately \$100 million. In that same period of time, I'd like to point out that the demands made on him, with the support for the 1988 Olympics, went up from \$300,000 to \$6 million. I say that this is a credit to the minister and his staff. It's an excellent example of what we have been talking about: restraint and what we're doing with it.

I come from central Alberta. We have a lot of parks there. We're the recreation playground for Edmonton and Calgary, and we're very proud to play host to those people. I know the park program and the park service. It's excellent. When I look at a budget like this and see that they're doing that on a decreasing budget with an increasing demand, I think this is one department we need to look up to.

We have friends that come from across western Canada. We do a lot of travelling in the campgrounds. My family does a lot of camping. With our friends that do the same from across western Canada, we find that Alberta is recognized as one of the leading provinces in western Canada for the service provided and the physical facilities in our parks. We have that reputation, and it's provided by the department whose estimates are up here tonight.

Now, when I look at costs — as I said, I'm just a greenhorn politician. I've listened to the Leader of the Official Opposition since I've come here. I've heard the cries of waste of money, the increase of money, and how we're running along. Tonight I was amazed. I heard him come in here — here's a minister showing restraint — and the first thing he jumped on was a \$200,000 reduction in some area. I can't understand the individual, Mr. Chairman. There's one thing for sure about the Official Opposition. They're consistent in one area; that's inconsistency.

The other comment I'd like to make is on the program of the mini-parks we see developing across the province. They address a demand in every area where they're developed. That's the demand of the local residents. The major parks serve our tourist industry, but these mini-parks serve local Albertans. They're there for Albertans in that given area. They play a very, very large role in providing that type of enjoyment for Albertans. By doing so, they also relieve the pressure on our major parks.

I look at the money we're spending on the 1988 Olympic Winter Games. I think that's very good support. Hopefully, the hon. minister and his staff will be able to continue to increase that support. I am very, very confident that in the final analysis, this will be one of the best winter games ever held. It will be a credit to the people in Calgary and to this government. I do not have the doubts that the Leader of the Official Opposition has. I feel that our support is increasing, and that from all reports we're going to be right on target.

All I can say tonight to the hon. minister is keep up the good work. You're doing one heck of a good job.

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to rise a second time and address the minister. This request is of a different nature from the previous one. It is motivated by a very personal and emotional factor. I'd just like to recount to the minister an incident that has, in many ways, affected and shaped the way that

I have approached life in the last couple of years.

I guess the political path is a long and winding one, and many individuals question what motivates them to get involved politically. Prior to being elected to this Assembly, I had always wanted the opportunity to address the minister. I thought that one of the quickest and most direct ways to have that opportunity would be to get elected. Thus I would have an equal opportunity with the minister to address what, to me, is a very important concern.

I don't know if the minister is aware of Garner Lake Provincial Park. It is located about 110 miles northeast of Edmonton along Highway 28. If you're driving quickly and you blink, you'll pass Spedden, Alberta. But there is a sign there, and it directs people to Garner Lake Provincial Park. Alongside Garner Lake Provincial Park, the Boy Scout troop which I've been associated with for over 25 years owns a quarter section of land, upon which it has camp facilities for Boy Scouts and Girl Guides. The Boy Scouts and Girl Guides have been using that for many years. They use the facilities of the park for camping and swimming.

On July 19, 1981, my brother, Leslie Szwender, drowned in that particular lake. He had, as we all had, been going to that lake for many, many years. He knew the water well; he was an excellent swimmer. Yet on that fateful morning, within five feet of shore, within a roped area, he drowned. Mr. Minister, it was a tragic shock to all of us, as you can well understand. It's taken until now, and it will take many more years, for us to accept that tragic incident.

The reason I bring this up is that in five feet of water within a roped area in a provincial park on a Sunday afternoon, with hundreds of people on the beach and in the water, there is absolutely no reason why there shouldn't have been a lifeguard on duty. For many years, there had been a lifeguard on Sundays. There is a lifeguard stand still standing there; it has long been vacated. It was reassuring to know that at least within that roped area, the swimmers, regardless of age or size, would be watched. However, for about the last five or six years, there has no longer been a lifeguard on duty, whether on Sunday or weekends, whether in the busy holiday season or any time of the year.

Mr. Minister, my request is this: would it be possible for the minister to get together with the Minister of Manpower and develop or support a program whereby students, many of them university — I suspect those who finish university at the end of April would be the best candidates for that — could be hired in a work project whereby they would man lifeguard stations in the provincial parks of Alberta, especially during this holiday season, the most frequently busy season. Mr. Minister, I am convinced ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member please direct his remarks through the Chair.

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that if there had been a lifeguard on duty on that day, my brother would not have drowned. It is just one incident. My remarks will not bring him back. However, I believe that if we take this step, a very affirmative step, a very necessary step, to encourage the use of our provincial parks and ensure the safety of all Albertans, maybe other lives will be saved.

So I implore the minister to consider my remarks and take whatever steps he feels would help rectify this situa-

tion. I'm not sure what the policy is on hiring lifeguards. But if it could be implemented at all, I request the minister to look at this.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of observations, that end with questions, I guess. One of the things I believe the minister has initiated in our camping sites in Alberta has been the opportunity in certain selected spaces or areas to reserve camping sites ahead of time. It seems to me that some of the complaints I get have been to the effect that certain people, be they retired people who have the week free, can get out to some of the weekend camping spots on Wednesdays and Thursdays. So they're all booked up, and so-called "working stiff" are not able to get in. I think that's a good move, through the Chair to the minister, and I wonder if the minister intends to continue it or even to expand the program.

I'd like to spend a moment or two on the MCR program. Others have mentioned it. It's been a godsend to many municipalities. Many millions of dollars have been poured into communities all over Alberta, and for people who otherwise would not have facilities or halls, the opportunity for cultural advancements and pursuits would not happen. Nevertheless there have been some problems associated with this in the last few years, even months. The city of Calgary presently — I think the Polish Canadian club, the Italian club, a few others are finding themselves in considerable difficulty, not being able to finance their one-half of the grant.

The other thing that concerns me a bit is that there are getting to be number of halls, and I wonder whether the market might be coming to the point of saturation. This is probably one of the reasons there is a critical need. Perhaps the minister could indicate whether there might be under consideration a tightening up of the initiator's 50 per cent, so that rather than borrowing that from a bank or financial institution or whatever, they might have to come up with the actual dollars before they actually begin construction. That may be one solution, although it may provide unnecessary hardship. I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that the local authorizing authorities or authorities who authorize some of these projects have some responsibilities here, and we've placed that on them. But perhaps the minister would like to comment.

The other thing with regard to the MCR program, and perhaps it was asked when I wasn't here, is that I believe the present program is soon coming to an end. Does the minister have any thoughts with regard to the extension of that program in the future?

If I could digress for a moment to the Olympics in Calgary, which I've been rather close to over the years, with the minister and others who have been interested. We are now well into those six years, or whatever it was, from approval until reality, and it's coming rather quickly. I noticed the minister in his opening remarks indicated he had hopes that things would be solved as far as sites and so on. Perhaps the minister could indicate to the Assembly just what sites the province specifically will develop and that will be provincially owned thereafter, and whether he has any thoughts as to who will ultimately run those facilities, whether the government will keep them under its own wing or perhaps farm them out as concessions, whatever the case may be.

I think the government has committed itself financially. It seems to me that we have said: here are the number of dollars that we are going to spend; this is what we're going to build. I think we have honored those commitments, and it seems to me that if there is foot-dragging,

lack of commitment, it may be on the part of our federal counterparts; not that I'm willing to point fingers here.

I believe that the Mount Allan site has been brought up by the Leader of the Opposition. While that's still under consideration, I understand there's to be an indication of sites as far as development of ski facilities. But the matter was brought up with regard to criticism of Mount Allan by professional skiers. I suggest that the majority of skiers are intermediate skiers. It's my view that the ski facilities in the Spray Lakes area, for instance, would be either at the very low end of ability or at the very high end, with a lack of the middle, which makes up the greatest number of revenue skiers as far as intermediate people are concerned. Would the minister perhaps indicate whether Mount Allan — which I believe was chosen not by the government but rather by the Olympic Committee in Calgary — nevertheless seems to fit that category at this point?

Mr. Chairman, I think those are the questions that I will put forward at this point.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, I apologize for taking the time to get back in on a second occasion. I think it is rather important, though, that I address the minister in another capacity; that is, as the chairperson of the Northern Alberta Development Council, to bring some of their views and concerns to the minister as well.

Mr. Chairman, in having listened to the various members, particularly those from the urban constituencies, I note that people talk about facilities such as Kananaskis and Banff and Jasper. I would like to emphasize that this is a bit of a sore point to those in the north. We realize there's a quality and a way of life that northerners have, and they choose to live in the north for various reasons. But they're then deprived of the use of some of these facilities.

I would like to encourage that the Department of Recreation and Parks, through the minister, would be able to allocate some extra funding to improve the overall facilities throughout the north, where they then could use some of these things, not having the opportunity to use Kananaskis and others. I'd like to point out, for example, that most of the areas would be 300, 400, or 500 miles distance prior just to getting into the central point, such as Edmonton, and then having to go on to one of these various recreation areas. It's almost an impossibility to use one of these facilities on a weekend, so their use by northerners is very, very limited and curtailed.

My main point I'd emphasize — and really, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be supported by all rural members, and I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition would be more than supportive. Recently we were privileged through the Northern Alberta Development Council to supply a copy of the cost-of-living study to the hon. minister and the department. It points out such operational costs in relation to other parts of Alberta. I think it should be noted that labor and utility costs are certainly of direct bearing in relationship to the operational funds and grants that are received in keeping some of these communities going. Because of the smaller population and the lower tax base, it's almost impossible sometimes to carry on with the funds.

As was indicated by one of the previous members, volunteers of course play a large role in this. In recognition of Volunteer Week, I too would like to extend a sincere thank you to all the volunteers that help and assist in these various recreation projects, especially in the youth-orientated programs.

Mr. Chairman, to close, it wouldn't be unfair to suggest to the minister that a dollar just doesn't go as far in the north as it does in other areas. Actual facts revealed in the cost-of-living study indicate that it's some 20 per cent higher. So in view of operational costs and consideration of future budgets and expense items, perhaps they will take into consideration these extra expenses as well.

Thank you for the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to express those concerns.

MR. TRYNCHY: First of all, I'd like to thank all the members for their kind words and for the number of good suggestions they've made to me. I have made some notes, so I've got these all down here and there. If I don't follow your presentations, you'll know that it's because I've picked up one piece of paper instead of the other. I'll try to answer all the questions as we go through.

Before I start answering the questions, I just want to comment on what the Leader of the Opposition said, and I'll get back in more detail. We have presented a responsible budget here, and we have worked through this. I want to say at the outset that there are no cutbacks, and I want to explain how we arrived at that. We have a philosophy — and I do, being in the business world for a number of years — that we should work smarter and not harder, and we've tried to incorporate that into our budget. We have put some delay on capital funding, capital expenditures, so that's where the decrease in funds shows up in the estimates.

You know, it's amazing when you show good business sense. What do you hear from people such as the Member for Spirit River-Fairview? He has comments of little or no substance, accusations of mismanagement. It disturbs me that a person who probably has never met a payroll in his life would say to us that we have mismanagement. I challenge the hon. member to show us where this mismanagement is, and we'll deal with that later.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Calgary North Hill raised a very good subject in regard to reservations. We have expanded that now to 12 parks across the province. I think it gives our local people, our Albertans, a first chance of getting in, reserving a site on a Monday, and going down on the weekend. We will do that more and more as time goes on, because I think that's a very good suggestion, something that we think will benefit Albertans.

I was kind of concerned with his comments in regard to more regulations and stricter rules. In the five years that I've had this portfolio, what I've heard from all members was, don't be so tough. So we've tried to put in less red tape — which governments tend to do whether there's reason or not — and we've left it to local communities. When we hear of clubs in the cities, towns, or communities that are having some difficulty, I wonder if we shouldn't sort of take a look at where the approval system came from first, and that's at city council level, town councils, village councils, community clubs, and all that. Certainly we want to follow up and make sure the dollars we put out as Albertans to other Albertans are well used.

He also asked the question, would government be involved in developing structures for the Olympics? I'll get into this a little later, but I would say at the outset that we are committed to the Olympics. If we find that we can't get it done by the private sector, if necessary we'll be involved in development. But as soon as that's done, if it's done, we would lease back to the private sector all those facilities. It's our concern that we have to have a recrea-

tion ski site in the province of Alberta. We have to look at all sites and get one that'll provide the best legacy for the future. Because if we hang our hat for the Olympics for 11 days — and I want to see the best Olympics ever. But let's not say that we have to develop these sites just for the Olympics, because they come and go. So we've got to start now and start looking for the long-term benefit, and that we plan to do.

The Member for Bow Valley expressed his concerns about Dinosaur Provincial Park. I was there with him just a short while ago. Expansion is needed, and we hope that we can negotiate the necessary land and move along with development, of course subject again to economic conditions and future budgets.

Nose Hill park was brought up again. To those members who raised it, I'm not familiar with it because I have never been contacted to do anything there. I guess if the city of Calgary would want to put in some dollars, they could use the MCR funds that are available to them. Their allocation of dollars is left to them. Certainly if they suggest that I should get involved, I'd be glad to meet with them and see just what we can do. But I wouldn't want to hold out too much hope when we're trying to hold the line on our budgets.

The question was asked by the Member for Calgary Foothills in regard to the World Student Games funding. I just want to say that today I presented the final cheque to the World Student Games organization of \$7.2 million for operating, and we also had invested \$3.5 million for capital. In addition to that, another \$32 million-plus was provided by Advanced Education for the facilities on the university grounds.

In regard to the second question, Western Canada Games, we have now provided the city of Calgary with \$9.23 million for capital, and we have provided \$1.67 million in operating. My understanding is that both games are proceeding well. They're on schedule; they're on budget. My understanding is that they require some 13,000 volunteers for the World Student Games in Edmonton, and they have some 19,000 volunteers ready to go to work. So my opening comments in speaking about volunteers are very valid. There are people out there who want to work. As the old saying goes, they want to put their shoulder to the wheel and help their neighbor. That's just tremendous.

Also to the Member for Calgary Foothills: we have funded some 100 sporting associations, so funds are ongoing to them every year. We'd like to see more done, and I think more can be done when we have our new legislation, the Alberta sports council put through, where the sporting communities, the sporting bodies, can control their own destiny. That'll be happening shortly, I hope. When that happens, we hope that some of the lottery funds would flow directly to the sports council, and they would distribute across the province.

The Member for Camrose — and he's gone again — missed most of my comments. If he'd been here when I first started, he wouldn't have asked the question. But I think he will read *Hansard*. I'm sure the county parks that have been developed — and I want to praise those people in rural Alberta who have taken the initiative and done this. I think they could go one step further. By providing these campsites and things that they do, they could put a fee for service. I don't see anything wrong with them charging a \$3 or \$4 fee, as we do in our provincial parks. They should do that, because there's only a certain number of dollars that any government has to provide these kinds of services. I think it's just tremen-

dous that we have the volunteers that do this, and I would like to encourage them to continue. But don't throw up your hands and stop because the Diachuks happen to go to Camrose, or what have you. I think it's just great that we move around, but I think we can all contribute a few dollars for a park or a campsite.

To the Member for Drayton Valley: yes, Buck Lake park is on hold. But I want to assure her that, as she put it, when things get back to normal, we'll continue with development, and it'll be near the top of the list.

The Member for Olds-Didsbury commented on support of funds to rural areas. That's something that's very dear to my heart, because I've always thought that the smaller centres seem to be neglected. It's not that we don't give them the same number of dollars, but they don't have the same population. So what do you get when you have a hamlet of 100 people? You get \$10 per capita. What can you do? I think we made a good move in suggesting that the Alberta games be held by five communities. That's our pilot project. If it fails there, you've let me down. I don't think we will, because I think rural Alberta can show us how to run these things. I don't believe we should always have them in the big cities — and there's nothing wrong with that either — but I think for Albertans, it should be moved around.

When you suggest these small centres, I go back to Rochfort Bridge when they built their little curling rink. Not many people here know where Rochfort Bridge is. There's a little story I like to tell. It's a small community. They say, well, how small is it? I took the words of the Member for Lloydminster in saying that it's so small that the New Year's baby for last year was born in August.

The curling rinks and community centres in these smaller centres are the gathering places for all the people that come there. If you go there, whether it's a church, a curling rink, a community hall, or the old school, that's where everybody gathers. I make no apologies for supporting rural Alberta and small centres.

The Member for Wainwright wanted to talk about MCR, and I think I can cover that for all members. Yes, it's been one of the best programs I think we've had for a long, long time. We provided \$10 on a per capita basis. At the present time there is some \$200 million across the province in this. On the operational grants, we now say there might a little room for improvement. I just want to go back a few years to when the operational grants were \$1 per capita for the first 20,000 and 20 cents thereafter. If you figure that out for Calgary or Edmonton, it wasn't very many dollars. We've increased that now to \$3 per capita straight across the board, which is just a tremendous boost.

I think we've got to have a continuation of the MCR. I cannot commit myself or this government to it. But I think all members of the Legislature should think about that and give me all the support I can get, if and when we get ready to present something else, because this will expire on December 31, 1984. Naturally, I've been getting calls from most of you saying, what's going to happen, because we need some lead time. I appreciate what you're saying; I think it's very valid.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

The Member for Calgary Millican talks about the WID canal, and can he get some funding for it. I believe that's an environmental project done by the Department of the Environment. I'm not aware of anything we funded in

that area. I am quite sure the land doesn't belong to Recreation and Parks. It might be government land, but it would have to be under another department. Maybe the member and I can get together and discuss that.

To the Member for Edmonton Kingsway: I think at the outset I mentioned that 81 countries have now made a firm commitment to come to Alberta for the World Student Games. There are 3,908 athletes committed. I understand our concern is not that we won't have enough countries and athletes; it's what happens if we have more than the certain figure that we can handle. But everything is ongoing and pretty well on target with that.

The Member for Cardston raised a very important topic. Are ecological reserves too large, and who sets the size of them? I just want to say that I hope to bring forward very quickly — and I hope it's before this session ends this spring, or probably this fall — a board of people, a committee of 12, that will sit on this ecological reserves board, the Wilderness Areas Act. There are six people from government and six from the private sector. They will make recommendations to me and to the Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife, and hopefully we can get some reason into the whole thing.

In regard to urban parks — and this is for all members — I don't want to spend too much time on that because the urban parks are under the capital projects division of the heritage fund, and we just talked about that a couple of weeks ago. If you go back through *Hansard* and there is something that I haven't covered, please get back to me and I'll discuss that with you.

I don't know if we're going to have a boat launch at Sylvan Lake Provincial Park. I always thought we had one. I'll check that out and see why that question was raised — we don't have one, why we don't have one; and if we plan to have one, why it isn't there.

The Member for Edmonton Belmont raised some good points with regard to William Watson Lodge. Of course that too is within the Kananaskis budget, and it's one of the greatest things I think this government has done for the handicapped. I've had letters from all corners of this province suggesting that if we do any more, we could do it in a number of other places, because it's just tremendous.

I'm sorry to hear his brother drowned. It's disappointing that we have a roped off area and this happens. I don't know where we stand in regard to lifeguards in provincial parks, especially there. But with this new STEP program we have this year, possibly it would be a good time for us to have another look at it, not just at Garner Lake Provincial Park but other parks, because nobody wants to see a tragedy such as a loss of life anywhere.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lethbridge West talked about a number of things, and very thoughtful comments. He suggested the budget is down. As I said, the budget is not down. What has happened is that we've reduced the budget because of certain commitments we made last year. I just want to read off some. The Goldeye camp was \$250,000, the World Student Games was \$3.5 million, and the Western Canada Games was \$8.5 million. Then we had a number of special warrants because of the MCR. So once you take that all off, our budget is in line this year with last year. Hopefully we can live within that. If we have more requests for MCR funding, then of course we'll have to go back for a special warrant. But the budget is not down. The budget is equal to what we had last year, except that we have now completed some projects and we don't need those extra dollars.

He commented that there are a number of parks that are overcrowded, and that's right. I think more and more people are staying closer to home. That's why we moved with the urban parks policy in both Edmonton and Calgary first, and now the other five centres. Hopefully, as those parks are developed, this will make more room for local people. As the Member for Camrose suggested, maybe the local people will have a chance to take part in their own parks. But that is something that is happening, and I'm pleased to see that Albertans are moving around to see the rest of their province. The overcrowding is, of course, something that we'd all like to eliminate. My understanding is that last year we had more movement through provincial parks than ever before. I think that's great. The reservation system is very valuable because — you see the "campground full" signs on the parks as you drive the highway — this at least gives the local people a chance to get to them.

The next question he raised — and I think I'll have to ask for some help here from all of you — is in regard to lottery funds to sports. I have been talking about that for a number of months. I just want to go over it for the members so they have this in their minds. The lottery funds are \$2.08 per capita in Manitoba, \$2.07 per capita in Saskatchewan, and 46 cents in Alberta. So you might want to keep those figures in mind when we discuss lottery distribution later on. I am certainly supportive of more funds to lotteries, because I think that's what it's all about. When we see these ads about the games and when we advertise lotteries, they always seem to bring in a sports picture; yet we don't see all those funds going to sports.

The athlete development program: some 600 athletes are funded by over \$600. Those athletes are named by the sporting associations. They tell us which athletes they want to see compete in the Western Canada Games or the Canada games in Chicoutimi, where we were this winter. Those athletes get these funds to make sure they go down there and participate. They are development funds and also some transportation funds.

I gave you an update on the MCR and the operational grants. The next question was, will we take over more than the 68 highway campsites? I hope, Mr. Chairman, that over time we can bring all campsites under one department. I don't know if that's feasible, because we have some with Transportation. Those are probably easier to take over, and they could be run by Recreation and Parks. But then you have some under Environment and forestry which are further away. Unless you have some way of taking care of them, I think it could become more costly to take them under one umbrella than to leave them the way they are. We're going to have to look at that. As we go on through the years and see how this works, we will have a better idea.

The next question was in regard to the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation. We all know that it's a Crown corporation, and they distribute the funds from lotteries without taking any funds from those lotteries for themselves. We pay the administration, so every dollar they collect plus any donations go directly out. I don't know if it's possible for us to get a per capita basis. If we did that, I hope the members would really think about that because they've distributed some funds to communities that would never ever get that many dollars if it were on a per capita. They've taken the most needy projects, and as you look through the annual report. I think they've gone to smaller communities a lot more than to the larger centres. We'd better have a good look at that

before we make any changes.

The Member for Calgary McCall raised a question in regard to the extension of Fish Creek park. That would be my hope when the gravel is finally mined and everything is put back the way we want it. There are some plans now for a golf course and a continuation of a people park.

Again, we have to have a good serious look at funding for sports through lotteries. But the thing that really impresses me is that if we can get the Alberta sports council operating, it will take all the sporting organizations under its umbrella. They'll make their own decisions and sort of control their own destiny. That's going to be a positive move.

On urban parks, I can't commit to the Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray when we will develop more urban parks. I think I've made those comments in the House before, and he can look at that. I appreciate that Gregoire park is overfilled and we need more new parks. It's easy to say gimme, gimme, gimme. But as a business man, and he is one too, there's only so much you can get. There's an old saying: you can't buy \$40 worth of groceries with a \$20 bill. That's where we're at.

We developed 20 recreation areas. We want to go with 10 more this year. We're trying to spread them around the province, so no M.L.A. can boast of more than one for the time being, until we try to cover everybody. That's a very positive program, and it's ongoing.

The Member for Edmonton Norwood asked me why we have extra staff. Mr. Chairman, we don't have extra staff. What has happened is that last year we had 80 staff transferred from Public Works to our department. We've reduced that by 40, so in reality our manpower this year is 40 less than last year. We don't have more staff on stream. He asked about the Dawe centre in Red Deer. Yes, that was funded partly by MCR funding through the city. Of course they can also use operational funds for it, because they are the ones who get it on a per capita basis.

Now we get down to the questions raised by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview and a number of other members in regard to the Olympics. Let me go back to the beginning. Some months ago, the Calgary Olympic Development Association made a presentation in Montreal with certain documents in a bid to host the Olympics. That bid book showed certain locations for certain venues: downhill, slalom, luge, bobsled, nordic — you name it. After that Montreal trip, where Calgary was successful, they ventured to Baden Baden with the same presentation, same book, same locations, and they were successful there.

Since that time people have come forward to the Olympic committee and suggested different sites. One of those sites asked about was Mount Allan. This site was recommended by the private sector to the Olympic committee. The Olympic committee in turn asked the International Olympic Committee to send their members from the international ski organization to assess the hill and let them know if it was feasible to hold Olympics on that site. This was done, not by government but by the Olympic committee in conjunction with the people from the international Olympic association, and the hill proved to be a site that could hold the Olympics. According to the report I received, and I can only go by that, it probably wasn't the best site in the world. But it was a site that could hold all Olympics, the downhill, the slalom: all the downhill events. So we went from there.

They presented that to us with a letter from the president to me. I replied that we were pleased they finally had

arrived at a site. We asked a number of questions. Would this site be suitable for recreation skiing and the Olympics? Would it have the snow capacity, or do you have to have snow-making equipment? The answer was very clear and came back quickly that it's mandatory for all sites that hold Olympics now to have snow-making equipment. So that took care of that problem. The next question we asked was in regard to what the wind factor would be for skiers. My understanding as of today is that the wind factor at tree level is very good, very positive. There would only be some caution above tree level, and that is being examined at the present time by experts in the ski business. It's my understanding that most of the events can be held from the tree level down, and I say that with not all the knowledge I should have at my fingertips, but this will be coming forward to us.

I might add that we have taken on an organizer for the Olympics, a gentleman who just went on staff and is working very closely with the federal government, the provincial government, the Calgary Olympic association, and the city of Calgary, to make sure that whatever sites are picked, wherever they are, they are the best possible sites not just for the Olympics but for a legacy for future use by Albertans.

The hon. member went on, with his voice raised high, and said he could not see how we can decrease the budget of Recreation and Parks in this type of year. He called it mismanagement. Let me just say to the hon. member that I think it's darn good management, because we have decreased the purchase of fixed assets by some \$900,000.

MR. NOTLEY: Are you looking under operations and maintenance? That's what I referred to; page 143.

MR. TRYNCHY: I'm looking at the other book.

MR. NOTLEY: I'm looking at page 143, operations and maintenance, under Vote 3.

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes, it's Vote 3.1, operations and maintenance. Under Vote 3.1, we have a decrease in fixed assets. We have a decrease of one contract position, and that comes to some \$900,000. So we have not decreased our operating budget. It's increased by some 4 or 5 per cent, if I'm not mistaken. What we've done is not go ahead and purchase a number of things; we feel we can get by for a year or so. So there is no decrease in operating budgets.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I've answered all the questions in regard to Mount Allan. I wrote down all the concerns the hon. members had, and I hope I've covered them all. If there are any more questions in regard to that, I'd be glad to answer them. I think I've done that, but maybe I've missed one or two.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, let me just respond to the minister. We're now looking at Vote 3 under the elements budget. When the minister first got up and went on not with much light but at some considerable length, I think he was dealing with Vote 2 on page 295. I'm dealing with the elements budget.

The minister indicated a reduction. I am sorry to say I don't see that identified in the estimates. If the minister is going to be commending estimates to the committee. I think he has to be a little more specific than that. Where is that \$900,000 identified under Vote 3, 3.1: 3.1.1 through to 3.1.8?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman. I was reading from that. I had the right figures; I'm not mistaken. I can start off with 3.1.1, a decrease of one contract position; 3.1.2, field support, a decrease in fixed assets; 3.1.3, a decrease in fixed assets; 3.1.4, a decrease in fixed assets; 3.1.5, a decrease due to labor agreement not being finalized; 3.1.6, a decrease due to labor agreement not being finalized and a decrease of \$95,000 in fixed assets; 3.1.7, a decrease of \$175,000 in fixed assets, and it goes on and on; 3.1.8, a decrease of five permanent positions and a decrease of some \$450,000 in fixed assets in the Kananaskis region. That covers that under the elements.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it's not in the book. First of all, the minister has indicated a decrease in fixed assets. In fact, as he goes through his information, we find that's not entirely accurate, that some of it is decrease due to labor contract not finalized. Before we agree to the estimates, perhaps the minister will tell us in specific amounts exactly what those figures are.

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can give those. For 3.1.1, the decrease is \$48,000; for 3.1.2, \$47,000; for 3.1.3, \$12,000; for 3.1.4, \$205,000; for 3.1.5, \$40,000; for 3.1.6, \$30,000 and \$95,000; for 3.1.7, \$103,000; and for 3.1.8, \$125,000 and \$450,000. I hope I got them all; they all amount to that.

MR. NOTLEY: Is the decrease in fixed assets or in labor contracts not finalized?

MR. TRYNCHY: I'll just give the labor contracts, and if you tick that off you'll have it.

Under 3.1.5, there's \$40,000 for labor contract; 3.1.1 is \$30,000 for labor; and 3.1.7, \$103,000 for labor. Those are the three items for labor contracts.

MR. NOTLEY: At the moment, then, we're looking at \$175,000 in a category of labor contracts not finalized. Is that correct? So that's not a reduction of fixed assets; that's something different.

MR. TRYNCHY: There's \$900,000 in total, and \$175,000 from \$900,000 is what? If you can figure it out, that's the decrease in assets.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, that doesn't seem to be entirely accurate either, because we're talking about another \$125,000 which seems to be due to five positions less under 3.1.8. Let's get the figures straight. Mr. Minister. You want the estimates through the committee tonight. Let's get the figures straight.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, a decrease of permanent staff is not a labor contract.

MR. NOTLEY: It's not a fixed asset, either.

MR. TRYNCHY: When the hon. member asked for what comes off for labor contracts, I gave him those figures. To that he can add \$125,000 for a decrease of five permanent positions. The rest is fixed assets.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, let's get the global figures so we have them completely accurate, so there is no question. First of all, let's have the global figure — the minister should have this at his fingertips; he tells us what a good businessman he is; I'm sure he has these at his

fingertips — as to the reduction in fixed assets, the global figure as to the reduction in labor contracts not finalized, and the global figure of the total number of positions that are not going to be filled.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I hope I have this right here. The first, under 3.1.1, is \$48,000. Do you want me to add these up? Are you going to add them up?

MR. NOTLEY: No. You're the minister. You want the estimates through.

MR. TRYNCHY: There's \$40,000 under 3.1.5; a \$221,000 decrease in regard to labor agreements not being finalized; \$125,000, a decrease of five permanent positions; and the rest is a decrease in fixed assets. I can add the fixed assets up for the hon. member. That would leave a \$504,000 reduction in fixed assets.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, now we have these figures, can the minister explain why he told me about five minutes ago that the fixed assets reduction was \$725,000, and he now tells me it's \$504,000? What is the reason for the difference, other than the time the minister has had to calculate his figures so that the information he is giving to the committee is accurate?

MR. TRYNCHY: The figure I gave him was not \$750,000; it was \$900,000 in total. I didn't have it broken down to labor, fixed assets, or permanent positions. Now we have that.

Agreed to:

1.0.1 — Minister's Office	\$224,645
1.0.2 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$245,865
1.0.3 — Administrative Support	\$367,192
1.0.4 — Financial Administration	[\$840,466]
1.0.5 — Personnel Services	\$546,830
1.0.6 — Systems Development	\$805,322
1.0.7 — Public Communications	\$755,332
1.0.8 — Planning Secretariat	\$256,943
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$4,042,595
2.1 — Program Support	\$824,124
2.2 — Financial Assistance	\$42,468,506
2.3 — Community Recreation Development	\$990,910
2.4 — Recreation Program Development	\$2,220,293
2.5 — Regional Recreation Consultation	\$1,752,236
Total Vote 2 — Recreation Development	\$48,256,069
3.1 — Operations and Maintenance	\$29,591,508
3.2 — Design and Implementation	\$5,955,199

3.3 — Parks — Reconstruction	\$3,521,000
3.4 — Parks — Construction and Redevelopment	\$3,479,000
Total Vote 3 — Provincial Parks	\$42,546,707

4.1 — Facilities Development	\$5,163,005
4.2 — Financial Assistance — Operating	\$1,000,000
Total Vote 4 — Support to the XV Olympic Winter Games — 1988	\$6,163,005

Department Total \$101,008,376

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

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration and reports the following resolutions, and requests leave to sit again:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, sums not exceeding the following for the department and purposes indicated:

Department of Recreation and Parks: \$4,042,595 for departmental support services, \$48,256,069 for recreation development, \$42,546,707 for provincial parks, \$6,163,005 for support to the XV Olympic Winter Games.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we propose to do committee study of Bill No. 26 and, assuming there would be time, a selection of other Bills on the Order Paper.

[At 10:40 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]

