

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, April 13, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, in reply to a question on warble control asked by the hon. Member for Bow Valley on April 6, I answered that three municipalities have currently opted out of the formal provincial warble control program. I should have said two municipalities, in that the county of Stettler requested they be included under the provincial warble control regulations. Accordingly this request was granted by order in council on January 11, 1977.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 33****The Cultural Development
Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 33, The Cultural Development Amendment Act, 1977. This being a money bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment act will provide for conducting competitions and awarding of prizes in the cultural development area, and will clarify the authority regarding leasing, licensing, and other administrative matters in the jubilee auditoriums of the province.

[Leave granted; Bill 33 read a first time]

Bill 215**The Environmental
Statutes Reform Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 215, The Environmental Statutes Reform Act. The purpose of Bill 215 is to eliminate the provision for certificates of variance set out last fall in The Environment Statutes Amendment Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 215 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table with the Legislature the 1976 annual report of Pacific Western Airlines. Individual copies will be made available to all members of the Legislature. I take this opportunity to pay my respects to the management, staff, and the board of directors for doing such a good job in a difficult year.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, *Je suis heureux de souhaiter la bienvenue a M. Jean Sudreau.* Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sudreau is seated in your gallery. He represents the Louis-Dreyfus group, which hosted our Alberta delegation and presentation in Paris in January. It was attended by over 100 top executives of industry, business, and finance from France. Mr. Sudreau is here by way of follow-up on the interest shown by a significant number of those in attendance at our presentation on the many opportunities offered in Alberta and by Albertans. We welcome him to Canada and Alberta, and wish him an enjoyable and productive visit. I would ask that he now stand and receive a Canadian welcome to the Alberta Legislative Assembly.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to the House a group of some 30 students from the Brander Gardens school. They are accompanied by Mr. Wylie, the principal, and Mr. Burkin. They are seated in the members gallery. I'd ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I'm particularly pleased this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, 20 students from St. Mary's Salesian school in my constituency of Edmonton Belmont. They are accompanied by Brother Brian. They are of particular and close interest to me and another member in the House. I should ask them to stand in the members gallery and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to members of this Assembly Marianne Lubeseder and 10 students from the Tree of Peace adult education centre in Yellowknife. They are located in the public gallery.

In order to facilitate this trip today, the students raised over half the money on their own. This morning they visited NAIT, and this afternoon they'll be visiting the Provincial Museum. I'd ask them to rise and receive the traditional welcome of this Assembly.

head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**Department of Education**

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, for many years the government of Alberta has recognized both official languages in Alberta schools. The linguistic diversity of our residents is recognized by providing for instruction in languages in addition to English and French.

Further to the Budget Address announcement by the hon. Provincial Treasurer of the continuation of the Ukrainian/English bilingual program and the extension of this program to other languages, I am pleased to provide the following details.

Where such a bilingual program has been requested by a responsible association of parents and supported by a school board, instruction in an additional language may be provided to the end of grade 6 for up to 50 per cent of the school day. At least one-half day in English is required of all pupils.

Financial support will be provided at the rate of \$65

per participating pupil for those school boards implementing such a program. For instruction less than 50 per cent of each school day, the amounts are prorated downward. During the first six years, \$15,000 for teacher bursaries will be made available annually for teacher preparation and development. School systems are eligible for regular transportation grants under existing regulations for pupils being transported to the schools offering programs in these languages. To qualify for provincial support, the school system as an operating authority must employ appropriate teachers and provide facilities and student materials.

When a linguistic group is assured of at least 100 pupils in grade 1 during the first year of operation, the curriculum branch of Alberta Education assists in the development of curricular materials.

Programs for languages not now offered may be initiated by application to the department. The application should be submitted at least one year before the proposed implementation, to permit appropriate planning and development activities. All such requests must be supported by one or more school boards. All new provincially developed programs will be subject to an evaluation, for which Alberta Education will pay 80 per cent of the costs over and above funds already indicated. The remaining 20 per cent will be assumed by the participating jurisdictions.

The continuation of programs implemented under Section 150(1)(b) of The School Act is subject to continued administrative support from school boards and continued parental support for additional services which are unique to such programs.

The evaluation of the successful Ukrainian/English bilingual pilot project in participating Edmonton schools has shown that students in the project achieve as well in core subjects as students not in the project. In addition, they are acquiring another language. Parental and teacher support for the project has been very positive.

Mr. Speaker, the continuation of this program and its expansion to other languages confirms the strong commitment of this government to the concept of Multiculturalism and its recognition of the great value to this province of the nurturing of those treasures which form part of our heritage.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Crime

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the first question to the Attorney General. It flows from comments the Attorney General made some time ago with regard to the incidence of organized crime in the province. Will the minister be releasing information this session which will show the extent and type of organized crime in the province of Alberta? I ask the question in light of comments made earlier by the minister that he was seriously considering giving a great deal more public attention to the incidence of organized crime in the province.

MR. FOSTER: I don't recall my specific remarks, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the possibility of giving detail on organized crime. Perhaps it came up in the dis-

cussion about access to criminal intelligence or specific problem areas. Clearly as a matter of policy the Crown does not disclose criminal intelligence specifically since, for obvious reasons, while it may be in the interests of certain individual groups it may prejudice sources of that intelligence and indeed cause great harm.

I don't want to leave any impression that Alberta is infected by the organized criminal community to the point that the government is seriously concerned about major sectors being taken over by organized crime. On the other hand I don't want to suggest that organized criminal activity has somehow by-passed Alberta. Clearly it hasn't. So I'm wavering, Mr. Speaker, as I do not see whose interest, including the public, it would serve for me to be specific sector by sector, or business interest, or the like, in this House. If you want to get into problems of specific kinds of offences under the Criminal Code after the fact and how they have or have not been handled in the courts, I would be happy to discuss those kinds of issues. But I don't know what would be served by general exposure here on the subject. Perhaps the hon. leader could expand.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could direct a supplementary question to the minister dealing specifically with the area of commercial fraud and relating to the RCMP annual report a year ago and to the report again this year. Were members of the RCMP force added in the area of commercial fraud in Alberta and was the province successful in acquiring, I think the term the government used in the House last year was, an outstanding prosecutor to beef-up the activities in that particular area?

MR. FOSTER: Oh, fine. I understand. Mr. Speaker, perhaps my colleague the Solicitor General might respond more appropriately to the first question in terms of the numbers of staff in the RCMP and their various strengths, but it runs in my mind there are 17 members of the commercial crime squad of the RCMP in Alberta. In my judgment they are an excellent squad doing an outstanding job. I and the RCMP are satisfied that the strength and resources of that capacity are quite adequate to serve Alberta's needs at this time. No doubt the Edmonton and Calgary city police departments are interested in expanding and perhaps improving some areas of their commercial crime sector, but that's not a problem at all.

Your other concern had to do with the capacity of the Department of the Attorney General in its commercial crime prosecution section to adequately handle that. The answer to your question is indeed yes. We have a special prosecutions section. We have a few senior Crown counsel who are operating in this section. We are giving very special attention to certain major cases. I'm quite satisfied with the level of expertise we have. Of course it can always be improved, Mr. Speaker, but at the moment I think the area of criminal investigation and criminal prosecutions is being adequately handled by the Crown.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Solicitor General. It flows from a conference held in Edmonton within the last week, when the suggestion was put forward by law enforcement representatives of the city of Edmonton that theft in the

city could certainly be cut by in excess of 10 per cent if more accurate information was available from certain sectors of the business community. My question to the minister is: what action is the Solicitor General's Department taking in this area; secondly, if I could follow up the comments of the Attorney General, is the Solicitor General satisfied with the strength of the commercial fraud group in the province of Alberta?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, to answer the last part of the question from the hon. leader first, I'm satisfied with the answer of the Attorney General and agree with his position. So far as alerting business to the prevention of such crimes and frauds is concerned, this is part of our overall crime prevention package which has been financed largely with provincial funds over the last year. I've had discussions within the last month with Calgary city police in regard to future plans they have for increasing the expertise of their particular commercial crime unit. I haven't had recent discussions with the city of Edmonton, but I will no doubt be doing so in the near future.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister with regard to the question of accurate information being available to law enforcement agencies and the possibility that this in itself could cut down the amount of commercial theft by in excess of 10 per cent. What specific action is the Solicitor General taking in that area?

MR. FARRAN: As I understood the speech made by the particular officer from the city of Edmonton police department, he was referring to the reluctance of merchants and businesses to prosecute in cases of petty crime. I support his position that this is not wise. Of course it is a public relations exercise for the police to explain to businessmen that putting the telescope to the blind eye only increases the size of the problem.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Perhaps I didn't make the question clear. What action is the minister taking in dealing with business organizations, be it the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce, but other groups which I think have to be commended for their interest in this area — but now it seems we need some follow-up from either the Solicitor General or the Attorney General, some encouragement in these areas.

MR. FARRAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader will appreciate that my jurisdiction over municipal police forces is indirect. It operates through the local autonomy of police commissions. For instance in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, where naturally the problem is of the largest proportion, their own police departments have total jurisdiction to enforce the law. All my department can do is to encourage overall policy for crime prevention and to make statements, such as I'm doing right now, to the public generally on the wisdom of a certain mode of action. If I were speaking to the Chamber of Commerce, I would endorse the remarks by that particular officer of the Edmonton city police.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one final question to the Solicitor General. Does the government support the position that in the case where theft convictions are received, printing the names, addresses, and occupations of convicted shoplifters is in the public interest?

MR. FARRAN: Yes. My position as a former newspaperman is that the media should mirror life as it is, and that it should not be in the position of playing censor and restricting information which is newsworthy and of public interest. But of course I don't intend in any manner whatsoever to direct the actions of a free press.

Oil and Gas Prices

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my second question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and ask if he can report to the Assembly what progress was made at the meetings in Ottawa last Wednesday.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the only useful information I could perhaps give would be that there was a general consensus that there should be an increase in price for oil and natural gas. But there was not any agreement as to what shape, at what time, or of what size that increase should be.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate to us what arrangements there now are to follow this up? Will the matter be referred to the first ministers? Will it be dealt with by the ministers of energy and the federal government?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I should have mentioned that there also seemed to be a consensus that it would be best to agree on the future price increase, in the form that it comes, at the energy ministers' level and not at a subsequent first ministers' meeting. We determined among ourselves that we would try to do that. The follow-up we have established is that there will be an energy ministers' meeting either in the last week of April or the first week of May. Before that, there may well be a meeting between the province of Alberta and the federal government.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate the position of the federal government? I raise the question because of statements attributed to the federal minister, who seemed much more interested in getting the price of crude oil comparable to the Chicago price rather than the world price. So my question to the minister is: is it still the position of the federal government and the government of Alberta that we should move to the world price as soon as possible?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, when we go into federal/provincial meetings, it's usually established by agreement that any participant can express outside the meeting the views he expressed in the meeting, but that none of us will speak for any of the others. Since the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked me the position of the federal government, I must say that the federal government, not I, has a responsibility to express that. He has said certain things publicly that I imagine the hon. Leader of the Opposition is refer-

ring to. It certainly is the Alberta government's position that we should move energy prices to international prices or fair market prices as soon as possible.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, we'll try to get the answer from the hon. minister this way: is the government of Alberta still satisfied with the pace of moving toward the world price, which the federal government until very recently had indicated they were prepared to do?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. leader is asking questions which, from time to time, elicit opinions. If he wishes to put the question in the context of government policy, that would be proper. But if we're going to ask for opinions, of course other hon. members will want to do the same.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I was just trying to give the minister a chance to give us a very glowing report on the conference.

May I put the question to the minister this way: is it the position of the government of Alberta that Canada is still moving toward the policy of getting to the world price as soon as possible? I raise the question, Mr. Speaker, because the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources seems to have gotten much more interested in the price of oil at Chicago, as opposed to the world price, and if the federal government goes on that tack it will have serious economic implications for Alberta.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it's certainly a reasonable concern for any Albertan. The federal government's stated policy position has been to move toward international prices. I'm convinced it is still following that policy. There is a large body of opinion amongst energy ministers, particularly those in consuming provinces, that the U.S. average price should be a large factor in determining how fast governments move toward international prices. Now it's quite possible that the U.S. price will move even more quickly toward an international price or surpass it, because it is a moving target. Other than that, we are really dealing in speculation.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. In light of the comment made by the minister prior to the conference in Ottawa that Alberta would settle for nothing less than \$2 per barrel, I'd like to ask the minister why he couldn't have made that announcement here in the Legislature rather than in Ottawa the night before the conference opened.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, that is a reasonable question as well. The comment about the \$2 price being, I think, rock bottom was made as a result of federal statements in the course of the meeting itself. Whether it was prior to the actual conference at a private dinner meeting or afterwards, I can't quite recall. But being drawn into that discussion along the lines that the federal government has said it's \$1.25 to \$2, what's your reaction, my reaction was that the \$2 sounded like the absolute rock bottom.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of reports emanating from the conference regarding the use of some of the

additional funds from higher oil prices for conservation projects, has the government of Alberta developed a position — I'm not asking him to reveal internal discussions at the conference — with respect to using part of the increase in the price of oil and natural gas for approved conservation projects?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, at the production level it certainly has been the position of the government of Alberta to have been in a conservation-minded program for some period of time. As explained in the estimates committee the other night, various departments of the government are moving in conservation programs: the Minister of Housing and Public Works, and in Advanced Education the universities are being encouraged. So will the Department of Energy and Natural Resources co-operate with the federal government in a general conservation program. However, it wouldn't be under any of the discussions or understandings I have of any of those programs that any portion of a revenue source would be tied to the programs themselves. They would be done because they are intelligent things to do.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Following from a question put by the Leader of the Opposition dealing with the so-called American blended price and the minister's comment that the price may in fact rise above the world price, has the Petroleum Marketing Commission compiled information on an ongoing basis? Are there reasonable grounds to believe that in fact the price in the United States will rise above the international price?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as I said when I was answering the Leader of the Opposition, that is pure speculation. The Petroleum Marketing Commission provides information on international petroleum pricing. I was merely using the potential for the U.S. price moving closer to or past international prices as a gauge for the hon. Leader of the Opposition that a person cannot judge what that is going to be from time to time.

Rent Control

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Could the minister indicate whether he has been given the green light to announce the government position on rent controls?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, no decision has been reached. However, it's of course being actively considered. As soon as a decision has been made, it will be announced in the Assembly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Has the minister any new data indicating excessive rent increases being given by landlords across the province?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, obviously the government has been receiving as much information as possible. When I make the announcement, I assume a certain amount of detail will be given.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether the matter is under discussion in cabinet committee, or will this be a total cabinet decision?

MR. NOTLEY: It's stuck in caucus.

MR. HARLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's receiving the active consideration not only of cabinet but of caucus as well.

Oil Sands Environmental Hearings

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Is the minister able to advise the Assembly whether the government is prepared to follow the recommendation of the ECA public advisory committee and call public hearings on all environmental aspects of the oil sands?

MR. RUSSELL: I've dealt with that question many times before, Mr. Speaker. The answer is no, not for several years.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In the light of widespread public support for public hearings, documented already by the ECA advisory committee I mentioned and now supported by the Canada-U.S. Environmental Council, is the minister in a position to outline to the Assembly whether the government is prepared to reconsider its previous position and place greater priority on public hearings?

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we have put a very high priority on environmental concerns in the oil sands area. As a matter of fact, when I spoke to the annual banquet and meeting of the Public Advisory Committee last fall, I indicated it would probably be three to four years before we felt any meaningful public hearings could be held. There is a very good reason for this. We're presently in partnership with the federal government in collecting baseline environmental data which we would propose to make available to the public for the purpose of public hearings.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the fact that the agreement with the federal government runs for a period of some 10 years, if I'm not mistaken, is it not the view of the government that 10 years is a rather long time to gather information before the public has sufficient background to participate in effective public hearings?

MR. SPEAKER: May I respectfully remind the hon. member about the question period not being a suitable vehicle for eliciting government or ministerial views.

MR. NOTLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can rephrase the question, accommodating your concern, and ask the minister: in view of the 10-year period of the agreement with Ottawa, is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly the reasons for a delay in holding public hearings?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'll say again that I indicated it would probably be three to four years from now before any meaningful baseline data is collected under that 10-year agreement. At no time have I ever said it would be until the 10 years had elapsed. Quite frankly, that's a remote and very interesting part of the province about which little baseline data is known, particularly with respect to environmental concerns. I think it's in the general interest to hold public hearings there at an appropriate time based on good information. That's the program the government has in mind.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Will the minister assure the Legislature that there will in fact be public hearings before a third oil sands plant is commenced?

MR. RUSSELL: No, I'm in no position to give that assurance, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to advise whether the Department of the Environment is contemplating any administrative or legislative changes in departmental procedure following the failure of the GCOS prosecutions?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that aspect of legislation is of course under ongoing review, not just in the Department of the Environment but in all departments. Incidentally, the failure came under the federal Fisheries Act, as the hon. member is probably aware.

Hang Gliding

MR. TAYLOR: My question is to the hon. Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. Is the hon. minister or a committee of his department studying hang gliding standards at this time?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not really sure I can respond to that. I would have to check with the sport and fitness branches whether they are doing a specific study on hang gliding. I'm not aware of it.

Public Affairs Printing Tenders

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Premier. I'd like to know if the Premier can indicate whether he's received presentations from concerned printers respecting the method [by which] printing contracts have been handled by the public affairs department. The Premier was asked this question last October and said he would report to the House. I wonder if the Premier has looked into the matter of how tenders have been handed out in the department of public affairs and can he inform the House.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I recall having that information checked. I'm not sure, perhaps it might have been the sequence of events that didn't bring it back to the Legislature. I'll have to take notice of it and respond to the hon. member.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier in a position to indicate if he has had representation made to him personally by members of the printing business?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, again, having regard to the volume of my correspondence, I would have to take that as notice and respond.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the Premier check his date book to find out if personal representation has been made to the Premier — I mean not in correspondence, but a delegation?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I can check it in terms of whether any group or delegation has come to visit me. I could not give an undertaking to the House as to whether I've had direct representations. I get them walking through shopping centres.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier. In light of the fact there's been an allegation of influence peddling in that tendering, can the Premier indicate if there's been any investigation about how tenders have been allowed to be given out by the public affairs bureau?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think it relates to the very first question and answer. I'll do my checking, and either I or the Minister of Government Services will respond to the innuendoes.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, having listened to the innuendoes of the member of the opposition, I would like to state categorically that the last government at no time had any tender . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

DR. BUCK: Maybe he should inform the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

Summer Employment Program

MR. MANDEVILLE: My question is to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower in regard to STEP. In reply to the question last week the minister indicated the municipal element of the program would be in operation. Could the minister indicate if the other six elements will be in operation?

DR. HOHOL: They will be in operation this summer, Mr. Speaker. We're examining very closely the national and the provincial figures with respect to employment and unemployment, the capacity of university students to obtain jobs on their own which as I said before is a significant part of the job itself. I recall to the House the number of hire-a-student offices we have across the province doing an outstanding job in assisting other students in getting jobs. But there will be a comprehensive set of programs for assistance to students who cannot get jobs in the first instance on their own efforts.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate when some of these other elements will be in operation or when the applications will be going out?

DR. HOHOL: The programs, their description, the criteria, will be out to all possible interested groups and groups that will process applications and send them to our department. This information will be out in a matter of days.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister or the department given consideration to having the appropriation for funding this program in the budget instead of funding it through special warrant?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I recall we did exactly that in 1971 when the unemployment figures were much higher than they are at the present time. Then we found that we didn't spend some of the money as the unemployment situation changed downward. Even though estimates are estimates and not exact figures, we felt that to anticipate the amount of money we would need for summer or winter employment was not a reasonable approach. We changed to the use of the special warrant, which in this case appears to be very suitable because we're dealing with something that's pretty unpredictable. We're examining the last two months, in which we have an important increase of about half a percentage point. I do not believe it's a trend, looking at figures over the last months and the last years. But it was a deliberate and carefully considered judgment not to include it in the budget but to look at these circumstances with respect to employment and respond to it using a special warrant.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Does the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower obtain its own statistical analysis provincially on the unemployed in Alberta or does it rely on federal statistics? By that I mean the breakdown in age grouping. Do we have statistics on unemployment among younger people as opposed to middle-aged and older workers? Do we obtain those statistics ourselves or rely on federal figures?

DR. HOHOL: We have figures from Statistics Canada. I should report, Mr. Speaker, that we had some important, maybe even significant, influence on the nature of how Statistics Canada is dealing with those figures. They used to be regional. They are now at least by province and by regions within a province.

One of my colleagues made the important point today that in view of the fact that the majority of unemployed are between 14 and 25, there's a real question as to whether the 14 to 16 age group, that may not even be covered by workers' compensation, is a reasonable age group to be included in Statistics Canada. But those are the figures, and they include youngsters from 14 to 16. By far the largest group of unemployed, particularly in Alberta, are in the age group 14 to 24; also the unskilled. So for unskilled people to come here from elsewhere would be an error.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister, following his last answer. As a result of the statistics acquired by the department, is the minister in a position to advise the House what

the unemployment rate is in the 14 to 24 year old category as opposed to the 4.5 per cent which has been announced for the entire employment picture in the province?

DR. HOHOL: I did not bring the sheaf of materials with me to the House. They are on my desk. We can certainly break those figures down by age groups, by sex, by a whole host of criteria. Some are variable and some are constant.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I might point out that we have the lowest unemployment rate and the highest participation rate. The labor force is growing, in spite of the fact the unemployment figure is also rising. But as I say, there are places with very high unemployment, and people elsewhere who feel that jobs are extremely easy to find in Alberta would be coming here in error if they did not have jobs to come to.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the hon. minister. Beyond STEP, designed to provide employment for students out of school and younger people generally, will there be any specific changes in job creation programs, perhaps a major facility program directed at those areas of the province that have specific problems of chronic unemployment? Will there be any specific moves this year to push ahead some public projects that might be begun to pick up the slack?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, over the years we have developed an approach to putting in place work programs of two kinds. One occurs without the capacity of anyone to predict that it would happen: either an industry has moved or some external force. Another is on the basis of trend, what the hon. member is referring to, Mr. Speaker. We do focus our unemployment programs, or employment programs rather, on those places that have been chronically high unemployment areas.

I should mention that in view of the highest unemployment rate in Canada's history the federal government has increased by \$100 million, on top of \$400 million for the nation, to deal with the matter of job creation. I am in contact with the hon. Mr. Cullen, Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Our officials are working on some of these matters. As we study them and get a real understanding — because the figures just came out this morning — we will try to respond in the most positive way we can.

Treasury Branch — High Level

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. On March 29 the Provincial Treasurer announced a new treasury branch at High Level, with mobile service to Fort Vermilion and La Crete. In light of the fact there are already two chartered banks in High Level and none in Fort Vermilion or La Crete, is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly the reasons the choice was made for High Level as opposed to Fort Vermilion for the new treasury branch?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, rather than answer that from memory — because I did review it with the members of the department prior to making the

announcement — I would like to check further on the matter and respond later.

Construction Industry

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Labour concerns recent decisions by CIL and Du Pont of Canada to scrap plans for petrochemical plant construction in Alberta. Would the hon. minister indicate what initiatives the government is taking to achieve industry-wide negotiations between industry and labor in the construction field?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I know the reasons the hon. member would link his preamble with the question. But they're not necessarily that closely related. Nevertheless the answer to the question is: there is a difference of opinion in the trade union movement and in the organizations that represent management as to the best structure for construction bargaining in the province. We have had many useful discussions with representatives of management, and equally so with representatives of the Alberta building trades and construction council.

I think it would be too early to indicate we have found a happy overall solution that would assure there would be fewer of the difficulties we and other jurisdictions have had in the past in regard to the very difficult area of collective bargaining in the construction industry. However, we are actively working at it, and will continue the consultations in hope that useful results will come from that.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could supplement the answer, having regard to the preamble the hon. member raised. Frankly I did some checking over the weekend, with regard to the preamble to the hon. member's question, as to [whether] the decision of CIL and Du Pont relative to their petrochemical plants was related to this issue. Our judgment is that that's not a fair statement of the circumstances.

If hon. members will refer to my statement to the House in May 1974, it's clear that the decision of both CIL and Du Pont not to proceed at this time with petrochemical developments here clearly relates to the Petrosar project in Sarnia, Ontario, and the market situation with regard to petrochemicals in this province.

MR. TAYLOR: I appreciate the explanation by the Premier.

One further supplementary to the hon. Minister of Labour. In the negotiations with construction management and labor, is any encouragement being given by either or both groups to register all construction contractors in one central agency that hopefully would sign a single agreement with all construction unions, thus avoiding splintering and a multiplicity of agreements? My question simply is: in your negotiations is there any encouragement from labor and/or management in regard to this?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the aspects that certainly is being discussed and, as I indicated to the hon. member, in some respects it's at the heart of the difficulty that exists in coming up with a system that would be better than we've had in

the past.

Reflecting very briefly on that, Mr. Speaker, there's certainly been a great deal of criticism of the effect of splintering of negotiations among various groups. However, doing away with splintering and bargaining in groups is not necessarily the answer. Those are the problems we and the people we're working with both in industry and labor are addressing, having had considerable discussions over the past number of months.

MR. CLARK: I would like to direct a supplementary question to the Premier and ask if he'd be in a position to table in the Assembly the information he pulled together on this question of construction costs in Alberta. With regard to the Premier's comment, which was that in the government's view, high construction costs were not the real reason for the decision by CIL to cancel its plant here, is the Premier in a position to table in the Assembly the results of his survey, at least one component of which would have to have dealt with construction costs in Alberta and the way they have gone up, let's say, over the past four years?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the information was not gathered in written form. It is an assessment I have made and the judgment we have on the circumstances. We're extremely interested in creating skilled jobs in this province, and of course we're alert to the difficulties involved. That's why that assessment was made.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. Premier. Do the decisions of CIL and Du Pont affect the place petrochemical development occupies in government priorities?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, they're a factor. Our position with regard to petrochemicals, as expressed in the House on a number of occasions, is that it's one of a multifaceted approach to economic diversification in the province. I think it's only now that the citizens of this province and the business and labor communities are beginning to realize the serious implications that we tried to bring to this Legislature's attention with regard to the Petrosar project. The very fact that the federal government through one of its agencies was promoting 12 to 16 per cent use of Alberta's total crude oil production to take jobs away from Albertans . . . and we have questions in this Assembly today with regard to skilled jobs. Right there is the problem with regard to Petrosar and that decision. No question about it; it's an important setback for this province.

Water Use — Joffre

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of the Environment. It deals with the complaints the minister's department has received from farmers in the Joffre area in response to application by Alberta Gas Ethylene for water permits. What action does the minister plan to take in light of the objections filed by several farmers?

MR. RUSSELL: The application advertised was with respect to using ground water sources for domestic

purposes of the plant, not for processing. Of course the bulk of that would be used in construction camps for the workers' facilities. The act of course requires that an applicant proposing to do something like that advertise, and this was done. A number of written briefs were submitted. Although they were received after the deadline they are being taken into consideration prior to any decision being made on the issuance of a licence.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could I ask the minister what steps the department is taking either to meet with the individuals who filed objections or to get more information into their hands prior to the department arriving at a final decision?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, there's a limit to how much assistance you can give citizen groups. I met with them some time ago and explained the situation. The company also convened a meeting with them in their own locality. I'm not sure if somebody from the department was there or not, but I received a report on that meeting. We did urge the people to get their briefs in prior to the expiry of the advertising period in the local press. Notwithstanding that, we're still considering the late submissions that were received. I believe we've given a reasonable amount of assistance to them.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister: will the Department of the Environment be taking any initiative in holding a meeting in the Joffre area with farmers who have expressed concerns under provisions of The Water Resources Act?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I don't know really what more we can do. Such a meeting was already held, and I believe the residents who are concerned understand the use of the water. The licence will be based on safe criteria with respect to ground water resources.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the licence been approved?

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Speaker, the application is still under consideration. As I tried to point out, the concerns of the local residents are one aspect that by law must be taken into consideration.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. Has it been brought to the minister's attention that supposedly some officials of the Department of the Environment have indicated to some of the farmers who have expressed concerns under The Water Resources Act that one of the alternatives the Department of the Environment has is in fact to put a meter on the farmer's well to see how much water the farmer is using?

MR. RUSSELL: I haven't heard that particular story, Mr. Speaker. But it's not uncommon in cases throughout the province where new demands are being made on existing water resources to monitor the production of domestic wells to see if new sources of demand are in fact having an effect on the consumers who were there ahead of the others.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. leader, but we have passed the time allotted for the question period. I've already recognized the hon. Member for Bow Valley and, if the House agrees, perhaps we might have one short question and one short answer — the proverbial ones.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Wheat Exporters

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, one short question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate whether the Alberta government will have representation to the officials representing the world's major wheat exporting nations on April 21?

MR. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (Committee of Supply)

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

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

Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife

MR. CHAIRMAN: As this department has gone through Subcommittee B, could we have a report from the chairman?

MR. GOGO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Pursuant to instructions contained in the Committee of Supply resolution of Monday, March 21, 1977, Subcommittee B of the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the estimates of expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1978, for the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife.

The committee recommends to the Committee of Supply the estimates of expenditures of \$52,317,610.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You have heard the report of the chairman of Subcommittee B. Is the committee prepared to receive the report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you would turn to page 257 of the estimates book. Mr. Minister, do you have any remarks before we start on the estimates?

MR. ADAIR: After four days in subcommittee, I will just see if I can respond to any questions that may come forward now.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I didn't have an opportunity to be in that particular subcommittee. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you might respond to a couple of letters that various MLAs have received in the last

several days, one from Morinville and one from another community in the immediate vicinity, concerning the major facility program. The suggestion contained in both letters was essentially that in addition to making money available through the major facility program, some commitment should be made to operating grants once these projects are opened.

I've had the same comment brought to my attention by other municipalities as well, although I think in fairness, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I should say that most municipalities would rather move toward a revenue-sharing program in any event. But they often fall back on the argument that well, if we can't have revenue sharing and we have these cost-shared programs, what about some form of operating grant, so once the recreation centre is opened, the ribbon is cut, the photograph has been taken, and then the bill has to be paid for the janitor, light, water and what have you, there is some ongoing commitment from the provincial government.

As I mentioned, Mr. Chairman, in the last couple of days there have been several letters from communities in the Sturgeon area making that same representation. I wonder if the minister would like — he probably dealt with this in subcommittee, but I didn't have a chance to be there — to bring us up to date on where the government sits on that particular question.

MR. ADAIR: Yes, I'd be quite pleased to. To start with I'll go back a little and explain that the major cultural/recreation facility development program is a capital program. As such, when the communities are applying for moneys under the program they must provide a five-year operating plan or a potential plan. We have very clearly stated that if they can't do that they wouldn't be able to tap the program to start with. So that covers at least the first five years of the 10-year program.

Now I can go on just a little further. One of the resolutions that was defeated quite soundly at the AAMDC, after a fairly lengthy debate, was relative to operating funds. I was quite pleased to see that. As a matter of fact one of the comments made at that particular meeting was if we in fact might be considered welfare waifs of the province rather than that one familiar quote we've heard, children of the province.

I think the program itself has been pretty darn well successful so far, Mr. Chairman. We have had small difficulties in getting applications approved, getting the master planning done. But at this particular point in time we are not prepared to look at any additional operating assistance. I say additional because \$1 million for operation assistance is provided, plus the fact that Project Co-operation does provide some additional assistance for that.

So having said that relative to the major cultural facility program — it's a capital program. As such it will remain in effect for at least the first five years.

MR. NOTLEY: To follow that up very quickly, Mr. Chairman, is there any consideration now to major changes in Project Co-operation in the next four or five years? Does the government see beefing that up in the years ahead?

MR. ADAIR: I'm not sure in just what particular way your question relates to changes in Project Co-operation. Right now Project Co-operation covers capital, equipment, or to some degree some operating . . .

MR. NOTLEY: The operating part of it was the . . .

MR. ADAIR: We're not anticipating anything right at the moment, Mr. Chairman. We have just made some adjustments in the programs at the request of the municipal authorities. Maybe I should point them out for you right now.

Primarily the two biggest changes are reducing the program to two categories, that is 40 per cent and 50 per cent, then the inclusion of the master planning costs on a 50 per cent cost-sharing basis is now in place. One other change made that doesn't relate to all the communities, but certainly does to areas where they have Canadian Forces bases, is the fact that they are now included in the program on a program basis.

One area where we did make a change that we had inadvertently overlooked is where improvement districts may have more than one recreation board within that improvement district. As the municipal authority they could only apply for one \$500 basic grant prior to this. We have now changed that and each one can apply. An example would be ID 17. I believe they have 10 recreation boards within that ID. They would then be getting \$50 each per board rather than the \$500. That's changed. It makes a difference of about \$38,500.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreeable to the committee that we follow the same procedure and take the total votes, in light of the fact that this has gone through subcommittee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will follow that procedure then.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I'd like to ask the minister if he has the order for return ready for me yet.

MR. ADAIR: No, Mr. Chairman. As a matter of fact that order for return will probably take some time to compile. I only have eight people over there working on that particular program, and I am not prepared at the moment to take them off the applications that are there in order to provide the answers. I would think it would probably take us one or two months. I'm not just sure. With those eight people working on the applications in place, I've asked them to continue that because the pressure is from the members in this Assembly to get those applications through.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I think that's a nonsense remark, to take two months for this simple little thing. These are administrative things that are asked for in the department. I'd like to ask these questions of the minister right from the order for return and find out what answers he has available to us in this Assembly.

First of all, could the minister indicate the procedural steps through which an application for a grant

under the major facility grant program must proceed for approval?

MR. ADAIR: I haven't really got that particular procedure here. We went through that in committee, Mr. Chairman. I think really what it amounts to is basically, in a nutshell, the application comes in, it's reviewed by the program planning branch, passed on to the programs branch, then goes over to Culture, comes back, and if we need any additional information, it's requested by the department through the community. In some cases it comes back very quickly, and in some cases it doesn't. In some cases we may have changed our priority, moved on to another application, and it takes a few days for us to get back to that particular one. As I said in committee, I guess the quickest one we have had is one that moved through from August to the middle of September, and the longest one we've had is eight and a half months.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Could the minister outline a list of criteria which must be met for the approval of an application for a grant under the program?

MR. ADAIR: I'll just say the same thing again, Mr. Chairman. I haven't got that particular list with me right at the moment. I can get it for the good gentleman. But in answer to the motion for a return where that actually is listed I can provide that, probably within the next day or two, so you can in fact have that. But I don't have it with me right now.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. How many applications are at present before the staff in the department?

MR. ADAIR: If you'll just give me a moment I have that information here for you. We have 206 applications presently before the staff. There are 106 being worked on over the 100 that are approved right now. Six have been rejected, and the rest are being worked on.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. In general what is the organizational make-up — and I've asked for an organizational chart — of the department relative to these facility grants?

MR. ADAIR: The same eight people working on that particular program doing, I think, just one heck of a job for the people of Alberta.

MR. R. SPEAKER: What's the salary range of the eight employees you are talking about?

MR. ADAIR: I haven't any idea, Mr. Chairman.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister a question. I also asked in subcommittee if a financial statement of Sport Alberta would be available. I would like to know if the minister has that available before we proceed with the estimates.

MR. ADAIR: Yes, I have the '74-'75-'76 copies of Sport Alberta that I can make available. I have checked that out. We have all of them on file, and I'm sure I can get it to you right away.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, at the same time the minister thought he might be able to find the financial statements of all recreational complexes since 1972 in which government money is involved. Was the minister able to get that information?

MR. ADAIR: Yes. Let's just clarify that, Mr. Chairman. It wasn't a case of whether we might be able to find them. They in fact are there. The question I had was whether there might be some problems with any of them relative to the financial position of that community, whether they are tendering contracts or what they may be. What we would in fact have to do prior to making them available is get the consent of those particular communities to release that. I can do that, but it would take some time.

DR. BUCK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't really understand that, in that these are public projects. They are funded by local public money and provincial public money. The last time I looked, Mr. Chairman, I understood that the public business is conducted in public, be it at the municipal, the provincial, or the federal level. So, Mr. Chairman, surely that information should be available to us.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, the other side of that is also some of the community's own money. Of course when they're involved in actually getting bids on particular parts of their project, if they have excess funds available or are having difficulty making payments, it affects their financial position in that community. Until we get their permission to do that in fact, I don't want to jeopardize in any way, shape, or form any position of any community in the province of Alberta. So I would first check with them. I think it's a courtesy check we would make with the communities. Once we got that, we could do that.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, the reason I'm seeking the information is not to badger anyone. But I'm concerned about the recreation complexes that are in quite shaky financial positions. These people are ultimately going to be coming back to the central government for assistance. This is why I think it's our responsibility, Mr. Chairman, to find out exactly how many organizations are coming back to the minister's department. The ultimate responsibility will be heaped upon his golden locks. Really, because we are all responsible for voting these public funds, I think it's important we know the financial situation of some of these complexes. I know several that I'm aware of are having serious financial difficulties. So in an attempt to resolve this, I think we should have this information available.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, under the major cultural/recreation facility development program, I'm not aware of any that are having major problems. I am aware that a few are having some problems and are working them out.

But just to clarify the air, I think really what you're referring to is some of the projects that came on stream prior to this program coming into place. Now those communities that may have a facility may use this program. That money is there for their use. But as we said in subcommittee, they again must apply and meet the requirements of this program.

They can meet it either by debt retirement or by way of additional funds being placed in the pot relative to completing that facility, if it's not completed. But if they can't, they won't be able to tap it. I think that's one of the areas we spoke of fairly strongly in committee, that they must meet these requirements. If they can't, certainly they have some problems. There's no question about that.

Now where they go at that point . . . I know when it comes right down to it, the base of the community is raising the funds that will then be matched by this particular program. Every community in Alberta is able to tap on a basis of \$100 per capita over that 10 years, either in one project totally or a number of projects individually applied for, one per year.

So I am aware there are some problems out there. Certainly any of those communities are welcome to sit down with any of our recreation consultants and talk about the problem. If we can be of assistance, we'll lay out for them the route they could go and what they must meet. Certainly they can do that. A number of them have. I know of a couple with problems prior to the program coming on stream that have now basically resolved the majority of their problems. They still have some minor ones, but they've accepted them.

DR. BUCK: Yes, that's exactly the area of concern, Mr. Minister: basically some of the ones that were built under the agricultural societies grants. So I asked the minister in subcommittee if there was some way these two could be married, because — let's be honest with ourselves — the \$50,000 come-on has just really got a lot of people in a lot of trouble. So I hope the minister can somehow marry the two programs — a shotgun marriage if it has to be — so we can help these agricultural societies out. The minister well knows that some got in over their heads.

The \$50,000 grant was what really got people going. In many of the facilities that are being used, the \$50,000 was a good first step to get them going. But of course, people being people, they somehow have, I might say, a fallacious philosophy. They build on the philosophy that once we've got it built, the government's not going to take it away from us. That's just not a good enough financial argument to use to build, say, a \$250,000 facility. You've only got a \$50,000 agricultural societies grant, plus maybe \$30,000 of your own money, and maybe a government guaranteed loan through one of the chartered banks or the Treasury Branch for the remaining portion. These are the ones causing me concern. I'm sure they will be causing the minister concern.

MR. ADAIR: I think I should point out right now that the co-operation between the Minister of Agriculture and me relative to those ag. societies that may in fact be having problems has been just great. We've been sitting down together to work out some of the problems for them. Some have been worked out. There are still a number to be worked out, and we're working on them.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. With regard to the information I've asked for, in earlier discussions and when it was raised in the House the minister indicated this was the type of material that was looked after every day. It was kept on hand.

on file and readily available. I wonder if the minister could indicate why it isn't available at this time. In his responsibilities as minister, what kinds of checks and what type of work does he do in assessing the administrative stream in his department?

MR. ADAIR: Actually, we meet regularly to go over any problems we may have with the program itself. I have to state again that I think the eight people working on that program are doing just one heck of a fine job. They've had some major difficulties in getting all the information together.

We're speaking now of the first year of a 10-year program, because we're almost at the end of the second year. Certainly from that standpoint I think we've had some small problems we've been able to overcome.

If you wish, I can now go through the 20 steps necessary — I have the list here — if that would help you. The first step is that the community completes the application. Then it's forwarded to the regional office for review. After review by the regional office, it comes into administration. It's then reviewed in all the necessary support . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, if the minister would like to send the material over, that's fine. What I'm trying to arrive at in my questioning from the minister: is he personally aware of what's going on? Does he know what's going on in the department? Does he know the steps? If he has to have a piece of paper sent in and then quote from it, I'm concerned that he doesn't know what is really going on in some of the administration of the department and the flow of material.

That's the first thing I'm trying to establish here. The minister can read these things; that's fine. But does he know what they are without reading from a piece of paper sent in by a civil servant? That's the one question I want to establish today. I have a second question I want to establish. But the first one seems to be answered. He can send over the written material, and I'll read it.

MR. ADAIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, generally I would say I have a pretty good idea of what's going on in the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. That covers the administration division, the recreation division, the parks division, and the fish and wildlife division. We're speaking right now of a component of the recreation division. I'll forward this copy to the hon. member so he may in fact review that. If he'd like to ask any more questions from that, he may.

As I said before, generally I think the success of the program to date has been the work of the individual communities in their preplanning prior to this program coming on stream. By having done that preplanning, their master planning is basically in place. It's just the smaller components, maybe, that are missing.

We've had some disagreements with some communities as to what we require and what they think we require. We've been able to work pretty well all of them out. I don't see any major problems. Out of the 209 applications we've had to date, I think something

like 17 have had some problems. That to me indicates the program has been extremely successful.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Could the minister indicate what review he has done with regard to material requested from the various communities? Could he indicate what seem to be the main priority objects or the things he is really trying to gain from a community? What does he need as information here in Edmonton from those local communities? What are the main specific things?

MR. ADAIR: Well, if you like to take that particular application, that tells you the main specifics right there. Practically anybody can read that particular document. I can read them if you like, Mr. Chairman. I don't think it's necessary. It's been out for two years. It's in place. Beyond that I really don't know just exactly what you are asking for.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. From my observation of these various programs and the fact the government is giving out the grants, I recognize these things as priority items which should be information in your hands, Mr. Minister, or in your staff's hands.

Number one: this is where this whole program got off the track in the beginning. My colleague here referred to it because there were ag. and other grants going out and things were happening. Yes, it was a different program. That's correct, sir. But what happened was, we built structures that couldn't operate. So then we raised it in the Legislature and concern about operating grants came up, which is very, very good. So that's number one criterion. I think that the provincial government, through your department, is responsible to assure that somebody locally can pick up the operating costs. That was the first ground rule of a starter. That's number one criterion. That takes either a letter from a taxing authority at the local level, some group that carries it on. I see that as your number one piece of information.

Number two piece of necessary information is with regard to the property. Who will own the property? Who owns the land the property goes on? I think that's important.

Then number three is with regard to building standards. I want to be very clear on this. Your department is attempting to make judgments with regard to criteria, quality, type of building, size, in all of these various recreational facilities. I think they're out of their depth in that area.

I think your local consultants help an awful lot. That's all right. But the local community knows the kind of building it wants to build. In the letters that go back and forth between these various local districts and your department I find that we get hung up on all kinds of crazy things. By the time the money should be in the hands of the local people, the local people have got the building built, they're ready to use it and the grant can't come. So it's this third criterion, Mr. Minister, that is holding up a lot of these recreational facilities.

In that third criterion I think you could eliminate a lot of red tape, a lot of responsibilities from these eight people you talk about — and I've no quarrel with those eight people; they may be the finest people in the world. I know they've done some good things.

They've tried to respond to my hundreds and hundreds of phone calls to them and tried to do some good things. I don't argue with that. But I think there are people in building standards in this government who can check with regard to fire, insurance, entrances, or materials.

The fellow from that particular branch came into my constituency's centres early in the game. Within a day or two we had his recommendations back as to how the building should be changed. The people locally said, that's great. The one group that was in the course of building just incorporated them right into the building, saved expenses, got things on the road. The next one was able to incorporate right on the blueprints.

But the involvement of the department in all these details — I'll just give you an example. I don't know how it happened but one example just illustrates this over and over again, where the projects get held up. I can give you more than one example, but I don't think that's necessary.

A letter went back to this particular community centre — this was after the application was in Culture for three months — that a wing should be added to the stage. By that time the stage was built, the building was practically finished. The local people couldn't incorporate that wing into the stage. So we had to write back and say it was a good recommendation but we couldn't incorporate it because it was too late. I find this in other situations.

So what I'm recommending to you, Mr. Minister, is that in administering this whole thing you should have another look at your department's involvement. I think that could cut a lot of time out of the processing of these applications. I can show you letters — I'm sure if you took the time and looked at them on file — they were written by the people in your department asking questions. We have the Vauxhall centre if I want to raise that one, the Vulcan centre, other ones. The Vauxhall one for example — the same guy built the Taber one. He's got lots of experience. He toured many centres. He'd had hundreds of hours of experience that he's putting into that plan. Your fellow from Lethbridge, Morley Roloff, finest guy in the world. I've never seen anybody who works with communities, facilitates things ... he makes good recommendations, but they seem to come up here and get all bogged down in many questions which take a lot of time.

That's the third criterion I think you're getting bogged down on, Mr. Minister. That's the point I'm trying to make in my discussions with you, privately and otherwise. I suppose my question to you after that statement is: what can be done there? My statements are to be helpful, most likely also critical. But maybe we can facilitate this thing. Is the government afraid at this point in time that because of a little controversy earlier we now have to bog ourselves down with a lot of red tape? Hopefully not. That's what I get very concerned about now.

MR. ADAIR: Well, I thank you for the kind comments about the good member at Lethbridge. I've heard some of the comments made by the hon. member that weren't quite so kind. I think one of the things that in fact we have to instil in the minds of the communities when they apply for the program is not to begin construction until it's approved. We have

communities going ahead and building their facilities, then coming in with that bank loan on their back. That's a problem. We attempt to say, now make sure that you've got it in place.

Three items we ask for very critically: have you involved all the other service organizations in your community, have you involved the cultural aspect of your community? If they haven't been, then we ask them to go back and do that. That's really part of their master planning. Most of them talk to them in some degree or another. But in some cases we may have the cultural component coming to us and saying, we really haven't had input. At their request we'll go back and ask what input was involved. The input may well be, you want a room, we'll put in a room. That's not really sufficient for that particular group in that community which also has a right to some of these funds and to be part of that particular building.

Most of the program is going very well. In 17 out of 206, we've had some difficulties. Yes, Vauxhall was one of the ones where we had a small delay for a while. There are a couple of others we've had some delays with. But I think we've been able to iron most of those out, getting it down in fact to where we have a shorter time span between them, if we get the co-operation of the communities.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. That's right. There was delay. And there's delay in others, \$10,000 or more delay in interest. The money could have been out much sooner. I can list other centres. But that's a debatable point.

To the minister again: has the minister assessed some of the criteria? Has he had someone come in and have a look at it from the outside and say, look, maybe I've placed some responsibility on my staff that just isn't reasonable, maybe I'm asking questions that just shouldn't be asked at the central level.

I get the feeling, Mr. Minister — and I want to make this point — it's fine to say, involving all those community groups. When the plan came out I said that's good. I think it's good that we're trying to involve these community-based groups. I like that idea. The idea of trying to put the five-year plan together has merit in the sense that it generalizes a plan. It doesn't add in all the specifics, hopefully it generalizes a plan and gets people thinking about their total responsibility. I don't argue with that. What I do argue with is: at a certain point I get the feeling that the provincial government's central office — Edmonton, these eight people you're talking about — is asked to make so many judgments about that local facility that it's just impossible to make. And doing so takes away local community responsibility. I want to make this point along with that. In grants such as this it has been said to every person in Alberta, you have been promised a grant of \$10 a year or \$100 over 10 years or all in one year however you see fit, if you plan correctly.

At this point in time the communities know that grant is theirs, and they want to do something with it under certain conditions. But I'm saying that it seems to me the conditions — that your central office group feels it has to be involved in every little decision made at that local level. That's costing us a lot of money in interest at the local level. We have to borrow money.

Two of my projects at the present time — I have

had to go out on the market and borrow money to pay the facility, to pay up some of the money. Fortunately you are helping them co-operate, but it is still interest money we are losing at that local level. The point I want to make is that there should be some things there: one, we have to build trust in the local community, hope for the best; and two, maybe we can cut out some of these questions that I really don't think are necessary.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, I think we have that trust in the communities. We certainly have [in] some areas. It comes right back to the onus on you and me as MLAs in this Legislature to also lay before those people planning an application to ensure they don't start that application before they get approval. That's where they get into the problem with the interest on the money they borrowed to go ahead hoping to get that other one, which may still be a bit down the road.

When you are dealing with \$100,000 or \$200,000, in three or four months there is a fair amount of interest. Now basically most of them, and pretty well every community and person in Alberta, know the program does not expire at the end of a given year. They are not rushed into a situation where they have to develop that particular plan and get it in place. They can do it this year, next year, or as it comes down the road. So they aren't forced to take that. It's there for them to apply for as they see fit and when they can meet the various standards we have set. Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I again say to those people working in the field and those eight in here, they are doing just one heck of a job.

MR. R. SPEAKER: That's fine and that's right. The communities, the people out in the field, and most likely your central office are doing a good job under the conditions set by you, Mr. Minister. What I think the minister should recognize is that some of the things like . . . I will make this point here. When communities get an idea or decide to build, they move very quickly and it doesn't take very long to get the plan into implementation.

Let's take the Vauxhall one. When we came up here, the mayor and the head of recreation talked to you and other ministers. They had to build a centre. The pressure was on in the community. The government knew it, everybody else knew it. We hired a first-class guy to put the building together. At that point in time there should have been some trust and some movement to get that money out to them as quickly as possible, and it wasn't. That's the very first thing.

You raised the question with regard to MLAs. Maybe we do have responsibility. But I would like to say this: the information with regard to the program . . . And I would like to give full marks to the fellow you have in Lethbridge. He has worked with every community. I didn't have to run around as an MLA and give them first-hand information, because he was there. When talking to the communities, he gave it to them. That was excellent. I just thought that was perfect, because that's what his job was all about. So in initiating these plans, initiating the programs, if a community came to me I would just phone him and say, go out and give them the details and work with their local recreation directors, which he did.

But somewhere in that system, in that discussion, the message you are attempting to give us at this time of the progress [is] that they should have been told not to start their building until the grant cheque was coming down. Well if that's true, you can imagine the cost of building the million dollar project in Vauxhall, the swimming pool in Vulcan, the project we just built. We all know that building has increased anywhere from 10 to 20 per cent. That's what that decision would have done. That's why at the local level we had to move right off the bat to get ahead of that thing. So maybe the advice the minister is giving now has some hindsight, but I don't think it has any validity.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, what I'm trying to say to the hon. member — whether he wants to listen to it or not is another thing — is the fact that if that community recreation board and that community fill in that application and meet those particular ones, they can almost get it back in six weeks. Now having said that, that means they have all their pieces in place. Their funds are in place for us to match. You know, sometimes we are moving slightly ahead of the time when we are providing those funds prior to matching them, and in a few areas we are having some difficulty responding to that or keeping that flexibility in. We want to keep as much flexibility in the program as we possibly can. But in order for the community to be assured that they in fact have their money in place, have their five-year operating plan, have their master planning finished, they should be aware of the fact that that may take them some time if they haven't done it, because it's not automatic. That's really all I'm saying.

MR. R. SPEAKER: That's fine, but I still have not arrived . . . The second area I want to cover is the way the minister is going to facilitate these applications moving through his department and getting that cheque back to the local level. Up to this point they have not been moving fast enough. What are you doing to reassess that paper flow in your department?

I am asking for two things: one, how you reassess the paper flow. How does it move from one person to another? I don't want [you] to feel that I did any research in your department, because I haven't. I don't put the employees in any awkward position. But just by asking questions I find that some people don't know where the paper is coming from at certain times and how it's supposed to flow. There doesn't seem to be any time check on these papers — to say, I've checked it and I move it to that guy — nor anybody following the applications through. There's paper flow and information asked for. What has the minister done to really check those two aspects in his department? Has he put somebody special on it to follow it through, or has he not?

MR. ADAIR: The Deputy Minister and I do a review of the complaints we get relative to the program, as to where they in fact seem to be, where there may be blocks in the program. We are doing an ongoing program trying to update and speed up that particular process from within. The concern we have is that every once in a while when we need additional information, the 14 days it takes for it to come back from the community are not considered in that par-

ticular area. We would like to get that back as quickly as we can, and I think it would be fair for me to state that we have had some problems in some areas relative to getting the final application approved and the cheque out to the community. We are attempting to speed that up as quickly as possible but within the regulations in place. Beyond that, I can't really say anything more.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, can you outline or name for me the person in the department who follows an application through to make sure it goes through the channels as quickly as possible? I can understand when somebody phones you — or I phone you, or one of the MLAs — and says, look, we are having problems with the application, it's somewhere in your department. You phone the civil servant and say, get it off your desk, get it moving. Each one gets a little incentive push like that. But who in your department is responsible for looking at some kind of flow sheet and saying, that thing is on the move? Is your director doing that?

MR. ADAIR: That's right. The director is doing that. I don't ask him to get it off his desk. I ask him to find where it's at, because generally it's past his desk. A small point, but I thought I would just respond to it.

The director of the major facilities program, Stan Fisher, is in fact the one who will follow those through. He and Richard Armstrong do most of that work on the follow-up, and have done an excellent job.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Do they actually have a check sheet, or do they check the flow of certain applications once a week or every two weeks? Or is it just by whoever the minister phones down — they take that application, run it through first, or what happens? Is there an actual formal checking process to make that application get through the department?

MR. ADAIR: Yes there is, Mr. Chairman. It's got "received, date reviewed, received, accepted, passed on, reviewed, accepted, passed on", and that particular one is a copy of it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The other point I want to make is with regard to the kinds of information. What checks have you made personally on the questions for information that have been asked from your department? What things have you cut out as information required by your department?

MR. ADAIR: Really we haven't cut out too many of the areas of requests for information at this particular stage. Because as I said to start with, just completing the second year of the program we did make four major adjustments in it, and we are assessing how those adjustments are going to fit in and just exactly where they [will] go. Again I have to emphasize the fact that out of all of them we have about 17 out of 200 that may in fact have some problems, which may be ours — and I won't say they aren't — and may well be part of ours and part of the communities. But certainly by working together with the community and with our staff, we will get them out as quickly as we can.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Could the minister indicate what review he has done with regard to questions about the actual buildings? What type of detail do you want about a building: where the bathrooms are? How nitty-gritty do you get in those kinds of plans?

MR. ADAIR: When it comes right down to it, I guess if it's approved by the building standards branch and reviewed by the department and the fellows we have in that particular area, it will then move on to the program branch and over to Culture.

I should state right now that I don't review every application individually. I haven't got the time, nor would I have the time if I were able to direct myself just to that. But in the same sense, when we do go over the applications — and we go over them every month — we review where the problems are, and attempt to get them resolved by getting that information back to us as quickly as possible.

Right now we have in place regulations that must be met. Basically I think the consensus within this Legislature and even among municipal authorities is that we are to be as tough as we can to ensure we get all that information for the protection of the community as well as of the program itself.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I wasn't asking the minister to get involved in reviewing where the bathrooms are, and so on. There's enough red tape involved. But would the minister consider going over some of those applications and cutting out some of this material? Has he given any directive to his deputy minister, saying: look, maybe we're asking too many questions. I want a review of that thing, and come back to me. Has he done anything like that?

MR. ADAIR: Yes. As a matter of fact, I've asked for a review of the problem areas that seem to keep popping up the most. After we've put that together and had a chance to sit down and review them, we may be able to tighten up that ship a little bit. That's certainly the idea behind keeping as much flexibility as possible in the program.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Could the minister outline some of the problem areas he's talking about?

MR. ADAIR: Primarily getting back from the various communities information we may want. The application may come in without the plans approved by the building standards branch. We may not have a completed master plan. After sending it over to Culture, we may in fact find out that none of the cultural component in the community has been consulted.

As a matter of fact, one of the areas we did change — and I think it's fair that I point that out right now — is: initially the program was that you had to have that cultural component. We changed it to ensure they didn't put in the cultural component just to tap the fund, just to get the money. In other words they could go with 75 per cent of the program, or vice versa. If the application was of a cultural nature, they could apply for the 25 per cent of the program and leave that 75 per cent until they were ready to apply

for it. So those kinds of changes have been made in the program.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. When I ask what kinds of things you have cut out, and so on, I look at some questions that were asked of one of the centres. Where are the auditorium chairs going to be stored? How are the scenes to be managed? Is the stage to have curtains? What is to be used as dressing rooms? How is the lighting in the classroom and the workroom? Has provision been made for a darkroom? Photography was mentioned in the five-year plan. Maybe that's a legitimate question. Those kinds of things are asked. And I say, if you hire a local engineer, and the community knows what it wants, are those things that hold up an application relevant?

MR. ADAIR: I'm not sure they are actually holding up the application. In some cases where they're asking for that information, I think it's just to verify that it has in fact been included, or to alert them to the fact that they may not have included it in their own. Certainly I agree that some of them may sound fairly insignificant in one sense, and maybe we can speed that up a little bit. But in the same sense, what we're trying to do is ensure the community gets the maximum use of that particular facility. The question about the darkroom — if you're talking about photography — asking where it is and how it's set up is, I think, more than legitimate.

Agreed to:

Vote 1 Total Program

\$1,747,370

Vote 2

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word or two on recreation, particularly in regard to Sport Alberta. In subcommittee the hon. minister told us the games branch had been separated from Sport Alberta. I would like to commend the minister on that move. I think that's a very excellent move, because in my view the games conducted by Sport Alberta were about the only item I know of that was really done well and was meaningful. I think it's very wise to have separated the Summer Games from Sport Alberta.

I am concerned, however, particularly if provincial money is going to continue to go to Sport Alberta, that that body be jacked up to the point where they're going to do something besides hold meetings. I don't want to be unfair, but it seems to me that the directors of Sport Alberta have missed the whole point of their creation. And I had something to do with their coming into being.

The whole idea was that they would be a real boost to amateur sport, that they would be a body through which amateur sport would thrive. Instead I find that Sport Alberta is having a lot of meetings and a lot of money going into administration, and a dribble going into amateur sports. I would ask the minister to review this matter very, very carefully.

Another item I'm very unhappy about with Sport Alberta, is that to my knowledge they don't have one director from rural Alberta. Another thing: while I have nothing against schoolteachers — I think they're

fine people — having an entire body of schoolteachers direct this is not going to do the job we want done. There should be a variety of people from the community and a lot of lay people who have an understanding of amateur sports.

I realize I'm being critical of Sport Alberta, and I really mean to be. I would like to see that body jacked up to the point where it can do the job it was intended to do when it was brought into being; that is, to foster, encourage, and enhance amateur sport in the province. That's a real challenge for any body that wants to undertake it.

All I'm saying at this point, Mr. Chairman, is that I hope the hon. minister will take a very careful look at what remains of Sport Alberta, now that he's moved out the most relevant part, the part that has been doing a very excellent job in connection with the summer games.

MR. ADAIR: One comment I might make, Mr. Chairman, is that the initial objectives of Sport Alberta, as you well know, were to promote amateur sport in the province, to act as a forum of exchanged views of the various sport governing bodies for the province, and to act as a liaison with other government agencies. That really got smothered by the success of the games.

One of the other areas where I think they have made some pretty good efforts is that Hall of Fame dinner. It sort of sputtered a little bit. Again, because of the smothering effect of the games, it sort of lost out in some of the areas. I think that particular area, plus the fact they have a role to play with the sport governing bodies . . .

The membership of Sport Alberta is by appointment from the various sport governing bodies. We do not direct what the membership might be. I would hope they may take those remarks in stride, and certainly see that some proper membership is there to represent rural Alberta. As a matter of fact, I've made that point to them.

But I think the idea behind it, with us providing additional funds for Sport Alberta to continue, was in fact to allow them to adjust back to their original role and to get on with the job they were originally set out to do; that is, work through the sport governing bodies as an organization to promote amateur sport in the province of Alberta. If they do that, they'll certainly do a good job for the amateur sports people of the province.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm very, very pleased with what the hon. minister is saying. As we watch Sport Alberta during the coming year, I hope we'll see a new being entirely: one that will keep administration costs to a minimum, and a maximum amount going to encourage amateur sports.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I would also like to second the concern of the hon. Member for Drumheller that the cost of administration with Sport Alberta was eating up most of the budget. I'd like to say that a good friend of mine was the late Dr. Don Smith. Just prior to his passing I was visiting him, and these were the concerns he expressed too: so much of the budget was being used up by the director at that time that the funds set up for the use of the programs were being eaten up by the administration. So the minister

of course has mentioned he was aware of that, and steps are being taken to change that. At the same time, the president at that time was concerned about what we're going to be doing with all this high-priced help between one event and the next.

I would also like to bring this concern to the minister: when we're having the Winter Games and the Summer Games, I think we should guard against duplicating the mistakes that the Olympics make. As a taxpayer, it has always concerned me that we put on these lavish Olympic Games in different cities every four years. We spend not millions any more but billions of dollars. Surely we as taxpayers should be a little more intelligent and rotate these sites throughout the world every four years. The facilities are available in, say, sites A, B, C, and D; rotate them. Maybe that would take the politics out of the blessed thing and let the sports get back to the athletes.

I'm trying to make the parallel here, Mr. Chairman, to the minister: let's not get such a bidding war between communities that we lose sight of the fact that what we're trying to do is promote the sports for the sake of the athletes. So I'd just like the minister's comment on this. Can he indicate to me the value of having or not having the Summer Games or the Winter Games in a certain community? Are we possibly going the route of putting funds into centres where the community would like to host the games and adding facilities that maybe are present in other communities?

MR. ADAIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess the best way to respond to that is: certainly we haven't had a "bidding war" going on the games. The games just awarded to Medicine Hat by the committee saw Jasper, Banff, Grande Prairie, Red Deer, and Medicine Hat actually applying for the games. Those were the first games which had more than two bidding on them.

One of the reasons was that the communities were coming to me and saying, really we would like more time to know what we have to do in order to be able to bid. So one of the main reasons behind the separation of the games from Sport Alberta was to concentrate primarily on the games and to develop a plan that would see at least a three-year spread between the games and the announcement as to where they would be played.

From the standpoint of dollars, based on the public funds that go into it through the department, there is a maximum. Any beyond that has to come either from the community or from the private sector. So I think we've sort of held a lid on that particular area, where we can in fact keep the true idea behind the games at the participatory level.

Now you obviously run into the fact that you get some cream coming out of that. Where does it go? What do we do there? I think that's where we have some assistance in the elite athlete program, as it's sort of called right now. It's the Olympic/Commonwealth/Pan-Am athlete programs, Olympiad for the Disabled — those areas where we provide additional assistance to athletes who are gifted with a particular trait in whatever sport they're good at.

But I think for the games themselves, we have to maintain the level of keeping as much on the participatory level, and getting the maximum number possible involved in the eight zones and in the games

themselves. There is no question about it: almost every other province in the Dominion of Canada is coming and asking us about the games and their success. That has resulted strictly from the acceptance by the people at the local level of the participatory part of that event. So I think what I would like to see is every community where it's possible to host the games at some stage having that opportunity.

Right now we have the Summer Games one year, the Winter Games the next. They alternate every other year, so there isn't a Summer Games every year and a Winter Games every year. One of the reasons for that was the fact that we begin to run out of volunteers to help, because it takes a tremendous number of volunteers in the community that is successful in getting the games. In fact they really have to work for about a year and a half toward making sure everything's in place: officials, people in charge of accommodation, people in charge of catering, people in charge of the ceremonies. A tremendous amount of work is done by those people. Without them, the games couldn't be a success at all.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. Can the minister indicate how many people are directly responsible for co-ordinating — the director and the co-ordinating people responsible for putting on, let's say, the Summer Games — who are being paid directly by the department? How large is this co-ordinating body?

MR. ADAIR: I'm not sure if I understand your question.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Minister, there must be a director responsible for organizing the Summer Games. How many people in your department or in this gentleman's or woman's department are there for co-ordinating the games *per se*?

MR. ADAIR: Within the games part of what was Sport Alberta, basically two. They are still on staff under the games council that hasn't yet been appointed. Within the department we have our regular people in the sport and fitness branch who work with them and with the host community. Once the host community has been named, in this case Medicine Hat, they will be naming a person to be the co-ordinator for that community — in the Red Deer area I believe a fellow by the name of Keith Carscadden is the co-ordinator of the games — who then sits on that body to work with them for the balance of the year before the Summer Games this September.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, one other area concerns me. I believe the hon. Member for Drumheller brought this up too. How is the athlete, the youngster way out in northeastern Alberta, made aware of the fact that the Summer Games are going to be in Medicine Hat on such and such a date? If he's a gifted athlete, how does he make it? The reason I ask this question, Mr. Minister through the Chairman, is that I have four youngsters from grade 12 to grade 5. I haven't had one of those kids come home and say to me, you know we've got a program going in our school; I may be good enough to get down to the games in Medicine Hat this summer. So I'd like to know from the minister, Mr. Chairman: just how good

is that publicity and co-ordination, so the youngsters are aware that they could participate in the Summer Games? In the minister's opinion, is that sufficiently co-ordinated so that everybody who is gifted has a crack at the games?

MR. ADAIR: Well, I guess I should clarify right now, Mr. Chairman, that it isn't a case of the games being for the gifted. The games are for anyone, really from 3 to 90 years of age; it's participatory. Now, from that come some of the gifted. I can go back to a couple of years ago; a young Chinese lad in southern Alberta was quite a good runner. He was a winner at one of the games in Calgary. Then he went on through the Alberta Track and Field Association to some fairly significant successes.

But the way of getting the message back to the grass roots, if I can use that term, in the various zones is through the recreation directors. I really think that in fact is happening. In the regional zone playoffs that led to the winners out there going to the games, for example, in the Summer Games of 1974, there were some 43,000 participants at the zone level. That increased to roughly 67,000 in 1975 for the Summer Games, for the two games that we had during the summer. We had roughly 38,000 in the regional level for the Winter Games of 1976, held this past February in Banff.

So I think there is fair communication with the various organizations in the communities through the recreation directors and zone directors who are appointed by their various provincial sport governing bodies. They're involved with that as to the sports that will be in the games themselves. At Red Deer this year, I believe 26 or 27 sports will be involved in the Summer Games. Right now that kind of information is being disseminated to the various zones, so they in fact can start gearing toward those particular sports for the Summer Games of September.

Agreed to:

Vote 2 Total Program \$27,252,560

Vote 3

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a comment or two. Looking at provincial parks, in our perusal of the estimates in subcommittee I wasn't really satisfied in my own mind that there was sufficient co-ordination between the minister's department, the minister responsible for lands, and the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. When looking at an overall master plan of what we're trying to do to develop not only recreational programs but recreational facilities, it seemed to me the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, because he's the biggest of these three, should be the guy able to grab the scruffs of the necks of the other two ministers and say, hey guys, we've got a recreation program set up and it's going to be done this way, this way, and this way. Because we have a plan, hon. minister responsible for Crown lands, we're going to ask you for the land; and we're going to advise you, Minister of Business Development and Tourism, that we're going to develop a ski facility in X area.

I think without that kind of co-ordination, Mr. Chairman, we're really running around in circles. I

think the ultimate decision should rest with the minister in co-ordination with these other two departments as to what we're going to do for recreation in the entire province and where we're going to do it. In the hearings of the subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, I just didn't feel we had that kind of plan. I'd like the minister to give us his feelings on this, because I think it is an area of genuine concern.

MR. ADAIR: When it comes to dealing in the area of provincial parks, I have the clout. When we're talking about areas related to recreational use on Crown land, I have a word in with my colleague, of whom I can say very clearly we work very well together. That particular area doesn't really concern me at this point in time because of our ability to work together. That's not just with the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, the Associate Minister responsible for lands, or the Minister of Agriculture; whoever it may be. When we're dealing in those areas relating particularly to Crown land outside provincial parks and the planning for use of that land relative to the trail systems, or whatever we're talking about, when we come down to specifics in the area of parks that certainly fits into that planning as well.

As I stated at that time in the estimates in subcommittee, through the minister we in fact had a plan being prepared for approval of cabinet that would relate primarily to the eastern slopes but could be expanded to the rest of Alberta. That dealt with areas where we could put in place trail systems or outdoor recreational opportunities in addition to the parks. Because we're relating now to all three divisions of my department: recreation and outdoor recreation, the parks division and its particular role, and the fish and wildlife division and how they relate to the other two, as well as the lands branch. So I think we're getting into the more complex areas of that. I can assure you that we have no problems in working together in that area. And I hope you'll accept that assurance.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I have a little bit of a question in my mind. When we revamped — this last round of musical chairs the Premier had, to sort out his ministers and the new ministries — I really think, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, that these three departments together is just too big a job for one minister to handle. I really do. Even though the minister is of broad stature and works 16 hours a day, I think this shotgun marriage of these three departments was too hastily conceived. I think it's too much. I wish you a long life and hope you don't burn out trying to administer this department. I just think it's too big. I think it's too cumbersome. I think it's so broad that one man can't co-ordinate it.

MR. DIACHUK: Walt's going to ask you for a favor now.

DR. BUCK: I don't want any more ministers though, Mr. Minister. But I think we could get rid of two or three others and split this one up. We could go that route. But I think it is a genuine concern, at least from the people who have given me some direction in this department. They feel it's just too large.

I'd like to just ask a question, Mr. Chairman, to the minister. On 3.3 and 3.5 — the minister knows we

had a little go around on this — we're spending almost \$2 million in planning parks and only \$2 million in building parks. Either we're going to do really a lot of planning and then in the next two or three years build a lot of parks, or we're certainly spending too much money on planning. When we see ads in the *Edmonton Journal* every weekend looking for these \$20,000 and \$30,000 per year people, maybe we're spending too much money on planning and not enough on building the parks.

So for the record, I would like the minister's opinion on the relationship between 3.3 and 3.5. I know there's some capital in 3.3 which will jack that figure up. It still seems we're almost going dollar for dollar three as to planning versus construction. I'd like the minister's opinion or his feeling on this.

MR. ADAIR: I'm not sure I should give you my opinion. I'll try to say it in another fashion. I appreciate the comments you made. I really think one of the best moves we made was to put recreation, parks and wildlife together so those particular ones that relate to our outdoor leisure time and recreation use are in fact there. If I had my choice, I could probably say the one area we missed was putting tourism in with this. We'd have a pretty nice package. But I may have some comments from my colleague.

One of the areas related to the amount of dollars is in the Alberta Public Works capital budget, which would more than double that particular one. That'll give you the other amount of money being spent on the capital side.

I guess I should point out too that this year 29 provincial parks are being worked on, actually having some construction work done. Plus of course the fact that we're doing the planning for the newer, larger parks. We're getting into that area now.

Primarily the parks department has been made up of a takeover of the old municipal parks through the years. We're now getting to the stage where we're doing complete planning and getting into park development from square one, if I can use that particular point in time, and then moving on from that point to the larger parks. So planning is a very important component of the new policy announced in 1973 by my colleague. Hopefully we'll be updating it sometime this summer, for a later announcement in the fall or possibly early next spring when we change some of the areas around. Certainly from the standpoint of dollars, what appears to be fairly close to equal in this particular one does not include the capital budget in APW.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to ask the minister if his attention has been directed to the Clearwater forest reserve and a group of students who did a study on that area and made some recommendations. Has the minister had a chance to look at that and at some of the recommendations by the students who did that study?

MR. ADAIR: I have their letter. I haven't had a chance to meet with them as yet. But I will be meeting with them sometime in the near future.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I just have one or two comments to make. I'd like to commend the government on the work they are doing in provincial parks. I

hear one criticism at the grass roots: it seems to be a long time to complete the various provincial parks. The parks affect the everyday lives of almost everybody in a community, particularly during the summer period.

In the Drumheller community the hon. Dr. Warrack, when he was minister, announced the acceptance of the large Midland area property for a provincial park. This was received with applause by the people of the whole area. The department has been working on plans for that and I fully support that idea of getting this carefully planned before actual construction starts.

However people are becoming very impatient and feel the planning is taking too long. I understand from the minister's remarks in committee that the planning is now reaching conclusion. I hope the minister will then provide an opportunity for input from the community, because many people there have had a lot of experience in this type of thing. The way it is being planned, in my view it is going to be one of the most interesting parks in western Canada, unique in western Canada, maybe in this part of the continent.

I would like to see more money put into parks. But when I look at the budget and see a 15.6 per cent increase over last year — this is beyond the guidelines, although the total program is under the guidelines — I can hardly recommend that more be put into parks this year. But I do think this item might be called one of the bread-and-butter issues, because it affects the lives of men, women, boys, and girls of all ages. I would like to express the hope that we could advance the cause of provincial parks even more than we are doing today.

I realize that Alberta has a very large expenditure on two urban parks, and this too is something unique in Canada and almost unique in this part of the country. When I was in central America some years ago, I was thrilled with the parks I saw right in the heart of the cities. I think it is going to be a real boost for all the people of Alberta when we get the two parks, in Calgary and Edmonton.

At the same time, people do like their own provincial parks. All I want to say is, I hope the hon. minister will move as quickly as possible not only in completing plans but also in completing construction in our various provincial parks.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a question or two about the Capital City Park. First of all the original estimate that the Premier somehow pulled out from on high . . . we've never to this moment seen a feasibility study on how we're going to spend just \$35 million. Already we've had a little waffle, already it's been said, well that was 1974 dollars. So if it ends up \$110 million, sorry folks, these are 1978 and 1979 dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I was driving by the new Commonwealth Stadium today. I would like to say that at least one member of cabinet who was quite an athlete in his day — and he's got the bad knees to prove it — was trying to get some money so we could look at covering the stadium in Edmonton and the stadium in Calgary. I say right in my place, Mr. Chairman, that the government should have had the guts to have indicated to the cities of Edmonton and Calgary — which will affect all the people of northern and

southern Alberta — that these two facilities could be covered. I can't think of any other place in North America that has people who support athletic events like we do in Edmonton and Calgary and the surrounding areas. I can't think of any other places in the cotton-picking world that need a covered stadium more than Edmonton or Calgary.

MR. GETTY: Regina?

DR. BUCK: I was really hoping the hon. Premier would have gone to Ottawa to bounce 'Joe Who' so we would have had the hon. Mr. Getty in the Premier's chair, so we would have had some leadership in providing covered stadia for these two facilities. [interjections] Because we build a facility like the Commonwealth Stadium with absolutely no provision to cover that cotton-picking facility. If that isn't waste of the taxpayer's money, Mr. Chairman, I don't know what is. [interjections]

We could have taken some of the dollars here, because this \$35 million was the estimate without any study. I say, Mr. Chairman, without any study at all. It got 19 P.C. MLAs re-elected in Edmonton, so it served that purpose. But there was absolutely no study [interjections] to indicate it was only going to be \$35 million.

So I would like to know — after my little plug about getting Getty elevated to the Premier's chair, because he would have covered those two stadia . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Keep it up.

DR. BUCK: . . . if the minister can indicate to us how close we are coming to that \$35 million figure already, and what his estimation [is] of what it's going to cost the taxpayers of Alberta when the Capital City Park's project is completed.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, he was making such a good speech that I just didn't have the heart to stop him and tell him that he'll have to ask that question when the estimates of the Minister of the Environment come up.

I handle the operating costs of that particular park. That's the only involvement I have with the Capital City Park. So I can't respond to the costs or cost estimates of that. You'll have to wait until the estimates of the good Minister of the Environment come up.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, we'll have a go at Fish Creek, Calgary then, because the minister is responsible for that one. Right?

MR. ADAIR: Yes.

DR. BUCK: Okay, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister. The original cost was going to be about \$15 million. Can the minister indicate what are we looking at now?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, I have to say again that the land purchase division of the Department of the Environment handles the land purchase for that park. We haven't completed all the purchases relating to Fish Creek Park so I can't give you a total figure. As a matter of fact, I can't give you an update as to where they are with the actual land purchases to this

particular point.

I know we have all the land east of the Macleod Trail. We're working on that area right now with the development of the park facility in that particular side of it. Beyond that, I can't respond with the total costs or the actual dollars spent to date for land purchase.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, back to covering the two stadia in Edmonton and Calgary. Have there been any meetings recently between the minister and cities of Edmonton or Calgary to look at putting covers over these two stadia?

MR. ADAIR: No, there haven't, Mr. Chairman.

DR. BUCK: Absolutely no discussions whatsoever?

MR. ADAIR: Absolutely no discussion whatsoever.

DR. BUCK: That's the kind of leadership I like to see, Mr. Chairman. No leadership is what we're getting.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister a question now about the Alberta Game Farm. [interjections] Can the minister responsible for recreation, parks, and wildlife in this waffle government indicate to us what is the status of the discussions between the minister's department and the owner of the Game Farm?

MR. ADAIR: Yes I can. This certainly isn't in any way, shape or form a waffle. This has been straight right from the horse's mouth [interjection] right here. I don't know exactly what position the people who are negotiating with Dr. Oeming — I don't know where they're at, because that's not between us and Dr. Oeming. That's between the individuals, group, or whoever it may be. They have until April 30 if they wish to apply to us for assistance. If on April 30 we get an application from a group that shows financial capability and what not, at that particular point in time we will begin negotiations with Dr. Oeming for the land.

In other words, nothing has happened. We have not received any applications to date. I am aware that other groups have in fact been talking to Dr. Oeming. But they have been direct negotiations between either the Lions Club, who were asked to wait by Dr. Oeming, or a group that emerged after that particular point. I'm not sure where they're at right now. They have not contacted us — nor do they have to, I should point that out, unless they wish to.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, for the record then, the government has discussed only the purchase of the land so that the Alberta Game Farm location would be where it is now. So the only negotiations or discussions would be as far as purchasing the land, not the animals?

MR. ADAIR: That is very clear. It was very clear on February 1 that we would provide a land base as the provincial contribution to any *bona fide* organization — I'll go through them again:

non-profit service organization, foundation or association, and/or any Alberta municipal authority [who are] prepared to purchase and operate the . . . Game Farm.

We would be prepared to assist them by providing the

land base, either that particular site through negotiation or an alternate site.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Has the minister, the cabinet, or the caucus given any consideration to purchasing the farm *per se* and allowing the foundation to run it? I know the minister would be hard pressed by his colleagues and say, we just don't want the bureaucracy to get any larger. I've heard that defense already, Mr. Minister.

Have there been any discussions about setting it up as a provincial park, if we have to go that route, then have the foundation look after the operation of the Game Farm so we do not set up a bureaucracy? The foundation would run it. When you're looking at a capital expenditure of between \$6 and \$8 million — the Minister of Energy might be able to come up with that kind of bank account, but not too many other people could. I would just like to know: has the government given any consideration to going the route of having the foundation run the farm?

MR. ADAIR: No. I think we stated very clearly that our interest in keeping the Game Farm in Alberta was to provide a land base for any organization, foundation, or other group that may in fact be interested in purchasing it. At that time we would negotiate with Dr. Oeming. We have not considered the provincial park concept, nor would we at this particular point.

Anything beyond that goes into the hypothetical area. We're dealing with something that may in fact happen after April 30, because they have until April 30 to come to us if they so choose. My understanding, from following the media, is that at this point basically it's practically a deal between some group — I'm not sure who they are — and Dr. Oeming. Whether they choose to come to us for assistance by way of our purchasing the land and providing it to them remains to be seen. I'll wait until April 30, until such time as they may or may not come forward.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I could follow that on for a moment. The minister said there's almost a deal between Dr. Oeming and some group. Where do things sit, as far as the minister knows, relating to the different groupings that were showing some interest in the Game Farm? Is the minister aware of it? Have you had discussions? Or is that being left completely to these individuals and, as far as you're concerned, you're not in any way, shape, or form involved in any discussions until April 30?

MR. ADAIR: That's basically it. No organization has come to us at this particular stage, although they are aware they can. They can apply to us. They have until April 30 to apply for assistance. The assistance we would offer is the purchase of a land base, either that site by negotiation or an alternate site, and enter into a lease should we be successful in getting that for them.

But in the interim, any organization, group, or individual may in fact contact Dr. Oeming, and have. The only thing I can say at this point is I'm aware the Alberta Game Farm Foundation was in fact dealing with Dr. Oeming. The Lions Club group and another group — I don't know who they are — were dealing with Dr. Oeming. At this particular point, I just follow it in the media. I'm aware he has been talking to

them. At this stage I'm aware of just the three groups that are interested. But they have not contacted us. Nor, as I said, were they obliged to unless they wanted to.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, to pursue it just so I have it clear in my mind. April 30 is the cut-off date. At that point the government will look at whether it will provide a land base. I take it that is not an unconditional commitment at this stage. Would you look at the successful foundation or group of people who worked out an arrangement before entering into an agreement? In other words, as far as the province is concerned is everything held in abeyance until the 30th, then on the 30th you would begin not only to negotiate but assess whether you want to enter an agreement with a group?

MR. ADAIR: I think two things should be made very clear, Mr. Chairman. One is that that option is open to anybody in Alberta. They may choose not to. I would hope the private sector or that group, whoever they are, may be able to do it without assistance from the government. That would be the ultimate. If that's not at all possible, they certainly have the right to apply to us for assistance, as we said, by purchase of the land base and working out a lease arrangement with them. That is open until April 30. We'll keep it open until that time. If they wish to apply, fine. If no one applies, we'll have to look beyond that. But at this point it's hypothetical.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the point I wanted to clarify in my own mind is that before — well let me just sort of follow this scenario through. The minister mentioned that until April 30 there will be an opening as to whether a successful group — either a foundation, a group of individuals, or what have you — can apply for a land base. My question really relates to — suppose Dr. Oeming and a group of people arrive at an agreement that is okay as far as Dr. Oeming is concerned and fine as far as the group is concerned. The group then comes to the government and says, all right, we've got this agreement. We want the government to come through with the land base — buy the land and work out a lease arrangement with us. At what point does the government check the financial capacity, the ability, the background, what have you, of the foundation or group of people who have worked out the agreement with Dr. Oeming before we as a province commit ourselves to supply the land base?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, we would begin once we got an application from that particular group, whoever they may be.

MR. NOTLEY: Just to follow that through. Would you then do a full evaluation of the group — financial ability of the group, whether they have the competence to carry on the project — so the land base would not necessarily be committed? That's the point I want to elicit at this stage. Would it be up to the government's assessment of the promoters, the purchasers, the foundation, or what have you, that worked out an agreement with Dr. Oeming before the commitment was made?

MR. ADAIR: Before we would make the commitment to begin negotiations, we would be asking again to ensure they had the management, financial, and operating capability, also the fact that we added they had an Alberta component in that group for whatever reasons that may be. We would like to see Albertans own that particular game farm. So their operating plan, the acceptability of it, and management and financial capability would be reviewed once an application was received, before we would make the commitment to accept that and begin negotiations for the land with Dr. Oeming on their behalf. If that were the case, if they come to us, certainly that's the route we would begin to follow.

MR. NOTLEY: One final question. I realize you'd have to undertake negotiations and there's no commitment, and rightly there shouldn't be, until you've had a chance to check the principals who've worked out an agreement with Dr. Oeming. However, have you given any preliminary assessment at this time to what would be necessary in terms of a return on the public investment, assuming we do obtain the land base? We'd have to work out a lease-back arrangement. Do we have anything in mind at this point as to what would be a reasonable recovery of rent in order to gain a return consistent with the rather substantial expenditure we will have to make to acquire the land base?

MR. ADAIR: We would certainly have to take a look at that. But I think we did state very clearly in our announcement that we would look at leasing that land to that group, whoever they may be, for \$1 per year for a negotiated term — and that may be 10, 15, 20, 25 years, whatever that may be — to assist them to ensure they have the capability of operating on a long-term basis.

So it wasn't a case of getting an economic return. It was some assistance in providing the land base and the equivalent of additional assistance by providing it for \$1 per year. That would be the basis, and that was the basis announced on February 1 when we made that clear so that non-profit organizations would have an idea of what they would be getting into before they went into the necessary rounds of trying to find out what their costs would be down the road as well. We tried to give them something stable by indicating to them that if the application came to us and was successful, we would negotiate on their behalf for the purchase of the land, and provide them with a land base on the basis of \$1 per year for a given term, whatever that may be.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word or two in connection with the Game Farm. I don't want the House to get the impression that everybody wants the government to buy the Game Farm. Certainly the people in my constituency don't want the government to buy the Game Farm. I want to be on record in that respect.

I have every commendation for Dr. Al Oeming. I consider him a personal friend. I admire the work he's done. He started that game farm on his own initiative without any government assistance. To my knowledge he's never asked for government assistance. As a matter of fact, some of his advancement has been in spite of government regulations. Many

times I met with Dr. Oeming in connection with highway signs, et cetera, to assist people to get there.

I have every commendation for Dr. Al Oeming, and I like the Game Farm. I enjoy going there. But I think we have to realize that this is in one part of the province. Thousands of our people in other parts will never in a lifetime get to see the Game Farm. In my view it would be a bad mistake if the government undertook to buy and operate the Game Farm.

In the first place, it would become an election issue. One party would say, we'll cut the entrance fee to \$1. Another would cut it down to 75 cents. First thing you know, the thing would be completely free and operated from taxation. That's an item for free enterprise. Surely to goodness in this free-enterprise province, we're not going to ask the government to take over everything and anything. I think the government has done an excellent job in providing and saying, we will buy the land. The land is going to be more valuable as time goes on. The people of the province can't lose in that regard. It'll give a new operator a chance to get his feet wet so he can make an enterprising and buoyant venture.

On behalf of the people I represent, I want to make it abundantly clear: we do not want the government to buy the Game Farm.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, consistency, oh how consistent thou art.

Mr. Chairman, when we start talking about free enterprise, it's quite interesting how it's all right to invest \$34 million of the taxpayers' money to buy PWA; how it's all right to invest \$1 billion — \$1 billion, I say — in the Syncrude project. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is an accountant. If he would just take the time to add up all the infrastructure and all the direct and indirect loans to Syncrude, he'd come up with a figure of well over \$1 billion, which happens to be \$1,000 million for the hon. member's enlightenment. [interjection]

But when we look at this government's record of getting involved in IPSCO, when we look at this government's record of buying the little chemical plant out at Two Hills, you know there's a lot to be said for the people of this province owning the Game Farm.

Let's get back to a little bit of leadership. Let's look back at the two auditoria that were built in this province. The hon. Member for Drumheller happened to be a member of that Executive Council. The government of that day had the intestinal fortitude to go ahead and build those two structures in Edmonton and Calgary. They were not built just for the people of Edmonton or Calgary; they were built for the people of this province. People from Medicine Hat go to Calgary to the auditorium. People from Grande Prairie come to Edmonton to sit in the auditorium, the same way that people in this province go to the Alberta Game Farm, not the Edmonton Game Farm. When we start talking about the heritage trust fund, to me a facility that's unique, one of only a handful in the world, is located right here in Edmonton. This government has not really taken any leadership in finding some way, be it free enterprise or be it the government buying that Game Farm and having a foundation or someone operate it — they certainly have not provided any leadership. That's what politics is all about: providing leadership.

So, Mr. Chairman, we could have taken the \$8 million premium that we paid for PWA and bought the Game Farm. But the government of the day didn't ask the people of Alberta. The people of Alberta didn't have an opportunity to ask if they wanted PWA or not. It was foisted upon them. But the government had to make a decision, and they made the decision. At least I will give them their due; they provided some leadership. They said, we bought PWA because we wanted to make sure it was serving the north. It was going to get us into the markets of the world. I remember back in 19... Whenever it was, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister Bennett was riding across the country. So, Mr. Chairman...

MR. NOTLEY: Blast our way into the markets of the world.

DR. BUCK: Blast our way into the markets of the world. That was the quotation.

MR. NOTLEY: Or die in the attempt.

DR. BUCK: Or die in the attempt. I guess they died in the attempt.

Anyway, I could understand the government using the rationale that we have to buy PWA because we're going to do this, this, and the next thing. But where was there any kind of leadership in trying to keep the Game Farm here in Alberta, even if it was a matter of pursuing the private sector and saying, look, we will help you, we will do some studies for you to find out the worth of the land, the market price of the animals. At least provide that kind of leadership. That's all we're asking for, some leadership from the minister and the government.

Getting back to the covering of the two stadia in Edmonton and Calgary. If those two stadia were covered, the people from Elk Point, from Grande Prairie, from Pincher Creek could come into Edmonton and Calgary in the middle of winter, have their trade fairs, have whatever you have, make those facilities functional. On January 15 when it's 25 below Fahrenheit out in the middle of McMahon Stadium in Calgary, it's a little tough to sell a tractor or a combine to a man from Manyberries. So we have a large investment in the two stadiums. We've already put \$11 million into the Commonwealth Stadium here. We should have provided some leadership and said to those two groups, we're going to help you cover those two stadia.

So, Mr. Chairman, it gets back to leadership. The government didn't provide any leadership when it came to the Alberta Game Farm. I expected more leadership than the government and the minister have shown.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Member for Clover Bar first started his remarks, I was almost under the impression that perhaps the Alberta Game Farm was in his constituency. But when he started talking about it later, he said we could have bought it because it's right here in Edmonton. I had to wonder if he knew where it was at all.

I have some difficulty in following any coherence in his remarks when he starts talking about PWA not being a good investment, about the money being put into the oil sands not being a good investment. But

he doesn't bring up the subject of the Alberta Resources Railway. What type of investment was that? It hasn't proved to be the sort of investment PWA is. So when he starts talking about leadership, we see that the leadership given when we bought Pacific Western Airlines is certainly a different kind of leadership than we had when the government of the day decided to build ARR.

He also starts talking about covering the stadiums. We must also remember such facts as local autonomy. Mr. Chairman, we remember that here in Edmonton when they talked about Omniplex, they had a plebiscite to see if they wanted a covered stadium. The people of Edmonton on that plebiscite day decided they did not. This government has indicated time and time again that as much as possible we want to see local governments, local representatives, make these sort of decisions. If the city of Edmonton has decided they don't want a covered stadium, certainly it isn't the position of the government that they should step out and say, you've got to put a roof over the stadium. This is what they've done in the past.

MR. COOKSON: Put a roof over Clover Bar.

MR. APPLEBY: Yes, we could put a roof over Clover Bar, as the hon. Member for Lacombe has indicated. But that would be an umbrella situation that would take in everything.

What I'm trying to say, Mr. Chairman, is that the types of arguments he has been putting forth just don't agree with each other. Pacific Western Airlines has proved to be a useful, profitable type of operation. The money that has been put into the oil sands projects is something that has been necessary. The federal government and the government of Ontario have found it necessary to see that those projects go ahead, because we have to look at the future energy needs of this country. When you try to relate those kinds of operations to the Alberta Game Farm you will find that maybe in his part of this province it's a very big issue. But time and time again I have been told by people in my constituency, we would like to see the Game Farm here in Alberta, we expect it will be here. There isn't much doubt in this province it will be here, but the government should stay out of it. Sure, if you want to supply some financing, do that. But don't take on the day to day operations of that game farm.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record in this House as saying that I do not agree with the statements that have been made by the hon. Member for Clover Bar, because I do not think the government should take on the day to day operation of the Game Farm.

DR. BUCK: I didn't say that, Frank.

MR. APPLEBY: Well, I'm not too sure what you've said because you said so many things. Anyway, Mr. Chairman — I'm sorry, I didn't make my remarks through the Chair just now — I want it to be clear that I don't think the government should take on the operation of the Game Farm.

Now, he speaks of leadership. I don't think it's the responsibility of the government either to take part in saying we should form a foundation, or we should do this or that to maintain that game farm. I think the

Member for Clover Bar is in an excellent position to show some leadership in this. He can start some sort of foundation himself. He can gather up the people he knows are interested. He could come to the government with a viable proposition. But to say the government should do this itself, I don't think is justified, reasonable or right. And I don't agree with him.

DR. BUCK: I'm not going to argue or debate with the hon. member. I just want to say that I'd like the record to indicate I said I do not want the government to operate the Game Farm. I want that point made very, very clear. The facility can be financed by the provincial government, but the operation could go on by the foundation. So, I would just like the hon. Member for Athabasca to have his thinking cap on. That's all I would like to say at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Agreed to:

Vote 3 Total Program

\$14,087,880

Vote 4

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask a question. Can the minister indicate to the committee what was discussed with the wildlife officers and what conclusions the minister arrived at. Because there have been so many public grievances, and most of the negotiations seemed to be going on between the wildlife officers and the media and only indirectly with the minister until he had an opportunity to sit down. I wonder if the minister could indicate to us exactly what the grievances were and what the minister's stand was, et cetera?

MR. ADAIR: I will just repeat what I said the other day. I had an excellent meeting with some 17 of them. I am not now prepared to discuss publicly what we discussed, but certainly there were some areas of concern for some of the officers, relating back as far as 20 years. And that's going back a fair time. Because it was an open and frank meeting we did indicate to them that we would have additional meetings. As quickly as we finish the session I'll get back at the fellows and have them come back again so that we can continue.

One of the areas of concern was communication between the field and head office. Certainly that's one area we can look at improving, if in fact that needs improving. Certainly we had a good meeting. There were 17 members there. We discussed a number of items that, as I said, related as far back as 20 years. After the discussions I agreed to meet with them again and will be meeting with them on an ongoing basis.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Where do things stand now on the question of manpower? I understand that that's one of the problems, is it not, in terms of the concerns of the wildlife officers, and that since we got into the restraint program the previous understanding of expanding the staff has been affected or qualified?

MR. ADAIR: Well, I'm not sure that is quite right, Mr. Chairman. We did have a program whereby six officers per year for four years, or 24 officers, were added to the staff. That finished up in 1975 and we have not added staff in the field area since then because of the restraint program. I guess it's the kind of situation you get into, you're sort of damned if you do and damned if you don't. You add field staff wherever you can and then you get hammered for adding field staff, so it works both ways.

But certainly we are looking at attempting to put in place whatever I may need as the minister responsible — the necessary documentation — to indicate to my colleagues that, number one, the outdoor recreation opportunity now is much greater than it was five years ago. For example, we have more people doing ice fishing in the province of Alberta than we have probably had at any time in the history of Alberta. We have more people doing any number of things in the outdoor recreation area: cross-country skiing, snowmobiling, moving across whatever it is in the great outdoors. I think that's great.

But it does put an additional load on the field staff. There's no question about it. They're handling it very well right now, and I commend them for that. Certainly I have to make my case, as does any other minister in the government, to get additional staff when that time comes. And I'll be making that case again next year.

MR. NOTLEY: Just to follow that up, Mr. Minister. One of the feelings of grievance stems back, does it not, to this question of whether there are sufficient officers, and whether you're in a position to make the pitch and carry it as to expanding the staff in the future?

MR. ADAIR: I don't really think that was a specific dealt with. It certainly covered one of the areas we were discussing in relation to the role of the officer. Certainly we're looking at what that particular role is, with the expanded year-round use by citizens of Alberta of the facilities out there in the great outdoors.

So really from the standpoint of additional staff in the fish and wildlife division this year, we got eight. They will be primarily going on stream, staged throughout the summer in the hatchery at Brooks as it's developed.

MR. NOTLEY: Will there be any increase in wildlife officers as such?

MR. ADAIR: No, I said that a little while ago. There were just the six per year for four years that finished in '75. We have not had any additional increase in field staff for '76 or '77.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just one question and one comment. My question to the minister is: in the course of your discussions with the wildlife officers — earlier during the discussion in question period you indicated you hadn't had any of these meetings before. Now if my memory is accurate, you met with at least one person, and more than one last year, when they lodged a number of the complaints presently being brought to you. Also, if my memory is accurate, virtually nothing was done in the year that elapsed until this thing surfaced again.

I'd also make the point that it's my understanding some of the complaints deal specifically with the way some of your senior officials in the department have handled transfers of people, how they've dealt with fish and wildlife officers out in the field. Frankly it amazes me that you would have had some of those senior people sit in on the discussions, knowing full well that those were the people who had caused some of the concerns. Now I sincerely hope that the fish and wildlife officers have spoken out frankly; and far more important than that, I hope no action will be taken against any of the 17 members who sat in with the minister in the last meeting and who will sit in on future meetings.

I say to the minister that I'm going to do all I can to keep a very careful eye and see what happens promotionwise to those 17 people. Because the people who have very definite control over the kinds of promotions those people get or don't get, or where they get moved to or don't get moved to, are some of the people their complaints are very much against. I'm sure the minister well recognizes that. But I say, Mr. Minister, it's what I regard as a very dangerous situation.

MR. ADAIR: I'll just respond that last year — and I said this in the House — I did meet with the president of the officers' association, and we discussed a number of things. Primarily we were dealing in the area of handguns and firearms. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be the one who met with him, so I think I have a pretty good idea of what we talked about.

Then at the meetings we had — now I'm jumping from there to the meeting I had with the 17 officers which was basically without an agenda. The agenda was set by the officers, working that particular part out with them, and we discussed very openly and very frankly and had a good meeting. There was no question about it. I thought they got a lot of things off their chests, and that will continue. As far as I'm concerned if it ever happened in the past, heaven forbid, I would like to have known about it.

But I don't think it will happen in the future that there's any recrimination or kickback, if you want, to anybody who may have the courtesy of speaking out the way those fellows did. I think they did an excellent job. We're going to continue to have meetings in that area. But as I said, I'm not prepared to discuss what we talked about. I think that's between the officers and myself and I would hope they would keep it that way.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, can I just raise one other matter very, very quickly. What progress has the minister made with regard to the Alberta Fish & Game Association and the habitat recommendations the Fish & Game Association have made to the minister and the government for some time now?

MR. ADAIR: I'm not trying to be facetious when I say, some progress. We're working with the the Department of Agriculture and attempting to put together a plan. It will relate basically to the budget process. That's what it is right now. I would hope by sometime this summer we would have something in place. I'm not sure when this summer, so I wouldn't like to put a time line on that. But we're working together with the Department of Agriculture on the proposal

that came to us basically through the Fish & Game Association.

MR. CLARK: You've no money in the estimates?

MR. ADAIR: Pardon me?

MR. CLARK: No money in the estimates?

MR. ADAIR: No.

DR. BUCK: I just have a very short question to the minister and this is to do . . . honestly, Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

MR. NOTLEY: You'll have to wait, Don. You won't get it through in four minutes.

DR. BUCK: A short question to the minister to do with the wildlife damage fund. Right now I would estimate we've probably got almost half a million dollars in the wildlife damage fund. The criticism brought to my attention is that it takes so long to get anything out of the thing, and also that the payments in many instances are not nearly large enough to cover the damage done, especially when we get into some of the high-priced dairy cattle and some of the exotics. So I'd just like to know if the minister can speed up this process and . . .

MR. NOTLEY: Provide more money.

DR. BUCK: . . . and just see if the fund is being adequately administered.

MR. ADAIR: I think we're moving in an area right now to attempt to speed up the process. What has happened is that they waited till all applications came in, then dealt with them at one or two meetings. We're attempting to speed that up, where certain applications at a certain level can be dealt with as they're received. The fund right now is provided with \$400,000 from the province, approximately \$400,000 from the hunter, and contribution of that level from the federal government. The Minister of Agriculture is now in the process of negotiating a new agreement with the federal government. Hopefully if that is agreed to, it will see an increase in the amount that would be paid per acre.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, just to close debate with my parting message to the minister. I'd like to [interjection] yes that's it . . . raise the two points again; the application flow with regard to the facility grants and the type of information required. I urge the minister to review those two things because I feel there's concern not only from me but from a lot of people.

If you look at it on just a straight basis of the relationship between a provincial government or a department of government and the general public, the government is giving out millions of dollars for a very good purpose in recreational facilities, an excellent purpose. It's helped a lot of local communities. But the flack that you're taking — if you want to look at it in political terms on the other side — because of these two factors that I mention, are erasing anything good that the facility grant is doing. I think that if the

minister doesn't look at it on behalf of the whole of government, you've got to live with the situation. I must say that in 14 years as an MLA I've never been more upset about the type of process and the reaction to the applications than I have with this one.

Agreed to:

Vote 4 Total Program	\$9,229,800
Capital Estimates	
Vote 1	\$36,800
Vote 2	\$20,969,480
Vote 3	\$2,863,100
Vote 4	\$24,506,630
Department Total	\$52,317,610

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, I move the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolutions, reports the same, and requests leave to sit again:

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1978, amounts not exceeding the following sums be granted to Her Majesty for the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife: \$1,747,370 for departmental support services, \$27,252,560 for recreation devel-

opment, \$14,087,880 for provincial parks, \$9,229,800 for fish and wildlife conservation.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow evening and Friday will be spent on estimates. Tomorrow evening we'll begin Vote 1 of Energy and Natural Resources, and hopefully proceed past that. The order of departments following that will be Hospitals and Medical Care, Municipal Affairs, Housing, and Attorney General.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Assembly adjourns, could I ask all hon. members if they might now, while they have it in their minds, put their *Standing Orders* books on their desks. The Law Clerk and his staff are coming to put in the change in the permanent standing orders with regard to reports from committees and minority statements. They will also be inserting the temporary standing orders which we adopted some time ago for the remainder of this session with regard to visitors, procedure on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons, and the privilege of non-government members to have two motions on the Order Paper at the same time. They will leave the old sheets in the *Standing Orders* with a line drawn through them, so in case you want to keep them they'll be there. If not, you can discard the ones which have lines drawn through them.

The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at half past 2.

[The House adjourned at 5:32 p.m.]