

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Thursday, June 4, 1987 8:00 p.m.**

Date: 87/06/04

[The House resumed at 8 p.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**

**(Third Reading)**

**Bill 33**

**Alberta Cultural Heritage  
Amendment Act, 1987**

[Debate adjourned June 3: Mrs. Hewes speaking on amendment to motion for third reading]

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Call for the question, hon. members. All righty, Calgary Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you. Mr. Speaker. If memory serves me correctly, when we were last speaking, the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar was speaking to the amendment which had been introduced by members of the Liberal caucus. I take it that ... [interjection] Pardon me?

MR. SPEAKER: It can't be introduced by a caucus, simply by a member.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Members -- at least they were the ones who spoke to it, Mr. Speaker. I find that all rather interesting. I take it from comments that were made by hon. members that they have serious concerns and reservations about Bill 33. Well, that I find very interesting. I'm glad to hear they're finally on board. I don't know where they were when the Member for Edmonton Highlands was in this Legislature during Committee of the Whole making amendments to this Bill which would improve its functioning.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, what we're looking at here is a council or commission established by this Act which I think needs to be rethought. To the extent that this amendment on the floor provides for the opportunity to give sober second thought to the direction that this minister is taking us with this particular Bill, I agree with it.

We have, Mr. Speaker, raised these very concerns at each stage at which this Bill has gone through this Legislature, made constructive suggestions for improvement, and in fact ourselves brought forward amendments which would have had the effect of substantially improving Bill 33. Those were rejected by the government, and it's unfortunate that they were, because they would have very much allowed for persons who have knowledge and background in this area being made members of the commission. It would attempt to try and remove the political patronage possibilities that this commission will now present to the minister and the government if it's adopted.

It's such an important area of our life together in this province that it really does require a genuine commitment to a concept of multiculturalism and not with the opportunities presented by this particular Bill to allow for the minister to, quite frankly,

pick and choose particularly close associates or friends who may not in fact represent fully the needs of the multicultural community in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to add my words of support to the amendment, although as far as I can tell, it's quite late. It seems to me that there were plenty of opportunities at second reading, at Committee of the Whole, to support both the amendments made by others in the Legislature to improve this Bill, and it seems to me to be a place at which a lot of these concerns could have been brought to the attention of the House. But now I guess at the last minute somebody has brought to the attention of the hon. members the importance of this Bill and realizing, almost before it's too late, that it was about to be adopted, they felt that they ought to intervene to say a few things about it. Well, it's better late than never, but just barely did the member get onto the floor the kind of amendments that start to make sense in improving this Bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those comments, I'd like to offer, as my contribution to debate, support of this particular amendment at third reading.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order in the House please. Call for the question. There's no summation on the amendment. Hon. minister, closing debate.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, this is on the amendment. I would think I wouldn't have an opportunity to close debate. I would be glad to do that on the Bill, however.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is getting confused by the Bill. This is a question on the amendment. The question has been called.

All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion fails.

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

|         |             |        |
|---------|-------------|--------|
| Barrett | Hawkesworth | Wright |
| Chumir  | McEachern   | Younie |
| Fox     | Mjolsness   |        |

Against the motion:

|          |           |            |
|----------|-----------|------------|
| Adair    | Fischer   | Reid       |
| Ady      | Heron     | Schumacher |
| Alger    | Hyland    | Shaben     |
| Anderson | Koper     | Shrake     |
| Bradley  | McCoy     | Stevens    |
| Cassin   | Mirosh    | Stewart    |
| Clegg    | Musgreave | Strong     |

|          |          |           |
|----------|----------|-----------|
| Crawford | Musgrove | Trynchy   |
| Dinning  | Nelson   | Weiss     |
| Drobot   | Orman    | West      |
| Elliott  | Pashak   | Zarusky   |
| Elzinga  | Payne    |           |
| Totals   | Ayes - 8 | Noes - 35 |

[Motion on amendment lost]

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Highlands speaking to the main.

MS BARRETT: Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the main motion, which calls for support for Bill 33, the Bill that politically gerrymanders the structure of the decision-making body which is charged with the dissemination of funds provided to it under statute by way of lottery funds for the purpose of supporting multicultural activities and development in the province.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is the gerrymandering component, you see. The minister knows that I never supported not having an elected body in the first place to help decide this or, in my usual compromising, co-operative posture on issues like this, at least a partially elected committee. So I find that it is more than just a little bit distasteful that what we have now is not just the shell game of, let's say, trading one 14-member group for another 14-member group, but we have the throwing out of the entire 14-member decision-making body and bringing in no more than five members, all appointed. Now, I know that members in the Assembly probably think I'm going to filibuster this Bill, but I'm not.

MR. FOX: Somebody might as well.

MR. PAYNE: Bless you.

MS BARRETT: The Member for Calgary Fish Creek observes: bless me. Well, that's true, but you see I think the reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is because I know that having introduced amendments myself, which I really believed to be good, compromising amendments, amendments that didn't call for a complete halt to the process or amendments that didn't call for, say, re-establishing a 14-member committee, but amendments which called for just specifics to do with the nomination process itself and insisting that no other M.L.A. be allowed to be a commissioner and that no senior staff member be allowed to be a commissioner. Those reasonable amendments, Mr. Speaker, were defeated, and I know that if something as reasonable as the amendment that I sponsored on Monday night is defeated, then this Bill is going to be passed by, to use the Premier's phrase, "the tyranny of the majority." But I can't let it pass without explaining the reasons I object to the Bill as it is.

I do not object to a commission. I'm not sure there is much difference between a commission and a foundation, except a commission possibly could potentially do a lot more work if it's struck with a mandate that tells them to do a lot more work. The minister is well aware of the area that I would like to see that work done in. I would like to see those commissioners charged with the responsibility of co-ordinating a provincewide campaign that is systematic and enduring and one which is targeted at making sure that understanding and mutual respect between ethnocultural communities, between individuals, and between

individuals of other ethnocultural communities becomes a reality, an uncontested reality, in Alberta. I think that's a laudable goal, Mr. Speaker. That's the sort of thing that commission should be charged with as its primary objective.

I speculate that just about anybody can give away money. I speculate that's one of the easiest tilings in the world today. However, what I know is not as easy to do, unless one takes a concerted, orchestrated, and comprehensive approach, is to nip racism in the bud in this province. Alberta has suffered, I think, across Canada and possibly, for all I know, in the United States because of a few individuals in this province who have made statements that I think blacken the image of all Albertans. I don't think any amount of occasions of the Premier standing up and saying, "It doesn't exist," is going to fix the problem.

I think the way we fix the problem is we get those commissioners to work with the minister's department and the Education department and, for all I know, the Career Development and Employment minister's department, with the Attorney General's department, with a whole a range of government departments to enact a program which isn't going to go away after one year, a program that consists of more than just posters or a few adverts taken out on TV or radio or in the newspapers. I also think the minister should take this opportunity, now that the tyranny of the majority is going to push this Bill through, to review the contents of the discussion from myself and my colleagues in the Official Opposition benches on Monday night, when we sponsored the amendments that I proposed.

He should consider how he could, whether by regulation or by ministerial decision, implement the best part of those recommendations, Mr. Speaker. Make sure that he's not going to appoint just political buddies to this commission, because he's going to get his way; he's going to get his commission. I don't want him to, but it's going to happen. But don't appoint just your political buddies. Appoint people on the basis of their background, their expertise, their knowledge, and their ability to represent regions in Alberta and not just Edmonton. Do yourself a favour, as a matter of fact, as a government, and don't appoint the senior staff member of the department. That would be a great step forward. That step, Mr. Speaker, would convince Albertans who are going to be directly affected by the contents of this Bill, once enacted, that there isn't just pure political motivation in this Bill, that the attempt is simply not to put a gag order on a decision-making process.

The minister should take the time then to do a proper consultation. He should certainly go out and tell people that he's willing to change this Bill or any of the regulations which might arise herefrom if the affected quarters believe those changes are necessary. Not if the minister believes that they're necessary, but if the affected quarters think they are necessary.

Because perception is so important in this whole field that we all play on, I think that we do all politicians a disservice if we bully through a Bill and don't pay attention to the concerns of the people, whether they're affected in reality or only in perception and then tell them that their perception doesn't count. Perception counts, Mr. Speaker. Perception is what multiculturalism is all about. The minister would be well advised to make amends to the people that he has -- I'm certain inadvertently -- offended by not having engaged in broader consultation prior to introducing or moving second reading of this Bill.

I understand the political process is such that you introduce a Bill very often just to float an idea, and it dies on the Order Paper. And that is not a bad way to float an idea. I could think of instances in which it's caused some considerable controversy

in this province, Mr. Speaker, but it's a workable mechanism. The minister didn't stop at first reading, though. He pursued it for second reading, committee reading, and now third reading. And I think the government has to make amends to the people who believe that they are being shut out of a very important process. As it happens, I also believe they are being shut out of a very important process. But I'll never sell that to the minister or this government. So let me try to sell the idea that public perception is worth fixing. If the minister doesn't think it's worth fixing for his own political future, then he ought to think about the political futures of all of his colleagues in the Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yeah.

MS BARRETT: That's right. The more we do to close the decision-making process off from public input, the greater the cynicism we promote within the population at large. And God knows, you don't want anymore Tories to stay home in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, if for no other reason, if not for the best of reasons -- to go out and make amends and to make sure that regional balance, gender balance, and expertise, background, and knowledge become the criteria for appointments to his new commission -- then do it for the worst reasons; do it for the purely political reasons, Mr. Speaker. But do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I read in the papers today that certain members of the Liberal Party were going to filibuster. I thought I knew what that meant, and so I was looking forward to the debate this evening. Having been reminded sitting here tonight of an experience that I've had driving through southern Saskatchewan, where you go through a small town and if you blink you miss it, I couldn't help but observe tonight, Mr. Speaker, that certain members of the Liberal Party must have taken a trip, and perhaps they are in "Filibuster," Saskatchewan, tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister, summation Bill 33, third reading.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I don't plan to speak for long. At the end of third reading we've definitely had lengthy and considerable debate in all stages of this Bill.

I would like to say to hon. members that I believe personally that in passage of this Bill we will be setting a direction that will be envied in Canada, that I believe will be followed in Canada in various parts in the future. And I believe that the Alberta multicultural commission will prove to be a body that effectively represents and deals with the cultural heritage of our province.

Just in terms of a couple of the comments that have been made, Mr. Speaker, I've stated publicly, but perhaps I should do so again in this Assembly if I have not before, what I assume or what I will suggest to be the composition of this commission in its initial stages once it's formulated. To remind members of that time frame, it will probably take between now and the fall, with consultation and through an implementation committee, to put together the cultural heritage division of the department and the foundation. Then we would appoint a commission probably for a short period of time, a year or so, to make sure it's working properly.

I would see only three people initially there: the chairman, who would be a member of this Assembly, an elected person; the chairman of the cultural heritage advisory council -- the cultural heritage advisory council, by the way, is a body which elects its chairman, so the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands' desire for an elected member on that council is thereby fulfilled in two ways, by both an elected member of this Assembly and by a member elected ultimately by all of the ethnocultural organizations in the province -- and the third person I would see initially, should cabinet agree and should he agree to take the post, would be the current chairman of the Cultural Heritage Foundation. So we indeed tie all those elements together in its initial stages.

Mr. Speaker, I just would like to say that I was somewhat surprised in third reading to find opposition to the Bill and in committee. In second reading, which was only a short six or seven days ago, members unanimously supported the Bill. I can only assume they hadn't read it and found points that they disagreed with following that. The Member for Edmonton Highlands said when that debate took place, "Oh, all right. . . there's nothing offensive about what the minister is doing here." The Liberal members, though, the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark in particular, talked about how excellent the Bill was and what kind of support, and indeed the Member for Calgary Buffalo, although a little more cautious, did support the Bill in second reading. There was no dissenting vote that I'm aware of unless the member left during that particular period of time.

Members of the opposition all voted for it, and I hope they'll find it in their hearts, when they rethink that excellent thought they had in second reading debate, to do that again. I must congratulate the Member for St. Albert and the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn in consistency, in standing with us on the amendment, and I assume that they will do likewise on the Bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Culture has moved for third reading of Bill 33, Alberta Cultural Heritage Amendment Act, 1987. All members wishing to give assent to third reading, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion carries.

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

|          |         |            |
|----------|---------|------------|
| Adair    | Fischer | Payne      |
| Ady      | Heron   | Reid       |
| Anderson | Hyland  | Schumacher |
| Bradley  | Koper   | Shaben     |
| Cassin   | McCoy   | Shrake     |
| Clegg    | Mirosh  | Stewart    |

|                     |           |             |
|---------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Crawford            | Musgreave | Trynchy     |
| Dinning             | Musgrove  | Weiss       |
| Elliott             | Nelson    | Zarusky     |
| Elzinga             | Orman     |             |
| Against the motion: |           |             |
| Barrett             | McEachern | Speaker, R. |
| Chumir              | Mjolsness | Strong      |
| Ewasiuk             | Pashak    | Wright      |
| Fox                 | Roberts   | Younie      |
| Hawkesworth         |           |             |
| Totals              | Ayes - 29 | Noes - 13   |

[Bill 33 read a third time]

### Bill 7

#### Alberta Agricultural Research Institute Act

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move third reading of Bill 7, the Alberta Agricultural Research Institute Act.

Since I've had the opportunity on a number of occasions to speak in depth on this Bill, I will simply move the introduction of it and listen to whatever comments are to be said.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Like the hon. minister I recognize that I've made a number of comments on this Bill, especially in committee stage, and indeed tried to amend the Bill in one area that I thought was crucial.

There's not a lot that could be said that I haven't already said, but I would just like to point out a couple of things. At this stage we in the New Democratic Party are in favour of this Bill and the intent of the Bill, and that is that we replace the Agricultural Research Trust with a new agricultural research institute that has the ability to accept funds from sources other than government. We appreciate the intention of that, and we support it. I think it's important to recognize that the need for agricultural research is growing more and more apparent all the time, and if there are benevolent and well-heeled citizens or publicly minded corporations that are willing to contribute money towards agricultural research, I think we should have some way that we can accept that and do some good things with it.

I raised a number of concerns, however, about how that increasing acceptance or reliance on the private sector for donations towards agricultural research must not at any stage either go hand in hand with the reduction of public-sector commitment or even be perceived as a reduction in public-sector commitment to agricultural research, because indeed the benefits of agricultural research accrue to everyone in Canada. It's vitally important, I think, that we maintain and enhance the government's commitment monetarily to agricultural research.

Now, I know that the minister has the very best of intentions in setting up this Bill, but there are some potential pitfalls in the wording of it, and unfortunately in committee stage we weren't able to resolve those, and I think that is a shame. I'd just like to go through a couple of the things that I feel a little awkward about. In the first part of the Act there is a definition of minister, and it refers in quite a standard way to "the member of the Executive Council charged by the Lieutenant Governor in Council with administration of the Act." That's a fairly standard

clause in Bills, but it leaves open at some point in the future for this Bill and the administration of the agricultural research institute to be under a minister other than the Minister of Agriculture. That possibility exists.

We go further in the Bill. There's a clause there in terms of powers. Well, the institute has the power to "solicit and receive donations." Again, that's on the face of it not such an unhealthy thing, but here we've got a thing called the agricultural research institute, that may not always be under the purview of the Minister of Agriculture, going out and soliciting donations from the private sector.

Then a little further we look at the makeup of the board, and we guarantee that out of the 17 people that are appointed to the board, at least nine of them, a majority of the board, are people "who are farmers or representatives of industries related to agriculture." And that's the area with which I had the greatest concern, Mr. Speaker, because I think it's important that we guarantee that there are farmers on that board, not that there are nine of them who are either farmers or representatives of industries related to agriculture. Taking that to the most remote possibility, they could all be directors of some agribusiness corporation that have interests in agriculture that are quite different from the bona fide producers and farmers and indeed quite different from the people of Alberta. That's a potential problem.

I'm sure the minister will be very careful in his selection and likely pick nine people who have a wealth of experience and background and things to offer. I have no doubt of the minister's intentions or integrity on this Bill, but I do feel that we need to be very vigilant in the wording of these sorts of things to avoid problems in the future. Because as I pointed out, we may have an institute in the future that isn't under the purview of the Minister of Agriculture, that is out soliciting donations and may have a majority of the members on the board people who have agribusiness interests and not bona fide producers who are interested in the well-being of farmers and the communities that they support.

A little further on there are provisions in terms of the discoveries and donations that are involved here, and it stipulates that

any donation acquired by the Institute is subject to any terms and conditions stipulated by the person making the donation.

In other words, the person who gives the money to the foundation can make some terms and requirements about how that money ought to be used. Well, that in itself is quite reasonable too, but when you put that together with the clause above in terms of discoveries, that implies that the person calling the shots, the person making the donation, may have the ability to determine what's done with the results of the research.

When I put all of these things together, Mr. Speaker, I see some real potential problems in this Bill. There is a likelihood that we could have a situation here in Alberta that is not unlike situations in the United States or elsewhere in Canada where companies with a lot of money could hold it out as a lure to the research institute, be willing to donate the money as long as they got someone appointed to the board, as long as they and only they were given the results of the research that was done, and if they and they only could determine what in fact is done with the money. So when I add all these things together, I do think we've failed in terms of creating a Bill that avoids not only the pitfalls of sliding more into a reliance on private-sector research but also the perception. We need to be able to convince producers that the government is indeed more and more committed to

doing meaningful long-term research that benefits them as producers, enhances their ability to survive and remain as productive members of our society.

With those concerns expressed, I say again that we'll support the Bill. We tried to amend it unsuccessfully. But overall I think it's a movement in the right direction. I just fear it might be a little bit too far to the right direction.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Call for the question. Minister of Agriculture, to sum up.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, let me indicate to the House my deep appreciation for a speedy passage of this legislation. As the hon. Member for Vegreville just indicated, it is a very important piece of legislation to the agricultural community. We are hopeful that it can prove to be a very valuable service in developing further research and development which so hinges on the profitability of the farming population in the province of Alberta.

[Motion carried; Bill 7 read a third time]

## Bill 11

### Historical Resources Amendment Act, 1987

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 11, the Historical Resources Amendment Act, 1987.

Since there's been considerable discussion both in Committee of the Whole and in second reading on this Bill, I won't make further arguments for the Bill. Those have already been addressed in terms of this Assembly, but I would refer members to the *Hansard* copies on both Committee of the Whole and second reading.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of third reading of a Bill is to review what's happened to it in the previous readings, whether or not it was approved in principle at second reading, whether or not it needed fine-tuning in committee reading. I regret to say that although I recommended both at each respective reading, the minister and his colleagues on the government side of the Assembly didn't see the wisdom of doing that. I suspect in the future, maybe a year or two down the road, they will see the wisdom of doing that.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems with this Bill is that it really has no statutory safeguards built into it. The minister referred in committee reading on the evening of Monday, June 1, to the Paleontological Advisory Committee that he says he will listen to when it comes to digging up our historical resources and selling, leasing, exchanging, or otherwise disposing of said. But it's not in the Bill. Neither is it in the Bill that he will assure that he will listen to archaeologists who have concerns about very important social artifacts that exist throughout Alberta, sometimes just a few inches underneath the soil, sometimes several feet beneath the soil. That's a problem too, because I actually suspect that the minister will not make uninformed decisions. I fear, however, that he will listen more heavily to one side than the other when it comes to making decisions which will allow companies, more than one, to go and dig with bulldozers, and I have no doubt that bulldozers or similar will be used in the excavation of this precious little product, those little

squids, as we tend to joke about them, in pursuit of the almighty dollar. I am not convinced that the almighty dollar itself is worth endangering the important, scientifically, social, and otherwise, resources that exist within the soil of Alberta.

But let's just assume, for the sake of argument, that it was diamonds or emeralds or rubies. I don't know about any gems that are more valuable than them, but they probably exist. Anyway, let's just talk about that category of gems that we know are worth something. God knows, South Africa wouldn't be able to survive its apartheid regime without them. We sure know they're valuable, Mr. Speaker. So let's assume for the sake of argument that we had diamonds, emeralds, and rubies, and not ammonite in the ground in Alberta that people wanted to dig up. There could be a lot of money involved there, and I would still argue that some caution, statutory caution, ought to be exercised in pulling those very valuable gems from the ground.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was just for the sake of argument, okay? I wouldn't hold up a Bill that had the caution built in if it came to something that was really important for Alberta to have, because by God, the billion-dollar man, the Treasurer himself, has told us that we're going to have a multibillion dollar deficit, and people in my riding are suffering because of it, I assure you; day after day they're suffering. So I would give it due consideration because money is tight, as the pop song goes.

But we're not talking about those precious minerals that are going to bring millions and hundreds of millions of dollars into Alberta, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about ammonite. Ammonite is not a precious gem. It isn't going to bring us royalties, even 1 percent, even half of 1 percent of the royalties that we accrued even in 1973, in 1973 dollars as a matter of fact, from oil. It isn't a big money issue. So what's the hurry to bow to a couple of businessmen who would like to do excavating on a large scale in southern Alberta in pursuit of ammonite? They're already doing it; everybody knows that. And I'll tell you something; the people who are experts in the field -- and I don't purport to be one of them -- don't like the way it's going in southern Alberta. They think those people are not taking sufficient care. It's true at this moment they're not using bulldozers, but by God, I suspect they'll take every chance they can after this Bill is passed to use bulldozers. And the people in southern Alberta who are in the know don't think that sufficient care is being taken as is. How much worse is it going to get when this Bill is proclaimed, Mr. Speaker?

It's possible that in the short run what worries me more is the way the foundation's board is being changed by this Bill. But I do say short run, because in the long run Albertans are going to wonder what happened to those artifacts from previous aboriginal societies that exist in other countries of the world and can't be brought back to Canada because they were dug up by the shovelful and allowed to be "sold, leased, exchanged or otherwise disposed of." That's a very important long-term consideration, and nobody thinks about it right now. You know, how many people do you know who are archaeologists and paleontologists? They're not exactly run-of-the-mill people. How much time do you spend in the Tyrrell museum? How much time do you plan to spend in the new Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump museum? Well, probably not a whole heck of a lot. But tourists will. Tourists are interested in the unique artifacts and the unique fossils that we in Alberta have. We don't know how lucky we are in this province. We don't appreciate how nice those glaciers were to us. They did us more of a favour than just about anybody else in Canada. The formation

of China has left remains, particularly dinosaur remains, that are of a similar nature to those found in Alberta. Some of these are unique.

We talk about how important tourism is going to be for our economy. Well, people aren't going to come to Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump to see replications of arrowheads, Mr. Speaker. They want to see the real thing. They want to see the real fossils. They want to see the real McCoy. But in the short term the minister has managed . . .

ANHON. MEMBER: For real? You'll have to go to Calgary West to see. . .

MS BARRETT: I'm not going to comment.

In the short term, what the minister has done to achieve the goal he has set out for this Bill is that he has tread on the democratic rights of the people who belong to the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation, because up to now they've had the right to elect three members to the foundation board -- three out of nine. It was no big problem. They weren't going to be able to run away with the show. They were in a minority. You know what I mean? They were elected by people who have a personal interest in the historical resources of Alberta, many of whom are authorities in various aspects of that very matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to achieve what I believe is nothing else than a gag order on the board, the minister is going to remove the right of the foundation to elect people to that board. He is going to appoint his own people to that board. Not only that, but the minister is now going to appoint 11 people. How much patronage do Albertans have to tolerate? What's the matter with nine? Nine worked fine for all these years. I never heard any problems beforehand. Why can't we continue to have nine? Well, it's another opportunity for a few buddies of government to have a little sniff at the trough, is it, because of the per diems and the expenses? Is that what's going on? It has to be that. There can be no other reason. If he's eliminating the democratically elected people so that he's got 100 percent control of the board, why on earth does he have to increase it at the same time? This is a very shortsighted approach to a very serious matter.

I can't imagine. My blood would be boiling if I were a real expert in this. Sure enough, the people who have phoned me -- hey, I could tell over the phone even from hundreds of kilometres away that their blood is boiling over this. They can't believe it. It is so unnecessary. It just proves that this government is operating under some kind of inexplicable siege mentality. Mine, mine, mine. They have to control everything. Everything has to be run by them and their buddies, all because one or two companies want to dig up those little squids.

ANHON. MEMBER: It's a squid?

MS BARRETT: Yes. The minister and I talk about this outside the House, and we do refer to the little squids and how he's going to make sure that those little squids get looked after. Well, I want to make sure that those little squids survive in squid form. That's my concern boiled right down. [interjection] Huh? I can't hear. One more time, please.

ANHON. MEMBER: They're dead.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, they're dead. That's the form I want them to exist in. They're dead, and I want them to exist in that

form so that scientists who know a lot more about this issue than somebody like yours truly can study them and can tell us things about climatic conditions of thousands of years ago, glacial formation, the nature of topsoil, vegetation that existed, all kinds of things that happened that shaped this planet. I think that's really important information to acquire. And guess what? So does the whole scientific community.

And me? I'm just basically a consumer of culture, Mr. Speaker. I go to galleries and live performances and museums, and I like being a consumer. I find being a consumer is one way that I can be better informed about how it is that this planet came to be, how societies developed, how they developed values, because that's very much the remains of societies. What was important to previous societies is what remains of them. That has been historically the case. You can have a look in the great museums of Europe, and you'll see that that is the case. The important things they put in tombs, the things they tried to protect from warriors: those are the things that survived because they were important to them. We have learned so much about other societies because we've taken the time to be careful in our archaeological digging not to disrupt the valuable stuff that is there.

It doesn't mean I don't want the ministers' business buddies to have access to those little squids that are no longer little squids. I want them to have their ammonite; by God I do. I just want the minister to make sure that they don't go destroying any important or any other historical resource other than soil, just plain good old fashioned topsoil, in pursuit of that ammonite.

And you know what, Mr. Speaker? The minister has never explained why it is that he has to take the elective process out of the foundation board. He's never told us that on record. I wonder if he'd like to tonight when he sums up his moving for third reading, this Bill that I cannot, that we cannot, that we will not -- despite filibuster talk from ranks that weren't even here to vote on it a few nights ago and still aren't here to vote on this important Bill, we will not support it, period.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Wainwright, followed by the minister perhaps.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to just speak for a moment in support of Bill 11. I would like to put it across to our Member for Edmonton Highlands that I had hopes at some time that she and I could form a partnership and go in and mine ammonite. I think from the reports we've had that there is lots and lots of industry there, that we could create maybe 1,000 or 5,000 jobs in this country. There are all kinds of possibilities. Mind you, we would have to get a Cat and scrub up the ground a little bit and look for some of these, but I also want us to protect our archaeology and our historic artifacts. We have to protect that, and I think we're prepared to do that. But also I don't think we can sit down and bury our heads in the sand and not have a look and see what is there.

I would like to caution the minister that one thing I am fearful of with what we're doing with this Bill is that we will over-regulate it so we won't let that industry, if there is an industry there -- and I'm sure the public are willing to take that risk to find out. They're willing to spend the money to find out whether or not that industry is there, and I'd sure like to give them an opportunity.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I'd like to say I welcome the contribution from the Member for Wainwright. He mentioned in his comments his concern over protection of this resource. It's a concern that we share very strongly. In fact, that is precisely the reason we brought forward the amendments we did during committee reading of this Bill. We don't believe that the protection that just goes without having been mentioned at all in the Bill really does need to be included in the Bill if we're to be serious about the importance of protection of this resource.

The hon. member also referred to the industry, the gemstone industry. I think that's a good point that he makes as well, and it's also one we share. I think we've said that consistently throughout debate on this Bill. But my concern, Mr. Speaker, is this. We can take any kind of resource and say that the only value of that resource is in its exploitation, and for the benefit of some short-term view we can say the value of such and such a gemstone in such and such quantities equates to so many dollars and so many jobs. But in the process of exploiting that resource, we may be indiscriminate about the way it's mined and, in doing so, perhaps destroy some other resource there that is equally if not more valuable.

So the point we're making and we've tried to make consistently throughout debates on this Bill is that there ought to be some sort of body that in a way removes the minister from the direct pressure point of short-term consideration of these resources in the way they are looked after by this minister and ministers in the future. That is, if we had a body of people who would act as a quasi-independent group that could review these applications from a basis of knowledge and technical expertise, they could review the permits and the requests and the terms of the sales or leases or the disposition of these resources and then advise the minister on how that minister ought to proceed. It's a way of, in a sense, kind of buffering or allowing for an extra body of review.

Considering the quality of the paleontological resources in this province, considering the importance of our archaeological resources, surely this is quite a reasonable request to put forward in this particular Bill. Because as the Member for Drumheller and members for Calgary and all over central and southern Alberta will tell you, the importance that the Tyrrell Museum is providing in tourism, educational, and scientific contributions to this province -- in a way, I suppose you could look at it as an industry equally important if not more so than the ammonite or the ammonite industry. So I just want us to put into this legislation the means by which we will protect the resource so that we will not be short term and narrow-minded in the application of the legislation and in providing the licences and permits to exploit that gemstone resource.

I know that the minister, in his earlier debate, pointed to this Paleontological Advisory Committee. You know, that's better than not having a committee at all, and while I'm quite certain that these people are excellent members and will provide good advice to the minister, if we're serious about their playing an important role, we should give them that mandate under legislation so that they're not appointed by whim or removed by the whim of the minister. We should ensure that that's part of the Bill and we really do provide a serious form of protection for our paleontological resources. I think the same needs to be done for our archaeological resources for the same very important reasons.

The other portion which this Bill deals with, Mr. Speaker, has to do with changing the Historical Resources Foundation,

the composition of the members of that particular board. This is another cause for real concern because of what it symbolizes of the government's commitment towards our historical resources in this province. Again, I think the same sort of philosophy which is expressed in the earlier part of the Bill is also reflected here as well.

You know, this particular body is an interesting body. It's an interesting composition as it presently exists, with six members appointed by the minister, by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, and three members are elected from the general membership of that particular foundation. It's a bit of a hybrid, and I think that at the time this body was first created, that was really an imaginative approach. As I've watched those who have served in this capacity and in other committees and bodies and groups across the province trying to preserve our historical resources in Alberta, they strike me as being a group of visionaries, because we're such a young province and our sense of history is very short compared to other provinces and other countries. These are people who have seen our buildings and our communities all over Alberta and seen them for what they are, as a connection with our very recent historical past, and if they are preserved they will keep intact an important aspect of the earlier years of our history as a province.

Now, there are not too many people who have had that particular vision, and they've had an upward climb in order to make others of us in the broader community aware of the same kind of resource within our midst. So they've been few in numbers, but I think their effect has been far-reaching in spite of their numbers, and that's a credit to their perseverance as well as to the vision they've been able to communicate. So I see this Historical Resources Foundation as a kind of umbrella body or a nurturing body that, somewhat like an incubator, has provided the credibility and support from government at the highest levels within the province, as well as providing an opportunity for those members of that interest community to elect their own people to serve jointly in that partnership. So it's a unique kind of hybrid, where we would take the public in the broad sense together with government in order to make for a body that I think has had an impact in this province.

But now the minister wants to change it. I really didn't hear particularly strong reasons or good reasons as to why he wants to make that change. But in making that change, Mr. Speaker, I think there is an inherent criticism by the government -- an unspoken criticism -- of those people who have served in an elected capacity on that particular foundation board and a criticism of the membership which elected them and put them there. I think that really is unfortunate. It cuts off a democratic avenue for input into this board. It removes a partnership that exists between the public and government. In essence, it allows the duly elected representatives to wind down on their term of office people who have served that foundation in this province very, very well.

So I ask: how is that community of interests in Alberta going to have its input? Because you can't simply cut them off like that and expect they would be satisfied with the new situation. So I predict Mr. Speaker, as a result of this Bill, that those people are going to have to go out and are in fact going to go out and create their own new body to perform the same mandate, to provide that democratic avenue for that coalition and community of interests across the province. And instead of working in concert, in one body, in one form, as it has in the past, I predict that simply by the nature of having a government-appointed body and this other avenue which I have no doubt would be

created, we're going to have two or more groups presumably working towards the same end but, unfortunately, as often happens in these situations, can end up working at cross-purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to see that this minister is moving in this direction. I think all it does is serve to increase government control. I've heard a lot said about big government and the party of government control. Well, this is the kind of legislation that leads a lot of people in Alberta to conclude that the governing party is a party in favour of lots of government control, and I'm sorry to see this Bill before us in this form.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a very brief point I want to make. My two colleagues from Edmonton Highlands and Calgary Mountain View have done an excellent job of summarizing the problems of the Bill.

Just looking at the first page, clause 2, section (b), subsection (3), which is the essence of the Bill in my view, says:

The Minister may, in accordance with the regulations, sell, lease, exchange or otherwise dispose of any archaeological or palaeontological resource on any terms he considers appropriate.

Why does the government feel it necessary to always give itself blank cheques? Particularly in a case like this, surely that should almost read the other way around. Our archaeological and paleontological resources are so important to this province, and one should move so cautiously in selling, leasing, exchanging or otherwise disposing of them, that we really should reverse that. We really should be saying that the minister should not do that or the government should not or no one should do those things, except by very special and careful consideration of a specific instance when everybody knows it's a reasonable thing to do and probably a sophisticated process has been gone through; perhaps, like my colleague from Calgary Mountain View said, some kind of independent commission is prepared to document the reasons why in this particular case this sort of thing should be allowed. So instead of giving himself a blank cheque, the minister should be setting up a Bill in such a way that, yes, there's a possibility of doing that in some particular case, like, say, in the ammonite case, if you can make a strong enough case for that particular instance. And that is the essence of what's wrong with this Bill. I just couldn't resist putting those points in.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary Buffalo, followed by Calgary Millican.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have spoken before on this Bill. I've expressed my concerns clearly with strength and with undoubtedly compelling persuasion. Those who know my natural reticence these days, as exemplified by my brief comments yesterday afternoon, will not be surprised that I am content to state that I have had my say and merely stand firm on the points I have previously made and my expression of extreme concern at the overkill with respect to the scope of one part of the legislation granting to the minister powers to dispose of and deal with the heritage and important parts of the heritage of this province. Secondly, to remove the element of independence from the board, a matter which is becoming very commonplace, unfortunately, in the minister's department.

Thank you.

MR. SHRAKE: Just briefly, Mr. Speaker, a couple of words on this. I think there's some confusion. I've heard some discussion tonight about some of the types of resources that might be mined, and they referred to the ammonite. First of all, the ammonite is a mollusk; it's not a squid. A mollusk is like your conch shells and these types of things. There are some descendants of the ammonites which are in the oceans today. But the ones in Alberta, in the ancient ocean that was here many millions of years ago, are like a great big overgrown snail, a great big snailshell. When they died, their big shells went down to the bottom.

As far as mining, I do wish those people that mine them lots of luck, because they're not like veins of gold where you strike it, it's in the rock, and you get this ore out. It's just for the little guy . . . Sometimes you find a spot where several of them died and went down in one little spot, settled in the mud. The mud got over them and through millions of years they actually did a similar thing to wood: they petrified. But their exterior was a mother-of-pearl shell, and this mother-of-pearl actually fossilized over millions of years. So when they extract these, they don't grind them up or something like that. They very painstakingly take that mother-of-pearl which has fossilized, cut small pieces out, and usually take a quartz crystal and cabochon it. They put it over it and it comes out somewhat like opal. It's a very attractive stone, but by itself has no strength and will dissolve or break up. So they had to put the quartz over it to get that stone. The only one that's close to being a squid is the bacillite, which is long shelled.

I hope the Member for Wainwright doesn't go out and decide he's going to mine these, because I think it's going to be some tough sledding. As far as him digging up the soil, if you go out on your good normal prairie, your black soil on top -- you've got your clay, and somewhere down under there, great distances, you will find there is probably the remains of that ocean again. But the only place where you're really going to find these things is where you have had your erosion along the rivers or the badlands near Drumheller where it's washed away your black soil and washed away the clay. If you go dig in that soil, you'll find some ammonites, because the top 50 to 60, maybe 70, feet has been removed by Mother Nature.

MR. FISCHER: I've got my claim staked.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, let's jump up a little bit quicker folks. Member for Vegreville, please.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to say that the Member for Calgary Millican's touching defence of that Bill is one of the most restful bedtime stories I've ever heard.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on this important Bill, I want to say that while I recognize the concerns of members of the Legislature with respect to safeguarding our archaeological and paleontological resources are well based and well founded, I think they are expressing those concerns without a knowledge of the current Act or regulations in depth. The amendment Act when read by itself certainly looks to give wide-ranging powers without restrictions to the government. In fact that's not the case, and I've outlined that on a number of occasions, but I would like to take this opportunity -- because it is a complex issue -- to outline for the record and for hon. members here this evening some of the safeguards which are in place or which we commit to being in place with respect to safeguard-



ing these important historical aspects of our past.

All regulatory controls under the present Historical Resources Act, whether statutes, permits, or other mechanisms safeguarding the province's heritage resources remain in full effect with this amendment. With this amendment persons wishing to sell, trade, lease or in other way dispose of Albertan paleontological materials must first obtain and approve permit for transfer of ownership of the paleontological resource from the minister. This permit allows the owner of these Crown materials to change into private hands. Only those types of specimens on a designated control list of resalable paleontological materials will be considered for transfer of ownership. The Alberta paleontological advisory committee, appointed by the minister, shall serve as advisors to the minister, making recommendations relating to the control of these resources. All permits naming qualified inspectors, establishment of control lists, specimen categories, and appraisals, if required, shall be vetted by this committee. Paleontological materials for which transfer of ownership is being sought must be inspected by qualified staff of the Department of Culture or by a professional paleontologist approved by the Alberta paleontological advisory committee.

Given the relative abundance and limited scientific value of the fragmentary or crushed ammonite material -- and this is not the whole ammonite; this is the crushed, fragmentary ammonite, of which there is a great amount and which is used for that particular gemstone -- the minister will allow limited disposition and commercial trade on a regular basis. That's the only item planned for this control list at this juncture.

Also, persons wishing to excavate or surface-collect approved ammonite-related materials for commercial purposes must comply with the statutes of the Mines and Minerals Act and its associated regulations as applied by the Department of Energy.

If transfer of ownership is not granted, the minister may, upon the recommendation of the paleontological advisory committee, appoint the applicant or any other person to be the custodian of the resource.

In terms of archaeological material, no aspect of the regulations to be developed for the disposal of archaeological specimens will supersede the provisions of the Historical Resources Act or the archaeological research permit regulation, numbers 124/79 and 88/82. Any new regulations developed will expressly forbid the conduct of excavations or surface collection for the purpose of sale or other commercial traffic of Crown-owned archaeological specimens. Excavation shall be defined as the disturbance of a specimen from its original stratigraphic position, even on the surface.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the minister going to read the whole Act for us?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to allay all of the fears that were expressed on that side of the House. I have a couple of other points to raise. [interjections] Ah, they're all convinced.

But while the Bill gives us the power to "sell, lease, exchange or otherwise dispose of," there is at this point no plan to sell archaeological material of any sort, and we have another significant outline of regulations which we would put in place in order to make sure that our historical resources are safeguarded -- indeed, many of which already are in place in the Historical Resources Act or other Acts.

In terms of the Member for Edmonton Highlands' request for explanation regarding the members of the foundation, I can only repeat what I previously said in that respect. First of all, it makes it consistent with all of the other foundations for which the government is responsible, and second and most important it furthers the democratic principle of responsibility where we are responsible for the people's funds, and we can only expect those people directly responsible to us, appointed by us, to be responsible for that. We can hardly expect those who are elected by a small group of others to be responsible in that situation.

The only other comment I would make, Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on this Bill would be with respect to the comments of the Member for Calgary Mountain View, who suggested that in changing the way in which we will select the members of the board of the foundation, we are in fact condemning or in some way casting disparaging thoughts upon those who have been previously elected. That's in fact not the case. In most cases, those individuals are highly qualified and good individuals. What we're doing is saying we have responsibility for the dollars that are there. When the foundation was originally established, it was established with the idea that it would only expend moneys raised from outside the public and therefore it was quite appropriate to ask people who are raising moneys to be involved in electing the people who would spend those moneys. But now that those are public dollars exclusively, the reverse is true.

Mr. Speaker, with those words, I would ask for approval in third reading of Bill 11.

[Motion carried; Bill 11 read a third time]

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

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

#### **ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVINGS TRUST FUND CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION 1987-88 ESTIMATES OF PROPOSED INVESTMENTS**

##### **Department of Agriculture**

##### **Vote 1 -- Farming for the Future**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, did you . . . ? The hon. Member for Vegreville

MR. FOX: As a matter of fact I do have some questions, and I thank the hon. minister for asking me for them. Mr. Chairman, we did delve a little more deeply into vote 1 here, the Farming for the Future program, on Friday last and I had the opportunity to raise a number of questions with the minister that I'm sure he'd like me to give him the opportunity to respond to. If the minister has it in mind to respond to a few of them now, then I wouldn't ask them again, but . . .

MR. ELZINGA: Sure, ask them again.

MR. FOX: You want me to ask them again? Okay.

I was wondering in terms of the way this \$5 million that we're voting on tonight -- which we're certainly going to vote

for on this side of the House; we're going to support this because it's a good idea -- in terms of how this money is allocated. I've tried to delve into the activities of the Farming for the Future program in the past, and the minister has told us that there was \$3.87 million spent last year. I was wondering what happens to the money that's unspent. Is it carried forward and available for use by the Farming for the Future program in the future, or is it money lost? Perhaps the minister might talk about that, because I think it's unreasonable to expect that in a five-year program -- \$5 million per year, \$25 million over the five-year period -- there would be coincidentally \$5 million worth of programs worthy of funding each and every given year. It may be that there's \$3 million of worthy applications in one year and \$10 million the next. I'm just wondering to what degree the minister has some flexibility in funding on an annual basis within the context of this five-year program.

I was also curious about what happened last year. It was pointed out to us earlier in debate that there were some 244 applications for programs last year and only 94 of them approved. I'm wondering what sorts of things caused that large number of applications to be rejected. Was it in fact that the 94 used up all the money, which may be the case, or were some of the applications not deemed worth while? Or were they not applied for in a proper way?

I did have a concern brought to my attention by an individual in Alberta who is interested in applying for some money under the Farming for the Future program and seemed to have some difficulty in accessing the proper application forms and procedures involved. So I'm just wondering: with the applications last year, were some of them lacking in terms of merit, or were they not applied for in the proper way? I'd sure appreciate it if the minister would comment on that.

In terms of some comments that were made in a previous debate, the minister did refer to a new initiative of the department, and that is money spent for soil research in northeastern Alberta. I think that's a wonderful initiative. I think it's significant that the minister went to my hometown of Vegreville to announce this program in conjunction with the Deputy Prime Minister and the federal Minister of Agriculture. They did this at the soil research centre in Vegreville, which is a federal station devoted to soil research, specifically in the solonchic soil zone there. So I think it was a good announcement.

I was, however, a little bit peeved, if you will, when the minister made note of the fact that the hon. Member for Vegreville wasn't there. Indeed I wasn't there, but as the minister knows full well, it was because I was holding a press conference releasing our task force report on agriculture at the very same time. I did, however, go out to the constituency right after for a meeting of farmers at Bruce, and I wouldn't make note of the fact that the minister wasn't there because I know full well that he flew down to Taber to announce an important tripartite stabilization program. So we're both well aware of what we were doing that day: we spent a long and tireless day involved in promoting the best interests of farmers in the province. So I just wanted to get the record straight for the hon. minister.

The other thing was something I had not wanted to mention -- this ceremony in Vegreville with the Minister of Agriculture from Alberta, the federal Minister of Agriculture, and the Deputy Prime Minister, because it would be too tempting for me to make some comment about the significance of three Conservative politicians going to Vegreville to dig themselves a hole. So I avoided doing that, Mr. Chairman.

I think if I could get the minister's response to those two or

three questions, I would be satisfied with lending this caucus' support to the two votes before us now.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to respond, and I made note of the hon. member's questions when he did ask them when we previously had the opportunity to debate our estimates under Farming for the Future. I should indicate to him -- and maybe the hon. Member for Cardston who serves on the Research Council would like to supplement this somewhat. He shakes his head no, and that's fine, because he did such a super job of contributing when we did discuss this before. He's the member of this Legislative Assembly that goes through the process of analyzing which groups should receive funding.

Firstly, let me answer to him that the reason that only 94 of the 244 are selected is because of money. The hon. member is correct. If we had considerably more money, we would very much like to participate in a number of other projects. The \$3.87 million goes directly to projects. The remaining money is used for administration purposes. We also contribute to a number of university projects and a number of other projects. In total, I should point out to the hon. member, the government spends approximately \$20 million per year on research. As he related also in his comments as it relates to our soil research in the Vegreville constituency, we do have a number of very worthwhile research projects in addition to our Farming for the Future.

I hope this answers all his questions and concerns, and in the event that I haven't, I'm more than happy to do my level best.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I was just wondering what flexibility the minister has within the framework of this five-year program, one year of which we're voting on now, to make sure that moneys aren't lost to the Farming for the Future program. If, for example, there aren't enough worthwhile or reasonably fundable applications in a given year, do we have the ability to carry that over so it's not money lost into the General Revenue Fund? I'm bringing this up, because I feel -- I think like the minister does -- that we want to make sure that we can use all of this money for its intended purpose.

Another question I just might raise -- it was something I brought up with the minister the other day -- and that is the matter of the Alberta Weather Modification Co-op. It's been noted in this Assembly a few times that the government has decided not to involve itself with hail suppression programs and get involved in the cloud seeding that was done for many years in the Innisfail area. I'm just wondering: is it the minister's intention to take a closer look at some of the proposals brought to him by Mr. Jim Bishop in terms of getting involved in some active hail suppression through cloud seeding as proposed by Mr. Bishop in the Alberta Weather Modification Co-op?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the comment was made in a very genuine way. As the hon. member is aware, we're not discussing general revenue funds; we're discussing heritage funds. In the event that we don't use the money, no, we would not have the opportunity to ask that it be saved, but I would make representation to the Provincial Treasurer in the event that that was the case. To date it has not been the case. But in the event that that was the case, we would make representation with the hope of having that money come forward at a later time from the heritage trust fund.

As it relates to Jim Bishop and his concern with weather modification, I will leave the hon. member with the assurance that we are willing to reanalyze the suggestions. As the hon. member indicated to me, I also appreciate very much the worthwhile suggestions that Mr. Jim Bishop has been forthcoming with. We are under budgetary constraint because of our depressed revenues from the oil industry, but we are willing to examine any worthwhile project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Agreed to:

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| Total Vote 1 -- Farming for the Future | \$5,000,000 |
|--|-------------|

### **Vote 2 -- Irrigation Rehabilitation and Expansion**

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to report, and move that the vote be reported as it relates to vote 1 under Agriculture in the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects division.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We're now on vote 2, Mr. Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Agreed to:

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| Total Vote 2 -- Irrigation Rehabilitation and Expansion | \$25,000,000 |
|---|--------------|

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, I would like to report that we have concluded debate on vote 2 under Agriculture under the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects division.

[Motion carried]

### **Department of Recreation and Parks**

#### **Vote 1 -- Kananaskis Country Recreation Development**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make a few comments further about vote 1 under the Recreation and Parks department tonight as far as the vote of almost \$4 million which is going predominantly to the subproject at Kananaskis village at Ribbon Creek. I think my main major concern about these particular dollars going the way they are has to do with what I think is a matter of unbalanced priorities within the Department of Recreation and Parks.

You know, the purpose for parks varies. There are numerous reasons why we create parks. But predominantly they are to protect lands, in particular natural resource, for the enjoyment of people today and for the future enjoyment of generations in years to come. And we see where a commitment is made to protection by the commitment of resources for the acquisition of land. But we also have parks to develop in order that people can use those parks and enjoy them. There is sometimes an uneasy relationship between use and preservation and protection. In fact, there is often conflict between use and protection. But

where we see development in parks, that's represented by commitment of resources towards the building of facilities. So two uses, Mr. Chairman, and we confine the commitment towards those two purposes: first of all, in protection by land acquisition and, secondly, for development through the building of facilities.

What Kananaskis Country represents, Mr. Chairman, is a commitment of resources. The minister, in his earlier remarks some days ago, talked about \$221 million worth of commitment, and we find in this vote almost \$4 million. These resources are a commitment to development, to the development of the park. And particularly when we see that some of the previous years' activities had to do with fish and wildlife enhancement, regional roads, trails, and primitive campgrounds, for example -- those are not being funded under this years vote; it's almost exclusively for the infrastructure for Kananaskis village at Ribbon Creek.

I think that this more than anything explains or symbolizes that the preference or priority of the government is to the use and development side of that parks equation, and not to the protection and land acquisition of that equation. We can find it not only in these votes -- I know that earlier in this session, for example, when we were going through the votes for Public Works, Supply and Services, the acquisition for existing provincial parks or recreation areas in this fiscal year was only \$452,000. I don't find in this particular vote we're dealing with tonight under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, vote 1, any moneys being set aside for acquisition of land. I know that in previous years there was some commitment for the urban parks system, but not this year.

By comparison, in the votes from Public Works, Supply and Services, where we also find spending being done on behalf of Kananaskis Country recreation development, we see for Kananaskis Country entrance signs -- reference 4.14.15 under Public Works, Supply and Services, vote 4 -- \$210,000; just for signs at Kananaskis. That's almost half of the entire land acquisition budget for parks in the 1987-88 budget, and there's none that I can see, at least in vote 1. To some extent, there may be moneys available for land acquisition in vote 2, but I gather that most of those are having to do again with moneys being committed to development.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this department has had lots of advice over the years about the way it should be going about using its resources in order to develop a provincial parks system throughout the province. There's a public perception, and the government has received this advice, that they've missed many opportunities, particularly when it comes to land acquisition over the years; that the department fails to follow through on major broad acquisition initiatives that have strong public support -- for example, in the designation of ecological reserves, for acquisition of shorelines, and indeed the department's earlier systems plan for which I think all government spending in this department should be being directed to as part of an overall plan.

So what this department has done is missed opportunities and failed to acquire lands, Mr. Chairman, which means, in terms of that equation, that by not acquiring land there is a loss of protection of important natural heritage resources in Alberta. We could be taking \$4 million out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects division now, when land values are at their lowest, and be buying land, acquiring land for parks to ensure that they don't lose that protection key. They don't have to be massive parks of the size of Kananaskis Country. They could be several square miles in size, or perhaps 30 or 40 or 50 square

miles in size. There are lots of areas in Alberta that require protection under the parks system that just do not receive that because this government has not used the resources at its disposal to make those acquisitions.

Now we see that we're running out of funds under this particular division. For 1987-88 it's a drop of \$4 million from the almost \$12 million in the previous fiscal year. Vote 2 is a drop of 50 percent, from \$4 million to \$2 million. There are fewer and fewer resources being committed to the system, and they're all going into this particular -- at least in vote 1 it's all going into the infrastructure at Kananaskis village. It seems to me that that more than anything symbolizes a lost opportunity to this minister and to this government. What are they doing? They're taking parks -- we once had 62, I understand, in this province. They've now been reclassified, 40-some of them, to the point that under preliminary allocation of existing areas to classes, as found in the most recent draft of the policy statement for the Ministry of Recreation and Parks, there are now 27 provincial parks identified. I don't criticize that, because I think that classification system recognizes a reality: that those parks that have been removed were not in a category of protection, and those that remain are.

But even the federal Minister of the Environment, in his report released just this week, also highlights that we're not moving in the right direction, that there are still lots of lands in this province that need protection that are not receiving it. The minister in his comments the other day seemed to reflect the notion that we're depending on our national parks as a way of indicating that we have a provincial parks system; that we point to the size of Banff and Waterton and Jasper and say, "Look at the large numbers of parklands dedicated in Alberta." But I think that that camouflages or disguises or negates the need that exists to protect other crucial areas throughout the province. And to the extent that we depend on the national parks and use that as an excuse not to pursue land acquisition for a provincial parks system, I think it's being counterproductive to developing a real and a meaningful provincial parks system across the province.

And so I look both to the investment in development of Kananaskis Country as found in vote 1, and I look also to the return that the province is getting from that investment, the fact that something like \$4,200 a year will flow back into the general revenues of the province from that investment of many, many millions of dollars. Well, Mr. Chairman, what that represents is a lost opportunity. It represents the fact that there are not investments flowing back into the general revenues to be made available to reinvest into the parks system. So it's a lost opportunity in many ways, not only by the commitment of resources in this vote, but the lack of return from those resources means that we're going to be crippled even further in the years to come to find the money available to acquire lands throughout the province.

And that's where the real failure, I think, of this policy can be found. You know, the whole notion that I hear preached by the government in this Assembly and elsewhere throughout the province is that when people take risks they ought to profit by their success when those risks perform and produce for them. But all I see in the kind of approach taken by this government is to put investments into Kananaskis Country, get no return for those, and if those investments pay handsomely and successfully in the way of large numbers of tourists, large numbers of tourism dollars into Kananaskis Country, the people who took the risks don't profit from it. The people of this province who made that investment don't profit by that success. They're com-

mitted to pay for failure; no doubt about that. There are the loan guarantees in place to protect those operators out there in case they don't succeed the way that they might like. It's up to the public to pick up the tab. But the profit from success does not flow back into the public purse.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that that is one more recognition of the failure of this policy by this government, because if Kananaskis does succeed, and if those leases had been tied to that success, so that as the money from tourism dollars flows into Kananaskis Country -- if those leases had been constructed in a different way to flow back those profits and a share of those profits into the General Revenue Fund of this province, we would then have the resources and the money available to make those larger investments in our parks system in the acquisition of further lands and the protection of lands.

So this lack of return on those investments, the lack of return off those leases, Mr. Chairman, symbolizes lost opportunities. I think because of that it says fundamentally there's a lack of commitment by the province to protection, that protection aspect of the equation in our parks system. You need a balance. I am not one who will say that we should never have development or never have use of our provincial parks or our national parks, but you need a balance. And you have to recognize that the importance of parks and their attraction in the first place is because of their protection of valued and valuable natural areas in our province. If we lose those wilderness areas, if we lose those unique natural areas and that natural heritage, it's lost forever, and there will be no attraction for people to go in and use those parks.

So fundamentally, our parks system must first of all protect lands in order that that resource is saved for this generation and future generations and then developed in such a way that people are attracted to enjoy that resource and do so without spoiling it. The fact is that there are few resources in this government budget, either in this vote or in the estimates previously adopted by this Assembly -- there's fundamentally a lack of commitment to land acquisition in this province, and I think that does not bode well for the future of Alberta. I think it's unfortunate, and I'm sorry to see that the resources that are being committed to our parks system are being done so in an unbalanced way.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I listened to the Member for Calgary Mountain View very carefully, thinking as he leapt to his feet that he would give us a positive view of Kananaskis Country, the Peter Lougheed Provincial Park, and the other adjoining parks that form part of this incredible part of Alberta.

ANHON. MEMBER: That's your job.

MR. STEVENS: Hang on, Mr. Member. The words that this member used, I'll share with you. But you know, the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, the Member for Highwood, the Member for Banff-Cochrane, we have a special privilege: we share, in the areas that we represent, the opportunity to represent Kananaskis Country. Yet the Member for Calgary Mountain View, part of Calgary -- Calgaryans enjoy this beautiful recreation opportunity, and yet he says that Kananaskis is a failure, that there is no return to Albertans . . . [interjection] You said it; I have your words: no return to Albertans. I listened to you very carefully. [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Calgary Mountain

View, would you -- order please.

MR. STEVENS: You said: if -- if -- Kananaskis succeeds, a symbol of lost opportunities, a lack of commitment by this government, and that there needs to be a balance in the development of our parks and recreational areas.

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Calgary Mountain View supports his federal party in its opposition to the expansion of Sunshine Village. I suppose that is also a shared view of the provincial NDP, and I would be pleased to hear what he feels about that later on.

But you know, Mr. Chairman, if we go back 102 years, 1885, two men in this territory working on a railway stumbled across some steam and discovered the Cave. It was private enterprise building a railway, with government assistance, that discovered that area, and a trust was made and a national parks system developed. As time went on, the CPR developed a hotel chain throughout this western part of our country to invite visitors from central Canada to our province, and a whole wave of immigration occurred to this part of our country. In 1970-1971 that hotel winterized, and suddenly Banff became a year-round resort, to the point that its success led to, in 1978, the announcement of a dream, the announcement by this government -- the former Premier, Peter Lougheed, and the then minister announced the beginning of Kananaskis and what it would be.

And how could that now be considered to be a failure, to have more visitors this last year to Kananaskis than in Banff five years ago? How can that be considered to be a policy failure? How can that be considered to be a noncommitment by this government to the people of Alberta, not only the management of resources and the protection of wildlife, but the blending, the ability to have people come and enjoy a recreation area?

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Calgary Mountain View even believes the golf course is in the park. It's not; the golf course is not in the park at all. There is a concession in the park, and there are some cottages in the park, and there's a visitor services centre in the park. Why don't you visit it more? There's a road system that's been developed that's second to none, a road system that brings visitors by car and by bicycle and by foot. There is a utility system throughout that country, power, sewage control, garbage collection and dispersal, campgrounds, picnic areas, boat launching, biking trails, hiking trails, skiing trails, visitor services throughout the park to welcome people to this country, police service, a golf course that's world-famous and world-class, William Watson Lodge, the only facility of its kind in this world. And this member has the gall to say, "This is a failure; this is not going to be successful."

Put your mind 20 years ahead if you can't think about today. Think 20 years from now and how people will be so grateful that the people of Alberta at this time took some of their resources, set them aside, developed them carefully, and developed them into this incredible, incredible recreational opportunity. Research, University of Calgary, Fortress Junction, entrepreneurs that are making a living selling gas and groceries, Mount Kidd Recreational Vehicle Park, information centres: you know, there's so much that goes on in that country. From Nakiska, the Canmore Nordic Centre, the alpine village. I can't believe this member has even been there from his comments today. The conversion of our natural resources . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: And he's a Calgarian.

MR. STEVENS: Exactly. And Calgarians, thank goodness,

love this country and love the park opportunities. In fact, Mr. Chairman, it's sometimes an embarrassment for the three members who have this privilege of representing the people who live in Kananaskis Country and provide those services because we don't have the resources, we don't have the revenue to continue with that kind of development in the north or in central Alberta at this time. But we will. This government will do that. When revenues are here, we will do that. But your point was lost in criticism and doom and gloom about a country that has been the best ever done by any government in the free world.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, did you want to respond?

MR. WEISS: Yes, I would, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity. I wasn't aware that the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane would be so vocal, but I'm pleased to hear his remarks in echo of some of my previous remarks with regards to the facilities in there, and he articulated them so very, very well.

It's not surprising, Mr. Chairman, that I would find myself disagreeing with most points expounded by the Member for Calgary Mountain View. But before the . . . [interjection] No, no. Correction: I said most points. Because before the hon. member sat down, I did find myself very attentively listening to some of his words, and I would say that he's right on. He talked about what is the attraction to the provincial parks. He said such things as the protection of the valuable resources. I support those views, and that's the commitment I've given to the hon. member, to this Assembly, as the minister responsible to protect, as the steward of those resources. So I certainly appreciate his remarks as he's brought them out in his overall views. I believe there has to be a balance to the user groups, in particular some of the areas that he talked about.

I'd like to go back then briefly to his initial opening remarks about the construction and the costs, and I want to make sure that everybody is aware in this Assembly, Mr. Chairman, through you, that implementation of this project is accomplished principally through construction contracts with the private sector. Now, that's an important point of view that I've tried to outline before and get out. Yes, we're nearly \$4 million, as the hon. member refers to, but that commitment of resources, as his words were, for that almost \$4 million -- it's very important to know that it's going back out there into the private sector. And surely, Mr. Chairman and all hon. members, he supports that that they would have the opportunity to create the employment and the overall materials and goods and services that will be developed within the infrastructure.

But the major part that he's missing, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that we had made the commitment to complete this development and last year in our estimates indicated that we would be coming forth with this request to complete -- and I say complete; near complete, if that's the words the hon. member wants to use -- because I'm not sure whether there will be any other requirements. The requirements would be of a minor scope, as I've indicated in my previous remarks in the Assembly a few days ago.

The overall Kananaskis Country, to the full intent as to the way it is today and the way it was initially developed and proposed, starting from some \$40 million to the \$221 million, as I've indicated, is complete for all intents and purposes. The \$4 million is being used to basically, as I say, complete the major building facilities and utilities for the infrastructure of the Kananaskis village at Ribbon Creek. Yes; so it's not a secret

It's no surprise that it isn't going to buy land or land acquisitions. That was not the intent, Mr. Chairman, and I want it to be clear and to be understood. I appreciate what the hon. member refers to in the concern that he has and raises with regards to land acquisition. I believe fully that the department -- through the land banking and in working in conjunction with the Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife -- that we have, with an overall land bank, sufficient areas and land to develop future parks and wilderness parks and areas.

And as I've indicated to the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway -- I believe I said: "Will you bear with us until I file the report from the ecological and wildlife committee to show what we're doing in that particular area and with regards to the announcements and projects that we are working on?" And I believe they will be supportive, particularly, though, when he refers to the \$210,000, the Kananaskis signs. I'd like it to be known that we have improved the facilities, as was indicated by the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane, such as the new facilities in place with the Canmore Nordic Centre, Nakiska at Mount Allan, and others. So that was no surprise. It has to be done to let people know where and what we have in place, as well as upgrading and continually updating some of the other recreation areas.

But, Mr. Chairman, before an hon. member raises it, it was not used, and there were no extra funds used for changing of signs to Peter Lougheed Provincial Park. That area is complete and has been finished and was done at a bare-minimum cost and was completed prior to, and not within, these internal funds. Any literature and acquisition of materials, goods, and services will be done on an ongoing basis. There was no extra cost made, and I wish to bring that out so all hon. members will be aware of it.

The overall points that the Member for Banff-Cochrane raises are very valid in relation to the overall development. And just by quick summation, Mr. Chairman, to all hon. members, there were the major building facilities and utilities to March 31, '87 of some \$38 million; campgrounds, day-use facilities, and trails, some \$44 million. The regional road program that the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane referred to is \$121 million. Look at the infrastructure that had to be put in place to accommodate these people that we talk about in the mass numbers. Some \$10 million for foothills trails and primitive campgrounds. The equestrian users in this facility, bar none, are so exceptionally pleased I just can't believe the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View to go on record stating that he is nonsupportive in principle to the development and against the policy. The policy was your word, sir, not mine. The fish and wildlife enhancement alone is some \$3 million-plus. That is the \$221 million, to all hon. members, and now we're asking for approval of the \$3.861 million as outlined.

I don't support the hon. member when he says we've missed opportunities. I think we've looked for a window of opportunity, found it, grasped it, developed on it, and are building for the future and a legacy for Albertans in generations to follow.

I certainly would like to follow up, though, with regards to the land banking and acquisition of funds. It's an area I believe strongly in and will work with the hon. member in developing proposals for future consideration through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund; would welcome that joint co-operation.

The federal report is interesting, as was referred to in the hon. member's remarks. I have a concern, and I will admit to the Assembly, Mr. Chairman, I've not had the opportunity to fully review the report; hope to do so this weekend. I under-

stand it's some 77 pages and some good content. There are some suggestions that the provincial government be involved. Yes, I would agree to that in principle, but at whose cost? We have to make sure that as custodians of the Alberta taxpayers' dollars, we don't go making commitments until we're sure of what we're doing, and that's why we're bringing this proposal today as we are with regards to the \$3.861 million.

The federal parks encompass, I believe -- by memory, Mr. Chairman -- some 6 million-plus hectares of land. That is a large parcel of land. Certainly we're not trying to build it in as ours, but we work within the overall system. That just means, though, that there's some 6 million hectares of land available within the overall park system for all users. We don't differentiate and say: "Don't go to the federal system. Come to the provincial system." We welcome that joint use, and that's the working relationship I hope we would share and continue to share for many years.

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View refers to the investment and return, Mr. Chairman. I think it's interesting to note that if one were to do a quick calculation -- and I reported to the Assembly just a few days ago that we've now surpassed 3 million-plus visitors, excluding those to the Canmore Nordic Centre and those at Mount Allan. And I want that to be noted: exclusive of those two facilities, 3 million-plus. If each one of those visitors were to only spend \$10, what would that multiplier be from the 3 million visitors to the park? Now multiply that by 100, and you're up to \$300 million. You know the interesting part about this whole exercise? I'm not a mathematician, but I've said before, I'm a realist. Do you know where those dollars are being spent, and a large proportion of those dollars being spent? In the hon. member's own area, by Albertans generally, for Albertans in the Alberta economy. I wouldn't want to see those dollars go out elsewhere; I welcome them.

And you know, I'd suggest that the hon. member -- while his intentions are great and his openings remarks, as I said, I certainly support in his views -- maybe should reconsider the policy and the direction and the goals. Maybe he'd like to make it his commitment to stand at the next election and say: "Hey, all you out there that are considering voting for me, I don't support Kananaskis Country and its policy. Don't use that park. I'm going to do something better for you." And just see what the people in his constituency say, because he's an elected member of this constituency responsible for all his constituents, the same as we are. I'd suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the constituents might offer a different return on his investment if he were to dare to invest it in that regard.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Albert.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I sat tonight and listened to some of the debate and found some of it very, very interesting. But how the Member for Banff-Cochrane and the minister could conceive that my colleague from Calgary Mountain View condemned Kananaskis as a failure is beyond me. But I think certainly what the member the question was the unbalanced manner in which this government's spending money.

Now, the unbalanced manner in which they're spending money is clearly reflected in the figures that we have before us. When we look at Kananaskis Country recreation development, we see the total actual expenditures to March 31, 1986, being some \$211.792 million, plus the money that was there for the estimates in '86-87 of another \$11.8 million; '87-88, another

\$3.8 million. Mr. Chairman, that's an expenditure in excess of \$227 million. Now, I support, and our party supports, the development of parks in the province of Alberta. They're tremendous things. They're things that we can leave to our children and our grandchildren to show that we've done our job and we've met our commitment to our future.

Then we get into the second vote here, which relates to municipal recreation/tourism areas. The amount to be voted is \$2 million. Now the objective of this, and I agree with this, is:

To provide capital funds to develop Municipal Recreation/Tourism Areas in rural Alberta. These sites will be developed by municipal and/or volunteer associations to provide outdoor recreation and tourism opportunities for local residents as well as tourists.

As I indicated earlier, I support the development of Kananaskis. I support and always have supported all those jobs that were offered by all the development in that area in developing Kananaskis. Although I do question, Mr. Chairman, how this minister can stand up and tell us in this Legislature that we are custodians of the taxpayers' dollars when he's turning around and handing out construction contracts to some of his buddies, particularly Stuart Olson, whether it's management or construction, without them even going through the tendering process. Now, how can that be looking after and being a custodian of the taxpayers' dollars here in Alberta? Now, I certainly believe in cost-effective and cost-efficient government, and our party believes that too, but one of the things that we've been complaining about here for two sessions now is just how cost effective and cost efficient this Conservative government is when it comes to handouts for some of their friends at the expense of Alberta taxpayers.

Go back to vote 2. We see the total expenditures for municipal recreation/tourism areas to March 31, 1986, being nil. I have a question to the minister: did we expend all of the \$4 million in the '86-87 estimates, and where is the \$2 million going to go for the '87-88 estimates? Now, not all of us live in the Calgary area. Not all of us in these depressed economic times in this province can afford the gas to travel all the way down south to visit Kananaskis Country.

ANHON. MEMBER: I'll drive you down.

MR. STRONG: Well, maybe we could arrange with the Minister of Social Services to put a bus on for some of the less fortunate Albertans, member.

I support this and I support the minister. I think some of the concepts that he's putting forth here and his predecessor put forth are very good ones -- excellent.

I believe the city of Fort McMurray is looking at trying to get some money from the minister for the development of a park for its residents and its tourists that come there. Mr. Chairman, I know St. Albert is looking for some money, because St. Albert did put in a request for an urban park proposal to the previous minister. I personally hand-delivered one to this minister when I took office, the urban park proposal that was put together by the city of St. Albert in 1985.

Now, I don't want to see those things go away, and we have many, many attractions in the city of St. Albert to attract tourists and visitors. It's the place of Father Lacombe. It has lots of history; St. Albert just celebrated a 125th anniversary last year. Now, certainly St. Albert would like to get some of this money to develop their river valley and a park that their residents could enjoy. And I'm sure there are other communities across this

province that would like to have parks established, biking trails established, campgrounds established in their communities for their residents to enjoy, as Albertans.

And I think what my hon. colleague for Calgary Mountain View was referring to was again unbalanced spending, imbalanced commitments, not the failure of something that certainly is a great thing for Albertans, and that is Kananaskis Country. And I can stand and firmly say that and commit to that. But the comment was made in light of the unbalanced manner in which this government has spent money: a measly \$6 million in vote 2 as opposed to an expenditure in vote 1 of over \$227 million. Now, is that a balance, Mr. Chairman? If that's a balance, the scales have almost gone off the table.

ANHON. MEMBER: Let's get us a park at Big Lake.

MR. STRONG: Jimmy, I'd like to get you an apartment, but unfortunately I don't take my \$75 a day travel allowance into the city. I've left that on the table; I'm doing my bit for the taxpayers.

ANHON. MEMBER: Get us a park for Big Lake.

MR. STRONG: Well, we need one.

Tourism. The money that's going to be spent down in Kananaskis for tourism, I think that's a good thing too. There are going to be thousands and hundreds of thousands of visitors in that park, and certainly that is going to bring dollars into every community in the province of Alberta. Not just in Calgary, because some of that money will get up here to Edmonton eventually, their northern cousins; we'll get some of it. And again that's a good thing for the economy, especially in light of the depressed economy that we have here in Alberta right now.

So maybe, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. minister and the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane would take the cotton balls out of their ears and listen a little more attentively to what we in the opposition say to those across the way, without jumping onto the socialist bandwagon or accusing us of being commies, maybe if they sat and paid attention, they would glean some good things from the discussion that is going on here in the Legislature.

Thank you.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting, the hon. Member for St. Albert's reference to a couple of points. With regards to the MRT areas, which he refers to as municipal recreation/tourism areas, and the \$2 million support, he went on to talk about what would the other funding be and where would it be directed in future years. We would treat it on the same fair, equitable basis we have in the past. Those applications under site nominations would come in; we would be reviewing them for overall need and area and geographics and then would be coming forth with the announcement. And I think if the hon. member would wish to check with his colleagues and others, he would find that that has been done on a very fair and equitable basis, on a needs basis.

The criticism that he relates through with regards to the support and the jobs, first of all his original support and then the criticism with regards to the construction projects, I just have to correct for all hon. members of the Assembly, Mr. Chairman, and certainly wouldn't want it to go in *Hansard* and be recorded that it has not been dealt with fairly. When I say "not dealt with

fairly," I would wish, and suggest, that he should direct his question either in a motion to the member responsible for public works with regards to construction projects that are not related to this vote -- and I say not related to this vote because in Kananaskis Country the vote we are requesting the funds for is, as we've said before, for construction contracts with the private sector as it relates to the development of Ribbon Creek. I repeat it once again, and I reiterate again to the hon. member that all contracts for the work that will be done on-site within this project will be public tender. So there is no other way that anybody ...

MR. STRONG: Has that been changed?

MR. WEISS: For Ribbon Creek that has not been changed. That work will be performed by general contractors on proposals called that will be submitted through the normal process. I would like that to be corrected so there is no misunderstanding whatsoever.

MR. STRONG: You're talking about the \$3 million; we're talking about \$227 million.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, I can only debate the issues that are before me within this vote. I'm not here to discuss what may or may not have happened eight years ago, six years ago, or three. We're dealing specifically with the vote as it's before us, and that's what I'd ask, Mr. Chairman -- you, sir -- to direct the questions and the information as it relates to that specific vote.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Chairman, I would defer momentarily to the Member for Calgary Mountain View, if that's okay.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. Well, you know, I've been sitting here listening to the members opposite, and I always like it when the Member for Banff-Cochrane gets up. You know, he's very articulate. And I like listening to the minister. When I hear what they say, it just makes me feel so good because I got them excited, and I really enjoy that. Because I know that when I've touched a raw nerve over there, I always see the Member for Banff-Cochrane to his feet. And I know why they're nervous; I know why they're defensive: \$221 million into Kananaskis and what are they getting back on the leases?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. Unfortunately, my mike isn't working; oh, now I can cut off your mike. We are talking about \$3.861 million, and I would like you to stick to the subject please.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, certainly. Three million dollars. And what are they getting back on the lease for the investment that they're making for almost \$4 million at Ribbon Creek? Forty-two hundred dollars a year. And that's not atypical. That's in keeping with the kinds of leases that they've been signing for operations in Kananaskis. If the minister wants me to go into Calgary Mountain View -- anywhere -- and explain to

people why there are cutbacks in hospitals, why community schools are being cut back, why the disabled are now having to pay user fees, I'll tell them about the leases in Kananaskis Country. I'll tell them about \$4,200 a year, and I'd be happy to do that. I can give him my word that I'm going to. We'll see. Sure, we'll see. I don't mind going into Calgary Mountain View or anywhere in this province and talking about that kind of fiscal policy. I know it makes them nervous. Sure it does, and it should. That doesn't surprise me, that they would be to their feet tonight.

I repeat that the failure of their policy to provide a reasonable rate of return on these public investments is keeping resources from coming back into the general revenues of this province, which would in turn be able to be committed to what has to be the first priority of this government's Recreation and Parks department. The minister knows what's in the documents that his department produces that say that the most important priority of his department has to be land acquisition or else by the year 2000 every important decision on every important parcel of land in this province that has any kind of importance for preservation for parks is going to be a commitment made on those lands, and they may well be lost forever.

I'm afraid, Mr. Chairman, that this particular vote for Ribbon Creek just carries on what I perceive to be a lack of balance within the spending of this department, primarily because of the rate of return which this government is receiving off of these investments. I have no fear in knowing and saying in this Legislature that many, many, many people in the public share that very same concern as to that lack of fiscal responsibility and return on those public investments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. When we started this debate on the heritage trust fund capital projects division, we went with an evening of general debate, but we never really did settle whether that one evening would be the debate on the general; we just moved the next day into specific votes, one by one. So I've been wondering if we would have another time to sort of summarize some of the main points and raise one or two others that did not get raised on that first evening. Of course, we have a full 12 days for these estimates, but we have pretty well, I think, wound down most of the various single votes. It's been a good debate, and it's been interesting too. We got some good answers from the ministers at times, and we've raised a lot of points, some of which have been answered, some of which have not. It's always nice to see when the opposition gets a little fired up and gets on their feet and answers questions or makes other points, as the Member for Banff-Cochrane did tonight.

But I wanted to, with your indulgence, take a few minutes and reiterate a couple of points I'd made earlier and add a couple of new ones that are sort of general. It would be easier to do it on this last vote and then be done with the debate and shut down the heritage trust fund estimates, rather than sort of open up the whole thing again after this particular vote.

I looked at the last page, and it's not slated as a vote, but it does total the spending under the capital projects division for this year at \$140 million. Last year it was \$236 million, and if you add the previous expenditures, we're talking some \$2.6 billion spent by the government in the capital projects division. That does not include, I don't believe, the \$2 billion that was



put into Vencap -- Vencap being the one part of the capital projects division that does make some money, this \$2.6 billion being that part which is called the deemed assets and are in fact then expenditures.

Now, one of the first points we made -- and I would just say it quickly one more time. It is a little bit extraordinary, when you think about how we handle our expenditures in this Assembly for the province of Alberta, that we would allow 12 days to debate some \$140 million in expenditures when in fact we only allow 25 days for a \$10 billion budget expenditure. In fact, we got cut short, if you'll remember, on the initial 10 days' debate that is allowed under the Standing Orders of this Assembly for the general budget debate. We had only three of those 10 days before we were pushed into doing the department-by-department estimates, the 25 days for the department-by-department discussions.

DR. WEST: Mr. Chairman, aren't we drifting a little bit off the topic here tonight?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chair has to do what the Assembly requests. Now, if the hon. member has asked to do a wrap-up and if the members of the Assembly agree that he can do a wrap-up, then I assume it's not going to be too long. Because if the Chair does . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you wish to spend half of the evening arguing about whether what I'm saying is in order or not, I can spend a lot of time relating it back to a specific vote and going round and round in circles and fighting with you about that. But I think it would all be more expeditious if we get on with the wrap-up and let it go at that. I promise to be a little briefer, if you will indulge me with that permission.

The second point I wanted to make is that one of the problems of trying to deal with heritage trust fund expenditures in this manner, separate from dealing with the budget, is that spending money under the capital projects division generates expenditures which we then have to pick up under the operating budgets. I've got to say that the government is not very clear in laying out where those expenditures come from. So it seems to me that having set money aside in the heritage trust fund and then deciding to use some of those as expenditures -- and the deemed assets are expenditures, make no mistake -- they end up spending taxpayers' money through a side route, so to speak, instead of through the budget and yet causing expenditures which we have to pick up in the general budget, and it becomes confusing as to where those expenditures come from and why.

So that's one of the problems that I see with deciding to set up a heritage trust fund and then sort of say, "There it is, this great shining example of how well we can manage the economy," but then starting to use it as if it were general revenue expenditures. I think the government really should think seriously about that. If you want to be really honest about how you should handle it, surely you should have said, "During the times that we had a lot of money, we put too much into the heritage trust fund, and we now need it for expenditures." So you should have made a lump sum pull back from the heritage trust fund, back into the general revenue fund, admitting that you had put more in than you really should have or that you had the revenues to handle, and then dealing with it in a normal

budgetary manner. Because those expenditures really are not that much different than the normal budgetary expenditures of this province. They are things done with the revenues of this province for the people of Alberta and should be part of the budget. So that particular point concerns me.

The final point, I suppose, to make is that we are in the capital projects division, of some \$2.6 billion total, pushing on the 20 percent allowance that the legislation for the fund allows. That is, the capital projects expenditures are allowed to amount to 20 percent of the total fund but not more. In fact, that was reiterated in this fall sitting of the heritage trust fund standing committee. There was a suggested recommendation that we move that up to 25 percent, and it was turned down. So specifically, the committee said, "No, we stay at the 20 percent level." The government should be aware that they are pushing on that limit. The \$2.6 billion should be compared to \$12.7 billion, not the full \$15 billion that the Treasurer sometimes talks about.

The final point I wanted to make is that the heritage trust fund has had a certain amount of liquidity, some \$2 billion, according to the Treasurer last summer. Recently he has been borrowing and in fact has put another order in council through allowing him to borrow up to \$2.3 billion of short-term notes from the heritage trust fund. Now, that can only come from the cash and marketable securities division; it's the only liquid part of the fund. It seems to me again that the government should be more up front. We have said that we're not going to use the heritage trust fund for general revenue expenditures, and although we're doing it, because the capital expenditures cause operating expenses for the budget, we should not be doing this. This is a major borrowing of heritage trust funds money into the general revenue account without any specific authorization from this Assembly. It's just been an order in council, and he's been doing it. He's up around \$2 billion at this stage, as near as one can tell from the December 31 quarterly statement of the heritage trust fund and looking at the order in council which he made.

So again, it seems to me that the government needs to be more up front with what it's doing with the heritage trust fund and tell clearly to the people of Alberta what it's doing with that fund and bring more of the fund back under control of this Legislature.

I rest my case.

MR. WEISS: Briefly, I would just close by saying that I'd like to assure the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway that I'll provide a written answer to all of those hon. members, that I've undertaken to do so, I'd like to thank all hon. members for their support and their criticism, because I accept it in the manner it was presented.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Question on vote 1.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 - Kananaskis Country

|                        |             |
|------------------------|-------------|
| Recreation Development | \$3,861,000 |
|------------------------|-------------|

Total Vote 2 -- Municipal

|                          |             |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| Recreation/Tourism Areas | \$2,000,000 |
|--------------------------|-------------|

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, I would so move that votes 1 and 2 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. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolutions, reports as follows, and requests leave to sit again.

Resolved that from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1988, for the purpose of making investments in the following projects to be administered by Agriculture: \$5,000,000 for Farming for the Future; \$25,000,000 for irrigation rehabilitation and expansion.

Resolved that from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1988, for the purpose of making investments in the following projects to be administered by Recreation and Parks: \$3,861,000 for Kananaskis Country recreation development; \$2,000,000 for municipal recreation/tourism areas.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you all agree with the report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? So ordered.

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

16. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that pursuant to Standing Order 58(6) the number of days that the Committee of Supply will be called to consider 1987/88 Capital Fund estimates shall be two (2) days.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, in speaking in support of motion 16 on behalf of the Official Opposition, I do so pointing out that we agree to limit the debate on the Alberta Capital Fund estimates in this budget year to two days this time. We realize we're dealing with a shrinking budget, but I would like to note that traditionally there have been up to three days allocated for debate of estimates under this particular division. We reserve our right to deal for more than two at some point in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: Call for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion carried]

[At 10:49 p.m. the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]