

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Tuesday, May 1, 1984 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **PRESENTING REPORTS BY  
STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES**

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the special committee appointed November 21, 1983, for the purpose of searching for and selecting an Ombudsman, has had under consideration the question of such an appointment. The committee unanimously recommends to the Assembly that Mr. Brian Sawyer of Calgary be appointed Ombudsman for a five-year term, commencing September 1, 1984.

I am tabling the report, Mr. Speaker, and copies are available for all members.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 260**

**An Act to Amend the  
Prearranged Funeral Services Act**

MR. ZIP: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 260, An Act to Amend the Prearranged Funeral Services Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to have interest earned or money paid under a prepaid, prearranged funeral plan either held in trust or paid yearly to the person who bought the plan.

[Leave granted; Bill 260 read a first time]

**Bill 210**

**Energy Conservation and  
Environmental Protection Tax Credit Act**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 210, the Energy Conservation and Environmental Protection Tax Credit Act.

This Bill provides that the tax credit applies to research and development in the field of energy conservation, as well as the refining and reusing of toxic or hazardous materials. This will help Albertans to clean up our environment and to keep it that way. It also establishes Alberta as a leader in high-tech energy conservation and environmental protection.

[Leave granted; Bill 210 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table the response to Motion for a Return No. 147.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, on your behalf, I would like to introduce a group of students from your constituency.

Monsieur le Président, je vous présente un groupe d'étudiants de Québec. Ils [inaudible] de l'école Jasper Place composite high. Il y a un groupe de quarante-quatre étudiants, ici dans la galerie publique. Monsieur le Président, c'est un groupe d'étudiants qui participent au programme Open House Canada. Je pense que c'est très important pour le pays d'avoir les étudiants de Québec ici avec nous en Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, we have a group of 44 students, half from Jasper Place composite high school and half from Quebec. The students are participating in the Open House Canada program. It's important to have exchanges like this. I ask them to rise and receive the very warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Member for Barrhead and on his behalf, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to hon. members, 75 grade 6 students from the Barrhead elementary school. Our students are seated in the members gallery, accompanied by teachers Mr. Ron Roblin, Mr. Marvin Sheets, and Mrs. Florence Wallace. I now ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you 40 very well-behaved and enthusiastic grades 5 and 6 students from St. Vladimir elementary school, located in the constituency of Edmonton Belmont. Seated in the public gallery, they are escorted by their teacher Mrs. Lynda Poplawski. Would they please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

**Battleford Mortgage Co. Ltd.**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the first question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It deals with the operation of the Securities Commission and, in particular, the \$1.5 million loss by investors in Battleford Mortgage Co. To the minister: what review has the government done of the actions of the Securities Commission and the superintendent of real estate and insurance in the matter of the collapse of Battleford Mortgage?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of a review, but I will get that information for the hon. member.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. If a review has not been done, have there been any discussions with officials of the Securities Commission and the superintendent of real estate and insurance, regarding whether or not the Alberta government fulfilled all the necessary statutory obligations to regulate the activities of Battleford Mortgage in order to protect the investors in that company?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the government indeed fulfilled all its statutory obligations or there would have been questions raised by court action.

MR. NOTLEY: Without getting into matters that I am sure will be before the courts, could the minister advise the Assembly whether any consideration has been given to amending the Mortgage Brokers Regulation Act and the section that allows

lawyers — or at least has been interpreted to allow lawyers — to operate mortgage companies without a licence under the Act? It's section 2(k) of the Mortgage Brokers Regulation Act.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the Alberta Mortgage Brokers Association, there have been a number of amendments contemplated. This one has been briefly discussed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister has indicated that it has been briefly discussed. Given the collapse of Battleford and the loss of investors' money, has the government given any consideration to changing this particular section, to protect investors?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I suppose it would be fair to say that all the recommendations coming forward from the Mortgage Brokers Association are receiving very careful consideration, and no decision has been made yet.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Given the \$1.5 million loss by investors in Battleford, when does the minister expect a decision on the various proposals; in particular, changing the Mortgage Brokers Regulation Act to protect investors from the actions of lawyers, who at this stage can escape through a loophole in the Act.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making an assumption that an amendment to the Act is indeed the cure-all for this particular situation.

But in answer to the first part of his question, a decision with respect to possible legislation for this fall should be made this summer.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. Is the Attorney General in a position to confirm that he has met with representatives of Battleford investors, who requested that the province make an ex gratia payment to those investors?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I had what I think would be called representations on behalf of people who declared, through their legal counsel, that they did have claims they would like to make on account of the dealings they had had involving Battleford mortgage corporation, in most cases a good many years ago. I met with that group last June, if I remember correctly.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister advise the Assembly what position he took with respect to this request? Was it the position of the government that it would drag these investors all the way to the Supreme Court if necessary?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I don't think words like that passed between us. I think there was some discussion of whether or not the people on behalf of whom representations were being made had a claim that could succeed at all.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. What considerations has the government made on this issue subsequent to that meeting, given that about 50 people are involved and that many of them are senior citizens? Has there been any review of perhaps the Re-Mor precedent in Ontario?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I've certainly reviewed the Re-Mor precedent from Ontario. In that particular case, I think it was of the essence that negligence on behalf of the administrative agency was in effect admitted to. If not in precise terms, it was certainly effectively admitted to by the government of Ontario of that day. Because of that, according to my understanding, they made a partial payment to claimants who might well have proceeded through the courts had it not been for that particular intervention. I could not find any comparison between the Re-Mor case and the Battleford case that would make such an approach appropriate in this case.

I think the only other thing I'd like to add at this point is that since these discussions following the meeting I had last year have been with legal counsel on behalf of persons who may indeed become more formal claimants, my preference is still to communicate with them on their concerns rather than with the hon. Leader of the Opposition. However, insofar as the matter is also a public concern, I have no hesitation in responding in the Assembly. I just want to indicate to the hon. leader, for consideration in his supplementaries, that we may indeed get to the point where I'll take the view that the matters are ones that should be made from legal counsel to legal counsel.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that day will come before too long.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary on this topic. If there's time, we can come back to it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, given the assertion of creditors that there was in fact negligence on the part of Alberta agencies, the Superintendent of Insurance and the Securities Commission being the principal agencies this assertion has been made about, my question to the Attorney General is: has any review as to the effectiveness of these two agencies in terms of fulfilling their statutory obligations been commissioned by his office?

MR. CRAWFORD: No, Mr. Speaker. That wouldn't occur, that the Attorney General's office would undertake to investigate another government agency. What does occur is that when people come forward and make representations that they believe they have a claim and urge that upon whatever grounds, whether it be negligence or some other grounds, then we examine the evidence they choose to put forward through their legal counsel and make our determination based on that.

#### **Bank of Alberta**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Given this government's position, as expressed in the Speech from the Throne, of commitment toward privatization, what was the policy consideration that led to investment in the Bank of Alberta?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the policy is very clear. Ever since approximately 1971, through a number of initiatives of the private sector and the government, the province of Alberta has been increasing in strength as one of the financial centres of western Canada. The government of Alberta feels it is very important that our financial sector be strong and be responsive.

In this case, we have a situation regarding a new bank which has headquarters in the province of Alberta. There are two other banks with headquarters in the province of Alberta. Accordingly, in order to ensure the continuing strength of finan-

cial institutions which are headquartered in this province, we felt it would be appropriate, not only as a financial policy but also as an economic strategy policy, to invest in the new Bank of Alberta to the tune of 5 percent.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

MR. MARTIN: Government involvement. Socialism.

MR. NOTLEY: I'm sure Bay Street is shaking in its boots.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the participation of the former superintendent of the treasury branch system in this new bank and as part of the government's broader banking initiative, is there any consideration to making structural changes in the operations of the treasury branch system and possibly linking it with one of the privately headquartered banks in this province?

MR. HYNDMAN: On the second point, Mr. Speaker, I can assure hon. members and Albertans that there will be no change with regard to the activities and individual identities of the treasury branches. They have served Alberta well; they will continue to do so. At the moment we are conducting an update of the activities of that organization. It is a homegrown Alberta financial institution. It originally was devised to fill, and has successfully filled, gaps in the financial services presented in the province by institutions. I am looking at ways in which it could continue, and perhaps expand that role.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Does the government's updating contain any option whatsoever that would alter the ownership of the treasury branch from what it is at the moment — an extension of the Alberta Treasury — to a combination, or some link, with one of the privately owned but Alberta-headquartered banks?

MR. HYNDMAN: No it would not, Mr. Speaker. There is no contemplation and no investigation of any kind into the treasury branches becoming linked in any way, other than perhaps the commercial ways in which various financial institutions are linked throughout the country. The treasury branch will continue to remain as an entity of the government of Alberta. It has served Albertans well and has a good reputation, and that will continue.

#### **Child Support and Maintenance Orders**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Attorney General is with regard to child support and maintenance. I wonder if the Attorney General can indicate the position of the government at this time with regard to the federal government's national program for the enforcement of child support and maintenance laws.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister of Social Services and Community Health may want to supplement the answer, as to some of the practical considerations.

As to the overall philosophy, I think hon. members would be aware that in particular the federal government and the government of Manitoba have recently given some publicity to plans to have child support payments on behalf of single parents — or separated in any event — collected more effectively, and have in mind what amounts to a reciprocal enforcement type of program that would link the various provinces. Much of the information would be computerized.

I make two observations on it, Mr. Speaker. One is that the government of Manitoba has done more in this field than other governments, and we've discussed that sort of program with them. One of the concerns I've always had is that the potential use of police forces in civil matters should be of grave concern to anyone who contemplates what that means. I'm well aware of the current philosophy in respect of the suitability of using more stringent law enforcement techniques, one might say, than merely leaving the parties to their private devices through their own legal counsel and going to the courts. So there is perhaps a growing recognition, including one that is the basis of certain recent international understandings, that it may be appropriate in areas, including the collection of support payments, to have a bit more involvement by government, as distinct from leaving it entirely to the parties.

That's the concern I wanted to express, in that one shouldn't just up and endorse it and proceed to do it, in my view. At the same time, I think there's a general concurrence among people that people who are ordered to pay support payments should indeed pay them, and that if there is something that can be facilitated in the way of reciprocal enforcement of judgments, that should be done.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the statement.

A supplementary question. Could the minister indicate whether some studies are going on within the department, or is someone looking at this matter, with regard to maybe a changed position of the government of Alberta at the present time, in terms of some type of compromise position that could facilitate the child support and maintenance orders across this nation?

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We are looking at that now and canvassing the significance of what developments in that area would in fact amount to.

To sum up, we're certainly working within the philosophical context of recent published reports or recommendations of the federal government. We feel that from the point of view of a totally integrated system, they and the provinces could not be ready for still some time, because it would involve interlinking — if it were done in the ultimate sense of reciprocal enforcements in the way that some people contemplate it, it would require a lot of computer software. For that reason we think they'll be a little while actually getting to that point, so we feel we have time to continue to examine it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. There is some concern that Alberta is or could become the haven for parents that have kidnapped their children in other provinces and come to Alberta. The ability to find those parents is not quite as adequate as it should be. Is the minister finding that to be the case in any of the research, and is there concern with regard to a matter such as that at the present time?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that type of concern has not been specifically brought to me, other than the hon. member mentioning it now.

It's the sort of thing one could speculate about and contemplate, and I would think that people from some other government who want to advance their particular system — in particular the federal government — could begin to make allegations like that. They have not made them to me; therefore I would not think it really is a type of concern that people would put forward with much credibility. I think the only thing that could be said about it is that if part of the country went to an

integrated system and part of the country did not, then you would probably find missing spouses and missing children more easily in the parts that had gone to the new system. The issues remain the same as to whether or not it should be done.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is the minister planning any meetings with federal officials or other attorneys general of Canada with regard to this matter in the next few months or over the summer?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would be surprised if that did not come up at any regularly scheduled meeting, either of provincial attorneys general or of the provincial attorneys general and the federal Minister of Justice. I can only say that there are no such meetings scheduled within the next month or so. But I would expect meetings during the course of the year and, in the course of those meetings, to have that particular matter raised.

#### **Rural Electrification**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications has to do with the Rural Electrification Association task force. Is the minister in a position to indicate if that task force has completed its work and when the information will be made public?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the interdepartmental task force the hon. member referred to was made up of the Deputy Minister of Executive Council, who chaired the committee, the Deputy Provincial Treasurer, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, and the Deputy Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications. The primary purpose of the committee was to review rural electrification services throughout Alberta.

The committee held a series of meetings and gave an opportunity to the utility companies, the Union of REAs, the three-phase power committee, and several other groups, to present briefs to the committee. As well, the committee reviewed the work of previous committees in this area. Their report was recently submitted to government. It is now being very thoroughly reviewed by both the utilities and the agriculture caucus committees.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to indicate when this information will be made available to the REAs, in light of the fact that many of the REAs are trying to decide if they're going to sell their lines to the power companies or keep them and update them?

MR. BOGLE: That's a very fair question, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member may be aware that in December I wrote to the presidents of each of the REAs in Alberta, in the event that they were not represented at the annual meeting in Red Deer in June 1983, when I announced the formation of the committee. Although certainly the decision whether or not an REA wishes to sell its assets rests solely with the membership within that rural electrification association, in that December correspondence I suggested that as the results of the report were expected sometime in the spring of 1984, if I were a member of an REA I would want to wait and see what decisions would in fact be made by government.

The member may also be aware that in the Speech from the Throne, delivered on March 15, we indicated that legislation dealing with rural electrification would be introduced during the spring sittings of this session. It is our intent to meet that deadline and commitment.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is there anything in place as an interim measure, if the REAs are seeking advice as to what position they should advise their members to take on selling their associations? Is there any mechanism in place so that the department or someone can give these associations advice at this time?

MR. BOGLE: Clearly, Mr. Speaker, it's not the role of the Department of Utilities and Telecommunications to advise members of the rural electrification associations whether they should or should not sell. On the other hand, we want to ensure that all the facts are on the table when the members are in fact making a decision.

Once the government caucus committees on both utilities and agriculture have concluded their review of the process and full government caucus has made a decision, it will be our intent to convene a meeting of representatives of all the REAs to share with them directly, one on one, what the government proposes to do.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. At this time, is the minister in a position to indicate, if he knows, just how many REAs in the province have sold their possessions to the power companies?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the REA program was initiated in the late 1940s, early '50s. At that time, almost all the farmers in the province were served by REAs. Today approximately two out of three farmers are served by REAs. One-third are direct farm customers of the utility companies.

#### **Viscount Bennett School**

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. Is the minister in receipt of complaints by the Viscount Bennett home and school association concerning the lack of time to prepare a submission with respect to the change of use by the school, and that the Calgary school board may in fact be circumventing the minister's guidelines by changing the use rather than closing it?

MR. KING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received letters from parents associated with the Viscount Bennett school. They do express the concern just represented by the hon. member, as well as other concerns.

#### **Labour Legislation Challenge**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour. Can the minister confirm that he received a copy of the CLC-sponsored challenge to Bill 44 placed before the International Labour Organization, I believe in November last year?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the normal routine is that, through the office of the minister in Ottawa, I receive copies of matters placed before the International Labour Organization. I assume that I have in fact received that document.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Has the minister read that brief?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I always read what my colleagues from Ottawa deliver to me.

MR. MARTIN: Then I take it that it is more than assuming that he has the document; he has had it.

My next question: can the minister advise whether the Alberta government, through the government of Canada, has filed a response to this challenge?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I believe all the concerns which have been forwarded from whatever source in Canada to the International Labour Organization have received responses. There are several, and I'm quite sure that there has been a specific response to all of them to this date.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Can the minister advise what steps have been taken to forward a copy of the Alberta government's response to the affected bodies: namely, CLC, National Union of Provincial Government Employees, and AUPE?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the procedure which is normally followed is that the responses are delivered to the appropriate minister — in this case, the Minister of Labour in Ottawa — and the minister co-ordinates the response. Canada is a member of the International Labour Organization, and that is the procedure which is followed in a federal relationship.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Is the minister saying that the Alberta government could not transmit their response to this to these bodies? Is that beyond the realm of possibility?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'm just indicating the protocol which is normal and usual and which is followed in dealings with the International Labour Organization.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. At the first opportunity, will the minister undertake to table in this Assembly a copy of the Alberta government's response to the ILO, so we can take a look at it?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I know of no reason not to do that, other than to be assured that since it is really a response on the part of the government of Canada to the International Labour Organization to which we make our contribution, it is kept in that context and that the parties to whom the response is going have had the opportunity to receive it first.

MR. MARTIN: I appreciate protocol. It's very nice. But it's the Alberta government's response and, because it's an important one, we as legislators would like to take a look at that response.

My final supplementary question is simply: could the minister give us a time frame when we might be able to see that response in this Assembly?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'd be quite pleased to check on the times which are obviously involved, and then I'd be very pleased to table it for the hon. member. I think he might find it very instructive.

MR. MARTIN: Oh, I'm sure I will.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Minister of Labour assure the House or inform the House or clarify for the House that matters of labour policy of this government are determined by the ILO in Geneva, Switzerland?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the policy for labour relations for the province of Alberta is indeed determined by this Legislative

Assembly and this government. Under the protocols and international conventions with which we operate, it is possible that there can be some questioning of those policies from time to time. When that occurs, it is handled through the offices of the federal minister because of the federal relationship. That's a protocol which I've been explaining. But in the end result, the policy is established in this Assembly and by this government.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, flowing . . . Because there seems to be some doubt, would the minister confirm for all members of the Assembly that the provincial governments and the federal government have signed the ILO, and we all operate under it?

MR. SPEAKER: It seems to me the hon. member is simply making an assertion.

MR. MARTIN: It's simply the same assertion that he made.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary Currie, and then the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health and the hon. Minister of Transportation would like to provide some information that was sought in a previous question period.

#### **Viscount Bennett School**

*(continued)*

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Education is with respect to Viscount Bennett high school in my constituency and the school closure policy of the Calgary Board of Education. In reviewing the request from the parents of Viscount Bennett school, is it the opinion of the minister's department that in fact Viscount Bennett is a closure, since all the students in that school will be moving to five other schools if current regulations or motions by the Calgary board follow through?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, it is the position of the government that the proposal adopted by the Calgary Board of Education for the operation of Viscount Bennett school in September 1984 is in fact a school closure, although the Calgary Board of Education has not referred to it as that. I have advised the parents and the Calgary Board of Education that I will treat it as a school closure and that the Calgary board cannot proceed with the plans it has discussed until such time as it has gone through the process leading to a resolution to close the school.

#### **School Closure Guidelines**

MR. SHRAKE: A supplementary question for the minister, Mr. Speaker. You had a series of guidelines for school closures, and among those were things such as social impact upon a community. Are these guidelines going to be enforced and conditions such as if it's a community school looked at before we allow some of these closures?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, if the question is whether or not we expect the guidelines to be honoured, then the answer is yes we do.

#### **Women's Shelters**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. Member for Clover Bar asked some questions relative to recommendations of the Alberta Council of Women's Shelters. One of the supplementaries he asked related to programs for counselling wife batterers. I prefer the terms "spousal abusers" or "perpetrators of spousal abuse".

In any case, I indicated that there were programs in Calgary and Lethbridge. We do have a family violence program in

Calgary, but not specifically for spousal abusers. I would like to indicate that I was correct in the fact that we have one in Lethbridge, funded through the family and community support services program. Also, the rural family violence program that we're funding as a pilot project in the Lac La Biche area does have a component for treatment and counselling of spousal abusers.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation, and then the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications wishes to supplement some previously given information.

#### **Highway 56 Upgrading**

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. Member for Drumheller asked some questions with regard to Highway 56 and, in so doing, indicated he had some information about the condition of the highway and the fact that it may have been closed for some two days this spring.

I took the opportunity to have staff in my department check with the maintenance foreman for the highway, the councillor of the county of Wheatland, who lives along the highway, the regional director, the district engineer, and the Wheatland county office. I'm advised that the road has been freshly reggraded, that calcium chloride has been put on it with regard to dust treatment, and that throughout the spring season it was in good condition. No one is aware of it ever having been closed at any time, and all those contacted are totally happy with the condition of the road and the maintenance on it.

#### **Rural Electrification**

*(continued)*

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, in my enthusiasm in response to the questions from the hon. Member for Clover Bar, I indicated that there is reference in the Speech from the Throne this year that legislation regarding rural electrification would be brought in during the spring sittings. The actual wording in the Speech from the Throne is session. While it's still my hope that it will be done this spring; it should be clear to the hon. member and others that the actual wording is session.

#### **Water Management — Oldman River**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of the Environment is over the concern about the lack of potential irrigation of water in the Lethbridge Northern Irrigation District in southern Alberta. I wonder if the minister could indicate what progress has been made on construction of a dam on the Oldman River.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I addressed that question earlier in the session in my estimates, and I repeat the information today. The government has under serious consideration the matter of a reservoir on the Oldman River. By midsummer, which is the end of July, we're committed to making a decision with regard to siting, whether it be at the Peigan site at Brocket or at the Three Rivers site.

#### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree to revert briefly to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### **head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

*(reversion)*

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It certainly is a distinct pleasure for me today to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 135 grade 8 students from F.E. Osborne junior high school in Calgary North West. The reason it's an added pleasure for me is that this is the first time I've had the opportunity to introduce students in this Assembly since I was re-elected in 1982.

Due to the foresight of one of the teachers at F.E. Osborne, who noticed that the students were studying a unit on China in social studies, the students have the opportunity to travel to Edmonton to take part in a very unique experience; that is, the Chinese trade fair and circus here in Edmonton. I'm very proud to say I was able to assist the school, the parents, and the students by appealing most sincerely to our Minister of Education to hopefully find some added funding so that students from the southern part of the province would have the same opportunity that the students from the northern part of the province have. On behalf of the students, parents, and teachers, I would like to thank the Minister of Education most sincerely for accommodating them.

The students are seated in both the public and members galleries. They are accompanied by Mr. Art Hanson, Mr. Dave Murray, who is the principal of F.E. Osborne, Mr. Al MacDonald, who is the vice-principal, and Ms. Maxine Bishop. The parents who are with the students are Mr. and Mrs. Tabachniuk, Mrs. Vanderberg, Mrs. Lott, Mrs. Nikiforuk, and Mrs. Nysetvold. I would ask all the students to please stand and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

#### **head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Question 165 stand and retain its place on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

#### **head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

162. Mr. R. Speaker moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) Copies of every contract concluded or existing between November 1, 1982, and March 1, 1984, to which
  - (a) the Alberta government or any department, office, agency, board, or commission of, or controlled by it, or
  - (b) any office, agency, board, or commission to which the government has the power of appointing, by itself or in consultation with any other party, a majority of its constituent members, or
  - (c) any Crown corporation or any corporation in which the government holds more than 5 percent of the equity

is a party, under which there is provision for any payment of money or other valuable consideration or benefit to any of the companies or partnerships listed as direct associates of Members of the Legislative Assembly in returns filed pursuant to section 31 of the Legislative Assembly Act, other than contracts or arrangements resulting from a provision in an enactment under which any member of the public or a member of a defined class of the public to

which the company or partnership belongs may receive the benefit.

- (2) Copies of every contract concluded or existing between November 2, 1982, and March 1, 1984, to which
- (a) the Alberta government or any department, office, agency, board, or commission of, or controlled by it, or
  - (b) any office, agency, board, or commission to which the government has the power of appointing, by itself or in consultation with any other party, a majority of its constituent members, or
  - (c) any Crown corporation or any corporation in which the government holds more than 5 percent of the equity

is a party, and under which any benefit accrues to any property listed in a return filed by a minister of the Crown as a declaration of assets pursuant to the directive of the Premier dated May 2, 1973, other than a contract of arrangement authorized by an enactment under which a member of the public or of a defined class of the public to which the owner of the property in question belongs may receive a benefit.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment to this motion. It has been prepared in consultation with the hon. member who moved the motion and with the government. It's a rather long amendment and is probably as complex as the original motion. I have conveyed copies of it to the Clerk, Your Honour, and the hon. member. It contains the elements of the motion and simply sets it out in a way to avoid duplication of time, effort, and cost.

[Motion as amended carried]

#### head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

201. Moved by Mr. Musgrove:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to research and encourage the development and adaptation of compressed natural gas as a primary fuel energy source for motor vehicles in Alberta.

[Adjourned debate March 20: Mr. Cook]

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin my remarks by moving an amendment to the motion. I have copies available for hon. members of the Assembly. The only change I'm proposing is to insert the word "consider" in the motion: "urge the government to consider research and ... development".

I think the motion as amended should be passed. I think the hon. Member for Bow Valley has done a great service to the Assembly by bringing this forward.

I'd just like to make a couple of quick points in passing. The Alberta-Canada energy research fund was established as part of the energy program of 1980. It set aside certain tax and royalty dollars from the federal and provincial governments and endowed a research fund which, up to this point, has largely had research into coal and energy conservation as its focus. Both those objectives are laudable. I think it might be timely for the government to also consider using some funds from that trust fund for research into compressed natural gas.

As I understand it, the main issue is extending the range of vehicles. With the capacity of most of the tanks on the market right now, a vehicle can travel perhaps 150 or 200 miles with

one fill-up. That's not as far in range as one can go in a lot of vehicles with liquid fuels. So to my understanding, the main problem in trying to market the compressed natural gas the province has is trying to extend the range. As the hon. Member for Bow Valley pointed out in his earlier remarks, there are some opportunities for using activated carbons which will absorb natural gas and allow greater carrying capacity for the same volume of tank. That's one area that could be looked at.

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has done the Assembly a great favour by bringing this motion into the Chamber. I think the motion ought to be adopted. I also think the government ought to be encouraged to use some of those research dollars that are there for energy research and reassign some of them for compressed natural gas research and, in particular, extending the range of vehicles.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to close my remarks.

MR. MUSGROVE: As the mover of the motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in favour of the amendment. As I see it, the amendment doesn't significantly alter the intent of the motion. To "consider" research is certainly important although, as I said in my former talk on the subject, there has been a lot of research done in this area.

Italy has been using compressed natural gas for many years as a basic fuel in automobiles. In Alberta, CNG Fuel Ltd. and Airways Compressor have done a lot of research and recently converted a diesel farm tractor to burn 75 percent natural gas and 25 percent diesel fuel. There is also some research in the United States that could be a great benefit to the transition to natural gas. Although they say it'll probably be two years before they will have it qualified to the point where it will be used, it will allow us to use compression tanks that only need 300 pounds of pressure per square inch instead of 3,000 pounds of pressure per square inch. Of course this will be a great benefit to the needs of filling stations. The problem right now is that it costs a tremendous amount of money — I believe \$300,000 — to develop a filling station. If we get down to 300 pounds per square inch, it won't take a lot more cost to have a filling station than it does to fill up with ordinary gasoline now.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the amendment, and I agree that we should pass the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment? The purpose of the amendment is simply to add one word to the resolution.

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to join the discussion on this resolution today and talk in favour of our doing some research on the use of natural gas. When I see a motion like this, though, I wonder why we need to have the government involved in pushing for something like this. If industry thought it was practical and could use it, then they would certainly go ahead.

I'm just amazed at seeing all the locomotives that roar back and forth across our country. They used coal initially, and then diesel fuel. I certainly think they would be the very first people to use natural gas if there were such cost savings. I wonder if the mover of the motion has ever had any contact with the railroads.

Insofar as using it on the farm, we've used compressed natural gas, or propane, for years. As the farms became larger, it became impractical to run back to a stationary tank to fill up. If you're going to be handling a pressurized container with 300 pounds or 3,000 pounds, you're dealing with a very volatile

commodity. Accidents can happen so very, very easily and quickly when you're handling fuel at the best of times. I think this is one of the reasons, other than the cost savings, why more people have switched to diesel fuel. It's the safest fuel we have that is practical for us today.

But I believe that if we were to expend some research money — not just here in Alberta, but I think it should probably be an initiative taken by all governments, and particularly the federal government, on a joint package. We could use it on our farms and have a compressor system that hooks onto our natural gas system, which comes right to our farms, and compress it right there, something that costs in the neighborhood of \$200 or \$500 or something like that. I'm sure they can be built. But I suppose the answer to that may well be: what are you going to use for power to compress the gas? So often we see these research projects, and they look so good to us. We wonder whether it might be like some of the first oil sands projects, where it took three barrels of diesel fuel to get one barrel of bitumen out of the ground: it hardly paid. So with the cost of running the compressor to compress to 300 pounds or 3,000 or anything in between — it takes a great deal of power to do that.

We have gas wells that have — I don't know what the maximum pressure would be on a gas well, but they would be up into the hundreds and thousands of pounds. If we could just bleed off a gas well and use the gas at that point — the hon. member from down south in the shortgrass country would know more about that than I. I don't think the gas that comes out of the ground is liquid, although I suppose it well could be. I think that's the kind of thing we have to look at: being able to tap. It would only be practical when we could actually tap into a gas well filler tank and away we go — and have it metered and pay for the cost of metering. But the cost of compression would be very, very dear.

I get a little edgy about another thing on this, for use in passenger cars. Although it would clean up our environment — there's no question about that; natural gas is a lot cleaner than any known fuel, other than sunlight. But when you go into a parking lot with a propane-powered vehicle, they tell you to turn around and get out of there. We've have some experience with vehicles popping off in garages and service stations and things like that. They call them a building expansion trick when they ... [interjection] That's right, members popping off. I guess that's what we're paid for. I'd rather be over at the Chinese trade show with those kids from Mannville, but I had to come back and do my thing. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I ...

AN HON. MEMBER: You should have stayed.

MR. LYSONS: They don't show pauses in *Hansard* — I don't think.

Anyway, I am happy the member has brought this resolution forward. No wonder I can't find my notes; I'm looking at the special report from the Ombudsman. I lost my notes here. But I didn't do too badly for going without notes for a while.

Mr. Speaker, the whole business of using available resources as best we can is commendable. It wasn't that many years ago that we had a great urgency to develop hydrogen and all those other things, so we could actually go to our well or to a slough and make hydrogen and fuel our vehicles and so on. After a little research was done, it was found that the cost of hydrogen was about five to 10 times higher than conventional fuel when you converted it.

With that, I say I would support this resolution but only in a very limited way, in that if there is money to be expended

by our government for research, it be done in a co-operative manner, much like AOSTRA is, where industry puts up 50 percent and we put up 50 percent. Do a test study. But I'm afraid that it's years and years down the road before the practical farmer or the practical businessman out in the country would be able to use this. Perhaps in the city it would be better.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I was talking to some farmers the other night. They had some 75 young people from all over the world coming to work on the farms here in Alberta. They're very impressed by our country and the vastness of things. I was mentioning to one of the farmers that the most economical farm seemed to be one between a section and two sections of land and those were the people who actually paid income tax. He questioned me on this a little bit, and I told him I knew a farmer who had three quarters of land and was making money and paying income tax and owned a new car and a new house. He said: my God, I can't believe that, because I would think of farming three quarters of land as something I would do after supper. It's true on his farm, where they farm 20 sections. He would do three quarters after supper.

When we are looking at fuel that's loaded as this would be, in all fairness I don't think we could really convert it to be used on the large agricultural acreages because of the complexity of getting it to the equipment involved. That's why I suggest that if it were done on the basis of using it firstly for the railroads, and if the CPR would take a chance on using compressed natural gas for at least five years, maybe I'd take a look at it.

Thank you very much.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to briefly enter the debate on Motion 201 and the amendment therein. I must confess that initially I had some reservations over this motion. But after carefully listening to the debate on March 20 when this motion was originally debated and having listened to the arguments on both sides, I've come down in support of the motion, particularly as amended, because the motion simply urges the government to consider the encouragement of research, development, and adaptation of compressed natural gas as a fuel source for motor vehicles in Alberta.

I must confess I'm still slightly concerned with the wording of the motion, which urges the government to consider it as "a primary fuel energy source for motor vehicles in Alberta". I'm not so sure that compressed natural gas can ever become a primary fuel source. Nonetheless, having said that, I am in support of this motion for a variety of reasons which I'd like to articulate at the moment.

There are a number of advantages in using compressed natural gas as a fuel in our vehicles. Of course one which has been stated before is that the cost of CNG to fuel a vehicle for any given distance is about half that of gasoline. Therefore there are significant savings in utilizing this particular fuel. In some of the research I canvassed on this subject, I notice that the potential market is as large as the number of cars but that a more realistic goal might be about 5 percent of the vehicles in Canada converted to CNG. Using that figure and interpolating it to Alberta, that could result in approximately 60,000 passenger vehicles being converted to CNG. If we quickly consider that the cost of operating a vehicle under CNG would be about half that of gasoline, it doesn't take much mathematics to recognize there is a considerable savings involved in this motion. I think that would greatly encourage the private sector to become actively involved in research on their own.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, compressed natural gas is very safe to use. Indeed it's much safer than gasoline. To begin with, natural gas is nontoxic. It's lighter than air so that if a tank is



ruptured and springs a leak, the gas will dissipate into the atmosphere. In addition, natural gas is more difficult to ignite than gasoline because it requires a higher temperature. I would raise one caution here. In my understanding of this subject — I would hardly consider myself to be an expert in the area — certainly when one considers the rupture or leakage of gasoline, gasoline of course forms a puddle or a pool underneath the vehicle. If ignited, of course it will blow up the whole car or light it on fire. On the other hand, CNG is the kind of gas that dissipates quickly and goes straight up. So that has considerable benefits in terms of safety. Again I guess the caution could be raised that that may not be quite so safe if the vehicle is confined in a garage, where that may blow up the whole building. It hearkens back to the whole emphasis of this motion, and that is that we're encouraging the government to consider research in this area.

The third point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that natural gas is virtually pollution free. That's extremely important, because this gas is a clean-burning fuel. I find that to be an appealing trait, given the growing number of difficult environmental concerns we're dealing with and trying to address in this area, particularly in the area of hydrogen sulphide emissions, acid rain, and what have you.

Mr. Speaker, natural gas is a very important resource in Alberta. Once overshadowed by the demand for crude oil, natural gas now represents this province's most important fuel in our energy future. Therefore it's not unreasonable to suggest that new methods of utilizing this fuel should be developed and encouraged. Increased use of natural gas in Alberta would be a definite benefit. It would solve the problems now being encountered by the industry with so many shut-in gas wells and the severe restrictions the industry finds in terms of cash flow. It would create jobs as the industry could again become more active. As well, if the use of compressed natural gas were encouraged over the use of gasoline, it would have a tremendous impact on our energy imports. Greater use of CNG, a resource we have on hand in abundance, could help us further down the road to energy self-sufficiency.

There are a number of drawbacks encountered in utilizing this fuel source, Mr. Speaker. I recall the debate on March 20, when the Member for Calgary Mountain View articulated a number of the drawbacks and raised some of the concerns. They are there. Certainly one of them relates to the size of the tank required to use compressed natural gas. Accommodating this kind of gas requires a large tank or cylinder. That large tank can't be handled easily in today's small cars. The weight of the cylinder disturbs the balance of these vehicles and road handling. There are a number of concerns there. Additionally, it tends to take up all of the storage space in these small vehicles. So these are some of the challenges that have to be addressed through research.

Perhaps another drawback with CNG is the fact that there are not as yet enough refuelling stations throughout the province to provide a viable service for everyone that might become involved in this kind of service. It is difficult to plan extended road trips in a vehicle that uses CNG, for example, for fear of running out of fuel before reaching the next CNG station.

Despite all of these problems, Mr. Speaker, the use of CNG does hold some promise in Alberta. It has many strengths, which I have tried to illustrate. Research into the utilization of this energy also looks promising. Improvements are continually being made, such as the development of lighter fuel storage cylinders and experimentation in blending CNG with other fuels.

On balance, I would come down in support of this motion. I feel that the future does look bright for this fuel and that we

as government have an important role to play in encouraging its continued and further use. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all members to support this important motion as amended.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak briefly to amended Motion 201. The whole issue of compressed natural gas is obviously one which the province of Alberta would have a tremendous vested interest in if further development of this technology does indeed take place.

This past weekend I was travelling in concert with a friend of mine, and his vehicle was equipped not only with gasoline but with propane gas. It was interesting for me just to watch the matter of the simple flick of a switch to enable a vehicle to use two types of fuel. It was also interesting for me to then try to figure out how many filling stations along the route, the Trans-Canada Highway or Highway No. 2, really had the facility for dealing with propane tanks to service vehicles that have been converted to that fuel. Obviously that kind of system has been improving, especially within our province. Therefore the matter of accessibility is of prime importance if you are going to use any other kind of alternative fuel for your particular vehicle.

I then had reason to deal with some comparisons between propane fuel and compressed natural gas as a fuel. I must confess I was quite ignorant of some of the capabilities of the two types of fuel as alternative means of propelling our trucks and cars. I understand that the conversion costs for either propane or compressed natural gas are somewhat similar. It's interesting that the federal government gives a \$400 grant for conversion to propane and a \$500 grant to cover the cost of converting commercial and private vehicles to compressed natural gas.

With respect to propane, I understand that it makes it almost impossible to start when the vehicle is cold, whereas one of the advantages that compressed natural gas affords in terms of an alternative fuel is that as it enters the engine in a completely vaporized state, it eliminates cold-weather starting problems. On that point alone, perhaps I should get my own vehicle converted, because there are some times when I am parked an awful long way from a plug-in. Given the fact that my vehicle is a standard, operating at the moment, this seems to be a good selling point.

I understand that the octane rating for compressed natural gas is in the neighbourhood of 130, which makes it 20 higher than the octane rating of propane. Therefore it is quite suitable for use in high-compression engines. As pointed out by the previous speaker, natural gas being lighter than air, it dissipates into the atmosphere if there is a leak. That makes it a much safer fuel than propane.

The price of course is something to be considered by all of us, in terms of research and development. As an alternative fuel supply, one can well agree that at the moment compressed natural gas selling at 22 cents a litre is a considerable bargain compared to what we are paying for leaded or unleaded fuel.

Of course the major drawback within the province, and not simply within our province, is the fact that there are very few public compressed natural gas stations available. That is a major problem. I understand that the Husky organization has opened one station in Calgary which has this fuel available. No doubt that organization is studying the experiment and may well go on to opening other facilities throughout the province to make the whole use of this fuel much more beneficial to other persons in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke with some people involved with Nova, an Alberta Corporation, especially people in the Alberta gas transmission division. They kindly supplied me with some

information which I would like to share with the Assembly, because this is an up-to-date indication of what movement is taking place within the province. I understand that in June of 1983, Nova purchased a 50 percent ownership in Compressed Natural Gas Fuel Systems and that that fuel systems operation is the world's largest in the business and in fact the only one in Canada to provide a complete line of CNG conversion equipment and service. CNG Fuel Systems has a compressor manufacturing plant in Brampton, Ontario, and also has conversion and training centres in Calgary, Vancouver, Toronto, and Montreal. They have just recently opened a product development centre in the United States at Detroit, Michigan.

I am given to understand that in this current year, 100 vehicles will be converted to dual fuel capability at Nova's head office in Calgary. That will pick up the majority of the vehicles they use in the Calgary area and will include half-ton trucks, vans, station wagons, and cars. I am also given to understand that in this current year, Nova will install CNG compressor and fuel dispensers at six field locations throughout the province for the vehicles that have been converted in those locations. Those field locations include such interesting places as Rocky Mountain House, Edson, Vegreville, Brooks, Athabasca, and Medicine Hat. In addition, with the new facility Nova is building at Airdrie, which should open next year, they are going to have the same capability for compressed natural gas fuels for the operation of their vehicle fleet. So by the end of this year, they hope to have 240 natural gas vehicles in place within the system.

They obviously believe the vehicle conversion is economically attractive and has an almost immediate return on investment. They would underline the fact that CNG has the following advantages: it is compatible with existing engines; the conversion system is readily available; and it's a clean-burning fuel, which results in longer engine life and makes for less frequent oil changes and reduced spark plug fouling and changing. They believe it to be one of the safest vehicle fuels available on the road today.

Mr. Speaker, with those few comments to read into the record some of the development which is taking place within the province immediately, I urge all hon. members to vote in favour of the amendment and then the motion as amended.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a few brief words. Most of my hon. colleagues have already made the points I was going to make. When the Member for Edmonton Glengarry suggests that we should be taking money from the coal research program, I point out to him that when we move into our new facilities in the very near future, we are very concerned about having enough money to operate the program. So I suggest that that is not one area where you can get any money.

I agree with the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking and the hon. Member for Calgary Egmont. It is primarily an industrial endeavour that should be carried out. When I listen to the Member for Calgary Egmont, I question why we need this motion, because obviously industry is doing that. And in my opinion, they're the people that should be doing it.

The research, as far as using it as a fuel or the containers it needs, is primarily done. It comes down to economics. As far as a citizen is concerned, he's got to decide if he wants to spend \$1,500 and hope to get it back over a short period of time or continue to use a fuel that is available at service stations throughout the nation.

With regard to the fact that it costs a lot of money to put these stations up, again it's economics. It costs a lot of money to build an ordinary service station. The hon. Member for Little

Bow mentioned \$300,000 for the facilities in an urban setting; it would cost you \$300,000 to buy the land to put the station on. So we have to keep all these things in perspective.

One area of research I would like to point out to hon. members, which perhaps they are not aware of: the federal government is developing a joint program with the B.C. research institute to consider how they could convert farm vehicles from diesel fuel to compressed natural gas. The B.C. research institute is farming out this research to various institutes across Canada. We at the Alberta Research Council are looking at becoming involved in this program. We have not yet decided whether or not we should participate, but some of us think this would be an excellent opportunity for us to use funds from the Farming for the Future program. It certainly should be of great interest to our farm members who are concerned about input costs on the farm.

While I appreciate the comments that have been made and the intent of the motion, I just suggest to the hon. members that if it is passed — it is an excellent motion, but I would like to know where the money is coming from.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, just to close the debate. We had a few questions this afternoon. The hon. Member for Lloydminster asked if anyone had contacted the railroads to see if they were interested in using compressed natural gas. To my knowledge no contact has been made with the railroads, but they are a diesel motor, similar to the research that has been done with farm tractors. I see no reason why it wouldn't be of financial benefit to them to be convinced to convert their diesel motors to use 75 percent natural gas.

He was concerned about the cost of energy to compress the gas. It's done with an electric motor and probably costs not a great deal more than the pumps that run our filling stations. He made mention of the compressors used by the gas companies. At the present time, some of our natural gas production companies are fuelling their own trucks out of their own compressor stations to use natural gas. This could possibly be a supply station to other vehicles, but generally the major compressors that are used by the gas companies are not in a location that is accessible to a lot of vehicle traffic.

It was mentioned that the compressed natural gas vehicle would be dangerous in parking lots. In Italy they've been using compressed natural gas as a primary fuel for many years. Unless it's enclosed within a building, they say it is safer than using conventional gasoline, for the simple reason that once it's been mixed with air it is not as combustible. This is one of the differences with propane. Propane is still quite combustible when it is mixed with air.

There has been some concern about the weight of the tank. Of course we have the research in Detroit, where they are now working on mixing compressed natural gas with hydrocarbons. It will reduce the amount of compression necessary to fill a tank. In a discussion with Alberta Energy recently, they're quite enthusiastic about that part of it.

The hon. Member for Calgary Egmont made mention of natural gas allowing a vehicle to start quite a lot easier than propane. The reason is that propane without compression can become a liquid at minus 40 degrees, whereas natural gas has to be cooled to approximately 260 degrees before it becomes a liquid.

I believe industry will adapt to natural gas without a lot of encouragement; that's private industry as we know it. What we need to do is to encourage the use of natural gas as a primary fuel for vehicles. That will reduce the amount of gas we have in reserve at this time and probably provide that industry with a freer movement of their product.

Mr. Chairman, I would call a motion on this.

[Motion as amended carried]

210. Moved by Mrs. Koper:

Be it resolved that the Assembly consider the desirability of legislation in Alberta to provide for the mandatory use of child restraint devices in motor vehicles for children from birth to five years of age.

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, you may recall during the First Session of this Legislature, on April 21, 1983, the hon. Member for Stony Plain brought a motion to the House asking us to consider legislating the mandatory use of seat belts in motor vehicles on the highways in the province of Alberta. He introduced this motion to the House because of his direct experience as a fire chief, seeing "death and carnage on Highway 16 and on . . . rural roads in the county of Parkland". He has a deep commitment, and has recognized the fact that seat belts save lives and can reduce injuries due to accidents. The hon. member spoke well in this debate, and he was followed by other speakers equally as eloquent and serious in their intent to save lives on the highways of Alberta. All of them unequivocally supported and recognized the idea that seat belts can save lives, but many of them brought forth very real concerns to their debate.

The first one was: should this Legislature enact laws that are difficult or maybe even impossible to enforce? The second one was: does the individual have the right to endanger others or even risk death or crippling himself or the other passengers in the car when he or she drives an automobile? Is it a matter of choice for the individual, or is it a duty of individuals and the government to protect people from a very evident danger? To me, any rules we introduce about seat belts are just as vital as the sign posted on the river by the weir in Calgary that talks about the undercurrents that will pull one to instant death, or those areas on a mountain that are restricted because of avalanche danger, which leave the people who break these notices liable to prosecution.

The debate last session, however, was not the first time this House has discussed potential seat-belt legislation since the Canadian Parliament in 1974 first decreed that all Canadian automobiles had to be equipped with lap belts and harnesses. In fact the hon. Member for Calgary Currie introduced a Bill in 1980 to amend the Highway Traffic Act. The objective of that Bill was to mandate the use of seat belts by every individual under the age of 18 travelling in a car in Alberta. The speakers at that point recognized the safety features, the educational value, of such legislation. They also recognized that it left the opportunity for freedom of choice for all individuals over the age of 18; they could make up their own minds. But this Bill was left to die on the Order Paper as well, and we in Alberta have gone on debating the issue. Without trying to be melodramatic at all, we have also witnessed 695 deaths and 25,121 people injured — some of them quite disabled — since 1981, when we could have enacted that legislation.

In 1982 the hon. Member for Calgary North West introduced a related motion, urging the government to initiate a multimedia campaign to increase public awareness of traffic safety. That again died on the Order Paper, but during the debate the people recognized the following facts. They recognized that first of all, there was a study that concluded the major problem was attitudinal and particularly a sense of a lack of personal responsibility of people to put their own seat belts on. It was felt that the wearing of seat belts could not be legislated, that other methods of awareness should be encouraged. It was also quite evident during that debate that Alberta has one of the worst

collision records in all of Canada — the average Albertan does not wear a seat belt — and that use of seat belts on a percentage basis is significantly higher in provinces with mandatory legislation. Seat belts were not in use in most fatal accidents in Canada, and over one-half of the fatalities could be prevented. This goes back quite a way. When we consider those facts and that this Legislature has had that opportunity to know the facts, I think it puts a different perspective on our debate.

Again the motion died on the Order Paper, but those in government responsible for safety on the highways have not ignored this problem. They have gone to different ministers since that time. Ministers of Transportation have accepted the challenge of a suggested alternative as it arises in every debate this House has heard on seat-belt legislation. The alternative is education of the public. They have accepted that and carried forth with it. They've done a really good job, with a lot of help of course from volunteer organizations throughout the province.

There was an active program of education initiated at the time the hon. Member for Chinook was Minister of Transportation in this House. There was active support of a program called Buckle Up, that was initiated in 1976. In 1979 there was formation of the Alberta Action Committee for Child Transportation Safety. That was a Year of the Child project. This committee has remained very active and is supported, I might add, by Alberta Transportation. It enjoys membership from such important bodies as the Alberta Safety Council, the Alberta Motor Association, the University of Calgary injury research unit, the health services of the city of Calgary, the Calgary police department, the Calgary boards of education, the Alberta children's hospital.

This organization of course supports mandatory seat belt legislation all around and specifically has worked very hard in spreading the material, the information, they have on child restraint devices throughout the province. They've actively promoted public education of the merits of child restraint devices in automobiles. They have travelled the province of Alberta and presented workshops to health professionals and to car dealers. They've initiated a car seat rental program. They've provided demonstration of car seats for pediatricians' offices throughout the province. They've included car seat information at prenatal classes and in newborn nurseries. They've gone to health promotion and anticipatory guidance for physicians and nurses. They've conducted displays in key community locations. They've gone on media interviews and TV public service spots wherever possible. They've maintained a data base. They're providing resource material, and they are doing active research on the problems in Alberta connected with safety on highways for children.

But, Mr. Speaker and hon. members, that's not good enough. Intelligence, as my favourite author Ashleigh Brilliant says, is not much use unless you're intelligent enough to use it. In the absence of legislation since 1980, when the amendments were first introduced by the hon. Member for Calgary Currie, statistics reveal that there's one traffic collision every four minutes in Alberta. There's one nonfatal injury every 21 minutes, and there's one fatality every 12 and a half hours. It totals 119,891 traffic collisions, 25,121 people injured and, more grimly, 695 people killed. Can you imagine the outcry if every year the equivalent of a PWA full of Albertans were to crash in Alberta? That's exactly what's happening on our highways. All the time there is enough evidence to suggest that at least half of these deaths could have been prevented had the occupants been wearing seat belts. For the children involved, child restraint devices in automobiles have been judged to be 85 percent effective in preventing fatalities, 65 percent in reducing serious injury.

Paraphrasing the title of one of the very excellent pamphlets produced by Alberta Transportation, do we really want to gamble with the lives of children here in Alberta just to save money? It doesn't even save money. For each child that dies on Alberta roads, there is one seriously handicapped. There are 10 others hospitalized for 30 days or more. For each child that dies on our highways, 40 suffer severe injury, 100 are hospitalized for smaller injuries. Do you know that one child in every 20 will be injured in a traffic accident before the age of 15? This is shocking to me.

In 1982 seat-belt usage in the province went up to 16.6 percent, and the deaths decreased quite dramatically by about 190 people. You could do a cost/benefit analysis on all of this, but how do you put a worth, a dollar figure, on the life of a child or the potential productivity of a young person? I guess you can do it, but I don't think any numbers will ever describe the heartache, loss, needless disability, and suffering of a family that has been in a traffic accident. Mr. Speaker, the right to choose not to use occupant restraint devices has too high a price altogether.

Child restraint devices are endorsed by the Alberta Motor Association. The Alberta Safety Council has issued a release that tells us they approve of this. The Alberta Medical Association has taken a proactive approach with their patients and the public. Legislation was enacted in Ontario in 1976; in Quebec, 1977; Saskatchewan, 1977; B.C., 1977; Newfoundland, 1982; Manitoba, 1983; and New Brunswick, 1983. In Nova Scotia, it's passed but not yet proclaimed — seven provinces in all.

Mr. Speaker, I have high hopes that the time has come for the government of Alberta to take steps in this direction as well. In proposing this motion to the House today, it is hoped that the focus is narrow enough — legislation for newborns and young people, who cannot make a decision for themselves — that perhaps it will be more acceptable. It is also hoped that it will be easier to enforce than universal legislation and will reduce the concern in the minds of the hon. members that it is unenforceable. It also has great public acceptance. I have received many, many petitions; one more came just the other day. Public acceptance is far more evident for the protection of young children.

Mr. Speaker, most living people are careful, and I believe the reason for that is that most of those who aren't careful are no longer living. I don't want that to happen to our children needlessly. So on behalf of the newborn children and those up to the age of five in Alberta, I urge all hon. members to pass this motion so traffic accidents will no longer be the number one killer in Alberta for children beyond the first year of their lives.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend and support the Member for Calgary Foothills in bringing this resolution forward. I will say at the outset that I don't think it goes nearly far enough. It makes reference to "consider the desirability". I think we're long past the stage of desirability. I think it's probably time we exercised something not found too commonly in this Assembly, and that's common sense.

How can we as legislators have the feeling that we should introduce within this Assembly an Act called the Child Welfare Act to look after those children who are unable to look after themselves and at the same time even doubt the desirability of using child restraints for young people in this province? Where else but in this Assembly could we even think that way? Clearly that's the absence of common sense. I'd like to speak in favour

of the motion and make some comments I hope would convince members to support the Member for Calgary Foothills.

She made reference to other jurisdictions. I suppose many Albertans think the key is to be different from other jurisdictions. I guess at the outset, if you look at Ontario, which has mandatory use except for those under five, Quebec that includes those under five, and B.C. which excludes those under five — I submit to those of you who know those people who live over the mountains, when things drop on your head as often as they do, one can understand why they think differently than we in Alberta do. But I say with respect that one of the provinces that entered Confederation in 1870, called Manitoba, has seen the practical use. They're the most current province to introduce it. I understand it became effective April 1, 1984.

Mr. Speaker, I think those members of the Assembly — it happens to be current now with the Canada Health Act — who maybe meet with physicians in this province know the A.M.A. or doctors' union position. But if you talk with a plastic surgeon who's in the business of putting people's faces back as a result of coming in collision with dashboards, one wonders how anybody could fail to even begin to utilize the system.

I don't want to get in particularly deep with regard to freedom of choice of those who are able to make the choice. I would argue and advance the theory that General Motors spent some \$3.5 million building a passive system called air bags. They then spent another \$2 million on an interlock system; unless you were sober, you couldn't turn the key unless you were belted up. Why in heaven's name can we put a man on the moon and bring him home, yet we can't design an automobile like a Volkswagen Rabbit that automatically belts you in? I don't understand. But we don't have that jurisdiction. The jurisdiction we do have is the preservation of our young people's lives.

Mr. Speaker, it's reminiscent of — I apologize to members who may have heard this before; perhaps someone here even told me. In a flood not very long ago, the water reached about five feet. The person in the house was obviously concerned. A boat came by to pick him up, and he said: no, no, don't worry about me; the Lord will look after me. Two hours later, the water reached the second floor. Another boat came by, and he turned down efforts and offers of assistance to rescue him. Sure enough, the water got high enough and he was on top of the chimney. A helicopter came by to lift him off. He said: no, no, I believe in the Lord; the Lord will look after it. Sure enough, he perished. He drowned. He ascended where all good people ascend, I suppose, into heaven. He said to St. Peter: I don't understand it; I've been a God-fearing man all my life; I prayed that the Lord would save me from drowning; what happened? St. Peter said: we sent two boats and a helicopter; what more could we do?

Mr. Speaker, one has to look at the seat belt question the same way. If those who are over the age of puberty, who certainly are of the age where they're allowed to drive an automobile, don't want to use safety restraints or seat belts or whatever we call them, I suppose that's their prerogative. One day we'll get around to deciding that, depending on whether it will defeat us at the polls. But when it comes to those who can't even vote, when it comes to those people who are young, surely to God we in this Legislature, after listening to the Member for Calgary Foothills about the numbers who die each year, never mind the ones who are maimed — if we have the intestinal fortitude to bring forward a Child Welfare Act, if we spend \$240 million on single parents, if we have all these concerns about those who can't fend for themselves, how can we possibly even debate this thing without having unanimous support? I think this should be a law, not a motion.

Mr. Speaker, in the riding I represent we have a service club, the female Jaycees, called Jaycettes, who three years ago undertook a project of supplying infant seats through the health unit. I'm very proud of the fact that my own children — and I have five and seven-eighths grandchildren — will not start up their automobile without those kids being restrained in the automobile. Now how did that happen? I think it happened because the Member for Chinook went a long way, took a lot of heat, to encourage Albertans to use common sense and belt up. And that message stuck. It certainly stuck with my children, and I'm proud of that. I'm proud of the former Minister of Transportation who went a long way to encourage that. The fact of the matter is that there are people today who don't. The fact of the matter is that there are young people in this province who are unable to fend for themselves. We're not talking about fluoridation in Calgary and dental health; we're talking about lives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members not only to speak strongly in support of this Bill but to encourage the Government House Leader that we should draw up legislation as soon as possible to implement it.

Thanks very much.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, unaccustomed as I am, I was invited and I will respond. The use or non-use of seat belts was of no interest to me for most of my driving life until the Premier said to me one day: by the way, do you realize that with the Department of Transportation goes the responsibility for seat belts? I said: no, I didn't know that. Having been informed in that way, I decided I should learn something about it.

Up until then I didn't like the idea of seat belts when I thought about them; certainly didn't use them, objected to having to pay for them when they were in the cars that I bought, and so on. I find it interesting that for some reason whenever the subject of restraints came up, be they for children, adults, or in-between — I noticed this with members of our caucus and others — there were always smiles around as though this was something quite funny. Having had the opportunity to think about it, I could never see what was so amusing about something that could be as useful as I think it is and as we could make it.

When you get into a discussion on seat belts, if you like, or restraints, be it related to adults, children, or both, I think it breaks into two parts. One, does it work? And two, does the legislation work? I don't think there's any question at all. I think it's been completely proven that restraints work, and it's not hard to illustrate how they work.

Those people who are required to drive dangerously — and I'm talking about the professional drivers, whether that's car racing, Hollywood, or wherever it is — would not think of getting into those cars and driving them the way they're required to do to make a living using just an ordinary seat belt. They strap themselves in so tightly that all they can do is move their arms and legs, because when those units they're inside of take off, they want to be a part of them. The shock that comes, not with the flying through the air but with the landing, is absorbed by the container. All your car really is at that point is a container and a protector.

We quickly found that people don't necessarily get hurt in cars when they are involved in a crash. Cars have a propensity to have the doors spring open when they start to roll. Then the occupants are thrown out in the same direction the automobile is going, and they wind up on the ground with the car crushing them. So you have to think about what it is you're trying to do.

I guess you could further illustrate whether these things work or not by checking into, as I did, what happened to the fellows that used to try to go over Niagara Falls in a barrel. The guy that finally made it was suspended in straps from all directions inside that barrel. When he went over, at no time did he touch the surface of that barrel, and he finally survived.

There are so many examples of how you would want to be protected. I had a discussion one day with a colleague of ours, Stu McCrae from Calgary, former Minister of Government Services in this House, and he was totally opposed to the use of seat belts. One day he was telling me he was going down the Deerfoot Trail into Calgary, going home from here. There were large patches of ice ...

Mr. Speaker, should I send that note back to you again?

MR. SPEAKER: I have a little difficulty chairing the discussion which is taking place in the back row, and I do have a responsibility to chair discussions which take place in the Assembly. I wonder if we might pay attention to the member who has the floor.

MR. KROEGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Stu McCrae was the fellow I'm talking about. He was charging down the Deerfoot Trail at a great rate, doing just fine, until he hit a patch of this ice. When that car started to go like a curling rock, he knew there was nothing more he could do in the way of keeping his hands on the wheel. It wouldn't make any difference. And guess what he was doing? He was fumbling around for his seat belt, trying to figure out how to put it on while his car is going like this. And it came home to him: if you find yourself in a position or condition where it's going to count, you no longer question whether it works or not. So I don't think there's any argument about whether the restraints work.

The second part is: does the legislation work? Because most people want to obey the law even though they don't approve of it, after a law has been in force for a while, about 54 percent will respond and obey the law without enforcement. With some enforcement, you can get that up to about 80 percent. So I guess it works. As far as how difficult it is to enforce, I still occasionally forget to put my belt on, except when I hit the Saskatchewan border. There's a sign that reminds me, and I stop and put it on. When I hit B.C., I do the same thing. So it's not really all that difficult. Over 80 percent of the people in Canada are now covered with legislation, so we're not really in the realm of experimentation any longer.

Who really says this is a good idea? The people who are most determined that it's a good idea are those who have to go to the accident scene: the police, first ones on the scene, and the ambulance drivers, usually the second ones on the scene. They see what happens. They're totally supportive, and in fact they insist. The medical profession has been mentioned; they know the people who arrive at the hospitals broken up and cut up. The doctors who have to deal with that certainly support it. Other groups such as the A.M.A., which the member who's introducing the motion mentioned — those people who are exposed to the results of not doing this sort of thing, the well-informed people who have to deal with it, are the ones who are saying: by all means you should do this.

I suppose you could make the argument that we don't need more regulation, and I'm a member of a committee that is looking at deregulation. I don't like regulations. I don't like government telling me what to do, but I've sort of gotten used to government telling me that I should drive on the right-hand side of the road. I suppose that's an infringement on my rights. I don't find that too onerous. Driving around the city, if that light turns red and I don't see it, I usually get about a \$30 tag

that reminds me. I guess you can drive through it even though the law says you shouldn't.

Notwithstanding our objection to regulations and laws, I think there are some things that have to be looked at in a more sensible approach than that. Let's extend that just a little bit further. The last year I was in this Transportation thing, I think we killed about 704 people in traffic accidents. Our best judgment, with research done by many people, was that easily 50 percent — probably more, but easily 50 percent — of those people would have lived, never mind all the people who had broken bones and were cut up. Just think for a minute about getting cut up in that fashion. When you go into a hospital, a doctor is going to make a very careful incision to do a very ordinary operation. There's great care exercised that the tools are sterilized and the incision is no greater than it has to be. This is all handled very carefully. When you get in an automobile, you can't select the part of that car that's going to cut you up or where it's going to cut or break you. So if you really had a close look, I think that could become a little bit scary.

There are so many elements in this thing that just don't make any sense to me when I hear the arguments against it. One of them is that if the number of roughly 700 makes any sense, and if the number of 50 percent makes any sense — that 50 percent would not be killed if we had the legislation — then I guess we as a government are deciding that we don't have the guts, if you like, to pass the legislation because it may not be politically palatable to avoid 350 people being killed. I don't really like that idea very well, but we play this Russian roulette with it because we don't know who is going to be slaughtered. We say, well, take your chances; this is freedom of choice. But we know that over 300 are going to be executed because we don't do something in this House. If you could identify ahead of time one person of those 350 who were going to be executed in this fashion because we wouldn't pass the law, you'd pass it this afternoon. You wouldn't fool around. But you don't do it because it's okay; we don't know who it's going to be next, and let's play the game. And so it goes.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have expressed my views. Thank you for the attention, and good luck with your motion.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's my great pleasure today to participate in this motion. We've had the opportunity in the last half hour or three-quarters of an hour to hear three speakers. I think the persistence of the mover of the motion, the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills, in putting forth this motion should be commended by all members. We then heard an impassioned plea by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West — logical, yes, but very forceful, very impassioned on the need to provide some direction and enact legislation to save many, many children's lives. Our third speaker on this motion was the hon. Member for Chinook, whose cool, dispassionate logic and wisdom just comes forth. I appreciate those comments as well.

Mr. Speaker, in my view it's an extremely important motion, and I would like to perhaps take a different slant toward this overall debate. In this province we are ever mindful of our need to protect our natural resources, both renewable and non-renewable. It begs this question: is there a more important natural resource in this province than our children? Surely there is not. What is a more important resource to the future of this province than our children? It has become very clear to me from the empirical evidence and research that has been done recently that most children in Alberta in fact are not being adequately protected while riding in motor vehicles. This is a situation that we as legislators have an opportunity to correct.

Mr. Speaker, I've had some misgivings in the past on the overall question of seat-belt legislation. In our constituency we recently conducted a questionnaire. The question with respect to seat belts simply stated this:

Compulsory seat belt legislation has been suggested by a number of interest groups. Alberta is currently the only province that does not have such legislation. Should the Government of Alberta enact compulsory seat belt legislation? Yes No Not sure

Well, Mr. Speaker, the jury's out. I sent out 22,000 of these constituency questionnaires and, at this moment, have only been able to go through 267. Of the 267, bearing in mind that I was asking a question in relation to seat-belt usage — not child restraint devices, but the full question — which has come under some criticism in relation to freedom of choice, the answers so far are rather startling. I hope to have the opportunity to stand in my place in the not too distant future and relate the statistics on the overall study. Of the 267 responses so far, I have 127 affirmatives, which represent 47.5 percent of respondents; 112 who have said no, which represent 41.9; and 28 undecided, which represent 10.48 percent. Frankly I was rather surprised at that. It's clear to me that the education process we have embarked on in this province for a goodly number of years, through the efforts of the former Minister of Transportation and the continuing efforts of our current minister, are working. They're certainly working in relation to changing attitudes, but I don't think they're working in relation to increased usage of seat belts.

Mr. Speaker, statistics on injuries and deaths in children as a result of automobile accidents lend an incredible weight to the argument that child restraint legislation is needed. I don't have to trot out the statistics the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills has done, but it is mind-boggling to me to consider that more children are injured or killed in car accidents than were ever killed or injured as a result of polio. More injuries to children are caused by car accidents than all other causes combined. Car accidents are the leading cause of death among children and the leading cause of debilitating injury to children. Head injuries from car accidents are also the most common cause of epilepsy among children beyond one month.

Mr. Speaker, in a motor vehicle collision there are actually two collisions. First, of course, there's the collision of the car. The second collision is the human collision, whereby an individual who is unrestrained is propelled forward into other occupants or into the dashboard. It's this second collision that causes the injury. The car begins to crush and slow down, but an unrestrained person continues at the vehicle's original speed. In just a fraction of a second, the occupant impacts against the vehicle's interior or is ejected. I could relate in some gruesome detail a personal experience I had of an individual who in fact was ejected from a car. Indeed I could relate two, but I'll leave that for another day.

Mr. Speaker, because children have a proportionately heavier head, a higher centre of gravity, and a lower height on the vehicle seat, they are by far the most susceptible to head and facial injuries — far more than adults. Unrestrained children tend to have a greater level of serious injuries due to motor vehicle accidents or sudden stops. If a child is properly restrained during a collision, he or she is decelerated at a rate that is tolerable to the body. Injuries do not occur, or if they do occur, they are minimal.

Studies indicate, Mr. Speaker, that child restraints are extremely effective in preventing death and injury. In fact, as has been pointed out by other members, statistics reveal that proper child restraints are approximately 85 percent effective in preventing death and 65 percent effective in preventing inju-

ries. These are startling figures and reassuring for the cause I in particular am advocating at the moment. Statistics from areas where mandatory child restraint legislation has been enacted are equally reassuring. In Tennessee, for example, where the first car legislation in North America was enacted, the child death rate decreased by 55 percent during the first two years of the program, and car-seat use increased two and a half times. There is indisputable proof, Mr. Speaker, that child restraints are effective.

No parents wish to intentionally harm their children. Yet there is growing and considerable evidence that parents in Alberta are not ensuring that their children are properly restrained while riding in motor vehicles. I think a recent survey done in Calgary indicated that over 80 percent of small children who rode in cars were not belted in. As I have mentioned, there is also evidence that education programs just aren't enough to significantly alter this occurrence. Either the fact that these programs do not reach enough people or the lack of a penalty for noncompliance — I'm not sure what the case is. But clearly, not enough people are using seat belts or child restraint devices in their automobiles.

It's become clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that some form of legislation is required before anything near the wholesale use of child restraints will be initiated. In my view, a law to enforce the restraint of small children in motor vehicles has become necessary. We have empirical evidence that death and injury to children due to motor vehicle accidents are very high in relation to other hazards that children face. We also have proof that child restraints are effective in reducing or eliminating deaths and injuries, but our citizens are simply not utilizing them. Finally, we have data from other areas that illustrate the effectiveness of mandatory seat-belt usage.

Mr. Speaker, a number of groups have been advocating the cause for child restraint legislation for some time. I would like to point out a number that have recently come to my attention. In a recent letter I received from the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses, they have adopted a resolution that says simply this. There is a crucial need to reduce the human carnage on our highways. Not one but many factors may cause automobile accidents. We advocate that the specific preventive measure, seat belts, be adopted to reduce the shocking highway statistics.

The Alberta Medical Association has long been on record. The people who are on the front lines having to deal with the gruesome realities of children involved in automobile accidents have recommended for a good many years that seat-belt usage would not only reduce health care costs but in fact would do the more important aspect, and that is save the lives and the important resource of our future.

There are some other aspects that I think should be entered into the debate. I do it with some caution, because one can hardly discuss the death, maiming, and disfiguring of children at the same time as discussing cost/benefits. But if it's given that our society is at a point where it is prepared to save the lives of our youth, then certainly to enhance that argument one could say that not only is that the most important aspect but the cost/benefits involved in this kind of legislation are absolutely overwhelming. It's clear that the total savings and benefits from installing child restraint legislation for children under five, by enacting that measure, have been estimated by researchers through the Department of Transportation to be in excess of \$5.494 million per year.

Where does one get that kind of figure? If we assume the number of lives that will be saved — and that is very easily estimated in relation to seat-belt usage and child restraint usage — if we estimate the savings in medical and rehabilitation costs,

if we factor in the benefits in increased economic production that would be lost in the event of the death of a child under five, if we add some other savings and costs that have been worked out, we arrive at a total savings benefit in excess of \$5 million for enacting child restraint legislation.

Which brings one to another point, Mr. Speaker, and it has to do with the ever increasing costs of health care in this province and indeed throughout North America. This may not sound like it should be entered into the debate, but I believe it should. In Alberta this year, the 1984-85 budget calls for \$2.8 billion to be funded towards the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care. Fifty-one percent or \$1.4 billion will finance the operations of our hospitals. Another 24 percent or \$641 million will pay for the nonhospital-related medical services of our doctors and other health care professionals. That's an astounding amount of money. We're dealing with costs that represent about 24 to 25 percent of our overall budget, and increasing at a rate we can barely track. In fact total health care costs over the past five years have increased at a rate greater than 24 percent per year.

In Alberta we spend on average \$1,000 per capita in health care. That is 17 percent above the national average. When we consider those numbers in relation to the contribution of individuals in the health care system, in my view it's startling. The revenue from personal income tax in this province is estimated for this fiscal period to be \$1.5 billion. I just mentioned that we will spend \$1.4 billion on operating costs of hospitals alone. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the stark reality of the situation is that we spend almost two times more on health care dollars than we receive in personal income tax. Startling revelations, in my view, and I feel it is time that individuals recognize the importance and the need first of all to protect our most important natural resource, our children, and of course at the same time recognize some personal responsibility that is needed to be attached to the difficulty and the problem of having up to 100,000 children in the province of Alberta driving around in cars without any protection.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would simply say this. We are indeed very fortunate in this province to have protected our resources so well. We have had to over the years, to ensure that our resource base continues to grow and provides the important contribution to our economy. I believe it is time that we extended at least this protection to the greatest resource we can possibly have, and that is to our children.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that all fellow members join me in supporting this motion.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to rise to participate briefly in debate on the motion before the House, briefly because I have spoken to this Legislature on several occasions with respect to my feelings on child restraint devices and because the members who preceded me made the case so well for this obviously necessary, obviously crucial, motion.

The reasons for it have been laid out before those of us here today in an extremely articulate and in-depth fashion. I could perhaps add, though, my first reason for supporting the concept of child restraint devices. That indeed is the philosophy of why government exists. It is my personal opinion that governments exist primarily and first of all to protect those who cannot protect themselves — to protect them from other people, from circumstances as is possible, and upon occasion from themselves.

In this particular motion we have inherently a proposal which suggests that we carry out our responsibility to the people of Alberta to protect those people least able to deal with their own destiny, least able to make decisions for themselves, least able

to in fact deal with the condition that many of them find themselves in after an automobile accident. For that reason alone, I feel we have to give serious consideration to immediate and quick passage of this motion.

Indeed the health care costs and the benefits that could possibly accrue as a result of legislation such as this were outlined well by the Member for Red Deer. The fact that children are by far the most hurt and most vulnerable in accidents has been proven emphatically. I have had the opportunity on several occasions to discuss the issue with Dr. Lane Robson, assistant director of the children's hospital in Calgary, who talks constantly about the degree of injury that infants and children encounter as a result of automobile accidents, the fact that these could be stopped or at least minimized as a result of legislation in this regard, and that technology has evolved to the point where we can now ensure that child restraint devices cum seat belts are a benefit and not a harm.

The case has been made in past years, and rightfully so, that the technology had to evolve, because for a long period of time it was thought that child restraint devices in the form of seat belts could harm infants and children of certain sizes more than they could help. That has now been dealt with well. There are stages of seat belts that are needed to keep an infant or a child in line with their particular growth and weight structure. There are seat belts for those of older ages, and that's of great benefit. So I believe those arguments are well made.

I have only one point of debate with the motion before us today, and that deals with the age. There is no question that we are addressing those most harmed by talking about those under the age of six. But when we put any age in a piece of legislation, we of course beg the question: why not those who are six years old? Are they any less deserving? Are they any more able to make their own decisions? Are they any less hurt when an accident takes place? What about those of seven years old? Even if we designate it to ages and talk about the weights and sizes, what about the 6-year-old who indeed has the body of a 4-year-old, and the reverse? Those questions are all begged by putting in place any particular age in legislation.

Mr. Speaker, that leaves us with somewhat of a dilemma. Either we go with full legislation for all Albertans, regardless of age, or we find another rationale for the age that has to be included in legislation. I personally would not support legislation for all Albertans, even though I strongly and emphatically support the use of seat belts by all Albertans, albeit I myself am often found without one in a car, being raised without the necessity being made apparent to me. I believe governments should not place upon individuals 18 years of age and over decisions about what is best for their personal well-being. If that person takes an action that harms others, then I believe government has the right to interfere. If it harms only themselves, then indeed, I believe that decision should be made by the individual involved.

There is a question regarding that, with respect to seat-belt legislation. There are those who contend that a person not wearing a seat belt is much less capable of controlling the vehicle in an accident and therefore becomes a danger to others in many instances. I have not yet had that proven to me, Mr. Speaker. I have read a number of the reports. I have looked at some of the data. I am not yet convinced that all of us aren't disoriented enough in an accident that the difference between wearing a seat belt for that aspect is not very great. However, should that become the case, I could be convinced of full legislation, if the research that we in fact harm others by not wearing seat belts were emphatic in that regard. But as long as it's for ourselves. I think those over 18 years of age have a right to make that decision for themselves, even if it's the wrong decision.

I say over 18, because that's the age at which this Legislature has decided people become adults. We have decided that by a number of pieces of legislation. Be it the right to drink, the right to vote, primarily, or a number of other areas, we have decided that at 18, rightly or wrongly, a person is able to make their own decision. It is for that reason that I suggest to this Assembly, as I have on occasions before, that they may wish to consider the age of 18 rather than under five, not because there is any specific development that takes place at that age that makes people less in need of seat belts than others but because we have a philosophical responsibility to protect those under that age. We have a philosophical responsibility to protect those whom we've decided aren't yet able to make those decisions. I believe that criterion does not leave us open to the question of why one age and not another should be in place with respect to the bodily harm that is done.

So with that caveat, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Member for Calgary Foothills on bringing forward this motion. I believe we've now in all ways completed the research in our society that shows us that this solution is one that will relieve the pain and suffering of many individuals in our society and will stop the destruction of many others. I believe we should at least move this far, though I strongly suggest that we look further at an age that we can philosophically justify, so that we won't be back to this Legislature each year saying that next year we will initiate it for 6-year-olds and the year after that for 7-year-olds, and so on. I suggest we start off with 18, that that be based on the philosophical argument, and that we do so for the arguments so well made by the Member for Calgary Foothills and others in this Assembly.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I fully support the resolution the hon. member has brought before the House on child restraint devices. I have a very vivid memory of coming back to school after spending the Christmas holidays with my parents and riding on the Greyhound bus up to Edmonton. A small Datsun had unfortunately slipped across the median and gone into the other lane of traffic, and was hit head on. There was a man and a woman, and a youngster in the back seat. The Greyhound bus driver and I pulled those three people out of the car, and it was a messy sight; it wasn't very pleasant at all. From about that point on, I became convinced of the need for not just child restraint devices but seat-belt use generally.

That feeling was compounded about two years ago when a friend of mine was hit head on, on the Capilano freeway. He had just come home from the Northwest Territories after two months as a Bank of Montreal manager, his first banking assignment with that bank, and he was killed at the age of 24; just an incredible loss.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think we can measure the impact of that kind of tragedy on the family, but I agree with the hon. Member for Red Deer that we can begin to measure the financial impact on society. I know there may be some people who are highly individualistic in their philosophy and would argue — in fact I got a note from one member in the House just a little while ago, suggesting that we might go so far as to try to restrict people from smoking around children, and that might be the logical extension of this kind of argument. I don't think that's an argument that really bears serious examination, but I understand the philosophical perspective one might have in that position. I think the hon. Member for Chinook put it best when he said that in our conduct on the road, we are regulated quite stiffly now by society. There are rules for speed; you slow down and speed up according to highway signs. You follow certain rules of the road, and you don't think anything of it; it's just the way it ought to be.



When you drive on the road I think it's a privilege, not a right. The Crown has conferred upon you the right to drive on the Queen's highway, and that's a privilege. When you exercise that privilege, some responsibility goes with it. So when I think back to that awful memory of the spring of early January 1976 and remember pulling the driver of the car, who survived, out of the vehicle — his wife did not. She was not belted in; she was sitting in the passenger seat. The youngster had massive injuries. I'm not even sure to this day whether the youngster survived. It was a bitterly cold day. We had to pull those people out of the car. Just the cold alone, because we had to wait about half an hour for an ambulance, and the blood — the windshield was crashed in on two sides. It was not a very pleasant sight at all.

Mr. Speaker, like the hon. Member for Calgary Currie, I know Dr. Robson, and he has lobbied me a couple of times on behalf of child restraint devices. The family physician that took care of me when I was a youngster, Dr. Crossfield of Calgary, happened across me at the Conservative annual meeting in Calgary a little while ago. He wanted to talk to me about the future of the Holy Cross hospital but also seat-belt legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to start asking ourselves as a society whether we can afford the ever increasing costs of medical services that are related to the style of life we have. People who drink a lot or smoke a lot or drive fast cars are asking for trouble. Unfortunately in our society, with state medicine, it's not that individual who bears the financial responsibility for his or her actions with that kind of conduct. It is society that tries to pick up the pieces and pays for it. With that reason in mind, I think we can argue with the people who take the individual rights argument to its logical absurdity and say that society, in bearing the costs of these accidents, of these problems, has the right to protect itself as much as is reasonable from people injuring themselves and then having society pick up the costs later. I would argue, for example, that the taxation on alcohol and tobacco should be dramatically increased again to make people think about what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation. It's a child restraint proposal. It doesn't deal with the larger concept, but I think it's a good start. I think that children under five are a good place, although I would say that perhaps we should look at children under 12, adults under the age of 80 — those would all be logical extensions of this concept that I would like to see. The suffering and pain that is needless and the financial penalties that society pays all argue, I think very compellingly, for the need for seat-belt legislation of some sort, and this is a good start. The hon. member has done us all a service by bringing this proposal before the House. I would like to see it come to a vote, and I support it.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in the debate on the motion, that the Assembly consider the desirability of legislation. I've listened to three or four, and we've had similar debates in the House. It's not often I find myself agreeing with the Member for Edmonton Glengarry, but in this case for once he made ultimate sense, and also, previously, the Member for Calgary Currie. I don't want to get us in any trouble on this motion, if we're going to pass it, so I'll be short.

What I would say is that I think we know very clearly, and we don't have to go over it one speaker after another, that most importantly, seat belts save lives. We know that seat belts save money. Most importantly, the Alberta Medical Association has been presenting very clear evidence of examples in Ontario where, if you have an accident, the average cost to medicare there is four hundred and some dollars if you're not wearing

a seat belt, to two hundred and some if you are wearing a seat belt. In terms of saving money, we hear a lot of talk about medicare being very expensive. Certainly that's one thing we've suggested before.

I know the extreme argument of civil rights, that you cannot interfere with my right to kill myself, which it comes down to. I think that breaks down when we recognize that we're all paying taxes and we're all paying for the high cost of accidents. So when that person's individual freedoms start to get into our pocketbooks and into our pockets, I think that argument breaks down.

Frankly, I wish — and we've had this debate before — that the government would have gone all the way, as they have in most of the other provinces, and said that seat belts are a necessity. As the Member for Edmonton Glengarry has pointed out, we are regulated by many laws on the highways. Other provinces as right wing as this government — certainly B. C. — have seen fit to go ahead. But saying and recognizing that this is not going to happen in this House, I believe there is some chance the government may move. I'm a little surprised it's being brought up again as a motion other than government motion, because it is my understanding — I wasn't there — that this was perfectly acceptable even at the most recent Conservative convention, if I read the newspaper reports correctly. [interjections]

So I am surprised — I don't want them to get excited over there — that we are dealing with this as a motion other than government motion. I hoped we would have gone this limited way and seen it as government legislation. I'm hoping that perhaps the hon. member is proposing the motion again to fly it by the Legislature and see if the majority of the members here support it, with the idea that it will be brought back as a government motion in the fall session. I sincerely hope that is the case. I would say to the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that if that's the case, we would go further with it. But if that's the case, certainly you'll have no problems with the Official Opposition. It's one of the times we can pass legislation through this House rather quickly, if you want to bring this motion back as a government motion.

Just to go on record, Mr. Speaker, the Official Opposition of this province would go further, but we will firmly support Motion No. 210 and look forward to its coming back quickly as a government motion.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to speak on Motion 210, towards which I would like to make a couple of brief remarks. After listening to the excellent arguments made by the hon. members, who spoke today on the merits of child restraint devices, there is very little left for me to say. The only thing I would like to emphasize — and that's a very important and a very paramount consideration — is that with regard to taxpayer-financed medical and hospital care, there is an onus on government to take every step possible to prevent expenditures wherever they can be made. That was very appropriately argued by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood. I think he brought up a very good point in this respect. Medicare costs have now soared enormously, and we should look at everything in people's life-styles that adds to medical costs. Since by and large under the Canada Health Act it's incumbent upon the taxpayer to pay this enormous cost; then it's no longer a right or a privilege of individuals to assume — as the Member for Edmonton Glengarry so appropriately said, they no longer have the right to pursue certain injurious life-styles that are costly to the taxpayers and become a burden and a nuisance to society at large.

Since child restraint devices in motor vehicles are proven injury preventers and, hence, health care cost savers, I can't but support this motion. As the hon. Member for Lethbridge West so eloquently stated, let us do all we can to protect the lives of our children, who cannot vote and protect themselves from injury and even death, a cost in terms of suffering and sorrow that cannot be measured. These considerations, faced objectively and honestly, have certainly changed my mind on the whole question of restraint devices. It's no longer a question of freedom of choice but of overriding responsibility to ourselves, to our families and, last but not least, to the taxpayers of this province and this country, to save wherever we can on the cost of medicare. Let us go further and enact seat-belt legislation and, in addition, look to save lives and prevent injury and suffering.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in the debate on Motion 210 — briefly, my colleagues tell me — I'm beginning to feel like somebody that's tied to the train track with a train coming down the track at him about 60 miles an hour, because I want to speak against the mandatory aspect of the proposal.

Mr. Speaker, in my family I have had my children in car seats or child restraint devices since they were born. Every time they go in the vehicle, they go in their car seats. There are no arguments. If they're put in there from the time they're very small, they gladly use them and don't fight with their parents as they would if you were only using them occasionally.

But let us look at the mandatory aspect. I don't agree with my friend from Edmonton Glengarry when he says we could use the argument about individuality and individual rights. That isn't a good argument to use against this. We have heard other speakers say that we should do everything possible to save on health care costs. If they feel strongly in that, what about mothers smoking when they are carrying their children? What is the cost? What happens to the child then? What about all the other things that happen to children?

AN HON. MEMBER: Alcohol.

MR. HYLAND: Alcohol. What about bringing back prohibition? You know, we can't tag all those things, that they're going to solve all our problems.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should seriously look at this proposal of the mandatory use. I asked my colleague from Calgary Currie, as he's had an interest in child restraint devices and has done some research on them, what the percentage use was. He guessed at between 40 and 50 percent, without its being the law. We read the statistics of the use of seat belts where there are laws. We're looking at between 54 to 60 percent. So without mandatory legislation, we've got almost the use that we have already. We hear phrases like: we've slaughtered 200 on the road; we've executed 300 because we haven't acted in some form. In the Social Care Facilities Review Committee that I'm on, I've toured facilities where children are and will be for the rest of their lives, and they can do very little for themselves. It's because of something we've allowed society to do. Some of them are birth defects because of things that happened because of things their parents have done. We haven't outlawed those kinds of things.

We have service clubs out there doing a very good job providing booster seats, other sorts of child restraint devices, and here we're going to step in and force — and maybe supply, maybe not. Yet we keep on talking about volunteerism and what we should do to encourage volunteerism. Here

government is again stepping in to take away from the volunteerism existing out there.

Mr. Speaker, even though I'm against the mandatory aspect of these devices, let me just tell you a short story about how my wife and I feel about them. We recently bought a new vehicle. I had a commitment to go some distance from home, and we wanted to take this new vehicle. So we spent 10 or 15 minutes to drill holes in the floor to put some bolts through so we could fasten the car seats down, even though we arrived at the commitment a few minutes late. That's how strongly I feel about the use. But I think we have to leave some responsibility for children to the parents. We have said today that we should protect those who can't protect themselves. That may be true, but I have also heard some of the very same members of this Legislature saying here during debates on education that we need to get back to the three Rs, and parents have to start accepting responsibility for the upbringing and the caring of their children. On the one hand we are saying that; on the other hand we're saying yes, but we should interfere here. We should get our act together and look at this and face it squarely on both sides, not just one side of the argument.

As I've said, Mr. Speaker, I support the use of these devices, car seats, et cetera. My children use them. The other day when we went somewhere with my son, who is now four years old, and a friend of his, he put the seat belt on his friend and on himself. I had already put mine on. When his mother got in the vehicle and we were ready to go he said, Mommy, put on your seat belt before Daddy starts. If children use these devices, they soon learn to tell their parents. I urge members to support the use of child restraint devices but not to support the mandatory aspect of it.

Thank you.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I gather I have a philosophical difference with the Member for Cypress. It would be nice if all parents were as responsible as he and his spouse are, but unfortunately all parents aren't as responsible. It seems absolutely incredible to me that very few times when you travel down the streets or roads of our province, you don't see children knocking around in a car without having some type of child restraint. It's incredible to me that parents would take their most precious gift, their children, and put them into a situation where they are not constrained.

The former Minister of Transportation has outlined some of the work he did within the department and some of the studies that have been done that adequately demonstrate how important child restraints are in safety. We've all seen pictures of the mock infant in mock accidents that hurls through the air at incredible speeds, making an enormous impact that with a real life would cause serious injury or a fatality.

Putting it into a political context, I wondered what the residents of the constituency I represent would feel about this question. In doing some door-to-door work some weeks ago, I asked the question at about 50 doors. I asked whether the residents would favour seat-belt devices. I didn't differentiate between adults and children, just seat belts. I was quite surprised that 75 percent of those I asked the question of favoured the passage of seat-belt legislation. Some went on to say that there should be legislation only for children. Some said, well, I wear a seat belt but my wife won't: if you pass this, I think she will wear a seat belt, and I really want to protect her too. So there was a feeling of protection of one's family in the majority of the people who responded to my question.

I think there are difficulties with this Bill if it were to be put into legislation. I think there's difficulty in enforcing the age, who would be under the age of five, and if we're going

to have children walking around with birth certificates to ascertain their age. I think there's difficulty with actual enforcement in stopping the cars to ensure which child is six and which is five. But I don't think that really is the intent. It's the spirit of the legislation that I would like to see enforced, and that is one whereby parents who now do not think of the risk of putting their children into vehicles would be compelled through the passage of law to think about this serious step. They would be encouraged to put their children into restraints and thereby reduce the risk they have within their own family.

Children that have used child restraints from the time they were very tiny don't realize that it's uncomfortable. They don't think about it. You and I, who did not grow up in a time when there were even restraints within a car, find that when you first put them on they are uncomfortable. However, when you travel outside the province, after a few days I find I don't even think about it anymore. It becomes an automatic habit. So I think it's more attitude and habit.

For those who feel that this is an infringement on their rights, there are all sorts of arguments to say that when you're travelling the public roadways, that is a privilege. To travel the roadways, you're required to travel a certain speed. There also should be a requirement to ensure that those who are least able to look after themselves, our youngest children, are given that protection even if the parents are not wise enough to do so themselves. Therefore I congratulate the member for bringing this forward again, and I support the spirit of this legislation.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to add my support to the motion, and I have some further remarks. I regret not being in the House for all the members' remarks, which would obviously add to it. But I have on good authority that if I lend my support to this motion and propose a certain action — and I sincerely hope it will come to the House in a different form in future — we'll get more support for it among our colleagues.

So with that spirit, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the business of the Assembly this evening will be in Committee of Supply. It is proposed to deal first with the Department of Recreation and Parks; then, should time permit, to move to consideration of the estimates of the Department of Manpower.

Mr. Speaker, I move that when the members assemble this evening they do so in Committee of Supply and that the Assembly now adjourn until such time as the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:25 p.m.]

[The Committee of Supply met at 8 p.m.]

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the committee please come to order. Could we have order, please.

**Department of Recreation and Parks**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the minister care to make some opening remarks?

MR. TRYNCHY: The score is 1 to 0 for the Oilers. [interjections]

Mr. Chairman, it's my pleasure to address a few comments to the committee tonight. I'd just like to say that the last year has been an exciting year for the Department of Recreation and Parks. It was an exciting year because of a number of things, and I guess the greatest thing that's happened is the number of volunteers across the province that have made it exciting.

I want to refer to a number of things that happened that have been positive, and I guess the first one was the World Student Games here in Edmonton, where thousands and thousands of volunteers set aside their own personal gains and worked for the betterment of the community. It's amazing what volunteers will do. It's also kind of discouraging when you read remarks about how bad they've done and the deficit that's going to occur and all that, when in fact it doesn't happen. I just wonder if all these bad comments we have coming from certain areas don't discourage volunteers from performing the way they do.

Mr. Chairman, along with the World Student Games we had the Western Canada Games in Calgary, where again the volunteers performed at their very best. Alberta came very close to winning the title. We lost it by one and a half points to British Columbia, but we recovered from about 17 points back in 1979.

Also last year we had a number of other events that were very positive for this province. Another one was the Winter Games in the Crowsnest Pass, which have just been completed. Again, I might say we've had really good success in all three games — the Student Games, the Western Canada Games, the games in the Crowsnest Pass — and also in the games in Mountain View, a first, where we've allowed five communities to band together and provide and perform on behalf of the athletes. All those volunteers that worked just have to be commended. Again, we did each of those games on budget, on time, and every one of those games provided a small surplus.

In 1984 we'll have the Seniors Games in Camrose for the third time. We'll have the Summer Games in 1985 in Fort McMurray, and in 1986 the Winter Games will move to Edson, Alberta. This last year we moved from the Alberta Games Council and set up a new Act last fall, the Alberta Sport Council, which takes effect April 1. Before I move into that, I just want to say how pleased I've been with the Alberta Games Council which has provided the kind of enjoyment to Albertans across the province. I want to thank all the members for their input. The volunteers there have worked so hard and have done the Department of Recreation and Parks such a great credit. Again, we've now moved to the Alberta Sport Council, as I mentioned, where we have 16 dedicated Albertans ready to go to work to supply their talents in conjunction with the private sector in making sure the sports activities of the province are well taken care of.

Mr. Chairman, we are now completing the last of two provincial parks, which we hope to have completed this year,

one at Carson-Pegasus and the other at Whitney-Ross. We expect to have some openings sometime this summer. I also wish to announce that we will be continuing with the municipal recreation areas. It's a program where we have provided \$100,000 in capital and up to \$20,000 a year for operations. We now have 30 of these areas in place or under construction, and I will be going across the province this year in conjunction with the MLAs in rural Alberta to take in the opening functions of these. As I mentioned, 10 more will be in effect from this budget. I'm really pleased that we're going ahead, because this provides a number of opportunities for local contractors and local employment.

Mr. Chairman, we're also moving into something that is probably a first in the province of Alberta, and that's privatization of a provincial park. We're going to do this as a pilot project at Whitney. We're advertising now for a private-sector entrepreneur to become involved in running the park for us, and we hope that will lead to more privatization as the years go on.

In regard to privatization, I just want to mention again that the bulk of our \$8 million budget for construction, over 80 percent of that, will flow to the private sector. We will have all those jobs done in the local area by local people. These reconstruction and maintenance jobs will consist of grass cutting, firewood supply, pump-out of septic tanks, and janitorial services, and will place about \$1.3 million in the hands of the private sector.

This year, Mr. Chairman, we've moved to another vote, Vote 5, which is Kananaskis Country operations. The managing director for Kananaskis is Ed Marshall. My understanding is that the golf course will open shortly, probably as early as next week. They tell me that by March 1 they had 30,000 applications for golfing at Kananaskis. They tell me that when the 36 holes are open and in play, if we have the kind of weather we have been having, we could accommodate about 80,000 golfers. They tell me that the golf course is too small already, so I hope we can accommodate all Albertans in that. I might say at this time that about 35 percent of the tee times will be held back for walk-on or 48-hour notice of tee time applications. That means about 25 tee times per golf course per day will be left open for those people who want to come from wherever to take part in our Kananaskis golf course.

Mr. Chairman, that moves me now to the last topic I want to discuss, the 1988 Olympics. We all recall that we made a commitment some two years ago. A provincial commitment is now in place. I've now been associated with six federal ministers in the course of my term as Minister of Recreation and Parks. We're not sure yet if they've finalized their commitment, but we have. There are a number of things we're going to do and, for the record, I want to just spell out what they are and probably give the members some idea of what the price tag will be.

We're involved in the Canmore nordic site. In this year's budget we have \$110,000 for preliminary planning and design, and that project's estimated cost when it's complete will be \$15.4 million. The McMahon Stadium upgrading is a project we are involved in, in a fifty-fifty obligation. This year we have about \$8 million in the budget for that, and the government's share of the total estimated cost of the project is \$8.045 million. We are also involved in the athletes' village, which will be built on the University of Calgary grounds. It will be done by the university. In this year's budget we have some \$104,700 for planning and design, and the total cost of that project will be \$16,012,050.

Mr. Chairman, the last project we are involved in is the upgrading of Mount Allan to Olympic standards. Of course at

this time we are not certain of what we have to do. We have an estimate of what's going to happen, and within that we have some \$44,000 in this year's budget for planning and design. We have an estimated cost, and that won't be firm until we have, within a couple of weeks, the master plan done by the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. But we suggest that our cost could be about \$5.5 million to upgrade Mount Allan to Olympic standards.

Mr. Chairman, that is briefly where we are in the Department of Recreation and Parks. I would now be pleased to take questions and try to respond to the members as best I can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Highwood.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I regret that this note isn't getting to you fast enough. I was wondering if I could ask you to revert to introduction of visitors.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have called the hon. member's name to make comments, so he could make those, I believe, at the same time.

MR. ALGER: How very kind of you. I didn't think I was first in line.

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

MR. ALGER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of all MLAs present that our good friend and your good friend, an erstwhile compatriot of this House, George Wolstenholme, is in our presence in the members gallery. I would like him to stand now and receive the enjoyment of the House.

Good to have you with us, George.

#### head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

##### **Department of Recreation and Parks** (*continued*)

MR. ALGER: Mr. Chairman, thank you for recognizing me right off the bat. I really wasn't planning on that, but it's a delight to be up first.

I would like to direct the following questions to the Minister of Recreation and Parks, for the simple reason that a big part of Kananaskis lies in my constituency. I have some very intricate problems down there with one and all, and I am sure you can handle these. It isn't anything you probably don't know about.

Mr. Minister, I wonder what returns will flow to the government with respect to the contract on the Kananaskis Country golf course. What actual funds are we looking at? Is it going to be a paying proposition, or is it just one of those things we subsidize forever?

Secondly, I would like to ask about how many golfers can be handled. You have already displayed an enormous number, but I want to know how many you are actually going to handle on a yearly basis and how many reservations are in place right now. Would you redescribe to us, at that point in time, the walk-ons you mentioned in your opening remarks?

Thirdly, what can we expect of the Mount Kidd recreational vehicle park in Kananaskis? By that I mean how many sites will it have, who's going to operate it, and what kind of return can the government expect on that particular project?

Fourth — and I think last — for a long time I have heard a lot about the Fortress [Junction] service station, and I often thought I should have started one up myself. In any event, I think this is a Shell service station, particularly Shell product . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Gulf.

MR. ALGER: I believe it's Shell that has the application in.

Knowing this much about service stations, Mr. Minister, a lot of service stations are much better than others. Since we're way back in the mountains, I'm wondering what services these people can expect. While I appreciate this is a grandiose system of allegory that you're proposing in the Kananaskis, I would like those questions answered at your earliest possibility.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to comment on the user fee. I think the user fee at our parks is \$3, and that's a pretty good bargain for the spaces that are provided. I'm thinking especially of Cypress Hills, the spaces especially in the new areas and the old areas that have been renovated. It's a pretty good bargain for \$3. I've heard some comments from private-sector trailer camps, et cetera. They feel it's unfair competition — the difference in what they have to charge to make even a small profit against what the provincial parks charge for user fees for trailer parks and tenting in the provincial parks.

Also, the future of the ski hill in Cypress park. I had sent to me in the last week a letter accompanied by a petition signed by 2,400 area residents showing their support for the proposed renovations to the ski hill in Cypress Hills park. One part of the letter specifically reads:

We feel that complete privatization of this project would be economically impractical and an abdication of responsibility by the government.

I know the minister's strong commitment to free enterprise and the desire that free enterprise play a part in these kinds of operations. I'd like him to comment on the future of this ski hill as he sees it. What number of years, how soon can we look forward to the start and then on through to the finishing of the proposed ski hill project in Cypress Hills?

A couple of questions related to Kananaskis Country. We've heard a lot about Kananaskis Country and the number of dollars that have been spent on this beautiful area. I would ask the minister if he has any estimate of the number of jobs or the number of man-years of construction that were created through the development of this park, even if it is in total numbers or if it can be broken down to the number of man-years of construction or jobs that were created relating to even the development and completion of the golf course. Also, the number of man-years it is going to take to operate Kananaskis Country — how many people he feels will be employed, those full-time and especially those such as students that would find a summer job there. I guess we'd call them occasional staff; I don't know what the proper term is in the department for that type of staff. How many people do we expect to provide jobs for in that area?

I had another question about the number of dollars generated from the golf course, but my hon. colleague for Highwood has asked that. I would also like to know the number of people who are expected to have jobs at the golf course.

Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to ask a few questions on user fees in the park, because the provincial parks in my constituency are well used and well received. If anything, they're too well used and too well received. By 9 o'clock on Friday night, it's pretty hard to find a place to park down there.

I have some specific questions for the minister. Maybe he could tell us how these user fees we have in Alberta compare with user fees in other provinces. Another thing I'd like to find out is how much of the cost in maintenance of the park these user fees take up. Another question: is the minister considering increasing our user fees from what they are at the present time? Another one is, what is the utilization rate of our trailer parks and campgrounds at present? One more question, Mr. Chairman, while I'm on my feet: where are we with the MCR program? I understand that we're taking a look at it, and possibly he could give us a little input on just what's proposed for MCR in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BATIUK: I have just a few brief comments. When the estimates of the Minister of Culture were debated in the Legislature, I said that it was a nice department and portfolio, because whatever you did, it was well appreciated. I think Recreation and Parks is very much the same. If the minister does nothing, he may even get away with it. And if he does anything, it is well appreciated.

Many times we hear criticisms, particularly in these economic times, that the government is spending money on recreation and so forth, yet there is need for other things. When I think back to the mid-1950s, when I was a school trustee attending a convention, one of the guest speakers said that it will not be too many years before a time will come that only 2 percent of the population will be working. At that time, I thought it was impossible. In the mid-1950s there was a 60-hour week. But in a little over 20 years, it has gone down to as low as 25 hours and even less than that. Chances are that in another 25 years, many people will have to look to find something to do so they won't destroy themselves by doing nothing.

I think that our programs with the major cultural facilities were very good. I recall so well when the village of Ryley, with only 500 people, made application for a swimming pool. At that time, the minister responsible for recreation was the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, and he said: John, I just can't see a community with 500 people being able to pay for a swimming pool and maintain it. It was brought to my attention that there were some communities with several thousand people, and they couldn't make ends meet. It was surprising, after a lot of pressure from the community and its MLA, that the minister agreed to that and, within two years, that swimming pool was paid for totally. It's right against their school; they use that swimming pool for their recreation and physical education, and the surrounding communities use it. So I think that such facilities have gone a long way.

Another thing that I've also noticed is our young people. Because many of these facilities have provisions for recreation, it keeps them away from other things that maybe would not be the most interesting or the best. You can't blame these young people. With all the energy they have, they have to burn it off someplace. I think the major cultural facilities program has provided an incentive that has brought a lot of good. I have mentioned that there are even programs that both Culture and Recreation and Parks jointly provide assistance for.

Realizing that this is the last of the 10-year MCR program, I was just wondering whether the minister could advise whether

it's going to end at this or whether he's looking at a new program or a continuation of this one. I think that this program was well worth it. It was well appreciated, and it did a lot of good. So I hope that the minister will be able to respond to that. There are other issues — I shouldn't say issues, but things that are good to know and have. But I think that some of them have been said; others may want to say so.

Thank you.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to say a few words when we're discussing the budget for Recreation and Parks. I think it's time that we all realized that the Minister of Recreation and Parks is a very special person, as far as we people in Alberta are concerned. I say this very sincerely, because not only do we have a fellow from rural Alberta, who was born here — born when times were tough — but he's a successful businessman and, beyond that, he's very active in sports activities and he knows what it's like to be a volunteer. With his strong character, he's been able to institute programs that have served all of Alberta.

Peter has had the ability to cut red tape, and he did this because of the experience he had had, being in rural Alberta. Any grants that were given by the governments were always endowed with so much red tape that by the time you got the paperwork finished, there was nothing left to put into facilities for the rural people. He appreciated the need for recreation as well as the need for parks. As such, he's been very instrumental in our major facilities recreational grants and getting the money out on time and promoting activities for which we in rural Alberta are all extremely thankful. In my own constituency, we are building the last of many arenas. I think this is the sixth one. Before I was elected to this Legislature, we had none.

I think we should also recognize the job that has been done in the parks. Peter — I call him Peter; I should call him Mr. Minister — has seen fit to utilize local groups, local organization volunteers, to establish throughout Alberta a system of rural parks that is second to none in all North America. We in Lloydminster constituency happen to be the recipients of a local park, located at Lea Park, Alberta, which was being developed and managed by the Marwayne Legion. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, it's a credit to the whole community and to the whole of the province of Alberta.

I think I would be remiss if I didn't [mention] the job the minister is doing in regards to the upcoming Olympics. He is on top of the program; he is very actively engaged in making sure that Alberta students, Alberta athletes, are given every opportunity to compete in the Olympic Games.

In closing, I think I would just express the appreciation of my whole constituency at the job the minister is doing. I hope he will continue utilizing volunteers to the greatest extent possible to provide recreating activities and parks for all the people of Alberta.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we call on the next hon. member, I've been given the information that the Oilers are still leading 1 to 0. In the other game the score is the Islanders 3, the Canadiens 1.

MR. SZWENDER: I wish you had saved that rather unfortunate news until after I'd spoken. I would have had a smile on my face, especially as far as Montreal is concerned.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to direct a few comments to the minister. If he promises not to blush, I would like to commend him for the excellent job he has been doing in his portfolio. I had a number of comments and some questions I

wanted to bring to the minister's attention, but I notice some of the speakers prior to myself have already covered these questions. However, I'll avoid those and go on to some other matters.

One that at the same time always amuses and annoys me to no degree is some of the misconceptions that still occur surrounding Kananaskis Country and the Kananaskis golf course. In the past I've had some criticism brought to my attention by constituents in Edmonton Belmont. In almost every instance, Mr. Chairman, I've asked these people: what are you reacting to; do you know what you're talking about; where are you getting your information; and most importantly, have you been to Kananaskis Country? I think I could safely say there was almost 100 percent negative reaction. Edmonton is about a five hour drive from Kananaskis Country, and none of those people who had brought to my attention that the park had cost too much, catered to the elite, and was luxurious in this time of restraint, admitted to having ever gone to the park, seeing what was there, and appreciating the value and beauty of the park preserved for many generations of future Albertans. I just want to let the minister know that as more Albertans become aware of that fabulous facility, I think that criticism will largely evaporate.

Questions about the golf course and whether it will be a paying proposition have, I think, already been brought to the minister's attention. Basically I want to find out when we could start expecting the projected revenues to be turning a profit back to the province and to the people of this province. I'd like to bring one other thing on Kananaskis to the minister's attention, Mr. Chairman. It really annoyed me when I read it, and I think I will just reread one paragraph from this. I'd like the minister's comments on the accuracy of this statement made by some half-baked reporter — I don't know what they were on when they wrote this. This is from the March issue of *Edmonton Magazine*, and one of their points is:

Money from the Heritage Savings Trust fund has been wasted on such inanities as trying to train elk not to urinate on the Kananaskis Golf Course.

Maybe once and for all the minister could lay to rest the ignorance of comments such as this, and we can go on to more important things rather than have the people of this province misled by such inaccuracy and, really, incompetence.

The questions I had about the rate for campers and what my colleagues have referred to as user fees have already been brought up.

Another point I'd like to bring to the minister's attention and maybe get some information on, Mr. Chairman, is the Intercontinental Cup, which is a baseball tournament held in different centres. It's an international baseball tournament, and for 1984, that tournament, the Intercontinental Cup, has been awarded to Edmonton. My information is that the federal funding, which was expected, to host this event has been denied or withheld, and that the sponsors, the directors, the administrators of this event have turned to the province and other sources for funding in order to make sure this event is held in Canada, since Canada, and Edmonton in particular, was awarded this event. It would certainly be a black eye on our reputation if it was suddenly cancelled because of a lack of financial commitment at government levels. Maybe the minister could outline what the provincial government's position would be on helping to fund the Intercontinental Cup in order to ensure its success.

Another point I'd like the minister to comment on is the Banff centennial. I know it's Banff federal park and, as such, is administered strictly by the federal government. However, in 1985 there will be the centennial of Banff National Park,

which was established in 1885. I was just wondering if the minister had any plans or proposals or any information he could share with us as to the participation the provincial government will take in ensuring that that ceremony is well attended and becomes a success we can all benefit from.

Another point I would like to bring to the attention of the minister, Mr. Chairman, is the newly established Alberta Sport Council. I was wondering if the minister could just outline to the committee exactly how many members are on the Sport Council; how long their term of office is; are those members paid members; what is their budget allocation and, more specifically, what kind of funds will the Alberta Sport Council have to deal with this year? I believe their funding largely originates from revenues the provincial government gets from the western lottery association. So if the minister could bring us up to date on that, it would certainly be helpful, as well as whether the Alberta Sport Council is establishing any subcommittees to deal with particular sporting areas or events of interest to all Albertans.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to get the minister's response on the Alberta Search '88, which is the program to provide as much assistance as possible to young Albertans in preparation for the 1988 Olympics. Could the minister again outline how much money will be available for this program? Does the minister have any indication right now of what the response will be? Has there been any response? Basically, how many athletes could we expect to benefit from the funding of Search '88?

With those words, I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, two topics. The first area of discussion I'd like to carry on is with items I'd like the minister to elaborate on and give more detail to the Legislative Assembly. The minister mentioned 10 areas for — I think they're called rural recreation parks. I was wondering if the minister could elaborate as to what those 10 areas are?

Secondly, with regard to the Olympics, as I took down some figures quickly, the total cost or investment of the Alberta government seems to be \$80 million. Maybe I've miscalculated one of those figures. I was wondering if the minister could indicate whether that seems to be the final figure, or are there other items that may cost more money, that may arise between now and the year of the Olympics? Are there other items outside of those listed by the minister that may become the responsibility of government? Are there certain guidelines or cost-control measures in place that will assure Albertans that all dollars go where designated, in terms of the Olympic facilities and programs? I'd appreciate a greater expansion on that.

In his first remarks, the minister was a little concerned about the criticism of local volunteers — not of volunteers, but of persons that do certain things to prohibit volunteers from doing their job — and I wasn't quite clear as to what the minister was aiming at. Possibly the proponents of that point of view are not in the Legislature at the present time, or maybe they are. It wouldn't be a bad idea if the minister would clarify what was meant by those comments in terms of the actions of Albertans.

The other area I'd appreciate elaboration on is with regard to the recreation centres that have been built across the province by the major cultural/recreation grants, as to whether the local districts are able to fund the operation of the facilities or whether the minister is getting a lot of pressure and representation at this time for additional funding or some type of new program. I'm sure that's happening. It seems like ever since many of the facilities were put in place, the local districts have been concerned with the operational cost. We all recognize that their

original commitment in their agreement was to meet the ongoing operational cost as a local municipality. I would think that on the whole most municipalities have done that without any complaint or regret with regard to the benefits of the facilities.

The other item I want to raise was not in the minister's remarks, and it's with regard to the internal workings of the department itself. Through communication with the minister, I raised the matter of a study that is going on to revamp the planning and design process in the department. I have a number of questions with regard to that process, but there are four that I'd like to raise at this time. First of all, who wrote the terms of reference for that study? I would like to say that after looking at and reviewing the terms of reference, I felt that person, if it was someone on staff, could have designed the process and put things all in place. It would have saved a lot of money in terms of the \$150,000 that's provided for this particular contract to revamp one section of the Department of Recreation and Parks. Because they are very elaborate terms of reference, the person that wrote them seems to understand what is needed and what is not required. So that was my first question: who did write those terms of reference?

Secondly, I note in the terms of reference that there has already been a manual in place and utilized, and that that manual is to be used as a reference. Why was that manual inadequate, and why couldn't the department itself update it without incurring a cost of over \$100,000 to this private consultant listed here, Mr. Kohut of Resources Management Consultants? Why couldn't we have cut back and maybe put this into hospital expenditures in this province?

The third question I have is with regard to other persons that made bids. Why can't they be made public? We take the Department of Transportation, that puts various contracts out for bid, and the name of the person that gets the contract is made public. The names of other people that are not successful are made public with the amounts they have bid. I can't understand why the names of other persons that made bids — and I know there was a number of them — can't be made public. I can't understand that.

We certainly have the successful person here. But I'd be very interested in why someone that bid at a rate of around \$75,000 didn't get it, and the contract was given given to someone that bid over \$100,000. I think it was around \$120,000. That's a significant difference — \$50,000 difference. Why was one much better than the other? I would be interested in that kind of assessment.

The fourth area is an item within the terms of reference themselves, and it relates to another study that is going on in the department. This is on page 4 of the terms of reference. Reference term No. 2 says:

A parallel study of the development process which starts at this point and essentially ends at the handover point of a finished product to operations and maintenance division is presently being undertaken by another consultant.

I would be interested in how much money that consultant is getting in the department, and how many people bid on that respective proposal. If that's another \$100,000 to \$150,000, we're talking about a quarter of a million dollars to two consultants to revamp the department, where we already have a massive planning division. We have a minister, deputy ministers, and executive assistants, and if they sat down somewhere for a week, they could have done it themselves. I think that very fact brings it upon the minister to justify why that kind of thing is happening. This is in the Department of Recreation and Parks. There are other departments doing the same frivolous kind of thing, because the managers of the department are not taking their responsibilities.

I urge the minister to justify why that kind of expenditure is going on. What's the purpose of it? Why can't people paid very high salaries — deputy ministers who sit here in the gallery, and others — sit down and do exactly that job? That's their job as managers, and they should be doing more of that. If we have tough times — our Provincial Treasurer stands up in this Legislature and tells about how tough things are, we have to back up, we have to hold the line — those are places where, with a little extra effort on behalf of people we pay in this government, on behalf of ministers, we could do those things without expending money such as the money that's being expended. We could allocate that to health care in this province. We could allocate that money to education in this province, children that need special care, special education.

I have had the opportunity over the weekend to talk to some of those people. They are frightened in their boots in some of these small schools in Alberta, where there are three or four children that need special attention because they have learning disabilities, that we are going to remove those teachers from the school system. That's a reality. They talk about losing so many of these special services because of losing \$150,000. At the same time, in this same government, we have studies here — and I remember when I first came into this Legislature, my hon. colleague used the word "gobbledygook". If you read the terms of reference here, there is a lot of it. They are not bad terms of reference, but there is a lot of it there. Under the present economic circumstances, the department itself could have done the job. It's incumbent upon the minister to justify that kind of expenditure to this Legislature. I hope that item can be aired before we stop here this evening.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I have had a little difficulty in the last few minutes trying to relate some of the comments back to this department. Perhaps more of it will come to light upon reflection.

To the minister, with respect to the recreation development program. A few other members of the Assembly have mentioned the matter of the MCR grants, and I'm sure the minister is well aware of the fact that I'd like to put in another plug on behalf of the Acadia Community Association. They for one group within the city of Calgary did show a tremendous amount of initiative in terms of building and developing their new recreational facility. Having met with them on a considerable number of occasions, I sincerely believe that to some degree they do feel they were shortchanged by the process of applying for funds within the city of Calgary. I know the minister has been good enough to meet with that group on at least one occasion and has made some suggestions which hopefully will come to fruition.

But my real concern, Mr. Minister, is not only with Acadia but with other facilities throughout the province, in rural as well as urban areas. My concern is that a number of these facilities are caught in the business of fluctuating interest rates, in terms of trying to retire their capital debt. That's a tremendous burden for them to have.

With respect to the community of Acadia, I know that the amount of money that in essence has almost been flushed down the drain because of the cost of interest payments, has really been quite astronomical. I know that the minister is aware that the interest rate is again starting to play games and is going upwards. Again, this is going to put even more pressure on all individuals, especially individual homeowners, as well as recreation and community associations that are caught in this terrible catch-22 situation.

So, Mr. Chairman, again through you to the minister. I know that he is sympathetic. I just urge him on to even more

measures about trying to find additional funds to help these various associations in the coming years to be able to deal not only with the capital difficulties and the interest difficulties but also with the whole matter of the operational.

Having said that, I realize that one of the difficulties which has transpired with respect to the development of a number of these facilities, especially in the city of Calgary, is that it has meant a tremendous drain on all the volunteer assistance that is there. In fact, a tremendous number of them have burned out. I'm sure that that in turn leads on to trying to find other ways of hiring staff. I think that really moves us away from the original intent of the MCR grant system.

Again, within the city of Calgary, I wonder if the minister would comment with respect to the whole process, that has been in place, of provincial government funding flowing through to the city and then the way the city has, if not diverted certainly gone overboard, I think, in terms of the number of applications that have been received. They have not really looked at the full matter of cost effectiveness and proper, full financing with respect to the projects, which then puts us all back into the very difficult situation of how do we maintain what is there, let alone looking at any new projects?

Again, in south Calgary areas, we have the very strange situation whereby the city of Calgary went ahead and used some MCR grant money to put two wave pools in south Calgary, which seems to be almost idiotic. It's proving to be so, I believe, with respect to the pressure that's being put on the south Calgary Family Leisure Centre at least.

In the same general area, Mr. Chairman, I see that recreation program development talks about providing

direction and program resources to provincial associations for the orderly development of recreation activities.

Mr. Minister, I hope you would comment in some detail with respect to a program that I think you are interested in, which might well lead to the further development of amateur hockey players, especially at the high school level, a continuum of a program throughout the whole province.

I've made mention briefly before that my real concern is that in terms of the spectrum of hockey development within the province, not simply in this province, a real disruption is under way, and it's simply this. If the National Hockey League — which we're very much interested in, including Flames fans, who lost out in a tough series to the Oilers — persists in trying to pick up all the good hockey players without paying for even a portion, certainly not for a realistic portion, of the development of those programs, then I think the whole effort of the NHL is really self-defeating in the end. You see some of the results in terms of the calibre of some of the hockey teams in the NHL. Often they're reaching further and further into younger age groups and, by so doing, then weaken the draw, weaken the teams that are in the Western Hockey League, for example, and especially the tier 2 league within the province of Alberta.

You then add to that the frosting on the layer cake, and you come up with the Olympic hockey team development program, which is great, and all of us would certainly love to see Canada win at hockey again in the Olympics, and no better time to do it than in 1988. But I know, in terms of my discussions in Calgary recently, that again we have this kind of competition going on between the Olympic development team and the NHL, and that no one really wants to get involved in putting any kind of money, any kind of coaching, any kind of liaison or promotion, back into tier 2 hockey, let alone into the Western Hockey League.

I realize that this topic ranges over a very broad area, Mr. Minister, but I really would like you to share your own personal



feelings with the Assembly on this issue. I'm very much concerned that at the tier 2 hockey level in this province, which has been seen as almost one of the basic building blocks in the system, right now the franchise in Fort McMurray is in some considerable difficulty; hopefully it might be rescued. The Canuck franchise in Calgary, which last year won Alberta, has been mothballed for the current hockey season, and some efforts are being made to revivify that franchise.

As the minister knows, it's in this tier 2 level of hockey that the emphasis, in large measure, has been for the hockey player to finish his education. We have them finishing high school and hopefully going on to either SAIT or NAIT or to a junior college or university. What has happened is that a number of these players have gone on to help feed the ranks of college hockey development within the United States, and a few of them have now made their way into the National Hockey League.

In all of this, there is still no flow of funds back, or a very minimal flow of funds back. I know that we have, under Advanced Education, some program bursary support available, but I'm concerned that that money is really not sufficient. It's a good idea; let's try to enlarge on it. But I think there must be some other kinds of programs accessible to these people — most of these tier 2 clubs are community operations — to help them in terms of getting the draw in.

I would think, Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister, that the minister, in terms of his office, could well consider talking to, say, the owners of the Flames and the Oilers and the people involved in the Olympic hockey program, and saying that whenever they have a game, they'll put aside some space in their program to advertise that these other team development projects are going on. At least they could sit down and have some discussions as to what might be some appropriate ways of developing some better liaison and support — and not all of it has to be financial — in terms of encouraging the whole development of the hockey player; the hockey player that also has the advantage of having gained his education at the same time, and not just the education that's there in the corners, with a few elbows against the boards and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to quickly commend the minister and his department for the provincial parks program. In particular, over the weekend I was again able to spend a day in the Cypress Hills and went into the Elkwater townsite, the lakefront development, to see what's going on there in terms of the various campsite developments. It's all very attractive and being done in a very tasteful manner. I know that those developments are well appreciated by a tremendous number of people — not simply Albertans; a tremendous number of people from Saskatchewan and a number of other people who tour from other parts of the country and from the United States.

I would like to underline the comments about the development of the William Watson Lodge in Kananaskis Country. Last fall we made a special point in taking the Social Care Facilities Review Committee to have one of its monthly meetings at the William Watson Lodge, and we were very much impressed by the facility. That has helped us, in turn, to go out to various facilities that we build throughout the province — especially with senior citizens or other areas where people are incapacitated — to urge them to go and take advantage of that beautiful valley but also the beautiful facility.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would be good enough to describe to the Assembly the liaison or working relationship between himself and the Minister of Tourism and Small Business and perhaps the Premier's office, with respect to what goes on in terms of the necessary preparations for the Olympics. I must admit that I think some people are a bit

confused as to who has responsibility for what areas, and that would be helpful. I see that in the support to the XV Winter Olympic Games, there's a line in there with respect to grants for capital construction, related to the expansion of McMahon Stadium. Could the minister list what those things are? I wonder if part of that was renewal of the turf — and if that is so, would that be a charge against the Stampeders Football Club or the university team or combinations? — or whether that really means other types of turf circling the field. I know that there's to be a large extension to press facilities and so forth, and I think I recall that this is where the opening — and, I assume, the closing — ceremonies are to take place. Again, I wonder why we list under this program the provision of additional housing for the athletes' village, to be located at the University of Calgary. Why does this come under your department rather than Advanced Education, Public Works, Supply and Services, or Housing — just the rationale of that. The other thing, of course, would be where are we at — did the cheques with respect to the Saddledome finally arrive from the federal government? Were the cheques really involved with the first estimated cost, or did they take into account the final completed cost of the facility?

The last comment I would like to make is this: I know that there is a tremendous number of people out there in southern Alberta — throughout all of Alberta. But in the area of southern Alberta, especially within the general environs of Calgary, there are a lot of people who are only too willing to volunteer to help with respect to whatever does take place with the Olympic Games. I wonder if the minister might comment briefly as to where that's at, as to if the Olympic development committee has started to expand its membership. Now that they've moved a few months closer to the games, are there some programs where they can now start to pick up more volunteers? In particular of course, last summer the Western Canada Games were managed so very well by the community of Calgary, with outside support coming in, that we now know that in the Calgary area we do in fact have a tremendous number of volunteers who are only too willing to become involved in these kinds of programs. I know in particular that Ed Chynoweth, the president of the Western Hockey League, is one who's only too willing to become involved in terms of the Olympic hockey program. I use that as just one person, but I know that there are many, many more who are only too willing to get involved and only too anxious to be asked.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a few comments to the Minister of Recreation and Parks. I appreciated his opening remarks, where he referred to the 1985 Summer Games to be hosted in the new city of Fort McMurray. We certainly look forward to that and extend an invitation to all hon. colleagues and encourage everybody to put it on their calendars and hope that they'd be able to take in the very exciting events. Of course, I look forward to the minister being there and participating, and I'm sure we'll see that happen.

I'd like to comment briefly with regard to the MCR funding, and would encourage the minister, through his department, to look for further programs, a continuation or an extension in this particular area where we've had some problems in the past with regard to communities getting their master plan into effect. I was wondering if there couldn't be some relationship or assistance through the minister and his department to cut this time down and to perhaps assist some of the smaller communities. It appears to be an oversophisticated problem, and sometimes the small rural communities just really can't afford or take on some of the expertise that's required. I realize there's some in-

house assistance available, but perhaps that overall program could be reviewed.

The hon. member previously speaking referred to the minipark program, and I am certainly very supportive of it. As the minister is aware, we have a program called the Snye Park in the city of Fort McMurray, and we look forward to that program and, of course, a wrap-up of that. But in particular, when you have the minipark program, you have on the other side the urban parks program. If the minister recalls, the city of Fort McMurray was not eligible at the time of the formation of the program, as it was under new town status. I'm quite concerned that in this period of restraint or downward period of adjustment, programs such as this might run to maturity and wouldn't be continued. I'd certainly like to speak for the continuation, and encourage all members to work closely with the minister of the department to see that programs such as this would continue. In particular the five communities that are benefitting from it will certainly benefit all Albertans for many, many years to come. I certainly believe that, and would like to go back to a little promise — if I could hold the minister to it — that he would put Fort McMurray on first, should the program be reimplemented or continued. I'm sure the minister doesn't want me to have to go back and refer to previous remarks in *Hansard*, but I would do so willingly if he forgets, and I'm sure his memory isn't that short.

In particular, as we talk about parks and recreation development, I think the overall north is one of the areas that has been left. I say "left" — not left out but left to the last. People took for granted that the natural waters, lakes, and surroundings were a conducive climate, that people didn't need these other fine amenities. We're finding, Mr. Minister, that some of these amenities that have developed near the large urban centres are now much in demand in the particular rural areas. We have overdevelopment and overutilized areas, such as you have near the urban centres. I encourage the minister to resurrect the Lakeland plan, and hope that we could create a Kananaskis in the Lakeland region, as the area is now overdeveloped and overutilized by people from the surrounding areas such as Edmonton and others.

Mr. Chairman, I don't share the minister's enthusiasm with regard to the Kananaskis, and I say this reluctantly. In my travels throughout the north, I find that an awful lot of northern Albertans are not able to enjoy the Kananaskis. When I say not able to, it's because of time, distance, and travel. For example, it takes a resident of Fort McMurray five hours to drive out from the city of Fort McMurray. I don't what the driving time is to Kananaskis from here. Can any hon. member tell me?

AN HON. MEMBER: Four and a half hours.

MR. WEISS: Nine and a half hours is just a little too far to drive, especially when you consider a weekend where you would have maybe a Friday at 4 o'clock to embark on your vacation or weekend, and have to return Sunday night. It's just impossible.

I bring this to the minister's attention, because I've asked him — and I'm sure he will have the opportunity sometime this summer — to come into the Lac La Biche-McMurray region and speak to our various chambers and concerned citizens who share this feeling. In particular, they feel they're unable to enjoy some of the privileges that other Albertans have the opportunity to enjoy because of locale.

I understand the William Watson Lodge is a fine facility, and I know of one or two individuals who have used it. They speak very highly of it. Through the minister's guidance, I

brought that program to the attention of several in the community and am very grateful for that. But I really am concerned, Mr. Chairman, that we're building parks that are developable and suitable for people who live in a certain region and have always taken the northern part of the province a little bit for granted. I encourage the minister to address this, because I look through all the votes and don't see any money being allocated for parks and recreation development in northern Alberta, other than continuation of existing parks and facilities, which as I've indicated to the minister are overutilized, overcrowded, and beyond the expansion stage.

With those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the minister respond. I'm really not degrading or certainly wanting to take anything away from Kananaskis. I'm sure, as the minister points out, especially in view of the numbers, the use, and that 2 million Albertans will have the opportunity to use the park in the future — I am one of the citizens who have not had that opportunity. I've never been to the Kananaskis since it's been developed. I can remember snowmobiling in the area many years ago. So I guess I have to be educated as well. Maybe the minister could take me under his wing sometime and lead me around that park.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or come and stay with me.

MR. WEISS: I'd accept that opportunity too. Thank you for the opportunity to express those concerns.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to address a few remarks to the estimates of the Department of Recreation and Parks. One could spend a fair length of time enumerating the variety of recreation opportunities that are available in Red Deer and throughout central Alberta. In deference to other members who want to speak to the estimates, I would like to limit my remarks this evening to a very important aspect of community activity in the city of Red Deer. Of course that deals with the burgeoning and rapidly developing Waskasoo urban park.

The city of Red Deer has made very substantial progress, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Waskasoo Park over the past year. Extensive trail development has occurred, as well as major construction in several important and large areas within the park. Just for a moment, for the record I would like to dispel some criticisms that I am hearing within the constituency. There have been some disquieting concerns, albeit not a great number, from some people who are suggesting that the government is overspending in areas that should be of lesser priority. On occasion, it will be presented to me that the parks that are being developed within the river valley of the city of Red Deer are an example of that.

I honestly cannot think of a more important legacy that this government could provide through investment of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund than the incredible legacy that will be provided to future generations of Red Deerites and central Albertans by virtue of this most important quality-of-life park that is being developed in Red Deer. I might also mention, not the least bit incidental, that I would have to think awfully hard to be able to find another capital project that has been developed within the city of Red Deer over the past three years and possibly for the next one and a half to two years. I would be hard pressed to find another capital project that would match the capital project that is occurring because of the urban park in Red Deer. We're dealing here with a \$28 million project. That translates very simply into many, many jobs. Frankly, it confounds me to think that people sometimes don't understand

that a \$28 million project of this nature does in fact provide a great many employment opportunities.

With the single exception of the petrochemical plants, which of course are not within the city of Red Deer but are on the periphery, I can't think of another capital project within the area of the city of Red Deer that has been such an important contributor in terms of jobs for the city of Red Deer. So let the record say that clearly this government's commitment to future generations in terms of life-style is also being translated in a very meaningful way today in terms of jobs for people within the city of Red Deer.

Perhaps another component that might be brought to mention is the important contribution made by volunteers. I'm continuing to limit my remarks within the confines of the Waskasoo urban park. Within that urban park, there have been a variety of committees established for the purpose of directing the management of that vast program over the course of five years. I think it would be appropriate for me now to enumerate a number of the members of some of the committees who have worked so diligently, so long, so unselfishly on behalf of the citizens of Red Deer in an effort to bring this park to fruition.

The Waskasoo Park Policy Committee consists of His Worship, Mayor Bob McGhee; councillor of the city of Red Deer, Claybon Hood; county councillor Bill Hazlett; another interesting member who I have known for some years, my brother Hugh McPherson, who is on the park policy committee by virtue of the fact that he's the chairman of the recreation board in Red Deer; and the erstwhile M.L.A. The management committee in Red Deer is an extremely hardworking group consisting of Don Moore, who is the superintendent of recreation in Red Deer; Mike Day the commissioner; Craig Curtis, who is a planner with the Red Deer Regional Planning Committee; Lowell Hodgson, who is a fine and hardworking individual with the Department of Recreation and Parks; Lloyd McMurtry; and the manager of the parks, Ted Johnston. Perhaps a special mention might be extended to the manager Ted Johnston and his very capable assistant Marilyn Haley for the extraordinary efforts put forth in the development of this park.

Mr. Chairman, in Red Deer at the present time we are witnessing the development of that park that is very near fruition. I have a status report in front of me. I fear to bore members with all the details, but I would like to simply mention that the Heritage Ranch, which has been entitled that by the park policy committee — it was formerly known as the Hooper property and has now been entitled the Heritage Ranch; an appropriate name, I think, considering the source of 100 percent of the funds — is some 50 to 90 percent complete according to my statistics, and complete in other areas. The fact of the matter is that I rode my bicycle there with my family last weekend, and the area is to all intents and purposes complete. It's going to provide a very fine facility for all Red Deerites and central Albertans, including equestrian dayrides, playgrounds, paved trails for bikes, hiking trails, overpasses, and gymkhanas — just a truly exceptional facility.

The other portions of the park in the Great Chief Park — Bower Ponds area, are essentially complete as well. This particular area is going to be a fun place for central Albertans. It will include a BMX track for kiddies on their bikes, which is complete, some 2.7 kilometres of paved trails, an outdoor stage, an amphitheatre, and picnic shelters. It provides ponds for fishing in the summer and ice skating in winter. It's truly a fine recreational area.

Then of course, Mr. Chairman, the whole park intertwines throughout the Red Deer River valley from the area of Fort Normandeau all the way through the city to the Three Mile Bend area, which will include a public golf course. It strikes

me that we're most [fortunate] in the city of Red Deer to have had the opportunity to be at a time and place where a provincial government would have the foresight and wisdom and financial wherewithal through resource revenues that we are allocating for future generations in this province to make an investment in the life-style of a city such as Red Deer. I for one am most appreciative of the efforts of all the people involved in this important project.

I would like to commend to the minister the fine, fine efforts by his staff and him personally in ensuring that this program has advanced as quickly as it has. We're blessed in Red Deer. We're very fortunate to have such a fine facility. I would simply like to commend the minister and the Department of Recreation and Parks for that fine facility.

I had one question that is unrelated, Mr. Chairman, that I would offer to the minister. It's a question that I fear even asking, because I don't have a great deal of knowledge on it. It was presented to me just the other day, and I've just been afforded the first opportunity to ask it. I would be happy to receive a note from the minister if he is not in the position to answer it. We have had recent representations from equestrian groups who would be interested in using the abandoned railway bridge just west of Red Deer and the accompanying railway tracks, which of course have been lifted, as an equestrian park. It is an area that I think the minister is going to be approached on, and I would ask him to consider that possibility to determine if there is any likelihood that equestrian activities could be developed along that trail.

With those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I commend the minister once again, particularly for the extraordinary facility that we are witnessing being developed in Red Deer.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few remarks tonight in the estimates of Recreation and Parks. To start with, I'd like to say how much the Drumheller constituency has appreciated the major cultural facilities grants. They have built up what I think are a real bonanza of facilities for small towns and villages across the constituency. It has had its effect, because I see we had 62 people from the Drumheller constituency taking part in the last Winter Games. Out of that 62, there are 19 medal winners. I believe there were two gold, 14 silver, and three bronze, if I'm not mistaken. I think it's a record of what these facilities are bringing to the rural community. They weren't in the large centres. I noticed that many of the participants were scattered well over the rural area in the constituency. So I think it's a really fine program; I hope to see it continued. I think it's more or less a self-help program, where the government helps people build facilities they require in their area. If they can get volunteer work and effort, they can just build that much better facilities. I've noticed in a lot of my areas in Drumheller that some of the smaller communities have worked together and co-operated and sometimes have the best facilities, while some of the large areas don't seem to have that type of co-operation and effort, and they don't have the facilities that maybe they should have.

I'd like to say that I appreciate the minister mentioning that he's continuing the rural parks program, because I hope that maybe Drumheller will be on the list this year. We think we have found a pretty good place for the park. If you live in a constituency that is 99 percent farmland, it's pretty hard to have any parks. We only have one provincial park. It's well used, but it's getting slightly short of water. But that certainly doesn't keep us from using the rest of the parks in Alberta, and I know my constituents surely do — Kananaskis. Even the ones as far north — I used some of them myself up in the Fort McMurray

area last year, and they're pretty nice parks too. I had occasion to be up there last summer on a camping trip.

I also had occasion to drive down to Winnipeg, and from Winnipeg south and into North Dakota and the Black Hills and back into Alberta. Nowhere on that trip did we find any facilities that could match the parks and facilities we have here in Alberta. I think the minister and the department are to be congratulated on the job they've done in that area. I think it's a credit to Albertans to have such facilities out there.

With the opening of the paleontology museum, I would appreciate it in the future if we could consider some type of campsite or park on the river where overnight camping can be accommodated. There is a road that could be built fairly easily on the old railroad right-of-way, and it would accommodate. There is a very pretty area and one of the few that we have in the Drumheller constituency, and I would appreciate it if some thought were given to opening some type of small overnight camping facility there in the near future.

Outside of that, I have nothing further to say. I would just like to say to the minister that I appreciate his good work. It's a pleasure to have him at the head of a department. I've always enjoyed working with him, and I hope he will keep up the good work along with his department. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have some final hockey scores: Islanders 3, Canadiens 1; Oilers 3, North Stars 1.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Chairman, I won't take very much time, but I would just like to compliment the minister on the funding he has allocated this year for a little park at Sedgewick. I have never seen such delighted people in all my life as when I was at their town meeting and told them they were getting this funding for a neat little park. I think it's just indicative of the things a small amount of money can do in a manner that's very pleasing to everyone concerned.

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Chairman, first off I'd like to just make a comment about Kananaskis park. I think the reason they put Kananaskis park in the area they did was very similar to when I got off in Bismarck, North Dakota, and asked the fellow there how come the train station was so far from town. The guy said, I guess they wanted it close to the railway tracks. I think it's very similar to Kananaskis park; they wanted to have it where the very beautiful scenery is. Maybe the minister would be kind enough to build a park up there. I don't know if he can build any mountains with snowy peaks on them or anything, but as far as Kananaskis park is concerned, I do want to try to reaffirm that we did the right thing there.

I had a meeting with the hotel association, and a bunch of us good old Calgary MLAs met there. They think it's going to bring a few extra tourists through the city of Calgary; that's the gateway to getting toward that Kananaskis Country. If you think about it, the hotels in the city of Calgary hire several thousand employees, and that provides a lot of bread and butter for the old tables there. As far as the beefing over the white sand or whether the elk's urinate on the grass or not, these types of things, that will come and that will go. Some way down the road, there are going to be a lot of Albertans who will go through that park and realize that a lot of wisdom went into that investment. That's what it is: an investment for Albertans as well as the tourists who will come in and spend dollars in this province.

I have one comment. I hope that this coming year the minister will take a hard look at the Western Irrigation development canal in Calgary. Right now I guess it belongs to the province. It's under the domain of the Department of the Envi-

ronment, but I think they are only concerned with the water, while the banks along there are beautiful. They run through a very heavily populated, low-income area in the city of Calgary. It sure would be nice if the Department of Recreation and Parks took a hard look at this, maybe cranked up a few little trees and a few more little goodies, and spent just a few dollars along the edge of that lovely canal.

When the Minister of Culture gave her estimates, I got up and gave a very long speech and congratulated her. When I was through, she explained later in her comments that all those things I was giving such great congratulations on were under the Department of Recreation and Parks. So at the risk of repeating myself, I will.

First off, I think the MCR grant program has been one of the biggest boons. It will probably be one of the best accomplishments, one of the best things the Department of Recreation and Parks of the province of Alberta has ever done. It would take me hours to go through the projects that have been created in that city to create recreation for young people. There are a lot of people who put on their skates here last winter in a facility that was funded out of that program. It was a program where you had the people, the community, the volunteers, kind of matching their dollars against those old provincial dollars. They went a long way, and we built some terrific projects.

In the little area I used to represent as an alderman, you had Dover community, a very low-income area, lots of public housing, and a lot of social problems. Yet this area built a magnificent large community hall with a sports area attached to the building. On the lower level there, they have a small lounge where the community people can go for a little drink. They don't have to go down to the old big barns, the hotels, or this type of thing. Maybe it was Ronnie Ghitter's way of — in any event they did get some community bars or community pubs, because that's what they have at Dover. In the main hall you have your Girl Guides, Brownies, and Beavers — all these people meeting in their own building, saving them the cost of rent, the hassle of dealing with the school boards, and all the red tape of trying to get a school gym to meet in. They got their own building. It saves them bucks; it saves them dollars.

If you go to Penbrooke Meadows, again an area of 15,000 to 16,000 people, there is a lot of social housing, a lot of low-income people, yet we have a beautiful facility. In fact it's the exact copy — we used the same plans at the Dover hall. And I could go on through Southview community. It is just a small community of 7,000 to 8,000 people, yet they crank up more hockey teams, ball teams, and soccer teams. The lovely building they built there would not have been possible except for the MCR grant program. Forest Heights, Forest Lawn — I could go on for quite a few of these communities. I won't go into the whole thing.

In Victoria Park, one community that's being wiped out through redevelopment — the Stampede board ate up half of it and various things — with probably one of the smallest populations left in the way of any community in the city of Calgary, they jumped on board that MCR grant program and built one of the largest halls in the city of Calgary. Even with their declining population — there are very few children left — the lower level of this is occupied by the Victoria Park Pioneers, which has 893 members, and I tell you, the building is used probably more than any of the other community halls.

So as far as the communities, sports, and recreation in that city, they did benefit. But that was an MCR grant program and that was culture. Everybody has their own idea of culture. I've got my own idea. I've seen a little culture when I've gone out to the Croatian hall, German Canadian hall, Dutch Canadian

Club, Ukrainian hall, and Hungarian hall. Even as the Sikhs, newcomers to the country, built their temple, they added a recreational portion onto that building. Thanks to the province they got \$100,000, which was 50 percent of the cost of the recreational portion, and they have a beautiful hall.

If you ever go to northeast Calgary, you've got the Austrians and the Polish. You go down to Renfrew-Bridgeland and the old area there, where I guess a lot of the new Canadians used to go, and there's a beautiful Italian Canadian club hall. They have dances and recreational types of activities going there pretty well every night of the week. Then in south Calgary — the city of Calgary lucked out on it — the Jewish community built a big recreation centre. I think we gave them \$1.5 million out of the MCR grant program. The city got very clever on it and said: if you get all that money and you build that big hall, we hope you let everybody use it. It serves the south part of Calgary as a recreation centre not just for the Jewish community but for everybody in that southwest area.

So I want to congratulate the minister and his department on this program. I hope when '85 comes rolling through that they will come in with another program. But I hope that before then — in fact I'm sure they will — they're going to look favourably on a proposal that might crop up one of these days to give just a little bit of assistance to the Croatians, Germans, Dutch, Austrians, Polish, and Italians who are now in a little bit of financial difficulty. Because these halls aren't just for '84 or '85, 1990, 1991, '92, or '93. These structures will be here long after we're gone, and they'll help preserve all the wonderful cultures that we have had come in from other countries. If you go to Dallas, Texas, or Denver, or wherever, they blended in and they lost that little bit of tradition. They lost the native dances; they've lost a lot of these little cultural activities. But thank goodness long after we're gone, thanks to the wisdom of that grant program, you will still have a little touch of the Dutch, Croatians, Hungarians, Ukrainians, Sikhs, Austrians, Polish, Jewish, and Italians, and their customs and traditions. It makes our Canadian mosaic a little bit richer.

So, Mr. Minister, congratulations, and I'm sure hoping you look favourably on getting a little program going here maybe to try to help these groups that have a temporary difficulty only in '84. There was a little recession in Calgary. A lot of the ones who were going to donate large amounts of money to assist these groups, and some of them as high as \$100,000 — their own companies went bankrupt, so they couldn't do it. But there is no doubt in my mind that between them and us and the determination, these cultural halls are going to survive. They will be there many years from now carrying right on with a little bit of culture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. minister wish to respond now?

MR. TRYNCHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, let me say I really appreciate all the comments made by the hon. members. If I don't respond to all your queries and requests tonight, just keep right after me. My door is always open. If I can help, you know I will.

Mr. Chairman, a couple of comments with regard to urban parks. I am going to say to those members who made those fine speeches: save those speeches until next fall, because I don't have anything in our budget for urban parks. I appreciate hearing it; I know they are a tremendous asset to all Albertans. For those who have been talking about urban parks, keep that in mind and bring those views back to me this coming fall when we go before this House again with the heritage fund capital projects division.

Secondly, Kananaskis Country has been mentioned a number of times. Let me assure all members that that would be something I would like to see happen in this province. I don't think we can stop at, say, one Kananaskis Country; there has to be more. I guess as time and funds permit, we will be looking at that very seriously.

I might say to the Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray that I appreciate his comments. I know it is quite a way from Fort McMurray to Kananaskis Country, but if it's any consolation, it's just a little closer than Banff. So tell your people that if they are going to Banff, to stop at Kananaskis Country, and they will certainly be welcome and appreciated.

With regard to the equestrian trails at Red Deer, I am not aware of what the hon. member has been speaking about. I don't know who owns the land or whose jurisdiction it's under. So if the hon. member will get back to me, I will help the hon. member try to find out who's in charge of that area in the Red Deer area.

There is one thing that we should all really be very, very aware of, and that is the word "volunteers". Everybody has mentioned that tonight in one sense or another. To me, they are the greatest people in Alberta. If you could just say it in a short sentence: nobody will replace them. You can't replace a volunteer. As we go through our political lives, whatever jobs we do, whatever functions we perform, whatever projects we construct or help in, let's remember that the volunteer is probably our greatest asset in this province.

There was a question asked with regard to where we are with funding for athletes at the school level. It has been quite a concern of mine and always has been from my younger days when I went to school and we didn't have that much. Things have improved somewhat. But the funding to the Alberta Schools Athletic Association is something that the Alberta Sport Council will shortly address themselves to in some great detail. I have asked them to make sure that the funding for sports across the province moves as close as we can to the grass-roots level. I have always said that the Gordie Howes and the Gretzkys don't need much help; it's the ones who want to be there who should get it. So I have instructed the games council and the chairman to work very closely with all those people at the grass-roots level, to make sure that the funding for junior tier 2 hockey and all those things is provided in the best way we can from the lottery funds which we have at our disposal.

The next question asked was on government Olympic involvement: which department, if any, has jurisdiction, and how do we go about it? I might say we have a cabinet committee for the Olympics, which I chair, and there are a number of ministers on that. We are all involved as a cabinet committee: the Premier, the Department of Tourism and Small Business, my department, Transportation, Advanced Education, and so on — a number of them, and we work together. When we have our proposals put together, we bring them to full cabinet and, of course, the caucus for final decision. So there is no one person that would, I suppose, be head and shoulders above the rest. We are all working as a team to provide, we hope — and I am sure it will happen — the greatest Olympics ever held.

With regard to federal funding for the Saddledome, the federal government has now provided some funds. I believe the first cheque was some \$40 million. Their installment or their contribution was the first third of the Saddledome, which I believe to be somewhere around \$27.8 million. I believe that cheque has already gone to the Calgary Olympic committee, and I understand that the Calgary Olympic committee has already paid off their debt in total to that facility.

The Calgary Olympic committee membership is now being increased by private-sector memberships across the province.

I am so pleased that they have decided to take some people from the World Student Games personnel here in Edmonton and some from Calgary. I want to assure everybody that I am working as hard as I can through my secretariat, George de Rappard, in our response through them to pick up many volunteers, because without them it will never be a success. I think they are well aware of the kind of job the Western Canada Games people did in Calgary, which was just tremendous. I hope some of that rubs off onto the Olympic committee and that we move forward with the many volunteers and a successful 1988 winter games.

A question was asked with regard to the municipal recreation areas, which are what some people call miniparks: where are they, and what's it all about? We have 30-some recreation areas under development, as I mentioned. We will be approving 10 more this year. We have some 100-plus requests on file for additional recreation areas. We are trying to designate them across the province so they fill the void, if I can call it that, between provincial parks. In the course of time I would like to see that each rural constituency, no matter where it is, has a recreation area. I am working towards that end. I can't give the details of all the recreation areas this year, but we will be making that announcement in a short time frame, probably within the next couple of weeks.

The final figures by Recreation and Parks and what cost controls we have were asked for with regard to the Olympics. Mr. Chairman, I am confident that the cost controls we have in our department will work, as they have over a number of years in all the facilities that we've been involved in: the World Student Games, the Commonwealth Games, the Alberta Games, and the Western Canada Games. That again will prove to be right when we have the completion.

I will just go over them again so we know where they are. In the planning and design phase of the Canmore Nordic Centre, we are planning to have \$110,000 in our budget. The total cost of that in our estimated budget will be some \$15.5 million. The next one is the McMahon Stadium upgrading. That is our 50 percent contribution as a grant. The total cost of that is roughly \$8 million. Somebody asked why the athletes' village is under our department. The funds will flow from Recreation and Parks to the University of Calgary, and they will be our construction team. The funds for that are \$16 million plus.

I believe that's all we're involved in, the four projects that will be under Recreation and Parks. Some of those funds will be a straight grant to the university; others will be funds that will flow from our department to Public Works, Supply and Services, and some of the work will be done by Advanced Education. That's how the funds will flow from our department. Those are the four things this department is involved in, and I feel confident that the figures I've just mentioned will be the final figures when the project is completed.

The next question was with regard to media comments re deficits. I apologize if I suggested that someone in this House made comments that were derogatory to volunteers. That's not the case. But I look at an article here by the media on July 12, 1983, that suggested that the games were "sure to hit a high deficit", and [asked] who was going to pay. Long before the thing was settled, it was in the media that there were tremendous overruns. If they'd waited a short while later, they'd have found out that it was some \$1.4 million of surplus. Those are the kinds of things that have been brought to me by volunteers.

I've had two volunteers who worked on that committee say to me: how did we manage to have a deficit; where did we go wrong? They asked me right after they read that article, and of course now they know they didn't go wrong and it didn't happen. But that's the kind of thing that the people of Alberta

who volunteer shy away from. You work your heart out, and then somebody condemns you long before the time is right. I don't mind being condemned; I don't think anybody does, providing you have it coming, but not before the final figures are known. So that's the kind of thing that is probably upsetting to a lot of volunteers.

I would like to see us dispense with that type of printing. Maybe that's a message for the media: that in time we'll print the facts, and if you don't have the facts, please ask the people who have them. I'm sure they can co-operate with you.

Mr. Chairman, the question was raised by the Member for Little Bow with regard to the planning and design process study we did. I'd just like to mention that the contract for that was to Resources Management Consultants for \$118,560. The department provided the terms of reference.

The question was asked: why did we do it? I asked to have this done through the whole department. We wanted to be a leaner, trimmer department within government. We wanted to see if there was waste, and let the private sector have a look at it and provide us with some ways we could correct this. The proposal was not a bid. It was a bid for people across the province to give us their best idea of how we could make the department trimmer and leaner. It wasn't that if you do this, we'll pay X number of dollars. We asked the private sector to come to us with proposals on how they saw we could make things better. There wasn't anything to judge this by. When somebody brought a proposal to us that had more meat in it than the other proposal, naturally we took the one we thought was the best for the long-term benefit of Albertans. So that's why we took the figure of \$118,000. There will be no other proposals asked for in the future. This is the one that will do us for as long as I can see. We are satisfied with what we have.

I don't think we could make this proposal public, because it's how you present the proposal that makes you a winner. If we made this information available to everybody, everybody would know how to make a proposal. I think what we're asking is to let the private sector use their common sense, their ingenuity, on how to make a proposal that would better government. So that's why we will not make that public. The figures are there, and I think the proof of the pudding will be in the eating, when we have the results of a leaner, trimmer department.

Mr. Chairman, the Intercontinental baseball cup was brought up. The question was asked: are the federal funds available? I guess you might call it another one of those federal government procrastinations. We agreed some time ago that we would provide a certain amount of funds based on what the federal government would provide in hosting the Intercontinental Cup here in Edmonton. We've had it here once before, and it would be a pity if we lost a Canadian sports function in Edmonton because of the federal government. I understand that these people will be meeting with me tomorrow morning at 7:30 and that the federal government is not providing the funds. I can't answer what we're going to do. We've made a commitment based on matching the federal dollars. If they don't do that, I will look for some guidance from probably anybody that wants to help as to what we do. Hopefully, if the hon. member wants to ask me the question again in private or otherwise after tomorrow, I might be able to satisfy both his curiosity and my own.

The Banff centennial of 1885 and 1985 is something I'm not aware of. It has not come to my attention as the Minister of Recreation and Parks. I believe it has come to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. I believe it will be handled by the provincial government in the Tourism and Small Business portfolio.

A question was asked on the term of the Alberta Sport Council and funds available to them in terms of office and

subcommittees. I'm pleased to advise that the term of office will be five for two years, five members for three years, and five members for four years. Then they'll rotate on a three-year basis so we have a continuous rollover of members every three years. There are 16 members, and the government member, whoever that is, will stay on while the Sport Council is in effect.

According to my information, there will be a number of subcommittees that will work with the Sport Council. I'm pleased at that, because the subcommittees will have people who — we had over 100 applications to the Sport Council, 100 great Albertans. We couldn't take them all. So they'll be slotted into subcommittees, and I'm sure we'll make good use of them over the course of the years.

The next question asked was with regard to golf course returns to government: what is the contract? I believe I responded to the question once before in the House. I'm pleased to say it's a very good contract for the people of Alberta. It's the only contract where if they make money they pay Albertans, and if they lose money they pick up the loss themselves. So after a gross revenue of \$2 million, revenues start to flow back to the provincial government.

By what I read in regard to the number of golfers and the number of visitors to Kananaskis Country, which was over 14 million last year, in time we'll see returns to Albertans many-fold over and not just in terms of dollars. I don't think we should expect a return to Albertans in the term of dollars. I think we should expect a return to Albertans in the use of Kananaskis Country. It's there for Albertans, and again I encourage even those from Fort McMurray to come and see it.

The question was asked with regard to the number of golfers per year, and I guess I should go over that again. My understanding is that on March 1 they had 30,000 requests. Today they have some 50,000 requests. Sixty-six percent of the requests come from Calgary and area; 24 percent come from Edmonton; the remaining 10 percent come from various Alberta centres, such as Red Deer, Medicine Hat, Banff, Fort McMurray, and Grande Prairie. There are also some bookings from British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Quebec, and as far away as Texas.

When the golf course is operating with all 36 holes and the weather is satisfactory, they tell me we could expect something like 80,000 rounds of golf per year. That could be done in an average season of approximately 160 days, which is about the same season as they have in Banff and Jasper. They tell us we should have a few more because of our sunlight hours.

The question was asked in regard to what was happening at Mount Kidd on the recreation vehicle proposals. I'm pleased to say we've had some 378 responses to our request for private-sector operations of the RV centre in Kananaskis Country. I believe the tenders closed just the other day. It will provide some 227 campsites within Kananaskis Country. Thirty-five sites will have full service — water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups — in loop A. Twenty-seven sites will have full services — water, sewer, and electrical hook-ups — in loop B. In loop C, we'll have 61 sites. In loop D — anyway, in total there are 227 campsites. If someone wants a copy of this, I'll provide it to them so they can have that for their information.

The next question asked was in regard to the Fortress Junction service station which we just opened. I had a news release that on April 6, 1984, the MLA for Banff-Cochrane was there to do the honours on my behalf and the government's behalf. That service will provide a full range of service and products, including gasoline, propane, a fast-food outlet, a grocery store, basic hunting and fishing supplies, plus tire and minor repairs. Also available are towing and 24-hour emergency service, as

well as a trailer dump station. Business hours will be from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. seven days a week until May 15, and then from 8 a.m. to 9 p.m. seven days a week until September 15, 1984. It will be handled by a group of people out of Calgary and Cochrane, and it again shows you what the private sector will do when given a chance. [interjection] You can figure that one out; it's either Shell or Gulf. I don't have that here.

The next question that was asked: the jobs provided at Kananaskis Country while under construction and at present. Mr. Chairman, between the period of April 1, 1978, and March 31, 1984, planning and construction produced some 2,839 man-years of employment. This includes private-sector jobs and government jobs. The development of Kananaskis Country has resulted in 344 man-years of employment each year. The golf course will provide 68 of those jobs. So that's quite a few jobs for Albertans.

There was a question asked in regard to elk problems in Kananaskis Country. It's quite simple. The grass greens and the tee-off greens in Kananaskis Country are some of the finest in the world. They had a snow fence put around them to protect them not just from elk or wildlife but also from cross-country skiers and so forth. You can just imagine what elk in battle would do to those grass greens if they were on them. They tell me the grass greens came through the winter in lovely shape. They're lush green today and, as I said at the beginning, the golf course will be in operation very quickly. As a matter of fact, they talk about next week.

A question was asked in regard to provincial park fees and the unfair competition [with] the private sector. That's been a concern of mine for some time, Mr. Chairman. [interjection] If that's a question to me, yes, so it is right.

The present fees in Alberta are this: a basic camping permit is \$3; a semi-serviced location is \$4; a fully-serviced is \$5. In comparison to the rest of Canada, we're very, very low. I am now putting Albertans on notice that this fall I will be proposing to put in my budget, or whatever it takes to do it, these fees, effective April 1, 1985: the basic camping fees will be increased to \$5 per unit; the semi-serviced will be \$7; the fully-serviced will be \$9; and the group camping, which is based on 10 units and is now \$25, will be \$50.

These fees will still be below the fees in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, or B.C., and will still be below the Canadian average. They will range somewhat below the private sector. I think it's incumbent upon us not to try to force the private sector out of business but to work with them as best we can. We haven't increased the fees now for a number of years. I think it's time we do that, and I'm sure that as we provide the kind of parks people want, they will not object to these fees.

I might say, in answering that question, that the park fees at present provide about 5 percent of the total operational costs of provincial parks. Even with the increase as proposed, if that goes into effect, the fees will provide less than 10 percent — just about 9.3 percent of our total operational costs.

The question was asked on utilization of our provincial parks. I might say that they run at just about 100 percent across the province on weekends all year long. I can see that, because people are travelling within Alberta, and that's good. That's why I think it's incumbent upon us to move rather quickly, not with more provincial parks, which I don't think we really need, but with these municipal recreation areas where the local people have some initiative, some pride, and they get involved. We can provide 10 of those for \$1 million. That's a lot cheaper and, I think, more effective than trying to provide a provincial park, which costs anywhere from \$6 to \$8 million. So you see what you can do across the province. If you were to build one provincial park at \$8 million, you could provide 80 of these

with local people involvement, which is just tremendous, and such a benefit to local areas in regard to participation, jobs, and all that.

Mr. Chairman, the question was raised in regard to the ski hill at Cypress Hills. I might say to hon. members that I did have delivered to my office a petition with some 2,400-plus names; I've responded to it. We are looking seriously at the 1981 master plan for Cypress Hills, and we're trying to develop a program where the government and the private sector can become involved. Just this year, and last year, I was successful enough to have the private sector run it. I intend to stay with the private sector. I want to see how I can get the private sector involved to work with us and develop the ski hill to where it's satisfactory, whether it takes snowmaking equipment, which I think it does, and things like that. I want to do that in conjunction with the private sector. I don't want to see government say: you move out; we'll take over. We've done too much of that in the past, and we're going to turn it around and do it the other way. I'm very concerned about what's happening in Cypress Hills and other places, and I'll work with the private sector to make sure that happens.

The question was raised in regard to the MCR, present and future. The hon. Member for Little Bow is very, very correct in suggesting that a lot of the communities, now that they have their capital facilities, are asking for operational funds. I guess it's not something they can be faulted for. It's something probably unforeseen at that time, because who would have expected 10 years ago, when your natural gas and utility bills were quite low, that they would increase to what they are today. Nobody built into their budget that kind of price increase, so we're very concerned about what happens there.

The present MCR funding expires December 31, 1984. The deadline for applications is that date. I would suggest and urge that all members talk to their communities and make sure they've made their applications for all the funds that are available, be they cultural or recreational, and get those in so we can meet the April 1, 1985, deadline of the end of the program.

I appreciate the fact that the city of Calgary has had some difficulty. I guess what you can contribute that to is that when we allowed the cities to take all their dollars in any given year, they took their dollars early, but they were also experiencing a 4 percent growth. They thought, if we take all our dollars for the 10-year program two years before the program expires, we'll catch up with the 4 percent growth next year and the year after, and we won't be out anything. But that didn't happen. The population growth stopped, and they've spent their money two years ahead of time. That is a difficulty. It's something that is unfortunate. We probably have that more seriously in Calgary than in other centres. But it's there across the province, and we'll have to work our way out of it.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that that program provided over \$300 million to Albertans in the 10 years it has been in effect. That's a lot of dollars out there in capital projects. You only have to look around your communities to see the kinds of things that have been developed, by volunteers, by local groups, by local communities, and of course by municipal governments. I hope I'm able to convince my colleagues — and I urge you to support me if and when I bring this forward — that we can continue the program. I think it's one of the better programs this government has had in the last 10 years. It's been very positive to all parts of Alberta, rural areas especially. As the Member for Lloydminster mentioned, 10 years ago or 12 or 14, when he was elected, they didn't have any rural arenas, and now they have six. With those six, of course, come other problems. We are now probably facility rich and operations poor. I think those are some of the things we have to look at.

The question was asked in regard to how many dollars we had for 1988 Olympic Search. We have provided \$4 million to the Alberta Sport Council to provide this funding to Albertans — athletes from every corner, wherever they are, to compete in the 1988 Olympics. You know, frankly, we haven't done that well as a province. In the last Winter Olympics, I understand we had two Albertans participate. We haven't won medals for a number of years. I think that's got to change, and that's why we're providing \$4 million this year for the Sport Council to develop athletes throughout the province — the athletes we've never heard of, from centres where they can't come in and compete unless they have some financial assistance. That's what we intend to provide, to make sure that when the Olympics are held in '88 — and if not then, that we will have a great contingent of Albertans in the following years. We want to continue, and that's what it's all about.

Mr. Chairman, I believe I've touched on pretty well all the questions that were asked of me. If there's anything I haven't answered, if members would like to catch me sometime, my office door is open. If I haven't answered the questions here, they might want to ask me some further questions.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I was late coming in, so I didn't want to get in before in case some of the questions were redundant. I would point out to the hon. minister that I was out dealing with volunteers in the riding, and I noticed that they balanced their budget and made \$800. So I can confirm that the volunteers in Edmonton Norwood are doing very well.

I have a couple of specific questions, and then I want to get into two areas. But I assure the members it will not take long. Just going through some of the more flamboyant increases — I'm sure there's a logical reason — I would ask the minister in Vote 3.3.3, multiparks upgrading, what is this . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the hon. member could bring that question up when we come to that particular vote.

MR. MARTIN: We haven't done that before, Mr. Chairman. You mean I have to do that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the general procedure.

MR. MARTIN: Let me talk about Mount Allan. I thought we had asked specific questions before, and I had other people going through specific questions, but that's fine.

There are just a couple of areas. I notice that the minister has talked about Mount Allan somewhat. But I'd like to go into that a little more. I know the announcement was made recently that it looks like — I know it hasn't been confirmed, but, if I recall, the Minister of Tourism and Small Business said in question period that a decision would be made this month — the government is having some difficulty getting the private sector involved in the Mount Allan project. The specific questions I have flowing from that — I guess the main one would be why. This is a case where the private sector — I don't think we should be putting government money in, because we'll be picking up a lot of operating costs later. But there have to be some solid reasons other than what was issued about the general economy. If it was a good deal for the private sector, I'm sure they would be in. So I'd ask the minister that general question.

Then I'd ask him to refer back and see if they've looked back at all — even though at the time, they turned down the Stoney people, who said that they had a proposal, that they wanted to develop Mount Allan, the Ribbon Creek alpine village complex. At the time, Mr. Chairman, we were told they



were too late. But obviously the government seems to be still searching for a private developer at this point. I wondered if they have gone back and looked at the Stoney proposal again and where that particularly sits. One of the reasons advanced to us — and I ask the minister to confirm if this is true or not — is that they weren't allowed in because private hotel developers won't build without Mount Allan. I'll just ask the minister that.

The other question I have in terms of Mount Allan: is the Mount Allan funding in this budget solely for the master plan? I believe it's \$44,000 in here. The other question I have dealing with Mount Allan, because we're still not satisfied with some of the answers: have any contingency planning meetings been held with federal officials regarding Lake Louise in the event that FIS approval for Mount Allan is not obtained? I know we've had assurances in this House that it will be obtained. But when you talk to various people, especially many skiers — I know the minister is well aware of this — there seems to be a fair amount of doubt about the Mount Allan proposal. I'm asking specifically: is there a contingency plan where it could be shifted into the Lake Louise area? I gather many people are still asking the question, and we're still not satisfied. I suppose it'll be raised time and time and time again.

Why did we chose a mountain which we're told — no matter what he says; we can't see the snow because of the trees — has an inadequate vertical slope and no reliable natural snow? The minister has alluded to the fact that we may need the extra cost of snow building machines in here. Mr. Chairman, I think it takes some talent to find a mountain in Alberta where we have to build snow building machines. We have a season broken by strong, frequent chinooks; unknown damage to the watersheds, which will be needed for snow making; and unknown impact on the bighorn sheep and elk. We are told by many people — I know the minister has had this, and I think many people want to know — why not the Sparrowhawk, when most of the people in the ski federation are saying that would be much more ideal? The minister is well aware that that criticism is still coming from experts. I think the people of Alberta want some clear answers on this. They're still asking the questions, whether the minister likes them asking or not. It's going to be an ongoing issue. Until the government can cover up these concerns, and not just with the platitudes we've been given, it's still going to be a sore point with many people.

We all want a successful Olympics. We all do, as well as the minister. But these things will be nagging there unless we can come to some conclusion. The other part — I would just like to go back. I believe it was on March 27, when my colleague asked a question about the report of the Special Committee for the Review of Wildlife and Environmental Matters re Mount Allan. If my memory is correct, there was no assurance from the minister that this would be made public. These are precisely the types of things that make people nervous, Mr. Chairman, because we don't seem to be getting all the answers. I hope maybe the minister can confirm tonight that that will be made public and tabled in the Assembly, that they've had second thoughts about it. So those general questions about Mount Allan — I know the minister would rather not get into the Mount Allan thing; I'm sure he feels that it's been aired enough. But I'm sure the minister is also well aware that there's a fair amount of discussion outside, and as long as that discussion is outside, as I said, it's going to act as a hindrance to getting on with the Olympics.

There's not much we can do about the other area, Kananaskis Country. The minister will forgive us on this side if we're not quite as — it's a beautiful park, no doubt; it's a beautiful golf course, no doubt. I think the point we're always trying to make

is the priorities when we're talking about restraint to Albertans, when we're talking about all sorts of things like user fees and 15.1 percent unemployment. That's why people are annoyed about it. Nobody is denying that it's a very beautiful golf course. It's just how much went into it and the overruns and all the rest of it we did.

I have two specifics dealing with Kananaskis Country. It's not in the budget, but I'm told that now, in a time of restraint, we have \$195 a month for a toll-free reservation line to the golf course. I'd just like to confirm with the minister that that's true. Again people could argue and say that's not a lot of money. But what we're talking about is restraint, because that's what we hear from the government all the time. If that's the case — if it's not the case, I would like the minister to confirm it — I would suggest that that's a very unnecessary expenditure in time of recession.

The other area is a specific question in the Kananaskis area; I'll wait. Going by your previous ruling, Mr. Chairman, I'll come to it when we come to those points.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately the member was late and maybe he wasn't listening. Let me start with the toll-free calls. He's got to remember that golf course is leased out to the private sector. They're the ones who provide the phone calls, not the government.

MR. MARTIN: But we're paying for it.

MR. TRYNCHY: No, we're not paying for it. The private sector is running a golf course, and they provide a return to the government after a certain amount of dollars.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell him what the private sector is.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, it's the only contract I know of where if the private sector loses money, they pick up the tab. If they make money, they pay it back to Albertans.

Kananaskis overruns — I don't know where the hon. member gets his information. I stood in my place here on November 6, 1981, for an hour and a half or two hours and made a report on Kananaskis. He might want to check *Hansard*. There are no overruns. I think I was in Public Accounts, and I was challenged by that and I challenged the questioner. There are no overruns.

MR. MARTIN: It's just expensive.

MR. TRYNCHY: No, sir. Maybe after he reads *Hansard* he might want to come back and ask me that question. There are no overruns in Kananaskis Country. If there are, I want to know where they are myself.

MR. MARTIN: Overestimates.

MR. TRYNCHY: The next question was about the committee that was set up. That question was answered by the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. There is no reporting of that committee. That isn't in the terms of reference. That committee was to make sure that every Albertan, whoever he or she was, could convey their concerns, suggestions, or alternatives to them. We made that committee work; they made it work. They reported back to the Olympic Secretariat, who then reported back to the Olympic Organizing Committee in Calgary. That system has worked very well. There's no report to report. There's nothing there. The conversations from the people who talked to this committee were conveyed to our secretariat, who

conveyed it to the Olympic committee of Calgary, and that's how the function worked.

MR. MARTIN: No minutes?

MR. TRYNCHY: No, I wouldn't think there were any minutes. There are no minutes for me. I have no report and will not have a report.

The next thing was why we chose Mount Allan. We didn't choose Mount Allan. The Olympic committee chose Mount Allan, supported by the provincial government after having it approved by the FIS, which is the federation of international skiing, the International Olympic Committee, the Canadian Olympic committee, the Canadian Ski Association, and the Calgary Olympic committee. Then the government put their approval to it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell them again, Peter.

MR. TRYNCHY: That is a fact that's been said over and over again. I'll say it again, because you can't go wrong telling the truth. That's what I've learned.

Have we talked to the federal government in regard to Lake Louise? Yes, at some time we had discussed that. There's no need for it. The Olympic committee in Calgary suggested once that all events would be held on Lake Louise. The Minister of Tourism and Small Business will be presenting, I hope — I shouldn't say I hope; I know he will — the full master plan, the report on Mount Allan to this House when his estimates are here. So the question should go to him.

The Stoneys were never too late. The Stoneys have never presented a proposal, according to my information from the minister of tourism. He's still waiting for it. If they bring a proposal forward, he will certainly accept it and look at it. I wish the Stoneys would do it, because that's not the case as far as I know. They've never presented a proposal to the minister of tourism. The private sector is still involved. The question asked yesterday of the Minister of Tourism and Small Business was that he is still meeting. We don't know where that's at; we'll have to ask him. But hopefully, if we're not successful with the private sector, we've always said as a government that we would develop a recreation ski site, which is Mount Allan, and then turn it over to the private sector, just as we've done with the golf course at Kananaskis Country and a number of places across the province, and as we're doing and going to do in the future with the recreation vehicle campground in Kananaskis Country and all those things.

The hon. member mentioned that nobody would build Mount Allan unless the alpine village was there. Those two are not tied together in any sense I'm aware of. I understand the alpine village will be going ahead regardless of whether Mount Allan is going ahead. Mount Allan would go ahead regardless of the alpine village. So that's my understanding on those issues, Mr. Chairman.

When the estimates come forward from the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, who is responsible for Mount Allan, I would really encourage the hon. member—I'm trying to fill in the spaces for you as best I can — to ask all those questions again and hopefully get the same answers.

MR. MARTIN: We'll check it out, Peter. If not, you're in trouble.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to the earlier matter I raised with regard to the study. The minister made the comment that the other proposals would not neces-

sarily be presented in the Legislature. I was wondering if the minister could indicate whether that was his own decision as minister, that the other proposals made with regard to this study not be presented or made public. I'd like to know the reasons in a little more detail as to why that position was taken.

I don't think any of the persons who would submit a proposal, such as Resources Management Consultants, really have any right to say that if they submit a proposal it can't be made public, because they are making a proposal for a publicly funded venture. I'm sure other people who made proposals would like to be able to compare their proposal to the one that was successful, to know why they were not accepted. I think that's only fair to them. I think it would remove any kind of doubt in terms of the minister's operations or decisions that someone wasn't selected because of who they were or what they could do. To clear the air, I'm saying to the minister it would be nice to have those other proposals tabled in the Legislature so we could look at them and compare one with the other. We could examine in this House whether the \$118,000 payment we're going to make is legitimate or not. I think that's a lot of money to just rearrange one segment of a minister's department. That's the first part of it.

Secondly, I believe the minister indicated in his remarks that there were no other studies. But I note on page 4, and I quoted it already, that another study, being undertaken by another consultant, is referred to. I'd be interested in what that study is and the cost of it. I don't think the minister answered that question earlier in his response.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, on the four, I did say there were no other studies contemplated. I believe that's correct. I will check that, because I found out from my department they were not asking for any further studies.

Getting back to this — and I think the hon. member has the letter of April 30 I wrote to him — he's free to go to the people who made the proposal and ask for their proposal if they want to give it up. It's not a matter of legality; it's a matter of ethics. That's what I'm working on. The proposal was not a bid on something. It was to give me ideas on how best we can do things. If you're bidding against your friend to your left, and you're both putting in a proposal, I don't think you'd want your proposal to be made public, because you're going to be bidding someplace else. It's a matter of ethics, not legality, that we should put this out, and I stand on that. I think legally we can probably make it available, but I don't think we should. I respect the wishes of the people that do these things. They provide this service to government knowing it's going to be kept that way. If they provide a better service, they know they'll get it, and if they don't, they won't. I don't know what else I can say, but that's the way the system works. I would hate the hon. member to make a proposal that was so much better than somebody else's and have a technique that was so much superior to somebody else's, and have us make this public so somebody else could pick up on his good talents. I don't think he'd want to see that happen.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The minister is saying that maybe the details shouldn't be there. Let's compare it to a contractor who makes a submission to the Department of Transportation. Normally the details of the submission are not made public, and I think that is the case to each one of the respective contractors. Even in this case, I would think that if I had as information before me five different submissions, the names of those five persons, and the amount of money they were requesting to do the job — maybe one was \$80,000; one was \$90,000; another was some other figure;

there was one at \$118,000; there might have been one at \$150,000 — it would be of interest just to have that kind of comparative statistic. If the minister would be prepared to give that, that's a good start on the matter. The inquiry that was made to me was that that kind of information wasn't available either. If the minister can commit that, that's a good start.

As I understand it, the minister is prepared to place the completed studies before the Legislature so we can examine whether the work has been done in accordance with the terms of reference. Then I guess we can judge whether the \$118,000 was well spent or not. If the minister is willing to go that far, maybe we've made some progress.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I'd gladly do that if the hon. member would have asked for that. There's no problem in giving the people who submitted proposals and the figures for it. But I wasn't prepared to outline the details of the proposal because of ethics.

Agreed to:

1.0.1 — Minister's Office	\$ 223,875
1.0.2 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$ 253,337
1.0.3 — Administrative Support	\$ 417,441
1.0.4 — Financial Administration	\$ 974,193
1.0.5 — Personnel Services	\$ 615,785
1.0.6 — Systems [Development]	\$ 774,518
1.0.7 — Public Communications	\$ 216,550
1.0.8 — Planning Secretariat	\$ 225,059
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$ 3,700,758

2.1 — Program Support	\$ 904,841
2.2 — Financial Assistance	\$41,609,481
2.3 — Community Recreation Development	\$ 1,109,451
2.4 — Recreation Program Development	\$ 2,525,439
2.5 — Regional Recreation Consultation	\$ 2,022,884
Total Vote 2 — Recreation Development	\$48,172,096

3.1 — Operations and Maintenance	\$23,191,982
3.2 — Design and Implementation	\$ 6,157,473

### 3.3 — Parks — Reconstruction

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member asked a question on 3.3. To members of the House, what has happened here is that last year we had \$1.2 million of work done by Alberta Public Works, Supply and Services. That has now been transferred to our department, and \$1.9 million was budgeted for new park development, which has now been moved into reconstruction. What we're doing with those funds of \$6,509,000 is repairing what we have in place — sort of keeping the tires on the car and upgrading our existing parks, not new construction. That's why it has increased and rightfully so.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a comment to the minister with regard to — I guess we call them miniparks — the one at Milo in my constituency. There are many constituents there who are very appreciative of the development that's taking place. I've had the opportunity of looking at it twice in the last three months and reviewing what's been going on. It's a good development. There will be many people from outside the constituency, out of Calgary, who will utilize the area, and I'd certainly encourage the minister to proceed with that development with full support. It has been well done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did the Member for Edmonton Norwood wish to comment?

MR. MARTIN: No.

Agreed to:

3.3 — Parks — Reconstruction	\$ 6,509,000
3.4 — Parks — Construction and Redevelopment	\$ 1,661,000
Total Vote 3 — Provincial Parks	\$ 37,519,455

4.1 — Capital Development Co-ordination	\$ 831,123
4.2 — Alpine Venue	\$ 44,000
4.3 — Nordic Venues	\$ 110,000
4.4 — University of Calgary Venues	\$ 7,889,700
4.5 — Operations	\$ 207,000
Total Vote 4 — Support to the XV Olympic Winter Games — 1988	\$ 9,081,823

5.1 — Program Support	\$ 1,062,176
5.2 — Recreation Services	\$ 4,181,354
5.3 — Facility Development and Maintenance	\$ 4,938,356
Total Vote 5 — Kananaskis Country Management	\$ 10,181,886

Department Total \$108,656,018

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I move that the votes 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. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolution, reports as follows, and requests leave to sit again:

Resolved that sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, for the Department of Recreation and Parks: \$3,700,758 for departmental support services, \$48,172,096 for recreation development, \$37,519,455 for provincial parks, \$9,081,823 for support to the XV Olympic Winter Games in 1988, \$10,181,886 for Kananaskis Country management.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow afternoon the Assembly will be in Committee of Supply. The designated department is Hospitals and Medical Care. It is intended that the Assembly sit Thursday night, and at that time we would be in Committee of Supply and call the Department of Manpower. If there is time and another department should be called. I'll try to indicate to hon. members tomorrow what that other department for Thursday night would be.

[At 10:35 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday/ at 2:30 p.m.]

