

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, March 7th, 1972

[The House met at 2:30 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill to amend The Legislative Assembly Act. In brief, the bill as proposed would fix the interval of provincial elections at four-year periods within the Province of Alberta while still leaving provision for an election in the event of the defeat of the government on a motion of non confidence.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 200 was introduced and read a first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce visitors. The hon. Minister of Culture Youth and Recreation has done me the distinct honour of permitting me to take his place in introducing to this Assembly 102 Grade II students from Avonmore School, accompanied by their teachers Mr. Semenuk, Miss Albuss, Mrs. Burke, and Mrs. Slater. The hon. Minister is now on his way to Calgary to officially open the World Figure Skating Championships on behalf of our Premier and the province and regrets being unable to be present to publicly introduce students from the electoral division of Edmonton Avonmore which he represents. Mr. Speaker, he has asked me to thank them on his behalf for taking an active interest in our democratic process. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the students and teachers be permitted to rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Smallboy Band

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Are Chief Smallboy and his band legally camping in the Muskiki Lake area?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is that they are camped on Crown Lands that would be illegal insofar as Bill 66 last year amended the Public Lands Act.

4-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'm wondering is the government giving any consideration to changing the situation to accommodate Chief Smallboy?

DR. WAERACK:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is that I intend to bring forward an amendment to The Public Lands Act that will repeal Bill 66 as passed last year in this Legislature.

Red Deer College

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to my friend, the Minister of Advanced Education and find out how his batting average was in Cabinet this morning on the question of the problems at the Red Deer College.

MR. CRAWFORD:

I intend to make an announcement on that later in this afternoon's session.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary question then. Could the minister at the same time make an announcement with regard to his batting average in his meeting with officials of the Committee on the Non-Canadian Influence Study?

Calgary Court House

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to hon. Attorney General. Has he got any plans or recommendations with regard to the addition to the Calgary Court House? This is an issue that's been raised often here and I wonder whether there are any plans to increase the space in the Calgary Court House.

MR. LEITCH:

When I first reviewed the plans for the Calgary Court House, I wondered if the hon. member was talking about the Remand Centre or the Court House.

DR. BUCK:

No, the Court House.

MR. LEITCH:

The answer to his question is no.

Canmore Corridor

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the hon. Premier. Are you aware of any studies which have been completed to develop the Canmore Corridor for tourist and recreation facilities which will attract additional tourists to Alberta and which will provide services to Albertans?

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-3

MR. LOUGHEED:

I'd like to direct that question to the Minister Without Portfolio Responsible for Tourism, Mr. Dowling.

MR. DOWLING:

I'd be pleased to answer that question. I know that there are studies underway under the Department of the Environment at the present time for this purpose.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the hon. Minister, Mr. Dowling, would tell me whether or not he has considered the possibility of the provincial government providing leadership to encourage tourist and recreational facilities in the Canmore Corridor, thus giving Canmore an economic boost, while at the same time, satisfying the concerns of those who are opposed to further development within the National Parks?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker I am happy that question was asked. I believe that this government has given leadership by separating tourism from the Department of Industry and Tourism and thus providing the leadership that is required.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the hon. Minister, Mr. Dowling, if he does not think it advantageous to have the percentage lease-land revenues flowing to the provincial treasury from a project similar to the proposed Village Lake Louise?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, if I understand the question correctly, it is one that involves a total parks policy for the Province of Alberta which is presently being developed, and this answer will come in due course.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, does the minister not feel that if the provincial government were to develop such a policy and get on with it immediately, that it may well alleviate many of the problems that the proposed Village Lake Louise project seems to be presenting?

MR. DOWLING:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of how long it took the former government to get a start on the Canmore Corridor studies, something on the order of six years, and I think I answered the question in my former answer.

Village Lake Louise

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, has any study been commissioned by the government to consider the impact of the giant Village Lake Louise project on the smaller Canadian ski operators, some of whom are on the verge of bankruptcy already?

MR. DOWLING:

I think I can say to the hon. member that there is a committee presently constituted of several members of Cabinet and we expect a

4-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

great deal of input to this committee on this very subject over the next number of days.

MR. NOTLEY:

A question to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the very considerable concern expressed on the ecological consequences of the Village Lake Louise development, is the government prepared at this time to commission a study on the ecological consequences of the project?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I would rather refer that question to my hon. friend the Minister of the Environment, since this involves his department so completely.

MR. YURKO:

It is to be recognized that this is a federal government initiative, the Lake Louise Project, and we have been somewhat concerned that the federal government has not responded in connection with ecological matters on this particular project, and has released no studies or has given any indication that it in fact is doing any studies. In this connection I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this government has recently sent a wire to the hon. Jack Davis requesting information along this line.

Calgary Court House (cont.)

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a supplementary question to the hon. the Attorney General. Has he had any representations from either the Chief Justice or any members of the Court House staff in Calgary seeking an expanded space program in the Court House in Calgary?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have not had any representations on that subject. There may be some in the files that I have not seen.

Municipal Financing Corporation

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier, or he may wish to refer to the hon. Treasurer. Has any consideration been given to increasing the per capita borrowing under the Municipal Financing Corporation for smaller cities and municipalities from the present \$50 per capita to \$65 per capita as has been requested, I believe, by the City of Lethbridge?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question, I believe it is, if any consideration is being given to increasing the per capita allowance. Consideration is being given. However, you know that the responsibility of government is to be concerned about the extent of indirect debt that we have. This is involved in the question. Certainly it is under consideration.

MR. NOTLEY:

I would like to direct a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker. Has the government given any consideration to amending the regulations of the Municipal Financing Corporation to

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-5

make it possible for municipalities to acquire ownership of their utilities at the local level?

MR. MINIELY:

Yes, that is under consideration.

Grants to Museums

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to, I believe it would also be to the hon. Premier. I understand that about \$8 million has gone to Calgary, wherever that is, to the Glenbow Museum and Archives. I'm just wondering if a similar grant on a pro rata basis would be available to Lethbridge, because Lethbridge is building a cultural centre and museum, and I'm wondering if such a grant would be appropriate.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, a very reasonable question, but I think it is a matter that should be more appropriately dealt with under the estimates, and particularly the estimates when we deal with the Department of Public Works.

Crowsnest Pass Highway

MR. DRAIN:

A question to the Minister of Highways. I wonder if the Minister can advise as to whether his Department has firmed up on the relocation of Highway No. 3 through the Crowsnest Pass.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the forewarning that the hon. member gave me in regard to this question. We are still doing exploratory work on it, and we have not as yet drilled holes in the area where we think the road will go to find out if there are mine shafts and so forth underneath, and this exploratory work is still proceeding.

MR. DRAIN:

Is the hon. minister aware that this program has been carried out for a period of five years now, and that, further is the hon. minister aware that there have been numerous studies and that the width of the Crowsnest Pass varies from 300 feet to 1800 feet? And, surely, Mr. Speaker, does not the minister agree that this should not be so complicated?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to answer this question. When it took the former government five years to study it I should at least be entitled to six or seven months here.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Highways. Is not the Minister of Highways a member of the 'now' crew, and for this reason would he be able 'now' to make a decision?

4-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

Grain Studies

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has he or his department of the government received a report, I believe along the lines of the Grain Rationalization Study?

DR. HORNER:

Referring to the studies that had been done by the Grain Group under the hon. Otto Lang, the answer is: yes.

MR. RUSTE:

When will this be available to members of this Assembly?

DR. HOPNER:

It will be available to the members of the Assembly as soon as the hon. Mr. Lang makes it public.

Lowery Gardens

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have another question to the hon. the Premier. The question is, sir, did the provincial government anticipate doing anything further with Lowery Gardens that I believe is provincially owned land in the City of Calgary along the Bow River? It occurred to me that there were negotiations started at one time and I would like to know where they sit at this time in regards to development of Lowery Gardens as a provincial park, or turning it over to the city for development as a park.

MR. LOUGHEED:

I wonder if the hon. member would make that a Return and we will try to get the information for him.

Canmore Corridor (cont.)

MR. DIXON:

Friday last, I directed a question to the hon. Premier, but time ran out on me and it only needed a yes or no answer, but it was the concern that people have in Canmore regarding the future of their mining industry and their concern about the Premier's attitude when the permit to allow the stripping was given. I am wondering when the Premier is going to give an order to the Minister of Environment to close down the operation?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that was obviously a presumption and there is no intention to do that. We are well aware of the concern of the people in Canmore and we are keeping it constantly in our mind in the establishment of our policies.

ARDA Projects -- Native Incentive

MR. R. SPEAKER:

I would like to address a question to the Minister Responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs. I would like to ask him what has happened to the special ARDA program that was to be initiated for Native incentive?

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-7

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, this program which was, I might laughingly recall, referred to as 'negotiated' by the previous government, has been received by us, and in our assessment of it is such a complicated mess, that frankly it is of almost no use. However, Mr. Speaker, we are attempting to work out ways in which we might implement this agreement and we will be discussing it further with the federal government.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Supplementary question, how many discussions have been held with the federal government to this point in time?

MR. GETTY:

Oh, I would say many, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

What is happening to the applications that are being submitted by the native organizations to this point?

MR. GETTY:

. . . them Mr. Speaker so that we may in fact allow those submissions to be handled in a way that the native associations will get the best possible use out of them and not under the terms that are so restrictive right now.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Supplementary, have the native associations been notified of this particular decision, and have they been given an opportunity to give some feedback as to how they feel the program should be operated?

MR. GETTY:

Yes.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, how many opportunities have the native associations had to meet the minister?

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are native associations in our offices many times. Many subjects are discussed. Minister without Portfolio in charge of native affairs is also discussing the matter, and we are having considerable discussion on it.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

I feel that I would like to have that clarified just a little more. How many direct representations have been made with the minister responsible for recommending and certainly negotiating with Ottawa?

MR. GETTY:

I don't know the exact number, Mr. Speaker, there are many.

4-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

Calgary Remand Centre

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Public Works. Can he advise the House as to the intended date of tender for the completion of the Calgary Magistrates' Court and Remand Centre?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, this matter has been passed over to the City of Calgary because the program is one that ties in very much with their plan for the City Centre and they will actually be putting out the tenders. The agreement with them has been drawn up and is ready for signing. As soon as that is completed the plans will be handed over to them for tendering.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

MR. FARRAN:

A supplementary on the question from the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View concerning the Remand Centre. Is it not true that the delays that took place over the building of this Remand Centre over the last 18 months were occasioned by a dispute between architects, the architect for the library and the architect for the Remand Court, over a question of 10 feet, and also a dispute with the former administration over the shortage of parking for the Remand Centre?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, quite a number of problems accrued upon taking office. The plans could not be completed because it was felt that there was a need for parking facilities and there was also a need for the possibility of expanding the facility at some later date, and therefore it became necessary to acquire land to complete this. There was some discussion with the City of Calgary regarding the positioning of it, or there was a 10-foot move required. This required a good deal of changing of plans, but these were all eventually straightened out and have been straightened out at this date.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, what is the province's responsibility with regard to this building now? Has it changed from DPW supervision and construction to merely supplying the funds for the building?

DR. BACKUS:

There will still be DPW supervision and in the agreement with Calgary we still retain the determination of the plans and the development and the building, but the City of Calgary acts as our agents in the construction of it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I didn't get the answer too clearly. Is the position of government then merely supplying of funds and concurrence in the plans of construction?

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-9

DR. BACKUS:

The answer is, No.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General. Will the advent of the Bail Reform Act, whereby less people are confined to our jails in the City of Calgary, have any effect on the design and construction of facilities of the new Remand Centre in Calgary?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, although the new act will reduce the number of people being held in confinement in the Remand Centre, there will be a number of people held who are now being held in the Spy Hill facility.

ARDA Project - Native Incentive (cont)

MR. P. SPEAKER:

A further supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. I would like to ask him how many applications were submitted by native organizations to the special ARDA project?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I don't have that number with me. The hon. member might put it on the Order Paper and we'll treat it then. I might say, Mr. Speaker, to give him as much information as possible regarding this matter, that the native associations are very upset with the agreement as it was negotiated and signed by the previous administration and they really would like it changed, and we are trying to help them in that way as much as possible.

Modified School Year

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Education. . . . studies being done regarding rescheduling of the terms of the school year?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, it is under very active consideration by the Department at this moment and it may be that an announcement will be made in the weeks or months ahead in that regard.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals, does he anticipate that there will be any near term acceleration in the amount of potential coal business that will develop in the province?

4-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

Coal Industry

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we look forward with great anticipation in this area.

MR. DRAIN:

Is it correct there is the potential for a coking industry being under active consideration in the province?

MR. DICKIE:

We will deal with that when we come to The Coal Conservation Act. I am sure we could answer the hon. member's question in detail at that time.

Canmore Corridor (cont)

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport. The question, sir, is: does the minister feel that the federal government has built a strong case for the need of tourist and recreational facilities in the Rocky Mountains and does he personally favour such a facility in the Canmore Corridor?

MR. DOWLING:

I'm sorry, I'm --

MR. WILSON:

The Minister of Highways and Transport has some interest in that local area.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I think the whole project is under review. There are going to be hearings shortly in Calgary that certainly will bring out a lot of information, and I think the government today would be very much criticized if they didn't take into consideration all aspects of the facts and the information that are available to them before they take any definite stand.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I did not make the question very clear. I asked the hon. minister if he, personally, was in favour of tourist and recreation facilities in the Canmore Corridor and I'll --

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, I believe the House knows that the personal opinions of members or of Cabinet ministers may not be made the subject of questions.

Village Lake Louise (cont)

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question to the Minister Without Portfolio in Charge of Tourism. In view of the government's often stated position that Alberta must be consulted on federal decisions which affect the province, can the minister tell us whether the government has received a copy of the letter of intent filed by the promoters of the

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-11

Village Lake Louise with the Federal Parks Branch, and if so whether it will be tabled in this Assembly?

MR. DOWLING:

. . . I am sure it is under the guidance of my very hon. friend Mr. Getty, and I am sure he would be happy to respond to the hon. member.

MR. GETTY:

I think the question, Mr. Speaker, dealt with the matter of prior consultation that we have had. I have not specifically received a letter of intent to which the hon. member is referring and if he would be more specific about it we would try to obtain it. It might be something you could put on the Order Paper. We would be happy to get it and if we got clearance from the parties involved we would be pleased to table it.

Provincial Participation in Petroleum Export Discussions

MR. DIXON:

... on a personal basis with the federal Government of Canada? In the information I received earlier they were going to look into it. If not, we are going to establish an office in Washington. I am wondering how long they are going to wait for an answer before they announce when the office in Washington will be established.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, that matter is something I would like to discuss quite fully during the course of my participation in the Throne Speech debate and I'd be pleased at that time to give as much information as possible to answer the question raised by the hon. member.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. minister could tell the House if he has had any encouragement from Ottawa that they will allow our provincial government to sit in on the meetings regarding the export of oil and gas?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, that is related, completely, to the question I dealt with and as I said, I would be happy to touch on that in my participation in the Throne Speech. When I complete it, if there are still any questions in the hon. member's mind then I'd be pleased to give him all the information possible.

Village Lake Louise (cont)

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to return to the question of Village Lake Louise. The Prime Minister has indicated that the government does not intend to take a stand on that particular project while they assess all the various implications of the various arguments and so on, and so forth. Would the Prime Minister outline to the members of this Assembly what specific effort this government is taking to accumulate the data, etc., he is going to take into account in arriving at a position on Village Lake Louise?

4-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether this direction to the Prime Minister is intentional or in any way a facetious comment, but in any event to answer that on behalf of the government, I think we have clearly stated our position on a number of occasions, and I think it's clear to the public of Alberta and the members of the Assembly, and we will stand on that basis.

MR. HENDERSON:

I wonder if the Premier, since he has stated it, would mind reiterating what the position is, as far as the government accumulating data, input, representation, viewpoints, etc. on Village Lake Louise, on which they're going to make their decision. Would the Premier please restate just exactly what the government's position is?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the benefits of documents, such as Hansard, which is the subject of a motion on the floor of the House, will very effectively deal with that answer.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister Without Portfolio Responsible for Tourism. Could he advise the House when the federal government initiated the study on the Village Lake Louise project or those studies which culminated in the present proposal?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I believe it was 1967 when they first put out a request for proposals for the Village Lake Louise area, and I can be corrected on this as well. I understand, through talking with federal people that there were four proposals made, and of these four proposals, the Village Lake Louise group -- the present proponents of this proposal -- were accepted and that's the total picture as I know it. It went as far back as that. Thank you very much.

MR. YOUNG:

A question, Mr. Speaker on the same subject. Was the Alberta government notified in 1967 of these considerations?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that they took any notice of it.

MR. YOUNG:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise us what studies were available by the end of August, 1971, concerning this proposal, for these consideration, what studies had been undertaken by the government of Alberta?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, there were several studies. The National Park study in total, that dealt with the total of the National Parks. I personally have received several copies of the Village Lake Louise proposal, and I'm not just sure of the dates on which these were received. I have studied them in detail as have most people in the Cabinet. I hope that answers your question.

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-13

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, could I have a bit of clarification? My question concerns what studies had been undertaken by the provincial government, inasmuch as it apparently was aware as far back as 1967 of these proceedings, or possibilities in that corridor. What studies were available at the end of August, 1971?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I understand the question perfectly now. There were no studies undertaken by the former administration to my knowledge.

Communal Property

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Since the exit of the Communal Properties Board, two notices have appeared regarding the formation of a colony, a Hutterian Brother Colony north of Killam. Can you tell me, will a decision on this particular colony be made before the fall session of the legislature?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, no applications for extensions to colonies, or the formation of new colonies will be considered until the whole matter of the Communal Properties Board and the Act is dealt with by the Committee of the Legislature. I had a letter from the hon. member for Drumheller enclosing a photostatic copy of one of those advertisements. We're attempting to find out where that was printed. I think what happened was that orders must have been given for printing at regular intervals with respect to that application just prior to the dismissal of the board, but we're attempting to track that down.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, does this mean that the Communal Properties Act is not in effect at this time?

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, because as you know applications must be dealt with by the Communal Properties Board, and all the positions on that board are vacant as of now.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Does that mean that the Hutterian Brethren may go out at this time and purchase land and purchase property for communal living?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, any individual Hutterite has the right to purchase property just like any other Albertan.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, to clarify my question -- a supplementary question. Does that mean that a group of persons may buy land on a communal basis and use it for their livelihood?

MR. HYNDMAN:

A point of order. The gentleman opposite knows that inquiries regarding legal opinions on the interpretation of legislation or regulations are out of order in the question period.

4-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

MR. R. SPEAKER:

This is not particularly asking a legal question. I'm asking a very direct question. Is the legislation in effect so that a group of people that wish to live communally may acquire property for that particular purpose?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I suggest the hon. member can seek legal advice as to his interpretation as to what he wants, from a solicitor.

MR. HENDERSON:

We're not asking him for a legal interpretation. We had the Minister of Agriculture stand up and pontificate in here yesterday saying that it's a matter of government policy. All we're asking is a question of government policy on this. Surely when this government's got so many policies arrived at so rapidly, we can have an intelligent answer on this.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rephrase the question if I may. A further supplementary question. If a group of persons in the -- ?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, that's a hypothetical question.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, would charges be pressed against a group when they purchase land for communal living purposes?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, that's a hypothetical question. I think the hon. member is aware of the terms of the Communal Properties Act. There has to be an application duly processed through the Communal Properties Board and there is no Board in effect because all positions on that Board are vacant at this time. We've said this many times publicly. We are not prepared to deal with any applications for additions to colonies or new colonies until this Legislature has dealt with the matter of the piece of legislation.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister. Were the members of the Board given an opportunity to be heard before they were dismissed, and if not why not?

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Under what authority did the government freeze applications under the Communal Properties Act? Has the government authority to freeze any law that's in this province without reference to the legislature?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, that is again a question asking for an opinion as to whether or not there is authority under a statute or regulation to do something and that is a question on which the hon. gentleman must draw his own interpretation.

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-15

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I'm not asking for an opinion, I'm asking for the authority under which the government acted. Surely that is a proper and logical question. Surely the government has some authority when they freeze applications, and I think in fairness to the communal people, the Hutterian Brethren, they are entitled to know whether now they may go out and buy land or whether they may not. But what I want to know is by what authority do you suspend laws and what authority did the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests use to suspend the law?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. gentleman opposite is completely wrong in suggesting that the government suspends laws. He knows very well the Legislature makes laws. He should indeed realize he makes laws. In any event, if the hon. gentleman wants to answer a question, of course the authority is under the Laws of the Province of Alberta in the regulations.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, they make a noise when they don't want to answer a question. I'm asking a question. Why doesn't the government give us the authority under which they're doing these things? Is there no authority?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how much clearer I can make it. The members of the Communal Properties Board serve at the pleasure of the Executive Council, and have been dismissed. I have had long conversations and discussions with every interested party that I'm aware of in the province including the Hutterian Brethren, some municipal councils, several real estate agents and many private citizens, and this situation has been explained to them and accepted by all of them. They expect that this Legislature will reach a decision by the fall session, and I'm asking the cooperation of all members on both sides of the House to help us achieve that goal.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to give that co-operation. My next question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is: is it logical that a government nullify an entire piece of legislation by refusing to appoint a board which is a requirement of that legislation?

MR. SPEAKER:

Out of order! Out of order!

T & T Report

MR. RUSTE:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. How many briefs or submissions were made relative to the T & T report that was tabled in the last session of the Legislature? Are you prepared to table those same?

DP. HORNER:

I believe that the procedure would be for the hon. member to move a Motion for a Return or put it on the Order Paper.

4-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

Grain Studies (cont)

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, has he contacted Mr. Lang to expedite the issuance of this grain rationalization study so that the people in the western provinces can study it and have their opinions expressed on it?

DR. HORNER:

Well, the study is being done by Mr. Lang's group. He, as I understand it, hasn't completed the final study which he's doing in co-operation with some other people in my department and others in the Provincial Government of Alberta in relation to the socio-economic impact of grain rationalization, and I understand when that study is completed that he'll consider making the entire study public.

Communal Property (cont)

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a question of clarification from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. I was wondering, in reaching agreement with the three bodies that you were talking to, what were the items that the bodies agreed to? In other words, what did you ask them to agree to? If I could just have that clarified, please.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, there was no formal agreement reached. I had either personal representations or phone calls or letters from the interested groups that I mentioned and I explained to them exactly what I've explained to this Assembly today, that we consider it necessary to have this moratorium period until the fall session of the Legislature, and I think all those groups have agreed to that.

MR. SPEAKER:

May I, just before recognizing the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands, mention that the allotted time will expire in five minutes?

Social Credit Board

MR. KING:

A question to the hon. the Premier. When the present Executive Council was sworn into office on the 20th of September of last year, was there in operation in the province a board, as required by The Social Credit Realization Act, which is on the Statute of this province?

MR. LOUGHEED:

In regard to the question of which I have not received notice, my understanding is that such a board does not exist, but it is interesting to point out to the hon. members that it took our administration some eight weeks to gather together from many different sources the aggregate number of boards and commissions and agencies within this province, but after perusing that document with great care, I was unable to find the Social Credit Realization Act Board, but if I am wrong, I'm sure the members opposite will be anxious to correct me.

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-17

Appeals from Board Decisions

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that boards are now an issue before the House, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General. Is it his intention to bring in legislation in this session to provide for appeals from the decisions of administrative boards and tribunals?

MR. LEITCH:

The answer is, no.

Liquor Study

MR. FO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the hon. the Premier, regarding the study being conducted by the Ghitter Committee on The Alberta Liquor Act. The question is, what are the committee's recommendations as it relates to our universities, our auditoriums, and will the serving of liquor be permitted in these institutions, or will the restrictions remain?

MR. LOUGHFEED:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. Attorney General will be responding to that question and to that issue, but at the moment, it's premature.

Provincial Parks

MR. WYSE:

I like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Is it the government's intention to maintain all existing provincial parks at the present level?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, we intend to improve them.

Social Credit Board (cont)

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Premier? Is it the intention of the present government to appoint a Social Credit Realization Board?

MR. LOUGHFEED:

Mr. Speaker, we had some considerable thought about that matter. We considered it carefully from August 30th on, and we came to the conclusion that it would not be an approach that we would take.

Provincial Parks (cont)

MR. WYSE:

A question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. From reports that I have received so far, it seems that it is the intention of the provincial government to cut back 25 per cent in their expenditures on all provincial parks. Can the hon. minister verify this?

4-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

DR. WARRACK:

This is a matter that pertains to the budget of the Province of Alberta and that information will be available very shortly.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question. Does this also include Elk Island Provincial Park? Is it going to be cut back 25 per cent? Could you give a direct answer on that?

Communal Property (cont)

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if it's the government's intention -- I'll direct this question to the Leader of the Government, the hon. Premier -- is it the government's intention to set up the committee on the alternatives to The Communal Properties Act prior to The Bill of Rights being passed by the House?

MR. LOUGHEED:

I'm sure that that matter will be reviewed in terms of the number of select committees. We have six that we're proposing and certainly, I think, it's very important that all of them get under way fairly quickly. I think there is a concern that we do have a number of members involved in all of the various committees, but the timing with regard to that matter will not relate to the question of The Bill of Rights.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In your discussion you didn't touch really on what I wanted to know. Really, this, to me, touches on The Bill of Rights and I think you're putting the committees at a distinct disadvantage until this Legislature passes or turns down the No. 1 Bill in the House. Now, I was just wondering if consideration couldn't be given to holding it up?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think that, if I understand the hon. member's question, and I think it's a matter of debate as to whether they inter-relate or not, but the plan, as I think it has been outlined, has been well expressed by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs with regard to timing in the fall session relative to the reporting of the select committee regarding The Communal Properties Act. And with regard to The Bill of Rights, I believe that I've made it clear that that matter is something we would like to have sit on the Order Paper during the summer recess, so we would presume that both matters would be dealt with at the fall session.

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder if the hon. members would note their other questions for the next question period. The allotted time has now expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Red Deer College

MR. FOSTER:

It is now a matter of public record, Mr. Speaker, that there were certain internal difficulties in the Red Deer College between the members of the board, faculty, students, and perhaps other

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-19

parties. I have personally been involved because, as this House recognizes, I represent that constituency. I also recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member opposite has also been talking to the various parties, and it is a matter that is of great personal concern.

There were certain demands made of me as minister, Mr. Speaker, by both the students and the faculty, as a result of which, and recognizing the fact that the college is an independent and autonomous body within the Alberta educational community, I was not inclined to accept. Accordingly, the groups involved agreed to sit down with the assistance of an independent chairman, to attempt to resolve their difficulties. And I regret to report, they were not successful.

We have received a request, Mr. Speaker, from the board of the Red Deer College to the effect that the Lieutenant Governor in Council appoint, under The Public Inquiries Act, an inquiry to examine the issues that have arisen at the Red Deer College, their origins and their possible resolution. I am reporting today, Mr. Speaker, that the government will, in fact, accept the request of the Red Deer College Board and order a public inquiry into the College, declaring that the matter of the Red Deer College is a matter of public concern.

We are, therefore, appointing a commission headed by a commissioner, Dr. Timothy C. Byrne of Edmonton, a commissioner for the purposes of The Public Inquiry Act. Dr. Byrne, as this House well knows I believe, Mr. Speaker, is the president of Athabasca University.

The terms of reference of the inquiry, Mr. Speaker, have not been adequately spelled out or carefully enough spelled out at this time. However, I would indicate to the House that generally the terms will be broad, to include the administration, organization and operation of the college, the relationships between and among the college commission, college board, the administration and staff, the faculty, students and the community. If the range of programs offered are to be planned by the college, and generally such other matters as may affect the efficiency and effectiveness of that college. I might comment, Mr. Speaker, that the reason for my wishing to have these terms broad rather than limited, as requested by the board, is that I anticipate that the problems experienced by the Red Deer College may, in fact, be symptomatic of some problems latent in the college system of this province, and I believe that we are all anxious to have a full and complete inquiry into that situation in order that whatever steps needed to remedy that situation can, in fact, be taken.

Moir Committee

I was asked, Mr. Speaker, during the Question Period, to comment further on my meetings last night with Mr. Moir and the Committee on the Non-Canadian Influence in Post-Secondary Education. I did, in fact, meet with Mr. Moir last evening, Mr. Speaker, along with Professor Dick Baird from the university, who is a member of his committee. Without abusing this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, I should report that the committee expects to be in a position to report to me, hopefully, not later than mid-April, and at that time, because I expect a question from the hon. member opposite, as I said yesterday, I would be happy to review the report, discuss it with my hon. colleagues and Cabinet, and then decide what we will be doing with the information.

It is perhaps important to comment at this time, Mr. Speaker, because of the delay in getting this report, that the members of the committee have experienced great difficulty in compiling the statistics and assembling and co-ordinating their information. The

4-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

reason that they have provided to me is that they were denied their office space, their staff, and their office equipment last August. Their operation was, in fact, closed down unilaterally, I think, by the previous Minister of Education, or perhaps by his executive assistant -- I don't know -- and they have found some difficulty in compiling their report at this time. I have tried to impress upon the members of this committee, with whom I have met, that it is of great importance to me personally that this report be completed as expeditiously as possible. I have received their assurance and I hope, Mr. Speaker, I will be in a position to deal with this matter further at a later time.

MR. CLARK:

[Not recorded]

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder if the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury could perhaps make his comments through the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HYNDMAN:

... in respect to ministerial announcements made on the government side, only the hon. Leader of the Opposition may comment thereon.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I don't have Beauchesne in front of me but I think if they read it, it also states that the leader or the recognized spokesman -- [Interjections] Well, I'll find it. [Interjections] No, that's not correct.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, it is page 84, paragraph 91(1) of Beauchesne. I suggest that it is clear and I now quote: "It is firmly established that the Leader of the Opposition or the Chiefs of recognized groups are entitled -- but no debate -- under any Standing Order."

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, if we could have your ruling on this matter for a later date, because I would like to have some time to do some research and put our side of it over when we have more time to look into it more thoroughly. But last year I was accused by the hon. Minister of Agriculture as giving a decision, I remember quite correctly, I think it was the hon. minister himself who was doing the objecting, that rose in his place and took the place of the Leader of the Opposition in answering a statement.

MR. LOUGHEED:

I don't want to enter into a procedural debate except that I think I would concur with the view expressed by the hon. member, that this is something that should be a specific ruling by you. I think it's very important. I recall on a number of occasions, being required, as the hon. Member for Wainwright recalls, to attempt to respond very quickly as the Leader of the Opposition with regard to agricultural matters. I think it is very important that not only the precedent but your own view, Mr. Speaker, be established for purposes of the clarity of the business of this House.

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-21

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, before we get in an argument, I think we should have a report on it, but tradition will show that even the leader of the NDP party who is represented here can also answer.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No!

MR. DIXON:

Yes!

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order, I would like to read 91(1), with your permission:

"When a minister makes a statement on government policy or ministerial administration, either under routine proceedings, between two orders of the day or shortly before the adjournment of the House, it is now firmly established that the Leader of the Opposition or Chiefs of recognized groups are entitled to ask explanations and make a few remarks, but no debate is then allowed under any Standing Order."

MR. SPEAKER:

This is my understanding of the rule, and unless the House wishes some further study or research on it, perhaps we should just follow it, since our rules require us to follow the 1958 edition of Beauchesne.

RCMP

MR. LEITCH:

I have an announcement to make over the use, or perhaps more accurately, the non-use of the letters RCMP. First of all, I would like to make clear, Mr. Speaker, the extent of the change that is now taking place. First of all, it is not a change of the name -- the name Royal Canadian Mounted Police is still being used. What has occurred is they have dropped the letters, RCMP, and in particular they have dropped them from the buildings and from the cars. The decision to do that, Mr. Speaker, was made in 1968 by the Commissioner and began to be put into effect in eastern Canada in 1968, or early in 1969, and only recently in western Canada.

We were aware of the great concern of the people of Alberta over any change in something that is very important to their history, their heritage and their culture. Because of that there was some communication between the government and the federal government and that will be dealt with later on in the Order Paper.

Alberta has, I believe, the largest, or at least one of the largest, contingents of Royal Canadian Mounted Police in Canada, and in addition to that, sir, this dropping of the initials has caused some confusion because the single word 'police' as used on a building or car may mean either the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or some of our municipal police forces. And for those reasons, in addition to the communications that I have been talking about earlier, I wanted to tell the House that I have been in touch by telephone with the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and I have asked him to reconsider the decision that was made in 1968 and to restore in Alberta the use of the letters RCMP. He has told me that he will consider my request and give me an answer.

Now I have been studying the terms of the contract between the Province of Alberta and the federal government relating to the use of

4-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

the RCMP in this province, and in the event that the Commissioner's decision is not to restore the letters in Alberta, I will then consider what we might do about it.

QUESTIONS

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like a little more time to prepare the reply to Question 101 and respectfully ask that this question be allowed to stand until Thursday.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

102. Mr. Taylor asked the Government the following questions:

- (1) What is the total amount of money paid, under Order in Council No. 219/72, to each of the members of each of the MLA Caucus Committees between September 9, 1971 and March 1, 1972?
- (2) Has subsistence, travelling expenses and/or other expenses been paid to any MLA since September 9, 1971? If so, specify the MLA and the amounts paid and the authority for the payments.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, in regard to Question 102, I would like to point out to the House that in fact the question is in error as there are no MLA Caucus Committees covered by Order in Council 219/72. The Order in Council covers a task force of the government and doesn't cover Caucus Committees. In any case, Mr. Speaker, we are quite willing to table the information this afternoon.

Answer:

- (1) No payments have been made under authority of Order-in-Council No. 219/71 for the period September 9, 1971 to March 1, 1972.

- (2) Payments to MLA's other than members of the Executive Council:

G. Awerongen	\$375.35	O/C 226/72
R. A. Farran	462.55	
D. J. McCrimmon	98.70	O/C 1834/71
J. S. Batiuk	165.05	as amended by
C. L. Doan	319.05	O/C 43/72
R. Zander	108.85	

103. Mr. Taylor asked the Government the following questions, which were answered as indicated by Dr. Hohol:

- (1) Having regard to Order in Council No. 2126/71:
 - (a) Who was appointed to arbitrate the dispute under Section 106 of The Labour Act?
 - (b) What were his qualifications?
 - (c) What remuneration, travel expenses, subsistence, etc., was paid to him for his work?
 - (d) How many full days were involved in carrying out this work?
 - (e) Were any instructions given to the Arbitrator and what were the terms of reference?

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-23

Answer:

- (a) Mr. George J. Bryan.
- (b) Barrister and Solicitor.
- (c) Fees \$500.00
Travel and subsistence expenses \$ 75.35
Clerical \$ 28.50
- (d) Approximately 3 full days.
- (e) On December 21st instructions in the form of a procedure pursuant to section 106(3) were issued by me. Copy of this formal instruction is attached as Exhibit 'A'.

115. Mr. Taylor asked the Government the following question, which was answered as indicated by Dr. Horner:

What is the total cost of constructing the wall in the East Wing on the third floor of the Legislative Building and the cost of decorating and furnishing the area enclosed by same?

Answer:

Renovations to construct the Reception Area, 3rd floor, East Wing:

Drapes	\$ 148.00
Carpet	366.93
Arm Chairs & Corner Table	859.00
Other Furnishings	629.51
i.e., 2 floor stands (ashtrays),	
1 secretarial desk,	
1 storage cabinet,	
1 steno chair,	
1 plastic rug protector,	
1 waste basket,	
2 hat trees,	
1 table and	
1 lamp.	
	<u>\$2,003.44</u>
Labour for installation of above and	
labour and materials for renovations	<u>7,092.34</u>
	<u>\$9,095.78</u>

DR. HORNER:

With regard to Question 115, I would like to point out that the answer includes the total cost of labour including the salaries of the Department of Public Works.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

104. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Mc Lem:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

- (1) Copies of all correspondence and representation made to the Federal Government by the Alberta Government regarding the Royal Canadian Mounted Police signs issue;
- (2) Copies of all correspondence between the Alberta Government and the federal government regarding plans to celebrate the One Hundredth Anniversary of the RCMP during 1973.

4-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the Motion for a Return which the hon. member has moved. I would like to point out, however, the practice we have had in the House when we are being asked to provide correspondence, either to or from another government, that we would agree to the motion, subject to, of course, first obtaining their approval.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is agreed then that Motion 104 will be subject to the approval of the other participating government for release of documents.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

105. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Mc Lem:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Copies of all correspondence between the Government of Alberta and the City of Edmonton regarding Alberta Government Telephones and Edmonton Telephones since September 15, 1971.

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I will be very pleased to provide the information subject to receiving the concurrence of the City of Edmonton.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

106. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Benoit:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

The number of people added to the Department of the Environment on a full-time, part-time, or retainer basis since September 1, 1971.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

MR. YURKO:

Sir, I beg leave to table the answer to Motion for Return No. 106 that has just been passed by the Assembly.

MR. LEITCH:

Would the hon. member agree to Motions 107 and 109 standing over until Thursday, because both of those motions involve some legal ramifications and I would like a little more time to consider them?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree that these two Motions, 107 and 109, may stand over until Thursday of this week?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-25

108. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ruste:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Copy of the reports of the Environment Conservation Authority on land reclamation procedures.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member moving this Motion to offer some clarification as to what he's really requesting. I am in a quandary as to whether he is requesting reports that have been presented to the Environment Conservation Authority at the public hearings that they have had in connection with this topic, or whether he is asking for internal government reports or reports that may have been compiled by the Conservation Authority, and which are as a result, a departmental or interdepartmental report. Perhaps the hon. member could give us some clarification on what he is asking.

MR. HENDERSON:

I'd be pleased to provide the clarification. We would like to receive a copy of -- firstly, I am referring specifically to the exercise that the Environment Conservation Authority undertook last year as a result of a directive from the chairman of the Executive Council to undertake public examination of land reclamation procedures relating to coal mining, oil and gas, and I think chemicals were involved in it as well. We're specifically wondering about land reclamation procedures in the coal mining industry. The Conservation Authority had been holding hearings, or has held hearings in various parts of the province on the subject and we would like to have copies of these submissions to the Authority if possible, as well as the copy of the report of the Authority to the Executive Council, if it's available as yet -- I don't know if it is.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the motion be amended so that the House may present the reports associated with public hearings. I would like to suggest at this time that any reports that have been compiled by the Conservation Authority are internal reports. The act itself, The Environment Conservation Authority Act, by statute indicates that the Conservation Authority will publish its findings to this Legislature through its annual report. In due course, I will be bringing their annual report to this Legislature, and as a result I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, or have the existing motion changed to read as follows:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Copies of reports presented at public hearings to the Environment Conservation Authority on land reclamation procedures.

MR. SPEAKER:

Now it seems to me that we may either agree to put this over and/or have it withdrawn by the consent of the mover and seconder, or we'll have to go the route of the formal amendment unless some other course may be suggested by either side of the House.

MR. HENDERSON:

Is this motion a formal motion, Mr. Speaker? If we move an amendment, where do we go from here? Can I speak to the amendment?

4-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

The amendment has not yet been seconded. Do I take it that the hon. member who moved the question, and his seconder, wish the question to stand and now wish to discuss an amendment, or would they prefer to have the motion withdrawn, with leave of the House, and replaced by one along the lines suggested by the hon. minister, or some other lines?

MR. GETTY:

I'd be pleased to second that amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder if I might have a copy of the amendment then, please. It has been moved by the hon. Minister of the Environment and seconded by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, that the motion be amended so as to request copies of reports presented to the Environment Conservation Authority at public hearings held on land reclamation procedures. Is there any discussion on the amendment?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, would you kindly read the amendment again? Normally, when an amendment is introduced, a copy of it comes to this side of the House. But I appreciate under the circumstance it isn't practical this time, so would you read it again before we speak to it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The effect of the amendment is to require copies of reports presented to the Environment Conservation Authority at public hearings held on land reclamation procedures to be tabled.

MR. HENDERSON:

I would like to speak on the proposed amendment, Mr. Speaker. I think it has been a procedure in this House in the past that correspondence inside government, between governments and its agencies, are considered to be internal documents. There were, however, precedents last year wherein such correspondence was tabled in this House for the benefit of the opposition. I am also aware, Mr. Speaker, that The Environment Conservation Act also has a section in it regarding tabling reports whereby the Lieutenant Governor in Council can require additional reports which are not covered in the Environment Conservation Authority Annual Report to be tabled in this Legislature.

So, Mr. Speaker, the machinery is there, of course, to see that a copy of the reports we have requested be made available to this side of the House. If the Environment Conservation Authority report is not available, it is of considerable interest to the people of the Province of Alberta, and we can't quite understand, particularly in view of the philosophy under which the Conservation Authority was set up, that there is any particular need for secrecy in this particular matter. And so, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that the amendment be defeated, and the hon. minister be called upon to provide us with the information we've asked for.

DR. HORNER:

Well Mr. Speaker, if I could just speak in support of the amendment very briefly. It's a pretty well-accepted practice that interdepartmental correspondence and documents are not tabled, and having been one who has discussed it from the other side on numerous occasions and has never won, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this has been the practice. That doesn't preclude, of course, the

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-27

government or the minister from tabling it voluntarily at a later date once he had an opportunity to consider. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment is in order and that it be carried, and the motion be passed as amended.

MR. SPEAKER:

May I then take the census of the House on the amendment? You have heard the amendment read. Unless you wish it read again, will all those in favour so signify?

[A recorded vote was requested.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Before closing off the time for the division, may I mention that the reason for the lights flickering in the House has not been due to the intensity of the debate but rather to a fire near the 105th Street Bridge.

The amendment as moved by the hon. Minister of the Environment, seconded by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, is that there be tabled copies of reports presented to the Environment Conservation Authority at public hearings held on land reclamation procedures.

[The House divided as follows:

For the amendment: Messrs:

Adair	Fluker	Miller, J.
Appleby	Getty	Miniely
Ashton	Ghitter	Mocre
Backus	Hansen	Paproski
Batiuk	Harle	Peacock
Chambers	Hohol	Purdy
Chichak, Mrs.	Horner	Russell
Cookson	Hunley, Miss	Stromberg
Copithorne	Hyndman	Topolnisky
Crawford	Jamison	Trynchy
Diachuk	King	Warrack
Dickie	Kozlak	Werry
Doan	Lee	Young
Dowling	Lougheed	Yurko
Farran	McCrimmon	Zander

Against the amendment: Messrs:

Anderson	Drain	Miller, D.
Barton	French	Notley
Benoit	Gruenwald	Ruste
Buck	Henderson	Sorenson
Buckwell	Hinman	Strom
Clark	Ho Lem	Taylor
Cooper	Ludwig	Wilson
Dixon	Mandeville	Wyse

Totals: Ayes - 45 Noes - 24]

MR. SPEAKER:

I declare the motion carried -- the amendment, rather, -- and now the motion as amended, appears to read as follows:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Copies of reports presented to the Environment Conservation Authority at public hearings on land reclamation procedures.

4-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

Is there any discussion on the motion as amended?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to ask the hon. minister one question. It is a straightforward factual question. It is to the effect that I said if the report of the Environment Conservation Authority is available -- could the hon. minister simply say whether the report is available and have they received it? I'm not even sure of this. This is why some of this exercise gets somewhat academic if they haven't received the report.

MR. SPEAKER:

Excuse me. I wonder if the hon. member might repeat that. I'm not sure that he was connected to the recording.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'm simply asking the hon. minister a question. In my comments relating to the motion and the amendment, I referred to a request for a copy of the report of the Environment Conservation Authority, whether it is available and if the Authority has reported to the government on it as yet. Would the hon. minister simply please advise us if the report has been submitted as yet to the government. I don't know, maybe it hasn't been submitted. If it hasn't, then this exercise we went through was somewhat a waste of time for the members themselves.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the Authority has had rather extensive hearing on land reclamation practices and as yet has not submitted their report to me, but I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet that it is a matter of government policy that on every hearing held by the Authority, the Authority has been given the instruction that it is to compile all hearings in their original form and prepare a copy for each MLA. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Authority has been given the instruction as a matter of government policy that it is to prepare a summary of all the submission reports that were presented to it during the course of the hearing and that this summary is to be presented -- one copy is to be presented to each MLA in the Legislature. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the summary report is to be given wide distribution amongst the news media and amongst the public at large. I would also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the total compilation of the hearings will have a restricted distribution for the simple reason that the cost can be very excessive. So as far as the total hearings are concerned, one copy will be supplied to each MLA, but there will be a limited distribution beyond the MLAs. I would also like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Authority recommendations to government will appear in their annual report tables in this Legislature in due course.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two in connection with the motion as amended. After public hearings it would be very unusual if the information wasn't made available to the members of the Legislature; after public hearings I would think the information is available to anybody who attends the public hearing, the press and so on, so the amendment has really made the motion meaningless. Surely if we are going to have land reclamation schemes there is no purpose in keeping them secret. Nothing can be gained that way. If somebody is going to reclaim some land on Joe Doe's land and Joe Doe doesn't happen to have any friends in high places and it's not going to be made public, this is defeating the very purpose for which the Authority was set up.

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-29

The Authority was set up so these things would be made known, and if there is a pollution problem that's going to arise further down the road, then matters would become evident at this time. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker --

MR. FARRAN:

What motion is the hon. member referring to?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member, I take it, is speaking to the motion that has been put as amended.

MR. TAYLOR:

If the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill would listen he would know which one I am talking on; it is No. 108, however, if he would like to have the actual motion as amended --?

The whole purpose of setting an Authority up was to avoid a situation where things are done which appear to be wonderful at the moment and then a few years down the road they give rise to serious ramifications. They are costly to governments, which means costly to the people and the Authority, insofar as it is able to do so, is able to look ahead and try to foresee some of these difficulties and avoid the pitfalls.

This is just as important for the government in power as it is for the government that was in power or any future government that will be in power. This is in the interests of the people of the province. It's trying to avoid a needless expenditure in the future; it's trying to avoid pollution with which the hon. minister is vitally concerned. It's trying to make sure that the people who own the land are going to have the whole picture and even they will not be permitted to do something that will mean costly expenditures on the part of the people at large, simply to give an individual a profit for the moment.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the motion as amended now becomes almost meaningless because public hearings are public, that's what they are. Surely no one is thinking that we are going to limit the number of people that can go to a public hearing. That's why we have public hearings; so every Tom, Dick and Harry, Mary-Ann and Josephine and their cousins and grandmothers can go and this is the way we want it. That's why we want a public hearing. To say that only those reports are going to be made available on land reclamation procedures I would suggest -- although the motion is now amended -- that the hon. minister and the hon. members of the government and the hon. members on the other side who voted holus bolus on this reconsider the thing, because land reclamation procedures are going to be useless entirely if they are kept secret; kept in the desk of ministers and members of the Authority.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I hope that all the paper from these voluminous reports will be recycled.

MR. HENDERSON:

I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member wishes to speak now he will be closing the debate.

4-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, just before the debate is closed I would rather -- we were starting to get into another one of these sort of round house speeches of the hon. Member for Drumheller in which he condemns everything from soup to nuts because they don't happen to meet with his position, and he is a master of distortion, of course --

MR. SPEAKER:

I must ask the hon. minister whether he might wish to rephrase his last remark.

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I might say this; I have noted that the hon. Member for Drumheller can distort things on occasion. The simple fact of course, is that he has tried to do so this afternoon in relation to this motion. What we have said as a government very clearly, is that we will make all information we possibly can available to all the members of this Legislature, but that confidential documents to the Executive Council are not going to be made available until such time as the government has reached a decision on them. After that the government will voluntarily table them in this Legislature. I think this is pretty straightforward; I think it coincides with our condition that we are going to have an open government.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, one brief remark. Of course the question of openness is an academic one since it won't come up until this government is turned out of office, but I think the subject has received enough debate, Mr. Speaker. I have nothing further to contribute to it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion, moved by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc and seconded by the hon. Member for Wainwright, is that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing copies of the reports presented to the Environment Conservation Authority at public hearings held on land reclamation procedures.

[The motion was carried.]

110. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Taylor:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

The terms of reference, written and/or verbal, for the Touche, Ross Inquiry into provincial finances.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member, realizing that it is impossible to provide a proper return on the verbal terms of reference, would agree to striking out the words, "written, and/or verbal" and substitute therefor "as written."

MR. HENDERSON:

Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, it is left in the judgment of the hon. Minister as to whether he is going to provide us with a transcript of the verbal instructions. [Interjections] If there were no verbal instructions given and he can't give us a transcript,

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-31

well then I guess that is the end of it Mr. Speaker. We have no choice but to accept the amendment.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, you are accepting the amendment? Fine.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion, I take it, if the mover and seconder agree, then without going through the formality of a formally moved amendment, I take it that the second portion of the motion will then read:

"The terms of reference for the Touche, Ross Inquiry into provincial finances," or do you wish to retain the word 'written'? Then I take it the motion would then read "the written terms of reference for the Touche Ross Inquiry into provincial finances," or, "the terms of reference as written."

You prefer the second? All right, I will make another attempt at it. "The terms of reference as written for the Touche Ross Inquiry into provincial finances." Now if the House agrees unanimously to the motion as amended we can let it go at that.

[The motion as amended was carried]

111. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Dixon.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Copies of all correspondence, briefs, submissions, etc. by the Alberta Government and its agencies to the Canadian Federal Government with regard to Health, Education and Welfare cost shared programs.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in regard to Motion No. 111, there are just a few comments which I hope will lead to an unanimous agreement to pass it in a slightly altered form.

First of all, in order that we can maintain the customary clarity with which the hon. member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc always speaks, I'd like to delete the word "etc." from the first line because I find it rather difficult to comply with that. Secondly, a minor point; now that it has already been mentioned by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, the usual rule in regard to the concurrence with the federal government would apply; and the other matter is that I would ask the hon. member if he could give me the period of time during which he would like the "submissions etc." to apply so that it can be made workable.

MR. HENDERSON:

The proposals made by the hon. minister are quite acceptable. As far as the time period, of course, we're rather familiar with the developments and dealings with the government prior to fateful Monday, August 30, and we're simply asking for information since that date, subject to the usual concurrence of the federal government.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would answer a further question. He mentions the word education and I presume -- am I correct in assuming? -- he's referring to the Department of Advanced Education and such federal-provincial cost sharing agreements as may

4-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

relate to post-secondary education activities as there are a number of small areas of involvement with the Department of Education.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like Mr. Clark to answer that question.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be helpful also to have the Department of Education, because of the Grade XII portion of the federal-provincial cost sharing arrangements.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion then as amended, if the House may consent unanimously, is as printed with the deletion of the word "etc." Are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

And with the addition of the date that it applies from August 30, 1971 to date. Are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion as amended was carried]

112. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Dr. Buck:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Copy of the Ecological Report prepared by Renewable Resources Consultants on the Sturgeon River drainage basin.

[The motion was carried without debate.]

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, with your leave I would like to table the information requested in this Motion for Return.

113. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Dr. Bouvier.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Report of the Federal-Provincial Task Force on water level control in Lake Athabasca and correspondence with the federal government relative to action to be taken on the report.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the only caveat I'd like to put on that motion is the usual one that it must be subject to the approval of the various governments involved.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any other discussion on the motion?

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-33

[The motion was carried without dissent.]

114. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Drain:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

A copy of the Interdepartmental Task Force report on land reclamation effected by coal mining and the oil and gas industry.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this Motion for Return, I would like to indicate that it has generally been traditional in the policy of all governments not to table interdepartmental correspondence as well as interdepartmental reports, and there are many reasons for this. It is desirable of course to have members of the Civil Service express their thoughts honestly and frequently, and without fear that they may be misconstrued by members who delve in politics.

Furthermore, I would like to suggest that in interdepartmental matters, matters of policy generally come up, matters that are confidential, nevertheless, these matters are expected to be discussed in intergovernmental reports. As this Motion for Return, Mr. Speaker, asks for reports which are interdepartmental reports, I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I find it necessary to reject this motion and not provide this information at the order of the House.

However, I do want to suggest that it is the policy of this government to table as frequently as we possibly can intergovernmental reports -- as well as departmental reports that may, in fact, deal in many cases with the establishment of government policy. So I would like to suggest that the matter be left up to the minister of this particular department and that in due course, if he feels it advisable to table these reports, I certainly will. However I must, under the circumstances, reject this Motion for Return.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any further discussion on this motion?

MR. HENDERSON:

Two points. Firstly, I find it hard to believe that the hon. minister is producing this information and not taking into account the fact that he is a politician. I reject the implication that it's OK for him to read as a politician but it's not OK for somebody in this House to read as a politician. Secondly, there were precedents set last year in this House where we as a government tabled interdepartmental correspondence for the benefit of the hon. members -- the 10 that were here last year -- in the opposition. And I understand that we have to leave it to the discretion of the minister to decide whether this information should be made public or not, but if possible we would like to have a copy of it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do I understand the hon. member to say that he is leaving it to the discretion of the minister, or does the hon. member wish the motion to stand?

MR. HENDERSON:

We would like to keep the motion standing.

4-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any further discussion on the motion?

[The motion was defeated on a voice vote.]

DR. HOHOL:

Because of the nature of the question, I should like to get the cooperation of the hon. member for Olds-Didsbury and this Assembly to hold Motion 116 over to Thursday.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member mean that he would wish the motion to come up again on the Order Paper for Thursday? Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CLARK:

Sir, I suspect Motion 117 will have the same fate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do you all agree that this one shall be treated likewise, the same as 116?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MISS HUNLEY:

I beg leave to move that Motion 118 be held until Thursday.

MR. TAYLOR:

If there is any problem with regard to subsection 5 as to a date, I'd be very happy to adjust the date of January 1st, if that's the problem, in order that it not be held over to Thursday.

MISS HUNLEY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that isn't the entire problem. There is a fair amount of information which must be obtained from the records and also a matter of Item 3, which I'm not prepared to speak on at this moment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it the wish of the House that this motion also appear on Thursday's Order Paper?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you will permit me to move Motion No. 119 on behalf of the hon. Member for Little Bow.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Member for Little Bow, I would ask that this be allowed to stand until it next appears on the Order Paper.

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-35

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree to the suggestion made by the hon. minister?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Provincial Parks

MR. FARRAN:

I am told that the best procedure is to read the motion at the beginning so I will start in that fashion. The motion is: "Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta consider the establishment of provincial parks in Calgary and Edmonton."

I move this resolution with little fear at all that it would provoke any partisan reaction from my hon. colleagues. In fact, it wouldn't surprise me if some of the hon. members from the opposition spoke in favour of the idea, because the merits are so obvious and so simple.

Provinces, and I'm not singling any particular one out, are fond of declaring wilderness areas to be provincial parks. They will choose a scenic spot or even a bit of remote moose pasture and hammer a sign in the ground declaring it a provincial park. Sometimes they add a few picnic tables or a barbecue pit, throwing them in for good measure; sometimes they will use the statistics of the number of acres of provincial park they have established as part of a propaganda pitch in an election campaign. Now I'm not saying that all these remote parks are bad; they are fine, but you need a car or a trailer to get to them. And they are not where the mass of the people are. Of Alberta's population of some million and a half people, 900,000 or thereabouts, live in Calgary and Edmonton. All these people pay taxes, but many of them have low incomes which limit the opportunity for them and their children to take long weekend jaunts to these distant parks.

Not all recreational facilities should be built for maximum use. We accept that, but obviously some should be. The cities themselves are hard pressed financially to provide all the services they are expected to provide from the narrow base of property tax. Calgary's gross debt now is well over \$3 million. Its parks budget runs over \$8 million a year. Now the only way they can preserve land, which should obviously be parkland for posterity, is by way of density transfer. They try to isolate some of it on the grounds that it might be in a flood plain or on a hillside where the ground isn't stable, but since there is no definition of a flood plain or of undevelopable land, they may well be on dangerous legal ground. So they do it by density transfer.

Density transfer means that if a developer lets them have some land on reasonable terms, in addition to the normal 10 per cent community reserve, they will allow him to build to a higher density on the balance of the land. Now this is not all that good planning practice, but they are forced to it by lack of funds, especially if they are loathe to borrow on the open market, and confine themselves to provincially guaranteed debentures from the Alberta Municipal Finance Corporation.

Nowe Hill in Calgary is a perfect example. As the hon. member for Calgary Bow knows so well, it is largely owned by two developers. The city doesn't want to see either the slopes or the crown of this

4-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

natural feature smothered with the usual concrete jungle of residential development, so they work out a sector plan for density transfer. This means, in the end, in order for them to acquire some park land, they plan for a population as big as Red Deer's in a very confined space further back on the hill where the area is less visible. But you don't have to be a planner to see the snags of this sort of an ant-heap of people, because people will pour out of the only two possible roads down the side of the hill in the rush hour, forcing premature building of a freeway on 14th street. It is far better to buy the parkland and allow the balance to develop at a reasonable density.

The same applies to Fish Creek in Calgary, probably the most beautiful corner of the City of Calgary, all the way from the Lacombe Home on the east side to the MacLeod Trail, Midnapore, all the way to the Sarcee Reserve. This beautiful creek goes through a natural parkland, treed valleys, open plains, just beautiful. Now developers are about to build -- in fact some of them are already building -- in the southern extension of the city and the subdivision of Canyon Meadows, right up to the flood plain, if anyone can define the boundaries of a flood plain. It should be preserved as a park -- about \$3 million would probably do it -- it would make a nice park. I'm told I'm not allowed to suggest sums of money, but I do happen to know that that would round it out very well. But the hard pressed local government just can't back it, they just haven't got \$3 million. They are finding it very difficult to balance both their capital and current budgets.

Now I'm sure that the same conditions prevail in North Edmonton. Of course the province is also short of money. I mean the days that the dollars grew on the oil rigs, as my hon. colleagues on the other side of the House know, those days are long gone. There is no use crying over the last \$3 billion, they won't come back. But the province has at least got a very good credit rating for borrowing, and I see nothing wrong with borrowing for a facility that future generations will enjoy after paying their share.

My thought is that this land could be turned over to the local government at a nominal lease of say, a dollar a year, to use as parkland as they see fit. As you all know Alberta, by circumstance, has the lion's share of the national parks. We need something more though, than the mountain playgrounds and the huge wilderness parks. We need real people parks, where most of the people are, right in the two large metropolitan areas. And I urge the government to consider this. I believe the cities didn't get a fair break under previous governments. Now we have a government that will be just, and will make a proper balance between town and country, remembering the interlocking importance of both of them, but also remembering where most Albertans live. So I urge you to vote in favour of this resolution.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, I have particular pleasure in seconding the motion put before us by my colleague, the member for Calgary North Hill, for a variety of reasons, the majority of them being of human interest.

Our rapidly changing times, changes in our way of life, changes in employment schedules, availability of leisure time, the realization of the need for family living, all have made a great impact on our society and on each of us as individuals. The need to take up the slack of unoccupied time with meaningful leisure activity has long been an established medical and psychological factor. The need for recreational body activity is a story in itself in the ever increasing medicare costs. A healthy body and mind build a healthy nation.

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-37

My colleague for Calgary North Hill has outlined the situation of the fair City of Calgary. As I have been honoured to represent the people of Edmonton Norwood, not diminishing my responsibilities to Albertans as a whole, I feel I must put before you the concerns of our Edmonton citizens. The location of a provincial park in the Edmonton area is a very real need for the people who could utilize it. The closest provincial park to the City of Edmonton of any consequence, is at least 70 miles. In the past, studies have shown a real shortage of park and recreation areas that exist close to cities, located to enable people to visit for just a day.

There are some 49 provincial parks in Alberta, but none within a close proximity to Edmonton, where exists a high concentration of populace. I believe surveys of the recreation habits of people in Calgary and Edmonton have shown how few citizens from these large urban centres ever get to visit national parks located in the province. In Calgary, approximately 15 per cent of the citizens leave the city more than twice a year to visit such parks as Banff. The statistics for Edmonton are even worse as the parks are farther away. The shortage of park facilities in the winter is even greater, as so many of the facilities are closed.

The population of the Edmonton area is at the half million mark. Of this population density, approximately 70 per cent are between the ages of five and 50. Over 2,600 of the citizens in the City of Edmonton alone are over the age of 65, and perhaps never have the opportunity to visit a provincial park.

The income pattern of people in the Edmonton area is somewhat like this. Approximately 51 per cent have male wage earners earning less than \$5,500 annually, with another approximately 33 per cent earning between \$5,500 and \$8,000. Mr. Speaker, about 84 per cent earn less than \$8,000 annually in this City of Edmonton. The statistics for female wage earners show they earn about half the earnings per male, and I think the women of Alberta may be interested in that.

Clearly, these figures indicate the large number of people in Edmonton that may be deprived of the use of park and recreational facilities as their incomes do not permit such luxuries as travel to the distant parks.

Another influencing factor for the establishment of parks adjacent or very near to two major urban centres is the need to reduce highway travel and the increasing carnage on our highways. As well, this would permit the use of such a park with recreational facilities by many people without private transportation. The short distance travel cost by bus would be minimal. The type of provincial park I envisage adjacent or near these urban centres, Mr. Speaker, is an all-encompassing one; a park with walks, trails, active recreation areas, boating, skating in winter, beautiful garden areas, picnicing, swimming.

Mr. Speaker, Edmonton has just such an area that would lend itself to such a development, all within six miles of the City of Edmonton. The masses of people residing north of the Saskatchewan River in the City of Edmonton have virtually no park facilities of any kind. So if we turn our direction to Big Lake, just about six miles northwest of the City of Edmonton, here we will find a lake stretching approximately seven miles in length, fed by the Sturgeon River. With some dredging of the Sturgeon River it would provide a long scenic canoe trip. A great portion of the land along the lake is already Crown owned and a vast area surrounding the lake is undeveloped and should make it economically feasible to purchase whatever additional land for such a development that may be required.

This government, in its 'new direction', could have a very useful target date for development and completion of such a park in

4-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

Edmonton. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest a development in Edmonton of such a park, to be completed for the 1978 Commonwealth Games, which I have no doubt will be awarded to Edmonton and would indeed confirm this government's support for the Games to be held in Edmonton.

Mr. Speaker, indeed it is my pleasure and privilege to second the motion of my colleague and member for Calgary North Hill.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate on this Motion.

[The motion to adjourn was defeated on a voice vote.]

MR. LUDWIG:

Did I hear that the motion was lost?

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion to adjourn was lost.

MR. LUDWIG:

There is nothing wrong with hon. members from both Edmonton and Calgary standing up and demanding a nice big piece of revenue, general revenue for their respective cities. I come from the City of Calgary and I would like to see this happen, because I happen to like that city and we can definitely stand more parks in the cities. But I am appalled that all of a sudden we have a new government, and we witness a power play between Edmonton and Calgary. How about Lethbridge? How about Red Deer? How about Grande Prairie? You might say they don't need parks. If they don't need parks, why are these two people standing up here in a righteous attitude about the fact that they need this because Calgary and Edmonton won't grow much more if you don't provide them with beautiful parks. And they're not saying that we would like to provide parks in Edmonton and Calgary to be financed and paid for by the 900,000 people from Calgary and Edmonton. They're saying that we want to get Grande Prairie and get Spirit River, and get Rycroft and Red Deer to chip in and pay for these parks, desirable as they are and the fact that every city ought to have adequate parks.

But how on earth can you justify two of the most affluent cities in Western Canada to demand expensive financed parks at the expense of the rest of the people of this province? And I'm saying this in all fairness and I believe it's in all honesty, because I come from Calgary and I always support things to be developed and progress in Calgary. But I haven't got the gall to tell the people of my constituency that Strathmore and Blairmore and Canmore are to help pay for these parks in Calgary and Edmonton. I suppose they will say that the people will leave the country and come to Calgary and Edmonton to enjoy the parks. I think this would show a selfish attitude and a touch of arrogance on the part of the two hon. members to say that we want a park in our cities. We want it paid by all the people. Who speaks for the rest of the people of this province? I'd like to see some hon. members from the other side who don't come from Calgary and Edmonton state their views in the manner that is proposed by an open government. I have no hesitation to repeat what I said.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

MR. FARRAN:

What is the interest of the people of Calgary? Who is arrogant?

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-39

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View has the floor.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'll repeat what I'm saying here and explain to my constituents the proposal made by the hon. member. I think it is a bit selfish to scream on one hand, that our cities are growing -- we are providing too much for them at the expense of everyone else -- and then turn around and say that we want an unspecified amount of money, millions of dollars, to be borrowed to be spent in these two areas. Of course, once a man is elected to the legislature he may speak for his constituency, but he also speaks for all the people of the province. The hon. members ought to be aware of it, and I would like to hear the hon. members for Spirit River, for High River, for Smoky and elsewhere to see what they think of this subsidizing parks in both Edmonton and Calgary. I don't think the hon. member for Red Deer can stand in his constituency and state that he supported big parks for Calgary and Edmonton but nothing for Red Deer, and I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Motion needs to be amended. I have not had an opportunity to prepare an amendment and I therefore will, at this time, move adjournment of this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

I'm sorry. The motion for adjournment is out of order until the House has completed another item of business.

MR. LUDWIG:

I repeat my remarks and stress the fact that I favour parks in Calgary and Edmonton but also in Lethbridge and in Medicine Hat. They also need these things and people live there and if we are going to use general revenue for the construction and buying of land and construction of facilities for parks, let's be fair, let's be honest about it, let's be a part of the people and do it for all the people and not for a chosen area at the expense of all the people of this province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I have some trepidation in rising to enter this debate immediately following the hon. member opposite. I am not sure that I could possibly follow the rabbit trail or maze that he led across the grounds of logic, but I will attempt to. I found his remarks very interesting in the light of some of his earlier comments in the legislature.

His argument apparently is that the people of the areas outside metropolitan Edmonton and Calgary should not be asked to pay for any of the services extended to the 900,000 people of Edmonton and Calgary. That is curious, in my view, in the light of his remarks about the AGT, Edmonton Telephones debate where his apparent position is that all the rest of the areas of Alberta should benefit from the revenue which might be produced in Edmonton. I am not saying that one or the other position is correct; but merely that I would appreciate consistency on his part on one view or the other.

4-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

I also wonder in my mind whether or not the remarks the hon. member opposite has had to make to us this afternoon were so polished in the light of having been made by the Social Credit candidate in Edmonton Whitemud last August when that hon. gentleman was proposing a provincial park for the City of Edmonton. Was his plan put down as forthrightly then by the hon. member as it has been this afternoon?

The third thing that comes to my mind is that a resolution which suggests that the services of the Government of Alberta be extended equally to the cities of Edmonton and Calgary does not necessarily preclude the extension of similar services to the cities of Red Deer, Lethbridge, Grande Prairie or indeed to the towns around the province like Lac La Biche and Whitecourt which I am sure are concerned about this situation. I trust the debate will receive careful consideration from the hon. members on both sides of the House. It has come from a member of the legislature and is not to be conceived as government policy at this point.

The hon. member opposite is very fond of estimating what is going to be the cost of some program or another. I presume that he must make these estimates through other people's programs because he has such a paucity of ideas for himself.

I would like to conclude by suggesting that since I think the resolution has merit, there are two particular sites in Edmonton which should be considered; one would be the Municipal Airport, a site of considerable controversy here in the city, and the other would be the present Exhibition Grounds which lies in my own constituency of Edmonton Highlands and which now is apparently growing too small for the services which are provided there. The Edmonton Exhibition grounds is not to be taken lightly. It lies in an area of high density where the age of the population is advancing rapidly and where income is going down quite significantly. It lies in an area of some deterioration, which is of concern to the City of Edmonton. It lies in an area which is in the forefront of the movement of the aged and the people of low income, and would, I think, be an ideal area to consider in terms of a provincial park that would serve people of low income, advancing age and lack of transportation. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. NOTLEY:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that the mover and the seconder of this motion raised it so early in the legislature. I think it would have been much better had it been introduced after the Budget Debate so that we could have examined the proposition in light of the government's policy with respect to provincial parks throughout the province.

I think it is very important that we get away from the idea of just looking at individual, case by case, and examine the overall needs in the province for adequate recreation.

There are very definite needs in the two major cities. I'm very sympathetic to the arguments, for example, advanced by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood. I think the case for adequate recreation facilities for low income Edmontonians, for people in the central core of the City of Calgary, that case is very strong indeed. I think that for too long we've had a tendency to overlook their recreational requirements.

By the same token Mr. Speaker, as I've travelled around this province, while there are some provincial parks dotted throughout Alberta there are many areas of the province where we don't have

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-41

adequate recreation facilities. South-eastern Alberta is one such area. The eastern part of the province generally does not have adequate provincial parks. The north side of the Peace River is another district in Alberta where we don't have adequate recreation facilities. My concern then is that by dealing with this resolution today, without having any idea where the government stands on its total parks program, we are, I think putting ourselves in a position where we are not able to take the long range point of view, which in my judgment is so absolutely necessary if we, as members of this Legislative Assembly, are to arrive at a prudent and reasonable decision.

However, let me conclude by saying once again, though, that there is a very strong case for the low income urban dwellers -- people who have for too long a time been ignored. I don't think that two provincial parks in the City of Calgary and the City of Edmonton are in themselves going to solve this problem, but taken in the light of the total recreation policy, Mr. Speaker, which acknowledges the need to spend more and more of our budget on providing adequate recreational facilities for our people wherever they live, taken in the light of this proposition, this resolution would have some merit.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I come from the Rose Constituency of Alberta that is very fortunate in having two provincial parks. I refer now, Mr. Speaker, to the Miquelon Lake Provincial Park and also to the Big Knife Provincial Park. But we have in Miquelon Lake on an average Sunday, 4,000 people for four months of the year. Mr. Speaker, these parks are being used, but during the winter season they are practically abandoned. They have a large staff, and I would believe that after one month of gathering firewood for the following summer, the work of the wardens is finished.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that we give consideration to more use of our winter parks or our provincial parks. Let's use them the year around. For instance, why are the wardens not operating ski lifts? This would fit in very well at Forestburg in the Big Knife Provincial Park, or skating for children in the winter on Miquelon Lake.

Now as we all know, we have in Alberta a trend that has developed over the last several years that is not going to go away, and this is the trend of snowmobiling. Now an order came this fall banning snowmobiles from all provincial parks in Alberta. Mr. Speaker, the reason forwarded for this was the ecology damage that was being done with snowmobiles. I can understand in some areas, and in some parks ecology can mean quite a bit -- the planting of evergreens, the planting of flowers -- but may I suggest in our two provincial parks that this is minor, the damage that would be done to willows, what we refer to as buck brush, would be minimal. May I suggest that if the people want to use these parks the cost of replacing willows and scrub timber could well be afforded by the Department of Lands and Forests.

As I have said before, the trend is here, snowmobiles will be here for many, many years. Now we have bylaws that have been set by our towns and villages and cities prohibiting their uses in certain hours. They are restricted to a back alley; they are run out of ball diamonds, they are run out of parks.

We have some counties and some municipalities within our province considering bylaws of the same nature. We have a case before the law courts of Alberta where a farmer gave permission to a snowmobiler to go onto his land, and I believe the man lost his head. The farmer is being sued for thousands of dollars. If this case is won, this means that no farmer will allow a snowmobiler to go out on his land for recreation. Now the Department of Lands and Forests

4-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

will use the excuse, let's make private parks throughout Alberta that these people can enjoy. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have provincial parks in Alberta. Let's make them provincial parks for year-round use, and let's open them in my constituency to snowmobilers.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word to that resolution. I favour the resolution very much. I think --

(Not recorded)

...may be enjoyed by the people who are not able to pay large sums of money. I think there's a definite need now, and there's going to be a more definite need in the future for this type of recreational facility because we are more and more getting into a shorter work week and people are needing recreational facilities perhaps more than they ever did before.

A few years ago I was invited by the Canadian Government to represent Canada at the opening of the Pan American Highway, it being my first trip into that area, and we went by bus from Panama City to Mexico City, a distance of about 2,600 miles. In each one of those Central American countries, which are generally considered to be so backward, I had a tremendous delight in seeing how their governments had set aside expensive areas, expensive land right in the hearts of their cities where people came by the hundreds to enjoy the water fountain, the birds, the trees and flowers. I thought many times as I looked at these beautiful parks and beautiful recreational areas that were put there for the enjoyment of the people, that perhaps these countries weren't as backward as we sometimes think they are.

In this country we have put too much dollar value on some of our lands. I remember when somewhat of a slum which housed a number of theatres and so on was being torn down in Toronto, just off Queen Street a few years ago. Suggestions were made by many people in Toronto at that time that here was a wonderful area adjacent to the new City Hall which would be a real adjunct for recreational purposes to the area contained in the City Hall complex. But the majority of people appeared to think that they couldn't afford to put highly expensive land into recreational facilities that would bring no money in to the City of Toronto.

I'm not condemning those who look upon the necessity of securing as much money from public lands as possible for the coffers of a city or province, or the country as a whole. I think they are to be commended. But I do think we have to give way in many cases now, where expensive land that might bring in much money if used for highrises or for shopping centres, provides at least a reasonable number of areas for recreational purposes. It seems to me that this is the purpose of this resolution.

However, while the need for recreational facilities in the metropolitan areas of Calgary and Edmonton is in no doubt, and I should say is greater than anywhere else in Alberta, where we have a high percentage of the population of this province living -- as was mentioned by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview -- these are essential, but to a lesser degree.

I would point out that other cities in the Province of Alberta also have need for recreational facilities. If they now begin to plan, and our provincial government begins to plan, to make sure that there is a reasonable area, what the amount of land is, for every 10,000 population or every 5,000 population, 10, 20, or 40 years from now those areas will have recreational facilities retained for that very purpose, to be enjoyed by the people and to be left as a heritage for those who come after us.

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSAFD

4-43

I'm thinking particularly of the beautiful City of Drumheller. I know it doesn't compare in population with Edmonton or Calgary, or Lethbridge or Medicine Hat or Red Deer, or maybe not even Grande Prairie or Lloydminster. It does compare with Wetaskiwin, but nevertheless the principle is the same. Here we have a number of people who are in the low income brackets, a number of people who have spent their lives in the bowels of the earth and have left much of their lives in the depths of the coal mines who today can't afford to go to our national parks, who don't have the money to go to Vancouver, who don't have the finances to get into a car and go to a provincial park 50 or 75 or 100 miles away. And yet in that valley there is potential for a tremendous recreational area, in the areas where the dinosaurs used to roam.

This was set aside a few years ago, and the government endeavoured to have laws passed that would make it an offense for people to tear off every dinosaur bone or every carcass that was unearthed in the hills -- nevertheless it still goes on and I don't know how it could be policed, it is difficult to police it -- but here we have something peculiar to the Province of Alberta. A provincial park in that area -- not the size you need in Calgary or Lethbridge or Medicine Hat, or Red Deer or Grande Prairie -- but a smaller size, a reasonable size and unique to the area, I am sure the hon. Minister of Tourism will agree, has something few other areas on this continent have. We should be capitalizing on it more, not commercializing it, but capitalizing on it so that the people are aware.

I think of the beautiful little church, for instance, that was the brainchild of a Pentecostal minister in Drumheller a few years ago and which was rapidly picked up by the mayor of Drumheller, Mr. Toshack, and his council, and many others. I see there on the register people from every part of Canada, Toronto, Ottawa, and from the U.S.A., New York, Boston. You should read their remarks. They're delighted with the geological effects of the valley, with the bones they find, with the petrified rocks they find.

While I'm on it, there are a few relics of very large trees that are now petrified. If they're not preserved -- and I intend to discuss this with the hon. Minister of Tourism -- if they're not preserved and taken now, in very few years they're going to disappear and we're not going to have them.

But the general idea of this resolution, while it will cost the people of Alberta money, is simply to ask for consideration for long range plans, for plans that will make it possible to develop and maybe reserve some areas that otherwise will be impossible to be used if they are not reserved at an early stage. It is asking for consideration and I think this is good because the recreational part of the human being is going to have to be given more and more importance, and come out more and more strongly in the programs of the various governments of this country.

So Mr. Speaker, without trying to take away from the resolution at all, I would like to make a simple amendment which I hope the hon. member might even accept. If he does, I'm prepared to let it go at that, by simply adding "and other cities in Alberta", and if the hon. member is prepared to accept that, then it will save me making the amendment and save the time of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are the mover and seconder prepared --

4-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

MR. FARRAN:

My seconder and I are very happy to accept the amendment and we also appreciate all the sentiments the hon. member of the Opposition expressed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree that debate may proceed on the motion as so amended?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. GHITTER:

Firstly, if I may, with respect to this motion I wish to congratulate the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill and the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood who have sponsored what I regard to be a very important motion before this Assembly this afternoon.

Unlike the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, those of us on this side of the floor believe that we represent our constituents and, indeed, if there is no need for parks in Calgary Mountain View -- although I doubt it -- I think we would be happy to obtain any allocation in Calgary Buffalo from the point of view of anything that could be done in this regard. You know Calgary Buffalo is somewhat misnamed for it leaves one with the impression that it has a great deal of space. When you look at it more closely, you soon realize that it is more of a paved jungle.

It is not surprising that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, regarding the use of parks, assisted my particular constituency prior to the last election by presenting us with a very fine paved park which takes approximately one-half a block next to our Court House, so that we can have a little bit of added pavement in downtown Calgary.

However, I do not regard matters of this nature to be a partisan power play, as does the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. From the point of view of the need for parks, however, I would like your consideration today of the thought that not only do we need provincial parks in the outlying areas of our cities, Mr. Speaker, but that the real need for park space is within the urban core of our cities in this province. Coming from an area where some 10,000 people live in high rise apartments, as the hon. Provincial Treasurer, the Member for Edmonton Centre would well appreciate, the concern for the quality of life of individuals with homes in urban cores is one which deeply concerns me. The fact that the people living within these apartments walk to work, never get outdoors, come back from their offices still within the elevators and within the high-rise structures, is one which I believe requires the consideration of every member of this House, from the point of view of what is the quality of life of the person who inhabits the core of our cities.

Let it not be forgotten that by 1980, some 80 per cent of the population in Canada will be residing in the five major cities in this great country of ours. Let it always then be remembered that the people who inhabit the core of our cities are really the people that we must consider when we talk in terms of their recreation, of the quality of their life, and what can be done to better their day-to-day enjoyment of their leisure time.

In Calgary, Mr. Speaker, we have an admirable area in the heart of our city, and that is along the banks of the river. The beautification that could be undertaken from the point of view of that wonderful valley and the beautiful river, could be assisted by provincial government funds which could assist our municipalities in

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-45

the City of Calgary by beautifying that area -- I believe it needs it. By taking that one attractive area and spending some money, those dwellers in downtown Calgary could have the opportunity of enjoying the benefits of the river valley and the benefits of getting outdoors and enjoying some recreation and leisure time.

So, although I strongly endorse the motion of the hon. Members for Calgary North Hill and Edmonton Norwood, I would also suggest that it should not be forgotten that these parks should not only go around the perimeters of our cities, but that they should be used as well, and encouraged, within the cores of our cities, where we have so many people desiring to use parks in their leisure time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much this resolution being brought before this legislature. Certainly it is a matter of great concern to all Canadians that we find the dwellers in our urban areas being so curtailed by the environment that they live in. All of us can concede that here is an area that in the past has not been properly explored, to the degree that it should have been.

I was struck, Mr. Speaker, on my trip to Regina and in my visit to the Regina Legislature, by this all-encompassing park in which the Legislature stands. Here, in the centre of a city, was in excess of a thousand acres of land used by all people at all times, an area where fathers and mothers could bring their children on Sundays, where there were flowers and trees and a natural setting and even, Mr. Speaker, a square where people could get up on a podium and express their thoughts, whether anyone listened or not.

Here was one unique area, Mr. Speaker, where I found that ecology had been properly changed to advantage. This, Mr. Speaker, that I refer to is the effect on the Canada Geese. The Canada Geese, because of the heat that is generated by the Saskatchewan Power Commission's station, are enabled to spend 12 months of the year in this specific area. They winter there, and they are also fed by the people of Regina, who go forth and enjoy these scenes. You find that nowhere has this been taken care of, if you look at the other cities of Canada.

By virtue of an accident in the City of Ottawa, we find the Canadian Experimental Farm located pretty well in the city. This was because, of course, the government bureaucracy was unable to move fast enough, apparently, to keep up with the real estate salesmen. This is the only reason that I could see for this survival.

Hence, we now have to look at planning. We have to look at planning for people, and I think we all in this Legislature share this concern. We all expect that, hopefully, our deliberations here will aid the betterment of our people. It has been mentioned -- and I concede -- that it is very essential in our city areas. There are other places where towns will some day become cities and where you have to look, not for today, but beyond today and into tomorrow. So, Mr. Speaker, I now suggest an amendment to the amendment to include the towns. This is a simple amendment and one which certainly enlarges the scope of the intent of the original motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

As I understand it, we did not go through a formal amendment procedure but -- would the hon. member please be seated? We did not go through the formal amendment procedure and consequently we are, in effect, speaking to the original motion. There was just a courtesy change made in the original text at the suggestion of the hon. Member

4-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

for Drumheller which was unanimously agreed upon by the House. I would say, therefore, that we cannot really consider the motion as having been formally amended.

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, I believe, is speaking to a point of order, and I wonder if we might hear him.

MR. DRAIN:

We're speaking to the point of order. I take heed and respect your ruling. I accept and believe that the members of this Legislature are prepared to think big. They're prepared to think for all areas of the Province of Alberta, and I'm confident that, if suggested to the hon. members this amendment which was agreed to unanimously, can also be stretched to include the towns which are the cities of the future in the Province of Alberta.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The motion which was proposed by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, reads,

"Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta consider the establishment of Provincial Parks in Calgary and Edmonton."

The addition of "and other cities" is in fact, an amendment on exactly the point I was supporting, and even though it is not a formal amendment, the meaning of the motion now suits what I believe in. I believe that it is a different motion entirely. We could not say that it has not been formally amended. The motion, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, is a different motion now, and I submit that it has been amended.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member had wished the House to go through the formal procedures so as to give each one who has spoken on the debate a right to speak again, then I would suggest that on future occasions the hon. member might dissent when the unanimous consent of the House is being asked.

MR. LUDWIG:

On a point of order, the definition of an amendment is "adding or taking away the wording or the meaning of the resolution," and this is what happened. We can call it what we wish, but in my humble view, I submit to you, sir, that the motion is now one with which I have no quarrel. I support this motion, and I couldn't in its original context. I submit that it has been amended and I have the right to speak again to this motion.

MR. DRAIN:

May I carry on, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member continuing with his speech or is he now proposing an amendment?

MR. DRAIN:

I'm attempting to continue with my speech and to overcome these obstacles that are being placed against the right of my expression by... My contention, Mr. Speaker is that the expansion of green areas in cities and towns and in potential towns in this province, represents a sociological benefit that can not be properly measured.

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-47

I am sure that some hon. members have read scientific research on the effects of confinement on various animal species, and the conclusions of these scientists are that, when people do not have areas of sufficient involvement, sufficient areas to move around, there develops a basic antagonism and an intense seeking out of areas of movement by aggressive means. This is one of the hazards that exists in high density and high population areas.

Hence, Mr. Speaker, I believe that in furthering the intent of this motion it will be in the interests of all of the people in the Province of Alberta. I am not, Mr. Speaker, specifically making a pitch for the Crowsnest Pass. I am not asking this legislature to fund the money sweated out of the lowly taxpayer in the Province of Alberta. I'm not asking for this money to spend in the Crowsnest Pass because there we have an area of beautiful mountains and we have all park. Regretfully we have a few sign posts that indicate a little coal pile, but I think that these are proper. I think that --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member permit the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill to state his point of order?

MR. FARRAN:

I beg to interrupt the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, who has already been hampered in his presentation by his own side. My point is this, that if the hon. member is assuring that his extension of the original motion is acceptable to me and my seconder, the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, in the manner that we accepted the extension from the hon. Member for Drumheller, then he is wrong, because we would rather that he put it in the form of a formal amendment so that we can discuss this constant stretching of the concept, from cities to towns to villages to hamlets and so on.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is my understanding that the hon. member had declined moving an amendment and was continuing to debate the original motion, with the slight courtesy change that was made.

MR. DRAIN:

The point that I am trying to make despite the obstacles that are being thrown up and the harassment, is that where today a small tree is planted, 10 or 20 years down the road grows a considerably larger tree, and who knows the areas in the Province of Alberta where the cities of the future will be?

This is where the Legislature of the Province of Alberta has to think, and think big. I was using, Mr. Speaker, the area of the Crowsnest Pass not with the intent of undermining the thoughts of the motion, but merely as an illustration to point out how fortunate we in the Crowsnest Pass are, where we have on each side of us mountains that are unequalled in any other part of the world, areas within one mile of Blairmore where you can walk and commune with nature, and go into virgin forest glades that have been unsullied and unmarked by any pollution whatsoever. These are the things that we lack in our cities, Mr. Speaker. Hence, having regard for this, confident of the ability of the hon. members to think beyond their own little spheres and to think in terms of the Province of Alberta, I herewith move the following amendment, seconded by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. FARRAN:

Is the seconder going to speak?

4-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member, I think, perhaps means that the text rather than the intention of the resolution be changed, so as to include towns. Does that mean the addition of the words "and towns" at the end of the resolution?

MR. NOTLEY:

In seconding the amendment after such a persuasive speech by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, there is really very little that I can add except to say, as I said in the original discussion of this motion, that we should be looking at our parks policy in the light of the total needs of this province, and not simply confining ourselves to urban needs although we acknowledge the very critical importance of recreational facilities in our two major cities. But there are equally important arguments for extending recreational facilities in provincial parks to other parts of the province as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight was on his feet first.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment to the motion, I think it is obvious to us all now through the discussion that we have just conducted that a provincial parks policy is definitely essential within this province. However, I would go back to the original motion and I would like to say at this point that we do have distinct needs in the cities that are not covered by the amending motion for towns, villages, and so on. Eloquent statements have been made for areas such as Camrose, Pincher Creek, and Drumheller, but one thing that we might point out, coming from the city and the urban areas, is that we really don't have that much room for the snowmobiles and the creatures of the forest that have been discussed in these last few minutes.

In order to give an idea of the problems that we do have in the cities, I would point out to you the nature of park growth that does occur within the two cities of Calgary and Edmonton. When I am talking about this growth, I am not meaning to subordinate this type of growth to any other centre of the province. But first of all in the cities of Calgary and Edmonton, the first thing we are faced with, that you are not necessarily faced with in other parts of the province, is a very high and escalating land cost, which makes it a very expensive procedure indeed to put a park anywhere within the city itself. When you look at where you are going to put your parks in these cities you are left with two things. You are left with river banks and ravines, where you can't put houses.

As was stated by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow or as was mentioned to the House in a question yesterday, there are many problems that we do face in developing, the Bow River particularly, there are many problems in stabilization and so on which makes this even more impossible. Now, in addition to this, within these two cities we see growth that is not following what we think of as the normal place to put a park. We find that in Calgary and Edmonton, growth in the cities is going north and south, completely away from what would be the natural area to place a park.

Consequently we now have a need for some type of park development outside of the river bank area itself. The result is this, that for many people within these two areas, with a population of 900,000 people, there is complete inaccessibility to the parks area and where we do have developed parks -- and usually developers

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-49

develop these themselves -- we have a completely dehumanizing crowded effect. Once again, going back to the Calgary Bow park, the Bowness Park, if you go down there on a weekend you can see the masses of people which take away, really, from the enjoyment of what is a very beautiful park in this particular area.

We have a high residential density in these two cities, and this overcrowding in these two areas just demonstrates the complete need we have in these two cities for some type of development.

We do take the position that we have needs within our cities. It has been stated in the last couple of days that we're not to the needs of the urban areas in our province. We do have these real needs and this real concern as a government, but the situation that I've just discussed in the last few minutes really applies only to two major urban areas now, and at some point in the future the variables that I've mentioned will probably spread to other smaller urban areas in the province, and will be dealt with at that time.

I assure the hon. Member for Camrose that the parks as developed in Calgary and Edmonton would be used all year round. They would be used all year round because of the high density that we have. At this time I support this particular motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

My understanding is that the second motion to adjourn may not be made until some intervening item of business has been completed. As far as I'm aware, that has not happened.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the amended motion now, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway was on his feet first if it was in regard to the motion and not a point of order.

MR. TAYLOR:

The hon. member was not permitted the right to adjourn the debate. Surely he has a right to speak now. He should have the first chance. Otherwise he may be taken as having spoken, as I understand it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member who was going to move adjournment of the debate wish to speak now?

4-50

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

MR. PURDY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm a bit unprepared, as I was going to adjourn the debate and start from the bottom of the Order Paper next time.

In regard to provincial parks I think that the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill has made quite a contribution by saying that we should have provincial parks within our city boundaries, and by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, in seconding it. We have one provincial park 38 miles from the City of Edmonton, and I'm fairly well acquainted with this. This is the Wabamun Provincial Park. It is a park that serves the City of Edmonton right now quite adequately, but at times -- and we have seen on days when they have held water safety days, we have had upwards of 40 thousand people. We have to expand this park beyond its present boundaries. There is land available, but the park must be expanded to accommodate these people.

I concur with what the hon. member for Edmonton Norwood says, perhaps to expand a provincial park into the area of Big Lake. This is an adequate area, there is Crown land available, and I believe that it would work in this area. It would certainly take the burden off Wabamun. It would take the burden off Miquelon Lake and our other parks in the area.

There are areas in the province where I would like to see provincial parks changed. I think that some should be used strictly as a wilderness area, and some as a recreation area. The resolution that was brought forward last year by the other administration as to no snow vehicles being allowed in the provincial parks -- as was mentioned by the hon. Member for Camrose -- has hindered the park in the Wabamun area. There has been great concern out there during the last winter as snowmobilers in the area had no place to use their snow vehicles.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to coming back toward the City of Edmonton, I don't know if Big Lake could work, as it is a shallow lake, but this is one of the things that can be worked out. It can be beautifully used as a canoeing set-up for people, and so on. There are adequate areas in that area for setting up a park.

Getting back to my own park in my own area, I would expect that there is \$1 million or \$2 million involved in this park. It is used, I would say, six months a year. I believe it should be, as I said earlier, used to capacity the full year around. But the men who are employed in this park do various tasks other than the wardenship of the park. They look after areas that need looking after.

I think that at this time, I would like to adjourn my part of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

I call it 5:30, and the House stands adjourned until 8:00 this evening.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:30 pm.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8:00 p.m.]

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSAFD

4-51

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(Adjourned)

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have the opportunity to continue with a review of some of the things that my department has had under consideration during the last seven months. I do want to suggest again, as I suggested the other day, that our government has taken many new initiatives in the area of environmental management. It is not possible for me, Mr. Speaker, to review tonight all of these initiatives that we have taken, but I hope to review some of the highlights. It is my intention to touch very briefly on some changes in the administrative aspects of my department and secondly, it is then my intention to review briefly the undertakings of the Environmental Conservation Authority. I would then like to review very briefly some of the broad objectives, some of the policy matters, and some of the legislation that has been concentrated in the department as well as some of the new thrusts we hope to carry out in connection with pollution control. I then want to take a quick look at water resources and review some of the broad guidelines in this area as well as some of the policy matters we are working on, and also, very briefly, some of the work that has been done, if time permits. I would then like to say something in connection with my department's role in land if time doesn't run out by then.

Mr. Speaker, in examining the role of the Department of the Environment and looking at the structure that had been established, it became evident that some changes were necessary. One of the first changes undertaken by our government was the establishment of a new division within the department called the Division of Standards and Approvals. This division was separated from the Division of Pollution Control for many reasons. The first and most important, of course, is that pollution control is generally a regulatory function and this function will be farmed out from the Department of the Environment to various agencies and departments of government.

In the area of standards and approvals; that is approval of new plans and the establishment of standards, we consider that this is a vital function of the Department of the Environment and as a result, there is no intention, or very little intention, to farm this part out to other departments or agencies of the government. I think we might look at Standards and Approvals as the judiciary arm of the department and the Division of Pollution as the police force.

I would just like to say very briefly that the Standards and Approvals Division will be made up of a pollution biologist, a plant pathologist, a medical officer, a veterinarian, and engineers on water and air quality and municipal engineering. The role of this new division will be highlighted, and I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it will be staffed, we hope, with men of the highest quality.

We also, in the area of water resources, took a new initiative this year in organization, Mr. Speaker, by establishing a water resource management office at Fort Chipewyan. The government considered that this is a unique point in water management in Alberta. Several of Alberta's major rivers meet at this particular point, at Fort Chipewyan, so there is need at this point for real expertise, and almost a day to day management or examination of our water resources.

In establishing this office, Mr. Speaker, we felt it necessary and proper conduct of government to train as many people from the local work force as we possibly can to staff this office and make the various measurements that we anticipate making in this area. And as a result, some 15 to 20 local people are going to be trained in water management in this office. In examining the role of the Department

4-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

of the Environment in irrigation, we recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there is a function associated with irrigation, that doesn't necessarily belong with the Department of the Environment. And after due discussion, it was decided to transfer back to the Department of Agriculture a number of people associated with work involving land management basically in connection with the irrigation districts. The Department of the Environment will, of course, maintain its overall responsibility for onstream management.

We, of course, as a government, felt it also necessary to transfer the Environment Conservation Authority from reporting directly to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, to reporting to the Minister of the Environment directly. The Authority does not report to the department. It just reports directly to the minister, and this was necessary for coordination and furthermore, it was recognized that the Conservation Authority had to have access to the various departments and had to have a mechanism for this access and this is being done through the Department of the Environment.

We are also examining intimately, at this time, the possibility of a major reorganization within the department, or readjustment, it would be better to say, in connection with the research arm of our department. The trend from the last government and during establishment of the department was to establish a research division of substantial proportions, but in examining the role of the Department of the Environment in this area, there was a general leaning more towards a corps of experts to co-ordinate research on the environment across all government agencies and all government departments, somewhat similar, perhaps, to a research secretary. And I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this aspect is under consideration and no finalization has been resolved in this area.

Before I go to pollution control, I would just like to suggest or indicate to the House some of the new thrusts of the Environment Conservation Authority. The Authority, of course, was asked to hold extensive hearings in connection with surface reclamation and strip mining, early last fall. It has conducted some major hearings in this area and there has been a tremendous amount of input and dialogue with the public as well as with companies, and this dialogue, of course, will provide the input to the new legislation that is being considered. I would like to suggest that the Environment Conservation Authority, contrary to rumours, has been given, and this has been announced publicly virtually, a full slate of hearings. One area of concern has been archaeological and historical resources, and the authority is presently putting together the necessary submission and the necessary requirements to hold a hearing in this area at the earliest opportunity. The Authority has been asked to hold public hearings on the environmental aspects or effects of the operation of sulphur extraction gas plants, and I'll have more to say about this later. The Authority has been asked to conduct hearings in connection with land use and development within the Canmore Corridor. I believe a question has been asked in this area earlier today. The Authority has also been asked to conduct hearings with respect to reclamation and development of the Crowsnest area. The authority has also been asked to hold hearings at the earliest opportunity in connection with regulated development within the Strathcona Industrial Corridor. And the authority has also been asked to hold hearings on the environmental effects of the use of insecticides, pesticides and hard chemicals. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, the extent of these studies has been made public through a news release.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of pollution control, I would like to suggest that this government has established some very broad guidelines and I would like to go through them very quickly. The first, Mr. Speaker, was to create the climate of responsibility and awareness for environmental problems and instigate preventative methods where possible. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-53

very encouraged at the behaviour of industry in connection with adopting and assuming a role of responsibility in this area.

It has really been encouraging, for example, that Procter and Gamble has come to us and indicated that an area like the Catwall falls area should be set aside. And this was done on their initiative. I'm pleased to indicate to you that in discussions with Exshaw Cement people they gave every indication of being concerned with the aesthetic aspects of their plant. And in this area we will be discussing with them the aesthetics of a plant located in a vital area as this one is. I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that a company came to us on their own volition (a major pipeline company) and indicated that they were going to change all their large tankage from fixed roof to floating roof so that vapours wouldn't be released to the atmosphere.

I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Chemical Producers Association came in to see us and indicated that they were examining extending their transportation emergency assistance plan to Alberta. Mr. Speaker, we find this very encouraging. We find that industry is responding and assuming a role of responsibility.

The second guideline that we have established is to establish a level of understanding of the problems before us and those that are expected to arise because of urbanization and resource development, and to do this through research and study at an early enough stage to prevent the need for panic solutions.

The third overall objective that we have established as a government is to establish meaningful legislation and regulations which are enforceable and establish the methods required for adequate enforcement.

The fourth was through short and long range planning to balance environmental preservation against resource development, and to adopt such management practices as to maintain our renewable resources in perpetuity and maintain an healthful and quality environment.

These, Mr. Speaker, are our overall objectives. I would also like to suggest that during the last seven months we have crystallized policies in several areas. We have, for example, recognized that there is a need for centralization of responsibility for pollution control and environmental management within government itself. This is, of course, being done through the Department of the Environment and with the reorganization of the department as well as having the authority report directly to the minister.

We recognize and have established a policy of controlling pollution at the source, if in fact, we are to have meaningful legislation. We recognized and indicated on several occasions the policy that the polluter must pay for the consequences of his pollution. We have indicated over and over again as a policy matter the fact that secrecy and confidentiality enjoyed by polluters would be legislated or regulated out of existence. We have indicated, as a policy matter, the need to involve the public in environmental management to a maximum possible degree; and we have indicated that there is a need to initiate land use regulation on a provincial or regional basis, that is, there is an increasing need to set aside areas within which the influence of man and his machines could be limited and regulated.

I want to suggest at this time that certain legislation was concentrated within the Department and I would like to indicate to the House what legislation rests within the responsibility of the Department at this time: The Department of the Environment Act, of course, The Clean Air Act, which we proclaimed as a government this

4-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

fall, and passed the subsequent regulations; The Clean Water Act, again the same; The Environmental Research Trust which we proclaimed this fall and have selected a Board of Directors; The Beverages Containers Act, which was transferred from the department of Highways to the Department of the Environment, regulations were drawn up and passed by this government. The Agricultural Chemicals Act was transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Environment. The Water Resources Act, of course, was within the Department of the Environment when this Government took over. The Ground Water Control Act was brought within the purview of this Department. And of course, there is new legislation coming up and The Surface Reclamation Act was transferred from the Department of Mines and Minerals to the Department of the Environment. So you see, Mr. Speaker, basically in the area of pollution control the department is now responsible for the control of pollution and water, land and the air.

I would like to suggest very quickly, Mr. Speaker, some of the new thrusts which the department will be undertaking during the next few months, in that most of these have been announced through news releases. First of all, I would like to say that contrary to what some hon. members have already indicated in this House, this government is vitally concerned with urban affairs, vitally concerned with urban life, and we have announced an overall noise study and odour study in the two large cities of Edmonton and Calgary. There is a need to establish a base understanding of what the noise levels are and how, in fact, these noise levels are changing, and what the cause is, and what the solutions might be. Depending on these studies, the government will then have to make a decision as to whether or not legislation may be required. The same is true of odour surveys, and to our understanding, there has never been a noise and an odour survey of the two main cities done in their entirety.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, before I go on to some of the new thrusts, to review one item I forgot to mention and that is in the area of municipal disposal facilities. My department has approved this year the expenditure of \$13.5 million in connection with the installation of sewage disposal facilities in Alberta. Of this amount \$9 million or approximately 66 per cent was money loaned by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and there were 34 communities which took advantage of this project. If the projects approved are completed by 1975 then Central Mortgage and Housing will, of course, be forgiving 25 per cent of the loan.

The City of Calgary received \$2.5 million, followed by Red Deer which was \$1.5 million, and Edmonton which was \$1,343,000. So, Mr. Speaker, this government is concerned with the plight of the cities and the problems of the cities. Other municipalities -- and I might mention them quickly -- Athabasca, \$96,400, Carstairs, \$91,159, Cochrane, \$131,000, West Edson, \$113,000, and so forth. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that initially the allocation to Alberta by the federal government was \$3 million and this was subsequently raised to \$9 million. In this light I want to suggest that the former minister did play a role in increasing this amount. It did make a good case for Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, we also recognize that we have a major problem before us of cleaning up the river -- the North Saskatchewan River through Edmonton, and the Bow River through Calgary. It wasn't long before we recognized, Mr. Speaker, that there was no way we could clean these rivers up unless we offered to industry, both large and small, an alternative to get rid of their wastes, and as a result we undertook a major study in connection with establishing the types of wastes that are introduced into the river by the universities, by smaller industries and so forth. We have commissioned a study associated with establishing a multiple disposal site in Edmonton and a multiple disposal facility in Calgary. These facilities, when designed and installed, will handle a number of exotic wastes that

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-55

are released by the various industries and by the university and other institutions. The facility will be a multi-purpose facility which will have incinerators as well as perhaps deep disposal wells. But it is our understanding that if pollution of the two major rivers running through the cities is, in fact, to be controlled, then an alternative must be provided and it is our hope and we have budgeted for it -- that these two facilities will become operational by the end of 1972.

Mr. Speaker, we have also undertaken a major study to define all aspects of pollution in Lake Wabamun and also in connection with determining or approximating the effects of thermal pollution on this lake. I want to indicate that the government has announced that Lake Wabamun will be retained as a major recreational lake in the Edmonton area, and as a result it's our intention to do whatever is necessary to maintain this as a quality lake. This project was farmed out to Reid, Crowther & Partners within the last couple of days at approximately, I believe, \$840,000.

I want to suggest that the department has undertaken a re-examination of SO₂ or sulphur dioxide emissions and the standards established for each sour gas plant in Alberta. And I want to suggest that our findings have been somewhat appalling. We have sour gas plants operating with ground level concentrations as high as 1.73 parts per million when the existing standard is .2 parts per million. It is my intention to table in this House at the suitable time, the existing conditions in sour gas plants as we found them as a Government when we took over. We would like also to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have taken a source emission survey in both Edmonton and Calgary. This has been farmed out, again in connection with the policy of this government to use private consultants as frequently as possible. This has been farmed out to a company in Calgary, Western Research and Development, for \$25,000. The final report will outline the present emission rates of all sources emitting in excess of 25 tons per year of any prime pollutant as well as motor vehicles, aircraft, and motorized equipment. The existing degree of air pollution controls will be evaluated and the report will evaluate regional trends and make projections of both controlled and uncontrolled emissions. So I do want to suggest again that this government is very cognizant of the problems of the city, irrespective of what has been said in this House thus far, by the other side.

I also want to suggest that the department has undertaken and intensified a program of sampling and investigation in the Pincher Creek area.

Also, I would like to suggest that the department is undertaking and is establishing the mechanism to conduct a complete survey and inventory of all feed lots in Alberta.

The department has undertaken and established a policy of publishing monthly pollution surveys that are done by the Department, so no attempt will be made to maintain any information in secrecy.

The department has also undertaken a major study, which I have just released in the last couple of days, on studying the environmental effects of tar sands development. This study has been given to a consortium of firms in which an attempt has been made to put together a substantial number of smaller consulting engineering firms to give us the type of expertise required to do a massive study of this nature. I want to suggest that this is basically an entirely-Alberta study, except if some information or expertise isn't available in Alberta that has to be obtained somewhere else. The project director of this study is Mr. Page, who was formerly the manager of the The Great Canadian Oil Sands tar sands project.

4-56

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

We have a program going on at this time of investigating the recycling of paper within the government. Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the initiatives that we have taken in the Department of Pollution Control.

In the area of water resources, I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have had some major new thrusts in this area, and here again we have established some over-all guidelines from which will be established a series of policies and policy papers. I would like to read very quickly the guidelines that, in fact, we have established as a government for performance in this vital area.

The Government of Alberta considers that it is in the public interest of Alberta to spend considerable effort and monies in the definition, conservation, management, and utilization of Alberta's water resources in the best interests of Alberta and Canada. Furthermore, the Alberta government considers that when consideration of all uses of Alberta's fresh water resources are related to the present and future demands of its citizens, that there are no new surplus waters in Alberta. In addition, the Alberta government considers that the future priorities of water uses should be established on provincial and inter-provincial bases without influence by or from international considerations.

The Government of Alberta has placed a moratorium on the use of provincial government funds for use either in part or in total for funding studies which involve the diversion of Alberta's surface waters for export beyond the Canadian borders. Also, the Alberta government has adopted the policy that each major impoundment and/or major inter-basin diversion of water would have to be authorized by a separate act of the Legislature.

MR. DRAIN:

Would the hon. member --

MR. YURKO:

I would just as soon continue as I hate to get cooled off when I get heated up, and I will take the question at the end of my speech.

This policy of diversion -- major diversion or major impoundment -- being brought in by an act of the legislature will be incorporated in the appropriate statutes. With respect to water resource management, the Government of Alberta will study and manage these resources on an individual water basin concept. Each major river drainage basin will be highlighted as an area for continuing water quantity and quality studies, use allocation and priority, use classification and overall management of existing supplies for optimum use and conservation. Government policies will encourage efficient and optimum use of the water resources within all river drainage basins. Intra-basin diversions will be studied and implemented where publicly desirable, and I want to indicate that an intra-basin diversion is one where water is taken from the river for some purpose or other and then brought back into the river. Inter-basin diversion studies and implementation will generally have a very low priority.

It is the intention of the Government of Alberta to develop a mechanism for public participation and public hearings in the planning process. It is expected that overall planning will be done on a regional or watershed basin basis, as well as on an overall provincial basis. It is the intent of the government to establish water management regulatory bodies on a regional basis so that local and regional input into the overall management process can be increased.

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-57

Framed within the overall government policy for guidelines, the Department of the Environment is actively formulating an overall water management plan for Alberta, hereinafter referred to as The Alberta Water Plan. In accord with the overall water management plan, the Government of Alberta will establish specific policy guidelines in a number of areas involving cost-sharing arrangements between governments as well as priority classification of project implementation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to you that we had a two-day policy forum in connection with water resources, which to my understanding was the first time such a forum had been held.

As a result of that forum, policy was considered and is being recommended to government and we hope that during this sitting of the legislature -- that means the Spring Sitting and the Fall Sitting -- a certain number of policy papers in various areas will be presented to the legislature. Some of the areas, of course, will be lake classification and stabilization. Another area will be river flood projects. Another area will be the Alberta Water Plan itself. Another area will be the Red Deer River Basin Management Policy. Our department in reviewing the various river basins has tentatively given number one priority to water management development within the Red Deer River Basin. There are indications that this basin is the most critical basin of any within Alberta.

I would also like to suggest that the department has undertaken to study and implement in several cases a number of projects in connection with flood control, lake stabilization, bank stabilization, surface drainage, water supply, erosion, and they have identified many problems. The department has also, at my request, put together a five-year inventory of projects, and I want to suggest that the five-year inventory of projects is massive indeed and really highlights the policy that this government has established of managing water on the river basin concept base.

I want to suggest that as part of the Winter Works Program, Mr. Speaker, several projects were undertaken as a matter of some considerable need, one being the Paddle River Flood Control program. I don't wish to take the time here tonight Mr. Speaker to discuss this in detail but if the hon. members want to discuss it later, there will be ample opportunity.

In connection with the Peace-Athabasca project, I want to suggest that the rock weir was built across the Chenal de Quatre Fourches and with the heavy snowfall that we've had up north this year, projections are good, and in fact 60 per cent of the delta will be safe. The task force study will, of course, be tabled in this House in connection with the Motion for a Return, but it was the intention of the government to table this report anyway. The task force has undertaken the examination of the effects of damming the Slave River in connection with the effects on the delta in total and also in connection with the effect on Lake Athabasca.

I would like to report very briefly on the Saskatchewan Nelson River Basin Study, and indicate that the report is now being put together in its final form and will be available next fall. I would also like to suggest that the various ministers that met on this study concluded that the study will be terminating three months after the final report is presented, in accordance with the terms of reference of the study.

In the area of irrigation rehabilitation, again I want to indicate very quickly that the government has given the federal government permission to reconstruct a Carsland weir for approximately \$4.5 million, and to suggest that the overall package in connection with the input from the federal government in this area for on-stream works is under active negotiation.

4-58

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

In the area of the inter-departmental planning division, I would like to say again, Mr. Speaker, that through the organization of my department a two day seminar was held on land and management of land in Alberta. And this again, Mr. Speaker, from my understanding was the first. The seminar identified that there were approximately 97 different programs going on in connection with land management in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to the hon. members that every effort will be made to present our seminar on land management to all the members of the Assembly during the course of this sitting. The presentation was so interesting that I think all members should have the benefit of part of that presentation.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would be correct to suggest at this time that this government inherited many mistakes from the previous government in land management. When we took office, of course, strip mining was being done along the face of Mount Rundle, along a slope which made the operation very visible from the Trans Canada Highway as well as to the people that lived in cabins along that highway. I want to suggest that permission to do this strip mining on public lands was given virtually at the same time as the government of that date was passing legislation which permitted it to establish restricted development areas. Mr. Speaker, nowhere in my search of the correspondence can I find any substantiation of the contention that the mining company in question would have been placed in receivership or would have declared bankruptcy in any way, if they had not been granted a permit to conduct strip mining on the face of Mount Rundle. The company has extensive underground coal mining facilities as well as extensive freehold property in the area. Strip mining on Mount Rundle was being done on public lands.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of a review of the entire matter of strip mining in a sensitive and aesthetic area, this government issued a policy statement in the form of a news release, and I think that it is noteworthy that I indicate what it was. It is the intent of the government to adopt such regulations as may be necessary to prevent future strip mining operations from being carried on in mountainous areas where the natural slope is such that the aesthetic beauty of the mountain is badly impaired.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of a visit by some of the hon. ministers to the area and consideration by this government, a new act will be brought in in connection with land conservation practices.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in connection with the Canada Land Inventory Program that basically the Canada Land Inventory Program is completed for the settled areas of the province and we now have under consideration the possibility of extending this to the unsettled areas of this province.

I would like to suggest that, in connection with the Land Assembly Program, in my department virtually a million dollars was spent during the last year in purchasing land for reallocation to higher use. Land was purchased for watershed conservation, wildlife habitat, raising reserves, forestry, recreation, and community pasture assembly. I would like to suggest that if the figures are examined, that perhaps the land bank that the hon. member was referring to is in fact a reality in Alberta.

We have within the department, set up within the last year, in connection with the federal government, a Committee on Remote Sensing. This will be an area of considerable importance in the future and it will tie in with the earth resources technology satellite which will in fact, compile the resources of the Province of Alberta. We have a considerable concern as to where and who will have access to this information.

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-59

The Canadian Council of Resource Ministers has established men and resources as major project during the next several years, and here again I won't take the time to delve into the details of this project, except to say that it is indeed an interesting project and most hon. members will be associated with it in one way or another.

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend gave me 30 minutes, and I have now taken almost 42 minutes, so I believe, that in light of the time flying by so quickly, that I have touched on the highlights of my department, and the highlights of my government, which I believe has taken many initiatives in this area in what it considers to be vital to the maintenance of a good quality environment in Alberta.

In completion of my talk, I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I for one am 'tickled pink' to see you, Mr. Speaker, sitting up in that Chair. It seems to me that it was just several years ago when we had our first conversation and at that time, in a somewhat impartial manner I'm sure, you indicated that it would really be great to enter the political arena in earnest. So I'm very pleased to see that you have ascended to a most honourable spot in this Assembly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank His Honour the Lieutenant Governor for his Speech from the Throne, to express some thoughts on it, myself. I would like to begin tonight by extending some congratulations, and immediately on the heels of what has just been said by the hon. Minister of the Environment, I want to express secretly in public, if I can, some fears that I held about a new Speaker, who had never sat in the legislature before, and I confess that tonight, without shame, because after two or three days of functioning in your capacity, those fears have been completely erased from my mind and heart. I sit in complete ease in the legislature, knowing that things are in good hands. It's a delight to have you in that Chair, Mr. Speaker.

I also want to extend my personal congratulations to the hon. members of the government, to all who have made a valiant effort and who certainly did some wonderful things some way to capture the imagination of the people of Alberta. I sincerely hope that we will be able to work together to continue the relationship that we have now. I was told by one of the hon. ministers, when I suggested that we might work together in this new arrangement, that we might like to look at the pictures on the other side of the House for a while. I confess, Mr. Speaker, that I am delighted with the pictures we have to look at. I believe, if I may express a preference, that I prefer the ones that we look at to the ones that the government looks at. In fact, I would like to say that I count it a real privilege to be a member of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. I like that phrase. It has a much finer ring than just 'the government' -- 'Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition'.

I really appreciate the comments made by the mover and the seconder of the Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the tenor with which the whole debate was set off. I hope that we will be able to follow in that way. I want to express my appreciation for the comments made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition last day, and I hope that we can all work together.

I'd like also to express, Mr. Speaker, my thanks to God and to the people of Highwood constituency for my seat in this Legislature tonight. Rumours were that I wouldn't have it when the campaign got under way, and I was prepared to hand it over to whomever might be able to capture it. For that reason, it's doubly precious to me tonight.

4-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

I want to thank whoever is responsible for the position of my seat in the House, also. As I said, the PC ingenuity has put us on the other side, but it means just as much to me to be able to stand on this side as on that side, a member of the legislature, to work with Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and for the people whom we represent in this province. I feel that the location of my seat is well chosen too, and I don't know who to thank for that. But when I think of the oriental wisdom on my right, something through the ages to which I can always turn for advice, and on my left is the Left, as it should be. And behind me is the Pincher-Creek symphony orchestra. The hon. members of the government had better be careful; there is only one way I can go and that is ahead.

I want to commend all those who are responsible for the new appointments in the legislative chamber, from the red carpet to the tiered seats, to the new ears in the press -- which I hope will always be attuned to our desires -- to the new pages, all newly dolled out and working very well, I must say, for the short time they have been with us, to the voice control in the amplification system, the man who looks after our amplification system. Mr. Ken Kaspell is a home-town boy. He comes from Nanton, my home town, and it is a real pleasure to have him working. I want to thank whoever is responsible for having him there, he has picked it up tremendously quickly.

I would like to encourage all hon. members to assist these people in whatever way we can. It isn't easy, especially at first -- the pages, and those who operate the situation here. I sincerely hope, however, Mr. Speaker, that I don't get sick in the legislature, because I would hate to have someone say: "Is there a doctor in the House?" and then discover that I had been smothered by the presence of eight of them surrounding me. I might never recover from my illness. It is just one of those situations where I think that probably we have only one other profession that has more representatives in the House, and that is the Law Association. We are well equipped with the professionals and we should have a professional situation by the time the four years -- or whatever length of time it is -- has expired.

I would like to say just a word or two about the constituency of Highwood -- which I represent -- before I go on to make some comments directly about the Speech from the Throne. The constituency of Highwood has in it some of the famous towns of Turner Valley and Black Diamond, High River, Okotoks, Nanton, other villages and hamlets whose names are well known to most of the people in this Legislature. There is no constituency that has any more beautiful scenery than that of Highwood, which reaches to the British Columbia border and has mountains, foothills and plains.

There is ranching and farming, agriculture, it has an overflow from the great city of Calgary in hundreds of subdivisions which are bordering on the agricultural area which creates problems -- people problems -- and other types of problems. We have all types of industries and resources and the people are just as varied as the industries and the resources that are in that constituency. As a result we have many blessings and we do have a good deal of problems, the kind of problems that only people located near a city can, shall I say, enjoy. And so, we are looking forward always to the assistance that we can receive from the legislature and the wisdom that might pour out in a situation like this.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a moment or two to touch on some spots and then I want to go back to the Speech from the Throne again and cover it from another angle. There were two or three comments that were made in it that I wanted to comment on, sometimes facetiously and sometimes otherwise. The bottom paragraph on page 1 states: "It is a major goal of my Government to reduce bureaucratic routine and red tape." The next sentence says: "New job creation and expansion of the private sector will be emphasized."

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-61

I am not sure that these two are compatible. If you do away with bureaucracy, you do away with a lot of jobs. It would be better to leave the bureaucracy if you wanted to have higher employment. I am not in favour of bureaucracy, but it's one way to look at the situation.

On the second page, open government; "My government is committed to the principle of open government, providing citizens with easier access to their Legislature and its deliberations." To this end there are five points given, and, Mr. Speaker, I have every regard for open government and I hope that it will be open. I have no reason to believe that it will be anything but otherwise -- that is anything but open -- but I have the uneasy feeling that sometimes there is a distinction made between the government backbencher and the opposition backbencher. I hope that that uneasy feeling will last only as long as my fears of your inability to cope with this situation, Mr. Speaker and maybe they will soon be eradicated. I have here another thought that I would like to consider, and that is the immediate program priority mentioned on page 6, I will not duplicate what has been said before except to reiterate that there were some areas that I thought would have been dealt with with a higher priority and they have been mentioned two or three times, mainly unemployment, grain handling, municipalities, things of this nature.

There are one or two other thoughts that I had marked in this regard; one has to do on page 10, speaking about investment, the Attorney General introducing legislation, amendments, to investment contracts, The Securities Act, things that will tighten the law protecting the public from abuse. And in this legislature last year, Mr. Speaker, we had a resolution concurred in by the Legislature requesting the government to investigate and survey, research and hopefully produce a new trespass act. It had to do with protecting the public from one another and it is my understanding that this will not be brought in at this session. I am somewhat disappointed because of the interest that was shown in that resolution last year. However since everything cannot be done now, we will look forward to its being done a little later. So someone has said, "the difficult we will do immediately, the impossible will take a little longer".

On page 11 our emphasis on the need for better long-term planning. Mr. Speaker, I believe that long-term planning is always a necessity. But my experience in reading the results of predictions and long-term planning in the last two or three years indicates to me that it is no longer possible to project into the future; it is no longer possible to predict any more than a very short time, six months to a year, what will take place. Projections however careful the surveys are made, are just not turning out, and somehow we must learn as governments, a lesson in this, that while we cannot always depend on what has been done in the past, neither can we plan what will be done in the future, for many have said what they will do in the future and have had to eat their words and they became bitter to this. It is no longer possible in the age in which we live to plan well in advance -- that is more than six months or a year at the most, because circumstances change so rapidly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as we went through the Speech from the Throne and as His Honour was reading it, something rather struck me that I'm not sure I should have been doing, but I was gripped with the idea as I read passage after passage, I asked myself the question, now what's new? I put this down about a dozen times and on the strength of that I want to say some things about the Throne Speech, not in a derogatory fashion but I wanted to point out if I can once again what I have just said, that it is not easy to project into the future, in these days in which we live, nor is it easy to produce something that is new.

4-62

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

For instance on page 2, under 'Open Government', "a resolution to open the public business of the Legislature to the television and radio media will be put forward." That resolution has been put forward and all members know to what this refers. But this is not new, Mr. Speaker. It is something that has been talked about, discussed, we've had special committees on, we have brought it back and forth, and differences of opinion have existed -- probably they won't exist to the same extent now because of the discussions that took place before, but this is a perennial subject. What should we do with regard to the Hansard, the news media, making public or making available to the public that information which comes in this Legislature?

On page 3, under 'Legislative Committees': "to ensure that objective, non-partisan scrutiny is given to the public accounts, my government will propose that a Member of the opposition be appointed Chairman of the Committee on Public Accounts." So what's new, Mr. Speaker? This has been the practice in the last two or three years, so it is not something that will be new but we appreciate the fact that it will be carried out.

The next paragraph says, "The formation of six special Legislative Committees will be proposed in order that issues and problems of contemporary concern receive detailed study," and so on. Legislative committees are not new. They have been the order of the day as long as I have been in the legislature for the past nine years.

On page 4, under 'Reorganization': "My government has made a number of major changes in organization to improve the effectiveness of its operations, . . ." Speaking of legislative ratification for these changes being requested is customary. Each government, whether it is new or not, when it's newly elected -- and in fact some governments year after year are in the habit of doing this very thing.

I've skipped one that I want to come back to. On page 8: "My government is committed to reforms in mental health, primarily by taking action on the Alberta Mental Health Study of almost three years ago." We are agreed too. For three years, action has been taken on the Alberta Mental Health Study, step-by-step, and it is impossible to implement the entire mental health study in one or two years and I believe that hon. members on both sides of the House will find that when this year is over there will still be a lot of this health study to be implemented, and with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that not all of the mental health study's recommendations will be carried out in the future.

Then on page 9: "In addition to these five areas of immediate program priority, my government intends to introduce a substantial number of new legislative proposals." So is this customary every year. Very important, it goes on to say, is the area of environmental control. Then it mentions The Beverage Containers Act, the new Litter Act, The Clean Air Act, and The Clean Water Act which requires some amendments, and The Water Resources Act, and a new Land Surface Conservation Act. There is no legislation that comes into effect in the legislature, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't have to have amendments made to it from year to year. This is particularly true of new legislation, and so this is really not something new; it is routine.

The next paragraph speaks about the fund that will give particular emphasis to new development for Alberta's smaller centres, and also separate and distinct from The Agricultural Development Fund, and this is something that has been done in the past three or four or five years, in fact, all along from time to time as circumstances required.

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-63

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will see that they will continue to dry up no matter what effort is being put in to keeping them, much as we would like to keep them alive. These legislative measures will be supplemented by a comprehensive program extension and improvement of Alberta's highway system, reflecting my government's emphasis upon rural development, and I believe that the new government has inherited a commitment which I believe they will wisely carry out with regard to this matter, not something that is new but an ongoing program.

In the field of improved communications, Alberta Government Telephones' construction program for 1972 includes a substantial rural buried cable program and from this service, more than 9,000 additional rural subscribers will be provided. Mr. Speaker, the buried cable program has been in progress for about five years now and is almost completed. This is not new; it is a continuation of a program that was in existence. Progress in terms of establishing adequate wilderness areas within Alberta will be reflected in various programs as well as amendments to applicable laws. The needed amendments to The Wildlife Act will be submitted for your approval. Mr. Speaker, year after year this particular act and The Wilderness Act which was enacted comparatively recently, will of course, have to be updated because it is also a new act.

On page 11, second paragraph: "My Government intends to commence an approach to repeal unnecessary statutes and considers its legislative program in relation to both the introduction of new legislation as well as the repeal of outdated laws of Alberta." As long as there are legislators and legislatures there will have to be this process of weeding out the old and updating some of the even more recent ones.

Next paragraph: "My Government intends to implement, without delay, the wishes of the electorate to reflect the positive vote by plebiscite in favour of joining with the rest of Canada by accepting daylight saving time." So, Mr. Speaker, what is new? What government would not have done what the plebiscite required of them? In the last election in 1967 the plebiscite said: "No daylight saving time". This one said: "We want daylight saving time", so it naturally follows that we will do it.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other area that I want to touch on in this regard, with regard to something that is new. On page 6, the protection of human rights, and The Alberta Bill of Rights, which has already received a good deal of publicity and comment, I want only to say this, Mr. Speaker, that what is included in The Alberta Bill of Rights and probably a good deal more than is included in The Alberta Bill of Rights, is enhanced and encased in the four basic principles of Social Credit which were first enunciated almost 40 years ago.

The first basic principle of The Alberta Bill of Rights, or the first basic principle of the Social Credit philosophy and way of life, has always upheld the basic human rights. In 1946, before there was a Canada Bill of Rights or a United Nations Bill of Rights, the Alberta government put forth a Bill of Rights that was more comprehensive than the one that is being put forth now.

It also puts forth a special section which pointed out how those rights could be maintained, how people could be assured their rights would be looked after -- the economic rights of people, the right to freedom from want was ensured. The bill, of course, as you know, was declared ultra vires by the courts because of the economic features that were included in the bill, but this is not new. However, we will substantially stand behind it 100 per cent, because human rights is something that we must constantly bring to the fore, and we must be constantly protecting if we have any interest in human beings at all.

4-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

Before I make a comment or two on one of my more favourite subjects, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word about a subject that has been talked about quite a bit already in the reply to the Speech from the Throne, and that is the matter of poverty. With all due respect, I was born on a farm in poverty and I have lived in the city in poverty. I know what poverty is, but I sometimes wonder, when I consider the rest of the world if I have any idea of what it is. That may be a bit of a contradictory statement, but poverty and wealth hon. members, Mr. Speaker, have to be relative terms and they have to depend on our own personal background and upon our own personal experience. We use these terms very loosely. The hon. Member for Calgary North and the hon. Member for Spirit River, Fairview, both spoke of great poverty in the Province of Alberta. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway made reference, saying that 20 per cent of the people in the urban centres live at a poverty level.

Mr. Speaker, in Hong Kong, I think the average salary is about \$600 a year and that is considered one of the highest average salaries in Asia and Europe as a whole. There are about 2/3 of the people in the world whose average salary is less than \$200 a year. Now I'm not so naive as to suggest to you that their \$600 salary in Hong Kong would be comparable to \$600 in Canada, but we in this country have become so accustomed to a high standard of living and so accustomed to making money so easily that we have really no concept of what poverty really is. And so we are saying -- for instance, I know that it isn't easy, that folks who are on an old age fixed pension are really strapped and really poverty stricken. I know personally any number of these people on old age pension who receive nothing more than their old age pension and the supplement who have no other income who say to me, we have never had it so good in all our lives. People who have really had to struggle, who now that they have very few needs in their old age, find that, they are getting along because they had a steady income. I'm not saying that it shouldn't be higher, but what I'm suggesting is that we be careful that we do not deprive these people of their right to be free, to have the opportunity of doing for themselves, by giving to them so much that they will feel that they are recipients of welfare because there is nothing that they can pay for themselves or that they have need of, or that they have to struggle for. I know in our own town, Mr. Speaker, a number of widows who are 70 years or older, who have all kinds of money, whose will include thousands of dollars bequeathed to others, who daily go out and shovel snow on their sidewalks because they want the exercise to keep them fit in order that they may not lose their health. It isn't such a bad thing if a person's health and physical fitness permits that they have the privilege to go out and shovel off their own sidewalks even if they are 75 or 80 years old. We must be careful that we do not indulge people to the extent that they feel as if they are recipients of welfare and that there is nothing they can do for themselves.

Hon. Member from Edmonton Kingsway said on another subject that he would like to communicate by space set aside in every newspaper to inform some of the readers what their elected representatives are doing. Mr. Speaker, I know some members who don't particularly want this kind of information in their newspapers. I know others who do, but who wouldn't care to have it in their newspapers, because it doesn't get read, and then, of course, who wisely don't want to put it in because the material is pretty badly slanted politically and it's not particularly information of the nature that they want. Another thing, the space might go begging for material, unless some MLA's got on the bit and did more than what they had been doing in the past.

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-65

Mr. Speaker, it would be a challenge if such space were offered, but it would also be a challenge -- particularly to the MLA's -- and I would hate to see us in the position where some MLA's were trying to do something just in order to fill up the space. I agree with the idea of the communication, hon. member. It is necessary, and this would be an ideal way to do some communicating.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend just a few moments on a subject that is, for obvious reasons, very dear to me. I'm going to speak on the subject of tourism because I have a responsibility in that area, and it came to me, I inherited it, because of my interest in it when I first came into the legislature in 1963. I've been listening to a good deal about tourism these days, and I realize how very important it is and how favourable the Province of Alberta is for attracting tourists. I think that definitely everything that we can do as a government and as a legislature should be done to encourage tourism. But how it should be done, Mr. Speaker, is a matter upon which we will never agree in our opinions.

I raise first of all the question of how important it is that we have a department set aside just for the purpose of tourism. I raise the question with some degree of temerity, because that was my first inclination when I came into the legislature -- get a special department for tourism, because tourism is an important area. But I saw what was done for tourism through a branch in the department of what was then Industry and Development. While they don't appear very significant, it apparently was doing the job for private enterprise, which is largely responsible for the tourist industry, seemed to prosper considerably. In the Province of Alberta, tourism rose to be what is now claimed to be the third largest industry in Alberta, amounting to something like \$300 million in business in 1970. All that, Mr. Speaker, without a Department of Tourism.

I feel that tourism has been brought to the place where it is because of the initiative and the incentive of the free enterprisers who are engaged in that kind of business. I would hate to see the legislature or the government do anything that would cripple the incentive and the vitality of the free enterprise that has brought tourism to the place that it holds in the Province of Alberta today. All we need to do is to start giving large grants, large incentives, so that private enterprise begins to pull in its horns and lets the government do it, and begins to ride on the government as a crutch. I believe that there is a definite place for the government in this matter of tourism, but I question the wisdom of giving the grants and large sums, and trying to run it.

When I talk about tourism, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two about Village Lake Louise, because it's close to our area and it's definitely connected with tourism. Probably I should hasten also, at this point, Mr. Speaker, to say that what I am going to express is my own opinion, not necessarily that of the other members on this side of the House. What I say, I want to say in such a way that I will be understood if I can possibly do it, because I realize that I now skate on thin ice. First of all, I'd like to say that there are some people who will never change their minds because they are so set. There are others who have said some things that they will never want to take back, and so they will have to hang tough on their belief regardless of whether they were right or wrong.

The conservationists have my support in all kinds of conservation because I really believe that now is the time when we have to conserve all that we possibly can conserve of the natural environment that is left in the Province of Alberta, even though we have millions and millions of acres that are virtually virgin and untouched, yet.

On the other hand, if we are going to encourage tourism, we are going to have to do everything that we can to encourage it, and there

4-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

is no way that we are going to encourage tourism by telling the tourists that they can't go and see what we have been conserving for them to see. At this point of inconsistency, I find it hard to accept some of the things that have been said about the Village Lake Louise development project. In principle, I agree with the development of Village Lake Louise, and I have no objection to its being in the National Park, providing that it is on the spot that it is now proposed where the bulk of the area is already developed to a certain extent. It is fact that here we have a location between the two larger towns, Jasper and Banff, and that people are coming in from British Columbia at this juncture, and that we have in these two National Parks, Banff and Jasper, some 6,800 square miles of territory, a very small portion of which has been utilized and developed in any way, and the National Parks policy is such that it would protect the natural environment in the bulk of the area. There is no way that we can say that the development of Village Lake Louise for a tourist accommodation and facility is going to do any harm to the environment, providing it is controlled under the Parks policy, and Parks policy is not violated.

I would like to think of it from the standpoint of the amount of area that is going to be involved. In Village Lake Louise the entire area involved, they say, is 750 square miles. It is connected with 750 square miles of present meagre development, but the actual development itself will never exceed more than 15 square miles at the most, and a portion of that is already utilized by the ski lifts, the lower village that is already developed, the parking areas, and this sort of thing.

Mr. Speaker, because there is a great deal to say about this, I will not take the time tonight, but I want it understood that it is only in principle that I agree with this development, and on the condition that it be developed strictly according to the Parks policy, and that there be strict regulations adhered to.

I have heard that the poor people will not be able to come to this resort or this new development, because they cannot afford it. Mr. Speaker, there are two ways to look at it. Number one, if there are not facilities for the poor people, I would not be in favour of it. Secondly, the poor people might not feel at home there. They may want to go somewhere else. But thirdly, the poorest people we have in Canada today are among the rich people who live in the cities, and they have a right to see our natural resources and our natural environment. They are not capable of tenting or trailering because they have lived so long in their softness that they have to have better facilities. Some of them have never been weaned from the bottle, so they need some place where they can have a drink while they look at the scenery. They ought not to be deprived of these privileges any more than the poor people monetarily, who have not had the opportunity to get out there.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if one looks at it from the full, broad spectrum that is involved, there is a need for this type of thing in order that the people of all kinds may be accommodated in our national parks and may have the privilege of enjoying the scenery.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I want to express my gratitude to you and the hon. members of the Legislature for this privilege of making known these opportunities that we have in our constituency and in our province, and I hope to be addressing this House on a number of occasions in the future. Thank you.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to participate in the debate and congratulate you on your election to the position of Speaker of this 17th Alberta Legislature. Like many of those who

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-67

spoke before me I have great confidence in your ability in the office you hold, however, there is another aspect to that story which really wasn't driven home to me until yesterday afternoon when the hon. Premier was referring to a government team of 48 members. It was only then that I really realized the significance of the fact that we have lost a very prominent and valuable member in the Conservative Caucus on this side of the House.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the hon. Member for Whitecourt, and the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Certainly those hon. members have both outlined very clearly the thoughts of the people in their own constituencies and the high regard which the population holds for the new directions which were outlined in the Speech from the Throne. I would like also to congratulate the new Premier of this province and all the hon. members who have been returned to both sides of the House, as well as those members who, like myself, are accepting their responsibilities as representatives of the people for the first time. Special congratulations are in order for all those members of the Executive Council who have made a contribution in the short time since September 10th which it may have taken others years to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some general observations on the Speech from the Throne, and continue from there to the areas which mostly concern my constituency of Smoky River. Before I talk about that general area of the Speech from the Throne I would like to make a brief comment in regard to the hon. Member for Highwood and his comments about backbenchers. I suggest that on this side of the House we call it the front row, the middle row and the top row. Over on that side you could call it the top row and the bottom row and you could have top benchers and bottom benchers.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of open government, of developing a Hansard publication, of allowing television and radio to cover the proceedings of this House, will allow all citizens of this province to more fully participate in our decision-making process. The expanded use of legislative committees will allow government members who are not on the Executive Council to develop and introduce government bills will provide for a team of 48 members.

There is recognition, Mr. Speaker -- late as it may be in this province -- of that group of people who have been living on either fixed or declining incomes for a number of years -- and I refer to our senior citizens -- problems of achieving an adequate standard of living on the family farm, the plight of handicapped children and the mentally ill.

Mr. Speaker, as I travel throughout my constituency and other parts of Alberta, there is a feeling for the first time in years, of real hope in our rural farming communities. I suggest to you that in every other administration in this country, the job of Minister of Agriculture has been delegated to someone in the lower ranks of the Cabinet and I think it is quite significant that Premier Lougheed has recognized the importance of this area by appointing not only the Deputy Premier as Minister of Agriculture, but the most aggressive and knowledgeable man that this province has ever seen.

Most of you are aware of the new directions taken in this province in agriculture. I would like, however, to outline some of the work that the agricultural task force and the hon. Minister of Agriculture have been doing, particularly in relation to federal provincial negotiations. First of all, I might just discuss briefly some of the areas that the agricultural task force has been working in. The hon. Member for Lloydminster, who is co-chairman of the agricultural task force, together with myself, were both in attendance at the annual Department of Agriculture staff conference in Olds shortly after last September 10.

4-68

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

The purpose of our being there, Mr. Speaker, was to discuss the new directions being proposed by a new government, and at the same time to allow the civil servants within that department an opportunity to have some input into the development of agricultural policy in this province. And I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I was somewhat amazed when a number of people who are long time employees told me that it was the first time that they had ever had an opportunity to talk to one of their elected members of the Legislative Assembly. I want to relate to you some of the things that not only the Minister of Agriculture but members of the task force did in relation to meetings which were held late November in Ottawa. And I refer to the annual Agricultural Outlook Conference held on November 22, 23 in Ottawa, as well as a meeting between the ten provincial Ministers of Agriculture that was held at the same time. There again it was necessary that the hon. Member for Lloydminster and myself travel with Dr. Horner to Ottawa because there were at least three or four meetings continuing over a period of a couple of days that were being held simultaneously.

In that connection, I just want to say that we, as co-chairmen of the task force, had a number of very important discussions with people from other provinces and with federal authorities on such things as Bill C176, discussions with officials from the Province of Quebec on feed grains policy, and discussions with federal government officials and the Canadian Rape Seed Association with regard to the introduction of newer varieties of rape seed.

For the benefit of those of you that aren't aware -- and I'm not too sure that there are too many that are -- of the things that the hon. Minister of Agriculture from this province did on that trip to Ottawa. As I said before, the provincial Ministers of Agriculture from across Canada, after meeting for five days in Toronto and Ottawa, presented the federal Minister of Agriculture with a comprehensive document entitled, Development of Canadian Agriculture. Alberta's input, Mr. Speaker, into this document was one of leadership in changing the entire tone of that report to one of development and expansion rather than adjustment and contraction. Since that time there have been four major changes in federal agricultural policy. The first was a revamping of the federal marketing legislation Bill C276 and the provisions that the bill will apply only to poultry producers is so far as supply management is concerned. Before application of the bill can apply to any other farm product there must be a separate Act of Parliament allowing supply management for another product, there must be agreement by all provincial governments and finally a majority of producing must vote. Now I think it's pretty significant, Mr. Speaker, that finally after September 10th this province was able to take a firm position on that marketing bill.

The second announcement made by Ottawa was one regarding a two price system for wheat, a request that has been a long standing request with many farm organizations throughout Canada, which was not finally realized until all ten provinces across this country including seven who produce little or no wheat, recognized the desirability of such a move. Finally on November 22nd the provinces asked the federal government to recognize a pressing need for a drastic revision in the manner in which The Agricultural Products Stabilization Act has been used. Specifically, we recommended an intervention in price levels well above the mandatory 80 per cent level, and a requirement that the federal minister take into account both the cost of production of the commodity concerned and a fair return to the producer. This has resulted, Mr. Speaker, in a change which will allow hog producers in this province to collect the deficiency payment on their 1971 production.

Certainly many of these programs, in my opinion, would not have been adopted by the federal government were it not for total

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-69

provincial agreement and the leadership of the hon. Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Alberta.

I bring these things to your attention, Mr. Speaker, not only to point out some of the things that we have been doing in agriculture but to point out the value of co-operation and consultation at all levels of government and the important decision made last fall by our Premier to organize a Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, headed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud.

Mr. Speaker, members of this Assembly have from time to time over the years referred to themselves as a junior government. We don't have to look very far to see that we have come a long way in the past few months in terms of equality with the government in Ottawa.

The British parliamentary system traditionally has dictated that the Upper House or the Senate will have red carpeting, while the Lower House or the House of Commons has green carpeting. If the members from the House of Commons in Ottawa visit this Assembly they will be looking not at their familiar green carpeting, but at red carpeting, and truly they will know that we mean what we say about being an equal level of government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to continue with some observations about my own constituency. The Smoky River constituency was developed during redistribution from parts of three old constituencies. The area is largely an agricultural area with a substantial oil production area centred around the town of Valleyview. As the net farm income in recent years has declined, so has the population in the rural area. And as the oil play has shifted further to the north, the jobs in that industry have continued to decline.

We look forward, however, Mr. Speaker, as the result of some of the new directions we have taken in agriculture, to a rise in net farm income, as a result of things like the \$50 million Agricultural Development Fund. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can use a good portion of that in Smoky River. We also look forward to a decentralization of government services there, so that in a constituency like mine all of the civil servants do not live in centres that are outside my constituency.

I suggest to you that there are a number of things that are a little unique about Smoky River, probably because of the way it was developed during redistribution. How many of you have a constituency that doesn't have a single practicing dentist living in its boundaries? How many of you have a constituency that doesn't have a single practicing lawyer living within its boundaries? With no reference, Mr. Speaker, to the members on either side of this House, that just may be why the Liberals failed to field a candidate in the last election.

The town of Valleyview is the largest town in Alberta without a railroad, and without a grain delivery point; mine is a constituency, Mr. Speaker, without one single senior citizens' home. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I hope as a result of the new directions as outlined in the Speech from the Throne that we will have a 50 bed senior citizens' home in the town of Falher when this Legislature convenes next fall.

Mr. Speaker, one of our greatest natural resources in my constituency is the abundance of big game animals in a large part of the area. I am sure that most of the hon. members here heard of the slaughter of fifteen moose by American hunters in the Valleyview area last fall. I suggest to the hon. members that the in thing to do is to blame the Americans -- to say, "kick out the Americans." Sure, they were wrong, but they were not the only ones that were wrong. When you have little or no regulation governing the guiding industry,

4-70

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

when you have a ridiculously low licence fee for non-Canadian hunters, when you have no regulations whatsoever requiring proof by non-Canadian hunters that they have obtained the services of a guide, when you have half of northern Alberta managed under one zone known as Big Game Zone One, when you have a wildlife officer covering 4,000 square miles with upwards of 4,000 hunters, when you consider all of these things, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that in that area we've had pretty ineffective management of our wildlife resources.

Now I know, Mr. Speaker, that the new Minister of Lands and Forests did inherit, in fact, a pretty neglected department, and I'm sure that with the co-operation of this Legislature he will move ahead very shortly to some new directions in wildlife management.

I spoke a short time ago about Valleyview being the largest town in Alberta without a railroad, Mr. Speaker. I'm not suggesting to this government that we should duplicate the mistakes that may have been made by the previous government in the development of another railroad. I do suggest however that when you have farmers hauling up to 75 miles to a grain delivery point, when you have a centralized education system that depends almost 100 per cent on a school busing system to get children to school, then there is a need for an adequate rural road system, particularly in the improvement districts that I represent. When a school system that costs \$5,000 a day to operate is closed for nine days in little more than a month because roads were not adequately maintained for bus travel, when elderly citizens, women with children whose husbands are away working in other parts of the province are stuck at the end of a snow blown or gumbo road for days on end, Mr. Speaker -- for days on end -- I suggest that is a case for equal opportunity for all Albertans.

I'm pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the Speech from the Throne calls for a comprehensive program of extension and improvement of Alberta's highway system reflecting the government's concern and emphasis on rural development. There again I am confident that the new minister of that department will move ahead in this area with some sorely needed improvements including the development of Highway 2A from McLennan, south.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier that Smoky River is a new constituency, formerly represented by three Peach River citizens who are no longer members of this Assembly. I think it only fair that I should mention them and pay tribute to the years of service provided by Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Ells and Mr. Fimright.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, it has been indeed a privilege for me to address this House as the first elected representative from the new constituency of Smoky River, and I trust that members from both sides of this House will work together in the months and weeks ahead for the development of a new and better Alberta. Thank you.

MR. ASHTON:

One advantage of following such an excellent speaker as the hon. Member for Smoky River is that I can share in his applause when I rise. I wish to thank all of the members who have preceded me in this debate, Mr. Speaker. I have found their ideas enlightening and they will assist my educational process, I am sure.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my congratulations to the hon. Premier for his appointment of the Executive Council. These men and this woman, I suggest, are truly representative of the people of Alberta. Every one of them, without exception, justifies the confidence that the people of Alberta put in you on the 30th of August, 1971.

I wish to thank my constituency for giving me the privilege to serve in this Assembly. This is a very proud moment for me and my

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-71

family in this, the time of my delivering my so-called maiden speech. My wife has only one disappointment and that is that she would like to be here delivering this speech instead of me. I can assure you that she has many things that she would like to tell you.

I would like to congratulate the hon. Leader of the Opposition for what appeared to be a very positive approach in his talk to us yesterday. I join him in his approval of the page girls; I would like to second his caution that he gave to the page boys -- I believe he suggested that they watch out or they may find themselves on the outside looking in. Well, the hon. Leader of the Opposition probably knows more about that than any other person here, because by failing to pay attention to his responsibilities he has found himself on the outside looking in.

Now, I would also like to second the statements made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition when he expressed appreciation to past members of Executive Councils for the service they rendered to this Assembly and for the sacrifices they made. However, it may have been not a purposeful oversight when he failed to mention the other members of this Legislative Assembly who served in the past. I think it is probably indicative of the reasons why the other side, particularly the hon. Member for Drumheller, cannot understand the concept of a 48 member government. Of course, when you have done things a certain way for 36 years, perhaps it is difficult to understand new ideas, but I wish to assure the hon. members opposite that this is a 48 member government and all members will be participating. This is a new era.

Now, with regard to the Speech from the Throne, I would like to say what a great deal of satisfaction it is to me that I may have played some part, albeit a very small part, in assisting in events which would result in a new government that could come forth with as powerful a Throne Speech as we heard last Thursday. I could name any one of, for example, the program priorities listed therein, and any one of them would justify my participation in this Assembly.

I'll mention a couple. One is that the government is going to give some support to programs to assist children with learning disabilities. I trust that the members of this Assembly are aware that studies indicate 10 per cent of our children experience learning disabilities. Now these aren't primary difficulties such as blindness or retardation, they are disabilities which prevent them from learning as other children do. Some examples might be hypertension, poor co-ordination, and so on. Now this is a very important 10 per cent of our population. Some progress has been made in the past few years, but I suggest that the previous Government only could see the tip of the iceberg. I'm delighted that this government has been able to see the whole problem and is going to take some meaningful steps.

I would like to say something about the mental health reform. I was rather entertained when I heard the hon. Member for Drumheller refer to second class citizens yesterday, when for 36 years the people in this province, the mentally ill and the handicapped have been treated as second class citizens. And it's time that that came to an end. Mental health is everybody's business. I congratulate the previous government for having initiated the Alberta Mental Health Study, but it was no use sitting on the shelf gathering dust. And I would question the statements made by the hon. Member for Highwood that some steps were being taken. There was a little window dressing, but that's all. This is the first time any meaningful steps are being taken. We have a long way to go, we are so far behind in this area that we must proceed with vigour to catch up, and I'm very proud that at this first sitting of the Legislature since the general election that we are taking steps.

4-72

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

Now I'd like to say something that concerns some of my constituents which is perhaps not of provincial scope -- and I may preface this by suggesting that this is my own opinion -- and that is the statements being made by some of the members of the present Edmonton City Council with respect to the Hanson Report and the proposed annexation. It's my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that some of these members of City Council do a disservice to the residents of Edmonton and the Edmonton area when they suggest that there are only two alternatives. The first alternative they suggest is large scale annexation in the Edmonton area. The next one they suggest, if you won't give us that, we want a large green belt. Now with regards to the second suggestion, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is completely impractical. You cannot restrict the growth of Edmonton. What we can do, however, is to take steps, and this government is already taking steps, not to let the major cities grow at the expense of the rural areas. And I believe that we will make progress in this area.

With regard to the proposed Hanson line annexation, the City Council refers to the efficiency of the unitary government. Now I'd suggest that if you read the Hanson Report that this appears to be it's dominant characteristic. It mentions efficiency on almost every page. It starts with the assumption that unitary government is the best type of government and then spends the next approximately 250 pages attempting to prove it. They refer to the problem of living space for the people of Edmonton. Now, if you take the present space within the city, and add the relatively small proposed annexation in southwest Edmonton, you would have space for over one million people. Now I'm quoting the Mayor of Edmonton on that point. They speak of the planning efficiency of unitary government, I would submit that the past has shown that the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission has done an excellent job in this area and can direct planning. It has one disadvantage for City Council, in that they cannot dictate the planning results. They must work in co-operation with the surrounding municipalities. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the larger the size, does not necessarily mean, the greater the efficiency. If you carried that argument on, it could be suggested that the provincial government should administer all the cities and abolish all city councils, and of course, that is ridiculous. Now, large scale government is not necessarily the best government. I submit the best government is that type of government which is closest to, and most responsive to, the wishes of the people.

Annexation to the Hanson Line would result in the destruction of several local governments. I'm talking about St. Albert, the Municipal District of Sturgeon, the County of Parkland, Sherwood Park, and the County of Strathcona. This report -- its whole philosophy -- is a direct affront to the philosophy of the value of local government. However, the Hanson report does have one recommendation which I would recommend to my hon. colleagues that they consider, and that is the setting up of an inter-governmental committee. There are problems in any growing area. We must recognize that, but these problems can be solved on a co-operative basis. We can set up this inter-governmental committee which would have representatives from the province, the city council and the surrounding municipalities.

I'm speaking about the value of local government. However, I recognize that the provincial government has a responsibility. Local governments are the creatures of the provincial government, and the provincial government has a responsibility to see that the local governments are structured in such a manner that they are indeed responsive to the wishes of the people. We have an unfortunate situation in part of my own constituency, where in the County of Strathcona, the electoral divisions are set up in such a manner that one division has less than 1,000 people, and another has well over 18,000. Obviously, this type of structure cannot be responsive to the wishes of the people, and in effect defeats the whole value of

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-73

local government. I am asking that this matter be considered, and I hope that this government will come up with a solution.

I appreciate some of the attitudes expressed during this debate. I hope that the idea of making positive suggestions is not being lip service. I hope that that will be my own attitude and that no matter whether the topic is raised on the other side or this side, I hope that that will be the attitude I maintain.

I don't want to neglect the two hon. members on your far left, the hon. Member for Highwood, for a start. I must say, as I indicated at the beginning, I find that listening to all of you has assisted me in my educational process and you know I thought the past government had no long range planning, because they didn't want to take the time to indulge in such planning, but now it appears that the past government didn't even believe it was possible to have long-range planning. I would also, Mr. Speaker, direct these remarks again to the hon. Member for Highwood. I note that he pointed out that there's nothing new about talking about TV in this Assembly. Of course, I hope the hon. member does understand that there's a difference between talking about something and doing something about it. The hon. member also referred to the grid road program. I happen to be a city boy and probably it's not as meaningful to me as to some of the rural members but you know, I've heard about this grid road program for many many years, and I can assure you that the new Minister of Highways and Transport will do more than just talk about it.

I don't want to neglect my learned friend from Spirit River-Fairview. I enjoyed your comments yesterday. I was delighted to hear you give reference to that great Conservative Prime Minister in the Mother of Parliaments, Benjamin Disraeli, the Lord of Beaconsfield, and of course, you quoted from his maiden speech so eloquently. However, in ending and in referring to the things you raised yesterday, I would like to refer to another quote from the great Benjamin Disraeli. This was when he was speaking in the House of Commons, approximately 112 years ago. These are his words: "this shows how much easier it is to be critical than correct."

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, if all this complimentary clapping is for the hon. member who has just spoken, I will concede that he has done a very good job, which has also been done by all hon. members who have thus far taken part in this debate.

I wish on my part, to extend congratulations to all hon. members -- and to you Mr. Speaker on your elevation to this which is the centrepiece of our parliamentary system, that of the role of Speaker. I have listened with interest to the speeches that have been made thus far and I have heard the tremendous amount of applause that has followed any remarks made by our hon. Premier. Certainly he is a man who has come far rapidly, and he has my admiration and respect. Mr. Speaker, from the amount of applause that he receives, I am wondering if his disciples will someday call upon him to walk upon the water, and if they do, Mr. Speaker, the answer shall be made four years hence. Will Peter walk on the water? Tune in four years from now and the answer shall be made clear.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituency, Fincher Creek-Crowsnest, it is indeed an honour and a privilege to stand here this evening and humbly attempt to represent people in many different walks of life. I wish to acknowledge with thanks the type of representation that I have received from the hon. members of the Cabinet on your right, Mr. Speaker. I specifically wish to refer to the consideration that was shown by the hon. Minister of Highways in regard to one specific problem in my constituency.

4-74

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

I also wish to thank the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests for the consideration that he has given our delegation from Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. As the hon. minister is aware, we are also faced with another situation, I am aware that he has great concern in this matter, and I hopefully expect to hear shortly and favourably from him in this particular matter.

Mr. Speaker, a program of building a senior citizens' nursing home complex was presented and approved by the former government, and I wish to acknowledge with thanks their commitment. Further, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to the present members of this government for carrying out this very worthwhile program. This is one that the people in my constituency gratefully appreciate. This is one area that could have been political, and it was not, and for this reason I am certainly grateful.

I certainly endorse the commitment in the Speech from the Throne towards open government. This is a theory and I hope sincerely that it will also become a practice. I have some reservations, Mr. Speaker, in regards to the use of government committees, in regard to the neglect of all the talent on this particular side of the House. I hope that the members on the government side will work a little harder in order to compensate for the valuable abilities that they are allowing to lie fallow at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly, the remission of medicare fees for our senior citizens is one that I can acknowledge on behalf of the senior citizens of my constituency with great gratitude. This is something that will add considerably towards easing the onerous burden that old age and poverty bring about. I have read the commitments in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, and nowhere did I see mentioned one particular area of social concern, and this is the case of widows who have raised families and are no longer able or should not be required, at the age of 50 and 55 and 60 to go out and seek out a meager living on the labour market, after making a major contribution towards the development of future citizens by properly raising their families. I think that this a social injustice and one that could well be taken into serious consideration. I look fondly or hopefully towards the day when this government will also accept this as a major matter for concern. To me it is not good enough that these widows who have given what is the most important contribution of all, Mr. Speaker -- the care of husband and a family -- should be forced out without training onto the labour market or else to accept what can be considered charity and subsistence level of existence which can probably be supplemented slightly if they have the good fortune to survive until they receive their old age pension. This is an area of concern, Mr. Speaker, and one I am sure that all hon. members of this Assembly will carefully take under consideration.

There has been a lot of chaff thrown out by the flower on the threshing machine that developed the Speech from the Throne. Thus far I have gone to considerable lengths in saying many favourable things toward the hon. members on your right, Mr. Speaker. Possibly I am giving them too great a measure of compliments, possibly I should think back to the honourable Lord Randolph Churchill's definition of what a member of the opposition should do. A member of the opposition, Mr. Speaker, should oppose -- according to Lord Churchill -- oppose with vim and vigour, but I would add to that, Mr. Speaker, possibly with some prudence and consideration, because it is conceivable to me, in spite of the garbage, that there is a possibility that some good come out of the program that the hon. members on your right Mr. Speaker, have enunciated, I am speaking extemporaneously, I will be interested in reading my speech after it is over.

I look to see changes in The Game Act, in the interests of true conservation. I look to see better enforcement. I look to see the day when game as such, is not used directly in the interests of

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-75

developing revenue. To me, Mr. Speaker, a program of permitting the purchasing and shooting of ten animals, ten tags, is ridiculous. There are some so-called sportsmen who do avail themselves of these tags. I know of people who have gone out and shot five or six different animals, and then complained about the deteriorating hunting conditions, gone to their fish and game clubs and so on, and I say, you're not conservationists. Well, how do you figure that? The government gives us permission. Well, I don't think this should be. I should think that there should be a limitation to one tag per animal in the Province of Alberta. And I would throw this out as a suggestion for the hon. members to consider.

In regards to game, a way must be found to arrive properly at a plateau of understanding with the farm people that raise the game animals in many areas. I have had reference made to me by a farmer who lodges -- and I think he feels as though he is running a free boarding house, on a 12-month annual basis on a very small ranch -- 50 head of deer. This is at his own expense. This man permits free access to hunters, endeavors to protect his hay by fencing the hay stacks in the manner that is prescribed by the Department of Lands and Forests. But, however, Mr. Speaker, because of the snow conditions that we have, a 20 foot fence around a hay stack is not adequate, because of the snow drifts, to protect against the encroachment of game animals. It is not the amount of hay that these animals eat, but the amount that is wasted by pollution.

So I think it would be naive to expect that any farmer interested in the business of farming and committed to the process of making a living should not be given consideration in this important matter.

I note in the Speech from the Throne that there will an agricultural fund set up in the amount of \$50 million which will add to the farm credit, make feasible the purchase of land, and probably, in some instances, the money will be presented freely to the farmers.

I have great reservations, as I have mentioned before in this Legislature, about programs which are designed to help and ultimately have an opposite effect to that in which they are intended. Will this program add to the cost of land? Is this program approaching the problem from the wrong end of the fence? Would not the proper objective be to find the markets? Viable market at reasonable prices, Mr. Speaker, make unnecessary an injection, and this is all I can call it, something that will hop up something temporarily, and which will result probably in the furtherance of debt and with the resultant return to the public purse for more of the same.

If markets exist, and if they can be expanded or sought out, then, Mr. Speaker, the role of assisting, financing and so on is proper. I would shudder to think that this fund could be used for the purposes of expanding production where no market exists, or the expansion of credit to put another weight, on the shoulders of an industry that cries for help. These are things that have to be looked at.

It was also mentioned that workman's compensation reform is intended. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if this can be construed as a commitment by the government to allocate funds out of general revenue to take care of the eroding effect of compensation awards that have been made in the past. As most hon. members know, the way the financing of workman's compensation is done at the present is through an assessment on industry on the basis of the claims that are made, and it is a total charge. However, these claims are capitalized at the time of their occurrence. Hence, there are no funds available in this particular area to take care of the accelerating factor of inflation.

4-76

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

Obviously we cannot go back on an industry that in many cases has ceased to exist five or ten years back down the road and expect to pick up funds for this purpose. Neither could it be acceptable in this particular area to have these funds charged against existing industries. So this, Mr. Speaker, I submit, would indicate to me that this is an area that will have to be taken care of by the general revenue of the province.

I look to see also in the proposed reform of The Workman's Compensation Act a built in, peoples' obsolescence factor. Now what I mean by this particular statement, Mr. Speaker, has relation to people, and I can cite cases: take the case of a man working on a green chain, he sprains himself or slips and hurts his back. He has a back operation. Six weeks later he's advised that his compensation is cut off, his total compensation, he's given a partial reward and told, go back to work. Go back to work at what, if you're 50 or 55 or 60 years of age, and all you've done is work with your hands and help build the industries and other works that are so essential as a basis for our civilization?

There is no way in social justice, Mr. Speaker, that this can properly be allowed to occur. So I suggest to the hon. members that all industry in the Province of Alberta which will then take care of what I call the human obsolescence factor. If one industry is a part of the whole, if one industry is essential, I suggest to you therefore that all industries should properly accept their responsibility in this dimension. This would not be an enormous charge on any particular industry, but would be an acknowledgement of the social conscience that all of us should have. I look to see this in future reform of workman's compensation.

I'd like to talk about Number 3 Highway from Pincher Creek to Crowsnest. I wonder if the hon. Minister of Highways is aware that the accident rate on Number 3 Highway is the highest of any area in the Province of Alberta. I have for this authority the RCMP (and please pronounce the "R"). There are many explanations for this. One explanation is that this highway was totally adequate at one time, but it's presently not adequate to take care of the traffic that is now being developed. West of us we have the new town of Fording. We see Number 3 Highway being used more and more as an alternate trans-Canada road, heavier and heavier traffic, growing population density. My constituency is one in which the rural population continues to grow. More and more people are added to this. So we have a highway that was adequate for five years ago, four years ago, but is no longer adequate for 1972. I can refer to one particular curve on No. 3 Highway, which in the short period of three weeks, Mr. Speaker, represented \$192,000 in insurance claims, and resulted in petroleum pollution to the extent of 10,000 gallons. This is why I emphasize this. Look back on the records, think of the blood that has been spilled on No. 3 Highway, the damage to life and limb, the attrition that is so unnecessary, the young people that have been crippled -- all of these things. If this situation existed outside of Calgary or Edmonton, the major cities in the Province of Alberta, Mr. Speaker, action would be taken now. This is why I feel that action should be taken in the more serious areas of No. 3 Highway through the Crowsnest Pass. I am not suggesting, in this area of priorities, that the entire danger areas should be looked at and certainly from the standpoint of people, and care of people, which is the responsibility of all hon. members in this Legislature. These particular things should be done, Mr. Speaker.

One factor that enters, in addition to the accident rate and the traffic flow, that enters into the problems of No. 3 Highway through the Crowsnest Pass is really basically related to what you could call the hydrological cycle, weather cycle, which of course is the cycle that generates the water. We find that the mean level in the Crowsnest Pass is around 4,200 feet. Every 1,000 feet of elevation that you rise creates another 20 inches of moisture. This is why the

March 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

4-77

rivers run, Mr. Speaker; however, from the standpoint of roads and care of roads, and concern for people, this means more road maintenance, it means a better quality of roads, and I suggest to you at the present time No. 3 Highway is no longer adequate to take care of the traffic that flows through it.

It is noted and mentioned by the hon. Minister of the Environment that steps will be taken or hearings will be held, hopefully, ultimately, towards rehabilitating some of the old mining properties that have been looted and abandoned by the exploiters of our natural resources, Mr. Speaker. There is no other way to call it. This may sound like an anti-statement, but this is what happened in the Crowsnest Pass. I can refer to you companies who loaded their loot and pulled out and left us their slack piles to look at. This is something I hope the environmental regulations at the present time will take care of, for future projected regulations. I think it can fairly be said that there has been an honest and earnest endeavour by the present mining operators in the Crowsnest Pass to do their utmost in the interest, of conservation, certainly, possibly, they realise that if this is not done, their operation will no longer be accepted by the public. However, it is being done and we have a way of life in the Crowsnest Pass, we have dug coal in the Crowsnest Pass since 1898, from father to son, through generations this is the mode of life we followed. This is the life we follow, this is the life we like, and we are not ashamed of our contribution to the national wealth of this country. So, I would look with great loathing on anything, or any type of legislation that would preclude the possibility of continuing with the way of life that we have, Mr. Speaker.

I was disappointed in the Throne Speech in that it did not specifically suggest any intention to carry on a long-term water study which would result in the proper long-term utilization of our water. However, the hon. Minister of the Environment dwelt at some length on this particular subject, and I would look to hear more of this in the future. I think that the Columbia River Treaty has been a sell-out to the western prairies, and one which the Canadian people will long rue. I think that some time will come when the acknowledgement of General McNaughton's efforts and the part that he attempted to play in maintaining this resource for Canada, will properly be acknowledged.

Mr. Speaker, the time drifts on, the eyes of the hon. members grow heavy. I request permission, Mr. Speaker, to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER.

The hon. member has requested leave to adjourn the debate. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House will now stand adjourned to 2:30 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier has moved that the House stand adjourned to 2:30 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

4-78

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 7th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until 2:30 o'clock tomorrow
afternoon.

[The House rose at 10:30 pm.]