

[Chairman: Mr. Oldring]

[2 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Would the committee come to order, please.

We have with us this afternoon the Minister of Recreation and Parks, and in a moment I'll ask him to introduce some of the people that have joined him. I would refer members to pages 24 and 25 of their annual reports, and you can see the projects under the capital projects division of the trust fund that we'll be reviewing this afternoon.

I'm going to take some chairman's prerogative here just to brag a little bit about Red Deer's Waskasoo Park. It's something that I'm very familiar with and have watched develop very rapidly in the last two years. It's something that the city of Red Deer is certainly proud of, and we extend an invitation to all the members to come and tour it with me.

Mr. Minister, you'll be happy to know that a number of the members had the privilege and opportunity of touring Kananaskis Country quite recently. I see that Mr. Ed Marshall and Margaret Qually are here this afternoon. They were tremendous hosts, certainly thoroughly familiar with Kananaskis Country, and were able to accommodate the members in a very helpful fashion during our two-day tour.

I also want to mention that for me a real highlight of the tour had to be the William Watson Lodge; I was very impressed with the facilities there. Also, we were greeted there by the assistant manager, Mr. Watson — not related to the William Watson — a very capable young man. It's something of interest to note that this particular young man was totally blind but pointed out to me that he had already memorized 25 kilometres of cross-country trails all around the lodge that he is able to go out and ski by himself. It's also interesting to note that he goes early in the morning before the sun is up or late at night after the sun is down so that he doesn't bump into other skiers.

We had a very informative and helpful two-day tour. On that note, Mr. Minister, I'll turn it over to you to, as I say, introduce the people that are with you and perhaps highlight the format you are going to use this afternoon.

MR. WEISS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I

appreciate the opportunity to be here today before you and, as well, welcome the opportunity to clarify any misunderstanding or misconceptions you may have about how the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee has affected our department. I am particularly pleased to note that within your annual report our particular department comes under the Quality of Life Initiatives, because we believe it is quality of life that can be expressed in so many areas, not just in what we provide in facilities but in the overall programs. To that end, we believe very strongly in what it does and how it affects Albertans as a whole.

I would like to introduce the people with me today, in no particular order. I'll start with Sara-Jane Gruetzner, the young lady in blue and the red scarf, who is the manager of the urban parks program in the recreation development division. Sara will be presenting a slide presentation to you this afternoon as well. Followed by Sara is Doug Balsden from the outdoor recreation facilities, section head of the recreation development division. Next to Doug is Carol Shields, my executive assistant, who most of you have had the pleasure of meeting and working with. To my right I have John Weins, the manager of financial planning and management in the finance administration division. To my left is David Rehill, the executive director of finance in the administration division, and next to Dave is the senior of our group, "the Senator" as we call him, none other than Ed Marshall, the managing director of Kananaskis Country, whom you mentioned earlier. Seated next to Mr. Marshall is Donn Cline, the assistant deputy minister of the design and implementation division. As indicated as well, there's Margaret Qually over on the far side. That's our group, Mr. Chairman.

We want to kick off today, if we may, with two presentations, one being an audiovisual on Kananaskis and the second a slide presentation on the urban parks program. We specifically zeroed in on those two items because they represent the major expenditure in dollars under the program that you people administer. We feel very strongly about it and very supportive.

We'd like to go over some of the highlights and welcome any suggestions and comments you might have after the two presentations. We would be particularly pleased to have the

negative side of some of the things that you may or may not have seen, because I understand that some of you were not able to participate in the recent tour of the Kananaskis site. To those that had the opportunity, I'm certainly pleased that you did. I apologize that we perhaps took a little more of your time in visiting a couple of other facilities in the area, but we thought it was very important that you saw them because they play a large part in what we're providing in facilities for the citizens of Alberta.

So without any further discussion from me ...

MR. NELSON: Excuse me. Could I just butt in for a moment, please, Mr. Chairman?

MR. WEISS: Certainly.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Minister, I just thought you might have missed one of your visitors here today, Murray Dale. He does all the photography work and also does the photography and reporting on OCO. He's sitting over here, and I didn't want to miss out.

MR. WEISS: I welcome the accreditation, and I'm sure Murray will as well. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, after the two presentations I would like to come back with seven or eight minutes of opening remarks as they pertain to the discussion as well. So perhaps I could kick off with having Ed Marshall carry on with the audiovisual at this time.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it was indeed a privilege for Margaret and me to host some of you on a trip through Kananaskis Country just a few days ago. We have tried to put together a film presentation today which recognizes the fact that some of you were there and some of you weren't. We know it will be sort of overstating some of the things for those who were there, but I would ask your indulgence so that we could show the folks who were not there some of the things we [inaudible], particularly in connection with the year which ended last March.

This little put-together was produced by Murray Dale, who is with us today, and narrated by Margaret Qually. More than anything else,

it's a collection of films and sections of films that we use for a variety of other purposes in connection with our Kananaskis Country work.

I think that's quite enough to say. I hope you will enjoy it. Thank you.

[The presentation was shown from 2:19 p.m. to 2:38 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much, Sara-Jane, for an excellent presentation. It was most informative. You covered a lot of ground in a short period of time, and we appreciate it.

Mr. Minister, I will turn it back over to you for a few brief comments before we open it up for questions.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, when you say brief, I hope you'll permit me to be about 10 minutes. There is some information I'd like to have on record as far as the department. In particular I, too, would like to say thanks to Mr. Marshall and Sara-Jane Gruetzner for their presentation. Really it's the M and M program, I call it, the Margaret and Murray show, with Kananaskis. I mention that specifically because it, with Sara's as well, shows you and gives an example of what we can do in-house. It's not a Barbara Frum presentation, but the cost was much less and I think the quality was just as good.

In particular, there are two different, distinct programs. If anything, I really should stand up and take my hat off, if I had one on, and say thanks to you, the members of the committee in existence today, and to the previous members of the committee for their foresight in planning and their wisdom in approving such programs. I think you can see how they benefit not only those communities they are enhancing but the overall environment for Alberta citizens, particularly when you realize some 3 million visitations to Kananaskis alone and the certainly significant numbers that are using the urban parks. I would go on to say that every Albertan is touched in some way way by parks. Parks are for people, and let's not ever lose that concept.

I know that for some of you the projects we will be discussing today are new. At least the level of information contained in the presentations you have just seen has provided a new insight or understanding of these projects and programs, and I certainly appreciate your

taking the time to listen.

While each of these areas represents individual initiatives in their own right, I think it is important to understand that the broad principles underlining their development link them by a common objective. That objective supports what I say is the allocation of funding through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund for the purpose of building a heritage resource for all Albertans. I emphasize that: for all Albertans. The development and operation of Kananaskis Country, the immensely successful urban parks program, the municipal recreation/tourism areas program, and the design and implementation of Fish Creek Provincial Park in Calgary all represent initiatives which are helping to build a legacy of heritage resources for the future. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that some members specifically ask questions as they relate to the municipal recreation/tourism areas program as well.

With projects such as the development of Kananaskis Country, statistics alone cannot provide a full appreciation of that resource and what it means to the millions of citizens who use it on an ongoing basis. It is truly a world-class, multi-use — and I emphasize, Mr. Chairman and members — year-round recreation area for all to enjoy: a four seasons use. I believe it is a shining example of heritage preservation that, through proper planning and management, provides a diverse range of recreational opportunities in one of the most spectacular natural landscapes found anywhere in this country — and unequalled.

The same fundamental philosophy has provided ongoing support for the new urban parks program over the past five years. Today as we begin to come to the close of the capital development chapter of this program, the reviews from program participants and public users have been overwhelmingly supportive. I'm sure many members of your committee who have shared and enjoyed those facilities will support that.

Through this program we have helped the participating communities by providing their respective constituents with newfound recreational opportunities and an ability to develop greater environmental and life-style awareness. At the same time, the five cities which have so enthusiastically participated in this program with the government of Alberta have benefitted greatly from the establishment

of a resource which has generated a renewed sense of community pride and will serve indeed as an added valuable attraction for the visitors to these centres in the years to come.

The development of our natural resources in a way that provides both recreational opportunities and future tourism potential has also provided the underpinning of the municipal recreation/tourism areas program. Mr. Chairman, I emphasize the tourism potential. We have recently heard from other members that they are trying to promote and build and develop tourism to a \$10 billion industry. Through the joint operation of our department, I believe we can help and assist to meet that level to help all Albertans and the economy as well.

The program on a more regionalized basis has provided development and operational funding for projects which will ultimately help to diversify and improve regional attractions for residents and visitors alike. At the same time, this program has ensured a high degree of local community involvement in the planning and development of these projects, as well as ongoing community involvement and volunteer-based human resources. In all facets of project development it helps to establish long-range regional support and community commitment, and community commitment is a very important aspect.

In Calgary the development of Fish Creek Provincial Park has proven to be a highly successful and popular resource for area residents and visitors to the city. It, too, supports the primary objective of applying the heritage trust fund to develop a resource that will continue to benefit our residents. It is there today for us and for our children, and it will be there tomorrow for our children's children. That will be the true legacy of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund: not what it creates today but what it builds for tomorrow. Singularly Fish Creek Provincial Park attracts more visitors annually than any other provincial park in this province. I'm sure that statistic will bear some dispute or argument, but we can substantiate it. The use and appreciation of this park cannot be denied. While the capital development through the heritage fund ended for this project in fiscal '84-85, the park continues to operate facilities and interpretive and educational programming that perpetuates the original objectives for the area.

With all these projects we have seen a happy marriage of provincial support and financial commitment through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund coupled with community-based involvement and initiative. It is a marriage which has worked well, and like a good marriage it will leave a valued heritage for those who follow. Economically these projects cannot help but have a positive long-range impact on the province, not to mention the stimulus generated during the development stages.

Before I move on to questions about these particular program initiatives, I'd just like to spend a minute or two to provide you with what I believe is a brief overview of these projects. For record purposes, by the end of the 1986 fiscal year the government of Alberta, through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and your committee, will have contributed some \$212 million toward the development of Kananaskis Country. During the fiscal period of '85-86 the heritage fund contribution was \$15 million, so you can see it was in a wind-down stage.

As the heritage fund commitment to Kananaskis Country has continued since 1978, as we've seen earlier, visitor use of the multi-use area has escalated dramatically. More and more Albertans, Canadians, and foreign visitors are discovering Kananaskis every year. In the summer of 1985, as an example, visitation to the area topped 2.3 million, which would mean, if you make the comparison, that every Albertan would have had the opportunity of visiting the park. That's an increase of some 14 percent over the previous year. When we recognize that some 92,000 people participated in special interpretive events and some 57,000 rounds of golf were played, there is evidence in the numbers that Kananaskis is a valued resource, thanks to this committee. By all accounts, Kananaskis Country is playing an important role in encouraging Albertans to spend more of their holiday and leisure time in Alberta. That, ladies and gentlemen, is a very important facet of it. If you consider the tourism dollars, Albertans are spending money in Alberta.

Perhaps more importantly, there has been the long-standing recognition since the inception of the Kananaskis Country concept of the need to embrace the desires of the handicapped and elderly, an important group that was not forgotten. The William Watson Lodge, as some of you have had the opportunity

to see, was designed expressly to provide recreational opportunities, through a special mountain holiday experience, for the elderly and the handicapped and was booked to capacity in 1985. This facility has proved so successful that construction of four new buildings, which has doubled the accommodation from 40 to 80, continued through '85 and '86. They're now officially open. I might mention, Mr. Chairman and other members, that this is a unique facility, the only one of its kind in the world.

Another major construction initiative included an emergency services building at Ribbon Creek, of which you saw the opening. It will house the new fire truck, ambulance, and emergency vehicle and staff. These capital initiatives, coupled with the ongoing provision of a broad range of special, all-season events, will ensure that Kananaskis Country will continue to offer unequalled recreational opportunities for a diverse cross section of the public.

In the urban parks program the expanding and diversifying of the recreational opportunities with a more regionalized approach to public access is a philosophy which has succeeded and of which this department is very supportive. As the minister responsible, I can certainly speak favourably for it. The end of this calendar year will see the close of the capital development initiatives undertaken as a part of this program over the past five years, with heritage fund investment totalling some \$82 million by the end of fiscal 1986. As was indicated, during '85-86 the heritage fund contributed some \$20 million toward the completion of the program, which has provided for the establishment of urban parks in the five cities of Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Lloydminster, Grande Prairie, and Red Deer. These parks are now open for public use, although development work in some locations will continue into 1987, as Sara-Jane indicated.

From the perspective of the citizens involved in this program, this has been one of the most positive initiatives undertaken by the Alberta government. In addition to providing significantly enhanced outdoor recreational opportunities, the urban parks program has also helped to preserve the natural environment for the education and enjoyment of future generations. I hope the environmental aspect in particular was picked up by committee members. It's a very important part of it.

Urban nature reserves and interpretive centres, hiking and bicycling trails, swimming, skating, fishing, playgrounds, and a host of other recreational facilities comprise the legacy that will remain as a result of the urban parks program. Practically every area is affected.

With the development virtually complete or nearing completion in all five participating cities, many thousands of Albertans are now able to access outdoor recreational services, facilities, and resources within their immediate urban areas. This park-around-the-corner concept will serve as a valuable addition to our provincial parks and recreation service in providing diversification and greater access to recreational opportunities for the citizens of Alberta.

In the municipal recreation/tourism areas program, which we hadn't elaborated on but would like everybody to be aware of in particular, diversification and access have also been key initiatives in the establishment and delivery of the program. Through the provision of capital development and operation and maintenance funding, the Heritage Savings Trust Fund has enabled the establishment this year of 27 recreation/tourism areas throughout the province. While they're not completed, the announcement has been made for 27 of these areas to commence in 1987.

To date some \$2 million has been committed to this program for capital development, and it's supported by an ongoing 25-year commitment for the provision of operating and maintenance funds. The operating and maintenance grants provided through the General Revenue Fund vary as a function of the initial capital grant, but most important is the commitment of long-term operating funds to the program. This regional, diversified approach to the development of recreation areas ensures a more equitable level of access for all Albertans in all areas, improves and expands recreation opportunities, and will serve to enhance the future attractiveness of the area for tourism.

These projects have also provided business and employment opportunities for Albertans and will serve to complement other community initiatives designed to improve the quality of life. Mr. Chairman, I have to emphasize again the quality of life, because I think we often overlook it and just think of parks as outdoor facilities to be used in that manner. But it is

important, as it's the quality of life that we try to improve and work.

The heritage fund commitment to the development of Fish Creek Provincial Park in Calgary has ended, as I indicated earlier. By the end of the fiscal period 1986 a total of \$45 million had been contributed for land acquisition and capital development of the area. Of that amount, Alberta Recreation and Parks has been responsible for managing the allocation of some \$16.8 million. The department has an ongoing commitment to the operation and management of the area. As I mentioned earlier in my remarks, Fish Creek Provincial Park as a single-destination park area attracts more visitors annually than any other provincial park in Alberta. The interpretative and educational programming is among the best offered anywhere, and programs have been developed to ensure that Fish Creek continues to provide all-season recreational opportunities for urban residents and visitors to Calgary.

You will note that these projects, Mr. Chairman, as identified in the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund's '85-86 annual report, come under the category of Quality of Life Initiatives, as I said before. That, I feel, is an important statement unto itself, for one of the fundamental philosophies supporting these programs has been to improve the quality of life for all Albertans. Providing improved access to recreational opportunities is the common thread which binds all of these program initiatives. Our heritage is our people and our resources. The programs and initiatives I have talked about today reflect a desire and a commitment by the government of Alberta to ensure that Alberta is left with a rich heritage for many generations to come.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to express my thanks to the committee. I'd be pleased to try and answer or redirect any questions you may have. If we can't provide you with the answers today, we certainly would be pleased to get them for you if they deal with statistical or other information. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much to you and your staff, Mr. Minister, for an excellent overview of the capital projects we're reviewing this afternoon. It has obviously stimulated some thought and some questions; we have 12 people on the list right now. I'll begin with the

Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche followed by the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

MR. PIQUETTE: Mr. Chairman, I also would like to thank the minister for the presentation. For the few of us that didn't go to Kananaskis, I think it was a good overview of the tour that the members did.

Some of the questions I would like to ask relate to the municipal recreation/tourism areas. We have funded approximately \$4 million this summer, with about 26 different projects. This would be to assist municipal and volunteer associations for outdoor recreation and tourism, which I guess is an offshoot of the urban parks development. Is it possible to obtain from the minister a complete list of the 26 projects that have been approved by the department?

The first question I have for the minister is: since the Department of Recreation and Parks actually administers these programs, why isn't the whole funding aspect run through the Department of Recreation and Parks rather than what we have now?

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, through to the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche. The first part of your question, with regard to the numbers: we would be more than pleased to provide it at any time. There is no secret as to what locations have or have not been approved. In particular, of the 27 locations I believe I announced 25 in my opening remarks to the Assembly earlier, in the spring sitting, so I don't have any qualms at all about what the other one or two might be at this time. What we've tried to do is have a broad-brush approach to have parks represented in all parts of the province and to all members. It certainly could be said that it's a minipark program, if one were to compare it to the urban parks program, to try and provide recreational facilities to those outlying areas in the municipalities.

As far as the overall dollars, with the commitment for the ongoing funds as far as operational, which is an important facet of it, as well as the capital, there won't be \$4 million spent in the first year. I believe you'll find it will be closer to \$2 million, because all can't be staged or come on to initial development in the first year either. So our initial program was to try and see 25 a year come on over a four-year period, or 100 parks. What we're saying is that

the particular funding level would not be in the overall department's \$133 million budget. With the type of program and the importance and significance of it, it was felt that it certainly would meet the criteria under the guidelines of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee, and it was approved by the committee to fund in that manner.

MR. PIQUETTE: Has your department determined the awarding? For example, you mentioned that you were trying to spread the 100 projects right across Alberta. Before we try and allocate these projects, has your department or the Alberta heritage trust fund looked at awarding these projects in terms of where some regional areas perhaps have a lack of these facilities, so that we have at least a fair regional distribution based on need as opposed to just spreading them across Alberta? Is that part of your . . .

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, through you to the member, please appreciate that some municipal recreation/tourism areas would take longer to develop, and we certainly welcome the applications from all. Some guidelines in particular were laid down by the committee and by the department. As the minister responsible, I'm responsible ultimately for the final decision, but I certainly work in close consultation with the members of the department and the MLAs in the various regions. I am very proud to say "all the MLAs," because it's for Albertans. What we've tried to do is address, exactly as you've said, the geographics of it, the regionalization, and the overall need.

There are some particular areas of it that I would feel reluctant to approve based on whether somebody wants to go ahead and build another golf course where I don't feel that would enhance or attract or accommodate all Albertans. So there are some guidelines, and we're trying to adhere to them, but we'll try to address the needs of all the members of the committee.

MR. PIQUETTE: Do I have one or two questions left?

MR. CHAIRMAN: One supplementary left.

MR. PIQUETTE: This has to do with the whole parks program for Alberta. There is no doubt

that we put a lot of focus on southern Alberta with the \$220 million spent for Kananaskis Country. A lot of northerners are saying that we do have a very captive market here with 600,000 people in Edmonton and area who are very distant from prime recreational areas — and northern Alberta being, I would say, probably the nicest part of Alberta, but some people would say the southern part . . .

MR. BRADLEY: Don't get carried away, Leo.

MR. PIQUETTE: Is any funding going to be left in the Alberta heritage trust fund to develop some northern Alberta recreational facilities which would take into account perhaps a thematic approach to developing tourism areas in northern Alberta which would attract people from Edmonton in terms of overnight and would make sure that we develop the north as a prime recreational ground? Is that in the plans of your department in the next year or two?

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, through to the hon. member, I realize we're dealing with items that are in the overall estimates in your financial report, but I welcome the opportunity to . . . On an unbiased basis — because as a northerner I'm certainly sure that my colours would show if I were to expound on a Kananaskis Country North program for northern Alberta — collectively and as an Albertan I can say that there are many good parts about all of Alberta. The south has its strengths, and the north has its strengths as well. As a proponent and supporter of a Country North development — and I take no backseat to it — I'm going to try to convince my colleagues, cabinet members, and all members of the Assembly to support such a venture. The timing is significant; our overall revenues, as you know, have declined. So I would say firsthand that that wouldn't be a priority at this time, but it doesn't mean that I would shelve it. I would hope that we could resurrect it when dollar levels are such that we could carry on with such a program.

As far as determining whether dollars would be in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund to commence such a project, you can best determine that as a member. I'm not a member, but I would certainly wish to put my recommendation forth that you should consider it and hopefully recommend such dollars to be

allocated for expenditure in that area.

Overall the department and the minister responsible are certainly supportive of a Country North project — not necessarily on the same lines as the Kananaskis, but perhaps it could involve more of a lakeland base or something similar. There have been studies done on it and review done on it. I'm not going to be parochial and say where it should be. I just believe there should be an alternative to Kananaskis for the northern citizens of this province as well.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my words of thank you to Ed Marshall and Margaret Qually for the excellent tour the committee members had of Kananaskis. I've had some association with Kananaskis Country in terms of being on the advisory committee from 1978 to '82, and I served on the cabinet committee from '82 to '86. I thought they gave us an excellent tour, and it was very worth while for me to get back and see the fruition stage of some of the developments I had worked on in the past.

I also enjoyed the presentation on the urban parks program today. As a member representing the third largest urban municipality in the province, the 14th largest in population, I look with a sort of jealous eye that that sort of program could be continued in the future when oil revenues return but do accept the initiative taken through the additional municipal recreation/tourism program. That will certainly fit a need in our rural communities in terms of developing those types of facilities. My constituents are looking forward to participating in that particular program.

To get back to Kananaskis Country, during the tour we took and the visitor figures that were given to us today, it looks like the facilities are being well used by Albertans. For example, the Mount Kidd Recreational Vehicle Park, I believe, was booked — just a high visitor usage. I think it was said that the estimate was some 3 million visitors in '86-87.

There has been some suggestion by those who wish to promote tourism in the province of Alberta — and I think that's certainly a goal of the government as to high priorities in terms of tourism — that we as a government should perhaps be looking at advertising Kananaskis Country outside Alberta as a flagship to attract

tourists to the province. I guess my own point of view is that Kananaskis Country was developed for Albertans with our heritage fund money, that it was to be used by Albertans, and that we would not be necessarily advertising outside the province.

Given the usage figures — and it must be mainly Albertans who are using the park — what is your view in terms of going this next step and advertising outside the province? It seems that the visitorship is such that the facilities are well used and perhaps are reaching the point of being crowded or close to that in terms of the usage.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, to all members, I certainly appreciate the question from the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, because I think it's a very important one and one that has to be addressed at some time. Yes, the park was developed, as you've indicated, primarily for Albertans, and that was the initial intent. There has been very little or modest advertising dollars spent outside of Alberta, and the advertising has all been geared for Albertans.

I indicated in my opening remarks that the dollars are being spent by Albertans in Alberta for their own park. But keep in mind that as Albertans we have a resource, and I consider that a very important resource because it's part of the overall Heritage Savings Trust Fund assets. Can we afford to have an asset — and I pose that as an indirect question — not having an economic return? It's an area that we're going to have to review, in particular as we're putting in new and improved facilities, the three new hotels in the area through the private sector, that then could be able to accommodate European and out-of-province visitors who have not had the opportunity to stay within the park overnight. So it's a very delicate one that has to be addressed.

As well, to be able to attract worldwide users, we would have to have first-class facilities, which I believe are being developed. With some 3 million visitations and looking at the decline in revenues, another important area that has to be reviewed by this department, as I'm sure all other departments are looking at, would be the revenue side. Should we in turn charge, say, \$1 per person for every visitor to Kananaskis? That would generate \$3 million. If one were just to make a quick decision based on

the \$3 million, they'd say, "Yes, go ahead." But then there would be some problems in implementation, because there are nine access areas to the park. Should those be manned? Should they be reduced in number? Would the visitations continue? These are all areas that we're going to have to review.

Seriously, as custodians, caretakers, and stewards of the resource and as Albertans, we're going to have to come up with some answers. I really look for guidance from all members of the Assembly, not just this committee, and would welcome them at any time to phone me or drop me a note and say, "Hey, I think that's what you should be doing." I welcome the input, and regrettably to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, I can't at this point give a firm, decisive answer.

MR. BRADLEY: I just wanted to make the observation that the facilities probably will be subscribed by Albertan usage regardless of the facilities that will be developed in the future. I think Albertans themselves will subscribe that. The question of a charge is something which certainly could be looked at in terms of the operating costs, and I don't think Albertans would begrudge paying some fee to utilize those facilities.

But I would regret to see in the future that somehow access by Albertans would be denied because of the increased usage by overseas visitors or out-of-province visitors who had been encouraged by the province directly in terms of advertising. I guess that's the point of debate. I think those facilities will become known worldwide anyhow. The golf course is booked full now. It's used by various groups, and this is not something that we as a government consciously directly advertise.

The same with the ski facilities. They will be well known because of the Olympics. That will be word-of-mouth advertising. I guess what I'm saying is that that usage will be there, but I wouldn't want it to be seen that we've directly encouraged the out-of-province visitors knowing that Albertans want to have access to it and probably are willing to pay a fee.

A second question . . .

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, may I supplement that answer before he asks the second phase of it? I believe I should ask Mr. Marshall to comment on an important point that you

brought out about the number of visitations, the overall use, who he would feel or see uses it now, and about our ongoing commitment to that infrastructure. If I could ask Mr. Marshall to comment a little on that, I think it's important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Little Bow, you're on.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Am I am on right now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We had you on there, yes.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I had you on the list. Sorry. Mr. Marshall, go ahead, please.

MR. BRADLEY: As long as that's not considered my second question.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, it's quite correct that we have yet to spend our first nickel on advertising outside the province of Alberta. The thrust of our advertising has been simply to tell Albertans what is ready for them. This has grown as time has gone on. As each facility is completed and ready for use, we try to make that known, and there is a repetition of that.

We have never had any place where people could stay in Kananaskis Country overnight, and of course this is the situation that will be corrected, if you like, or dealt with by the opening of three hotels, all of which should occur in 1987. This opens up Kananaskis Country to people who have never been there before, certainly from within Alberta and we can expect as well from outside Alberta.

This restriction, if you like, of advertising has only applied to expenditures made by the government, and what people who run hotels want to do with their advertising money, of course, is something over which we have no control. We expect that there will be a considerable addition to our places from which people come — right now it's largely an Alberta list — as time goes on without the government actually spending a great deal of money and saying, "Come from far away," because we think our hotel people will do that.

But the thrust of the story to be told by the government can go in any direction the government wants us to take. We could

advertise in New York, Alabama, Tokyo, or whatever, or we could remain within Alberta. Whatever the government wants to do, we would be glad to do.

In any event, as you go through Kananaskis Country now, you can almost make a game of looking for out-of-province licence plates, because while they're there, it takes a long time to find them. You go through the golf course or the Mount Kidd RV Park and, by and large, most of our visitors are Albertans. But we are making a contribution to having Albertans spend their holiday dollars at home and enjoying doing so. I think that answers it, Mr. Minister.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, my second question to the minister is with regard to the private-sector opportunities in the park. On our visit we had an opportunity to visit a private-sector development at Spray Lakes, which looks like it's a very needed facility. Is it the policy of the government to look at other private-sector opportunities? I was thinking in terms of the report we had on the Mount Kidd Recreational Vehicle Park, that it was full every night during the summer in its first year of opening. Perhaps there's an opportunity for a second recreational vehicle park that the private sector may be interested in participating in. Also, in terms of the golf course and some expanded facilities there, I think there's a need for a tournament facility. Is the province looking at providing the private sector perhaps an opportunity to build and construct such a facility?

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, through you to the member, as far as private-sector opportunities, we certainly wouldn't want to exclude. We would like to encourage and would welcome those proposals. We're reviewing on an ongoing basis people who come to us with suggestions and proposals, and we're trying to weed those out. It's not like we say the "good" and the "bad," but there are some strong and, perhaps one could say, weaker proposals that we're not able to accept. We've not formalized any. We're looking at several and, as I say, would use the word "encourage" and would welcome the opportunity to discuss with any individuals. We're reviewing the need on an ongoing basis. For example, you talk about the utilization of the existing Mount Kidd park and others. There are some infrastructure dollars that would be

involved that are not committed to go ahead and expand, so those are some gray areas that we have to determine, but we certainly want to try and involve the private sector wherever possible.

As far as the tournament facility, we have a proposal now that we're reviewing and we are working closely with the people. Hopefully we'll be able to proceed with that. That is an unknown at this time. There are such areas as the Canada tourism subagreements: will it meet the criteria or not? These are areas that are being reviewed. We're having ongoing discussions and meetings, and at this point I'm not breaking any confidentiality of it other than to indicate that we're supportive and would like to see such a development proceed. There's no final decision because there have been no final approvals given at this point.

MR. BRADLEY: Thank you for that response. My final question is with regard to access to Kananaskis Country. There's excellent access from Calgary west into the Kananaskis Country facilities. There are southern access points which are dear to my heart as the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, particularly the extension of the work on Highway 40 south to the Crowsnest Pass. Currently the road has been upgraded to the Highwood junction. Are there any plans in the future to look at the upgrading of that particular road, 40 south, into the Crowsnest Pass? It would give an excellent access from southern Alberta.

The other access point is Highway 22 south from Longview, and I believe Transportation is working on that. But I know that Kananaskis Country dollars had been spent outside of Kananaskis Country in terms of developing access. Is the department at least looking at continuing the highway development south to the Kananaskis Country boundary on Highway 40?

MR. HYLAND: I'll vote for that, Fred.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, through you to the member, yes, we're concerned. If it were just a matter of a decision and funds were available from this department, we certainly would like to see it proceeded with on an immediate basis. We've had representation made to us by people in the area, not necessarily in the immediate area but others that are affected

such as the Fortress Mountain area over in the one portion, where we've been able to work with Department of Transportation to maintain the winter road on an ongoing basis. There has been a need determined for Highway 40 in particular, but that as well has to be a decision jointly with the Alberta Transportation division of the government. So I am unable to commit to the hon. member what may or may not take place, other than support his request on an individual basis.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Chairman, I'd also like to express appreciation for the very fine presentation by the minister and his guests. I would like to address the issue of the lodge at Kananaskis. The focus of my question is related to the degree of public benefit that the province will be getting from its investment in that area and the way in which public assets are being managed by the government on behalf of the people of this province, the bottom line being: are we getting value for our investment, and are our assets being managed well on our behalf?

We have a \$212 million investment in Kananaskis Country, of which in the immediate area of the lodge at Kananaskis there's a \$25 million ski hill, a \$10 million golf course, which is described in the literature of the lodge as being a \$50 million golf course -- I'm not sure what the correct number is, but I understood it was \$10 million -- and most recently, in this fiscal year, an investment of approximately \$10 million by the provincial government through the heritage trust fund in infrastructure, including underground parking for 190 vehicles. On top of that, we find that the literature of the lodge refers to a long-term subsidy of the marketing and ongoing costs of the village association by the Alberta government. For all of this, the statement of return to the people of this province is that which we're to receive on a 50-year land lease with a 25-year renewal and an annual rent of \$4,200 for the first 15 years.

I wonder whether or not there is some way in which the heritage fund or the government in some other way is going to be able to participate in any potential upside if this is a successful venture, whether or not we're bearing all of the costs with none of the benefits or, as they say, getting the shaft while someone else gets the money.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, first of all, I accept his compliments, knowing full well they would be followed by a good direct question. I feel they are very fair questions. I am not going to play semantics, but when he talks about the lodge in Kananaskis, I could always say, "Well, I thought he was referring to the William Watson Lodge," because that's really the only lodge that we're directly responsible in that way. But I certainly know that it's not what he refers to. In the alpine village, as indicated, we do have a very, very direct involvement and participation in none other than the gentleman to my left, Mr. Ed Marshall. I believe the title of president goes with it, does it not? Is that the honour?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. WEISS: President of the alpine village association, which, yes, we are funding. I'd like Mr. Marshall to outline that in just a minute, to supplement the answer, because there is a funding mechanism in place to see that it's phased out over a three-year period. I'm sure three years is what it is.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, just on a point of order. We're discussing the investment of the heritage trust fund. My understanding is that the alpine lodges, the hotels, are from general revenue and not heritage trust fund money. Am I correct, Mr. Minister?

MR. WEISS: Yes, that is correct.

MR. R. MOORE: So that is outside the parameters of here, really. We should get back ...

MR. CHUMIR: I might point out to the hon. member that we're just putting \$10 million into infrastructure supporting this very village that we're talking about.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: It's referred to in the report too.

MR. CHUMIR: It's in the capital projects.

MR. WEISS: The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo is correct in what he is saying. Again, it has to be addressed under the Heritage

Savings Trust Fund. While some of the other ongoing private-sector involvements with loan guarantees and others are not within the confines of this specific question, this question is directly related to our department and involves the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

The facilities are in Kananaskis Country, and that's the important thing. We want to be overseers and have a direct involvement, because it's very important. It's important because of the dollars and the magnitude of it. The golf course you referred to has attracted some 58,000 rounds of golf and enhances the overall area, and the private sector is involved, yes.

I'd like Mr. Marshall to comment a little bit on the stewardship, the workings of the ongoing operation of the alpine village, and the economic return that you indicated -- is there going to be a day type of thing? -- because there's some buy/sell type of ...

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman and Minister, I think I need to back up a little on the business of the returns to the government as a consequence of the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. We take very seriously our trusteeship of what we're supposed to be doing in Kananaskis Country, and we try to ensure that the money is never spent in a frivolous way and that the Alberta taxpayers really get their money's worth for what we're supposed to be doing there.

In general terms, the idea of having a return to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund or to the general revenues as a consequence of money expended for capital development purposes has never been an objective that was, shall I say, stated to us. We are to do what we are supposed to do in terms of developing the countryside for those Albertans who want to play it on the one hand and conserving the countryside on the other. This has been the direction of our efforts for a very long time.

With respect to the alpine village, again it's worth while to back up a little on that. One of the things that was made very clear in a policy sense was that whatever Kananaskis Country is or might be, it was never to be a duplicate of Banff, Jasper, or anything of that kind in a townsite sense. Where overnight accommodation was to be provided, it was to be provided through this medium of "alpine villages," if you like, whatever that was

supposed to mean. They were supposed to be small knots or nodes of accommodation. That is what I think we have tried to accomplish with the first alpine village, the one we located at Ribbon Creek.

The government's role in connection with that development was to select the site, provide the infrastructure, and set the rules for the conduct of the business, if you like, of the common lands associated with the village. There are three hotel parcels in the village, and the parcels themselves don't take up much more land than is necessary to accommodate the actual buildings. The rest of the land is called the common area, and the business of the common area is conducted by the resort association. The government has a fairly major role to play in the resort association in its initial stages. As time goes on and it's perfectly clear that the government may back out, then the government can back out gracefully and wouldn't even have a vote in the conduct of business of the resort association if the government decided to stop making a financial contribution toward it.

It's a big-stick role in the beginning, because the government is a big contributor. I was elected president of the resort association for the first go-round by the three hotel developers. How long that will last, I don't know. I am there to ensure that the conduct of the business in the common area will be suitable to the government and that the Albertan who isn't necessarily staying in a hotel gets value for his or her money at the time of his or her visit to the first alpine village. So we're doing our best to look after people who simply want to visit the village and aren't necessarily staying there overnight. Every one of us has hang-ups about where we haven't been looked after very well, and we're trying to look after everyone who comes to that village site very well, whether they're going to stay overnight or are just visiting for a few hours or half a day.

I think that covers the ground, Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHUMIR: Did I blink and miss something? I was requesting a statement as to what kind of financial return the province of Alberta and the heritage fund is going to get for the money it's putting into what is not a standard capital investment or capital project of the heritage fund but what is money which is

backing up a commercial investment right in the midst of Kananaskis park. While I understood Mr. Marshall philosophizing a bit about the role of the capital projects division and I agree that that's generally the rule, we have something here that is very unique and individual. I directed my question specifically to the kind of return we were going to get. Are we limited to that \$4,200 a year land lease?

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, through to the member, I guess the contentious point is the variance between what you see and what I see is the direction we were given by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund in providing and maintaining an ongoing facility and getting it developed. If the Heritage Savings Trust Fund's specific direction were to be, hypothetically, that you would have a new program here and you must return 8 percent on investment to us, that would be the objective and goals we would go out and reach and realize for you. That has not been part of the criteria or conditions that have been outlined. While the word "philosophizing" was used, the explanation Mr. Marshall was outlining was that we're meeting the criteria.

MR. CHUMIR: I'm just trying to ascertain if it is correct that the \$4,200 is the financial return to the province and the heritage fund.

MR. WEISS: At this point, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHUMIR: That's it. Is there anything in the agreement to provide for an enhanced return? Do we get a piece of the action later on?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: You can get up as high as \$10,000 a year.

MR. CHUMIR: As high as 10 grand?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Yes. That's May 1, 2051.

MR. WEISS: There is a percentage factor that will vary it.

MR. CHUMIR: Is that up to 10 grand on the land rental?

MR. WEISS: That's on the overall facility.

MR. CHUMIR: Is there any piece of the action on the hotel operation? Can we get any significant amount of money, or are we talking peanuts?

MR. HYLAND: Tax.

MR. WEISS: First of all, on the hotel facilities, which are separate, Mr. Chairman: yes, there is rental, there are ongoing leases and commitments, and some are attributed to gross sales and others. Yes, we're going to receive a return on our investment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Calgary McCall, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Chairman, I believe that was one question and certainly direct follow-up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, there were at least three or four supplementaries on the main question.

MR. CHUMIR: Certainly no more than direct follow-up. My question clearly wasn't answered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. We have nine people on the speaking list right now, and we have exactly half an hour left. I think the Chair has tried to be as lenient as possible in the questions, and the Chair now recognizes the Member for Calgary McCall, followed by the Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, as usual I'll be very brief. First of all, I'd just like to indicate to the minister our appreciation for the time taken for the visit to Kananaskis last week. I think it was an outstanding tour by Mr. Marshall and Margaret and all those people who participated.

There are always two things I marvel at and pat the government on the back for: one is Kananaskis Country and the other is Pine Ridge Nursery. There are other things, but certainly those are two things that really benefit the province a great deal.

I would just like to make a comment with regard to the member's suggestion that you could put a fee on people going into the park. Knowing how the bureaucratic system works, if you want to collect three million bucks, it's

going to cost you \$10 million to do it, so it doesn't make any sense to me. Of course, the amount you'd have to collect to pay for the bureaucratic bungling of collecting it would have to be substantial, which Albertans would not want to pay. I just thought I'd give that a shot.

Mr. Minister, last year we had a resolution passed by the committee, which went into the report. It related to Kananaskis Country. I'll read it:

That funding be provided to develop the Powderface Trail and campsites in Kananaskis Country as required or on an as needed basis.

We are hearing that Kananaskis has lots of visitors. At times the campsites at Mount Kidd are full, and to develop the Powderface Trail would mean additional campsites. I'm wondering where that stands in your priority as minister. Then maybe Mr. Marshall could assist us in indicating what benefits might accrue to developing that trail and those campsites.

MR. PIQUETTE: Let's spend money elsewhere first of all.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, through to the hon. Member for Calgary McCall, I appreciate the briefness, and perhaps I could respond in a brief manner as well, because I don't think it should take an awful lot of elaboration. It's certainly very high on our list of priorities. We welcome and realize the need, but we have to be realists as well and know full well that dollars are just not there to expand at this time. The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest certainly referred to the utilization of some of the ongoing facilities. There is no doubt. We recognize it and we support it. It's just not a number one priority at this time but certainly one that we hope we can expand on in the near future. We welcome it. I appreciate your remarks as to Kananaskis Country.

I would like to mention one thing, Mr. Chairman, in defence of what I feel is a pretty solid, good working crew, the people in the Recreation and Parks department. I would say this on or off the record. The term "bureaucratic bungling" has been used. I'm sure we'll see that happen in areas, and it's up to us to work harder to try and improve on them. I am very defensive. We've got some good, solid support people in all regions of the park, and I'm

hopeful that we could try and address those areas and not just cause or create problems but look at them as challenges and offset them.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I certainly wouldn't want to indicate any specific aspersions on any members of your department. But I've been this route before, and you know as well as I do that when you've got to pick up \$3 million, it's going to cost you \$10 million to do it. I'd certainly rather build a park than do that.

Insofar as the government has indicated that tourism is one of the highest priorities — and, of course, to bring tourists into the province there have to be facilities; there has to be a reason for people to visit — what effort will be placed to bring this additional development? Rather than putting funding into some of our socialist friends' ridings, maybe we could keep it in some of the ridings that are going to accrue benefits to all Albertans, in particular Kananaskis Country. Why would we not pursue this, considering that we need these benefits for additional tourist dollars to come into the province and keep our own people within the province? Can we get some commitment that we can pursue the Powderface development, as I've been trying to push for two or three years, that as soon as dollars are available, that might be given some priority?

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, it's a tough one to answer in view of the way the question was posed. As Minister of Recreation and Parks it's my responsibility to deliver parks for Albertans, and we don't know of any political boundaries that we try and deliver them for. In particular I indicated that we certainly support the Powderface Trail as a high priority and will try and develop that particular area. With regard to potential tourism development, I could best sum it up in that you give us the money, we'll develop the parks, and we'll promote and increase the tourism. If that's getting on the bandwagon, that's what it is.

I believe we've got some of the finest resources to develop and work with, as was shown in the examples of Kananaskis, the urban parks program, the Capital City, and the municipal recreation/tourism areas. But we certainly know no boundaries, and we believe that we can be successful in that quality and way of life that we talk about. We look at

health care costs and others. We believe that through good leisure-style programs and ongoing development of facilities — people now have longer periods for leisure and recreation. Some people in some areas are working what's termed the "four 12s," four on and four off. These people are demanding more amenities and more recreation facilities. The farmer in southern or northern Alberta is trying to develop and increase his time, and we believe that as a department we have a responsibility to develop the parks and increase the usage. We are going to try and encourage that, to have Albertans from the north and Albertans from the south come and meet and use those facilities in all areas. That's our emphasis.

MR. NELSON: I'm just wondering, Mr. Minister, if you have any thoughts or consideration for support of additional investments, either in the park or outside of it, particularly, let's say, in Canmore, where the Nordic centre is, for some kind of development of a high-class, Baden-Baden style casino, profits from which could assist in developing Kananaskis Country or something of this nature. Just in three words or less, I guess.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, it's difficult in three words or less. I've never been known to say anything in three words or less. Canmore in particular or any region as it relates to a casino is something that would certainly be out of my jurisdiction and responsibility as far as the overall approval or even on a support level basis. Keep in mind, though, that we do have two Crown corporations within the department, the Alberta Sport Council and the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, that are responsible for delivery of programs to Albertans in amateur sports and, through the wildlife foundation, recreation areas and needs as they relate to requests they receive. We're trying to meet these overall needs, but I can't specifically say that a casino would be the answer without some long and detailed study as to the effects, the costs, and whether it should be in one area or another. I'd really be unprepared to comment on that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the minister would be in a position to answer this question, but perhaps a member of his staff might. It was nice to see

so many openings of park facilities all over the province, and I'm sure the minister enjoyed travelling all over the province to do that. While I watched those presentations, something kept going through my mind, and that was: once you figure out all the staff time and the costs of filming and editing and so on, how much did that presentation cost to put together?

MR. WEISS: The presentation specifically as it relates to Kananaskis, Mr. Chairman?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Both the slides and the film.

MR. WEISS: Certainly. First of all, I'll ask each individual to try and quantify dollars. But may I emphasize that as a department we've tried to do everything in-house at minimal cost. As far as the number of openings, if you were to note, you found that I was at about three or four. I look around this particular room alone and find that the majority were represented by other MLAs, who I felt could do just as good a job, just as efficiently, and who did attend and were the number one spokespersons for those openings. So no, I did not attend all. I don't enjoy just travelling around; I try and represent the province and the government to the best of my ability.

As far as the dollars, what we've tried to do is that when we have staff in those areas, as was noted in the slides, they take those on an ongoing basis. We have an in-house 35-millimetre camera. I'd guesstimate the cost to be about \$150. It's been in use for some years and will probably be in use for many more years. We take the slides not just to use for presentations such as this but to meet with recreation co-ordinators and groups within the cities, Calgary and Edmonton and others, to show them what can be done, what we are doing, how to work on it. So we use it ongoing. We just don't have a cost per se limited to this particular function. If we did, I would not support it. The particular one you've seen on Kananaskis is one that was geared or designed for this committee specifically because of the impact need and how important it is to this committee and to me as a minister. We will use it as well for other presentations, but it was within our in-house facilitating. Dollarwise, I'd like to ask each of

them if they could guesstimate what the dollar value was; I honestly don't know. Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Minister, it's just as you describe. We grab a little bit here and a little bit there and so on and put it together. So there is some cost of studio time and editing and dubbing and all these things that happen. The incremental cost of that presentation for this purpose would be comfortably under \$2,000.

MS GRUETZNER: Mr. Chairman, I would say that 95 percent of the slides are not mine. They're from the cities, and I duplicate them on behalf of the city. Part of my job is to market the urban parks program as well as to promote the involvement of the heritage trust fund. So the slides that I've had prepared for this presentation were \$36.98.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, if I could reiterate or supplement, the total cost for the two programs would probably be \$2,036.10. I think that is not an expenditure but a good investment, and I hope it would continue to sell this committee on the overall programs.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: The incremental cost, that is? I think I heard the qualification.

MR. WEISS: Yes. To the hon. member, I would put that quantifier on as well.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Okay. It will be seen by other than this committee? It was just labelled as a presentation only for this committee.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, to clarify that point. As he has talked about changing, that can be changed in a matter of moments to meet the needs of others and other groups that we will be presenting it to.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: I'd like to follow up on a series of questions asked by the Member for Calgary Buffalo. I'd just like to refer to or summarize what I understand are the arrangements between the province and the developers of the Ribbon Creek facility. They're kind of all over the place, so I'll just try to make a list of them. I might miss some or double count, and I'm sure you'll tell me if I'm off base.

First of all, the province agrees to

underwrite 75 percent of the operating costs of the resort association for the first two years, and then that drops gradually: about three-quarters of a million dollars in '86-87, \$588,000 in 1988, and dropping to around half a million around 1990. There's 75 percent of the costs in marketing common area maintenance. In addition to that, there is a loan guarantee of up to 50 percent of any loss incurred by a lender on loans made to finance the capital costs. There's \$10 million or \$12 million invested in infrastructure — and I could be wrong on that; perhaps a more up-to-date figure could be given — and somewhere around \$1 million for underground parking facilities. I don't know whether that's part of the infrastructure or not.

On the other side of the ledger is an income of about \$4,200 annually received from the land lease for a 15-year period starting May 1, 1986. The partnership then has future terms of renewal so that they could renew, starting in May 2036, at \$8,860 annually and rising at May 1, 2051, to \$10,000 annually.

Is that all the province is getting in direct return for its investment? After all, you've assumed some of the risks, if the project doesn't fly, in terms of loan guarantees. Is there any other direct return to the coffers of general revenues of the province of Alberta as a result of this lease agreement?

MR. WEISS: I think you should be specific and ask Mr. Marshall to reply to you, as he is part of our ongoing negotiations as well. But in particular, as you outline in the 75 percent of the cost and have been kind enough to point out that it diminishes and pertains to the loan guarantees and others, I'd ask Mr. Marshall to specifically answer that for you.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, the government's contributions, except those related to the resort association, are really capital contributions. The government is not seeking any return on its capital contributions to the resort association, at least to the alpine village. None is expected. The province's role there, having provided that infrastructure, is the same as the province building roads or trails or whatever. It's not looking for a return. There's a land rent, and that is the \$4,200 escalating over time that you're talking about. That is the return to government. All the other contributions by the

province are purely and simply capital contributions on which no return is expected. The resort association is somewhat different, because it's not a capital contribution. It's there for the common business of the village, including the maintenance of common areas for all Albertans who wish to make use of them and, to what extent it may be appropriate, perhaps on the local marketing.

MR. WEISS: Could I supplement, Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. Just in case there is some concern about the loan guarantees and things for the developers, keep in mind that when it was first anticipated with regard to the development, the government really didn't want to come back to a committee such as this and say, "You put in the millions of dollars for the infrastructure in relation to the hotels and that." The government really didn't want to do it, and without the assistance in the level of guarantees and things, they never would have proceeded. I think that is a very important point to be brought up.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: People have looked to the savings fund — it's a savings and trust fund — and with a \$3 billion deficit you are presumably looking at all kinds of cuts all over your department, wherever they may be. People all over the province are going to be hit, apparently, if I can believe the announcements that are being made in the paper. Hospitals aren't even going to open. Schools aren't even going to be built or renovated. They're going to say, "Where are those savings in the savings trust fund? Where's the return that was going to save us from this difficulty?" They're going to look at these investments and say, "You're going to guarantee losses and pick up the cost if it doesn't fly. How come you couldn't negotiate it so that at least you'd share if the thing succeeds?" At least if you're going to take it on the chin on one end of it, the whole system is set up, I thought, so that you could reap the rewards on the other end. Why hasn't the government taken the same attitude towards spending or investments for a profit-making venture such as this hotel resort in Ribbon Creek?

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. We'll share a difference of opinion

with regard to this particular discussion, and it's an opinion that varies. The facilities will be in place; and they will be provided for the citizens and be first-class or world facilities to attract the tourism and the increased economic spin-off benefits that should be received or derived from them. I won't comment specifically as to the schools or hospitals. Those are other departments and part of the government's announcements as they will pertain later and will be brought forth to the Assembly. As the Department of Recreation and Parks we have a responsibility as well. We'll share those costs and look for areas, as you've indicated, to try and reduce or defer where we can.

As far as the overall agreement: it is in place; it has been struck. It's one that's not open for further review and restructuring. It's in place. You'll be critical of it and I accept your criticism. But I'm sorry; I'm not in a position to change it.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, my question is related to the part of the minister's comments about the William Watson Lodge being fully booked. My first question is: were you speaking about the original lodge building being fully booked? And if not, are the additional four or six units fully booked as well? What sort of representation is there of people from various parts of the province?

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. The reference was made to the bookings at that time, under the existing. As you're aware, it has been expanded to 80 from 40, which is a 100 percent increase. But the need is still there. We still receive requests for the maximum use. The difference is that we are able to accommodate more people, but we could still be fully booked at any given time. Once again, it's hard to determine people's use, but generally they all want to be at a key time or one specific weekend, if it's a long weekend, so it's very hard. We're able to accommodate double the number of people.

As far as the users, they come from all parts of the province, not just the Calgary area. With the guidelines that have been laid down for usage, it's not limited exclusively to those who are handicapped. If a handicapped person wishes to use it and has a parent or an assistant who wishes to accompany them, facilities are provided for both of them so that we can

accommodate that person as well. My overall remark would be that I wish it could be 160 units. Unfortunately, it's not going to be able to at this time.

Just as a sideline to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, in preparation for the Calgary Olympics the Canadian handicapped skiers' association will be sending members to train for the special events and will be using the facility. I'm not sure of the gentleman's name. I'm sure most people are familiar with him and have seen him in TV commercials. Mr. Karl Hilzinger? Is that the gentleman who skis in the skiing commercial? He will be the chief coordinator for that specific event.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you. Maybe when answering the next question, you can answer the part on the regional distribution of the people if you have it available.

My second question relates to the golf course. I understand the golf course is almost fully booked. I'm concerned that people from Calgary, being close, are getting the greater percentage of the golfing because they can whip out there. What percentage of the tee-off times is held for walk-on traffic, so a person camping there can decide to go golfing and, indeed, get on it in some reasonable period of time?

MR. WEISS: Specifically, Mr. Chairman, of the 57,000 or 58,000 rounds of golf this year -- yes, it is booked to capacity. There is a reservation system. I don't think Calgarians have any more advantage to pick up the telephone and make a reservation over one who may live in Fort McMurray, for example. The point of destination or origin of that call is not determined, nor is it determined in the bookings.

There is the term you used, "walk-on", and walk-on times are tee times available for those who are camping and for tourists who come through the area. Specifically you asked what percentage of time, and I honestly don't know that. I'm not sure if Mr. Marshall would be able to comment on it, but I will ask if he can do so. If not, we would undertake to provide that for you.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, at the present time we attempt to make sure that 20 percent of the times are not

booked on an advance booking basis, and "advance" means more than 48 hours. We keep about half of those for phone calls today and the other half for phone calls within 48 hours.

The problem is not going to get better; it's going to get worse. I don't think Calgarians have been at an advantage, but nobody outside Calgary believes that. The 1-800 number is a no-charge number for everyone in Alberta, but we don't think that's the answer to the problem. The problem is bound to get worse once you get the additional demands placed upon the golf course by people who will be staying in the hotel. It's a management situation which we are facing.

We have in the pot, so to speak, a new scheme for the year ahead that hasn't quite come together but certainly has as its purpose fairness for all Albertans, particularly to give those who may be planning a camping holiday reasonable assurance that they're going to get the time they want and won't be put at a disadvantage to anyone from Calgary or close by. One of the problems is no-shows. It can be said that we have a lot of walk-on golfers on any day. That's not something we're really proud to say we have, especially when we accommodate those people who come out specially. It's a problem when somebody else didn't show up.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you. My final question. We've talked about the tremendous amounts of money invested or spent in Kananaskis. I prefer to call it invested. I wonder if the minister could tell us two things. During construction, how many construction jobs were created in Kananaskis Country for residents of Alberta? Secondly, how many ongoing jobs are being created because of the development of Kananaskis Country — even if it were just answered on the parts we fund out of the heritage trust fund — the various recreation areas that are open year-round, the campsites, and the other things we fund out of the trust fund.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, it's very difficult to answer, because that would vary on specific times or occasions. In a high construction period or when a capital project was being undertaken, it would vary as far as the number of people at that specific time. We can give you an exact manpower count we have as it

relates to the department, and we can give you a guesstimate of how many people it's employing. But you specifically said Albertans. I can't determine whether they met the criterion that they lived here six months, one year, or two years. I would think you'd have to determine anybody who is in here working as an Albertan or Alberta-based. But numberwise, I'd ask Mr. Marshall to guesstimate a fairly accurate count.

MR. HYLAND: Perhaps I should have said "residents of Alberta" rather than "Albertans."

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, some years ago we produced a figure of how many people were employed in the construction sense. I would prefer to have an opportunity to update that figure and provide it to the committee if the committee wanted it. I think that's [inaudible]. There's the construction people figure and the operating people figure. The operating one itself would — well, it knocks my socks off. The golf course, at full stream, has 115. There are already 65 people on the payroll at the Nakiska ski area, and 120 more are being recruited. They start to be pretty big numbers. There are a dozen or so at the Mount Kidd RV campground.

We'd be pleased to provide these, Mr. Chairman, if you want them.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, please keep in mind in your consideration that even the alpine village, the hotels — it's all going to change dramatically. On-site now it would be different because of what stage they're at in construction. Again, when they come to open or to be in accommodation as a facilitator, they're going to have their ongoing commitment. We'll try, but they'll be guesstimates.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, very quickly. I appreciated the minister's presentation and the other presentations as well. My question follows with regard to the alpine village as well. On our on-site inspection I was very impressed with what was there and what I saw going on and the fact that private developers were building the facility. I left with a good feeling on that, even though I recognized that the infrastructure was paid for by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

Since then, a couple of things have arisen that I get a little concerned about. One was the information today about the possibility of only \$10,000 being paid toward land rent after some period of time. Secondly, the infrastructure put in place — as I understand it, the government must pick up the cost of rehabilitation, upkeep, and ongoing operation of that facility. I see no charge at all for water, electricity, or sewer usage to the villa people or any resident there or anybody with any kind of enterprise. Normally that does happen in a development. Possibly you could comment on that.

As well, I note from Orders in Council 713, 714, and 715 of '86, approved at the cabinet meeting of November 12, guarantees are being given to the Kananaskis alpine resort, the Pocaterra Development, in two different ways. I don't note Financial Trust company here anywhere — I'm not sure whether they are able to carry it on their own — or Al Olson. Possibly you could comment on that now. I've made comments without information; possibly you could clarify those matters at this time, because I felt we were given a commitment from Mr. Ghitler's report that private developers would develop the hotel or the accommodation facility. I understand we expended a fair amount of money doing that for his services. I don't know whether that motion for a return has been tabled for our information or not, but I understand it was a fair amount of money. I feel a little misled at this point if what I observe is accurate.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, I'll be very brief. First of all, there are common areas and common charges that will be assessed for various things that will be determined through the alpine village association on an ongoing basis. Specifically as it relates to the orders in council, please don't have any misunderstanding. You made reference to a gentleman who was paid a fee or whatever negotiation for involvement. There was one hotel that was negotiated by that individual, and there are two other hotels or facilities. The private sector is developing those, and government provided a loan guarantee based on an economic development decision, as we would for any developer that would come to us at any given time for any project, whether it be of that type of complex nature or for any specific need. It could be a chicken farm if you want to

be hypothetical or take other areas of concern.

We felt the best decision was to see these projects proceed and go ahead and provide the amenities for the ongoing tourism and economic benefits that I pointed out and to have them on time for the Olympics as well. The way to do it was to provide a loan guarantee, as we've outlined in the orders in council.

I'm not sure if I've answered that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Will Financial Trust or Al Olson get the same benefit of a guarantee? Aren't those the other two developers?

MR. WEISS: All three have been addressed on that particular . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: Oh, in here.

MR. WEISS: I should say all three. There are three developers, and only part of them addressed there. All or any have the opportunity to come at any given time to make any approach such as any individual has in the private sector.

MR. R. SPEAKER: At the moment they haven't all done that.

MR. WEISS: No, they have not.

MR. R. SPEAKER: But they most likely will be doing that.

MR. WEISS: That I don't know. I'm not knowledgeable if they are or not. I'm just saying that it's available for them.

MR. R. SPEAKER: In terms of the profits or any payback — and that would seem to be the question that was being raised here earlier — I'd like to farm this way. If I could irrigate, I could make money this way. If government puts in the infrastructure and then guarantees my operating in a sense and also guarantees my further capital expenditures, I could make money on the farm.

MR. WEISS: I didn't think the hon. Member for Little Bow would want to accept any more grants or subsidies, because he already has enough in place and I wouldn't think that would be fair.

MR. R. SPEAKER: You don't know that, not in this little form.

Is there any way in the contract that some payback can be made to government?

MR. WEISS: Specifically I'm not aware.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Okay. I want to say this to you, Mr. Minister: you've inherited this particular situation, and I respect very much the job you do in your role and don't want to be accused of hoarding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, again, our thanks to you and your staff for a most informative afternoon and an excellent presentation.

MR. WEISS: Thank you for the opportunity to all members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We stand adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., at which time we'll hear from the Minister of Agriculture and the Associate Minister of Agriculture.

[The committee adjourned at 4:06 p.m.]