

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: Thursday, April 26, 1990 8:00 p.m.

Date: 90/04/26

[The Committee of Supply met at 8 p.m.]

head: **Committee of Supply**

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee will please come to order. It is now 8 p.m.

head: **Main Estimates 1990-91**

Recreation and Parks

MR. CHAIRMAN: These estimates are to be found commencing at page 287 of the big book, with the details in the element book at page 127. I would invite the Minister of Recreation and Parks to introduce his estimates.

DR. WEST: Thank you. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we are about to look at the estimates of one of the best divisions and departments in government. We're a positive department. We are involved in just about every aspect of Albertans' lives through Recreation and Parks. I appreciate the opportunity tonight to present the 1990-91 budget estimates for Alberta Recreation and Parks, and I'd like to take a few minutes of your time now to provide an overview of significant components of my budget and how adjustments have been made to better support overall government priorities and directions.

In her throne speech the Hon. Helen Hunley referred to the stewardship role of the government in five priority areas, those being fiscal responsibility, economic opportunity, environmental protection, people's needs, and Alberta's role in national and international relations. My department's programs and service delivery have been reviewed in detail and have been modified to respond to the important initiatives of this government.

I might say before I start in on those five areas that in the last year my department has worked tremendously hard. There have been a lot of trials and tribulations as we have had to apply ourselves deeply to fiscal management and to the responsibility we have to Albertans, and I want to personally thank every member of my staff and department who have given a lot of extra effort in the last year.

The first priority as pointed out by Her Honour: fiscal responsibility. The 1989-90 budget was decreased for my department some \$6.3 million, or 6.3 percent, in addition to \$1.9 million in salary increases being absorbed. The 1990-91 budget will see a further budget decrease of \$4 million, or 4.3 percent of my total budget, plus an estimated \$1 million of salary increases being absorbed. Over the course of two fiscal years we have managed to contribute \$10.3 million to the reduction of the provincial deficit, which represents a 10.4 percent cut to my budget. Also in that estimated salary increases of \$2.9 million, nearly \$3 million, and an overall inflation absorption of \$2.5 million have been absorbed and reallocated in resources and dollars throughout this province.

I would like to say also that Kananaskis Country, which is a separate entity under managing director Mr. Ed Marshall, has also contributed in a very meaningful way to this fiscal plan: the first time they have seen a pullback of 3.4 percent, or some

\$474,000. This is their 11th year. They're going into the 12th actual operating year, and they're doing an excellent job out there in providing services to this province and to the people of Alberta. That is a world heritage site, Kananaskis Country, and I'm sure each and every one of you will take an opportunity to visit it.

Fiscal management. Short-term reductions help, but developing strategies which will have a longer term effect on expenditure control is important in terms of sustaining a balanced budget. Some of the cost-saving initiatives include revamping our building standards in park systems, which could achieve, if you can believe it, up to 50 percent cost reductions. I have seen outdoor biffies, if you want to call them that, vault toilets. We have reworked it with a committee in our department and have taken the cost of these, that averaged between \$24,000 and the highest I got was \$45,000, and we can now build them for \$12,000 to \$15,000 and not compromise quality.

MR. MITCHELL: What about the guy that built them for \$45,000 in the first place? Where is he?

DR. WEST: You have to remember that that one style I saw at \$45,000 had no running water or power, so that's a pretty powerful biffy.

In addition, increasing privatization of specialized services and operations where economic gains can be achieved and decentralizing service delivery should result in both short- and long-term savings, and they also support sustained regional economic growth.

The challenge we have in government in the '90s and today is to deliver our programs and services in accordance with the public agenda and the public resources and their ability to pay, or more simply put: we keep a balanced budget without going after any more of people's moneys through their T-4 slips. Reorganization of Parks and Recreation does exactly that, as many other departments are doing, and they do it in four areas: they deliver efficient and effective services on a continued basis where they are required and located in the province of Alberta where the actual job is going to be done; they keep, as I said, a sustained, balanced regional economic growth; they look at fiscal management and yet good services and new developments for the people of Alberta with the same dollars or less; and they look at the protection of our natural resources, the environment, and the heritage of this province.

Talking about that sustained economic growth, we come to the second area Her Honour mentioned: economic opportunity in the province. Thirty-two million dollars in grants will be provided to municipalities and recreation and sport associations and groups throughout Alberta to further develop new facilities, programs, participation levels, and for operational support for this fiscal year. There are 107 associations of recreation and sport bodies in this province, and these grants flow through to help them facilitate some 700,000 volunteers that work throughout this province. This spending generates an approximate increase in provincial household income of \$30 million in this province and a \$45 million impact on the provincial gross domestic product. Roughly 1,000 person-years of employment will be created through direct and indirect spending and spin-offs, particularly in the areas of community facility development and operations. This helps further support sustained regional economic growth.

Seven million dollars will be expended in-house over the next eight years on the development of Lakeland provincial park and

recreation area in the Lac La Biche area, with tremendous support from the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche. This investment by my department is estimated to generate in excess of 200 person-years of employment through design and construction phases and should contribute roughly \$4.1 million to the provincial household income and \$7.1 million to provincial gross domestic product. The moneys to build this park will be worked out inside the department over the next eight years. In the budget this year \$350,000 has been achieved through reorganization and cost efficient methods that we've developed. So anybody that says that this park is coming from new moneys hasn't seen the reorganization of our provincial parks program.

Privatization of recreation and parks facilities and operations, where feasible, will continue. Discussions are under way at this point in time relevant to the operation of the Canmore Nordic Centre and the Blue Lake Centre by private interests. Annual cost savings over the next several years of between \$500,000 and a million dollars are possible if negotiations prove successful. I am preparing a preliminary privatization policy for review and comments, and I'm hoping this will provide a sound basis for my department to move more actively in pursuing privatization initiatives, particularly in the area of parks, campgrounds, and general service provisions. Parks presently under consideration include Kinbrook Island, Thunder Lake, and Long Lake. Quality will not be compromised, but significant long-term cost savings to government can be achieved through partnership approaches with the private sector.

Overall recreation and leisure expenditures in this province are estimated to exceed \$6 billion, of which nearly three-quarters represents family expenditures in this province. You talk about economic development in this province. If you look, for example, at our games, we put on our Seniors Games, Masters Games, Winter Games, and Summer Games in this province along with a tremendous amount of tournaments and interaction between communities through sports groups. As I said, some 700,000 volunteers interlink not only with Recreation and Parks but with health care and what have you. But the sustained regional growth developed by those games of people moving back and across in this province you can't measure. It is one of the greatest things I've ever seen. They come into communities, they rent motels, they go to service stations, and they have their meals. They're constantly on the move in this province.

At the present time I'd like the pages to hand out a list of the sporting events and these games that will take place over the next few years to give you the dates, and I hope you will all join with me as I travel across this province to visit these various games. In August in Hinton we have the Seniors Games. I'm sure they're getting very excited out there as that approaches. Of course, Lethbridge this year has the Masters Games, which is the first-ever games where those between 18 and 54 can show their skills at a formal games.

The third area that Her Honour spoke of was environmental protection. I mentioned Kananaskis Country earlier. If you want to see environmental protection, go to Kananaskis Country as it relates with recreational opportunities. It's a beautiful piece of our landscape, some 1,640 square miles or over a million acres of some of the best sights in the world. It has 80 recreational areas and three provincial parks within it, and it will host – I'm sure the Member for Banff-Cochrane is very proud of this fact – the 1993 Canadian Scout jamboree in which we'll have some 10,000 visitors.

Environmental protection will be a critical issue of this decade, and my department is in a position to dovetail in on what the Minister of the Environment said the other night.

MR. DINNING: What did he say?

DR. WEST: He said that some nine departments will have to join together – not including Education – to try and bring forth the expectations of this world and this country as it relates to our protection of our environment. The establishment of Lakeland provincial park and recreation area reinforces my department's commitment to protect and conserve Alberta's natural heritage while providing further recreation and appreciation opportunities for Albertans. This almost 145,000-acre tract of land in northeastern Alberta encompasses and will contribute to increased representation of seven of the 10 different types of natural history themes with the mixed wood boreal forest biogeographical subregion in the province. That is significant when we hear the great concern with endangered spaces. Lakeland provincial park will contribute, as I said, to almost 10 different types of natural history themes, and those that said we only had two represented in this province will be surprised when we demonstrate some 14 of the 17 subregions well protected.

The establishment of more ecological reserves continues to be an important priority for my department. To date Alberta has 11 ecological reserves with a total land area of 52,000 acres. Consider that in 1981 we didn't even have an ecological reserve program in this province, and since then we now stand number three in Canada for the total number of acres under environmental protection and ecological programs, and we stand number one in Canada as far as the protected area where we don't allow mining, logging, and hunting. Number one in Canada: we have the most protected lands in that category. These preservation initiatives rank Alberta third in Canada, as I've said before, and only in a mere nine years. The Advisory Committee on Wilderness Areas and Ecological Reserves has been appointed for three more years, and they have made recommendations in their 1989 annual report that Rumsey candidate ecological reserve be established, and further recommendations can be expected for Plateau Mountain and Ross Lake candidate ecological reserves. These three reserves will contribute another 27,000 acres to the ecological reserve program in Alberta. Rumsey is situated in the Stettler constituency, and it represents some 8,000 acres of some of the last pristine aspen parkland in the world.

MR. MITCHELL: Is Buffalo Lake in it?

MRS. McCLELLAN: You need a geography lesson, Grant. You'd better get out of the city.

DR. WEST: I hear a buffalo.

While the further establishment of ecological reserves is becoming a topic of increasing interest, we must be careful about setting arbitrary targets for land area designations. The protection and quality management of the right resource is more important to the success of the overall program than in reserving a set percentage of our total land base in this province. If you want to get into figures at the present time, this province has 164 million acres, and if you take the total number of acres that are under protective notation or legislation, there are roughly 24

million acres in that capacity at the present time. We can make a play – the Brundtland report, or Our Common Future, and the World Wildlife Fund want 12 percent. I don't know that that target may be enough. All I know is you can't play on figures, because our protective notation at the present time plus legislation with the federal parks system – and they're part of Alberta – has roughly 14 and a half percent already. I don't think that's satisfactory, yet the World Wildlife Fund says 12. So you can see what happens to figures when you get into that crunching business.

The fourth area Her Honour talked about was people needs. Promoting healthy and productive life-styles for Albertans is a priority goal for this government. My department influences life-style development through the provision of recreation facilities and opportunities throughout this province, support for leisure education skills and development programs, and support for sport recreation and athletic development.

As I said before, this week just sums up – and I'm going to a sport recognition banquet tomorrow night in Red Deer – that we have tremendous, I guess, participation in this province, that isn't in any other province, called volunteerism. We had it on the floor today. But there are some 700,000 to 850,000 volunteers in the province of Alberta, and they just do a tremendous job. I thank them because in this department they are probably 90 percent drivers of what we do. We only facilitate as government. Albertans do the real job out there in our sport and recreation field.

[Mr. Moore in the Chair]

Substantial start-up work on phase two of the urban parks program will be seen in 1990-91, which will result in the development of park areas within or very close to approximately nine additional cities throughout this province bringing the total number of urban park developments to 14 cities. Of the \$82 million in the heritage fund \$3 million will be spent this year, and I think some of the resources have already started to flow through. I know that Sherwood Park has started on theirs, and there are other cities already beginning and have their master plans in place. We look forward to some very innovative and good parks throughout this province. Just under \$3 million will also be distributed this year on the municipal recreation/tourism areas to some 43 constituencies throughout this province in rural Alberta. I clarify that 'cause last year in the estimates there was confusion in the cities, why they weren't getting the MRTAs, but it's to 43 constituencies, that program, on rural-based allocation.

The operating funds from my budget this year for urban parks is \$3.4 million, including phase one, and \$3.6 million for MRTA, or municipal recreation/tourism areas. That is \$7 million in operating funds to ensure maximum use and enjoyment of these facilities in the future. In addition, to the city of Edmonton, the Capital City Park receives out of this budget another \$2.2 million of operating funding.

Preliminary planning and design for Lakeland will be initiated soon with input from the citizens of the province, and we will be holding public hearings in the north so all interested groups can come forth and give their input to the development of this park. This project will represent a much needed and readily accessible recreational resource for Albertans in the northern part. The direct line of people that will be involved is about 11 million people in northern Alberta for this fine recreation and conservation area.

A review of grant programs will be undertaken to determine if financial resources are being directed to the areas of greatest need and benefit. Many of our grants to those 107 recreation and sporting groups have, to a large degree, accomplished their goals, but programs may need to be adjusted to respond to the new challenges of the '90s and where the best direction is going as far as recreation and sports. Administrative procedures are also being examined to ensure that our sport and recreation supporters and volunteers are not being unnecessarily burdened by red tape in this government. That is something I am really going to come down hard on, and I hope the department works hard at getting rid of the red tape in government that complicates our volunteers in their application of programs.

Regionalization of many of our parks and recreation services will enable my department to better respond to the needs of people who use our facilities and services throughout the province. Working more closely with communities and local interest groups will result in better programs. Decentralization of services and putting the people out where the action is is going to be a direction we take in the future. Providing facilities for recreation and personnel development is important, but encouraging Albertans to utilize these facilities as a means of improving their health and overall personal well-being is just as important. My department undertakes a number of leisure, education, and fitness related programs which include funding eight Be Fit for Life centres throughout the province. Encouraging healthy life-styles is a priority. These eight centres are located at the University of Alberta, Medicine Hat community college, Lethbridge Community College, Lakeland Community College, Mount Royal College, Grande Prairie community college, Red Deer community college, and Keyano College in Fort McMurray.

The fifth area that Her Honour talked about was national/international relationships. National/international relations in the area of sport and recreation are very much a part of this department's business. I believe some of the strides we are making will help Alberta's economic future and the co-operation between many countries and this province and this country. I just recently came back from the Soviet Union on our first-ever sports exchange mission. At that time we signed an agreement, and we'll see the return of athletes and coaches and expertise from the Soviet Union to use our Canmore Nordic Centre and much of our post-Olympic legacies in Calgary.

Before I go any further, one thing I noticed when I was there and appreciated was the tremendous freedom we have in this country. Communism does not work.

AN HON. MEMBER: Socialism doesn't either.

DR. WEST: Communism – socialism – removes freedoms in the end. It's written down as should work the best system, but capitalism works better, under a democracy.

I'm going to relate back, take a little break here. Those that preach socialism and intervention in every piece of life in this province should heed the words many years ago of a person called Abraham Lincoln. He sets it just about right. If you don't believe these words, then go to Russia and see what happens when you don't. Abraham Lincoln said:

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. You cannot build

character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could do for themselves.

MR. MITCHELL: What's this got to do with parks?

DR. WEST: Somebody said: what's this got to do with Recreation and Parks? We carry on an international sports exchange. We just started one with a country that wants to achieve what was just said in here, because they've had enough of communism and socialism, where the government does everything for everybody.

We also have continued relationships with Japan and Korea. One significant thing this year is that it's the 10th anniversary of our twinning with Hokkaido. We have a sports exchange in this department, along with many other departments that have other exchanges, but they will be bringing, believe it or not, over 600 individuals here to show their appreciation for what Alberta has done in their country in sharing our expertise and our friendship with them. That's at their expense they're coming. They're planning it in September. I think we'll all have to get a good welcoming committee for them.

The other areas of national events that we take place in are, of course, our games throughout Canada with the other provinces. In 1995 we will see Alberta play host to the Canada Winter Games. Those bids just went out to the cities in this province. We have also been asked to host the Arctic Winter Games in 1994. For any of you who can get to Manitoba this year, the Western Canada Summer Games are in Winnipeg, and we will have the largest contingent of Alberta athletes going to those games: 700 athletes will travel to Winnipeg this summer.

On a national level – the Hon. Norm Weiss is not here tonight, but I wanted to thank the hon. Member for Fort McMurray for the work he and the department did for the 1988 Olympics in this province, because when I was in Russia on that exchange, they were still talking about the tremendous Olympics in 1988 in Calgary and the facilities. In Russia they couldn't get over the attitude of the people and the way the volunteers came out in Calgary. They were talking about that in this exchange.

AN HON. MEMBER: Only in Calgary.

DR. WEST: Only in Calgary.

In closing, I would like to state that my department, through this budget, 1990-91, is strongly supporting the priorities and directions of this government in a manner which demonstrates good fiscal responsibility and management. Let me reiterate the primary objectives of that: number one, to move service delivery closer to the people who use our facilities and services; number two, to improve operational efficiencies through the elimination of duplication of effort and increased private-sector partnerships; number three, to streamline administrative procedures and eliminate unnecessary red tape; number four, to reduce capital costs of facilities through design modifications without unduly compromising quality; and number five, to improve the quality of life for Albertans in the areas of health, environment, and economic opportunity.

I have been able to contribute to the reduction of the provincial deficit while at the same time introducing new programs for the benefit of the people of Alberta. I believe that this responsible type of growth will be the strength of Alberta's future. I ask you to consider the estimates and would be pleased

to respond to any of your comments and questions here tonight.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for West Yellowhead.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's my pleasure to stand up as the critic for Recreation and Parks, although I'm a strong believer in the games and in parks and recreation and an outdoor liver almost all of my life. I have to compliment the minister on the steps he took to trim the deficit and also the steps he took at times to make sure he had good financial restraint. I want to thank the minister and his office for the great support his staff have shown me when I made requests of his department.

But I'm afraid, Mr. Chairman, that the minister deserves a failing grade for the way he's run his department since he became minister a year ago. First of all, the minister fails to grasp that he is responsible not only for providing recreation opportunities but also for the planning and protection of Alberta parks, natural areas, and ecological reserves. [interjection] That he has not yet proven. Under this minister's tenure, Alberta's natural areas and ecological reserves program is stalled. The professional support for services needed to fulfill the mandate of the provincial parks system is being gutted, and many services previously provided by professionals within the minister's department are in the process of being privatized.

The Official Opposition has received many reports that the morale of the employees within the department is at an all-time low. Many dedicated long-time employees have chosen to quit rather than continue to work under the misguided leadership of this minister. The Official Opposition is not opposed to the need for fiscal restraint or to the centralization of government services per se. However, such changes must be made with full consultation with those affected and be based on a sound objective basis rather than a ministerial whim, as appears to be the case here.

In the throne speech of March 8 this government claimed a newfound concern for protecting Alberta's environment and natural heritage. For protecting Alberta's environment means that this minister, within his government, seems to be flying in the face of the supposed concerns for the environment. From a review of the minister's budget estimates, it is not hard to see what the minister's priorities are and also the reason the minister's priorities fly . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: You're reading.

AN HON. MEMBER: He knows how at least.

MR. DOYLE: I know how.

... fly in the face of the wishes of most Albertans.

In vote 1, Mr. Chairman, Corporate Planning Services is being cut by 25 percent. The minister obviously has no appreciation or understanding of the essential long-term strategic planning these professionals do for our parks and natural areas.

In vote 2, recreation and parks grants to municipalities and community groups are being cut by over 11 percent, which comes on top of a 15 percent cut in last year's budget. The government appears to justify these cuts in recreation program

funding by saying groups can apply for the community facility enhancement program. This wouldn't necessarily be so bad, except for the fact that the community facility enhancement program is not subject to the approval of this Legislature and grant approvals under this so-called government program often appear to be politically motivated.

In vote 3, Provincial Parks, the minister's priorities are clear when you look at the 42.1 percent cut in Program Support for provincial parks. These are the people that ensure . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: You're reading.

MR. DOYLE: You weren't the minister when I was going to school.

These are the people that ensure that the provincial parks system meets the objectives laid out in the Provincial Parks Act, namely the conservation of the ecosystem and the protection of areas of geological, cultural, and scientific interest.

One new initiative the minister has undertaken is the proposed Lakeland provincial park. Even here the minister's track record is not encouraging. No sooner had the announcement been made in the throne speech than the Official Opposition started getting information about surveying contracts for Lakeland not being awarded by public tender in the amount of some \$200,000. Then people from the Cold Lake air base complained that there was no prior consultation with them about the park's location right on the boundary of the Primrose Lake air weapons range. How can the minister justify this?

The minister has referred to the ecological reserves program as a land grab, this despite the fact that there are only 214 square kilometres of land currently protected by the ecological reserves compared to the 170,000 square kilometres that have recently been handed over to forestry and pulp companies. Who is engaged in this land grab? Compared to that, 10,000 square miles of prairie cottonwood river bottomland and the northern caribou range doesn't seem to me like very much to protect. Alberta is now a land of endangered species because it is a land of endangered spaces. In spite of our size of seemingly unlimited wilderness, the wildlands of Alberta are in very real danger of disappearing. They must be protected for future generations, and I see no better way than by establishing more provincial parks. We have to protect them not only for the future of our children but also for Alberta's growing tourism industry, soon to be the largest industry in Alberta with countless thousands of jobs.

Of the 17 biogeographical zones in Alberta, 14 of them have very little protection. Development and jobs are good and needed things, but they cannot be the whole concern or the sum total of our lives. In the riding of West Yellowhead, the riding I represent, the most beautiful in the province, there is great beauty to preserve, more lands, the way our forefathers preserved it for us. Past ministers have done a great job on this, and I think this minister has the foresight that he will establish many more in this province before his tenure is up.

Willmore Wilderness and Switzer park, named after a former minister of this Legislature, are two of these areas that are well protected within my riding. However, Switzer park covers only part of Gregg Lake; it does not cover the northeast part. As recently as last year a local resident went in there and started cutting trees out of the north end of that park. It's not a very large expansion, but I would like to see the minister move toward expanding that park to protect that total lake.

Not everything can be judged by the balance sheets of commerce. We must think about our future generations. Jasper National Park and part of Banff National Park are part of my riding. I'm sure every member of this House will agree that there's no more beautiful place to drive or see than the Icefield park between Jasper and Banff. To further protect Jasper's beauty, the wildlife and the streams, I would ask the minister to establish a peripheral rim of no less than 10 kilometres along the eastern slopes of Jasper park. Also, the Emerson Lakes eskers and hoodoos should be protected by a new provincial park. We must protect our sensitive areas before they're completely decimated by these multinational companies.

It is not only these parks. Others also must be expanded and proclaimed. The city systems have been well funded, and now we must look beyond and use the same foresight that was put into these city parks. If we don't do this, we'll be found unworthy by those who come after us.

I want to talk just a few minutes about the potential development of recreation in the Peace River valley, from the B.C. border to the town of Peace River. This is one of the most beautiful river valleys to be found anywhere. The municipalities along the valley, ID 20, ID 21, the MD of Spirit River, the MD of Fairview, and the municipal district of Peace River along with the town of Peace River have developed some creative and exciting plans for this valley, plans which are sensitive to the environment but would permit people to experience and enjoy this beautiful area. I would like to know the specific plans the minister has for expanding on this development in the year ahead and know exactly what will be happening with the historical site of Dunvegan during the year ahead. The campsite facilities are certainly in inadequate shape, and I would hope the minister of culture will be involved with the Minister of Recreation and Parks to see that the Dunvegan site is repaired.

Mr. Chairman, I haven't had the opportunity to tour Kananaskis. I worked there several years ago building power lines through that country, and I doubt if I would know the area if I went back there today. But I would hope the minister would consider development, perhaps not the same as Kananaskis, in the northeast and northwest of this province and put funding to the northern part of Alberta at least equal to what it has been to the southern part. I do see that Lakeland is going to be a major development and one that will benefit future generations and I'm sure this government and this minister will be very proud of.

However, I have never been to Russia. I do understand that the minister seems to have a habit of touring these socialist countries. There's another one coming up in Cuba right away. Perhaps he could advise us on that after he gets back. I'm sure everybody in this House knows the severity of the ruling that has gone on in Russia over the years, and none of us wants to make any joke of it. I would think, though, that the days of Lincoln . . . Nobody intervened in economic development more than Lincoln did when he freed the slaves, so I don't see how he can feel that anybody but Lincoln has done a better job of taking the poor to hurt the rich.

Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman, I'll be waiting for the response from the minister.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When I began my comments on the estimates of the Minister of the Environ-

ment, I had to ask the question that it was interesting that the Minister of the Environment didn't seem to be doing his own job; the Premier was doing his job. Then the Minister of the Environment was doing the minister of forestry's job, because not the minister of forestry but the Minister of the Environment was to establish whether or not there should be environmental impact assessments on forests. Now, this evening, I hear that the Minister of Recreation and Parks seems to be doing either the Treasurer's job – I hear more about fiscal responsibility and cutting costs, that that is the measure of the effect and achievement of this department, than I heard from the Treasurer himself – or in fact I get the sense that he may be doing the job of the Minister of Agriculture when I hear him talk about huge land grabs that are inherent in initiatives like the Middle Sand Hills ecological reserve. I hear a Minister of Recreation and Parks who simply, in my estimation, is having a very difficult time achieving a focus of his mandate, a focus for what it is he has to do within that park.

I don't want to hear the Minister of Recreation and Parks talking about huge land grabs. He should be out there fighting to establish a program, for example, of ecological reserves and fighting against other people, maybe the Minister of Agriculture, who's concerned about huge land grabs, and the Minister of Forestry, who's concerned about huge grabs. But the last guy in this House who has to be concerned about that with respect to parks is this minister. He can pay lip service to 14 percent of the province or 11 percent of the province or 20 percent of the province, but in fact his opening comments and certain things he said throughout his remarks are very, very telling.

When I see this minister get impassioned, it isn't about things that might be related to his department. It is about things like socialism in communist countries or some right-wing fanatical philosophy that somehow he has brought to bear. What I want to see, what we should see from this minister in opening remarks and remarks like these, is a sense of vision about where parks, ecological reserves, natural zones in this province fit into the quality of life of Albertans, fit into Albertans' very, very important relationship to the outdoors, to wildlands, to their mountains and their Eastern Slopes and their rivers. Instead what I see is some guy who must have a degree in accounting and wants to emphasize that and brag about that, a minister who is more concerned about the commercial development of land in this province than about the preservation of land in this province, which is exactly and precisely what his mandate should be. I'm not saying I don't like this minister; I think he's a nice guy. But I am saying that somebody needs to give him some direction about what in fact his job is.

Endangered spaces. Not one mention, if I'm not mistaken, from this minister about the internationally established Endangered Spaces program.

AN HON. MEMBER: Spaces or species?

MR. MITCHELL: People will joke about endangered species. You know, there is a fundamental relationship between endangered species and endangered spaces. In fact, the premise upon which the Endangered Spaces program is based is that if you don't protect their habitat, species will not survive. In fact, that's why we should be emphasizing – not just paying lip service to but emphasizing and aggressively emphasizing – the Endangered Spaces program.

When I look around the world and see countries that don't have the luxury, do not have the privilege, do not have the

opportunity any longer to reclaim the spaces we still have as a God-given gift to us, that we have yet to ruin – and believe me, it seems at times these people, this government, are intent upon doing that – I become extremely concerned. We have an opportunity to contribute to this program in Alberta on behalf of Albertans to the world in a way that very few other parts of the world have. If we had a minister . . . And I want to hear this minister talk about the beauty of this province and how he is driven to preserve the beauty of this province, how he understands the relationship of Albertans to their outdoors, how he understands the importance of establishing and preserving ecological reserves, not that they are land grabs but in fact that under the Endangered Spaces program ecological reserves play a very, very important role in, one, preserving our natural history and, two, providing us with the vehicles for understanding and preserving very, very sensitive ecosystems that may be critical to the livelihood of species on this earth in the future. I want to hear some arguments about that, some emotion and some passion about that. We simply do not.

Instead, we see a freeze on ecological reserves. The minister stood up several months ago, made a statement, said we have to have a freeze on ecological reserves. Of course, he didn't say let's freeze forestry management areas, let's freeze logging contracts, let's freeze development permits, let's freeze anything commercial. No. He said, "Let all those things go ahead, but let's freeze ecological reserves." He said "a massive land grab." One of these ecological reserves amounts to 2,000 hectares. Well, I'll tell you, I'd love to see where one ecological reserve in this province amounts to 2,000 hectares. I'll list the number of square kilometres, the amount of area, a negligible amount of area that in fact is put over to reserves: Kennedy Coulee, 10.68 square kilometres; Hand Hills, 22.29 square kilometres; Wainwright Dunes, 28; Silver Valley, 18; Marshybank, 8.3; Goose Mountain, 12; and I can go on. These add to 289.61 square kilometres. These are the 11 established ecological reserves. Compare that to 69,000 square kilometres put over to the forestry management agreement for the Al-Pac project. This is negligible. In the broader sense of land use planning in this province, this is negligible. Instead of saying maybe we should find a way to make sure these are big enough, the minister happily says we're going to cut back some of the ones we're even planning. Well, to this point probably three of the 11 ecological reserves in this province are large enough to be self-sustaining, large enough to preserve what should be preserved under the Endangered Spaces program.

Middle Sand Hills ecological reserve has been put on hold because it takes a tremendous amount of area. I wonder whether the minister could indicate to us why he believes it takes such a great deal of area. One theory is that it runs counter to a proposal to build an irrigation dam on the South Saskatchewan River, a dam for which the MLA for that area apparently lobbied extremely hard. I wonder whether the minister could indicate what his motivation is for saying that that area is too large. I believe very strongly that this Endangered Spaces program is an extremely important component of environmental policy, and I believe it is a relatively easy thing for this province to achieve. Yes, some progress has been made since 1981, but we have no indication of whether the full 17 ecological reserves will be established and will be established large enough, of adequate size, by the year 2000. I would like the minister to confirm and to commit here this evening that that in fact will be the case, that not only will they be established by the year 2000 but they will be of sufficient size to ensure they

are self-sustaining and will not be overwhelmed by encroachment of commercial enterprise, the encroachment of agricultural enterprise and so on.

The minister mentioned the Brundtland commission's objective of 12 percent of our province being set aside, all jurisdictions being set aside, by the year 2000. He argues that 14 percent is set aside. I would ask that he give us a clear indication of where that 14 percent is, because the statistics we've been able to muster indicate that about 10.86 percent of the province has been set aside and only that. But even that is a very misleading statistic, because, one, the bulk of it is in national parks, it has very little to do with any initiative by this province; and two, much of what has been set aside is drawn into question because of management practices. I'll give you an example: the White Goat protection zone. It's been said it's a protection zone, and then we turn around and find they're allowing the mining of glacial ice because yuppies like to drop it in their glasses. Of what possible credibility is that designation? Could the minister please establish for us, one, the area and, two, the quality of the administration of whatever designation that is applied to that given area?

The Canadian Heritage Rivers program. The government's reaction to that is a tremendous disappointment to many Albertans. The Canadian Heritage Rivers System program is a program that was endorsed and committed to by this government, the previous Minister of the Environment, in 1987.

DR. WEST: Mr. Chairman, the Canadian Heritage Rivers System is being worked on through the Department of the Environment. It's not that I mind you're talking about it here tonight, but these are the estimates of Recreation and Parks.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm shocked that the minister isn't interested in this program. It is consistent with the ecological reserves program, and I would simply like to mention it briefly to bring his attention to it and how it fits into the broader initiative of preserving our natural resources, and I mean natural resources in a sense that hasn't generally been used in this province. The Heritage Rivers System: we're not getting satisfaction from the Minister of the Environment. I raise it because I would like this minister to begin to at least put some pressure on the Minister of the Environment to do something about it. It is unacceptable that we haven't designated rivers under that system, and I would ask that this minister do what he can to see that that in fact occurs.

As we said, the minister carried on about fiscal responsibility, and it seems he's proud about the fact that he's been able to control expenses within his department. Certainly in a general sense that's to be encouraged. But I see that there are some inconsistencies in his version of fiscal responsibility. On the one hand, he cuts his department in certain respects; on the other hand, the Alberta Sport Council, which comes under his jurisdiction, has an interesting history of financial allocation from the Western Canada Lottery Corporation. In 1988 the Alberta Sport Council received \$6.69 million from the Western Canada Lottery Corporation. At the end of that year they showed an unexpended funds total of \$5 million, so they still had \$5 million left over. Undaunted, this government forged ahead and increased the amount of money they were given by the Western Canada Lottery Corporation to \$9 million, and at the end of that year they were left with \$6.8 million. Considering the amount of money that's been cut from, for example, program support in his department through, we presume, decentralization, how is it

that the minister can justify that kind of cut when there are these kinds of unexpended funds? Could he, for example, get this group to perhaps fund some of the things that should be done within his department, which it appears may well be lacking or failing to be funded because of his obsession or enthusiasm for cutting?

Decentralization was mentioned earlier. It seems that may have been initiated to cut costs. I think it has implications that have not been fully explained or understood by this minister. It may well erode, and I would ask how he could explain that it doesn't erode the ability of his department to undertake programs like the ecological reserves program, to analyze and assess and ensure that those are not only established properly but administered properly.

I'm interested in the revenues the department receives and whether the minister could indicate to us what those are from their various parks operations. Specifically, I would be very interested in knowing what revenues come from Kananaskis park. We've been unable to determine that. I would like to see how they compare with the \$13 million annual budget of the Kananaskis park. And specifically within the Kananaskis park, I would like to know what revenues the government of Alberta receives from the operation of the golf course.

I, too, am concerned about the shift from CRC grants to CFEP grants. I believe the result is probably about the same – that is, the result in terms of what's done within communities with that money – but I am concerned that in the former case the Legislature was able to review the allocation of those funds and in the latter case, of course, they're not. It's hard to justify, it seems to me, that that kind of money and those amounts should be outside the purview of this Legislature. They are moneys that are as public as any revenue raised by the government of Alberta, and it is a cynical political motivation, it seems to me, that distinguishes them.

Lakeland park, Kananaskis north: it can be said that that's better than nothing, I guess to the extent that the government, the minister, has determined to take an initiative to begin building such a recreational facility in the northern part of this province. He's to be congratulated, but I believe we must put that in its context. One, it seems to me to be little more than a smoke screen to demonstrate some commitment other than a commitment to forestry development in the north at a critical time when the government was feeling some political heat about that. That is underlined in particular when you see the size of this park, which is minuscule compared to the amount of land that's been set over for forestry management areas. The commitment to this park seems to be more cynical when you consider that the amount of money that will be put into that is minuscule compared to what was put into Kananaskis south, and even that commitment can be drawn into question when I look at the budget and see that only \$350,000 of that \$20 million has been allocated for this year. What in fact does that mean? What that means is public relations. It doesn't mean very much more, it seems to me.

I raised this last year, but I would like to raise it again. I'm concerned about the fate of the Tofield bird sanctuary. I believe that was an excellent project, supported to some extent by the Alberta government, an initiative undertaken by the community itself with the help of a volunteer group. It has had some real promise, it seems to me, for future parks and recreational development in this province. The fact is that its premise has been not commercialization but the promotion of environmental protection as a tourist attraction. Statistics that were given to

me indicate that as many as 1,500 people would come to that area. The Tofield population is only about 1,000 people. It had real promise. Last year the government gave that area \$60,000 to do a study. The fear on the part of some people who have a profound interest in that area was that that would lay the foundation for commercial development. I wonder whether the minister could give us an update on what in fact has come out of that study and what is planned for that area.

The Capital City Park program, to the extent that it's been done in this city, I think has been excellent. It's not finished. It has tremendous promise from the point of view of promoting quality of life and recreational opportunities within this city. It has tremendous promise as being a companion or a supplement to a network of bicycle trails that can have environmental implications as more and more people begin to commute on their bicycles. It is a project that has implications for job creation. Try as I might, I haven't been able to see really firm statistics about the schedule of completion and when we could expect to have the rest of the Capital City Park program in Edmonton completed. I know the minister will say that it's up to the city, but I think it's not quite that simple. I would like to see the schedule of the money that he has committed over the next 10 years, what the specific schedule of that commitment will be.

One piece of legislation that we have on the Order Paper at this time is under the name of my colleague from Calgary-McKnight. It's the Alberta Youth Conservation Corps Act. It is an Act that would establish a youth group – in a sense, an Alberta CUSO – that would allow young people to commit themselves for a year of their lives to conservation programs and the like within our parks system. It would take a relatively nominal amount of money by way of payment to these young people, but it would provide them with outdoors experience as well as an experience in social contribution and, of course, the discipline of some work experience. It would be a program, as I say, that would parallel a CUSO-type program or a Katimavik-type program. It would lend itself to and would also support what this department is attempting to do. I'm wondering whether the minister has reviewed that piece of legislation and, if he has, whether he could give us some comments tonight and, if he hasn't, whether he could see about giving us some comments in the future.

Mr. Chairman, those are my comments on these estimates.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane.

MR. EVANS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm delighted to have an opportunity to rise in the Assembly this evening to speak to the estimates of the Department of Recreation and Parks. Although I could specifically review some of the provisions that are incorporated into the votes, I want to take a somewhat more unique approach to these estimates. It's an approach that I will take through the close association that I've had with this department as a result of my even closer association with Kananaskis Country since its inception in 1977.

I certainly appreciate and applaud this minister for his commitment to fiscal responsibility and his desire to ensure the budgetary items that are approved through his estimates maintain the quality of this department and still recognize the political and fiscal realities that we live with today. However, as the Member for Banff-Cochrane, an area that depends so highly on tourism, I must make mention to the minister that one of the

main reasons for people to come into our great province is because of the recreational opportunities and the parkland opportunities, which people from outside of this province and, indeed, from the province itself recognize. All of these areas, of course, come under the mandate of this minister. I know I've had many conversations with the minister on this very point, but I would just like to reconfirm how important it is that we maintain into the '90s and into the next century the first-class facilities and the first-class attitude that has been the history of this department so that we continue to take advantage of the tourism opportunities that we have in this province. Tourism, which will be the largest industry worldwide by the year 2000, will continue to look very favourably on Alberta if we continue to have that vision and that focus.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, I've had a tremendous opportunity to deal with the department through the fine people at Kananaskis Country, and I'd just like to take a few moments to talk about some of the very special mandates that have been forthcoming from that part of the department, things that perhaps many of members of this Assembly are not as aware of. I'd like to start by talking a little bit about William Watson Lodge, which is located in Peter Lougheed Provincial Park and is a facility for the physically and mentally challenged. It is unique in this country. It is a masterpiece of vision from then Premier Peter Lougheed, continued through the premiership of Premier Getty and through this department. I know how special this area is to the current Minister of Recreation and Parks, and I applaud that commitment to the William Watson Lodge philosophy. I encourage the minister to maintain the high quality of that part of Kananaskis Country.

I note, Mr. Chairman, that the overall budget for Kananaskis Country has been reduced by almost half a million dollars. Again, I have mentioned this before to the minister, and I will state it again this evening. This government took a very courageous step in ensuring that a very special part of Alberta was enshrined for Albertans today and Albertans in the future. There has been much time, effort, blood sweat, and tears put into Kananaskis Country, and we must maintain a level of service and a level of commitment to capital works and replacement of capital works in Kananaskis Country to ensure that that initial investment is maintained and, in fact, enhanced over time. That is not just a commitment to the people in the Calgary area or indeed in southern Alberta. That is a commitment to all of the people of this province. I daresay, Mr. Chairman, that all of the people in this province gain from the experiences of Kananaskis Country.

I'd reflect just for a moment on the Kananaskis Country Interdepartmental Committee, which is comprised of members from all of the various government departments that have any impact on Kananaskis Country and has served as a real model for the various interactions between government departments. It will serve as a wonderful model for Lakeland when it is ongoing and for any other large park developments which may occur in the future if our economic circumstances, our financial circumstances change in this province.

I want to say just a couple of words about the Canmore Nordic Centre. I'm very proud to have that facility at my back door in Canmore. Again, I want to compliment the department on the incredible job that was done in creating that facility and that is being done today in maintaining the facility so that, as the minister said, the people from Russia, the people from all of the Nordic countries recognize that facility as the best in the world, and they want to have the opportunity to access that facility.

Notwithstanding a time of fiscal restraint, we must maintain the highest possible quality we can in that area so the people of the world will be able to look at Canmore, look at Alberta and say: "This is where we want to be. This is where we want to train. This is where we want to come to see how those who know best how to take care of facilities do it." We want them to continue to come to our part of the world.

I don't want to take too much more time, Mr. Chairman, and I'm not going to go into some of the general matters. I'd just like to conclude by making a brief reference to the 1993 Scout jamboree in Bow Valley Provincial Park. This is a tremendous area just outside the most frequently used and most traveled parts of Kananaskis. It's proven to be a site that Scouts have chosen to come to from all over Canada and the world on previous occasions. They have enjoyed the physical outlay, the surroundings that are second to none. I think most of all that the reason they keep coming back is because not only of the kind of reception they are given by the people who are responsible for setting up the jamborees – and their input cannot be minimized – but also the interaction they have with the people of the area, the people of the Bow corridor, when they have an opportunity to come to our particular part of Alberta. I want to commend the minister for all the time and effort he's put into ensuring that that jamboree goes ahead and in maintaining that area so we can have these kinds of jamborees in the future. Again, it's visionary. It's typical of the vision of this department and the other programs that this minister is becoming involved in: a critical look at the ecological reserves, the very bold step to implement decentralization of the department. Both of these initiatives and the other things that are happening in the department bode well for the future of this department and indeed the future of this minister.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to begin by asking a few questions of the minister arising from his opening remarks earlier this evening regarding privatization. I guess the question basically comes down to the whole area in terms of what the public has invested in various parks and facilities around the province. That's been paid for out of the public purse, and now as a result of privatization they're being turned over to be managed and operated by private companies. I'd like to know, in terms of the public's expense in developing these areas, whether the province has any policy in terms of the amount of money it wishes to recover to pay for that public investment, whether that's in part or in any way included in the formula or in the evaluation the department does in reviewing applications or reviewing potential leases they might sign.

I'd just be interested as well if they've done any kind of evaluation. I don't know; they may not be at all interested in doing this in any kind of rational way. It may be one more example of ideology triumphing over common sense. Assuming that this minister is trying to run his department in a responsible way, making sure that he's protecting the investment the public's made, assuming that he wants to get the best value for money on behalf of the public taxpayer, has he done any kind of evaluation and can he tell us tonight how much money the government has put into developing these areas that are to be privatized? Do we know for all the areas that are privatized in

the year 1989 or the year 1990 how many millions of tax dollars are represented by those areas or facilities?

Now, having done that, then do we get any kind of return on our investment? That is, in terms of the contract that's provided to the private-sector operator, is the government wanting to get back 1 percent, 2 percent, 3 percent, 10 percent on that investment? Is it part of the lease agreement that brings revenue to the department, or is that even considered in terms of evaluating privatization applications?

Finally, as another sort of question in terms of the quality of service, I want to make sure that the quality of service provided to Albertans doesn't deteriorate. Are there any guarantees that average Albertans will have access to these privatized operations, these privatized facilities? Or will they become, by the rate structure or the rental rates that private operators are allowed to charge, prohibitive to average Albertans and their families? We don't want to see privatization become a disguised effort to turn our park system into a sort of two-tiered system for Albertans, where one group, if they're rich enough, can afford to pay the cost of admission and the rest of us are going to have to go elsewhere.

Now, in case the minister thinks that this is just idle speculation on my part, I think one only has to look at the whole experience that we've had with Kananaskis Country to realize that all he's doing is part of a tradition in this department, where the public invests millions of dollars – in the case of Kananaskis, hundreds of millions of dollars – in infrastructure development and operational development. Facilities are then privatized or leased at virtually no return at all to the taxpayers, which ends up being a massive hidden subsidy for the operators of those facilities. Given those kinds of arrangements, I'm surprised that any company would be unable to operate them at a profit, but I guess even in Alberta, with our entrepreneurial spirit and so on, even with these massive hidden subsidies of millions of dollars in infrastructure improvements and development, some of those facilities are operated at a loss. In fact, we have the example from a year or so ago, I guess it would be, and not part of these particular estimates, where the previous minister even approved an \$800,000 grant to Ski Kananaskis in order to help them out. Maybe with this winter and the number of skiers there this year, the operational losses they've experienced in the past are not going to be repeated.

However, the whole history of Kananaskis is that the public puts in megabucks and gets nothing in return, and I hope that this minister will come at it with a different approach. He says that he's very concerned at the amount of taxpayers' dollars that are under his administration and under his responsibility. I would hope that he doesn't see his responsibilities as simply to cut, cut, cut, which might be admirable if it could also maintain a quality of service at the same time. I hope that he sees his responsibility as going further than that, that being the stewardly and prudent administration of public facilities and, if he is going to privatize them, that we get a fair rate of return as a result of that.

The other thing that goes along with it, of course, is that we do have a responsibility to the personnel, the people that work for the public, that work for the province of Alberta to ensure that they're treated fairly and justly. With the rumours and the stories that I've heard and the media reports about this minister's penchant for not worrying about what staff feel, I would hope that he's learned the lesson that that is not the proper and the right way to administer his department, that he will respect the abilities and the people that work in that department and

will honour and treat them as human beings and treat them fairly in all that he does, especially in light of privatization initiatives.

Mr. Chairman, I'm also very, very concerned that now for the second year in a row the Auditor General has had to bring matters in this department to the attention of the Legislature and to the attention of the public. In recommendation 32, contained on page 62 of his most recent report, for the year ending a year ago, he made the observation that Kananaskis Village Resort Association was paid \$635,000 in excess of contractual obligations. To sort of paraphrase the Auditor General, it means that the province gave them too much money under the contract they had with that resort association, and he believes that this ought to be returned to the people of Alberta. Well, I would concur with that, inasmuch as it was a letter from myself to the Auditor General that drew his attention to this matter in the first place. So I have a particular concern to ensure that this money is repaid. I would hope that sometime in his concluding remarks the minister would give assurances to the Legislature that he intends to pursue that matter and ensure that that recommendation doesn't appear in next year's Auditor General's report.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are also rumours that the hotel at Kananaskis which was financed through Financial Trustco – and we know the difficulties that company has gone through. As a result, it's still not clear to me what is the exact financial status of that particular facility at Kananaskis, but I've been hearing all kinds of stories and rumours and discussion that it may be for sale. Well, I wonder if the minister could confirm whether that is in the works and whether the minister has any intention of trying to recover any of the public funds that were invested initially in order to allow or make it possible for that hotel to be developed at Kananaskis, whether the province has any policy that they would want to recover funds that might be received as a result of that facility being sold. I'm also interested whether there are any policy restrictions or views of the minister himself about who might be suitable as a potential investor in any potential sale of Kananaskis assets. Would he want to see those restricted to Alberta businesses, Alberta companies? Would he want to see it restricted in any way to Canadian business or Canadian companies?

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I fail to see where this reflects on the estimates. I've been listening very carefully for the last five minutes, and we've gone back in history which will be reviewed in Public Accounts, and that's the arena where it should be. Tonight we're here discussing the estimates of this year of the minister. He's here to answer questions about it. In Public Accounts there'll be plenty of time, and you're a member of the Public Accounts Committee, to ask those questions related to past history, and future history is speculation. We aren't here to discuss that tonight. We're here to discuss the estimates. Please continue in that area.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Vote 5.13 is concerning the Kananaskis Village Resort Association presently in this year's estimates. Approximately \$532,000 is being requested from this Legislature to support that association; as well, a little over \$13 million for the total management of Kananaskis Country. I'm wanting the minister to address some of the policy questions regarding the operations of Kananaskis Country, particularly given his opening comments that he's a great proponent of privatization. I'd like to know

what the policies are regarding privatization and particularly, given the controversy and debate that's occurred about the number of Japanese companies that are purchasing hotels in Banff and the Canadian national parks, whether this government has any desire to encourage Japanese investment in potential purchase of these assets of companies that are a part of the Kananaskis Village Resort Association or whether he would prefer to see any kind of Canadian or Alberta companies instead.

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

I have another concern regarding Kananaskis Country, as well, Mr. Chairman, and it has to do with the structural organization, the way the department is organized. I know that if hon. members would simply turn to the front page of the estimates for the Department of Recreation and Parks, they'll note that both the deputy minister and the managing director of Kananaskis Country are named. What I've always found is a bit of an anomaly or have failed to understand the rationale for is: why is it that the managing director of Kananaskis Country did not report to the Deputy Minister of Recreation and Parks? If my advice or impression is wrong, if in recent years he has come to be brought under the reporting relationship with the deputy minister, then I would be interested in hearing that. But, in effect, what this department has is two deputy ministers: it has a deputy minister for Kananaskis Country and it has another one for the rest of the department.

I think this kind of arrangement creates some difficulties and some problems in terms of directives, advice, decisions that are taken from time to time within the department. In fact, I am advised that there was recent experience where there was confusion over the termination of an employee of Kananaskis Country, that the managing director tendered his resignation, albeit reluctantly, on March 1, 1989. Now, I see that the gentleman is still working with the department, so obviously that resignation was not accepted. But I guess the question that concerns me is not so much the personalities or the reasons for that from the personality point of view but the structural arrangement within the department in that there's no clear reporting relationship from the minister through the deputy to all the other staff people within the department.

That concerns me, Mr. Chairman, and I hope this minister will take a look at the way his department is organized and have a very serious discussion with the key people who are part of that to ensure that in the future all operations within that department have a clear reporting relationship in order to ensure that conflicting directives, conflicting advice, conflicting decisions are not allowed to occur. That's a very serious arrangement, in my view. I don't understand it. It's not in keeping with what I understand to be other departmental organizations, and I would hope that this minister would take steps to ensure that that anomaly is corrected.

That concludes my remarks for this evening, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to the questions being answered by the minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To talk about privatization in the department before us tonight, I want to talk about a couple of examples that I know a little bit about because I've been there. I think it was the first attempt at privatization in the parks department when the government built a complex

at Cypress park. The complex was then rented out under agreement to a private individual to run a store and a restaurant. I don't know what that would have cost if the department were running it, how much more it would have cost to run, or if we'd have made any more money than we did on it. All I know is that it didn't cost us a lot of money to have that facility there. It's a top-notch facility. It's a good store and a good restaurant, and there's even a post office that, again, is run by a private individual in that same facility. For those to say that because private people run them, they're going to cut the service or cut the kind of service, I think is really not right.

Before we talk about some of these things, why don't we go look at them? How many people have been out to see that? How many people have been to Kananaskis Country, to Mount Kidd park and stayed in Mount Kidd RV Park? It's not only people with RVs that stay there; it's people with tents that stay there. It's a clean park. When you move out, they're there probably within 15 minutes. I've left stuff in the campsite and had to walk back after you check out, and they're already there cleaning it up. It's a super-clean area. It's run and rented by private individuals and run as a paying service to the people of Alberta or to the tourists that stop there. The people are courteous. The facility is great, and it works. It's not run as a second-class unit, as some members would suggest, or in any form. It's top-notch. It's as good as the Lougheed park that is south of there. There's nothing wrong with the privatization in those two instances that I am aware of, in that I've stayed and camped there.

Mr. Chairman, I'm interested in the comments made by members, and especially the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, about ecological areas and about a certain ecological area in my area and about the minister killing it, et cetera, et cetera. I'm sure I don't need to repeat, nor would I want to repeat, something that he had said. But to make a comment such as: the reason we don't want the ecological area is that we want to put a dam in the river and it'll affect the ecological area – I would challenge the member, and I wish he was around to listen at this time. You know, before you talk about something . . . My grandfather always told me, you know, it's nice to go look at something before you start talking about it, especially when you don't know a darn thing about it. He's talking about the area being flooded, colleagues. The point in the river where the cliffs start is about 375 feet to the water level in the river. Even putting in a dam on that river, we might raise the water 100 feet at that point. Now, in my mind that's still 270 feet or thereabouts before you get to where anything would flood. To flood those points, you'd have the city of Medicine Hat under water.

MR. CARDINAL: How many gallons?

MR. HYLAND: How many gallons? That's a good question, Mike. I don't know a calculator that goes that high.

That's ludicrous: talking about something and not even going to look to see where it is. The other thing local people say about that ecological area – they're not saying that it should never go. They're saying: let's find out where it should go, and let's find out how big it should be. Because the name suggests a certain kind of sand hills that are on the other side of the river, in the British block, that is protected already. They're not on the side of the river where we're talking about having an ecological area. So when we start talking about things, let's go have a look, especially things like flooding. I'm sure we're not

going to put the whole city of Medicine Hat under water if there ever was a dam built on the river, because how would you ever get it high enough and wide enough to hold back that amount of weight. So, you know, it wouldn't . . .

DR. WEST: You wouldn't want to interfere with a good story, would you?

MR. HYLAND: No. Maybe that's the trouble, Mr. Minister. The truth often interferes with a good story, and the truth probably wouldn't look good published in the paper, but a good story looks good published in the paper, even if it is all wrong.

I wonder if the minister could outline any of the future steps that he would expect to do this year to carry us towards privatization in parks and in recreation areas that the department controls so that we could see the direction they're going and, if we have enough privatization going on now, if he has any assessment he can share with us about questionnaires or something that campers and users have filled out in the last year or few years so we can judge their satisfaction with the service they've received in these privatized areas.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. CARDINAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am also pleased to speak to the budget estimates of Recreation and Parks, although I think my speech will be brief. I commend the minister and his staff for the important role they are playing in the overall socioeconomic planning of our province, because they do play a key role. An example of this is in the forestry developments in northern Alberta, some that are developed already, some under construction right now, and some proposed: the role they play to ensure that parks are set aside and other protected areas are looked after.

An example of this in my constituency would be the Lakeland region which is adjacent to a couple of forest management areas, a 200-square-mile recreation area which will be developed in the next eight years. This shows that our government does plan. The Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, of course, called that a smoke screen, and he wants a freeze on all developments and activities in northern Alberta. I'd like to tell this Assembly – I am from northern Alberta, and I know – we've had a freeze in development in northern Alberta the last 35 years. That is why the majority of our northern residents are presently unemployed and on welfare: because the freeze has been around too long. But the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, of course, would never know that, because I don't think he's ever been up there. I will challenge him sometime to come and look at that area up there. It's a place where you can be dropped off and probably never find your way out unless you know the area; it's a vast area.

I know our government is doing a fine job in planning forest development, along with parks development and parks management. Of course, in the past number of weeks I hear the Official Opposition talking about putting a moratorium on all pulp mill developments in the north. I still can't see this, because I can't understand why they can't see how we are going with our forestry developments and how we can also put in parks developments and necessarily protect our environment and waters and whatnot. But I guess they probably don't have a vision as to how we can develop our economy and our parks

and still manage our environment. I believe they may have other motives probably.

I'd like to also take a moment to commend this minister and the department for being innovative. I call them very brave to take on an issue that may not be very popular in the short term, but I think the wisest move we can make is a decentralization of staff from urban centres to areas where the job and the action is at. I commend the minister for that, because it's not a popular thing to do. It's not the easiest thing to do, but it makes a hell of a lot of sense.

Other programs that are playing a key role in Alberta include the urban parks program, a very well-developed program, and I think it's a program that could continue. The program that affects us in rural Alberta most of all, and we have some input in it, is the municipal recreation/tourism areas program. That is again playing a key role in providing small parks in areas where we cannot put large, large parks because possibly sometimes of the geographic setting of the area. These programs are necessary, along with our economic plan for the whole province.

One area I would like to suggest the minister look at seriously is possibly some joint planning with Forestry, Lands and Wildlife. That's an area where I've always pushed in the past 10, 15 years to try and develop a detailed land use plan of all Crown lands bordering lakes in Alberta. I think it would be a wise move for us to go that direction.

Other than that, I would again just like to say that I believe the minister and the department are doing a fine job, and I would like to thank them personally for their efforts in my area, for sure.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Stony Plain.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The other members before me did a very good job of critiquing the estimates, I feel, especially the ones on this side of the House. However, there is one specific that I would like to address. I was pleased to see the minister hand out a schedule of upcoming games, and I would hope that somewhere in this year's budget there is an allocation to assist a particular set of games.

I'm sure the minister is aware that the first North American Indigenous Games were conceived as a partial effort to combat alcohol and drug abuse amongst the native peoples. This is quoting from their own goals, and it's not a supposition of mine. The games will be running from the 30th until July 8. However, there are some associated cultural activities that I think are worthy of note. On June 20 there's the Hobbema all-aboriginal rodeo, which is a component or a side effect to the games. On June 28 through July 1 there's the international powwow hosted by Poundmaker's; June 29 through July 1, the Enoch Golf Classic hosted by Enoch, again in conjunction not necessarily with athletics but with the games. The games themselves, June 30 through July 8, are run primarily in Edmonton, including the canoeing on the Saskatchewan River and so on, and those are hosted and co-ordinated by the North American Indigenous Games committee. July 2 to July 5 is the National All Chiefs' Conference at the Edmonton Inn, co-ordinated by Enoch First Nation. July 7 is the National Indigenous Youth Day hosted by the Edmonton indigenous youth group, and July 5 through 7 is the international powwow hosted and co-ordinated by, again, the Enoch First Nation.

I would strongly encourage the minister to support this worthwhile effort. The games, as everyone knows, occur in Edmonton and the Edmonton area. The general manager in charge of public relations is a fellow by the name of John Fletcher, who can be reached at 421-0991. In addition to that, the group that is putting on the North American Indigenous Games is requesting support from wherever they can get it. I would challenge and encourage all Members of the Legislative Assembly to become directly involved. I'd like the pages to pass out a contribution form that starts very low, and I think it would be a very good effort on our part to support both Parks and Recreation and these games by getting directly and personally involved.

In closing, I'd like to also bring attention to another worthwhile set of games that will be occurring in Edmonton and are deserving of the support of all the members of this Legislature, and that is the Law Enforcement Games coming up towards the end of July and the beginning of August.

On that note, again I'd like to reiterate my request to the minister to have his department become, hopefully, directly involved with the North American Indigenous Games people to either supply them with moral, organizational, or even financial support. If that is not in fact a part of your budget, I'd like to see you address that.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

DR. WEST: I believe what I'll do, Mr. Chairman, is start at the back and move myself forward, the freshest in my mind of the questions. Any that I don't answer, I would say that we will take *Hansard* and get responses to you about your direct questions.

The Member for Stony Plain brings up a very important event that's going to really help Edmonton a great deal, I believe, the North American Indigenous Games. Your question is, I guess, good timing, because two weeks ago we helped the indigenous games through this department – the people of Alberta have helped them – to the tune of \$50,000. That is the exact amount that the federal government put in, so we're very supportive of these games, and the people of Alberta have contributed in a meaningful way. We have contacted the indigenous games organizing committee, and I'm certain they'll relay that to you. But I appreciate your support, and I hope all members will follow through with your recommendations to help these games, as I believe they're very significant and will help this area tremendously, as well as be a first for Alberta.

Athabasca-Lac La Biche, I really appreciate your comments. It is very important for your area that we do have sustainable growth in our resources, and the Lakeland provincial park certainly will help you also in that area as tourism and regional growth develop. The MRTA program that you bring forth certainly is very important. We'll have some \$13 million out in that program to some 240 sites across this province, providing in local municipalities some 12,000 campsites and recreation overnight staying places. A detailed land use plan for the lakes is something I'll be looking into, but as I say, it goes with Forestry, Lands and Wildlife. We certainly do have a land bank, or ILS we call it, in place, but the lakes have been brought forward to me before, and I will relate that to the Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife.

Cypress-Redcliff, all I can say is that we really appreciate your comments on privatization. Privatization is a very positive thing in this province. The private sector has proven, whether it's in Britain or in other places, that they can efficiently and effectively run organizations and part of public service, probably to the tune

of 40 percent more efficiently and provide the same quality. That's evident in all of the privatized areas in Kananaskis Country and five campgrounds that we have throughout the province that we've started privatization on. There's very positive feedback. And we have a tremendous number of contracts, whether it's cutting grass or water maintenance and that, throughout the province, and they're working very well. That is going to be an initiative, and I will bring forth a plan to you in the future and will show you where some of the contracts are in the province, working very effectively.

You did make note about the Middle Sand Hills, and I hope the members are listening who asked the question about that, because in your comments you did answer some very important things, especially to the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark about the Sand Hills project. So if you read *Hansard*, you'll get an answer.

Calgary-Mountain View brought up a lot of good questions. I don't want to praise him too much for fear it goes to his head, but you brought up privatization also, and many of the things you've brought up – I'm going to go over *Hansard* – are relevant, about the costs of our capital projects that we have out there versus the private sector running them. We have to see that we do get a return and that we don't turn over assets to the private sector in unfair competition to other private-sector initiatives that are out there. So there is that catch-22. We have 112 private campground operators in this province running some 11,000 sites, and we must ensure that we get a good return on the investment for Albertans in comparison to the input and not jeopardize the private sector that's out there. The recovery is something that we will look at. We're not doing it just for the sheer sake of turning over public services to the private sector. There must be a cost recovery, and the quality must be maintained. So I share with you those concerns.

A few other things that you brought up. The civil servants, as far as the decentralization, are being treated justly. I want to assure you that we've been working very closely with the Minister of Labour and also with the union involved on an ongoing basis. Every week we have a meeting with that union and go over the exact details of what decentralization means. I do share with you the sensitivity that some of the staff have shown to movement away from Edmonton when they've spent the majority of their life working here, and I'm fully understanding of that. We're trying to do it cognizant of their families and their situations and what they have here in Edmonton. We've made every effort to ensure that they have other options within the department or perhaps in other areas of government. I do share with you that same concern. We took criticism, as you said, in the media, but we have been working very closely with the staff to ensure that they're treated fairly. I must say, in all due respect, that in decentralization, if you do have to move from Edmonton, it is a very big shock to some lives. That happens in the private sector too. If you're with a pipeline company that decides to ship 700 people from Toronto to Alberta, which happened recently, there have to be some strong decisions made too. That is going on throughout all of Alberta in the private sector and in government departments, so it's not just isolated to government employees.

KVRA: I heard what you said, and we are working. We do have a formula out on payback, and we're in the process of having that signed. We've already started collection of \$635,000 dollars. The final agreement, because of some problems with the bylaws of the KVRA versus the original agreement, we're still working out with the Attorney General's department and

our lawyers. But I assure you that we will be recollecting the \$635,000, which came about, I guess, in due respect to the KVRA, through a misunderstanding between the interpretation of their bylaws and the way that government accounting goes from one fiscal year to another. They got caught in a catch-22, but recognize that it will be paid back to the province of Alberta.

You got into some comments about foreign ownership. I know that's a very sensitive area in the province, but Alberta has always been open for business in certain areas, and there will be continual investment in this province, I think to the benefit of all. We will watch, of course, in any of our areas that we have built, such as Kananaskis, as to the business arrangements that are being set up. Rumours: I can't comment on rumours. Unfortunately, I like to base it on fact, and so I won't comment on some of your references to the hotels in the area.

Banff-Cochrane, your comments in regard to tourism and maintaining a first-class attitude in Kananaskis Country and its maintenance. I do listen to that. In fiscal restraint there is that concern, and I said that Kananaskis Country did contribute in a meaningful way, but we're going to watch next year to ensure that our maintenance of that facility doesn't deteriorate and that the ongoing capital projects flow through into the future in respect to the investment that we have there at the present time. There is some \$238 million there, and we want to ensure that we don't cut the fine line of fiscal restraint and jeopardize that. So I listen to you in that respect.

William Watson Lodge, of course, is a tremendous facility. You know, in the future I would almost like to see one of those developed in the north. People in northern Alberta have to travel a long way to share William Watson. Last year I think there were 25,000 Albertans who got to share the experience at William Watson, and certainly in northern Alberta, as we rearrange our finances in the province of Alberta and get on with building this fine province, we'll be looking at that.

Canmore Nordic Centre. Again, the same comments you made about Kananaskis Country. The Canmore Nordic Centre is a very important facility, and we must maintain it. And I'll tell you, the buildings in Russia compared to the buildings here as far as their maintenance and construction – there is no comparison. They talked, as I said, on many things, but they couldn't get over the fine facilities and the way that we maintain them here in the province of Alberta. They're going to come and use these facilities in the future, and the first exchange is a biathlon team and coaches coming to the Canmore Nordic Centre, where we're going to have the world junior competitions in a couple of years. They want to bring their athletes and train at the Canmore Nordic Centre, and they will teach our young athletes, too, quite a bit in getting ready for those games. So they recognize a fine facility at Canmore, and we will certainly ensure that we maintain that for the future.

The Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark. Perhaps I could address some of the things that you've said. I think if you go back through *Hansard*, you will find that I did cover quite a few statements on endangered spaces. The Minister for Forestry, Lands and Wildlife has a tremendous number of habitat protection programs also. They're not in my department, but as you said, you think we should deal in isolation, in one comment at the beginning, but I'm sure that you want to work with Environment and Forestry, Lands and Wildlife in protecting the endangered spaces. So I'm a little perplexed at your comments about me dealing it for the Treasury and accounting principles and others, and yet you want us to co-ordinate on endangered

spaces. So I'd like you to get that straight in the future. I'm sure if you get together with Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, they'll give you some 10 projects, including Buck for Wildlife and wetland habitat and prairie conservation, that are putting aside thousands and thousands of acres of habitat for the protection of species. We have a Park Ventures Fund, just so that you understand, through the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation that takes bequests of land now for protection of habitat and environment in the future. We as a parks department are constantly looking at enlarging our parks facilities, such as at Lakeland, and adding to parks, such as we've done down in Taber-Warner. In Writing-on-Stone Provincial Park we've added a tremendous, large sum of land to that park recently. So we take your comments in that regard to heart.

You asked about Tofield and the bird sanctuary that's there on the moraines. There's a hundred thousand dollar municipal recreation/tourism area which carries a 25-year, \$20,000 operating grant with it, and that municipality is working on that. We'll certainly have bird watching and protection of the habitat involved in that. The other you were talking about was a \$60,000 joint tourism agreement grant that went out there to look at the Tofield bird sanctuary, and you'll have to talk to Tourism, because they're the ones that initiated that program with the federal government.

Capital City Park in Edmonton: you asked about where we're going with that. Of course, there's \$15 million in phase 2, urban parks, to both Calgary and Edmonton. That will flow through, as I said, through the next eight years. Capital City Park over the years, just so you know, has taken between operating funds and capital some \$122 million since 1975. That doesn't include the Fort Edmonton or the science park, so there's been a tremendous amount of money, and as far as priorities you'll have to go to the city of Edmonton, the mayor and that department, because we don't try to tell local municipalities what they should do. I do know one thing. They'd have to make priorities, because they have a \$60 million upgrading project for the Storyland Valley Zoo, which is inside that park. So the dollars that flow to the Capital City Park will have to be balanced against other priorities the city of Edmonton has. But we have made a commitment to \$15 million, and that carries an operating grant with it over the next 30 years. That is a pretty strong commitment on top of the original \$44 million that went into Capital City Park. In 1989-90 the extension of Capital City Park – there was another \$15 million allocated to that, which will make the total \$59 million in Capital City Park.

You had talked about an issue – and all I can say is that we do have a very interesting development in Kananaskis Country called the Tim Horton camp that's going in there. It may address some of the things you were saying about giving an opportunity for our youth to go and have an outdoor experience as well as some leadership in some peer group, especially underprivileged kids who need that sort of strength in their lives. The Tim Horton group is a tremendously strong group involved with kids throughout Canada, and we're looking forward to the completion of that construction in Kananaskis Country. It'll be a huge asset to this province and to the children in this province, so we're certainly looking forward to that.

I take exception to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark downgrading the size of Lakeland north. It's 145,000 acres. If you're calling that just a spit in the north, I'm afraid you don't know much about an acre of land. That's a huge area. Someday we'll sit down, and I'll go over geography with you and let you know the size of this province and what we

have out there. But as I said before, if you look at *Hansard*, under protective notation and set aside in this province there are some 24 million acres outside of all the other public lands. There are 83 million acres of green zone in this province. That's the forestry side of it. If you're looking at protection of our environment, I think 24 million acres is a good start, and that does not include the special areas and does not include the Metis colonies and the reserves and does not include a tremendous amount that's been set aside in the military zones. I'll share those figures with you and send them to you following tonight.

The Member for West Yellowhead brought up some discussion. I see him kind of shuddering over there. You didn't mean it, did you? You asked about decentralization in that program and the consultation and morale of the department. I answered that before, but I don't take away from anything you said. It's a sensitive thing whenever you disrupt somebody's life, but I believe strongly that regionalization of our parks system will bring a stronger, better service in the future, and we will be protecting and conserving the environment I think better than we are at the present time. We are going to put in a new ranger series out there with degreed background to look after conservation and to work at resource management planning. All these things we'll unravel in the future, but for those individuals at the present time that have worked 20 years in the parks, I do have a sensitivity to what's happening in their lives. Some of them will have some strong choices to make, but down the road our regionalized parks service should be a strength in this province.

You made a reference to the Cold Lake air base and that they said that they didn't have any input. They had tremendous input into the Lakeland integrated resource management plan. That was done five years ago, and it was a public process, and they had tremendous input at that time. Nobody – nobody – from the Cold Lake air base has communicated to the Minister of Recreation and Parks at this time. I know there was an article in a newspaper, but I hope that isn't where the stories are coming from or where decisions are made. There will be a public process. It's starting in May on the Lakeland provincial park, and the Cold Lake air base has ample opportunity to make representation. The lines are not written in stone at this present time.

We did survey, and you say that the survey contract went out without tendering. We had to get in there before freeze-up because many of the survey pegs and the mounds had to be put in before it thawed out. It would have taken us six to eight weeks to do a tendering process, and so we have just given out the contract, and it's not going to be a full \$200,000. The estimate for the whole job was that. We will tender the balance as soon as we go to doing the complete survey, but we had to get the mounds in, and we had to do it quickly. So I share that with you in your concerns over the tendered contract.

Gregg Lake: good comments on that lake. I went up there myself and toured it not long ago, and I've talked to Andy McCracken, who's the chief park ranger there. We did go out and look, and there are some 15,000 acres there. I'm working at the present time with Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, and we're going to communicate with the company that has the forestry management agreement in that area. I would like to see that area cut out. I think it would make a tremendous ecological reserve. There are some areas and watershed in there that shouldn't be disturbed, and I wouldn't want to see large cut blocks on that side of the lake. So I share with you that I have the same concern. There are some ferns in there and some

nesting grounds and that sort of thing that should not be disturbed, and we're going to work at that. So I appreciate your bringing those comments forward.

Mr. Chairman, on any of the other questions – and you had some others – we will get back to you and answer them, but if there are other members who would like to get in, I'll sit down now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the vote?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 1, Departmental Support Services . . .

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're not ready for the vote.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to thank the minister for his response and let him know that I would be in full agreement to work with him on the finishing of that park around Gregg Lake and William Switzer park till we bring it to an end sometime within the next short term.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the vote?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Agreed to:

1.0.1 – Minister's Office	\$212,069
1.0.2 – Deputy Minister's Office	\$221,104
1.0.3 – Public Communications	\$211,493
1.0.4 – Corporate Planning Services	\$404,730
1.0.5 – Financial Services	\$1,686,286
1.0.6 – Human Resources Services	\$485,315
1.0.7 – Information Services	\$599,395
Total Vote 1 – Departmental Support Services	\$3,820,392
2.1 – Program Support	\$781,150
2.2 – Financial Assistance	\$32,074,424
2.3 – Community Recreation and Sport	\$3,982,497
2.4 – Provincial Recreation and Sport	\$3,291,470
Total Vote 2 – Recreation Development	\$40,129,541
3.1 – Program Support	\$2,185,830
3.2 – Operations	\$21,535,713
3.3 – Parks – Reconstruction	\$7,715,693
3.4 – Parks – Construction and Redevelopment	\$350,000

Total Vote 3 – Provincial Parks \$31,787,236

4.1 – Capital Development Co-ordination –

4.5 – Operations –

Total Vote 4 – Support to the XV Olympic Winter Games – 1988 –

5.1 – Program Support \$1,810,391

5.2 – Operations \$9,932,432

5.3 – Redevelopment and Construction \$1,630,485

Total Vote 5 – Kananaskis Country Management \$13,373,308

Department Total \$89,110,477

DR. WEST: Mr. Chairman, I move that these votes for Recreation and Parks be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee now rise, report progress, and request leave to meet again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports as follows, and requests leave to sit again.

For the Department of Recreation and Parks: Departmental Support Services, \$3,820,392; Recreation Development, \$40,129,541; Provincial Parks, \$31,787,236; Kananaskis Country Management, \$13,373,308.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the Assembly to meet in Committee of Supply tomorrow morning, when the estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs will be under consideration.

[At 10:17 p.m. the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]

