

THE FOLLOWING TRANSCRIPT HAS NOT BEEN EXAMINED FOR ACCURACY, AND IS THEREFORE AN UNOFFICIAL, UNEDITED DOCUMENT.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

May 4, 1977

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the committee come to order please. You have copies of the minutes. I have to say that Mr. Purdy's name was inadvertently omitted, so that will be included in this week's minutes.

Any other comments on the minutes? Otherwise, a motion to receive them would be in order.

Moved by Mr. Clark that the minutes be received.

I'm very sorry to advise that our Provincial Auditor, Mr. Rogers, is in the hospital with a touch of pneumonia. We're hoping he will have a quick recovery. In his place today we have Mr. W. E. Schell, the Assistant Provincial Auditor with us. We'd like to welcome you, Mr. Schell. I'd ask Mr. Schell at this time if he'd outline the sections of the public accounts dealing with recreation.

MR. SCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Gentlemen, if you'll turn to page 284 of the public accounts, about halfway down the page is appropriation 3517 which is the one for your review today. You'll see that under the Legislative column there is an amount of \$20 million, which was the amount actually provided in this appropriation for the period. Of that amount, approximately \$12,100,000 was spent and \$7.8 million was unspent at the year end. Turning then to page 291, the detail of the appropriation is shown -- that is of the \$12,178,000 spent, and of this, \$12,100,000-odd thousand was spent on grants, with the small remaining portion being spent on materials and supplies administratively.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Schell. Any questions on the actual public account figures? If not, as directed by the committee, I have invited the hon. Al Adair, Minister of Recreation, Parks, and Wildlife, to be with us today and we welcome you, Mr. Adair, to Public Accounts Committee. Mr. Adair has brought with him Mr. Tom Drinkwater, P. Eng., the Deputy Minister of Recreation, Parks, and Wildlife; Mr. Stan Fisher, the director of the recreational programs; Mr. Richard Armstrong, grants administrator in the Grants Administration Branch, Community Recreational Program. I'd like to welcome you to the Public Accounts Committee, gentlemen. At this time I would ask the hon. minister, the hon. Al Adair, to make a short opening statement.

MR. ADAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like first to indicate that I hope the Provincial Auditor has a speedy recovery and that he'll be back with us very shortly and welcome Mr. Schell.

I think the easiest way for me to begin is to indicate that we're dealing with the grant portions of that year 1975-76 and the fact that it specifically relates to 89 projects of which \$12,178,390 was in fact provided to the public through the program. It was the first year of the 10-year program, based on the \$100 per capita, a capital facility program where the municipal authority who would be applying would provide to us on the application form the necessary information that would be their request, consistent with their master plan, for funds to be provided in co-operation and cost-sharing with them for a facility that would either be recreational or cultural in their community.

Now the whole idea behind that program was that the \$20 million would be in place. We anticipated approximately \$9 million to \$10 million of it would be spent in the first year, basically because the master planning had to be put in place. We were pleased, as I did indicate in the estimates, that a lot of the pre-planning had been done by the communities. A lot of that work was already in place. Thus we had some \$19 million worth of applications in the first year and the approval of some \$12 million or that indicates that the work had been going on by the various communities involved.

I think I should be fair to point out that we did have some small problem areas in assisting the communities to identify and determine exactly what we meant by master planning and what the process was involved for. Basically, that comes back to getting all the different service clubs, the organizations within the community, the cultural community, the recreation community, talking to each other about what, in fact, they have in place, what they would like to see, and how they would go about requesting it. One of the keys to that, of course, is their ability to indicate to us their operating costs for the first five years.

If I can just lay that before you, after that first year of operation -- I'm going just a little bit beyond that if I may, Mr. Chairman -- a number of problem areas came to the fore and we then, at the request of the municipal

authorities, worked out with them some changes that are now in place. We've had quite a number of discussions with the Provincial Auditor as to how we can tighten up the ship, if I can use that, and I think we have basically provided that opportunity as well.

One of the very important points that I would like to emphasize is that the program has been extremely successful, from the smaller communities to the cities. We also have in place a bit of a problem in that the communities now are beginning to build facilities prior to their making applications for the funds. Some of that was happening in year one, in this particular area that we're talking about. They were going into the actual construction phase, making the application and getting into the kinds of problems where they were borrowing money and then having to pay the interest. Now, we have, for example the shortest application, one that came into us completed, cleared our regional office on August 10 and September 24 the cheque was issued. The longest was about eight and one half months. That involved quite a number of discussions by our recreation planners getting back to the community for additional information. Each time you do that, of course, there is a time when they have to get together and provide that information, then get it back to us. We then have to plug that into the system at that point and go on from there. We also have the cultural component that has to be cleared.

I should point out that if the facility does not have a cultural component, it does not go across to the cultural people for clearance at end. But if there is a cultural component in it, it then is cleared by Alberta Culture and what percentage is approved at that stage then is applied to that program and that approval comes back to us.

Having said that, I think there were 142 applications that particular year, 89 of which were approved, the balance carried on into this past year. Basically, I believe out of that there were some 9 withdrawn by the communities because they had completed their master planning in the interim and their priorities had changed. So they are now coming back to us with different proposals. The others are in the stream and in many, many cases have, in fact, been completed and the cheques forwarded to them.

I think, Mr. Chairman, with that I would entertain the questions that you may have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Adair. Now, while you are thinking about the comments of the minister, I'd like to clear two items with you. The first one is in connection with the Public Accounts meeting on Wednesday, May 11, next Wednesday. We have a request from Mr. Jim Horsman, chairman of Private Bills, to waive the meeting next Wednesday as they have a long meeting. They didn't want to bring delegates in and send them home without being heard. So I spoke to Mr. Notley and Mr. Clark, and Mr. Horsman I believe cleared it with the government people. All agreed that we would waive the meeting. I now need your confirmation of that. Are you prepared to waive the meeting next Wednesday in favour of Private Bills.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All agreed? Thank you. The next item is in connection with the meeting on May 18. I would suggest that we hold a meeting on May 18 providing the House is still in session. Agreed? Okay.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister a question, perhaps on the philosophy of his program. He mentions that it's for culture and recreation and I kind of feel that the master plan, as such, that's being drawn up in Calgary, there is too much of a heavy emphasis on the recreation side and I know the government's attitude is devoted to a total program. I wonder what you are doing to try to influence the community to go the direction that we thought we had started out with with this \$100 per capita in the first place.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, of course there are two parameters within the program that very clearly spell out the fact that there should be and must be some cultural component to the application, either the specific application or included in the master plan. I guess to clarify that, if the priority of the community is that they want to go ahead with a recreation facility now, they can do that with the exclusion of the 25 per cent factor that relates to culture, and that would be held then in abeyance for them until such time as they would apply for that. So they can't spend all of it on a recreation facility. They must plug in some of the cultural components at some stage.

Now the program is basically on in which the priorities are set by the community. We attempt to try to get them together to in fact discuss -- either the arts councils or the cultural people in the community, the service clubs in the community, the recreational groups in the community all get together to in fact lay out what they have in mind for their plan. Once that's plugged in, and once they have put together their master plan and it lays out what their needs are for both recreation and culture, then they can apply. Now they can apply for one or the other or both. In some cases the community has said their priority initially is a recreation facility or basically an arena. They then will be able to draw 75 per cent of their eligible funds for that particular one if it doesn't include any cultural component. Some of them are including within

that the arts and crafts room, the fine arts area, where they would have the stage and the hall above the service portion of the arena and they then can get a portion of that included as the cultural side. Now that would be the stage, the drop storage area and those things, with the approval of the cultural side. If in fact it's not in there, it's then approved on the basis of it being strictly recreational and 75 cents on the dollar is provided with the other being held in abeyance until they make application consistent with their master plan.

e.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if there is a restriction resulting from a lack of ability of cultural groups to come up with operating programs. Has this frustrated them in the capital portion of their program? Perhaps to phrase it another way, Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned that the recreational people in the city are well organized and know what they want and the cultural people are all over the block. I was wondering if the government should be doing something about trying to bring these people together.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that they aren't aggressive. Certainly from any discussions we have had with the cultural groups we have found them, I think, quite aggressive in their particular field. Obviously, in most of the communities, a fair amount of that is already in place, particularly in the metropolitan centres and some of the larger urban centres where they have their stage areas or Theatre III's or Citadel's or whatever they may be plugging in. But the smaller facility on the cultural side is where there may be a problem. I'm not really sure. The initiative is there with the community and that organization to, in fact, make their case and certainly I guess the best example that I can use right now Stan would be Lloydminster where, as they put their master plan in place, they have what is called an allied arts council who felt that they wanted some more input into their master plan. Again, by the aggressiveness of that particular authority, they are now sitting down and reviewing and going over the input that was first put in which, to their mind, was not quite what they were after. But the council themselves, in dealing with the municipal authority, is plugging in their plans and their priorities so that they fit within the master plan.

MR. MUSGREAVE: One last question. Are you running into any resistance from the groups generally because of the insistence of your five-year operating budget? Is this giving you any problems?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, not major problems. I would think if anything it might be giving some of the communities some problems because we constantly are getting the other side of it. The communities are saying, fine, you're helping us with the capital and we'll look after the operating. But once the facility is built they come back -- and I think it's human nature -- and they say now we've got the facilities, how about helping us with the operating. We have specifically and very clearly and adamantly stated that this is a capital program. We would not be involved in operating and you couldn't tap the program to get the capital without being able to operate it or at least show that you can operate it for five years. That's very difficult for them to do, to provide the ballpark operating costs for five years with the kinds of situations we're dealing with now where the costs are escalating.

But basically they've done a pretty doggone good job in that area. We do not consider any changes at this point in the first phase of the program. What I'm doing now with the staff is looking at what we might do in stage two or from year six on. Because in the first five years, if they've tapped the program it's because they were able to show us, with some degree of competence, that they could operate for that five years so it's not necessary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I may say to the minister that it's quite in order to have the men with you answer questions if you wish to have them answer or supplement answers.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the minister encourages building on school grounds to utilize the facilities that are already in existence there.

MR. ADAIR: Yes, actually we do. That obviously is one of the better attributes of the program. If they can work out an agreement with the school authority to work together on that, we would like to see it. It provides sort of a total use of a facility in a community and not a duplication of services, so we in fact do encourage. We have, I believe, two or three cases where we have approved a facility that has been applied for through the municipal authority in co-operation with the school authority.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Does this apply to private schools as well? I'm thinking of the Strathcona Tweedsmuir School. Does that apply to private schools or do they have to belong to the larger units?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, I would think it would apply as long as they are prepared to ensure to us that the facility that they are building is open to the public for some portion of time. I'm speaking of prime time, when I say 50 per

cent of the time. We have in the regulation 50 per cent of the time. That's prime time, it's not from midnight to 7:00 you can have it and we'll keep it for the rest of the time. But it's similar to the working agreements we have between the school authority and the municipal authority where the plan and the priority goes to the school, obviously, to start with. But the other open times are planned and plugged in for community use. I'm sure that as long as they would provide that to us, we would approve the project.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: In the case of private schools, or even the school units, do they have to form a part of the regional recreational plan? Do they have to conform to that, or could a private school do it on their own?

MR. ADAIR: It would have to be a part of the regional master plan, Mr. Chairman, and that would have to be worked out in their master planning prior to the application, which would have to be made by the municipal authority. It could not be made by the group themselves.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I recall when the program was first announced, one of the ways in which communities could use it was for debt retirement. A lot of communities have existing facilities where they have debts, some of it five years old, some of it 15 years old. Have communities taken advantage of this provision of the program in retiring debt? If so, what portion of that grant money that was approved this year was for debt retirement?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, I may have some difficulty giving the exact dollar figure that was paid out for debt retirement in that particular year. Yes, they can use the program for debt retirement. But we have indicated to all communities starting from day one that debt retirement was one of the lower priorities. We were basically wanting to get into the new facility program, but if that municipality had, in fact, their facilities in place we would consider debt retirement. We would also consider debt retirement on debt incurred prior to the program by that particular community. Stan is working right now to give us an idea of just exactly what the figures are from that particular period of time for the total debt retirement figure. Does that answer, in part, the question you are asking?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, in addition to that, having an idea of the amount of the \$11 million that was used for debt retirement. The other question is related. Is it necessary for the community to have the general plan in place in order to qualify for funds under the program for debt retirement of existing facilities?

MR. ADAIR: Yes, that, Mr. Chairman, is incumbent in any application that comes before us. I guess I should also point out too that in the first year of the program we did not provide funds to assist the communities in doing their master planning. It was quite late in that first year of the program when we did get some requests from communities for cost-sharing on the master planning process. We now have that in place as of January of last year so that we can assist with the cost of doing the master planning. But as I said earlier, the main planning had been done prior to the program in many, many cases by the communities out there, both metropolitan and rural. So, yes we would like them to have their master plan in place before they apply so they have recorded what it is they have and what plans they are intending to lay before it. Because basically, if they are looking to retire a debt and they need another facility, we would prefer that they make the choice and indicate to us that the need is there for both and that they have that down the road. So they could do both.

Stan has roughly put together the debt retirement in that first year and it's roughly about three-quarters of a million dollars in projects, about 5 per cent of the total expenditure.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Just a short preamble, if I might, of the situation in my own constituency. We had a regional recreation board and a regional concept and it's rather sad and unfortunate that that whole concept has collapsed in my constituency which means, in fact, that we'll lose our recreation director likely. The whole concept of our recreational picture will have to be redone. I represent about seven or eight municipalities. This has involved about a two-year planned program. That time is all lost. What we're facing now in my area is a reassessment of the whole thing. Each municipality is going their own way and their all fighting amongst themselves as to who should get the complex. I see down the road that probably the majority of them won't be able to fulfil the requirements which are important, and that is to be able to project a five-year cost of operation. I guess what my question is -- and maybe it's a submission, Mr. Minister -- because it's a ten-year concept and because we're set back in our area maybe five or six years, our people are going to be faced with the inflation factor. Theoretically, \$100,000 at the beginning of the ten-year plan in terms of capital facilities is really going to only buy \$10,000 or \$15,000 or maybe \$20,000 at the end of the ten-year picture. Have you or your department given any consideration with regard to a built-in inflation factor, and if so, would you give consideration to that in terms of a situation that I've just expressed?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, it would be fair to say that we have given consideration to it in a number of cases where communities have come to us with that inflation factor after they've got the project underway and with a project application the next year for the additional cost. We have considered that and I think probably in four or five cases where we have had that kind of a situation where the actual capital cost factor has increased by 8 to 13 per cent or whatever it may be. Steel costs have gone up and whatnot. A separate application the following year would assist them to get at least a portion of that.

Now, if I may just relate to a part of the problem you were talking about relative to the regional concept, obviously that's the ideal if we can continue to have them working together. If they can't, they can apply individually and separately. But as long as the regional board is in place, I would hope that maybe with the help of some of our field staff, that we may be able to generate some additional excitement and enthusiasm to continue to keep it together.

As a matter of fact, I have one application out in that area where we have said to them -- again we're now relating to the first couple of years of the program where in fact some things were in place prior to the start of the program. A facility was already under construction. Their master planning for the community was basically done. They were able to satisfy the board that theirs was going to fit into that regional application. So what we did do to them was say, fine. We would accept the individual application if, number one, your master plan for the region was complete, and number two, those other communities would sign a waiver that you could go ahead, that they agreed with that being in that master plan.

Now unfortunately they have not signed a letter because of some of the problems you have just related to in that case. That community still sits there waiting for something to happen, either for it to go down totally so they can apply on their own, or to come back so they can get the signatures of the other ones. They had agreed on the phone when we talked to them, to in fact provide that waiver signature from the various communities, that in fact it was consistent with the regional plan.

I guess with our regional people that we have in the field, the field staff, and our head office people, if we could sit down with them if they would request it -- now we won't go out unless they request us to come out -- to sit down with them and go over where some of the problems might be. I might suggest that you ask them to do that if they would. I have had one invitation -- I believe through you, sir -- to meet with them as soon as we can after the session.

But getting back to the last portion of your question, yes. I think we do take into consideration the inflation factor and the fact that they can apply -- that should be clarified. You can apply once each year as long as you have funds available. You can make an application each year for funds. Or you can leave it, by choice, to year three, four or five, once you've done your planning, and apply then. So if a community of, say, 7,000 had \$700,000 available to them on a cost-sharing basis and their first application was for \$100,000 and the increase in costs were such that it would be \$120,000, they could apply in the second year for an application for the \$20,000 cost-shared to provided the total costs, as long as it was again consistent with the initial plan that was in place and the master plan.

MR. COOKSON: If I understand you, Mr. Minister, clearly, then it is possible that this capital works program which will eventually involve \$100 per capita that they will be able to, because of a delay which is not of their doing or which is something beyond their control -- it will be possible to acquire more than \$100 per capita?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, if I may clarify that. No, not more than \$100 per capita. The only way they can get any additional funds is if, in the period of time between the start of the program a year ago and the ten years, your population goes up, there is an escalation factor. For example, if you are 5,000 now and are 7,000 five years from now, you have the additional \$2,000 that you can draw on from the program.

What I am saying relative to the inflation factor is, as long as there are eligible funds for that community in place, they can reapply for the additional costs of that facility within the \$100 per capita.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Minister, then we're pretty shrewd down in our area. It would appear that we're in a good, fast growth area that we should maybe we should maybe delay our capital works project because that will maybe compensate for the inflation. I'm not sure whether this is going to be planned, but it looks like a reasonable concept.

MR. TESOLIN: Mr. Chairman, are Indian reserves treated in the same way as other municipal governments when it comes to facility funding?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, yes they are. I believe we have one in the northeastern part of Alberta that is, in fact, already approved. The Goodfish Indian Reserve -- their application is already in place and their master plan has been approved and their letter of approval -- this was this year -- has gone

out to them. So one, in fact, has created their master plan and got the approval necessary for their application.

I might point out their application is roughly \$63,000 for a recreation-cultural facility on the reserve. So they, in fact, can apply as a municipal authority.

Mr. Chairman, I might add that there are two other reserves that have completed some work. The master plan for the Blood Reserve is in and I believe the Stony Reserve has been in contact with us relative to what is necessary for their master plan. So three of them are, in fact, working on that.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the city of Edmonton, I'd like to ask first of all, how complete is the master plan that has been presented? I know there have been applications and my understanding is that there are series of ongoing applications, but how does the department judge when the master plan is complete, if you will, in the case of the city of Edmonton or the city of Calgary?

MR. ADAIR: What we have done to start with, primarily with the two metropolitan areas, is once their initial master plan was in, we've asked them to update it because the cities change quite a bit more rapidly than most of the smaller centres do. I might just ask Stan Fisher to just elaborate a little more on that -- where we are at, in this case, with the city of Edmonton.

MR. FISHER: Specific to the city of Edmonton, they did have in place in 1971 a ten-year master plan which would have taken them into 1981. Many of the projects that they have highlighted in this particular plan, because of their planning department and because of their degree of sophistication with the people and the resources that they had, the requirements for our grant programs were sufficient for us to make allowances and process applications since the inception of the program. I should like to mention that the city of Edmonton, right at this time, is undergoing a revision of their master plan. They are trying to narrow this ten-year concept down to more of a workable concept, a more practical concept of the five-year plan. They have advertised for numerous community meetings. They have conducted numerous community association meetings throughout the city of Edmonton, and they are currently working very actively on the revision and the updating of that particular plan.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, it's a question I should know the answer to, I guess, but when a master plan of that nature is presented, does it have to have city council approval on every variation thereof? Does it go through city council, or is it at the administrative level, or just what is the authority, if you will, for changes in the master plan, that is recognized by the department?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I'll just have Mr. Fisher clarify it. I believe once they've got their master plan in place, they then have to get approval in principle through the recreation board itself and through council. Once it comes back from there we work the necessary discussions in place with them. But they must have approval in principle by the council.

MR. FISHER: I think in many instances we have -- when you're talking about once a program is in place possibly you're alluding to the fact that many community associations may be wanting to develop a playground or a ballpark and you say, in a massive community the size of Edmonton, how do those things fit in. I think that we're getting a request from the community associations saying that it is our plan to upgrade these facilities. We don't know exactly at this time whether a ball diamond is going to have precedence over a rink or a play lot and so forth. However, they have indicated that these are maybe five specific projects that we would like to do. Then we honour the recreation board and city council's approval of those applications as they come in.

MR. YOUNG: My next question is still related to the city of Edmonton. I suppose we don't know exactly how much the total of the grant could actually be, because that's based on population and the population at what point hasn't been clarified here. Maybe the minister would care to do that when he or someone else is responding to the balance of the question. How much of the total amount which is available to the city of Edmonton has been taken up, either to date or to the point of the estimate period?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, first of all, it's a \$200 million program with an escalation clause for population increase over that period. So if we have a major increase in total provincial population, it will obviously need more dollars going into it at the end as we get down to the applications coming in relative to the increases in the communities. The cities of Edmonton and Calgary have annual grant applications based on \$10 per capita, or roughly \$4.3 million for the cities. We also have included in that a carry-over factor for the two cities. I'll just check with Stan. Mr. Fisher, do you have the actual carry-over from that first year for the city of Edmonton. In the first year, the carry-over of the unspent balance into the next year of three-quarters of a million was then included in the second year applications that came in. If they don't use the total, there is a percentage that can be carried over into the

next year. There is a maximum, though, so they can't go say four years and then dump a great number of applications on us -- in other words, not spend any of their \$4.7 million for say three years, and then come in one year with \$12 million worth of applications. There is a limit of carry-over that can be applied to the two cities.

MR. YOUNG: The last question, Mr. Chairman, relates to the experience, I guess, of the department in terms of requests from the city. Have there been problems and delays in applications from communities getting through the recreation board and the administration, if you will, at municipal level? I know of at least one case where it's been brought to my attention rather vigorously and I am unable at the moment to finger where the problem is, whether it's in the department or whether it's at the municipal level. I would like to know what the general experience is in the department.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, we have experienced some difficulties in that area, and I think more in a communications manner, where community X or the community association or the applicant to the city will place their application before the city as part of that municipal application that comes into us. In other words, if community X applies, it sits then with the recreation board of the city for their approval and then processing by council. Now two things have to happen, obviously. When the application comes in, it must have the signatures of all the appropriate persons, the recreation board chairman, the representative for council and those officials for the community. That is considered then an application and it does come to us. We then begin to process it. But in some cases we have had calls from various organizations where their application has gone to the municipal authority and for reasons obviously of their own where they are either seeking verification of some of the statements in that application by that organization, or justification in some senses as to how they intend to operate it, and until they are satisfied, they won't approve it at that stage. So that is check one there. The community -- in this case the city -- would then approve it if they are satisfied with all of the information that is gathered, and forward it to us.

Basically, that covers most of the steps that we have. But we may have some concerns over the operating or some of the other ones and we may then go back and then we can get into the time factor that it takes from there. But I think directly in answering your question, sometimes there have been some delays. In some cases we have had a package of applications that have been gathered over a fairly long period of time and then approved by the recreation board and the city and then flowed to us.

The reasons in there are a number, the checking they would like to do with the organizations in place, but there is a time factor in there that appears to be a bit of a problem with the president of the organization, whatever it is, saying we made our application. Were is it? On checking, we haven't got it yet, so it's still back in the city system. If it's still in the city system, we'll do a check as to where it is and they may indicate to us that they're holding that, along with four others, to do them all at once and then get them in to us.

But I think that has speeded up quite a bit. As a matter of fact I know, not just in the case of Edmonton, but in the case of the city of Calgary, in one instance they held quite a number of applications from the spring into the fall, right through the summer so they could check it. There were a number of reasons. People they wanted to contact relative to information were away on holidays. The person they needed the other signature from wasn't there at that particular time. So they just held them until September, went through them and fired them in to us.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, I'd like to know the status of the Calgary master plan and the financial state of it too, the same as for Edmonton.

MR. ADAIR: If I may, Mr. Chairman, I'll ask Mr. Fisher to respond to that.

MR. FISHER: The status of the city of Calgary master plan is one that our regional recreational consultant is working with the city of Calgary on at this time. They, too, are doing an update and they, too, are doing a revision of their master plan in trying to focus it more on a practical -- when I say practical, I think the communities are also saying that a ten-year -- a number of years ago ten years in a planning sense was a very idealistic kind of thing but at today's prices and the way our economy is now, five years is something that is more practical. The city of Calgary is doing that at this time. We're assisting them as much as we can, but once again, they have their own resources and they have their policies in place. We're pretty comfortable with the city of Calgary master plan at this particular moment.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I want to know what the financial resources are. How much of their money have they got and how much is still sort of available to them?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, how much did they spend of their first year's program? I believe they spent all but \$200,000 in Calgary. I would have to check that for you. But there was a carry-over in the city of Calgary. As a matter of fact, the request for consideration or carry-over factors came from the city of

Calgary in that a lot of their recreational programs and their cultural programs weren't sufficiently far advanced in the discussions with the community organizations to allow them to tap year one. So they asked if they could have that carry-over. Now Mr. Fisher has just indicated that the carry-over from the first year, added to this last year we've just completed, has seen both years with applications in for the total amounts.

MR. MUSGREAVE: This is a difficult question to pose to the minister, but it's one that concerns me. I still have a feeling that the recreation side dominates, and when you do inject the cultural aspect it's of an amateur nature rather than of a professional. I get the feeling that perhaps we're not doing enough for the professional theatre and the professional musicians and the facilities in which they operate. This kind of thing gets me. Sure, we're doing very well for the hockey teams and the hard service side of recreation -- and the playgrounds and all the rest of it. I'm glad we are. But I'm just a little worried about the fine arts side of the program. I'm just wondering what the minister's response is.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, as the minister of recreation, obviously there is a bias to the recreation side of it. But I should indicate too that in the case of the city of Calgary, they have met and applied for the maximum relative to the cultural side of their program, in both the professional fine arts, if I can use that area, and the amateur fine arts area. I'm thinking of using Edmonton examples where the Citadel and Theatre III have made applications through the city for funds from it. It's their priorities that they relate to us by applications. We have not had any queries as to additional funds for the program. I should say that. If that were to come I think we would consider that in discussions with Alberta Culture.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, my question is in a little different area. If anybody else has questions in this area -- otherwise I'd move to a different area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's nobody else on the list. Are there any other questions?

MR. CLARK: My question is to Mr. Schell. Mr. Schell, would it be possible for the Auditor's office to give us a breakdown of the 1975-76 expenditures and an audited statement of Sport Alberta? If you could provide us at the next meeting with that information that would be good. If you could do the same thing for 1974-75 it would also be very helpful. That is the audited statements and the accounting of all the expenditures.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure of the relevance of that relative to 3517. The Major Cultural Recreation Facilities Program doesn't have any input to that. I'm not saying that that request shouldn't be provided, but we're just relating to the major facilities program and the capital program.

MR. BRADLEY: On a point of order, it's my understanding we're supposed to be discussing the Major Cultural Recreation Facilities Program and therefore a request to look at Sport Alberta would not be in order.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, that's why I asked if anyone else had any other questions in this area. I think I made it quite clear to the committee that I was moving into another area and I simply asked Mr. Schell for the information. It should be public information, Mr. Bradley.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are discussing recreation, and Sport Alberta does come within that scope, so I would think it would be in order.

MR. MCCRAE: Mr. Chairman, could we just clarify that it is public information and the minister with direct responsibilities has no objection to it.

MR. ADAIR: Oh, yes, as a matter of fact I believe I made that statement in subcommittee and again in committee that the statements for Sport Alberta for 1974-75 are in place and 1976 is being worked on right now. It's my understanding that it should be ready by the end of this month. I'm not sure when we'll receive that. I believe it is Buchanan Barry in Calgary who are doing the auditing and then we'll have that in place. It wasn't a problem. I just related it to the discussion we had earlier.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I guess the only question I have on it is, in supplying it, is it the intention of the hon. member that it should be supplied at a meeting when the minister is here, or rather just be supplied.

MR. CLARK: No, just be supplied. There will be ample other opportunities, Les.

MR. YOUNG: Agreed, hon. member. I just wanted to make sure there are no misunderstandings here in the committee today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any requests made in Public Accounts Committee -- the information should come back to the Public Accounts Committee. I think this is procedure.

In order that all members will understand, the question is a request from Mr. Clark for the Assistant Provincial Auditor to bring to the next meeting an audited statement of the 1975-76 and 1974-75 accounts of Sport Alberta.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to it, but just in terms of these proceedings, we're looking at the year 1975-76, and it seems to me that to go back to 1974-75, although I have no objection to it, I don't want to be precedent-setting here and have the hon. member some other time say, look, we went beyond the parameters at a given period of time on this particular date and use that as an example. I think more properly for the 1974-75 audited statement he might well ask for that in some other avenue. If we can accept that it is not a precedent-setting thing we're doing here by agreeing to give him the 1974-75 audit, fine. But if it is going to be treated as precedent-setting, then I prefer he ask his question for that particular audit through another mechanism.

MR. R. SPEAKER: To talk to that particular comment, we're here studying public accounts. If we want to go back to 1960 or 1930, we can do that. Limiting our Public Accounts discussion to one year of public accounts is not the purpose we perform here. To think that is a precedent is nonsense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that it would not be a precedent. In Public Accounts throughout the years there has been no hesitation in going back. There have sometimes been questions about going ahead, but certainly no question about going back. We have done this a number of times in various Public Accounts meetings. Any further questions to the visitors today? I take it then that we have completed our discussion of recreation, right. So, we'd like to thank the hon. Mr. Adair, Mr. Drinkwater, Mr. Fisher, and Mr. Armstrong for being here and for answering the questions.
There will be no meeting next week. The following meeting, if the House is still in session, will be PWA.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, on that point the minister responsible for Pacific Western Airlines advises me that he will not be here on May 18. So in case we are going to have a meeting, could I suggest we move to the number four item, which is northern development, if in fact we meet on May 18, but if we don't meet on May 18 I would suggest we go back to the regular schedule and take Pacific Western Airlines as the first agenda item in the fall session.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, in an unusual display of agreeing with Member for Calgary Foothills, I'd be very pleased to have PWA the first item in the fall.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the next meeting will be the consideration of northern development. Is that next on the list.

MR. CLARK: Yes.

Moved by Mr. Butler, seconded by Mr. Gojo, to adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you gentlemen. Thank you, Mr. Schell.