

THIS TRANSCRIPT HAS NOT BEEN THOROUGHLY EXAMINED FOR ACCURACY AND IS,
THEREFORE, AN UNOFFICIAL DOCUMENT.

Standing Committee on The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act

Thursday, October 4, 1979

Chairman: Mr. Payne

9 a.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to call to order this meeting of the select committee. Good morning, gentlemen.

I had committed yesterday to having this document in your places at 9 o'clock. I regret it's not quite ready. It's now being assembled in the lounge, and I'm assured it will be another five or 10 minutes.

Perhaps I could explain what it is. Out of those memoranda that incorporated a number of recommendations we simply took all the recommendations individually, determined I think it's seven categories, and then simply assembled them in this binder by category, with the surname of the submitter at the top right hand side of the page. We have simply numbered them sequentially within each division or topic. I think that's going to facilitate discussion and review as we proceed. Hopefully, I'll be able to circulate these to you and to members of the press gallery in another 10 minutes.

I'd like to suggest we begin our deliberations today by discussing and hopefully accepting with or without amendment the redrafted scholarship recommendations of the *ad hoc* subcommittee.

I must admit, I was expecting an omnibus or combination recommendation, but we appear to have one signed by Mr. Knaak and one signed by Mr. Clark on the subject of scholarships. Mr. Clark, am I correct in assuming there will be a third recommendation from the subcommittee?

MR. R. CLARK: No. Mr. Sindlinger will be making an addition to the recommendation dealing with the \$100 million, so that really there will be two, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see.

MR. R. CLARK: That's an accurate assessment, Tom?

MR. SINDLINGER: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. I think that perhaps I was laboring under a misunderstanding as well. I thought that we had come in with a composite. I think that perhaps if I take my recommendation and include it in this one from Mr. Clark, we could also probably take the other recommendation and include it as well, and without any trouble, finally come up with one recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I suggest that those of you who haven't done so take a moment or two to read both of them. Then I'll invite discussion.

Perhaps I could invite comment with the obvious observation that the distinguishing characteristic of the two recommendations is the academic level

at which they function. One is obviously an undergraduate scholarship, the other intended for postgraduate work.

Mr. Clark, could I ask you to begin discussion? Perhaps you could summarize the discussions of the *ad hoc* subcommittee, and we could go from there.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I think your assessment of the difference is basically correct, that this is not only aimed at undergraduates at the universities, but also at the other postsecondary educational institutions in the province. That's why it talks in terms of postsecondary educational institutions.

My own view, Mr. Chairman, is that with Mr. Knaak not being here . . . We had a bit of an attempt yesterday to incorporate the two ideas together. I hope I'm rather reflecting the feeling of the subcommittee accurately when I say we found that somewhat difficult to do. I suggest we ask Mr. Sindlinger to suggest to the committee his addition so that we might deal with this matter, and that when Mr. Knaak returns next week we could have a crack at further incorporation of his into this recommendation or going that one alone. But I think it important that he be here to have a chance to develop the idea somewhat further.

MR. SINDLINGER: I'd like to suggest we take the recommendation from the official opposition and begin with that. If I may, it reads that "\$100 million be allocated from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund to endow a 75th anniversary scholarship fund for. . ." Stop at that point and put a colon. Under there say: "1) for undergraduate students of Alberta's postsecondary educational institutions," et cetera; "2) for provision of graduate scholarships to outstanding Alberta students for the purpose of facilitating," et cetera, which is, in effect, Peter Knaak's recommendation.

So just tack that on as number 2, and at the end of that, a semicolon and you go to number 3, my recommendation, which would be: "for students playing for any university or college intercollegiate team", et cetera. So now you have a consolidation of the three scholarships.

The concept is the same: to provide a 75th anniversary scholarship fund. I think the subcommittee would be unanimous on that. Then the three subitems just specify the directions in which the funds should be dispersed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sindlinger, may I ask what the implications are for the total funding of the endowment in such an omnibus recommendation embracing all three? Do you see it remaining at the \$100 million figure, or do you add the \$100 million to the \$30 million, plus whatever the third figure was intended to be?

MR. SINDLINGER: At the risk of sounding like C. D. Howe and saying what's another million when you get around this \$100 million here, if you take the \$100 million in the opposition recommendation and the \$30 million in the Peter Knaak recommendation, you're at \$130 million. Since these are rough estimates in the first place, I think that would be sufficient, at this point, to cover the requirements of the three subcategories of the anniversary scholarship fund.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the committee's efforts, I think they have missed the thrust of the whole thing. How are you going to encourage students to thrash around for \$2,500 when, as a common laborer on a

construction crew working for 10 weeks, you can make \$3,200? So I'm not going to get to excited about picking up \$2,500 to go on to university.

I think we have to emphasize -- and none of the suggestions of Mr. Clark, Mr. Sindlinger, or Mr. Knaak recognize the difficulty we're facing. Somehow we have to convince people after they have their advanced education and have been exposed to world scientists and traveled in European universities and wherever else, that somehow we have to develop programs or incentives for them to come back to Alberta.

They're not going to come back to Alberta just because they like the blue sky, and I think the committee should address itself to that problem. This is why I was suggesting the \$100 million shouldn't be just restricted to the scholarship program. Really, I think they're losing . . . The idea the federal government had after the war was, let's educate our veterans. Period. Let's not be restrictive about it. Let's take a strong stand on it.

I won't quarrel with the idea that people should be required to pay part of their education costs. I don't quarrel with that at all, and I certainly don't agree that we should be putting \$500 million in, even though it was in my suggestion. That was only a long time down the road. It should start at \$100 million.

So I'd like the committee to go back to take another look at it. Frankly, I'm concerned that if we add in Mr. Sindlinger's scholarship for sports, I feel. . . I know he's sympathetic and has a particular bias; unfortunately I have a bias the other way. I think it's going to be a lot easier to sell a program of this nature to the people of Alberta if we eliminate the athletic scholarship side of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clark.

MR. R. CLARK: I'd like to respond to those comments very directly. The way this is going to encourage students to go to university or other postsecondary institutions is to say to them, at the end of four years you'll have \$10,000 less student debt to pay off. In essence, that's what it comes to.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, as far as the suggestion of encouraging people to come back to Alberta from other parts of the world, I can appreciate that that is a concern. But if all of us were to read our own speeches on occasion, there should be no reason at all why they don't come back to Alberta.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, if we're going to get involved in that kind of detail in all the recommendations we're going to handle on this committee, we're never going to get recommendations by the time the House is adjourned, whether it's November or December.

I appreciate the points Mr. Musgreave raises, but it seems to me we have to deal in general principles here, and then all of us have a crack at the implementation when the legislation comes back to the House. I really urge the members of the committee to deal with the general principles. We all have some concerns about the various recommendations, but let's deal with the general principles, get those before the public of Alberta, and put the meat on the bones after that.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to find out if Mr. Musgreave's concern is with the concept or with the magnitude of the numbers. I'd suggest if it's with the numbers we not deal with that point until we get consensus on the concept.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say I agree with Mr. Sindlinger's comment that it's first of all . . . I had assumed yesterday we had reached agreement on the concept. The only comment I'd make with respect to Mr. Clark's statement is that I think that's correct. We shouldn't get into a detailed statement here of all the ifs, ands, or buts. As a matter of fact, if anything, the rewrite is, in terms of the \$2,500 per student, maybe a little more detailed than I would have liked to see.

I think the original drafting by the official opposition was probably a good statement of the principle, that we want to make available a scholarship program for undergraduates in the province. Whether it should be a maximum of \$2,500, \$2,000, or \$3,000, frankly is the kind of thing I would imagine people in the Students Finance Board, the colleges, and universities would be in a better position to judge than us.

I think it would be a mistake, in all of the recommendations we're going to be dealing with over the next couple of days, if we get into infinite details, because then we'll never achieve anything.

I would agree with the composite we have. We're saying a scholarship, a) for undergraduates, b) for the provision of graduate studies, and I don't know how we can deal with this question of bringing people back who studied in the United States, England, or wherever, unless you have some kind of punitive program that I think most of us would be reluctant to see attached to a 75th anniversary scholarship plan.

That's why I asked Mr. Knaak that yesterday, and it seems to me he took the position that we're just going to have to take our chances with people coming back to Alberta once they've gone to another jurisdiction to study. But that doesn't mitigate against the value of the scholarship program.

With respect to the intercollegiate sports scholarships, quite frankly, as far as Mr. Musgreave's view is concerned, I have a sneaking suspicion that would sell the program in this province. It would be a plus in terms of making it an attractive, popular program that people in this province would accept.

MR. MUSGREAVE: In response to Mr. Notley's last remark, hopefully some day we're going to look at the highest common factor instead of the lowest common denominator. I agree with Mr. Clark. I think this committee should recommend that \$100 million should be allocated from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund to endow a 75th anniversary scholarship fund. Period.

I think then we should leave it up to the foundation, or whatever is set up to establish this, to set the terms of reference and how much the scholarships should be or whether or not . . .

One simple way of bringing people back home would be to suggest they could have research money available so they could conduct a 10-year program, say, in conjunction with industry or university. That's a positive, not punitive approach.

Mr. Chairman, I'm saying I would agree that we just make the general recommendation that we put in, I think \$100 million into a scholarship fund, leave it at that, and proceed on.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I'm getting the impression there's a fourth area here. We've all categorized three: one, the undergraduates; two, the graduate scholarships; three, the athletic scholarships. Now Mr. Musgreave's is a fourth one, postgraduate research scholarships. I'd ask if that's correct, and if it is, I suggest we again take the first line of the opposition recommendation, as Mr. Musgreave has suggested, and after "the anniversary

scholarship fund", instead of putting a period, put a colon and list these four areas, so that after it's established, those in charge of the fund have a good idea of our intentions in regard to the disbursement of those funds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps I could try to focus our discussion now. It seems to me we have two conflicting recommendations or suggestions before the committee. On the one hand, Mr. Sindlinger's, in which he initially suggested three post-colon categories in the recommendation -- I presume to help the reader understand the intent of the recommendation -- followed by his amendment, the addition of a fourth. On the other hand, we have Mr. Musgreave's that we avoid any such specific detail and simply go with a single sentence statement of principle, if you like, quantified to the extent of the \$100 million reference.

Could I invite comment on those two recommendations?

MR. MUSGREAVE: I had made a note to that effect, and while I thought it was getting too much detail, I would be prepared to withdraw mine and support Mr. Sindlinger's. I had a note here that it could be fellowships, the establishment of university chairs, grants for long-range study--all sorts of these kinds of devices that we're not able to recommend or develop, and obviously the university people . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then do I have committee agreement on the initial sentence or preamble of the recommendation of the official opposition, supplemented by Mr. Sindlinger's recommended list of four categories of scholarship recipients? Do we have agreement there?

MR. R. CLARK: I don't like to play the role of the Leader of the Opposition again, but I can obviously buy the first three. I have a little bit of difficulty with the fourth one, the postgraduate.

It seems to me that so much of our money goes into the postgraduate area. Let's put it this way: here we're trying to emphasize a portion of the postsecondary education system, aren't we? It seems to me we're saying here that the emphasis is on undergraduates, on people going out of the country and hopefully coming back, and on people going to other postsecondary institutions.

My own biases are rather strongly that so much of our university funds end up in postgraduate people that here's a chance for us to say at least that we're going to emphasize those other areas. If the powers that be, when they're implementing the program, feel there's a gap there, obviously they'll come back to the Legislature with a pitch.

I think we lose a bit of our emphasis if we try to cover the whole gamut. I'd see postgraduate work as the fourth area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comment on Mr. Sindlinger's recommendation, the fourth category, the postgraduate research scholarships?

MR. APPLEBY: I'd like to ask a question, Mr. Chairman. When we speak of postgraduate research scholarships, does this mean we're looking for scholarships for students who've gone into a postgraduate program and are going to be doing research at the same time? I'm not too sure just what it means.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Musgreave would be in the best position to respond to that.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, what I had in mind was conceivably a person could get his doctorate in science in Europe and decide he wants to come back to Canada. Perhaps there may be an industry in the province that would be interested in his doing some long-range work. They may be prepared, say, to pay three-quarters of the costs of establishing labs and a salary for this person and his group, and I'm suggesting that perhaps this fund could put up the other 25 per cent. Those kinds of things. Maybe the university wants to establish a chair in a particular basic science in conjunction with, say, Cambridge, Oxford, or some university in England; this fund again could provide some of the money. In effect, it would be seed money.

In reference to Mr. Clark's remarks, we have to get beyond just the engineering degree or the Master of Science degree, because you can train engineers, chemists, and related scientific people a lot easier than you can bring forth, say, a person the caliber of Fleming, who discovered penicillin -- this kind of person. This is what we have to aim for, regardless of how much money we think we've put into those programs and the people have gone elsewhere.

MR. APPLEBY: Then what we're actually looking at here, Mr. Chairman, would be a program for research funding for people after they have completed their postgraduate studies. Is that right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, that should be part of an Alberta science policy.

MR. NOTLEY: With great respect, I think that's the point. We had a recommendation from Mr. Pahl that aimed in that direction, and it seems to me we should be looking at an Alberta science policy. One of the components of that policy is the very thing that Mr. Musgreave talked about: are we going to be picking up part of the cost for someone coming back and doing their research in the province of Alberta?

I hope I don't overstate the case, but to tack this on as sort of an afterthought in a bursary and scholarship program minimizes what should be one of the more important recommendations that we make as a committee. That's why I suggested yesterday that we wait until Tuesday when Mr. Pahl is here. He's presented us with a recommendation that deals somewhat with this issue. It also covers some of the things Mr. Musgreave has raised. Let us look at that as a separate area for recommendation, rather than try to lump it in with this one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There appears to be no further discussion. I'd like to call for the committee's response to two questions. Number one, do we agree with Mr. Sindlinger's recommendation that we add a number of items, after the colon if you like, in the recommendation of the official opposition. Do I have agreement on that principle?

Could I have a show of hands for those in agreement? Okay.

MR. R. CLARK: We'll have this vote, and if it's positive, we'll discuss the fourth one, will we?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Exactly.

MR. R. CLARK: Okay.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, you're saying that we add a number of items. Could we be specific about that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll be specific on the next question. I just wanted to be sure we had committee agreement on the principle.

MR. NOTLEY: For a composite resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, for a composite recommendation. We appear to have a consensus on that point.

We've obviously had both sides of the discussion then, on whether we include provision for research bursaries for those who have completed their academic studies. I'm reluctant to use the word postgraduate because it's ambiguous.

MR. R. CLARK: Before you pose the question, can I make it very clear at least from my point of view, that it isn't a matter of being for or against funding in this area. I strongly support the idea, but my plea to the committee would be that this isn't the place to do it. It's part of a science or research policy. That's where we should be looking at that kind of financial assistance.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get too political, and I know Mr. Clark is trying to zero in on the science policy. But let us assume we come forward with a grand science policy for the province of Alberta, and it envisages a lot of research and scientific endeavor of one kind or another, the very first thing that's going to occur to you is: where do we get the people?

We on the Research Council right now are considering a long-range plan for future expansion, and obviously we need more people. The usual place to get them is the universities.

I don't know whether I mentioned it yesterday, but the number of people in the province of Alberta going to university compares with the number going to university in Newfoundland. Perhaps in Newfoundland the reason is they can't afford it, and perhaps in Alberta the reason is there are lots of other ways of making money besides going to university. While I appreciate what Mr. Clark is saying, I think he's missing the whole point of the exercise. There's no point in thinking you're going to do something if you don't have the hands to do the job with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: An unfortunate repetitive element is coming into the discussion now.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I'll try not to be repetitive, but I have to agree with Mr. Clark on this particular issue. I feel that the scholarship fund we're discussing this morning will produce the people who will be qualified to go into research programs.

We do need a great many people for these programs. We are expanding research in many directions: in farming for the future, in the Vegreville research centre. I'm hoping we'll be going into more research in forestry at the Pine Ridge nursery, and so on. We'll need a lot more people, but I do

believe that financing or funding the people in the research area should be a separate thing from what we're discussing here right now. We're discussing scholarships to get people educated, to qualify them through their undergraduate and postgraduate studies, and then set up here, in some sort of a research program I hope, an atmosphere that will attract them to return to Alberta and go into the research programs we are promoting. I think that's the route we should go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sindlinger, may I ask you to repeat your initial recommendation, without amendment. Then I'm going to call for a vote.

MR. SINDLINGER: The one with the three attachments thereto? All right.

We have three pieces of paper, and I'd like to lead the committee through them by the hand, if I may please.

The first one is the official opposition recommendation to the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee. My consolidated recommendation is: "That \$100 million be allocated from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund to endow a 75th Anniversary Scholarship Fund". The next word is "for". I ask you to strike that out and put: "a.) for undergraduate students of Alberta's postsecondary educational institutions, such scholarships to be in the maximum amount of \$2,500 per student based on need and academic achievement"; and then I ask the committee to put down "b.)" and go to the recommendation submitted by myself yesterday on the long piece of paper -- the 8.5 by 14. It's recommendation 3. I'd ask the committee to go through the first part of that line and put down: "b.) that \$1.4 million . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Sindlinger, that appears as item 5 in the first section of the bound material.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have item 5, then. It would be: "b.) that \$1.4 million be provided annually for recreational grants for students playing for any university or college intercollegiate team, in order to. . ."

Then I would ask the committee to go down the page in the discussion to the fourth line from the bottom: "to encourage highly skilled, young athletes to remain in Alberta; to develop a high level of recreational competence and expertise; and, provide a rich resource of skills and leadership for Alberta's recreation and leisure industry"

Then "c.)", which would take us to Mr. Knaak's recommendation, the first one in this yellow booklet. Go to the fourth line. Cross out the first three lines, and begin: "c.) for provision of graduate scholarships to outstanding Alberta students for the purpose of facilitating the attendance at Universities of their choice in Alberta, other Provinces in Canada or any University in the World in order to permit Albertans to draw on expertise from around the world."

Mr. Chairman, that is a consolidation of the three recommendations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder, Mr. Sindlinger, if I could ask for a point of clarification. The consolidated recommendation you've just reviewed for us makes a specific reference in the first line to \$100 million. There is no dollar amount in subsection a or c, but you have plucked the \$1.4 million reference from your initial recommendation. That seems inconsistent to me. Could you comment on that?

MR. SINDLINGER: You're absolutely right. That is inconsistent. I wanted to get to the point where we agreed on the concept and the wording, and then we could plug in the numbers. I hadn't gotten to the point where I felt I could plug any numbers in here, so I just took the easiest course and put the numbers that were in. But that might be a matter for discussion now.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Sindlinger, I suggest we omit the numbers. I'm in no position even to begin to judge whether \$1.4 million is reasonable or not. Mr. Knaak's proposal suggests \$30 million, but we've had suggestions ranging somewhat higher than that. You know, I'm not even comfortable with the \$100 million. I would be willing to accept that, but I think the more we try to put figures into it, we get away from the principle.

We're talking about a three-faceted principle. We're saying scholarships that include undergraduate, postgraduate, and athletic or intercollegiate scholarships. It seems to me that the more we say that, the stronger our recommendation will be, rather than trying to plug in figures and arguing over whether it should be 1.4, 2.3, 3.6, 100, 120, 136, or 56. You know, I really think we get into a blind alley by doing that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I may, Mr. Notley, I would like to suggest that there is an up side of at least one dollar reference. For the reader, at least, it indicates the importance that we as a committee attach to the recommendation.

MR. NOTLEY: The \$100 million.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I agree with your point and Mr. Notley's. Another way of getting around this is that I think it's important that we give some dimension to the scholarship fund. I have to agree that it's really hard for us to sit here and say it ought to be \$100 million or \$100 billion. Perhaps we might get around that by suggesting the scholarships cover a certain portion of the student body. Say, the scholarships should be available to 10 per cent of this body there, 10 per cent of the athletes, or whatever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, Mr. Sindlinger, I detect three or four heads moving in the horizontal plane.

MR. EORSTAD: I think the simpler we can have the recommendation -- I agree with the \$100 million. Keep the rest simple and the three main objects we're trying to accomplish, and I think we're better off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I ask for committee agreement then on Mr. Sindlinger's reading of his recommendation, with the one change, the deletion of the \$1.4 million reference in subsection b. Any disagreement? Well, we'll show it in the minutes then.

MR. APPLEBY: The \$2,500 was included there, wasn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Appleby has raised the appropriate question, that we do have a second dollar reference, the \$2,500 per student.

MR. R. CLARK: Quite prepared to leave that out. The \$100 million, and we'd go from there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We then have agreement, with the exception of Mr. Musgreave? Do you want to speak to your exception, Mr. Musgreave?

MR. MUSGREAVE: Yes, I would like to say that, unfortunately, I have been unable to persuade any of my colleagues of my position. Regrettably, I think you have missed the whole point I was trying to make. That was my fault for not being better able to communicate with you. I see these recommendations at this point, without the suggestion of further moneys to encourage people to do a variety of things to come back here, I think you're doing nothing more than expanding programs that are already in place in our province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With Mr. Musgreave's comment, then. . . Mr. Appleby, did you want to make another comment?

MR. APPLEBY: Just briefly, Mr. Chairman, I want assure Mr. Musgreave that I don't think I've missed his point, and I don't think the other committee members have. What we're trying to get across is the idea that this should be a separate issue, something that could be considered, if we wish, in a different light, in a different manner. Certainly we could provide encouragement for this type of thing in some other manner, but I don't think it fits into this program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Let us then turn, if we may, gentlemen, to the . . . Sorry. Mr. Sindlinger.

MR. SINDLINGER: Would you like me to draft that and have it typed up for redistribution?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that would be very helpful. I'd appreciate that. Thank you.

Then, with Mr. Musgreave's exception we appear to have committee agreement on that recommendation. If you'd then turn, gentlemen, to the Parks, Recreation, and Culture section, the second section of the bound recommendations, you'll find six recommendations. Two or three are similar; all six are brief. Could I suggest that, because of their brevity, we take this opportunity to read all six.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I hate to be a thorn in your side again, but I don't happen to agree that all these are the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't indicate they were. I said two or three might be similar.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I'm sorry. Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I invite discussion, I'd like just to offer by way of explanation: item six, of course, is perhaps the least similar. It's in there because I really had no other category for it. As well, it did have a cultural implication in its reference to commemoration of the 75th anniversary. If anyone wants to challenge this categorization, I of course can understand that.

On the assumption that we've now read those, I trust you've noticed that at the top right hand I've written the surname of the submitter. I would ask Mr.

Musgreave and Mr. Borstad to speak to their similar recommendations related to the use of heritage funding for urban parks.

MR. BORSTAD: My recommendation goes along the lines of the present assistance allowed in the last two years to the two major cities of Edmonton and Calgary, in the Fish Creek and the park in Edmonton. It would help smaller cities to create a park in their cities, along the same lines, realizing the size of the city. I think it would probably have to be based on a per capita grant of some sort.

MR. MUSGREAVE: My thoughts were the same as Mr. Borstad's. I don't want to get into the per capita grant. I think it would be difficult to do that because in some areas there may be a significant amount of land that had to be purchased, and the per capita grant may restrict that. I'm not sure, but I think in the case of Calgary the funding was not done in that manner. I think it should be applicable to every city in the province, excepting, of course, Edmonton and Calgary. That was the intent of my notion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any discussion of Mr. Borstad's and Mr. Musgreave's recommendations?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, to both members. Mr. Borstad's proposal of a per capita grant would make it a little easier to apply the concept on a somewhat larger basis. I think it's fair for the smaller cities to say, Edmonton and Calgary have these urban parks, why shouldn't Grande Prairie, Red Deer, and Medicine Hat have them?

By the same token, though, if we're going to be putting substantial amounts of money into this kind of venture -- there's no question that an urban park is useful, not only for the people who live in that city but for the people around -- should we not also be looking down the road, on a phased basis, at some kind of program for parks in our smaller communities too, because they also are centres. Just to give you an example, the town we live in is 80 miles away from Grande Prairie. Wainwright is 70 or 80 miles away from Canrose. So it seems to me that the concept is a good one. A per capita grant arrangement would allow other communities also to look at the role of parks in their boundaries.

If we just get into the concept of engineering these parks, I could see where we'd just have to go a step at a time, and the best we could do would be to start with the cities, and perhaps work down. But in the capital works section of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund we are talking here about everybody's money, and I would ask both gentlemen whether they could see the principle being applied to the smaller centres. Let me put that to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Borstad, would you care to respond?

MR. BORSTAD: Yes, I could see that being added down the line somewhere. But you know Calgary and Edmonton have been going for a few years, and now a recommendation is coming for the other, smaller centres in the province, the other cities, and probably in a few years, I could see it going on down to the smaller municipalities. But that's why I mentioned it should possibly be established on a grant system of some sort. I realize Mr. Musgreave's comment, that that might dilute it some, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Musgreave, did you wish to respond to Mr. Notley?

MR. MUSGREAVE: I agree with what Mr. Borstad said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other discussion?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I agree in principle with the philosophy of what we're trying to accomplish here, but I have great difficulty in the pecking order that we should decide for allocating the money. I think we recognize that Capital City Park, Fish Creek Park in Calgary, and Kananaskis Country were great concepts and worthy places to invest our money. But we have to recognize that the parks system in Alberta serves a lot of urban people in rural areas. If we're going to continue to put our priorities on funding of parks by the graduated sizes of the cities of our province and not recognize at the same time that a lot of our park system throughout the province in the recreation areas is falling behind in dollars spent and the use by people from both the urban centres and the rural areas, I think we're missing the point of my idea that we'd better progress with a parks program that's all encompassing.

From my point of view, the people outside the metropolitan areas have accepted that we have a beautiful park in Edmonton -- I'm not as familiar with the park in Calgary. We accept that. But there has to be a point in time when our city brothers and sisters come out for recreation. And we find that since 1957 there hasn't been a dollar spent on some particular recreation area, that we'd better look at the total parks program when we start thinking of a heritage investment. I do not believe we can say, well now Edmonton and Calgary have urban parks, it's Red Deer's, Grande Prairie's, and Lethbridge's turn. I would be uncomfortable supporting this without recognizing that the total parks program, in some form, had better be recognized at the same time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you indicate what form that would take?

MR. STEWART: I would hesitate to support an urban parks program without in the same recommendation emphasizing that the total parks program should be funded and recognized, as well as being specific about one or two parks.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Borstad's original comment would make this possible. If we had some kind of per capita arrangement, it would seem to me feasible to move into development of parks on a decentralized basis in the smaller communities too. That's one way of doing it.

But I think Mr. Stewart has made the point that if we're going to be investing Heritage Savings Trust Fund money in a project like this, then it has to be looked at not just in isolation in terms of the other cities, but what we can do in terms of the entire parks system for the province.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the remarks made by Mr. Stewart that we should be looking at the total parks policy and the total parks concept, but I have some difficulty thinking this could be tied into some sort of formula on a per capita basis. If it was, the population of our local municipalities is not that great.

I have in mind the provincial parks in my area, where about 9 or 10 o'clock every Friday night in the height of the summer, you see signs up that the provincial park at Long Lake is closed or full and the provincial park at Cross Lake is closed or full, and the other parks are the same way. Yet the local population, on a per capita basis, would be expected to develop these facilities on the basis of what type of funding they got on that. I don't

really think it would work out in that type of formula, to give the kind of recreational facility we need. I think that funding has to be looked at on a provincial basis, on a use basis as far as those parks are concerned. I don't think the per capita would work at all.

MR. STEWART: I think Mr. Appleby has hit exactly on the point. We recognize parks are for all people. When we come into the city and get the opportunity to enjoy our Capital City park, we recognize that the bulk of the people utilizing it are citizens of the city of Edmonton, with the exception of visitors who are here on a short-term basis. But when we look at our parks system, we recognize that the mobility of people and the natural park facilities we have draw people from the urban to the rural areas.

When you start talking about a per capita funding system, it gets all out of proportion. I think the point I was originally trying to make is that I have no quarrel with the philosophy of having urban parks in our major centres, but part and parcel of our recommendation should be that we recognize the overuse of a lot of the recreational areas we have in the rural parts of the province that are used by our city cousins. We expect them to come and use them, and if you start talking about per capita funding, it gets all out of proportion.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I agree with what Mr. Stewart and Mr. Appleby have said. I believe we should be looking at a broader program than was discussed in the earlier recommendation. I was wondering if we said that financial support should be provided through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund to parks operated by municipal bodies. I understand that the Edmonton park will be operated by the city of Edmonton, the Calgary park by the city of Calgary. Across the province, I know in the rural areas -- I can think of three in my own constituency where small municipal parks are being initiated at the present time that do require funds, and that serve not only local people but people from Calgary and the urban centres. Possibly that is a categorization. I'm just taking it off the top of my head that maybe a per capita formula could allocate the funds accordingly to these municipally operated parks.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I wholly support what Mr. Stewart said. The only difficulty I have with per capita funding is that we've had a lot of criticism from the Alberta municipalities association on per capita grants and this kind of funding. But I don't know how we get around that difficulty. I just felt that the suggestion was that there was an expansion into the parks program. Perhaps we are zeroing in on just part of it, and we should be taking a more general approach, because, going back to our discussion on the other subject, we were thrashing around with the same sort of thing. Perhaps we should try to put the motion more in the direction of Mr. Stewart's thoughts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Since the opening remarks of Messrs. Musgreave and Borstad on their recommendations, we've had I guess three new points raised; one, the inclusion of other communities or municipalities that are not "cities"; two, that the funding arrangements, whatever they are, be done on a per capita basis -- and I haven't by any means detected a consensus on that one; and third, Mr. Speaker's comment that perhaps the vehicle would be an allocation of funds from the heritage fund to the municipal operating units for the operation of their municipal parks. Could I ask for committee consensus, if we have it, on the initial concept of the inclusion of non-city municipalities, if you like, in this recommendation?

MR. BRADLEY: I was going to put forward an amendment to Mr. Musgreave's recommendation which I think would cover that: instead of saying "funding of urban parks", just put "funding of parks in the smaller centres in the province" rather than in all cities. I think that would cover all the bases, and we could get on to the discussion of whether it should be on a per capita basis or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Discussion of that amendment?

MR. NOTLEY: I think that would be an excellent amendment. As a matter of fact, as I understood the original proposal, we were really saying that quite apart from our provincial parks system we now have two parks in Edmonton and Calgary, and we're looking at the idea of urban parks in the centres of the cities that will be somewhat comparable to the two parks in Edmonton and Calgary. The suggestion that has been made fits that, as far as I'm concerned. I think that in terms of overall parks planning you can't just ignore what we're doing in all the parks, the provincial parks and the municipally operated parks out in the country, because they all have an impact.

But as I understood the proposals, we were really dealing with the rationale for the city parks, which was that we have a problem in the urban areas of people having access to recreation facilities. If that holds true in Edmonton and Calgary, it also holds true in a smaller centre where a senior citizen may just like to go through a park in the middle of town. It's not going to be anything like Fish Creek park. It's just an attractive town centre. It seems to me that the suggested amendment would allow us to fit that concept into the proposal. Whether we link that to a total parks policy for the entire province is another question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree it's another question. Any comment on the suggested amendment of Mr. Bradley?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to support that amendment. The only thing -- I didn't hear it in the amendment, and I hope the concept was that we do not tie this policy to per capita funding. Because geographic differences will sometimes create an opportunity for a small community of say 5,000 to 8,000 people to develop a park that would have a lot of outside use by the nature of its location. But if we start putting a per capita figure on its cost we may be putting a city like Drumheller at a particular disadvantage, because they've got the opportunity to develop something much greater than their per capita dollars would allow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate what you're saying, of course. I don't believe Mr. Bradley's amendment made any reference to the per capita funding arrangement. I'd like to confine discussion to the amendment, if I could, and then move on.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, looking at Mr. Bradley's amendment, it refers to funding of parks in smaller centres. I think this gives us a sort of gray area. I would be more inclined to go along with Mr. Speaker's recommendation that we say the funding of parks in municipal jurisdictions within the province. It would be more specific.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Chairman, I had one along the same lines, so I might as well throw it in too: that the program of assistance to municipalities be

established to provide parks in these areas similar to those being carried out in the two major centres.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do I have agreement on that?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we have it. Mr. Bradley has withdrawn his amendment, and it appears we have consensus on Mr. Borstad's revision of the amendment. Could we now have discussion, if it's warranted, on the concept of per capita funding. It seems to me that we've had a difference of view there. It was an afterthought? I see. Do we have any proponent for per capita . . . ? I think we're there, then. Mr. Borstad, could I ask you to draft the revised recommendation, and then we'll circulate it to the members of this committee when we meet next Tuesday and get the ratification.

Passing on, then, to recommendation 3, Mr. Bradley's recreational lake development project. It has no similar recommendation, so discussion will be confined to this one. Mr. Bradley, did you wish to speak to it?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the particular area of the province with which I'm familiar, southern and southeastern Alberta, due to the climatic conditions we don't have the bountiful number of lakes that people in the northern part of the province have, unfortunately. Most of the water-based recreational opportunities we have there are on small man-made reservoirs or lakes, or sloughs where a dam has been built at one end to increase the level of water. This has been our experience, and I'm sure the Member for Little Bow will agree with me -- either we've had these lakes built because of irrigation projects, or a fish and game association has gone out and built one of these small lakes. I can think of the areas we have now: Chain Lakes, Beaver Mines Lake, Allison Lake, Kehoe Lake, and Park Lake have all been small man-made lakes. In Calgary you look at Chestermere lake; again, that's an irrigation lake.

Quite frankly, people are attracted to water in terms of looking for recreational experience. We have a real lack of lake opportunities in the southeastern part of the province and in the eastern slopes. This is why I bring forward this recommendation. I don't think the province would, in its normal budgetary process, engage in the development of small man-made recreational reservoirs. We have a number of multiple purpose reservoirs, the irrigation ones, but if for need of water they have to be drawn down you lose your recreational opportunity part of those lakes. That's why I suggest we should engage in the project, look throughout the province in those areas that are deficient in that water-based recreation experience, and look at constructing some of these small man-made reservoirs. I'm not talking about large bodies of water; they can be under a square mile, a half-section type of development. But I think it would be important to present and future generations of Albertans that we make this type of investment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Discussion of Mr. Bradley's recommendation and comments?

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Bradley, could you give us some indication of what it would cost to build a man-made lake of 1 square mile?

MR. BRADLEY: Each one would of course depend on the site you're looking at and the type of problems you have, the type of terrain you're looking at, the

height of a dam you'd have to build. It would vary. You're probably looking at around \$1 million per project. I would suggest in that order: \$.5 million to \$1 million a project, at the minimum. I don't know how many projects -- you'd have to do an analysis in terms of the province, where you could do this, in which areas it would be desirable. It would be similar to the grazing reserves program. You'd have to have people in Environment or Recreation and Parks look at this. I would suggest you're looking at five to 10 as an initial program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have agreement? Do we have any disagreement with the specific phraseology or wording of the recommendation?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if I could take this opportunity to read you Mr. Borstad's suggested redraft of the urban park recommendation: "That a program of assistance to municipalities be established to provide parks in these areas similar to those being carried out in the two major centres of Alberta". Agreement?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We turn then to item 4.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, going back on that, I wonder if we should say, "provide provincial parks".

MR. NOTLEY: We're talking about municipally owned parks.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Well, Fish Creek park is not municipally owned. Sorry.

MR. NOTLEY: But it's operated by the city of Calgary, isn't it?

MR. MUSGREAVE: It's a joint deal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the committee like to pursue this discussion; that is, the question raised by Mr. Notley and by Mr. Musgreave of the question of ownership and operation of an urban park?

MR. APPLEBY: Would you read the recommendation again, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: "That a program of assistance to municipalities be established to provide parks in these areas similar to those being carried out in the two major centres of Alberta".

MR. APPLEBY: In that, then, we are not going into the question of control or responsibility, and I think we should leave it that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll turn then to item 4 in this section. That's Mr. Bradley's recommendation of a historical resources conservation and stabilization program. Mr. Bradley, would you care to comment on your recommendation?

MR. BRADLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I feel quite strongly in this area that, in terms of the development of the province and the condition of a number of our historical resources, we are in need of an immediate program or project to attempt to stabilize or conserve some of these historical resources which may be in jeopardy. I think the appropriation from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund would be most appropriate in this particular case, in the sense of a catch-up or a stabilization of these resources. If we don't take some immediate action, we're going to lose some of these buildings or resources, and quite regrettably, down the road 25 or 50 years from now, when we look back at the early development of this province, its early history, we're not going to have those examples to show our children or future generations.

The Department of Culture probably has a list of critical provincial historic resources which need immediate attention. If one wanted to discuss dollar terms, I think \$5 million to \$10 million would be an initial program which would go a long way to stabilizing or conserving some of these provincial historic resources which may disappear quite soon if we don't take some action.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if I could ask, Mr. Bradley: do you envisage this as a new program or as an extension and elaboration of the existing program within the Department of Culture?

MR. BRADLEY: I look at it in terms of -- we have a program managing our forests which is a sort of catch-up program. This would be that type of thing: a catch-up, a stabilization, and then after you've been able to stabilize these resources, get them to the point where they're no longer in jeopardy, then this program would naturally end and become a normal program. The restoration or reconstruction part of it would then become a project of Culture.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Could Mr. Bradley give some examples. It's not clear to me what he means by these resources. What are some examples across the province?

MR. BRADLEY: Well, let's see. There's the Stephansson house in the Markerville area, which is really in a state of disrepair and needs some reconstruction. I can think of Leitch Collieries in the Crowsnest Pass, where one of the walls of one of the buildings has recently fallen down. If some action had been taken to shore that up, to perhaps get in and put some mortar in there and stabilize it, we would have that for a longer time without its deteriorating to that point. There's the factor's house at Fort Dunvegan. The Delta Potteries in Medicine Hat is another one. The Grandin house and Father Lacombe's church in St. Albert are some examples I could give.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I would be very pleased to give my full support to this type of resolution. The type of funding for these historical restoration programs has in the past been on a very *ad hoc* piecemeal basis. I have a significant example in my constituency, the Athabasca Landing trail. They have a foundation set up for this, and over the past several years they have been endeavoring to find sources of funding to help them restore the trail and preserve the various artefacts along it that should be necessary. There has been some modest funding through Culture, Tourism, the former Department of Recreation, Parks, and Wildlife, but there has been nothing that is set up and any source that a foundation such as this could go to to get assistance for this type of program. I think it's very necessary. It could be under the

Department of Culture, but it has to be a specific development within that department, so that they could have this funding available for these purposes.

MR. BRADLEY: If I might add just one further point, we talked about economic diversification in this province. I think one thrust could be in the area of historical resources. If we don't have them there down the road, in terms of generating tourist traffic, things for people to see in Alberta, we've missed the boat. If we take some steps now, then in terms of economic diversification strategy later on, we've got these resources which can then be developed further. But we have to stabilize and conserve them now that they're there, if we have those options down the road.

MR. NOTLEY: I think there's no question about that. The preservation now is going to be an investment in the future. The only thing I wonder, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps Mr. Bradley could answer this question: where do things now stand -- I should have asked this when the minister was here -- in terms of our parks policy as far as historical parks are concerned? I gather that one of the categories is the historical provincial park. It strikes me, frankly, that this is an area where we are so far behind where we should be, because I think the sense of history can be a real selling aspect in having a good provincial park, and there are a number of areas where you can combine the recreational facilities and history.

You mentioned the Dunvegan factor's house. That's one obvious example, but there are others as well that could be cited. I recall when I finished university I went down the Coal Branch, and at that time I think it was Mercoal was still standing. Of course, in our typical approach the whole thing was just levelled. But there was a mining town where people had lived for 40 years. In the United States they'd turn that into a gold mine, and you'd have people going to see it, or as they did in British Columbia with Barkerville or as they're doing in Dawson City in the Yukon. In my own mind I'm not in a position to know what the policy is. Are you in a position, Mr. Bradley, to advise us just where things stand on that historical component of our parks policy in the province?

MR. BRADLEY: I believe there is the category of a historical park, as one of the five categories of parks the province has, the interpretive sort of park. I think there's enough scope there that that would be part of the thrust of the provincial parks. But I couldn't say exactly that that is there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other discussion? Are you ready for the question? Do we have agreement on Mr. Bradley's recommendation as submitted to the committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Recommendation number 5 within the section, submitted by Mr. Sindlinger: "That an Alberta Council for the Arts and Humanities, similar to the Canada Council, be established to foster the cultural endeavours of Albertans". Mr. Sindlinger, do you wish to speak to your recommendation?

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, for the information of the committee I'd like to outline a few things about the Canada Council, so we all have a general idea of what this recommendation deals with.

The Canada Council was created by an Act of Parliament in 1957. Its objective is to foster and promote the study and enjoyment of, and the production of, works in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. It receives funding from three sources: one, from a Parliamentary grant; two, from an endowment fund established by Parliament; and three, from private funds willed or donated for use in accordance with the wishes of the donors. Over the years the Canada Council has expended funds to individuals and organizations. Funds have gone to music and opera, theatre, dance, visual arts and photography, art banks, writing, publication and translations, film and video endeavors, and for tourism.

I would envision something similar for Alberta. We do have several organizations in the government which deal with certain areas, but to my knowledge there's nothing that deals with these things on a co-ordinated basis. Furthermore, I think these are the types of areas that require creativity, imagination, and initiative. In my experience, these are not qualities that have been imbued in our civil service. Therefore I think an agency such as an Alberta council for the arts and humanities would serve the social welfare of the people of Alberta.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I wonder if this isn't an endeavor that's already under way by the province through the Department of Culture. As MLAs I'm sure we all get copies of letters where various grants are going to dance groups, individual artists, things of this nature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sindlinger, do you wish to speak to Mr. Musgreave's reservation?

MR. SINDLINGER: There's no question that the Department of Culture is providing grants to various individuals and groups. But again, I don't believe it's on a co-ordinated basis. I think all these things ought to be brought together under an outside independent agency rather than a government agency, because I don't believe the provincial civil service has the initiative or the mandate to go out and develop and promote things in the arts and humanities the way an outside independent group could. MR. CHAIRMAN: And obviously you would see that funded from the heritage fund as opposed to general revenues.

MR. SINDLINGER: Yes.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I guess we've come to a fundamental difference again, and that is that this government has abolished several commissions -- I can think of the universities commission for one, and the health commission for another -- which were devices where large sums of tax dollars were given to independent agencies to do specific things. I think this would be in a similar category. I promoted an arts council in the city of Calgary some years ago, when we were giving something like \$20,000 a year to the arts. When I left it was over \$100,000. I don't quarrel with the concept, but I think the arts community is very adept at generating ways and means and ideas of how they should receive more money. I don't think they're depending on civil servants to take the lead.

So I would have reservations about going this route, not because of the support for the arts but because of this fundamental difference of, do we have commissions, boards, and agencies that are independent of the political arm,

or do we have the politicians, by way of ministers, responsible for the development of these things?

MR. BRADLEY: Is there not already an Alberta arts council which is an established body funded through the lottery program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The chairman does not know. Mr. Sindlinger, would you be aware of such a council?

MR. SINDLINGER: To my best knowledge there isn't a council, nor is there one similar to the Canada Council, which I've just outlined.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Chairman, there is an arts council. I'm not sure exactly how they're funded, but I think they get their money from the province. My wife belongs to the arts council, so I know there is such a thing. I'm not sure it operates exactly the same as the Canada Council, but there is an arts council for the province.

MR. SINDLINGER: I'll be more specific then. There isn't an arts council in Alberta that has the breadth and scope of the Canada Council, nor the co-ordinating ability. Things in Alberta are done on an *ad hoc* basis, to my best knowledge.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I certainly believe in the concept of support for the arts. When we get into the areas of funding and decision-making regarding that funding, I think we're going to get into the question of human beings making decisions. I don't think it will make that much difference if they're going to be made by civil servants or by what might be called an independent council for the arts. Certainly I know some of the decisions made by the Canada Council in this respect have been things you could wonder about. I don't know if we need to go this route at present or that it would be an improvement over the system that's being followed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Two questions. One, would there be the necessity of legislation to bring this council into being? Two, are you thinking in terms of support for the operations of such a council, or in terms of capital grants to the council which in turn would allocate them to various groups -- not really capital, but grants made available to various groups for performances. . . There's two, operation of the council and operation of other kinds of art groups or cultural groups. I'm not clear.

MR. SINDLINGER: First of all, in regard to the necessity of legislation, the answer to that question is yes. Second, in regard to the manner in which support would be given to the proposed council, I think there would be two types: one in the form of an endowment to sustain its operations on a continuous long-term basis; and two, operational grants of a short-term nature for *ad hoc* occasions or as necessity dictates. I might add that the Canada Council co-ordinates this type of thing, not only for all of Canada but through Canada's overseas efforts through the United Nations as well.

MR. NOTLEY: What are we looking at in terms of this operation? Would there be an endowment? Of how much? Are we looking at annual allocations from the fund to this Alberta council? For example, what is the budget of the Canada

Council for the country? Do we have any figures on that, so we have some idea of what we're comparing it to?

MR. SINDLINGER: First of all, the Canada Council is . . . I've got some figures in front of me, and they run into the hundreds of millions. I'd have to take a few minutes to add them up. But it was initiated by an endowment from the federal government, the magnitude of which I don't know. An Alberta council would have to have an initial endowment from the Alberta heritage trust fund as well. We're in the same situation we were in earlier when talking about educational scholarships, in terms of ascribing numbers to them. I can't put a number to it this time, any more than Mr. Bradley could put a number to the development of recreational lakes in the province.

MR. STEWART: I've only got one observation to make. It appears that on a national basis we have a Canada Council. The Department of Culture in this province has fostered and supported many groups that have been quite successful. I fail to see the pressure from the community for an Alberta council of this nature. When you start to talk about co-ordination, I think it's the initiative of the individual people and groups that make the success of a lot of these programs. If our Department of Culture has been successful in supporting these groups that have on their own initiative brought forth individualistic programs relative to their own culture and needs, I fail to see where we need an overriding body that's going to start dictating and taking away some of the initiative that we've already generated in this province. On that reasoning, I would have to have more convincing arguments for the program than I've heard today.

MR. SINDLINGER: With all due respect to the Department of Culture, I don't believe the department has the inherent ability to promote and foster the arts in this province. It's true that it promoted them in a sense, but that promotion has been in the form of writing cheques. They're good at writing cheques and going over proposals and things of that nature, but they do not have the creative ability, imagination, and initiative required of the arts. The arts is a very specific cultural area.

MR. NOTLEY: With great respect, Mr. Sindlinger doesn't place quite enough credit where it is due as far as the Department of Culture is concerned. I've had my quarrels with the department, as people know, but there are a number of very useful programs. The comment is made that the department is good at writing cheques. That's true. But one of the things the department does is to make it possible for performing artists to travel around the province. If we didn't have the funding made available from the Department of Culture it wouldn't be possible to have drama, many of the arts now available in the smaller centres in Alberta. In the last few years we've made some real progress with concert societies and what have you being established throughout the province. It's not possible for somebody to set up a concert society in High Level and then pay all the costs of bringing in a symphony orchestra; yet because of our Department of Culture program it has been possible to get a much greater access to the arts among the people of Alberta. So I think the department has done a little better job than the suggestion has been made.

Where I would see some merit in Mr. Sindlinger's suggestion is that as things presently stand it is still an arrangement where government is deciding what will be done. As I gather, the Alberta council for the arts and humanities would try to bring in more representation from people directly

concerned in the arts themselves, in the decision-making process. There may be some merit in that. It's possible that it could even be dovetailed with what we're doing now. The thing that concerns me a bit, before making a resolution, is that I'd like to know exactly what we are doing now. Mr. Borstad says there is an Alberta arts council; we're not exactly sure what its role is. We have a situation where we have what I think is the germ of a good idea, but the question is how it can be dovetailed with what is already being done.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, could I volunteer to do some more research on this, and bring back the information Mr. Motley has requested in regard to agencies already in place providing similar services?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have agreement there?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've now been meeting for 90 minutes, and we have another 90 minutes. Is it the committee's wish to go straight through, or would they like a break of five or 10 minutes? Okay, let's break for say 10 minutes and reconvene at 10:45.

Gentlemen, we do have a quorum, so I'd like to proceed. Mr. Sindlinger has indicated that in the interim he's been able to do some preliminary research that he feels may be adequate for us to complete our deliberations on the parks, recreation, and culture recommendation number 5.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. During the coffee break I went downstairs and got an organization chart of the government of Alberta. For the information of members, there are quite a few activities undertaken by the department. I'd like to list a couple of them. One is the Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts; another is the Alberta Art Foundation; the Alberta Cultural Heritage Council; Historic Sites Board; Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation; Alberta Historical Resources Foundation; et cetera. They are all along those lines: councils, foundations, boards, et cetera. The only question I have in regard to the recommendation and to the present structure of the department is the question of the opportunity that participants in the arts and humanities have for input to the decision-making process. That's one area, an important area, that could be bridged by an Alberta arts council. It could provide the opportunity for input to the government programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any discussion of Mr. Sindlinger's coffee break research report?

MR. BRADLEY: A question to Mr. Sindlinger with regard to the council for arts and humanities. Obviously we're looking in terms of an endowment. Does he have a figure he would be proposing in terms of an endowment to the council?

MR. SINDLINGER: No.

MR. BRADLEY: Because I think the idea of setting up a council for the arts and humanities is probably an excellent one. I've done some preliminary research during the break too. I thought there was an Alberta arts council, and it is the Alberta Art Foundation, which deals with only one segment of what Mr. Sindlinger is talking about.

The question of an endowment interests me. I have some concerns as to how much you'd put into it at this time. I think you could set up an Alberta council for arts and humanities outside the trust fund, and consider an endowment at a future date once the council is operating and has some of its parameters set.

MR. SINDLINGER: That's the second time the question has come up, and I'd like to elaborate a little. Rather than just saying no, I have no idea of what amount of money should be put into an endowment. I would suggest the first thing that would have to be done would be to take a survey of what's going on in the arts and humanities at this time, and identify and define their needs and requirements for the years to come, and then from that point determine the magnitude of the endowment.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a mistake for us at this point to try to put any figure, even though I asked Mr. Sindlinger if he had that information. It strikes me that his answer is a very good one -- that we should in fact get some indication of the need. But that doesn't stop us from considering the principle. Whether that endowment is \$10 million, \$2 million, \$20 million, or none at all, the proposal is that we establish an Alberta council for the arts and humanities.

The other principle that strikes me as important is that while the Department of Culture does a lot of good work, the role in the decision-making process of people in the arts and humanities -- somewhat similar to the Canada Council -- would be conducive to a better feeling on the part of these people rather than however well laid out the plans of the department may be. It seems to me the two could dovetail together: the department work on one hand and the Alberta council on the other.

So I would be generally in favor of recommendation number 5, but I wouldn't want us to try to put a figure on it now, because quite frankly we'd be stabbing in the dark, and I don't think that would be a responsible thing to do at this stage. But the principle of a council which would not operate in competition with but complement the work of the department, where there is a more direct voice for the people in the arts and humanities -- I think that's an excellent principle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Singlinger, I wonder if for the benefit of Mr. Clark and Mr. Appleby you could summarize your coffee break research report, and then I think we'll be ready to call for the question.

MR. SINDLINGER: During coffee break I went downstairs and got an organization chart for the province of Alberta. I'd just like to identify a few of the foundations, boards, or councils the Department of Culture has. There are already in existence the Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts, the Alberta Art Foundation, the Alberta Cultural Heritage Council, Historic Sites Board, Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation, et cetera. The point I made was that the question remains what input the participants in the arts and humanities have in the decision-making of these boards, councils, and foundations. I've made the suggestion that an Alberta council similar to the Canada Council could provide that communication between the participants and these agencies of the Alberta government.

MR. BORSTAD: I agree totally with the principle, but I wouldn't like to see us just creating another body. I would like to see a dovetailing of some of

these along the lines of Mr. Sindlinger's recommendation to accomplish the things he's trying to get at. I don't agree with just creating more bodies to keep . . . Government seems to have that tendency to keep adding more bodies. I would be more along the line to try to see something more dovetailed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Borstad, would you like to see a rewording of the recommendation, or not?

MR. BORSTAD: I agree with the principle, but I'm not sure I agree with just creating another body.

MR. NOTLEY: Would it complement the work of the Department of Culture, so in fact we . . . I think that's the point we all want to make: we don't want two bodies competing with one another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sindlinger, would you be happy with such an amendment, and if so would you care to articulate it?

MR. SINDLINGER: I think that's an excellent suggestion, and to articulate it all we would do is put a comma after "Albertans" -- "complementary to existing Alberta government departments".

MR. CHAIRMAN: "Government programs". The council would be complementary to a program as opposed to a department, I think. A subtle point.

MR. SINDLINGER: All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Discussion of the amendment?

MR. MUSGREAVE: Could I hear the whole recommendation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's as written, number 5, with the addition of "complementary to existing departmental programs".

MR. MUSGREAVE: Would this council have a separate grant, a foundation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sindlinger, do you want to respond to that?

MR. SINDLINGER: Yes, it would.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Appleby, did you wish to comment?

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I should, because I'm opposed to it, and I should say something. I feel it would just be creating another body, as Mr. Borstad said, to do the work being done already. I don't agree that the Department of Culture is just a cheque-writing group, because they have drama workshops, music workshops, dance workshops, and a great many other activities to encourage the arts. I don't really see any necessity for this Alberta council for the arts and humanities.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I support the principle of setting up an Alberta council for the arts and humanities, and I think it may be something we need in the province. But I have really strong doubts as to whether it should be funded out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund at this point in time. If such

a council were set up, at a future date, once it's operating and has some parameters, it may then be eligible, or we may look at an endowment to that council to carry out some of its activities. But at this point in time I would be opposed to setting it up out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. But I support the principle of such an organization.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bradley, I operate from the assumption, and I stand to be corrected by the committee, that any recommendations that are tabled in the Legislature from this committee will have direct current relevance to the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

MR. BRADLEY: Then I would oppose this recommendation at this time.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, for the record, that would be my feeling as well. I would like to see Mr. Sindlinger present a bill to the Legislature when it opens, with this idea in mind. Certainly after it has been discussed by the various interested parties, in principle I would support it in the House; there's no question about it. Following that, I'd certainly be prepared, from the group's advice, to look at some type of endowment from the heritage savings trust fund. Possibly a year from now Mr. Sindlinger could come back . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: After the passage of legislation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: After the passage of the legislation, and make a request to us. I'd be quite open at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion? Those in support of recommendation number 5, as amended by Mr. Sindlinger -- could I have a show of hands. Mr. Notley. Those not in support of Mr. Sindlinger's amended motion. Messrs. Appleby, Speaker, Stewart, Borstad, Clark, Musgreave, and Bradley.

Recommendation number 6, submitted by Mr. Sindlinger:

That low interest loans be made to small municipalities for capital projects undertaken to commemorate Alberta's 75th anniversary; and, that operating grants for these projects be given on a decreasing scale so that after five years, the municipality assumes responsibility for all expenses.

Mr. Sindlinger, did you wish to speak to your recommendation?

MR. SINDLINGER: Just three brief comments, Mr. Chairman. First, in regard to the low-interest loans, I think we ought to establish that it would be worth while to consider an in-between point for investments of the heritage fund: a point between those social investments which do not have any rate of return at all and those investments made to give the heritage fund a reasonable rate of return. That's one thing that should be established by this committee.

The second thing is that I think it is worth while developing projects commemorating Alberta's 75th anniversary. As a young person and even now, I and my family and all Albertans enjoy going to the Jubilee Auditorium in Edmonton and Calgary. I would suggest something else along these lines.

Finally, the third point, operating grants for projects. Very often governments provide capital grants for development, and the recipients of those grants find they're in a position where they can't operate them immediately. However, over a shorter period of time they can develop the capability to operate a capital project given them through a capital grant.

So I would suggest that not only a capital grant but an operating grant be given which would ease the transition from the point where a recipient had no operating expenses to cover to the point where all operating expenses would be assumed by the recipient of a capital grant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Discussion of Mr. Singlinger's recommendation?

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, as a former member of the Alberta Provincial-Municipal Finance Council it was very revealing to me to learn that many municipalities in the province, excluding the major cities, were debt-free. This was quite a surprise to me. The \$250 per capita debt reduction program that we carried out this year results in many municipalities having their own small heritage savings trust funds. Because the money was given on a per capita basis and they had no debt, obviously they got the cash. I'm sorry, it was \$500. In the case of Calgary it came out to \$250 million.

I think there is substantial money available to these small communities now, and if they want to do these kinds of things they should make it on their own initiative and do it in that regard. I am opposed to more of these kinds of things by the provincial government, because it does weaken the local authorities. If we try to go this route, we are weakening the ability of small communities to govern. I don't think we should engage in any program that would contribute to that.

Similarly, it's my understanding that the rate of interest on loans through the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation was in the range of 8 to 9 per cent. The prime rate at the bank today is 13 per cent, and if you want to borrow money it will cost you anywhere from 14 to 16 per cent, depending on your credit rating. So I think there is already money available if they want to do this, and I would be strongly opposed to this notion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions of Mr. Sindlinger, or any comments in general?

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, this program as suggested basically has some valid foundation for something that would be useful in Alberta's smaller communities, no doubt. But I see it as encouraging those small municipalities to undertake capital expenditures, and this clause which states that operating grants would be given would tend to lull them into a false sense of ability to maintain and support these capital expenditures, these capital projects they have undertaken. I know a lot of our smaller communities have in the past run into difficulties by undertaking capital projects that were perhaps beyond their means to maintain. This is an increasing problem, this maintenance and operating cost of projects.

Of course this would be a general budgetary item if there were to be an increase in grants for operating costs for these types of projects. Under the 75th anniversary program a certain amount of money is going to be available, in addition to what Mr. Musgreave has said in the debt reduction program giving them their own heritage funds. There's going to be a certain amount of money available in grants for this sort of thing. I'm not very sure that this recommendation is timely at this present stage.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think I agree with some of the points Mr. Appleby has made. In travelling around the province talking to local town councils, there's no end of concern about the problems of getting into major capital projects where we've had cost-sharing programs available by the province, and

then what happens to the operational costs. This proposal makes it even more difficult for the town council, because a group that wants to build let's say a community hall, and they go to the town council and they say, look, you guys are out of your mind; we can get the capital to build this thing plus the operational costs for up to five years -- and that's certainly going to be very difficult to say no to. But at the end of the five years the town is going to be stuck with the operational costs.

Of course that's exactly the sort of thing you get over and over again. We find that we're caught with budgetary commitments that have been made by other people, and we don't have any control over our budget. So however useful the project may be, it does distort local priorities. It seems to me that the operational grant end of it is even trickier than our present schemes, because it will make it almost impossible for many communities to say no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion of recommendation number 6? If not, could I have a show of hands for those members of the committee in support of the recommendation. Mr. Speaker. Those not in support of the recommendation. Messrs. Motley, Appleby, Stewart, Borstad, Muggsavage, and Bradley. The recommendation is defeated.

We turn now to the next section of our recommendations, related to public lands. The first is too long for the Chair to read, so I'll give the members of the committee an opportunity to read it and then invite Mr. Stewart to speak to it.

It appears the committee members have now read your recommendation, Mr. Stewart. Do you wish to speak to it?

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't think this resolution comes as any surprise to the members of the committee. I brought a resolution before the Legislature this spring. It was debated, and one of the few that got full support; it was passed in the spring session.

I think public land in this province is a natural resource that saw very little initiative on the part of government, to upgrade and take full advantage of. At the present time, as my brief states, we have roughly 6 million acres of this land held under grazing reserves, grazing leases, that are continually deteriorating through brush encroachment. We also have in the fringe areas of our province many farms that I consider are operating in a bottleneck, for the simple reason that they cannot expand. The green area is designating land that has very little forestry potential that could be absorbed into the agricultural portion of our economy and would create an opportunity for people already there to keep their families together, expand their farming operations, and become more viable enterprises.

Throughout the balance of the province, in the parkland area most of our lease land is unproductive as far as agriculture and any other capability is concerned. But it's also an area where we've had the highest degree of encroachment by brush in the last 10 or 15 years, to the point that the grazing potential has dropped roughly 30 per cent. I think a program of this nature has to be timely with the economy of the province and the particular industry it's adapted to; that is, the livestock industry. When our cattle numbers are low we have the local people with the initiative to get involved in a program of this nature. The land that was held in private hands at the drop in the cattle market in 1974 -- any of it that had any other agricultural potential was brought under the plow and at the present time is producing cereal grains and things of this nature. With the high escalation of land values since that time, there's very little likelihood that much of this land

will ever go back into grass and be utilized for livestock production in that nature.

As a province we have a responsibility. We have a natural resource that has . . . We're probably the most fortunate province in Canada that has undeveloped land with agricultural capability. In this respect I'm talking specifically of land that could be producing grass and enhancing our livestock economy. The program has to be timed. When our cattle numbers are low, the reasons I've given that they will not likely return to the numbers we had in the past -- Alberta's got an opportunity to enhance its livestock production back to its former numbers, when we were producing 40 per cent of Canada's beef. We have a Canadian market for that product. This particular phase of the industry recycles itself through several phases within the province. It gives the barley producer a market for his feed; it gives the packing industry an opportunity to handle this product before it reaches the consumer.

I think we have a responsibility as a government to take this Crown land and create a program where it will come on stream in an orderly manner that will be acceptable to the people in the area. It deserves the same consideration as our irrigation for funding. The whole program needs to be reviewed. We've got a great opportunity. We talk about diversification in this province. It's an opportunity to enhance an industry we already have. For that reason I would ask the support of the members. I'd be glad to hear their viewpoints, and hope that this recommendation will go forward from this committee.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Stewart, could you indicate the difference between your recommendation and the program already undertaken in the capital projects division, the grazing reserves development? Are you departing from that program in your recommendation?

MR. STEWART: This would supplement that program. The grazing reserve program is specific to identifying a parcel of land of sufficient scope that a grazing reserve operated by the provincial government can be developed and utilized by farmers who can deliver cattle to the project, and they are totally under the control of the administration of the grazing reserve during the time they're there. This program would fit the other areas that could not comply to a grazing reserve type of operation. We have grazing associations that are self-contained as far as their administration or management is concerned. Throughout the province we have many individuals with grazing leases that vary from a quarter section to several sections. This program would facilitate the upgrading of those portions of land that are under the control of private individuals and grazing associations. The opportunity, with the expansion and improvement of some of this Crown land, would make a reallocation of some of these grazing leases possible so that more people could become involved and utilize them. It would take nothing away from the grazing reserve program, but would supplement it.

MR. R. CLARK Mr. Chairman, I plan to support Mr. Stewart's recommendation. But in saying I'm going to do that, I want to make the point now, and I don't want to make it repeatedly when other recommendations come up. If I understand Mr. Stewart's recommendation, it's really a matter of helping individuals, grazing allotments, or grazing associations improve grazing land we have today. I'm very supportive of that. We have some nominal programs now that make small, perhaps halting, steps in that direction. Some have been in place for a number of years, some are more recent.

The point I want to make to the members, and that I don't want to have to make time and time again -- make the speech again -- is what we're really doing here is building on a program that is in the normal operating budget of the province. My colleagues and I have made recommendations the last couple of years about this. In principle, I think it isn't right. But we're now starting to use the fund this way; in other words, for operating beds in hospitals or whatever. If we're going to use it in that area and other areas, and that now appears to be an accepted practice of the allocation of funds in the recommendations the government makes to the Legislature, I see no reason why we shouldn't move on this recommendation Mr. Stewart has made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before acknowledging Mr. Borstad's desire to participate, could you, Mr. Stewart, speak to Mr. Clark's reservation about the use of the heritage fund for this kind of program as opposed to using general revenues?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I think we have precedents in believing that this sort of program should be funded from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I use the irrigation rehabilitation program as one of the prime obvious examples. I also see this program going beyond the existing leases in the fringe areas of our province, to developing and redefining some of the green areas that have limited forestry potential. In my travels -- and I'm sure Mr. Clark and Mr. Notley will agree with me -- I think that in the fringe areas of our agricultural part of the province we have many farmers who are limited in their ability to expand, because they're sitting next to an area designated as green area. Some of it has forest potential, some of it is questionable. It's an opportunity to give those people the chance to expand, the chance to keep their families together and expand our agricultural use of this province.

This is another justification of why money from the heritage trust fund . .

When we talk about diversifying our economy, I think we have a golden opportunity here to invest money that will recycle through the community and through the economy to the extent the rehabilitation of irrigation will do. For this reason, I think we have a justification of believing that this money should be cycled through this program, and it will return to the people of Alberta and give us a much better economy.

MR. BORSTAD: I totally support Mr. Stewart. Coming from the north, I'm not quite familiar with the areas in southern Alberta he's talking about, but I know in the north there are grazing leases townships in size. Any improvements to those in the way of clearing, brushing, and seeding is sure a heritage for the future, as far as I'm concerned. I guess the other recommendation I had here about homesteads falls along the same lines Mr. Stewart just mentioned. I know a couple of areas in my constituency where there are 25 or 30 families living almost totally isolated in a green area pocket. They want to increase the size of their area so that their children can stay there and take over the farms, but naturally in today's economy you have to keep expanding if you're going to keep the bread on the table. In this one particular area I'm talking about, there's no way of expansion under the present system, because it's totally in a green area. There's no forest potential there whatsoever -- it's poplars. Any expansion along that line probably leads into my other recommendation. I'd leave it at that.

MR. NOTLEY: I was going to say that, first of all, we do have several recommendations, but these recommendations deal with homestead sale in the

yellow area. What we're talking about here is the efficient use of the green area. I certainly support the recommendation Mr. Stewart has made.

Just in terms of our report, though, perhaps it might be possible for Mr. Stewart to summarize it for our recommendation, because it's going to be fairly long to put the entire recommendation in the way it is. There's a fair amount of argument, all of which I agree with, but I don't think we need the argumentation in our list of recommendations.

The argument that this in fact could come under the operating budget -- I guess that's true with so many things. It's very difficult to draw the line. As Mr. Borstad pointed out, if what you're doing in a grazing reserve is brushing and fencing, you're adding to the capital of that grazing association in the same way that we are when we spend money on irrigation rehabilitation. If we can commit money from the heritage trust fund to irrigation, and properly so -- and we have a number of recommendations where we're even going to propose increasing that commitment to irrigation -- then the same argument could be made just as validly. One could say, we've got the grazing reserves. That's true. We've got the grazing reserves. But beyond the grazing reserves is the question Mr. Stewart raises of economic units where in fact we may have leases that could be upgraded to make a more viable farm unit in a given area.

So I think it's an idea that has a good deal of merit, and one that should be supported standing on its own. Then we'll look at the homestead question separately.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to lend my support to Mr. Stewart's proposal. I agree with Mr. Notley that perhaps Mr. Stewart would be able to put it into a recommendation form rather than the form it's in right now. I believe an investment from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund in a natural resource, our land -- upgrading of land -- is a very appropriate use of Heritage Savings Trust Fund moneys. I can think of areas in the foothills where a lot of grazing land has been encroached by trees and brush. This would enable us to increase the carrying capacity of these lands. It's an investment in land that I think will stand the test of what a heritage investment should be. So I would certainly support it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do I sense, then, that we have committee agreement on this recommendation from Mr. Stewart, with the understanding that he will summarize his discussion into a recommendation form?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

In view of the fact that Mrs. Fyfe is not here today, I'd like to suggest to the committee that we pass recommendation number 2 and return to it on Tuesday, and continue with a discussion of recommendations 3, 4, and 5, inasmuch as all three deal -- although not identically -- with the question of homesteads. If I do have that agreement, could I then ask Mr. Clark to speak to recommendation number 3.

MR. E. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of recommendation 3 is obviously to enable us to get more homestead lands available. When the minister was in, I think he talked in terms of 50 sections a year. We've arbitrarily talked here in terms of doubling it. But the purpose of this recommendation from us is to say that we should double our effort in this area. I don't think I need to say a great deal more than that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Notley, would you care to discuss your recommendation in the context of this discussion, or would you prefer that it be treated separately?

MR. NOTLEY: No, I think it should be treated in the same discussion. Basically all three are very similar.

The question is really whether we should set out an objective. This resolution has been accepted for the last two years. Mr. Clark's resolution would double the number. Frankly, I think the important point to make is that we want to underscore the importance of getting on with the job. Fifty sections a year is rather a leisurely pace.

Having represented a rural area in the north for some time and dealt with the Department of Public Lands and Wildlife, I have a certain amount of sympathy for the new minister, who takes over a department that I think needs to be upgraded in terms of its importance, and probably needs more staff so that it can do the job properly. We have back-ups on inspections for a year or two years. It's a personnel problem, because we don't have enough people in the field.

What I think is needed is, first of all, a recognition of the importance of this as a priority item. Second, if we're going to open up homesteads, we do need the infrastructure, and that means there has to be co-ordination. You can't just say to people, we're going to open up 500 homesteads, and then there are no roads, no power, no schools, none of the infrastructure. Mr. Borstad and I both emphasize the infrastructure. Third, I think we have to take a look at the question of financing and even the terms of sale. I find it very difficult to understand some of the prices charged for public land, for example in the La Crete area. We've come a long way from the day when the homesteaders said, \$10 and a quarter section of land. It's now a different situation entirely. I've talked to a number of people in the region on that score, and it was discussed at the Agriculture North conference as well.

Basically, my recommendation is to stress the need to get on with the job, upgrade a department so we can get on with the job, and recognize that in doing that we're going to have to take a multidepartmental approach so the infrastructure is there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Borstad, did you wish to speak to your recommendation?

MR. BORSTAD: My recommendation is similar, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to see land added to those areas. I'm thinking in particular of the La Crete and Fort Vermilion areas, where machine agencies are closing because there is not enough farmland to enable them to carry on. If we were to add to those areas by expanding the infrastructure along the periphery of the settlements as they stand now, I think we could establish a better farming community. Also we would establish machine agencies and the other services that go along with it, to enable those farmers to carry on. Right now we have machine agencies because there are strictly not enough farmers in the area to warrant a machine agency. So they have to go to Manning, Peace River, or someplace else.

MR. R. CLARK Perhaps I should have made this comment when I made my opening remarks. It seems to me that one possibility the committee may want to consider at this time is that -- and this is based on the assumption that everyone on the committee feels that the land branch needs the leverage or beefing-up of this committee. Here's a chance for this committee to really say to the Legislature, not in a critical manner: here is an arm of government which we think has got to be substantially upgraded. Maybe what we should do,

Mr. Chairman, if that feeling is prevalent within the committee, is go back and have a couple of members of the committee take the intent in these three proposals and come back to the committee next day with a resolution that incorporates what's here, but also really says, look, the land branch in Alberta needs to be beefed up and elevate its priority a great deal. That would be a new role for this committee, but one I think this committee should seriously consider shouldering, and one I'd be prepared to say is worth the earnest consideration of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We 've now had introductory comments by each of the submitters of these three homestead-related recommendations. We've had Mr. Clark's suggestion that these three form an *ad hoc* subcommittee with the purpose of drafting a consolidated recommendation that would at least implicitly, if not explicitly, indicate the committee's feeling of inadequacy as to the present programming. Discussion of Mr. Clark's suggestion?

MR. SINDLINGER: I'm not too sure where we stand on that, Mr. Chairman. As Mr. Notley has indicated, these same recommendations came from the committee in the two prior years, '77 and '78, and the response given by Mr. Hyndman when he was here was that these things are being done, and being done on a phased, orderly basis. The departments responsible for them are Energy and Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Transportation.

MR. NOTLEY: I think it's precisely the response that we got this year from Mr. Hyndman on the recommendations last year, that I think Mr. Clark's proposal is a very reasonable one. I'm not blaming anyone. I think the Department of Public Lands and Wildlife has a very difficult assignment with the personnel it has. When you've got back-ups in inspections for more than a year, I don't blame the people doing the inspections. I really question whether we place enough emphasis in developing the system so that we can handle it efficiently. I think that's basically what Mr. Clark has suggested here.

We could pass the resolutions -- we've worded them very gently and politely. I suppose even putting the resolutions in again would indicate to the government that, notwithstanding the response by Mr. Hyndman, we feel this is a priority that should be addressed. But beyond that, I think there's some merit in saying to the Legislature that we really think there should be an upgrading and that that's something the minister and the Executive Council collectively would have to consider.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion of Mr. Clark's suggestion of a drafting of a consolidated recommendation?

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, the response we have received to this recommendation as it has gone in the past two years leaves some room for doubt in my mind as to whether we have received a satisfactory answer in respect to its disposal. I feel this is something that rates very high priority and that has not received the recognition it should have received when it was being considered for Heritage Savings Trust Fund investment. Therefore I would be very pleased to see it go forward once again.

Also, with regard to Mr. Clark's suggestion, I speak from a very personal viewpoint at the present time. My view has always been that here in this province the status given to the Department of Lands and Forests, as it originally was set up, and the other departments as they developed out of that in the last few years, has never been as high as that of certain other

departments, and certainly never received the recognition that it should have as far as government was concerned. I feel there is a very, very urgent need for a definite upgrading of the manner in which we deal with development and disposal of Crown lands. This also applies to forestry, as far as I'm concerned. I would be very happy to see, if we think it is appropriate, this committee make some recommendation that we feel there is an urgent need for this upgrading, that we feel the time lag in decision-making in this department regarding lands is in a very sad situation, and that something has to be done very quickly in order to bring it into line with the recognition it should receive.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I support the thrust of the recommendations with regard to homestead programs, increasing the amount of land that comes on stream in that program. If we're talking about an upgrading of the Department of Public Lands and Wildlife, I think that sort of discussion, urging, or debate would better take place in the budgetary process next spring than in the heritage fund committee.

MR. MOTLEY: With great respect, I think what has happened is that we've put in the recommendation -- incidentally, the unanimous recommendation from both the 1977 and '78 committees -- and the response we got from the minister -- I don't want to put this in any partisan sense -- was essentially, we're doing the best we can. I think that as a committee we have to sort of review that. While it is certainly proper, Mr. Bradley, that in the budget debate next spring we discuss the estimates of the Department of Public Lands and Wildlife, the question here, in addressing a resolution for the coming year, if we think there should be a speeded-up program . . . Because I think Mr. Hyndman's response was completely accurate within the context of the present strength of the Department of Public Lands and Wildlife. Probably we are doing the best we can.

But what Mr. Clark has said, and what people in the field have told me, and what I feel very strongly myself, is that we have to upgrade the department. Mr. Appleby is completely right: the Public Lands department has been -- not the unwanted child, but the not front-and-centre child in the government for far too long. We're saying it's important enough now, that the land that could be used for homesteading in this province is sufficiently important as an objective that we want this to be given some attention by the investment committee. We have to say it, not in rude terms but in fairly direct terms, to convey clearly our sense of the need to move and upgrade the importance of this department.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I can get back in, I support the discussion with regard to homesteading, that we should be moving in that direction and increasing the amount of land available. But I really have a great deal of difficulty in discussing in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund Committee the upgrading of the Department of Public Lands and Wildlife. I really think that that debate or discussion should be urged in the Legislative Assembly in a different matter, if it is the judgment of members of this Assembly that the upgrading of that department should take place. That debate should really take place in the budgetary process.

I cannot support the idea -- and I'm extending this principle to any government department -- that we should be taking Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee recommendations that we should upgrade a certain department which comes under the normal operating budget of the province. I just cannot agree

with that concept or principle, that we should upgrade a department of government from Heritage Savings Trust Fund money. If we make that decision -- and maybe rightfully so -- that a certain department should be upgraded, it should be within the normal operating budgetary process of the province.

MR. R. CLARK Mr. Chairman, in responding to Mr. Bradley's comments, I think the committee is at somewhat of a crossroads. I believe this is the only recommendation the committee has passed unanimously for two years, where the cabinet has come back to the committee and said, we're doing all we can possibly do.

The committee has three choices, I guess. One, we can say, thank you very much, and we will make the same recommendation a third time, which would seem to me the very gentlemanly thing to do. Second, we can say, look, we've sent the recommendation in twice, and nothing of substance has taken place, so why send it a third time. Or third, we can say, look, we're serious about this recommendation. Despite the fact that we've sent it in twice, and we've been told twice that the government is doing all it can under the existing circumstances, we still feel there's a need for us to expand what's being done in this area. So we say, despite the fact that we've recommended this twice and no great action has taken place, we're saying we want to substantially increase homestead land that can be available for young Albertans as a part of diversification for Alberta and for the future.

The committee is really saying, doggone it, whatever has to be done to make that possible, let's get it done. We're really saying, look, the lands branch is the place it has to start. Because I get the feeling the poor old lands branch -- it used to be this way in the past, too, unfortunately -- has very little leverage when it comes to Transportation and getting money to put roads in the La Crete area as opposed to getting roads up where the next oil sands plant is going ahead, or to get the attention of the people in Agriculture when they've got other communities fighting for additional DAs and all other services. It's pretty hard to get Agriculture's attention for that kind of expansion.

So I urge members of the committee to think: isn't the committee at somewhat of a crossroads here? For two years we've made the recommendation. We've been told, we're doing all we possibly can. If the committee still feels we need to expand this area -- and I get the feeling we do -- then we have to take some additional step to impress the Legislature and Albertans that this needs to be done. Mr. Bradley, the time to make the argument that you're making, I believe, with great respect, is when the report of the committee comes before the House and we're debating it. We need to say, look, these things have to be done in the lands branch. This committee, I hope very much, will speak out and say, we're not satisfied with the reaction to date, let's move from there.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I think the function of this committee is to make recommendations relative to the heritage trust fund. If this had been the first time this recommendation was coming forward, I think Mr. Bradley's argument may have been in order.

But this committee sat for two years recognizing this problem, recommending on this problem, and the Provincial Treasurer has come back and said, we're moving as fast as we can. If we're serious in our responsibilities here, I think it's our prerogative at this point in time to make this resolution again, recognizing that it's been in here twice before, and be very firm about the fact that we're not satisfied with the progress that's been made. They

have made the statement that their people are working to the best of their ability. It's within our jurisdiction to make the statement that if that's the best we can get from that many people, maybe we don't have enough people. I don't think we're out of line in making this statement, in view of the fact that this committee has sat and made that same resolution three years in a row.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With the concurrence of the committee, then, I'd like to strike an *ad hoc* subcommittee comprising Messrs. Clark, Notley, and Borstad, perhaps with the chairmanship of Mr. Appleby, with a view to bringing a consolidated recommendation that reflects the comments passed today, for this committee's review next Tuesday. Mr. Bradley, would you like to speak to the Chair's suggestion?

MR. BRADLEY: I want to get in a point of rebuttal perhaps, too. I support that recommendation of the Chair, to set up the committee. I guess maybe I'm getting into a question of semantics and terminology. I support the thrust in terms of increased homestead lands being brought on stream. I solidly support that. My question is in terms of the definition of upgrading with regard to the department, and I just put that out there again: in terms of recommendations of upgrading departments, I don't feel that's the thrust we should be taking. I do support quite strongly the homestead increase proposal.

MR. NOTLEY: One other point I'd like to make. Basically I think that's true: we shouldn't be getting into discussing matters that properly should be dealt with when the budget comes up in the spring. But we can't just make these recommendations in the abstract. The vehicle of all our recommendations, or most of them, is going to be the government of the province of Alberta. If there seems to be some problem with that vehicle, there really isn't a heck of a lot of point in making the recommendation again in the abstract. We then have to identify the problem. Mr. Stewart has quite properly pointed out that if this had been the first year, fair ball; but this is the third year. So I think most of us perceive a problem in the way the government has been able to respond to our previous recommendations, and where that exists we have to draw attention to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sindlinger, and then I'd like to suggest to the committee that we will have ample opportunity to discuss these very principles when we have before us the redrafted consolidated recommendation.

MR. SINDLINGER: Two things, Mr. Chairman. First, I'd like Mr. Stewart to know I support him wholeheartedly in what he has said. The second thing is in regard to these recommendations we make. I'd like to make this note now but bring it up again at another time when the committee is deliberating other matters. That's the question of the response of the government to these recommendations. I would rather not wait another year to sit down here and then say, what has government done in response to these recommendations. I'd like to see if we couldn't incorporate some mechanism whereby throughout the year we could somehow monitor the response of the government to the recommendations the committee has made. I want to note that now, and bring it up again at a future time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair has taken due note of Mr. Sindlinger's comment.

MR. R. CLARK: Could I just add, Mr. Chairman, I think it's an excellent comment. All of us have to remember that unfortunately the budgeting process starts about June or July. For the budget that is going to come in in 1980 it started last July. That underscores the reason for us to rethink how we structure this committee so that we get some input back in June or July -- to the Member for Calgary Buffalo -- because if we don't get the input there . . . It's virtually too late now, isn't it, for the budget next year? At least to a very great degree. So I support strongly the point made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On that realistic note, then, I'd like to ask Mr. Appleby: are you clear on the expectations of this *ad hoc* subcommittee?

MR. APPLEBY: I hope so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. With that, then, we meet next at 9 o'clock Tuesday morning. I'd like to point out that we will not meet in the legislative chambers; apparently some work will be being done on the sound system. It's been suggested that we meet in room 312. With that, could I have an adjournment motion? Mr. Notley, thank you.

The meeting adjourned at 11.55 a.m.