

[Chairman: Mr. Kowalski]

[10:55 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good morning again, ladies and gentlemen. We have with us today the Hon. Peter Trynchy, the Minister of Recreation and Parks, and a number of officials associated with Mr. Trynchy in his portfolio.

In the annual report for 1982-83 there are really three subject matters that fall under the purview of Mr. Trynchy. There are the two mentioned on page 18 of the report, Kananaskis Country recreation development and urban parks, and a third item, the Fish Creek Provincial Park project, administered jointly by the departments of the Environment and Recreation and Parks.

Mr. Trynchy, welcome. Perhaps it would be a help to members of the committee if you were to introduce those with you. If you have an overview statement, please proceed. Then committee members will raise questions.

MR. TRYNCHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are pleased to be with you this morning. I would like to introduce the group with me. On the right, Linda Taschuk is our budget officer for Kananaskis Country. Ed Marshall, the gentleman who made the presentation on Kananaskis Country, is our managing director. Barry Mitchelson is my deputy minister. Bill Porter is a staff person responsible for the Fish Creek park development. And Cliff Lacey is the gentleman that works with us and is responsible for urban parks policy and development.

Mr. Chairman, we sent you some material, and I believe the presentation this morning pretty well covered as much as we'd like to get into. I was hoping that maybe with the presentation and the material, we could go right into the questions and go from there.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. First of all, it's really a policy question. My recollection tells me — and I wonder if you can confirm it. By the way, I enjoyed very much the presentation by Mr. Marshall. I haven't been to Kananaskis, and I plan to be there before the end of the year.

With regard to the policy, I recognize that tourism is the third largest revenue producer for this province. It's very important to have tourists come in and leave their money and not much else. However, I seem to recognize and recall that it was a stated policy of this government, announced by the Premier, that Kananaskis Country was for Albertans and not for so-called tourists.

First of all, could you indicate whether that policy — and I'm not sure whether as minister you're responsible for that policy; I would think you're responsible for implementing it. Does that policy still stand, whereby Kananaskis Country is designed primarily for Albertans, and we're not making concerted efforts outside Canada to attract people to Kananaskis Country?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Lethbridge West is quite correct. We are not trying to advertise Kananaskis Country outside the province per se. I believe travel and tourism under Mr. Adair have been instructed to try to advertise within the province for Albertans. It's tough to not have visitors come in, and I think Kananaskis Country will attract visitors from around the world in time. But we're not doing any advertising ourselves, through this department, outside the province.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary. I recognize, Minister, that you don't build highways. But as Minister of Recreation and Parks responsible for Kananaskis Country, you initiate the

requests for roads and then presumably the Department of Transportation puts them in. It's been my view that as convenient as paved highways are, I think that to properly reflect the values of Kananaskis Country should be to keep it in as natural a state as possible, while at the same time discouraging tourists from outside Alberta. Yet I understand that it's a priority of your department to see that anything that can be paved by way of roads in Kananaskis park is paved. Is that accurate?

MR. TRYNCHY: Not really, Mr. Chairman. We have a highway policy that we brought forward in 1980 and '81. There will be certain roads paved, such as Highway 40 and a number of other portions. But some of the roads and probably the majority of the tie-in roads will be gravelled, standard, and oiled in some cases. But no, all the roads won't be paved within Kananaskis Country.

MR. GOGO: The final supplementary, Mr. Chairman. Minister, I know your love for amateur sports, and I know your record with regard to amateur sports. Could you indicate to this committee where you would see Kananaskis Country — recognizing that there may be many of those some time in the future, but at this time we only have one — accommodating amateur sports within this province? We have many playoffs of various sports outside of skiing; for example, baseball is familiar to the minister. Would it be within the policy of your department that Kananaskis Country could be used for provincial playoffs of amateur sports, for example, and that accommodations could be designed that would allow groups from Alberta to have, say, a central area within the province for provincial finals, et cetera? Kananaskis Country is for Albertans, and what better place to gather people than in that country and to have amateur sports people from around the province travelling to it?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, that's an interesting presentation by the hon. member. I would like to see Kananaskis used as much as possible by the sporting associations in the province. We encourage that. I can't see Kananaskis Country being used for swimming, say, because the waters are too cold. But certainly amateur golf, amateur bicycling, amateur skiing, cross country, whatever areas can be provided for, I would encourage the associations across the province to go in and use them. I don't know what else we could do. I don't see any ball diamonds in there, like you say, so there would be no sports in that area, or skating. But certainly for cross country, for rowing, if we have areas where they could do boating and things like that, we would encourage it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Perhaps either you, Mr. Minister, or Mr. Marshall can give us an estimate now of the final cost as of this year. We have \$161.7 million as of March 31, 1983. Perhaps we could now have the estimated total, including the roads. We did have some figures on completion estimated by the Minister of Transportation when he was here. In addition, as part of the first question, I'd also like to know what the total cost of the golf course will be.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has raised the question of \$161,680,000 for expenditures to March 31, which are in the document. We anticipate investing some \$23 million in addition to that this fiscal year. We would anticipate a request this fall for an additional \$23 million for 1984-85, and that would pretty well do all the capital development within Kananaskis Country.

MR. NOTLEY: That's including the roads?

MR. TRYNCHY: No. The following year we would ask for an additional \$10 million, which would cover the road. That should bring it close to a total of \$218 million, which would complete Kananaskis as we see it today, of course taking into account that there

might be additions and there might be some deletions. So it's \$161 million, \$23 million in this fiscal year, a request for \$23 million for '84-85, and an additional \$10 million in '85-86.

MR. NOTLEY: That would include the roads?

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes. That should include the way we see Kananaskis today being completed; \$218 million. Of course, if we move into other areas — and we haven't got to that stage — such as alpine development and Ribbon Creek, that might either be increased or decreased.

There's one more question you asked about the golf course. The golf course figure, if I'm correct — and Ed can help me. I believe the golf course itself and the clubhouse, which is a family recreation clubhouse centre, is some \$10.2 million.

MR. NOTLEY: And there are no additional expenditures on that? It's now complete in every way?

MR. TRYNCHY: The golf course will be turned over to the private sector on November 1, and some funds within this year's budget of \$23 million that we are expending will be used towards completion of the golf course. But in every sense, the golf course should be completed by November 1 within that figure.

MR. NOTLEY: The other question I have, Mr. Chairman, is on page 5 of the handout.

In terms of new major developments . . . recreational downhill ski development is being supported as a private sector business opportunity. In light of the 1988 Olympic Winter Games being awarded to Calgary there is now an opportunity to combine the Olympic alpine requirements with recreational ski area development. Also, some Olympic nordic venues are proposed for development within Kananaskis Country. In the event that meaningful private sector commitments are not made, other methods of development will need to be evolved.

No Olympic developments have been funded from the Kananaskis Country Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund budget. It is, however, anticipated that certain facilities developed within the "Country" will benefit the 1988 Winter Olympic Games and vice versa.

Mr. Minister, are you contemplating, or is the investment committee contemplating at this stage, a contingency plan that should there not be sufficient commitment from the private sector, additional funding from the heritage trust fund could be made available to finance some of these nordic venues for the Olympic Games?

MR. TRYNCHY: Not at this time, Mr. Chairman. We're not anticipating any requests for funding for the Olympics in Kananaskis Country in this fall's request. There could be areas that could be used for both the Olympics and amateur sports, or the Albertans, within Georgetown, but we are hoping other means of funding will come forward with regard to the Olympic funding.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, my question was dealt with to some extent by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, but I would like to follow up with questions regarding the William Watson Lodge. During the presentation this morning there was an indication by Mr. Marshall that the lodge was utilized heavily. Do you have any figures on that? If it is fully utilized, are there plans to expand the facilities at William Watson Lodge, as was indicated as a possibility in previous heritage trust fund hearings?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, some time ago I suggested that we have the William Watson Lodge opened. It would serve a purpose for the handicapped and underprivileged, and we had four lodges constructed. At that time I suggested that if the uses were such that we had to have additional lodges — and I believe the first request was for eight such lodges; we only constructed and developed four — we would come back for additional funds. It's not our anticipation to come back for additional funds this year, even though the lodge is being used extensively. I want to ask Ed Marshall to comment on the use and whether or not the need is there for additional lodges at this time.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Trynchy, Mr. Chairman, the facilities are full every summer day, every summer night, every weekend in the rest of the year, and every holiday. On the Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and sometimes Sundays in the off-seasons, if you like, you can certainly have less than an empty house. On the other hand, you can sometimes jam the place full with a special group under those circumstances. But its level of use is about what you would expect it to be; in other words, it's hard for people on other programs to leave them during the week, and I include certain disadvantaged children in that. So we do have some nights when the place is pretty empty. But for the most part, utilization of it is excellent. People are coming from all over the province on both a stay-over and drop-in basis during the day.

If we had four more cottages or 14 more cottages, I think they would be full on the same days the four are full. It's like our campgrounds. No matter how soon we build them, they're immediately full when people want to go camping. I think the same situation applies at William Watson Lodge.

MR. ANDERSON: As a follow-up to that, can the minister indicate — he said he wasn't planning on coming back for further funds for development this coming year. Is it in his long-range plans? Does he still have a commitment to further facilities at William Watson Lodge as the economy permits?

MR. TRYNCHY: I think that's a fair assessment of what will happen, yes.

MR. ANDERSON: Would the minister say it's one of the higher priorities for further funding, if not the highest?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I think I could say it personally. I believe in the William Watson Lodge concept. I think it's the greatest thing that we've done for handicapped people. If I have a say in it, when the economy turns around and we're able to do something else, that would be one of my top priorities, yes.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, my question is related to the urban parks and especially to Medicine Hat park, because of their in-house planning previous to the announcement of the program, I think Medicine Hat is probably further ahead in urban parks than most of the other cities. My question relates to the uniqueness of Redcliff's boundary being side by side with Medicine Hat and the problems related to that. I've discussed this with the minister before, but the problem of having a complete circuit trail in this park involves going on to some land owned by the town of Redcliff and construction of a pedestrian bridge across the river to complete that circuit.

Because of the uniqueness of the two municipalities being close and the uniqueness of the river bottom, does the minister see any possibility of completing the whole development? Is there any possibility, near the latter part of the program, where this could be looked at to help fund such things as a bridge to complete that and whatever work might need to be done on the north side of the river on the land owned by the town?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I've just recently completed a tour of all the urban parks, the five urban parks under development in the province. I took the occasion at Medicine Hat to make an extensive tour with the mayor and some of the people on his staff. We did talk about the Redcliff crossing to incorporate Redcliff along with Medicine Hat. It was my understanding, from the mayor, that they would work closely with the Medicine Hat people to see if something can be worked out. I was encouraged by their comments that they would support such a development and might include it in their program under the urban parks policy. So I think I'd like to leave it with Medicine Hat and Redcliff, to see if they can work out something and come back to us with a proposal to fit within the urban parks policy they have there now.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Minister, I can well appreciate the benefit of the urban parks to the cities which were fortunate enough to be selected for that type of park development, but the program does tend to be discriminatory to the other cities in the province and the towns of similar size. Would your intentions, or the developmental intentions, be to include in future programs other cities and towns of similar size, and the villages which are discriminated against, in this particular program, in future programs? What's the plan?

MR. TRYNCHY: A good question, Mr. Chairman. When the two urban park policies were developed for Edmonton and Calgary, the other cities made those same comments: they felt they should be included. In 1980 we moved with the proposal of five more urban parks, and they are to be completed somewhere in 1986 or thereabouts. If I'm still the person responsible for the portfolio of urban parks and if the economy of the country allows, it would be my intention to present the other five or six cities in the province for urban park development.

With regard to villages and hamlets, I would hope that we could work out a different solution for those centres. I'm now speaking of the recreation areas, of which we have developed some 30 in the province of \$100,000, and up to \$20,000 a year for operational grants. We might look at expanding that program to the villages and towns where they could develop these kinds of recreation areas within their centres. I feel that the initiative of local people has just been tremendous in the 30 that are being developed now, and I think that would be very positive to continue on in other parts of the province, to cover all villages and towns that probably would not qualify — maybe "qualify" is a bad word to use — or that would not fit into an urban parks policy.

MRS. CRIPPS: What type of ongoing operational commitment has the province of Alberta undertaken in relation to the urban parks?

MR. TRYNCHY: We have a policy for urban parks similar to that which was established in the Capital City Park in Edmonton, whereby we would provide 100 per cent of the operating costs for the first five years, 75 per cent for the next two, and then 50 per cent for the next 23 years. After that, they become the sole responsibility of that city, municipality, or government.

MRS. CRIPPS: What — I guess that's not heritage. I was going to ask — yes, it is related to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. What kind of operational obligations are we taking on for the budget of the province through the development of the parks by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund?

MR. TRYNCHY: We arrive at an operating grant on this basis: we take 10 per cent of the total capital cost of a park to be the operating cost. If you spent \$10 million on a park, we would consider \$1 million as the operating portion. So under our formula, we would have 50 per cent of that for the next 23 years, to arrive at some 30 years of

commitments.

MRS. CRIPPS: The second part of the question was: at what price?

MR. TRYNCHY: Ten per cent. Let's assume that Lethbridge develops a park for \$10 million. Our commitment would be 100 per cent of what they develop the first five years, 75 per cent the next two years, and then 50 per cent for 23. So at \$10 million, that would be \$500,000 for 23 years, and a little more in the first few years.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Drayton Valley raises a very interesting point. The experience of MCR, as the minister is well familiar, has resulted in — although the funds were eagerly grasped by municipal governments throughout Alberta, the reality is operating costs have reached the point where it's become somewhat embarrassing to many communities. So I think the point raised by the Member for Drayton Valley is very important. It would be my perception that the operation of urban parks won't be the same.

With regard to urban parks and the question of policy, Mr. Minister, could you indicate to the committee the policy with regard to the government that views the urban parks program having primary emphasis on local autonomy; that is, that the five cities now that have had, in addition to the capital city's and the other capital city — the emphasis this government places in terms of policy on the autonomy of local communities in developing those urban parks; i.e., the role of government which, through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, submitted today's dollars for tomorrow's benefits for Alberta citizens. Would you comment with regard to the policy that you in fact don't dictate the development of urban parks, but the local governments do?

MR. TRYNCHY: That's very important, Mr. Chairman. When we initiated these five urban parks, it was our intention to be involved only in the funding to regulations. These parks are developed, planned, and will be constructed by the local governments. We do not get involved in their ideas of what they should have in there. Some parks will have equestrian trails; others will not. We work with them. So from the outset, it's been one of co-operation and not of leadership in the sense of saying, you do this or that.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Finley is in attendance, who I think is the man primarily responsible for implementation at the local level. Is that correct? Is it Finley?

MR. TRYNCHY: It's Mr. Lacey.

MR. GOGO: I apologize, Mr. Lacey.

Last month, Mr. Minister, as you are aware, you visited Lethbridge with Mr. Lacey. I was very impressed with that visit and very impressed with the flexibility with which the policy seems to feel those parks should be developed. They should be individual parks, based on the priorities within those communities, and I very much appreciate that.

I was somewhat disappointed, though, to see in the case of Lethbridge — some \$50 million-odd for the urban parks, as I recall; Lethbridge being some \$20 million — such minute signs around the place. It's nice to be in favor of local autonomy, Minister, but I do think your department could be a little more assertive, let's say, in indicating to probably some 150,000 Albertans where those parks are located and that in fact the heritage fund is providing those funds. I'm not suggesting they be neon signs, but I do think there should be a meaningful sign indicating that heritage fund money is going into that. Would you care to respond to that, because I have one further supplementary?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, as I travelled those five urban parks, I too was somewhat disappointed in the type of signage that was up. I'll have Mr. Lacey comment, too.

In my conversations with the people in each city, I've broached the subject in this manner, that I'd sure like to see more signs outlining to the people of Alberta what the heritage fund is doing for them. I asked the mayor in one city: when these questions are asked, how do you answer them? He wasn't sure, but he said: it would be nice if they had a sign to point to, that this is the park developed by you and the people of Alberta. So I'm assured there'll be more signs up in all five centres.

Mr. Lacey, do you want to comment?

MR. LACEY: Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman, I believe Lethbridge is one example where we have provided signage specifications which would reflect heritage trust funding. I suppose I should point out that three of the other communities involved in the program have followed those specifications and do have a fairly high level of signage on display now in and around their communities. As a result of the minister's visit and the comments generated there, we're working with the city of Lethbridge to ensure that that deficiency is soon rectified.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, a final question to the minister. In terms of the future, part of the rationale for developing the urban parks policy to the other five communities wasn't just in response to "hey, what about me?" from those communities, after looking at what the government's done for Edmonton. Of course, what they do for Edmonton, it follows within two weeks you must do the same for Calgary. Indeed, it was an indication, as I understand, that through the development of the parks policy, we would show Albertans not only something about Alberta's past but indeed the future, Mr. Minister, which raises the question: what discussions or co-operation have resulted from your department getting Alberta Education involved for some 540,000 schoolchildren throughout Alberta who could learn to appreciate not only where we've been but perhaps where we're going with respect to the urban parks policy; for example, in Medicine Hat and Lethbridge, et cetera.

MR. TRYNCHY: Just going back to the question before that in regard to signs, I've also talked with the MLAs of each of the cities involved, and I'm sure that you, Mr. Gogo, will be back there making sure the signs are up.

In regard to our involvement with Alberta Education, we are trying to develop in a flexible way. I think your example of the museum in Lethbridge is a good one to use. We have been very flexible in making sure funds were available to tell the story of the past and, of course, of the future. We encourage the schools in the areas to use the facilities. We are not involved in any way in formal discussions with Alberta Education or the minister, but it might be an idea where we might get the message to them once these parks were developed, and I would kind of leave that up to local autonomy. It's a local park, and certainly the school children of that jurisdiction should be just as well advised to use it as anybody else. I hope we get the message across.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I just wanted to get some information. Did I understand you to say that the joint operating costs that will be shared between the province and the cities are coming out of the heritage fund in the future? Or will that be coming out of general revenues?

MR. TRYNCHY: No, the operating funds come out of general revenues. I'm sorry if I left that impression.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I just think that impression might have been left, and I wanted to

make sure that was not the case, because I wouldn't assume it would be.

MR. TRYNCHY: You're correct.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, one other thing I would like to comment on that concerns me is the difficulties of the signage. This is more in the form of a comment. It really revolves around a larger problem, and that is establishing what the role of the province is within the community of Alberta and what the roles of the various municipal governments are. As an alderman in the city of Calgary for seven years, I ran a contest on what we should do for our city. One of the things was that we should make Fish Creek park into a park. This proposal was made years before this present government took office.

MR. GOGO: They listened to you, too.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Yes, they listened to us. But the point I'm trying to make is that the more programs like this we get into, the more this problem is going to continue. I think it's a larger problem that we should be aware of. It's great to put up signs, but signs are subject to vandalism. Unless you're prepared to spend an awful lot of money over a long period of time, just signing these projects isn't going to be sufficient.

MR. TRYNCHY: A comment well taken. I have to agree that maybe we're not doing as good a job of communication as we should — and I say all of us as individuals, as representatives of our own constituencies — to what the heritage fund is doing for us. Maybe that's a lesson for all of us to learn, to spread the story and spell out the good news.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I noted yesterday and Mr. Hyndman indicated that the 15 per cent of oil revenues that are now going into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund are essentially pretty well committed to the Alberta capital projects division and the loans they have commitments to. Under those circumstances, what's happened to the plans for a second Kananaskis which were so prevalent a year or two ago?

MR. TRYNCHY: You probably answered your own question by asking that. Certainly the amount of funds that are available will dictate whether we continue with more development or not. As you've mentioned, the Provincial Treasurer is cautioning us all to not have too large expectations. So I wouldn't want to comment on when the next Kananaskis or Kananaskis Two would be developed. But certainly if things do improve, we can be looking at Kananaskis Two and also other urban parks and other developments.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, my question is related to the buildings in Kananaskis Country. I notice the use of rock and cedar siding. With the upgrading carried on in Cypress park, I note one of the calls on the tender of buildings was for straight-grain, no-knot cedar siding. I notice in Kananaskis Country they're varnishing it so that you can see the cedar. I would like to have the assurance of the minister and his department that they don't come along with some of that damned awful green paint and paint over that very expensive siding, like they do in other parks. I think it's a shame.

It may be a small subject to bring up here, but that siding costs a lot of money. We literally wasted a lot of money on a lot of buildings by putting that siding on and painting it with that god-awful colored paint until somebody comes along with another color that's probably as bad and paints it again. I think the use of that siding with the rock and everything looks very good in the pictures. I would hope that remains and we don't get into some of that green paint or brown paint, as some of them are starting to come out with now.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, Public Works, Supply and Services does the tendering for all our construction. I'll see that the message gets to them that we do leave it in a nicer finish than that green paint that is so disliked by the hon. Member for Cypress.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I'd ask the indulgence of the committee and, if I'm ruled out of order, so be it. I wanted to put a question to the minister. As he's responsible for Recreation and Parks in this province, almost by implication that indicates responsibility for amateur sport. I've long been concerned with the great dearth of financial problems amateur sport has. I think, Minister, that you'd be the first to agree that in terms of support from government to amateur sport Alberta is five, sixth, or seventh, depending how you look at the figures. Would you comment as to how you would view the heritage fund? If you would make a recommendation to your colleagues within the cabinet — the use of the heritage fund to establish some type of foundation that could retain the corpus and use revenue from the foundation toward the furtherance of amateur sport in Alberta, particularly at the local level?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I have a great love for amateur sports, and what the hon. member has just mentioned is indeed true. I would have to just add this: in regard to capital development for amateur sport in towns, we're number one in Canada by far. Nobody has a program such as our major cultural/recreation facility program. In regard to additional funding, we might lag behind the others.

I would hope that we would use other avenues of funds to promote and add to amateur sport organizations in the province. Something that's coming up shortly is the distribution of lottery funds. I think we should look at that. That would probably be more appropriate than the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Of course, being that the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is based on depleting resource revenues, I don't know if that would continue in the future, whereas your lotteries probably have a better chance of continuing into the future. That should be the source of funds we should be looking at to get to amateur sports and not from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

I haven't addressed this amateur sport thing from the heritage fund, and I wouldn't until after we see what happens with the distribution of lottery funds some time in the future.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary, Mr. Minister. I'm sure you're well aware that a dollar invested in a young person today probably saves us \$25 or \$50 later on in terms of social costs, whether it be the jail system, law enforcement, or social assistance. I know you're concerned that we spend about 41 cents per capita per year in this province on amateur sport, compared to \$2 in other provinces in western Canada.

I happen to know — and maybe it's an unfair question — how strongly you feel about amateur sport. I guess what I'm trying to do is initiate some type of lobby by this committee. It would just seem to me that use of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund by Recreation and Parks . . . What better legacy could you leave as an initial one, in case you're not around next time, than to see every young Albertan who's interested in sports wearing a baseball cap or some kind of cap with the heritage fund on it?

MR. TRYNCHY: I look forward to your presentation from this committee in the future.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I noticed that in the pictures of the urban parks we had earlier this morning, one of the criteria appeared to be quiet, restful areas within the city setting. Yet in the Pigeon Lake park, the camping spots are so close that there's absolutely no room for privacy. I mean, if you drop a kettle in one tent or trailer, you can probably hear it in the next one. Aside from the fact that they're very, very difficult to get into with any size of vehicle, has that kind of development been looked at and

expanded in Kananaskis Country, the urban parks, or any other camping parks, so campers have more space, which is more conducive to a family setting? I think in the Pigeon Lake campground, there are eight or 10 spots in each of those circles. They're ghastly. I wouldn't go there on a bet.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, some of these parks the hon. member talks about were developed some time ago. Indeed, the circles or campsites are closer together than I would want to encourage us to do now. I'll ask Mr. Marshall to comment.

Our policy has been and will continue, both in Kananaskis and urban parks, that we develop campsites with a little more privacy, take up a little more space, and space them a little further apart. That's our policy now, and I hope it will continue.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman, perhaps it didn't show as well as it might have in some of the slides, but our density is very low. We try never to put more than three campsites per acre. We have different kinds of campsites: back-ins, pull-throughs, doubles, triples, and so on. Sometimes in that circumstance you could have more than that. But as a general target and because we're blessed with lots of land to work on, we try to be very generous with our space, to give the level of privacy that you talk about. The thinner the cover of the trees, of course, the greater the separation we try to make, so you aren't on top of somebody else's campsite and you can enjoy almost a wilderness experience, even though somebody is not too far away. But we've been blessed with lots of land, so it's easy for us to do it.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm glad to hear that. Alan keeps telling me to come to Cypress, and maybe it was developed after Pigeon Lake. I was there recently and drove around it, and it's just not conducive to any privacy whatsoever.

This is off the topic, Mr. Chairman, but the centre of those camping areas are treed. The day I was there it was raining, and there were kids all over the road in every one of those circles. Yet if the trees in the centre had been removed and a volleyball net put up, I think you'd have had a lot of activity there, with children playing. There's just simply no place for them to go. You're half a mile from the lake. That's something else I think you should examine in the development of all these parks.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, it's off the subject, but if I could comment, that's a very good point. We're looking at a redevelopment program for our provincial parks. You have to appreciate that times do change. I've been to some provincial parks where a motorhome cannot navigate within the cut lines. Now you have to remove trees, because in the old days it was a car with a little tent trailer behind. Now we have 40-, 50-foot motorhomes, so we have to adjust our new developments to this kind of travel. We're going to do this. It's a comment well noted. In the future, when we develop, redevelop, or develop new ones, we'll take it into consideration, very much so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've now exhausted our list of members who have indicated to me an interest in raising a question with the minister. Are there additional questions forthcoming from members?

Well then, Mr. Trynchy, we wish to thank you for being available today and for the audio-visual presentation, which I found very helpful and very useful. If all goes well, we look forward to seeing you here one year hence.

MR. TRYNCHY: Before you leave, I would like to — and maybe I should have done it at the outset — invite the members to Kananaskis, if we could arrange a trip. I'd like to see the members go there, at your pleasure. Mr. Marshall is willing to make sure you can see as much of it as you can. I know the presentation this morning gave you sort of an eye opener, but I'd sure think you would really find it attractive and enlightening to be

there. I encourage you to let us know when you can go, and we'll try to set it up for you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Trynchy, I think there has been some interest expressed by the majority of the members of the committee to not only see Kananaskis but also have a more in-depth view of some of the urban parks, Fish Creek as well. I'll be following up with you to ascertain the best time.

(The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.)

This page intentionally left blank