

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Wednesday, April 29, 1981 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, today I'm delighted to introduce to you 14 students from the Bible Baptist Academy in the constituency of Edmonton Avonmore. They are accompanied by their teacher Dennis Killoran. I would like them to rise and receive the acknowledgment of the Assembly, and welcome them to this House.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I would also like to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly 13 students who have travelled all the way in from the school at Bawlf in the Camrose constituency. With them is their teacher Mr. Erga, his wife Mrs. Erga, and bus driver Harvey Pederson and his good wife.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that Bawlf is approximately 15 miles east of Camrose, has a fast-growing population of about 350 people, and is just a wonderful place to live in for anyone considering retirement. I'd ask them to rise and be introduced to the members of the Assembly.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, it is my opportunity today to introduce 12 young people from Wainwright-Lakeland College who are here to view the operation of the Assembly today. They are accompanied by Diane McKinnon, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I think we saved the biggest till last. I'd like to introduce to the Assembly 60 grade 9 students from the Northmount school in the Edmonton Glengarry constituency, accompanied by their group leader Miss Tabbert, teachers Mr. Belseck and Mr. Allsopp, and bus driver Mr. Assaf. I'd ask them to rise now and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of Education**

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce a special government project in school program funding to assist Alberta's teachers and school systems in the implementation of the 1981 Alberta social studies curriculum. The special project results from extensive public and professional interest in the social studies curriculum.

Under the new initiative, Alberta school jurisdictions will be provided extensive assistance in the form of resource personnel and in-service materials, to ensure that all social studies teachers are provided the opportunity to become familiar with the prescribed content, objectives, and resources of the new social studies curriculum, and

familiar with a variety of strategies for teaching social studies.

A total of 125 experienced and qualified social studies teachers will be seconded from their present duties for the period September 1981 to January 1982, to conduct workshops and provide follow-up assistance and consultation to teachers in topics relating to the social studies curriculum. The form this assistance will take will be determined at the local level by boards and by teachers. The 125 resource teachers will continue to be employed by their boards, but their salaries will be funded by Alberta Education at a total cost in excess of \$2 million. In addition Alberta Education will assume responsibility for training the resource teachers prior to September 1981.

An extensive variety of in-service materials, focussing on social studies teaching strategies, is in the final stages of preparation and will be available for use in both the workshops and school-based follow-up in September. These materials have been prepared under a collaborative project involving Alberta Education, ACCESS TV, and the Department of Elementary Education at the University of Alberta, over the past year.

The social studies implementation project emphasized co-operation between Alberta Education, school systems, and the teaching profession. Boards that choose to participate in the project will be expected to provide release time and travel expenses for their social studies teachers to attend a minimum of two days' workshops early in the fall. At this time teachers will be provided a general orientation to the 1981 curriculum. Alberta's teachers will be expected to participate fully in the workshops as well as follow-up activities with their colleagues and resource teachers in the schools.

The selection of social studies resource teachers will be undertaken in the coming weeks. A provincial steering committee to provide criteria for this and other aspects of the project will be created immediately. It will comprise representation from Alberta Education, the Alberta School Trustees' Association, the Conference of Alberta School Superintendents, Alberta's universities, the Alberta Teachers' Association, and the Social Studies Curriculum Co-ordinating Committee. Orientation seminars will be held in each zone of the province for several days in June and in late August for the resource teachers.

The social studies implementation program addresses a major need in school programming based on the current interest in social studies and Canadian studies. As well, it represents the interest of the government's decision last year to move the mandatory social studies implementation ahead from 1982 to 1981. It reflects the government's commitment to the interests of Albertans for enhanced geography, history, and government in the social studies curriculum of the province.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Land Tenure Program**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister responsible for Native Affairs is with regard to the land tenure and supplying the two acres to the residents of the Little Buffalo Lake reserve. I understand that a number of signatures and contracts have been completed with regard to the two acres. Could the minister inform this Assembly what kind of explanation was given to the people, and whether an interpreter fully fluent in

the Cree language was present at all times when the signatures were being sought?

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, as that comes under my colleague the Minister for Municipal Affairs, I'll ask him to answer that.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, wherever possible and in the case of the Little Buffalo community, the staff in the land tenure secretariat in the Department of Municipal Affairs do obtain interpretive services. As a matter of fact some are employed by us, in particular one individual under contract who speaks the Cree language well and has made every effort, in that case and others, to ensure people understand what they are signing. It is my belief that all those who signed an application for land under the land tenure program in the Little Buffalo community were well aware of what they signed. In my view the speculation contained in certain newspaper reports is inaccurate with respect to the suggestion that people did not understand what they were signing.

Mr. Speaker, I should add that the land tenure program, whether in Little Buffalo or any other community, is a voluntary program. It is not mandatory that any individual, no matter how long they've lived there, sign up for the land tenure program. If they choose not to take advantage of that program, that's their right.

In view of the controversy surrounding the Little Buffalo project, I've instructed my staff not to pressure anyone into altering their position, even though they may have altered it once already, and to continue with the program on the basis that it's voluntary, it's available to those who want it, and the government is not interested in creating any further controversy in the area. Indeed, it's unfortunate that there has been as much controversy as there has.

I believe we're working on the fifth community with this program, and we hadn't previously run into this type of controversy. It's my view that it's unwarranted and is largely brought about by people who are not well informed about the intent of the government in this regard or the details of the land tenure program.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs with regard to the band's land claims. Could the minister indicate that when the application was signed and discussed with the various applicants, it was indicated to them that signing this particular contract would not interfere with the band's land claims?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that individuals who work for me or interpreters specifically said, if you make application for the land tenure program, it won't interfere with any land claims. At the time that some 60-odd heads of households made application for the land tenure program at Little Buffalo, the matter of some pending land claims being pursued by certain groups in that area was not an issue. It wasn't considered necessary to suggest to them that this would not interfere with any future hypothetical or potential land claims. I haven't inquired, but I would guess there wasn't any specific direction in that regard.

But I should say that through both my office and the MLAs for Peace River and Lesser Slave Lake, we have repeatedly said that we did not establish the land tenure program for any purposes of ensuring that natives wouldn't have an opportunity to pursue their land claims

to the fullest extent. We established it so people who have been legally living as squatters on public land in Alberta in this day and age would have an opportunity to obtain title to that land, title they need for a variety of reasons. I've said quite clearly that in my view the land tenure program has no relationship or bearing on any land claims, and I hope people in Little Buffalo and others who are advising them would take seriously that indication of support for the program on our part.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister responsible for Native Affairs. Has a representative of the Native Secretariat been present in the Little Buffalo area while these approaches and discussions with officials of the Department of Municipal Affairs have been going on? I ask the question because hopefully the people of Little Buffalo would see the people from the Native Secretariat somewhat as defenders of their situation within the province. That's the reason I pose the question: if officials from the Native Secretariat have in fact been present.

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody from the Native Secretariat was at the actual signing, but certainly at all times people from Little Buffalo have access to the Native Secretariat. If they want advice, recommendations, or help in any way, shape, or form, they certainly have full access to the Native Secretariat. But when an individual from any department goes out, we don't automatically send somebody from Native Affairs along with them.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might pose just one further question to the minister. Were people from the Native Secretariat involved in any rather general discussion with the people in the community of Little Buffalo prior to the approaches being made by Municipal Affairs? Were people from the Native Secretariat present to hold some sort of public discussion with the people in the area prior to that?

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the land tenure program was in effect long before land claims came up in the last — I believe it was about a year, a year and a half ago. The land tenure program has been in effect for several years. It was in effect when I came in as Minister responsible for Native Affairs. It's just been developed for Wabasca-Desmarais, and I think at the present time it's on its fourth or fifth area.

This is not a new program; it's nothing exciting. It's been working well in certain areas of the province and is into the Little Buffalo area now. If the land advice had not been given to the people of Little Buffalo, it would automatically have carried on as it has in the other three or four areas. I'm not in a position to say whether there is a land claim differential. That's up to the courts whenever this case comes up down the line. But certainly this is the third or fourth land tenure area that's come up, and it's a normal process.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add that before finalizing a land tenure program or a number of programs for an ensuing fiscal year, the staff in my department consult with a number of government departments, most notably the Native Secretariat, the lands division of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources and the minister there, and the Minister of Telephones and Utilities and the Minister of Transportation and their depart-

merits, all because they have some role to play in providing services, expertise, or some other matter. So it's not a single decision taken by the land tenure secretariat. It's something that's well thought out in terms of discussions by various government departments.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I should add as well that this morning I received from the chief of the band in that area a telegram asking that the program be delayed or cancelled, and containing the signatures of 24 people who supposedly previously signed up for the program and wished to withdraw. That's out of some 70 people involved. I've checked the signatures of those 24, and three are not recorded as having ever signed up for the program. Two others are duplicates, husband and wife; in other words, two names from one household. Two others are daughters of another individual who is the head of a household. So of the 24, 17 in total actually did sign up. That leaves about 50 people who still have an active application for the land tenure program. As I said earlier, I don't believe we should cancel, alter, or change the program when we've made a commitment to that many people who seriously desire to take part in the land tenure program.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, if I could pose just one further supplementary question to the Minister responsible for Native Affairs. The minister used the term, the land tenure program is not "exciting". I want to ask the minister this question: prior to the people from Municipal Affairs going to the community, were officials of the Native Secretariat in the community to discuss with the people what's involved in land tenure?

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what date the actual signing-up was done, but the land tenure program has been in effect for a number of years, and it's well known throughout the northern areas and Little Buffalo. This has been in effect in Wabasca-Desmarais. It's been incorporated into the improvement district set up there and counselling, and it's following along. It's a very good program to give native people title to their own land so they can build their home on their own land and own their own property for the first time in history. So it's an excellent program. Now as to this controversy that's come up about the land claims in this area, I'm not in a position to say whether or not they're receiving good advice.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, if I may, to the hon. minister. In view of the mandate approved by cabinet for the minister's Native Secretariat, that it would "be mobile to meet issues affecting native people and assist in resolving these issues", and in view of the controversy, why is the minister not able to report that the Native Secretariat in fact has held meetings? As the Minister responsible for Native Affairs in this province, has the minister taken any initiative to resolve the concerns that have been expressed as late as this morning by the chief?

DR. McCRIMMON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is a little out of line, mainly because this has just come up in the last very short period of time. Yes, the Native Secretariat has been in there and given advice and help to the people in the Little Buffalo area. But to say as he has stated, I think is quite ridiculous.

There has been help, and the availability for help is with the Native Secretariat. Everybody knows that. The

people in the Little Buffalo area know it. They've had their land tenure program explained to them, then something else comes up, someone from out of the province says, this is going to interfere with your land claims. I'm questioning whether it will interfere in any way, shape, or form with their land claims. But that's for the courts to decide down the road. I see no way that getting legal title to two acres of land through the provincial government is going to interfere in any way with a native person's land claim now or in the future.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The question really is: in view of the mandate which the cabinet gave the minister's department, and the Native Secretariat in particular, what specific action has the secretariat taken? For example, has the Native Secretariat held a formal meeting with the chief and council? Has the Native Secretariat considered a meeting between the Municipal Affairs people and the legal counsel representing the band, engaged by the band and not by anybody outside? What specific steps has the Native Secretariat taken in view of the mandate the cabinet gave the secretariat — not the opposition, but the cabinet?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview knows full well that the mandate provided the Native Secretariat and the minister does not preclude a number of government departments and agencies from working with native people. Surely the member is not suggesting that we have a situation in this province where every department that works with native people must first of all ensure that the Native Secretariat has a meeting with them.

As I said earlier, we in the land tenure program in the Department of Municipal Affairs work very closely with a number of other government agencies and departments. Included in those, including MLAs, is the Native Secretariat. For the hon. member to suggest that there's some kind of commitment in terms of the Native Secretariat's responsibilities that preclude the land tenure program from functioning, is absolutely ridiculous.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. I take it one can pose further supplementary questions in view of the argumentative nature of the minister's response. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Might I sense a certain equality in the argumentativeness of the questions with that of the answer.

MR. NOTLEY: Fine, Mr. Speaker, just as long as there's equality on both sides on this issue.

My question specifically to the hon. minister is whether or not it is the intention of the minister or representatives from either the Native Secretariat or the Department of Municipal Affairs to sit down with the legal counsel chosen by the band, in view of the very serious concern expressed by the legal counsel — people who took the James Bay case and are very knowledgeable in the area — that there is a potential problem? Is the minister prepared today to clear the air by taking that kind of initiative?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, insofar as I've been advised, the legal counsel for the native people were in this province a few weeks ago. Through my department staff I

advised them that they were welcome to sit down and discuss any matter they wished with the private solicitors who are acting on behalf of the government of Alberta in the case of land claims. My advice is that indeed they did have discussions with that law firm here in the city of Edmonton. It's not my intention, now or in the immediate future, to open any personal discussions with these particular solicitors.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs with regard to the chiefs request to delay the decisions with regard to the contracts. I'd like to ask the minister whether he will honor that request of the chief to delay at this point, seeing that the program is rather voluntary, where people can get the two acres if they wish, or they don't have to take the two acres. Will the minister meet that request so some of the concerns raised here today, or the concerns of the chief, can be considered?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the request is to delay the program for approximately a year, which they believe would be the time required for the land claims issue to be settled. All of us know that time frame is not likely nearly long enough for the issue to be finalized. In my belief, even a year's delay would be unfair to those people who have been involved for some months now in terms of expectations that they might receive title to some land in the area.

My position is simply this: I've asked my staff to ensure that no pressure is brought to bear on anybody who wants to withdraw from the program, but to allow the program to continue for those native people in the area who are desirous of having title to their land. So there's really nothing for me to withdraw. If those people don't want to participate in it, we certainly won't pressure them to. They'll be free to continue to live on the land. Nobody is going to go up there and suggest to them that they don't have a right to continue living there over the immediate term.

So my advice to them is that those who don't want to participate, because they believe their rights may be jeopardized, shouldn't participate. But we know there are others who do want to. I don't want what happens in this case to be a minority — but even if it were a majority — to undermine the rights of those individuals who are actively seeking some title to their land.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by a final supplementary by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the minister. We've heard the assurance from the minister — and I appreciate the assurance — that in the intent of the government, in no way is the land tenure program designed to undermine possible aboriginal land claims. Nevertheless, in view of the concern in some legal quarters, has there been any effort by the Department of Municipal Affairs to obtain outside legal advice to determine whether there is any possibility at all that this program could have any prejudicial effect on possible aboriginal land claims by the people in the area?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, as I said on the same subject in an earlier question period a couple of weeks ago, from time to time the government of Alberta does obtain legal opinions on various matters, indeed on this

matter as well. But it's not our practice to share publicly those legal opinions. The hon. member is perfectly entitled now, as he was a couple of weeks ago, to seek his own legal opinions on this matter.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the minister with regard to the request of the chief. Could the minister indicate whether the chiefs request was on behalf of a limited number of the residents of Little Buffalo or on behalf of the total Cree reserve as such? If it was, Mr. Minister, I'd appreciate you re-evaluating your position with regard to allowing contracts to continue.

MR. MOORE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should clarify that there is in fact no reserve in the area but a group of people who refer to themselves as a band. As I understand it, the request was on behalf of 24 people who had signed applications to withdraw, if you like, from the program. As I explained earlier, only 17 of those 24 in fact represented people who had originally signed up for the program. So the request was really on behalf of 17 of the original applicants for the land tenure program.

#### **Ratification of Premiers' Agreement**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my second question to the Government House Leader is with regard to the agreement of the eight premiers and the timing of ratification of that agreement in this Assembly. I wonder if the minister could indicate when a resolution will come before the House, and possibly what form that resolution will take.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that question should be referred to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I've not gone into that matter with him myself. I could maybe offer the hon. leader two choices: one is to ask the Acting Premier; the other might be to ask the Acting Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, who is on my left.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I've always wanted to ask questions of an Acting Premier. I'd certainly like to direct my question to the Acting Premier, who may act on the answer at this time.

DR. BUCK: Whoever that is.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, [inaudible] the Acting Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, I think we should await the return of the minister, who would be able to elaborate on that question.

#### **Fertilizer Prices**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It concerns steps taken by the government of Alberta to protect consumers from energy increases or changes. What steps has the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs taken to ensure that the lower feedstock prices for fertilizer companies noted on page 15 of the Public Utilities Board report are in fact passed on to farmers in the form of lower fertilizer prices? What steps has the department taken?

MR. KOZIAK: A very interesting question, Mr. Speaker, and one that indicates the philosophy of the hon. member perhaps might differ from the philosophy that I hold and that is held by this government.

In terms of the market place, what we are concerned with is to ensure that the consumer is not disadvantaged by unfair trade practices, and that the credibility of the market place is maintained. It's not the responsibility of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs or of this government to determine prices, except in those areas where we've chosen to make it so: in monopoly situations, with Public Utilities Board making decisions there. It's up to the consumer in the market place to determine those prices on the normal supply and demand curves.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. One wonders if the government has any philosophy at all on this.

In view of the 24 to 34 per cent increase in fertilizer prices, the fact that last year farmers in this province spent \$200 million on fertilizer, and in view of the statement in the government's own report about lower feedstock prices, is the minister saying to this Assembly that there has been no investigation by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to determine whether lower feedstock prices and at least modified fertilizer prices can be passed on? Is there no protection at all for the farmers?

MR. KOZIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the huffing and puffing of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I think that when it comes to philosophies, the vast majority of the people of the province of Alberta are in tune with the philosophy held by this party, rather than with that held by the hon. member and the party he represents. I'm sure that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the hon. minister that perhaps we might proceed from philosophy to information.

DR. BUCK: He doesn't have any.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the very first phrase in the hon. member's question was with respect to philosophy. I thought we should deal with that first in answering the question, before we got to the other one. [interjections] As a matter of fact, that aspect of the question was so interesting that I forgot the second aspect. [laughter]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me put the supplementary question very simply to the minister. What have you done to protect farmers in this province as far as fertilizer prices are concerned? When the government's own Public Utilities Board indicates that feedstock prices are lower, why has there been no protection for farmers who last year had to spend \$200 million on fertilizer?

MR. KOZIAK: Again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member suggests that the role of government should really include price setting on every commodity offered for sale in the market place. That is completely unacceptable to the people of Alberta, and completely unacceptable to the people of Canada. I don't even think it's acceptable to the people in the Soviet Union, but it's imposed upon them there.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. That's certainly a nice little discussion on philosophy, but the point is: what steps has this government taken? Has there even been a study? Has the minister done anything about it all?

MR. KOZIAK: I've answered the question, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member suggests we should move in the direction of setting prices on every commodity. I'm answering that that's not the philosophy of this government.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I didn't suggest anything. What I asked is a very simple question. What has this government done? Has it done any . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. As the hon. member knows, the normal number of times a question should be asked is once. This one has been asked three times. I think we should stop short of four.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question then, please. I ask the minister how he would reconcile the role the Alberta government played in the recent court case in regard to collusive price setting by the fertilizer companies in western Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, the reconciling of a role is very much a matter of opinion and debate. Perhaps he might achieve that purpose through the Order Paper.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. When can the minister advise that the government will get away from a cheap food policy and give the farmers a fair return for the product and not have them existing on subsidies?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, I have a little difficulty connecting that with the question as a supplementary.

#### **Motor Vehicle Condition and Equipment**

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Transportation. Does the minister have information coming to his office that would indicate the degree to which motor vehicle accidents on Alberta highways are the result of the poor condition of motor vehicles in the province?

MR. KROEGER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, about 1.5 per cent.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'd like to thank the minister for that very precise answer. Given that 1.5 per cent, resulting in quite a number of accidents, are a result of poor motor vehicle condition, could the minister indicate if his department has any plans to deal with those particular difficulties through mechanisms such as motor vehicle inspections in the province?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, we do man the weigh scales through the safety branch. Heavy vehicles particularly, the trucks, are checked at random, no warning. Beyond that, of course the ordinary inspections do go on, the interception by the patrols that are constantly on the roads. Cars can be taken off, as trucks are taken off. Yes,

there is an ongoing process. If the question relates to inspection as we knew it some 15 to 20 years ago, no, we're not really looking at that factor.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, just one further supplementary question. Does the minister have any indication of how many motor vehicle accidents in Alberta are caused as a result of poor motor vehicle condition, compared to jurisdictions which might have compulsory motor vehicle inspection over a period of time?

MR. KROEGER: No, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't have that kind of statistical information. The answer I gave on the 15 per cent wasn't facetious. Actually of about 84,000 accidents we identified last year, about 15 per cent could be attributed to fault with the vehicle.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Solicitor General. It has to do with vehicle equipment enforcement. Can the hon. Solicitor General indicate if there has been a directive from his department to enforce the carrying of flares for small farm and commercial vehicles, especially half-tons? Has there been a change in policy or a directive from the minister to enforce this section?

MR. HARLE: No there hasn't, Mr. Speaker, although certainly the RCMP is presently carrying on an enforcement program throughout the province, trying to get at unsafe vehicles and ensure that vehicles are carrying proper equipment.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a short supplementary. Can the minister indicate if he would give consideration to some type of publicity campaign to remind motorists, with small trucks especially, that they must carry flares?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I guess it's a difficult decision that has to be made. Literally hundreds of requirements are contained in pieces of legislation relating to vehicles. Publicity programs have tried to concentrate on the area of the drinking driver and driver attitudes and making sure people are properly licenced and vehicles are properly registered. I guess it's a matter of trying to arrive at what should be a proper allocation of funds to various programs. So far, a program directed specifically in the area suggested by the hon. member has not been done.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the minister. In light of the fact that in many instances cars left on the shoulders of roads are no different from, say, half-ton trucks left on the shoulders of roads when they've had mechanical failure, can the minister undertake to have a study done by his department or the department of the Minister of Transportation, to find out if there's any difference between abandoned cars or abandoned half-tons? The two cause the same problems.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I can give that undertaking. The hon. Minister of Transportation may want to supplement the response, but I know of no surveys that have been done that would result in an answer to the question posed by the hon. member.

#### **Hospital Facilities**

MR. R. CLARK: I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, dealing with

hospital facilities and planning in the city of Calgary. What's the present status of the planning for the two new hospitals in Calgary, I believe, one in the southern part of the city and one in the northern part of the city? What is the anticipated date of commencement of construction?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that the four major hospitals, two in Edmonton and two in Calgary, were announced approximately one year ago. It has been our intention to get those into the construction stage as quickly as possible. In order to do that, we've organized the boards into a planning consortium and hope to build four very similar hospitals, with programming and architectural design not varying too much among the four, unless there are specific local institutional requirements.

The plan is coming along quite well. The organization I mentioned, which really was new in the field of hospital construction, has been carried out. The project manager has been hired by the department, and the programming for the first hospital — that is, the Mill Woods hospital — is pretty well complete and is now in the department for assessment. Once that's assessed, it will be a very simple matter to adapt that programming to the other three hospitals. From there on, they'll go to work with their local architectural consortia and produce their drawings.

We're still aiming for a completion time for those hospitals of five years from the time of the announcement. I would hope that construction could start sometime in 1982.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister, on the same broad, general issue. What is the status of the request of the Calgary General hospital, not for millions of dollars worth of renovations but looking at the question of a new facility?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, in discussions with the Calgary General, we tried to point out that provincially we felt that a priority in Calgary, because of its rapid growth, had to be the provision of more beds and not the replacement of existing beds. The Calgary General, as one of the two boards involved in Calgary, has been asked to take on the responsibility for developing the new northeast hospital, which will be under their jurisdiction and administration.

In response to their concerns about the state of the existing main wing of the building, we've done two things. We asked them to prepare a list of necessary, urgent emergency repairs. We responded a hundred per cent to that list. It's worth \$3.2 million, and we've asked them to undertake that work immediately. The second thing we asked them to do, as well as other major hospitals throughout the province that are undergoing ongoing reconstruction programs, was to develop a master plan so we have some good, long-range idea of what those hospitals hope to build with this ongoing construction that seems to take place.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. This deals with the Foothills hospital, more specifically the question of planning and the 11th floor at the Foothills hospital. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly when the work on the intensive child care nursery was completed, and the cost? That's the 11th floor of the Foothills.

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information at my fingertips, but I'll be glad to get it and report back to the hon. member.

#### **Tent Caterpillars**

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Environment. In view of the fact that another year of tent caterpillars will soon be upon rural Alberta, has the minister any plans to assist rural municipalities in the supply of chemicals?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, this is an ongoing problem that I'd like to refer to my colleague the Minister of Agriculture. But he's not here and I'm the acting minister, so I guess I'm stuck with responding.

These creeping little beggars are moving down into my country. I had hoped I could issue a stop order, but I don't know who to issue it to, so I can't do that. We have some funding provided through our budgetary process for biting flies. But to answer the Member for Stony Plain — and I agree that there is a pretty serious problem in the province — as yet we have not come up with any funding insofar as the tent caterpillar is concerned.

MR. PURDY: Supplementary question to the minister. In view of the fact that in winter the minister's biologists are not as busy as in the summer, I wonder if the minister would consider having the biologists visit the various areas in the poplar forests to determine if there's some method where larva eggs cannot be killed before they hatch this time of the year.

MR. COOKSON: Well, I wouldn't want to suggest that my biologists aren't busy because it's a different season of the year, Mr. Speaker. We had hoped that this particular problem would run itself out. The information I have is that they tend to run in cycles, and we're into an awfully long cycle. I would think that somewhere along the way perhaps we'd better start assessing whether there may be some way of curbing it. I'll certainly take the suggestion as notice.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I was just going to say the minister has about a year on the cycle.

#### **Legislature Cafeteria**

MR. L. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Government Services. It's in regard to the Edmonton city by-law that requires all eating places to designate smoking and non-smoking areas. Could the minister inform the Assembly whether or not it's the government's intention to conform to this by-law in the cafeteria in this building?

AN HON. MEMBER: Or even in this room.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I think the by-law is not intended to have any authority in this particular building or in any government building. As a courtesy, though, we have posted the usual no-smoking warning in some of the buildings. I think perhaps the better thing in this building is to get an opinion of all the members. I'm not too sure how that would go.

The one thing we can do here is have a no-smoking area in the cafeteria, and I think that is happening through the good judgment of the members in being with

non-smokers if they are non-smokers, or being with smokers, or whatever. Generally, I would favor that approach and, at this juncture, subject to the direction of the members, probably will not be posting the building.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let's have a vote.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. At the same time would the minister give consideration to opening a diet centre in the building for those members who do not smoke and perhaps could use some diet advice?

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, and ask if he was asking his question as the chairman of AADAC or as a member of the Assembly.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I was asking the question as a member of this Assembly who has the interests and good health of my colleagues at heart.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Bow Valley. Then the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources wishes to deal further with a topic that arose in a previous question period.

#### **Heritage Trust Fund Debenture Program**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Could the minister indicate what response the government has had with the debenture investment capital program announced in 1979, where corporations have debenture capital from the heritage trust fund?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm a little puzzled as to which program the hon. member is referring to. No venture capital program was initiated by the heritage fund. Perhaps the program which related to the purchase of debentures.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Yes, this is a program where big corporations that want investment, or the heritage trust fund invests, for example in Calgary Power, or where the heritage trust fund invested. That's the program I'm thinking of. It was announced September 5, 1979.

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to get some updated information and report to the Assembly on all aspects of the program.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate what criteria the government uses to establish the interest rates or the rate of return that comes to the heritage trust fund, and the term these debentures are out on?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the rates of return are the market interest rates, so are the ones any corporation would have to pay in the market place in order to borrow that kind of money. This is ensured because of the fact that the program is only available up to 66.66 per cent of the amount that is sought as a borrowing, and the balance has to be taken up by the private sector. So there's an assurance that it always be the market highest rate of return at a given date.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate if there have been any out-of-province applications to get involved in this program?

MR. HYNDMAN: I'll check on that and report back, Mr. Speaker.

#### Revenue Accounting System

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, last April 22, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview asked whether I could assure the Assembly that there had been no loss of revenues to the government of Alberta as a result of the difficulties the department had experienced with the recently installed main accounts receivable system. I have been able to review the matter again and would first call the Assembly's attention to the comments on page 42 of the Auditor General's report for the year ended March 31, 1980, where he says:

[IT SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED THAT THESE WERE ACCOUNTING DIFFERENCES, WHICH HAVE SINCE BEEN SUBSTANTIALLY RECONCILED: THEY WERE NOT LOSSES OR SHORTAGES OF FUNDS].

I have been advised by other personnel within the department that the departmental revenues for the year ended March 31, 1980, have now been reconciled to the cash-received records and the Treasury Department accounts, and that for the same fiscal year all energy royalties were reconciled to independent figures established by the operating division.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all the accounting differences were due to timing; that is, the transactions were recorded at different times by the operating division and accounting services. In my view, the reconciliation of the accounts in the manner I've just described establishes that there was no loss of revenues to the government of Alberta.

On the same day, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview drew attention to a memorandum dated July 4, 1980, from the Provincial Treasurer to the Deputy Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, which noted that the Treasury Department would be unable to determine the amount of non-renewable resource revenue to be transferred to the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund until the Department of Energy and Natural Resources revenue figures could be considered reliable. He asked what specific action I, as minister, had taken as a result of that memorandum.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not certain that I took any specific action I could directly relate to the receiving of the memorandum. Sometime after assuming the portfolio, I had become aware that there were difficulties with the implementation of the computer-based main accounts receivable system and, during the course of several discussions with senior departmental personnel, discussed what was to be done to overcome those difficulties, including discussions about the fact that we had hired an outside consulting firm, that we were hiring additional personnel on a project basis, and that we were working closely with the audit office in order to overcome the difficulties. Putting it in a sentence, Mr. Speaker: at or about the time of the Deputy Provincial Treasurer's memorandum of July 4, 1980, I was satisfied that the department was putting forth a concerted effort to meet the accounting needs of both the Treasury Department and the Auditor General's office, as well as working

towards solving the deficiencies of the system.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the Assembly that we have significantly improved the accounting systems and procedures, and at the moment I believe the accounts for the 1980-81 fiscal year will be completed on time and in conformity with the requirements of the Auditor General's office.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (Committee of Supply)

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

##### Department of Culture

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a list of names of people who indicated they wanted to make some comments. The first one is the Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I'd just like to make a very brief comment in regard to the 75th in general, in particular the gold medals handed out to senior citizens. Over the last year, I had the opportunity to deliver 143 gold medals to senior citizens in Calgary Buffalo. Their general reaction was one of joy. They were very grateful they'd been remembered and very happy that they were thought of. When I presented them, I took the opportunity to stop and visit and chat for a while. Invariably they'd start by relating what the province was in the years before and how much things had changed. I asked them what was the greatest change they had seen over the years. They'd think for a while and tell me what that was.

I expect that perhaps when we get to the 100th birthday, the members may be receiving something similar from the MLAs at that time. I'd just like to pass on to the government, as the representatives of the people of Alberta, from the senior citizens to whom I presented the gold medals, their appreciation and thanks for being remembered at that particular time.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too want to make some comments to the Minister of Culture, primarily flowing from the vote on the 75th Anniversary. However, there are a couple of other comments I'd like to make. One, I was really impressed with the Member for Camrose and the description of either dead meat hill or Driedmeat Hill. It's like everything else in the Camrose constituency. It's always very significant, and I suppose it's the only constituency that has not only every department of the government of Alberta represented, but additional things as well.

With regard to the comments by the Member for Clover Bar, I think we in the House should all recognize that the opposition does have their difficulties. I understand they draw straws to see who will undertake to oppose various government departments or ministers of the Crown. I guess the Member for Clover Bar drew that straw, so I don't think he has much option than to say some of the things he's said. When the Member for Camrose sends out copies of *Hansard* to the Camrose



constituency with the comments of the Member for Clover Bar, I'll look with interest and see the results that come back. Because my perception of the 75th has been dramatically different than what I have heard from that member.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to commend a couple of people in the Commission, whom I became deeply involved with in carrying out some of those programs. I was one of those in this Assembly who, as the MLA for Lethbridge West, was initially somewhat critical at the allocation of the \$75 million, and the initial perception I saw the Commission taking. I termed it a Madison Avenue approach, with all tinsel and glamor and high-priced advertising agencies. On reflection, in hindsight I've had an opportunity to see how it was carried out. I think the point should be made that \$42 million to \$43 million of that program was not spent by the government of Alberta but was allocated to municipal groups — cities, towns, and villages. I can speak only for Lethbridge directly, but I've talked to other members of this Assembly and I think it truly was a success story in terms of some of the programs they carried out. Let's face it: without assistance from the 75th Anniversary Commission they just would not have been carried out.

I think of problems I experienced during that year. I want to pay public recognition to several people besides the commission. Certainly Mr. Bill Barry in the Commission was very helpful to me as a member in assisting unravel some of the complications from a somewhat hastily organized anniversary. I say that, in that most of us who are involved with government programs spend two or three years in preparation. This was a case where that just wasn't available. In addition in Lethbridge, and I'm sure other areas, we had an extremely helpful staff. I recall Marg Culler, for example, looking after that office, who knew no hours. I don't know how much she was paid; I don't care. I just know there was no such thing as an eight-hour day with the 75th Anniversary staff. They worked all hours based on demand, and I think she and Dale Taylor of that office should be complimented.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to put a question to the minister, as minister responsible for the 75th, recognizing a cabinet committee had that responsibility. It concerns the medallions. Normally I would put it to the Minister of Government Services. But my concern is this: just this week I submitted two additional applications of citizens who had not applied for medallions, one gold and the other silver. I would like the assurance of the minister that we do indeed have some structure in place to look after requests of various citizens who qualify for those medallions; that they will be receiving those medallions, and perhaps somewhat expeditiously, recognizing that the 75th Anniversary is essentially packed up. I would like that assurance from the minister.

On the exact question of the medallions, we had about 230 medallions. Lethbridge West put on a very successful party, presenting the medallions, in the Southern Alberta Art Gallery. We had the assistance of the 75th commission taking photographs in a volunteer capacity. This past Saturday we hosted an event in a shopping centre, where these pioneer senior citizens came by, identified themselves, and got complimentary color photographs. I think it was a very, very exciting program, if we did nothing other than the medallions.

Mr. Chairman, there are just two other comments. The night before last I landed at Edmonton Municipal Airport at about 1:15 in the morning. Probably four times in my six years, I've landed after midnight. Three of those

times have been with the Minister of Culture ... [interjections] ... and the pilot. I had the pleasure and opportunity of welcoming the minister to Lethbridge for a final presentation of the Lethbridge Symphony Orchestra, which is not really an understudy to the Crowsnest Pass Symphony Orchestra, but they're equally as good. Mr. Chairman, the point I'm trying to make is: I've never known a minister of our Crown to put in more hours or work harder to see that the people of Alberta are served through her portfolio as Minister of Culture.

In closing I would simply like to say that we should all recognize that the first Monday in August is Heritage Day, a day that means a lot to many Albertans. The Minister of Culture, following the steps of the Minister of State for Economic Development, has carried on with just as much enthusiasm as her predecessor. Many ethnic groups around the province — I know the Southern Alberta Ethnic Association is deeply appreciative of everything the minister does. I'd simply like to close by saying publicly that I'm extremely happy, with not only the minister's plans in the coming year, but the way she's performed in the past year.

Thanks very much.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to address some questions to the minister with respect to the matter of historical sources, historical sites, and specifically the policy of the government with respect to compensation to individuals whose property may have been designated as an historical resource or site. My concern in this area emanates from a situation a constituent of mine has found himself in. In fact, if the minister will recall — and I'm reading *Hansard* of April 23, 1980 — I queried the minister on the same subject. I'm interested in pursuing the subject further and perhaps seeing what progress has been made in the area.

In the first instance, I would appreciate the minister advising what the policy of the government is with respect to compensation to owners of property designated as an historical site or resource. Specifically, could the minister advise the Assembly whether it is true that the policy of the department is not to recommend payment of compensation in any designation situation. Thirdly, if it is true that the department's policy is not to recommend the payment of compensation in any designation situation, could the minister advise how that policy is in keeping with the existing legislation. Section 36 of The Alberta Historical Resources Act specifies that compensation may be paid. Surely that provision must clearly have been inserted with the intention that compensation would be paid in some situations.

Following from that question and concern, could the minister then advise whether any consideration is being given to amending the legislation to make it mandatory that the government pay compensation in circumstances where there is clear, undeniable evidence that the value of a property has or will be diminished as a result of the restrictions imposed upon it by having been designated an historical resource. By way of example to the minister, I suggest a situation where the value of a piece of land appreciates over time to far exceed the structure that is on it. However, because that structure has been designated an historical resource, it naturally cannot and ought not be demolished, but in fact the owner of that land finds himself in a position where he has suffered a very real pecuniary loss because that land can't be used for other purposes.

As a final query and concern in this area, if some

change to the existing policy or legislation is not being considered to make it obligatory to make compensation in proper cases, could the minister then advise what steps are being taken to ensure that Albertans will not become reluctant to accept an historical designation on a property site for fear of potential economic loss which, in the judgment of this member, would be a very sad state of affairs. It should be a very high honor to have a site designated as an historical resource or site and certainly not a cause for alarm for the owner of a piece of property. So I'd appreciate the minister's comments on that subject.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'll start with the Member for Lethbridge West. I would like to assure him that when he has submitted those applications for the silver and gold medals, they will be taken care of at quick speed. We still have four clerical staff on hand to ensure that anybody who has not received their medals will be able to do so.

As far as the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn, I have to admit I'm not quite sure which building he is referring to, but I know he will quickly tell me. When it comes to amending the legislation, Mr. Chairman, there has been a suggestion to me that we might review the legislation and change it to "shall". I believe it is going to the urban municipalities to get some reaction from them.

I would also like to state that perhaps we are not paying compensation, and in the last few years we've had approximately 140 designated properties. In the 140, there have only been two instances where we have had some problems, and I know the hon. member is referring to one. I would like to think that rather than paying compensation, one way we could deal with the problem is perhaps by forming a compensation board which is completely independent of government, so that if somebody has a problem, they could refer to the compensation board to see if they are actually having a loss on their property.

Instead of paying actual compensation, one can look at a number of areas. For example, when we did the LeMarchand [Mansion], we were able to transfer the adjacent lot and give them an unused density. Basically, when a builder feels he has some sort of restriction on him, we try to do a transfer of density. Or like on 8th Street in Calgary, where basically the front of the building is the historic aspect, there is nothing to say one cannot build behind and create a building still maintaining the historical aspect of the front of the building. Third, in the case of a small building that has been declared a provincial historic site, it could be part and parcel of an historic area and could build around it.

We do not pay compensation, but we do pay grants. If it's a registered historical resource, they can get \$25,000: \$5,000 a year or \$25,000 in one grant, and reapply every five years. If it is a provincial historic resource, then of course they are able to get \$75,000 in one go or reapply every five years.

Perhaps the member would refer specifically to what building he is referring.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Chairman, in response to the minister, of course I'm referring to the Major Stewart residence in the constituency of Calgary Forest Lawn in the Inglewood area. I appreciate the minister's comments that the matter is getting some attention. If I might offer the comment: in the judgment of this member, the suggestion of a compensation tribunal would be a positive step.

The only difficulty I'm having is reconciling the suggestion of the minister — and I'd appreciate her just giving it her consideration, I'm not asking for a response this afternoon — that that is under consideration, in other words, a vehicle for providing compensation, with her subsequent statement that the present policy is that no compensation is going to be paid, and there are other ways to go about doing it. I'm not sure where that leaves us, but I'm pleased to hear that the matter is receiving the attention of the minister.

Thank you.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Perhaps the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn is very interested in this compensation area, and I think it is an issue that is of great concern to many people. Perhaps we could meet and try to discuss ways that would be pleasing to all of us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Several more people have now indicated they wish to make some comments. The first is the Member for Vegreville.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, in making my remarks yesterday, I applauded the 75th Anniversary program. I would like to add that maybe everything wasn't just perfect. If we were having another celebration this year, I'm sure some of the creases would be ironed out. But I would like to bring to the attention of the Assembly that two years ago, at the spring session and subsequently, the Minister of Government Services on numerous occasions announced the 75th Anniversary celebration and the commission advertised at intervals in weekly papers throughout the province asking for input from people from across the province on how to improve and make the celebrations the best. I was just wondering whether the minister could advise whether there has been input in reference to the program from those who are very badly criticizing the program.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Chairman, a couple of comments with regard to the 75th Anniversary activities, the first at least complimentary to the minister. It's already been mentioned, and I'll just add my very brief remarks to the effect that the medallion presentations were most satisfactory in my constituency, where we also have a very, very high proportion of senior citizens. I said in my speech the other day that one of the highlights of my political career was presenting those and recognizing those people who had in effect laid the foundations for our province. Not only was I able to do that, but the kind of, I guess, gratitude those people in turn reflected to the province, and through me to the province.

Specifically with regard to funds that were designated to the communities and the city of Calgary, I have not seen the complete list but I know that investments are going to be made. The committee was under chairman Nomi Whalen, the former alderman. In a number of programs, some of them capital programs which are still going on with regard to swimming pools and so on — one of the very unique programs that happened in Calgary took into account the Metropolitan Foundation, which operates a number of senior citizens' lodges. The foundation made application to the committee to install videotape centres in their homes and lodges, which was granted. These seniors in the city of Calgary are enjoying that. Of course the one problem it has caused for me is that some of those not under the Metropolitan Foundation are saying, why in the world don't we get those as

well?

With regard to 75th Anniversary funds, I'd like to ask the minister whether or not the total amount was expended. It may be here, but I haven't picked it up. I notice she said there's still four staff there. The second thing is with regard to — I know that some of the programs [are] well-meaning; I think one in Calgary ran into the red about \$24,000 — whether or not the government is able to, intends to, or should help pick up some of the deficit of some of these activities that went into the red.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to note one more area not now connected with the 75th Anniversary, but having to do with international aid, which is listed in the book and schedules on page 109. It indicates there that this year we have designated some \$4,920,000 to international aid, which I believe is matched by private organizations which raise dollar for dollar. I was going to ask the minister why there is a decline of 23 per cent this year. I'm sure there is an answer for that. I believe we spent between \$6 million and \$7 million for that, and I'd be much interested — indeed I would be dismayed if we were to reduce that, in view of the world need that is around us today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to get the minister's view, and ask her if she's made a decision on the aqueduct in Brooks. I know she's had some officials down there checking the aqueduct we had for carrying water across this particular coulee. Now we have a fill there, and the minister's been looking at it for an historic site.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to express my views on having this aqueduct as a site. I think it's an excellent gesture and suggestion to set it up as a site. However, there's several miles of aqueduct, and if it was set up for a site — one of the officials from the minister's department, the manager from the Eastern Irrigation District, and I went out and investigated it personally. A lot of the cement is in poor condition. It will take a lot to upkeep the aqueduct if it was all to be kept as an historic site.

My suggestion, and I think that of the manager of the Eastern Irrigation District, would be that they keep and set up a portion of the aqueduct as an historic site, if the minister, some of her officials, and the board of the Eastern Irrigation District can work out what portion of the aqueduct would be most feasible or accessible to set up for a site. I would just like to ask if the minister has made any decisions on this, or what her views are as a result of setting this up as an historic site. I would just like to say that if it was all left there, it would be too expensive for anyone to maintain, and it would be a big weed problem because a number of acres are involved in setting this entire structure up as an historic site. Mr. Chairman, could I get the minister's views and recommendations.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Certainly, Mr. Chairman. First of all I'd like to answer the Member for Bow Valley. The member and our staff have had the opportunity to review the aqueduct. I agree with the hon. member that there is no way we could possibly save the entire aqueduct, and would like to say that we are looking at just working with one portion. We will certainly be in touch with the member and keep him fully informed of how we are progressing.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with a couple of areas in addressing the estimates of the Department of Culture. First of all, with respect to funding for Alberta writers, my understanding is that there is some concern about the allocation of funds for the film and literary arts branch of the government. Just quickly looking at the estimates, I see that we have a reduction to \$396,000 from the forecast \$650,000. I understand that on April 26 there was a response by the Writers' Guild of Alberta. For the minister's information, I will read that response into the record and ask for her comments:

The Writers' Guild of Alberta is protesting the provincial government's attitude towards funding of the literary arts. At its semi-annual meeting in Edmonton this weekend, the Writers' Guild of Alberta called upon the provincial cabinet to increase the budget allocation to the film and literary arts branch of Alberta. The level of funding for writing and publishing has been frozen since 1975.

Considering costs of everything else going up, I find that rather disturbing. "This minimal level of funding suggests a limited vision on the government's part," says a spokesman for the guild.

The guild urged the government to note that the interests of [Alberta] do not reside solely in financial investment and energy, and that it has the duty of any society to encourage its cultural values.

I appreciate that the minister would agree with that. But beyond the agreement that most members would have, what are we going to do in terms of providing money?

"The arts, and especially literature, are more than the leisure-time activities many believe them to be. Literature is the mirror of what a society thinks of itself, and projects an image of that society abroad .... Literature is both a cultural and political product."

The Writers' Guild of Alberta has a membership of 240 writers from 53 communities across the province.

Mr. Chairman, I was quickly looking over yesterday's Blues, and I don't recall this question being raised. If it was, I'm sorry. But I would appreciate a response on what we are proposing in this budget, why there's a drop from \$650,000 to \$396,000, and what the minister has in mind for the future. I'd be particularly interested in whether there's any forecast over the next five years. I have a sneaking suspicion that this particular estimate got caught between the A and B budgets. I'm almost certain that that happened. But are we going to be able to do a little better next year, and make more funding available in an especially important area?

The other point I want to raise in the form of a question to the minister, is with respect to the aid abroad, Vote 4 — International Assistance. I note a reduction from a forecast \$6,350,000 down to \$4,850,000. I take it the reason for that reduction is because of the Italian earthquake — perhaps not. I'd be interested in a full explanation as to why there is a reduction from last year. While the idea of matching money raised on a voluntary basis has some merit, I really question whether assistance of \$4,850,000 — considering the staggering problems elsewhere in the world and the target of the United Nations, I believe, some years ago, that each country should reach as a very minimum, 1 per cent of its gross national product.

Now, 1 per cent of Canada's gross national product would be a significant amount of money. I know the federal government does make some funds available,

supplemented by the provinces. But I would ask if the minister has any specific figures as to the combined Canadian commitment; that is, the federal government as well as the commitment of the various provinces. How close are we to that objective of 1 per cent of our gross national product? That would probably be in the neighborhood of \$5 billion or \$6 billion from Canada as a whole. I would ask the minister if she has any figures she can supply us with on the cumulative total of the provinces and the federal government in this important area.

I think the international assistance issue is one of the really key issues of our time. More important than the east-west dialogue is the north-south dialogue; the incredible difference between the have and have-not people in the world. Unless those of us in the world who are favored in terms of resources and expertise are prepared to share more generously than we ever have in the past, not only are we going to see problems throughout the world, and risk continued violence and war and eventual disruption of our way of life, but I think that at the same time, from a moral point of view, there are times when one has to commit oneself and one's country to a major effort to effectively help others.

At this stage of this game, I say with greatest respect to the minister that while many members have applauded this \$4,850,000, very few parts of the world are as favored as this province. Very few people have quite as great an obligation to be generous as do the 2 million people in the province. I say to the minister and to members of the committee that I realize we're not going to get any change in the estimates in this session, but the points that I make are for the future. We have to do better than this. We have to do better as a nation. We have to do better as a province. I urge the minister to make the strongest representation for a more substantial increase in this budget in the years ahead.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself first of all to the writers' concern. We did discuss this last evening, and I'm sorry you were not here. But I would like the Member for Spirit River-Fairview to know that it is of great concern to me also, and that as I stated last night, because I have been aware of the concerns of the writers and their plight, we did form a literary advisory committee to work with me during the year. There is money in this budget so that we can work together. I also stated last night, and I think I did quite well — I was able to inform my colleagues and the community about the lack of funding for libraries, and I will do so in the plight of the writers.

Now when it comes to the international aid program, I would like to tell the hon. member that last year we spent over \$6 million on international aid. In our budget you see the \$4 million figure. One has to realize that when we address ourselves to the budget, it is done in August or September. Consequently, the agencies have not had their year end. This is one of the times when a special warrant is very necessary. Each year we match by a special warrant the dollars raised from the private sector, so that we have a true dollar matching program.

I do have some of the facts when it comes to the gross national product. It is not something we should be very proud of. As a matter of fact, Canada ranks 14th at present in terms of the percentage of gross national product it spends on aid, behind Australia, Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. Canada has only recently made a commitment to increase its aid to .5 per cent of the gross national

product. As a people and as a country, we should and we could do an awful lot better. I hope I have addressed myself to the hon. member's comments.

I believe I did reach some of the comments of the Member for Calgary North Hill on the decrease in the aid program. I hope I have satisfied that we will be coming for a special warrant so that we will have a matching dollar program.

As far as the 75th committees, the one you were especially referring to has come to the 75th Anniversary committee, and we have addressed ourselves to that problem.

Thank you.

Agreed to.

1.0.1 — Minister's Office	\$219,464
1.0.2 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$160,791
1.0.3 — Financial Services	\$617,421
1.0.4 — Personnel	\$138,837
1.0.5 — Planning and Development	\$244,747
1.0.6 — Communications	\$158,832
1.0.7 — Department Library	\$92,963
1.0.8 — Records Management	\$47,446
1.0.9 — Executive Director for Finance and Administration	\$68,014
1.0.10 — Special Programs	\$508,488
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support	

Services \$2,257,003

Vote 2 — Cultural Development

2.1 — Program support	\$344,239
2.2 — Visual Arts	\$1,425,921
2.3 — Performing Arts	\$4,460,342

#### 24 — Film and Literary Arts

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, may I just make a comment on the minus factor in film and literary arts. That was because there was a special warrant, to the tune of \$200,000, for the Banff Film Festival that's coming up this September; also \$95,000 to offset a deficit from the previous Banff Film Festival. That explains the minus 39 per cent.

Agreed to:

2.4 — Film and Literary Arts	\$396,256
2.5 — Library Services	\$8,843,488

#### 26 — Cultural Heritage

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, just one or two comments to the minister. I'm sure the minister is aware of the historical significance of the provincial jail in Fort Saskatchewan as it applies to being an historic site, in that that was the North West Mounted Police barracks. The pitch I wish to make to the minister, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in light of the fact that that institution will be moved out of there within the next two or three years, is that the minister give very serious consideration to preserving the original site as an historic site. A pioneer museum is already there, and it's never too early to start lobbying the minister responsible, and the minister will have to lobby the minister responsible for public works. Once these things are lost, they seem to be more difficult to get back. That's the way the system seems to operate.

I'd like to bring to the minister's attention the fact that formal representation for the preservation of that site will be made by the historical society of Fort Saskatchewan. I'm sure the minister is aware that some representation has already been made, indicating that they think they've found where the original stockades were located.

So I'd like to bring that matter to the minister's attention, because it is of very historic significance. I'd like the minister to keep that in mind.

Agreed to:

2.6 — Cultural Heritage	\$1,079,802
2.7 — Cultural Facilities	\$1,148,059
2.8 — Film Censorship	\$163,897

### 2.9 — Major Cultural Facilities Development

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, what planning is taking place now between the minister's department and the Minister of Recreation and Parks with respect to a new 10-year program? I believe the program we now have in place runs to 1984. Many communities have already completed projects and are now looking for additional projects to consider. What is the current planning process for a follow-up program?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, the officials of the hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks and our officials have been addressing ourselves to the issue. We have not come up with a plan that is cut and dried. As soon as we do, I'm sure we will bring it forward to all members. It is an excellent plan. I think it has provided excellent facilities for the communities, and I would hate to see something like this not continued.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I agree with that, but the point is the planning process at this stage. Are we going to see any announcement before 1984? Or is it going to await the expiration of the present program before any formal announcement is made? I have a sneaking suspicion we will probably have an announcement in 1983, just shortly before the next provincial election. I can't imagine that these people would pass that opportunity. But apart from the political planning that may or not be involved, when might communities that have honored their commitments and are looking for other projects, expect a little more definitive idea of what is in store?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, I wish I could come up with a date right now; I can't do that. I know we will all look forward to hearing the result of that program very soon.

Agreed to:

2.9 — Major Cultural Facilities Development	\$1,203,964
Total Vote 2 — Cultural Development	\$19,065,968

Vote 3 — Historical Resources Development:

3.1 — Program Support	\$293,049
3.2 — Archaeological Survey	\$791,437

### 3.3 — Archival Acquisition, Preservation and Storage

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, under element 3.3.2, I see a reduction from \$681,000 to \$400,000 in acquisition,

preservation, and storage. What is the reason for that reduction?

I don't know if one wants to do it in each vote, Mr. Chairman, but there are reductions in a number of categories. I could list them all, and the minister could respond to all of them if that would be more convenient. Or we could come to the appropriate vote; it doesn't make much difference which we do. But I would like an explanation as to why there is a reduction, first of all, in the archival acquisition.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, I think I'd like to take them vote by vote as they come through. The decrease in this vote was to the amount of dollars that was frozen into last year's budget in case we proceeded with the Roloff Beny collection. Seeing we did not, it is now causing a decrease in the percentage.

MR. NOTLEY: Highly commendable.

Agreed to:

3.3 — Archival Acquisition, Preservation and Storage	\$605,535
--	-----------

### 3.4 — Financial Assistance for Heritage Preservation

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could have the minister outline the reasoning — by the way, the grants for heritage preservation, \$1,003,000, are exactly the same as last year. In view of the inflation rate, I wonder whether there wouldn't be some increase there, or if there's going to be a limitation in the program, because obviously the dollars won't go quite as far. The Alberta heritage foundations are down significantly, from \$325,000 to \$125,000. The Glenbow institute is down from \$4 million to \$2,796,000.

Perhaps we could have an explanation for each of those subheadings under the elements section of the budget.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: If the hon. member would just bear with me one moment, I'll get right to it. Let me start off by saying that the decrease in the Glenbow museum was the fact that we had given them a one-time grant of \$2 million for the Riveredge collection; that was paid last year. They are getting the normal increase in their operating grant this year.

I will certainly take the Alberta heritage foundations as notice and report back to you. I'm sorry, would the Member for Spirit River-Fairview name some of the others you say are at a lesser scale?

MR. NOTLEY: The other one, Mme. Minister, is 3.4.2, grants for heritage preservation. It's not a lesser scale; it's the same. With the normal inflation rate, \$1 million this year is going to be a little less than \$1 million last year. Are we cutting back on this program at all?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, no we're not. Last year was the final year of our \$1 million grant to the Strathcona area, a final payment of \$200,000. So basically we are not at a loss on this one.

Agreed to:

3.4 — Financial Assistance for Heritage Preservation	\$3,950,864
3.5 — Historic Sites Preservation	\$1,781,691

3.6 — Historical Resource Facilities	\$3,817,511
Total Vote 3 — Historical Resources Development	\$11,240,087
Total Vote 4 — International Assistance	\$4,920,869
5.1 — Planning and Administration	\$277,686
5.4 — Cultural Programs	\$858,000
Total Vote 5 — 75th Anniversary Celebrations	\$1,135,686
Department Total	\$38,619,613

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, I move that this vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### Department of Recreation and Parks

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the minister have some opening comments?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like briefly to run through some of the programs we have planned for this year, and I'd like to start off with a little discussion on our Alberta summer games. Last night we had a tremendous gathering at a function where we saw a film on the games. As we all know, in 1981 the games will be held August 6, 7, and 8 in Lethbridge. Planning is under way; we're moving along quickly.

MR. GÓGO: Where's that?

MR. TRYNCHY: In Lethbridge, John.

In 1982 the winter games will be held in Lloydminster. We're now asking for bids for the 1984 games. One of the things I feel the Alberta Games Council did extremely well is that we asked them to look at smaller communities, and five communities in the county of Mountain View banded together — it's a first in Alberta — and they will hold our 1983 summer games there.

Also this year we'll have special funding for the special Olympics to be held in Lethbridge; I believe it's in June. Just a couple of comments on that, Mr. Chairman. I hope there's some way we can encourage the special Olympics to join our summer games and consider it one function. We'd be glad to have them. Possibly, because of the year of the handicapped, they'd probably want to go on their own this year. But we'd encourage all members who talk to handicapped people, to see if they'd consider joining our summer and winter games, because they have been a tremendous success.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

As we're well aware the Alberta Seniors Games, that were first held in Camrose in 1980, were a great success; over 800 participants. The games will be held again in 1982 and every two years thereafter. We're now asking for bids for the 1984 games. We are seeking out communities to hold the 1982 games, and we feel that asking for the bid, and having the communities that are successful for 1984 participate and watch how the community hosts the games in 1982, would be a tremendous advantage to them. We should shortly be making the announcement on where the games will be held, and I encourage all

members to talk to their communities and see if they can become involved.

The province of Alberta has accepted an invitation to attend the Canada summer games in Thunder Bay in August. The Alberta team will consist of some 299 athletes, coaches, and managers, and we have provided provincial support governing bodies with team training selection grants totalling some \$65,000. Just briefly, Mr. Chairman, in 1983 the western Canada games will be held in Calgary — that's the four western provinces: Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and B.C. I understand things are on stream, on schedule, on budget, and hopefully they too will be a tremendous success, as the ones I have attended in the past.

Another new initiative proposed in our budget this year would be a hosting grant for international and national events in the province. We have \$200,000. We've asked the sporting associations to request funds some two years in advance, and for 1981-82 we have just about all the funds committed. Some 20 events will be held in Edmonton, and I have the list for any member who wishes to see it.

Mr. Chairman, I think we're moving in an exciting way with upgrading, expansion, and major developments in provincial parks throughout the province. In my first two years of office I toured 99 per cent of my provincial parks. I have two left to visit and am planning on seeing them this summer. Over the years we have arrived at a concept that we would provide one new provincial park a year, and this year we're moving with Whitney-Ross-Laurier in northeastern Alberta. Planning is ongoing for two additional parks, one in the Edson region and one in the Drayton Valley region.

We've initiated a reservations system again this year in our provincial parks. Last year we had it at one park, Wabamun. We felt it was a good program, and this year we've expanded to include Sir Winston Churchill, Little Bow, Young's Point, and Jarvis Bay. If they wish, people can make a reservation by mail, or by telephone and then mail the funds. If they want to reserve today for, say, August 5 or 6, they can get their money there and be assured of a spot.

We're moving in the Cold Lake region, where we have an exciting program. We've joined with the air force base in developing a ski hill, and that should be an exciting program for that part of Alberta. A concept that I think is something new, something that I'm excited about, is our recreation areas. This year we will be moving with 10 recreation areas in the province. I asked MLAs to provide to me their choice of recreation areas where we could develop such a project, and I received somewhat over 90 locations. I had a committee set up, chaired by the hon. Member for Barrhead and a number of other members on the committee, and they gave us 10 proposed locations. I'd just like to read them for the record.

The constituency of Ponoka would be one. Cypress-Medicine Hat would be the second. Lac La Biche-McMurray would be the third; Chinook, the fourth; Vegreville, the fifth; Wainwright, the sixth; Barrhead, the seventh; Wetaskiwin-Leduc, the eighth; Cardston, the ninth; Peace River, the tenth. We've tried to distribute these projects across the province, not group them in one location. We hope this type of program — we might be able to see how it's accepted. This is a program where we will provide up to \$100,000 for capital expenditures and up to \$20,000 operational cost-sharing to the community. We as a department will not be involved in operations ourselves. This will have to be done by the local municipi-

pality, local service club, or whoever is interested.

Mr. Chairman, I guess the most exciting program we have — something that I'm sure will be accepted throughout the province — is our major cultural/recreation facilities operational grants. At present the grants are based on \$1 per capita for the first 20,000 population, and 20 cents thereafter. Effective this year the grants will be \$3 per capita, and a minimum of \$3,000 to any community.

Just to give you an example of what this means to, say, the city of Calgary. Let's assume they had 600,000 people; today they would receive \$136,000. Under the new program initiated this year and in my budget, they will receive \$1.8 million. So that means they would have \$1,564,000 new funds or approximately 1,400 per cent increase. The city of Medicine Hat is another example. They would receive approximately 500 per cent more funds.

This year we will be opening the special user facilities — that's our handicapped facilities — in Kananaskis Country. Also we'll be looking at Wedge Lake to see if we're moving along there in the fishing resort for the handicapped. The opening of the visitor centre in Kananaskis will also take place this fall. That's an exciting program for that part of Alberta.

I just want to touch briefly on our urban parks policy. It's something we initiated last fall through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It was approved. It's a new concept where we'll have five cities involved in the construction of new urban parks: Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Red Deer, Grande Prairie, and Lloydminster. The total 1979 dollars will be \$59,090,000. We will initiate that program shortly, and it will be done along the basis of our major cultural/recreation program on a grant system. The towns and cities will be able to develop and plan the parks themselves, and we will advance funds. Land purchase can take up to 40 per cent of the funds, and that will be the limit.

We will pay the operation of the parks to the cities, but not based on their actual expenditures. From experience we've learned that 10 per cent of our capital investment, excluding land, is about what the operation costs. We'll try to use that formula throughout the province. This program will commence on construction. We will pay 100 per cent of the operating costs until the parks are complete. We will then provide 75 per cent of the costs of operating for two years, commencing January 1, 1987, to January 1, 1989. After that we will pay 50 per cent of the operating costs for 23 years. In the year 2011 the parks will be turned over to the communities, and the government will have no further cost-sharing with it.

Mr. Chairman, briefly those are the exciting points I wanted to mention. I'd be pleased now to answer or take any questions the members have.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to receive the minister's comments with respect to three areas in particular: Cypress Hills Provincial Park, Kananaskis Country, and also with regard to Calgary and the Olympic bid.

First, with regard to Cypress Hills Provincial Park, I applaud the work being done by the minister's department there, renovating some areas of the park, in particular along the lakefront at Elkwater. I wonder if the minister would comment on whether or not plans are in place to further expand the boundaries, especially on the west side of the area. Perhaps the minister could have his department undertake some investigation with respect to a difficulty which seems to be built in to the renovation

process. In the attempt to redesign the camp facilities for trailers and tents at the south area of Elkwater Lake, with regard to controlling the access to the park, it now appears that there is no access to drinking water where the general public can load up their water barrels because not all the camping done in that area has access to a fresh water supply.

With respect to Kananaskis Country, the minister knows that once again I'm on my feet to ask what further developments are taking place with respect to the development of what would be styled a freedom museum at the former prisoner of war site, which is presently the University of Calgary environmental research station, operated in conjunction with the forestry department. I wonder if that museum site is still on the positive condition and if the preservation of the commander's cabin will take place and that it be developed as a museum; but in addition, because it is adjacent to it, that the whole upgrading will take place with respect to the nature forestry walk on site.

The third area is with respect to the Olympic bid. I wonder if the minister would take some time to share with us what kind of encouragement he and his department have been giving in that matter, not only to the development of the Olympic bid but with respect to Calgary Millican in particular, any progress to be reported on the development of a coliseum.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the minister care to answer the questions individually?

MR. TRYNCHY: All at once.

MR. L. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to say: my compliments to the minister for the way he's run his department. Any problems I've ever had have been answered with honesty, and I really appreciate the open way he runs his department. I'd like to thank him for being one of the people you can go down and talk to at any time.

After being at the Alberta games supper last night, I'd also like to say that I'm certainly glad these are going to continue. I know it's a place where people who are really not what you'd call athletes can go and take part in what they wish, from cards to many other things. I even see a few gold medals hanging around in my own house. I didn't win any, but some of them have. It is a program that's really greatly appreciated across southern Alberta.

I watched with interest the progress that's being made in Midland's park, and I would ask the minister where he sees this park going now that one of the largest paleontology museums in North America is going to be built in it. How does he see this park working in conjunction with the museum? I would like to know what is happening with Little Fish Lake Park, which is really the only park with any amount of water in our country, especially this year. Little Fish Lake Park — maybe he's forgotten he has that one. The problem is the shortage of water. The outlet has washed down. I brought it to the attention of his department last year, and I would like to know what might be done on that.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I applaud the programs of the minister, realizing that people are spending more and more leisure time and this will provide for them. But something sort of bothered me. In his opening remarks the minister mentioned that he had asked for

recommendations of parks and areas for financial assistance, and of the 10 he had hoped for there were some 90 recommendations. I noticed that the constituency of Vegreville was mentioned. If the minister could clarify what particular area that is, maybe I'd want to elaborate a little more. What particular place in the Vegreville constituency did you mention as one of the 10?

AN HON. MEMBER: Lac Sante.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, if it's Lac Sante, I'd like to clarify and make known to everybody that Lac Sante is in the constituency of St. Paul. I did a lot of lobbying for that, and the Member for St. Paul is getting it.

At any rate, the town of Two Hills has been managing that resort for a number of years, and I'm glad to see that it's being considered, for the fact that every weekend that place is filled totally, mostly by people from Edmonton who have to leave the city for the weekend. So regardless of where it is, I'm glad for this assistance. I feel just as happy that it's in the St. Paul constituency as if it were at my back door.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With regard to Kananaskis Park and Kananaskis Country, the minister made reference to provision for handicapped people. A couple of years ago I recall policy decisions being made with regard to that park, that provisions would be made for handicapped people, including retarded people. I ask the minister if he's prepared to give a report on where that's at. My real concern is that the minister's department has had some meaningful discussion for advice with the people involved in that area. That is my major concern.

With regard to the river valley park in my constituency, which is part of the urban development parks, naturally we welcome that; we think it's exciting. We understand very clearly, Mr. Minister, that it had to have its trial run in the Capital City Park and Fish Creek Park. We understand that. We know you want to get things ironed out and now, several years later, we're prepared to have that river valley park in one of the major cities. No doubt when the coliseum in Calgary has two or three years' experience, we can perhaps have the same opportunity for that type of activity in Lethbridge.

He mentioned though, Mr. Chairman, the formula of the land costs being 40 per cent of the cost. I realize there's a formula there; I think it's a per capita formula. What caught my ear, however, was when the minister said the operating costs would be 'guesstimated' at about 10 per cent of capital cost. He went on to say that operating costs would be 100 per cent paid for by government. My concern would be that the minister clarify that whatever the cost, in terms of operation, the province would pay 100 per cent of the operating costs. I really don't care what the formula is, as long as they'll pay it. I sense an inconsistency there.

Mr. Chairman, the minister mentioned a matter which was discussed in great detail several years ago when the Minister of Tourism and Small Business had the portfolio; that is, a reservations system. I'm very excited to hear the minister mention that, because I was unaware of it. As you know, the federal parks just don't have it. We have a policy in place in Alberta where we virtually guarantee that anybody from Edmonton who works for a living will never be able to stay in Waterton Park. We know that because by the time they get off work and get there, there's no space left. So on the provincial scene, it's

very important to enable all Albertans to have equal opportunity to share or enjoy our provincial parks.

Mr. Chairman, the other two items are very important not only to the province but certainly to Lethbridge West. The first is the summer games. I recognize that the people involved in the games in Alberta are always keen to participate with local communities. This year the summer games in Lethbridge on August 6, 7, and 8, are going to have about 3,500 athletes, which I think is a tremendous indication of the time Albertans are taking to participate in physical activities. Comment was made by the Member for Drumheller that they don't have to be athletes. I think what he really means is that they don't have to be champions, because here we offer an opportunity for all Albertans. The other night, eight senior citizens from Medicine Hat came all the way over to Lethbridge to participate in a meeting. I recognize that none of these things really means anything without the people involved. The chairman is Mr. Logan Tait of Lethbridge, a well-known athlete and successful businessman, who has taken the time to involve about 3,000 volunteers. I suggest that's the secret of the games. Morley Roeloff, who the minister may or may not be familiar with, was a member of his department and is working just as hard today as he was yesterday in assisting these games. I wanted you to know that.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Social Services and Community Health is in the House. This year we have the special Olympics being staged in Lethbridge. In the International Year of Disabled Persons, I think it is particularly significant that special assistance is being given by the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, along with the Minister of Recreation and Parks. I suggest \$11,000 is really not very much money. When you talk to the principals involved with the special Olympics, the very uniqueness of the fact that they are prepared and want to participate, I felt it was the least the government could do to participate in some financial way. I'm more than grateful that within 48 hours of being asked, the Minister of Social Services and Community Health got together with the Minister of Recreation and Parks, and they came up with a solution to the financial problem. I'm very deeply indebted for that.

The minister made mention that perhaps it could be done in co-operation with the summer games. That's laudable, but I suggest that's obviously a decision those people will make. As long as we have a policy of local decision-making and autonomy, I suggest that decision should rest there.

Let me close, Mr. Chairman, by simply saying that looking to the years ahead, leisure time recreation is obviously going to be more important than ever. I'm pleased to see the government has put in place a healthy budget that's going to accommodate that.

Thanks very much.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At the risk of overloading the train, I too would like to jump on board, first of all with a couple of bouquets to the minister and, to maintain a sense of balance, follow that up with a couple of concerns. I would like to commend the minister particularly on the announcement of substantially enhanced funding for operating grants for our municipalities. That's definitely a positive move and a real shot in the arm. I would also like to commend the minister for having made the decision to allow the municipalities of Calgary and Edmonton to draw upon the full funding of the major recreational/cultural grant program



and having removed the restriction that tied them to a \$10 per capita per year allowance.

Having made those complimentary remarks, the two concerns I have are as follows. The first still relates to the major cultural/recreational grant program. While the minister has assisted Calgary and Edmonton by allowing them to draw on the full \$100 per capita allowance that is in place for the 10-year program, it should be pointed out that that potential has always been there for every other municipality in the province of Alberta. In fact, only the cities of Calgary and Edmonton were denied full access to those funds from the initiation of the program. So really what has been done is simply to give Calgary and Edmonton an equal situation with other municipalities throughout the province.

That being the case, I think it also must be borne in mind that, within the next year or so, we are still going to face a very serious problem of inadequate funding for major cultural/recreational facilities. That arises primarily for two reasons: number one, the crippling effect of inflation on the value of the grant program. Since 1976, when it was initiated, the value of those dollars has been depleted to the extent of some 40 per cent in 1981. From the looks of it, that situation will not ease up but perhaps be further aggravated in the next few years. Secondly, we've had tremendous growth and influx of population throughout the province, and specifically in the metropolitan centres of Calgary and Edmonton. So again I urge the minister to give consideration to a new and revised program which takes those two factors into account, and will ensure that some very needed recreational and cultural facilities throughout the province — and particularly in Calgary and Edmonton, given their somewhat unique situations — are able to proceed and are not held up or in fact not proceeded with whatsoever.

The other concern I would like to raise with the minister arises from a recent review I made of some population statistics in the province of Alberta, which point out that in the Calgary and Edmonton regions — and I say regions, as opposed to cities *per se* — presently reside some 65 per cent of all Albertans. For me that was a very startling statistic, but the fact is undeniable. I think that imposes upon this government an obligation to ensure that a sufficient percentage of government expenditure and funding take place in those metropolitan regions. I think it's particularly appropriate that I make my remarks following the Member for Lethbridge West, who put a plea for centres other than Calgary and Edmonton. I commend him for representing his constituency as well as he is doing. I'm undertaking to do the same in the constituency I represent.

The fact remains that we do have 65 per cent of Albertans residing in the Calgary and Edmonton regions. I think we have to be very concerned about maintaining the quality of life in those regions, given the close quarters we all live in. With that in mind, I'd appreciate it if the minister could advise the Committee of Supply as to what proportion of the Recreation and Parks budget is aimed at providing recreational and park facilities for the benefit of that 65 per cent of Albertans residing within the regions of Calgary and Edmonton. Frankly, I've looked at the figures provided in the estimates of expenditure for 1981-82 and been unable to make that determination. I'd very much appreciate the minister advising us as to approximately what percentage, just a ballpark figure, of his budget for Recreation and Parks is aimed in a direct or approximate way at the citizens in those metropolitan centres.

I want to make absolutely clear that I strongly support this government's policy of decentralization and ensuring that there is a sharing of the benefits of the provincial wealth and riches throughout this province. None the less, I think it is important that we not lose sight of the significant majority residing in these two specific regions. I'd appreciate the minister's advice on that matter.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to talk about a couple of parks in my constituency. First, at Writing-on-Stone there was a problem that was in existence when I became a member of this Legislature in 1975 — the minister was finally able to solve it last year — of the Writing-on-Stone rodeo association being able to have their rodeo inside the park boundaries, as they had for many years. It took some negotiations and some decision-making on behalf of the minister. We were able to allow the association to continue to have their rodeos inside the park. They'll be able to have them for many more years. But I think it proves that that kind of park can be a people park, and all people will be able to use the park. It is part of the recreation of the people of the area, not only those who come to see the rodeo once a year; the people of the area to use that facility, which they constructed themselves, approximately once a week and sometimes more often for recreation events they wish to carry on. They expressed to me to forward their thanks and mine to the minister for solving that problem after so many years of being in question.

I also talked with some senior citizens in my constituency who wished to thank the government for the support of the Seniors Games that were in, I believe, Camrose this summer. They were very happy to be able to participate in such games and hope that we carry on these kinds of games for many more years to come.

Some of the previous members have talked about the Alberta Games, and games in which you don't need to be an outstanding athlete to participate, and where it becomes participation in numbers so that a lot of people can participate. Many years ago Max Gibb, executive director — which I believe is the right title — of the Alberta Games Council, started what they call the southern Alberta summer games. They continue to this day. They have had anywhere from 1,500 to 3,000 people participate. I believe they compete in 16 to 18 sports, all the way from track and field, seniors' slow-pitch, and regular slow-pitch teams. It's competition in numbers and not necessarily exceptional quality. If you win more than a couple of times, especially in the track and field events, you are barred from competing. Because it's to get people involved; it's not necessarily to see who is the best athlete to represent the province somewhere. There are other games that do that. So I'd like to pay a bouquet to that man, and to say that I hope we continue to support such games as that, and the Alberta Games, so that many people who are not especially good in sports, but are mediocre, have the chance to compete and have the feeling of competition as part of their recreation.

Mr. Chairman, I'd also like to say a few words about Cypress provincial park, the largest provincial park in the province. People in the area say it's the best provincial park in the province. I believe them. There is one advantage to having a part-time resident of a provincial park who is another member of this Legislature: you don't have to say everything about the park. He's covered a few of the problems, so it cuts down considerably on my speaking time. Cypress park has been going through a great deal of improvements in the last few years. Some of

those improvements have caused concern to the resident users of the park. Partly in answer to the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn about where the people in Calgary go, some of the people who use Cypress park can assure you that a good many of them often head down to that beautiful area on Thursday night and stay there until Sunday night. Often if you're in Cypress after Thursday night, you have problems finding a parking spot because the spots are all used up.

But the concern expressed to me lately, and I'd like the minister to comment on it, is that the work done along the shore of the lake is going to make it a very nice beach and a nice marina, but there may be fewer boat stalls than in the old system. A number of people were on a waiting list to be able to leave their boats there, and they were concerned about that. Another concern lately expressed to me was what we locally call the scenic route. Many people who have visited that park have driven up past the campsites onto the top of the bench. It's probably the most beautiful drive in the park. I haven't had time to check it out, but I've been told that that may have been blocked off. You go past some of the most beautiful scenery we have in southern Alberta, and I'd hate that to be blocked off so people couldn't use that road.

I know, and I'm sure the minister agrees, that we've had a lot of trouble preparing a master plan for that area. I'd like him to comment on when he feels that master plan will be done, and when he expects public display of that plan, and that they keep in mind in the department that a park such as that is not just for the planners or for people who like to backpack. It is a park for all people — for families, where one can take his family and play horseshoes, baseball, or whatever they want — and not a park where you have large areas blocked off and you only get access by foot or through certain paths and stuff like that.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

In finishing, I'd like to ask the minister to comment on the fire risk in the park — I assume that even this early in the year, the fire risk will be high — if he anticipates certain areas having to be blocked off, maybe even all year, because of fire risk, and the steps his department will be taking to see that people are not in the areas where fire could be a high risk.

Thank you.

MR. ISLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm afraid I'm going to continue to heap the bouquets. I was very pleased to hear the minister mention the Cold Lake ski hill project and his excitement with it. As I mentioned in my budget speech the other night, I think it's the most exciting thing that's been happening, or is about to happen, in northeastern Alberta. I would like to compliment the minister on his approachability, responsiveness, and decisiveness. The proposal put forward by Canadian Forces Base, Cold Lake, for the ski hill joint concept was presented to me this winter on February 19. I presented it to the hon. minister on February 26. Within six weeks a decision had been made to proceed, and discussions were going on between members of the Recreation and Parks Department and the people from CFB, Cold Lake. To me, that is a very decisive, responsive action. I'm looking forward to the same type of falling together on a golf club in the Cold Lake park area, also done in co-operation with community groups and, hopefully, operated by them.

On behalf of the people of Bonnyville constituency, I would like to compliment the minister further on the increased development of the Lund's Point/Cold Lake provincial park. I think we're seeing a recognition of something the local people have known for some time, that there is tremendous recreational, tourism potential in the lakeland. I was also pleased to see another group recognize that fact this winter, the Northern Alberta Development Council, which I understand has presented a recommendation for consideration of a major park in the lakeland area. I invite any of you who don't know the lakeland to come out and take a look. There are some tremendously beautiful lakes scattered throughout the area that could be put together into a tremendous lake-land park.

My only question to the minister would be, what consideration today has been given to the recommendation of the Northern Alberta Development Council?

Thank you very much.

MRS. CRIPPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, like my colleagues, wish to compliment the minister on the progressive moves he's made in the department. He may not be able to handle all these bouquets.

The increased operating funds will be extremely useful especially, I think, to rural communities. You'll note that last year in the budget debate on recreation I made the comment that there was a definite need for this. I'm pleased to note in the Budget Address the new provincial park on Buck Lake at Calhoun Bay. I expect that budget to be included in Vote 3, Mr. Chairman. Would the minister indicate what funds are available and what planning will take place this year, and also give me an assurance that there will be some public input to this planning?

The Brazeau dam area is a beautiful site just waiting to be recognized, Mr. Minister. I hope the minister will consider the Brazeau-Rocky-Nordeg-Kootenay Plains area as a potential second Kananaskis. It's also in close proximity to Edmonton, and I encourage Edmonton MLAs to drive out to the Brazeau area and have a first-hand look at the potential out there. I will endeavor through another budget to have a through road constructed between the Lodgepole area and the trunk road, but that's another debate. I hope the minister will have a chance this summer maybe, to go out and have a first-hand look at the potential of that area.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of comments. I hope the minister is not allergic to flowers. He seems to be getting a lot this afternoon.

As much as I might like to be slightly critical, I'm certainly in no position to be, since the 1983 summer games have been awarded to Mountain View and the other communities, and I have a good portion of Mountain View in my constituency. Certainly the very least I could do would be to say to the minister that the Three Hills constituency, those people who are going to be part of those games, are indeed pleased.

I would offer some comments in support of the small parks and help that a lot of the smaller communities are getting across the province. Listening to the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn talking about percentages of budget and so on has certainly brought it to mind. One of the problems that certainly some of the smaller jurisdictions have had is that they've been trying to maintain parks that have ostensibly been used by people coming out of the large urban areas. I don't know how we ever

balance that situation. We certainly have in Mountain View and in some small parks around the Three Hills constituency that are just a few acres in size, maybe 18 feet of water in a small coulee that's been banked up and stocked with fish, supported by a very, very small constituency, maybe 50 farmers, and you can't find it on a weekend — indeed sometimes during the week — for the urban dwellers who are out in our area. I guess that kind of balance, that I know the minister strives very hard to maintain — I have constituents say to me, what are we receiving when, for instance, Calgary may be getting substantial help with a coliseum? I don't know that I want to get into the counting of dollars or percentages, because certainly in any given year there may appear to be some imbalance. I say to my constituents that I have complete confidence in our Minister of Recreation and Parks, and I know that in the course of time those kinds of balances will be maintained. Certainly if we get into counting dollars, I don't want my communities to put up fences around our small parks and say, we don't want people from Calgary to come out. I think we have to share and share alike.

Getting back to the summer games, I say to the minister that my constituents are most pleased. The minister has certainly contributed to the programs in our constituency that lend some assistance across the province to the decentralization policy we're pursuing.

Thank you.

MR. OMAN: First I would like to commend the minister in several areas, and then I have some questions I would like to pose to him. On behalf of the city of Calgary, I would like to thank the minister in a couple of areas, certainly the MCR grants that have been forthcoming in so many areas, that have provided fine facilities. Over the past years, the city of Calgary has chosen to use those grants largely for community facilities — rinks, halls, and so on — rather than building one large facility which would take up the bulk of the available funds. That's not to say there isn't need; there is. I believe there is a line-up for funds in those areas. Even though those funds were advanced for the next four years, I think we would appreciate the minister's taking another look at that, as the Member for Forest Lawn mentioned.

I would also like to commend the minister because he has given good support over the last couple of years to Calgary's Olympic bid efforts. That's going to come to a head in a matter of just six months or less, when the decision will be made to award the games to one of three cities: Falun, Sweden; Cortina, Italy; or Calgary. At this point we don't feel we've got the inside track, but our committee in Calgary has been doing a very good job and has laid a good foundation. So we're certainly feeling that the chances are good. I think the government has supported the pre-bid to the tune of about \$250,000. Of course if we're successful, in the years to come we'll be very involved in developing sports facilities, not just for Calgary; many of them will go out into the mountain areas and will serve southern Alberta largely.

Mr. Chairman, some three months ago the Calgary caucus met with a group of people from various ski clubs in the city. They had some complaints with regard to ski facilities in the province of Alberta. Specifically they were concerned that ski excursion trips could easily be secured for places in Montana and Colorado, but that we didn't really have the kind of facilities in Alberta that would attract people from either the local area — of course the grass is always greener; we recognize that. But specifically,

the line-ups in the ski facilities in the Banff area were of concern. They asked whether or not the government had any plans to develop more ski facilities out of the federal parks, as well as overnight facilities so they're a sort of complete unit. I wonder if the minister would have any comments in those areas.

Thank you.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Chairman, I also would like to express my appreciation to the minister for his openness and his willingness to come out to various constituencies to meet with community groups, to listen to the concerns first-hand. It certainly means a lot to those of us who represent various regions throughout this province, to know we have that co-operation and that the minister will take the extra time that is necessary for openness.

First I'd like to make some comments on the major recreation facilities grant. In 1974 — I believe that's when the program was announced — it was indeed a most generous program. I remember the enthusiasm at the time, hearing the announcement of the \$100 per capita and how important that was to the communities. In the city in which I live, this grant has contributed to the development of major projects such as a swimming pool and an arena, to mention only a few. But I would like to express the concern, which perhaps has been expressed by others, but also emphasize what I feel is a dilemma for the smaller communities. The Member for Calgary Forest Lawn mentioned that he was concerned about the Edmonton and Calgary regions, so I will limit myself to the Edmonton region outside the city of Edmonton.

In 1974 some of the small communities experienced some growth, but not to the same extent they have, the cumulative figure in 1981. When you apply those 1974 dollars, \$100 per capita, to the capital and operating costs we're facing seven years down the road, there's no doubt that that inflationary effect has had just a tremendous impact on what those communities can supply.

At the same time, there has been tremendous growth in the expectations of people. Whether that's right or not, I think we have to face the fact that values have changed. I would like to suggest that recreation cannot be looked at just as a fitness program or as a recreation program, but should be looked at further as a preventive program. When you put recreation together with other government services that are provided — to use an example, if you have a junior hockey team, it's very difficult to say that that is only recreation. If those youngsters were not participating in the recreation program, they might be involved in other activities that weren't so productive.

So I think we must look at recreation in a much broader context. I certainly would support the minister, and I know he is very sympathetic to reviewing the total grants made available. The small communities, the growth areas in particular where many people have come to Alberta from other parts of the province, expect to have facilities that meet a certain expectation, and we must very seriously consider the development of a new program that will try to assist these areas in developing at least some level of service that would provide a degree of equality across the province.

I would also like to mention a concern I have, related to the regional parks program developed last year. I certainly agree that not every region can have approval of a park in the first year of the program. But I would like to say that within this Edmonton region, that was identified earlier, I think there is a great need for a regional park to serve the people of the city of Edmonton and

surrounding area, perhaps families in lower economic categories who do not have the economic capability to travel to the mountains or to other parts of the province on the weekend. I think we would serve these people not just through a Capital City, where they perhaps would not feel safe canoeing or certainly should not be swimming, but to look at an alternative within this region that has easy access.

I suggest several areas that I would like to have the minister review. There have been extensive studies. One would be the Big Lake area, which is very close to the cities of Edmonton and St. Albert. It's an area that I realize is rather sensitive environmentally; it is a staging area for migratory birds. But if there is a way of developing this area for canoeing and for use by families that could enjoy outdoor environment without having to travel great distances, I think this would serve the entire region very well.

I would also like to say that I commend the minister and his programs in the regional parks. I hope the \$100,000 programs that were announced will continue, and that there will certainly be consideration of more within this Edmonton region. I have provided the minister with my recommendations on previous occasions, and I do feel this will contribute not just to the constituency I represent but to people living throughout the region.

I'd like to conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying that I did not have the pleasure of viewing the summer games film shown last night, but I understand it covered a fair amount of St. Albert footage. I would say that those games were an extremely important function for the entire community. It did just an enormous amount in developing community spirit, having many people participate to put on a rather large program, and it really paid off in spades in many, many ways. I feel that this program will serve many communities, and I know it will be nothing but a positive program for all Albertans involved in it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. C. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To the minister: I'd like to add my bouquet to the many things that have been said here this afternoon and to thank the minister for the service he's done for the people in my constituency by electing to establish a provincial park at the east end of my constituency in the Laurier, Ross, and Whitney Lake area. I was a newcomer to Elk Point in 1971, and at that time the erosion of the fine sands that was taking place, and the terrain that was being destroyed by the use were major concerns of the people. That erosion and destruction have become more of a problem over the past few years, and I'm sure the Member for Clover Bar would agree that it's timely, and passed time, that this park be developed.

Last year we had a concerned citizens' group from Elk Point established to deal with the overcrowding and problems of the area. I feel that the planning that's gone into effect and the use of public input will be very helpful in the creation of this park. At the present time we have concerns of cottage owners presently established on land, leased from the county of St. Paul, that will eventually be taken over by the government to create this park. They have some major concerns of where they will be going and what kind of deal they'll be given.

I'd like to thank the minister and also my colleague

from Vegreville for the assistance he has given me in getting another facility for my area. I am a little bit flabbergasted by the announcement the member made for me, and appreciate his assistance in our area.

With the development and growth of our communities throughout the constituency, there's more and more pressure being made on the MCR grant program. The county of St. Paul is allocated a certain amount of funds and has been trying to allocate this throughout the constituency, to Mallaig, Ashmont, Heinsburg, and other communities. Those communities have also developed expectations that are, I think, beyond the scope of the program. Right now I have the village of Ashmont asking for money to construct an arena. I have Mallaig asking for an arena. And of course the moneys that are available are nowhere in the area required for that scope of development. So I'd ask the minister if there's any possibility that we may be able to saddle some of the money coming out of the major lottery funds to help give more recreation facilities in rural Alberta.

Thank you.

DR. BUCK: How about an arena for Owlseye?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, rather than ask the minister to make any response or comments now, in light of the hour I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions and reports as follows:

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982, sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the Department of Culture for the purposes indicated: \$2,257,003 for departmental support services, \$19,065,968 for cultural development, \$11,240,087 for historical resources development, \$4,920,869 for international assistance, \$1,135,686 for 75th Anniversary celebrations.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow evening we will continue with the estimates of the Department of Recreation and Parks and, if there's time, follow that with the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:29 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]