

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, March 30th, 1972

(The House met at 2:30 pm.)

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

POINTS OF PRIVILEGE

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege which has two aspects to it, sir. The points of privilege arise out of a story that appears in this morning's edition of the *Albertan* entitled, "Ho Lem Reacts -- Cites City Crime Cases". The story purports to quote the hon. member. It then goes on, sir, to quote me as saying that organized crime would not gain a foothold in the province and that I denied a problem of organized crime existed. Mr. Speaker, I did not say that at all, and if the hon. member will check the Hansard record of the speech, he will find that I did say organized crime existed in Alberta, and that we had to work very hard to make sure that it did not grow, but that I was confident that with an honest police force and an honest government, we would prevent it from growing to the size where its weapons would be fear, brutality, and intimidation.

The second point of privilege arising from the same story, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. member is quoted as making statements to the effect that some foreign investors at least were associated with organized crime, and then referred to two specific examples in the City of Calgary -- one dealing with the acquiring of an interest in a restaurant chain and the other dealing with acquiring of an interest in a funeral parlour chain.

Mr. Speaker, those statements not only cast doubt as to the motives of foreign investors generally, but in particular, they bring anyone who has acquired an interest in a restaurant chain or a funeral parlour into disrespect, and I wonder if the hon. member would not consider either withdrawing those remarks or alternatively naming the businesses he has in mind.

MR. HO LEM:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Number one, to the initial statements by the hon. Attorney General, I am very glad that you did clarify your position that there is some alarm that organized crime has a foothold in Alberta. It was my interpretation, after hearing your talk on Tuesday, that...

MR. GETTY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker...

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. minister please state the point of order.

21-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

MR. GETTY:

The point of order is that the hon. member is now saying that it was necessary for the Attorney General to clarify his position when he had already made it clear in his speech. The need for clarification was caused by the comments and the story that the hon. member opposite has raised in the paper. So his statement that he is pleased our Attorney General has clarified his position is incorrect. His position was clear - his story was incorrect.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the so-called point of order, may I say that the hon. Attorney General invited the hon. member to make a statement. Surely he should have, under a point of privilege, the right to make his statement.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. Member for Calgary McCall complete the statement that he wishes to make in reply to the one by the Attorney General.

MR. MC LEM:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the question of the naming of the funeral home, I am sure you would know, sir, this problem has been discussed long before our sitting in this House. It was a topic which was quite widely discussed about a year ago on various radio stations in Calgary, so it is nothing new. It is a concern of the people of Alberta.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege. The hon. member still has not given the name that he has in mind. In my submission, that is essential to remove this cloud of suspicion that has been cast over business people, who may now be or who have been doing business within the province of Alberta, and specifically, within the City of Calgary.

MR. SPEAKER:

As I see the matter, the question of privilege, which is what has been raised, involves whether or not the hon. Attorney General was misquoted, or whether his statements were misdescribed. I think this is the nub of the matter, and that this is, perhaps, what we should be addressing ourselves to. I don't think a group of business men necessarily has a certain privilege in this House.

DR. MCNER:

The more important question of privilege deals with the action of a member of this Legislature in making certain allegations outside this Legislature without naming the particular names he should have named, if he is making those kinds of charges. I refer you to Section 108 of Beauchesne. In the top line -- Anything which may be a contempt of court by a tribunal is a breach of privilege perpetrated by a member of the Legislature.

MR. MC LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I think I can clarify this position very easily, in that I didn't attribute the comments to the hon. Attorney General. I did not say the statements referring to funeral homes and other establishments came from him. So, therefore, I do not think I should withdraw my statement. I have a responsibility to the people of Alberta to state my feelings on this important issue.

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-3

DR. HCFNER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member certainly has a responsibility to the people of Alberta. And he has a responsibility to this Legislature, so that, in fact, when he makes these kinds of charges, he substantiates them.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, again, on the so-called point of order, an hon. member need not name anyone in this Legislature. He has made no accusation against anyone sitting in this Legislature. He is perfectly within his rights to bring to the attention of these people conditions he feels are detrimental to the people of Alberta. He is perfectly in order.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the matter is still considered to be an issue before the House, perhaps someone would like to move a motion that it be referred to the appropriate committee. Otherwise, I do not see what further steps this House can take.

DR. HCFNER:

Mr. Speaker, I then move that the allegations made by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall in the newspaper interview of today in regard to the Calgary Albertan, be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, seconded by the hon. Mr. Getty.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the motion, I would like to suggest that the matter of privilege is something that pertains to the conduct or the privileges of the members of this House, and the matter of privilege cannot be extended to people who are not sitting in this House. Such is not a matter of privilege. Consequently, I can see nothing that the committee could do in regard to this particular item. If the hon. members have in mind forcing someone to name some particular person, then I again suggest this is not a proper motion to put before this Legislature. There may be a number of people who are involved. It may be the hon. member has no intention of naming them. He is simply alerting people that such conditions may exist. Surely to goodness a member of this Legislature is going to have the privilege and the right to bring to the attention of the people of this province conditions that he thinks are detrimental to the welfare of the people of Alberta, without naming a person outside of this Legislature. That is not required by the rules.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. The question before the House is not whether or not the remarks made outside the House by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall were in order, or a breach of privilege, or otherwise. The question before the House is whether or not this matter should be referred to a committee, as has been moved and seconded.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, might I say that nowhere in this publication did I attribute to the hon. Attorney General that he stated that funeral homes were involved, nor any other institution. I did not attribute that as a statement from you.

21-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

MR. FARRAN:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Member for Drumheller says that a member has the privilege and the right to make information available on conditions in his area. Surely he hasn't got the privilege to withhold information on criminal activities from the Crown. If he has the information, he should give it in detail to the hon. Attorney General. He smeared every restaurant and funeral home in the city of Calgary.

MR. HENDERSON:

On the point of order. Of course, it is ridiculous to stand up and say that if a member of this House has information of criminal activities he should make it available to this House, because the Attorney General himself would not be prepared to stand up and do that, and he shouldn't be doing it. So that the suggestion that the hon. Member for Calgary McCall on this side should stand up and make a statement to the effect that he has certain information of criminal allegations in this House would not be appropriate.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to refer to a committee of this House the question of statements made by members outside this House, we will have to adjourn this House and do nothing else but examine the record. And in the forefront will be the statements that have been made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, because nobody in this House makes more unsubstantiated statements in the Province of Alberta on more subjects than I can think of, than the Minister of Agriculture. If we have to dig into records, I would be more than happy to oblige so that we can have lots of fun...

MR. DIACHUK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc would read Section 114, and this motion is properly placed, and should not be debated any more. It is quite proper to place in this committee this type of a motion.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. According to Beauchesne, page 102, Section 113: "A dispute between two members as to allegations of facts does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege."

Again, under the same section: "an attack in a newspaper article is not a breach of privilege, unless it comes under the definition of privileges," and then newspapers must be laid on the table -- paper and not clippings.

And thirdly, privilege is "first demanded as a protection against outside interference," under Section 103, on page 93.

"A matter of privilege which claims precedence over the public business should be a subject that has recently arisen." It requires the immediate interposition of the House." Insults must "be raised at once in spite of the interruption of a debate." It should be "a prima facie case that a breach of privilege has been committed."

The custom of taking up a matter of privileges after prayers is, "No new privilege can be created" by Parliament. Anything that is considered contempt of court if perpetrated against parliament is a breach of privilege. A question of partiality or discourtesy is not a breach of privilege. Libels concerning the character or conduct of members constitute a breach of privilege. Notice, libels concerning character or conduct of members constitute a privilege." The offer of a bribe constitutes a breach of privilege. Acceptance of views from professional advisers connected with procedures or measures in parliament constitutes a privilege.

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-5

And Mr. Speaker, therefore I suggest that the motion is out of order as the second point is out of order and not a breach of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would say this -- that we are now debating the motion, and notwithstanding that several members have already spoken twice, I think we should revert to the usual procedure of each person speaking once and the debate being then closed by the mover, if he so desires.

MRS. CHICHAK:

On the point of privilege that was raised by the hon. Attorney General. To my mind, I do not believe that the hon. member from Calgary McCall replied properly or sufficiently and therefore I support the motion that has been put before the House and I think that we should vote on it.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, as I have not yet spoken on the motion, I would like to make two points clear. Firstly, the hon. members opposite have, in my view, misinterpreted the issue entirely. We are not debating, and I did not raise as a question of privilege, an attack on myself. The first point of privilege I raised was merely one of saying that I was not accurately quoted, and I think, having said that, that point of privilege is finished with.

But the second one, and the one with which we are dealing here, is that a member made accusations, naming types of businesses, and those accusations are serious and apply, so far as that story is concerned, to all people involved in both of those businesses. And I have asked him, as a matter of privilege, to either withdraw the statement, or to give us the names of the businesses he had in mind when he made that statement, so that it would clear the people who are now covered by a cloud of suspicion. That is really this issue here, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this motion is most definitely out of order. Even the high office of the Attorney General cannot demand that any member in this House make statements if he doesn't wish to do so. There is no breach of privilege; there is no assault on a member; it is a newspaper story; it has been confirmed. This motion is definitely out of order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that when the hon. Attorney General demands something to be done, that it is incumbent on him to quote the rule and give us a citation as to his authority. I am saying that this hasn't been done, sir, and therefore the motion is out of order unless they establish that they have a rule under which they are coming before you. Quote the rule and let us have it.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, it is with some hesitation that I rise to take part in the debate, because I would like to advise the hon. members that while I believe the motion is in order, I intend to vote against it; the motion that this matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

I think that it is in the power of the House to refer any matter relating to any member of the Legislature to the whole House or to a committee of the House, and and it is undoubtedly within our power if we choose, to exercise that power. I think, too, that the

21-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

controversy may simply be based on the fact that we on this side of the House are more careful about our responsibilities to the province, than perhaps some other people are.

I consider this to be an important matter, Mr. Speaker, regardless of their action from the other side of the House. It has been made clear to some members at least of this House, that they should not say within the House and with the protection which privilege grants to them anything which they would not be prepared to say outside of the House where the normal course of civil law pertains. The hon. members opposite may disagree with that position, but I think that the other side of the coin is, that there should be nothing said by members outside of the House, nor inferences made about business, nor aspersions cast on the activities of business and individuals, that the members are not committed to state plainly in this Legislature.

I am inclined to the view that we should view very dubiously the statements which a member may make either inside or outside of the House when that is to his advantage, if he is unprepared to restate them, or to make them clear, in another place when that is to his disadvantage.

So while I believe that the resolution, (and while I believe that the principle on which it is founded) is an extremely important, I am going to vote against it, because I believe that hon. members do have a freedom to take whatever advantage they choose, whether in my view it is rightly or wrongly taken, of their membership in the Legislature.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking support of the motion, both in the substance and the principle, I think the unfortunate choice of the preposition 'a' in reference to a restaurant chain will draw the attention of this Legislature and the people of the province to the speculations of a particular restaurant chain. On that basis, the point made by the hon. the Attorney General is a proper one, so that we who are new can identify the zone of tolerance that we have for statements inside and outside the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Without wishing to appear to be taking part in the debate, but in order to save time, I think it is necessary that we be perfectly clear about which point of privilege is or is not to be referred to a committee. Since the debate has begun, the hon. the Attorney General has clarified his position -- I am not suggesting that he didn't make it clear in the first place, but in any case, he stated that in so far as the first point which he had taken originally was concerned, he was prepared to consider that matter to be concluded by the correction of what has been described as a misquotation. It would then appear that the remaining point of privilege, which may, or may not, be referred to a committee, and which may, or may not, be the intention of the mover and seconder to refer to a committee, is a statement made by the hon. member for Calgary McCall outside the House.

In this regard and in order to save time in debate which may not perhaps be effective, I think it would be well to revert to a citation which occurs somewhere in Beauchesne to the effect that a matter which may be dealt with by the civil courts under the ordinary law of defamation is not ordinarily a matter which may also be a matter of privilege before this House. My understanding of a point of privilege is that it must be a matter which touches the privilege of the House or the privilege of one of its members, and not the privilege of any group outside the House. If that be so, I wonder if the mover and seconder of the motion might wish to consider whether

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-7

the resolution is still appropriate or whether it should specify precisely the point of privilege which it is intended to refer to the committee.

DR. HOFNER:

Mr. Speaker, I thought I had made it clear when I made the motion that the point of privilege that I was concerned about was related to the statements and the allegations that the hon. Member for Calgary McCall had made and which he has subsequently refused to substantiate. This is a responsibility of the hon. member of this Legislature and there in fact is privilege involved. We would be quite willing, Mr. Speaker, for you to take the matter under advisement and to advise the House whether or not you consider it a prima facie of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps I can save the hon. Leader a moment of time. May I then suggest that, if the mover and seconder would wish to withdraw the motion (and this could only be done, as you know, with the unanimous consent of the House), it might then be rendered into writing so that I might consider it and that we might revert to it again on a future appropriate occasion.

DR. HOFNER:

We will then resubmit the motion in writing to you for your consideration.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree with the suggestion made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion, as I understand it, is now to be put in writing and to be referred to the Chair. Do we take it then that for the time being the motion is withdrawn?

NOTICE OF MOTIONS

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give oral notice at this time of the fact that at five o'clock today, in response to interest that has been expressed by some hon. members, I shall rise and move that at five we call it five thirty, which would result in the House being adjourned today at five o'clock. I realize that adequate notice of this change has not been properly given under the rules, and if any single member disagrees, at five o'clock of course, the motion does not pass.

MR. STRON:

We want to say to the hon. House Leader on the other side that we certainly appreciate this. There are some members who would like to get away early for the Easter holiday, and I am sure they appreciate very much this suggestion.

21-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 201: An Act to amend The Planning Act

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being An Act to amend The Planning Act. At the present time a person wishing to establish a sub-division with less than 20 acres, adjacent to a main highway, is required to apply to the Regional Planning Board, even though the Regional Planning Board has no authority with which to deal with that application. The Regional Planning Board then rejects the application and the applicant is in a position to apply to the Provincial Planning Board. This bill suggests that the needless expenditure of money and time involved in applying to the Regional Board should be eliminated, and that in such cases an application directly to the Provincial Planning Board would be permitted.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 201 was introduced and read for the first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

DR. FAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly 14 students from the Diagnostic and Treatment Centre, located in my constituency. They are accompanied by their staff members, Mr. Kinoshita and Mr. Gaunce. I would like to thank them for coming to take part and listening to the governmental activities. I would ask them to rise and be recognised.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted today to introduce to you and through you to all the members of the Assembly some 60 enthusiastic students in Grade VI, Parkview Elementary School, in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Radcliff, and I would ask them to rise at this time and be recognised by the Assembly.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I am rising on this occasion on a less contentious issue. It is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly, 39 students from Fairview Junior High School, in the constituency of Calgary Egmont. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Ron Swingle and I am impressed by the fact, Mr. Speaker, that they rose early enough to leave Calgary by 7:30 this morning. And I would ask that they now rise and be recognised.

MR. STRICH:

I do not very often have the opportunity of rising in my place to introduce anyone. My constituency being so far away from the Legislature it is very, very seldom that anyone arrives from there to visit us. But we have in the gallery today the chairman of our Irrigation District of St. Mary River, Mr. Jack Bruin and I would ask him to stand and be recognized.

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-9

ORAL QUESTIONS

Human Resources Research Council

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like direct this question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I wonder if the Provincial Treasurer would tell the House why the government has transferred the trust funds of the Human Resources Research Council to the General Revenue Fund?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Miss Hunley has been looking after that and I will refer the question to her.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, this is quite correct. This was done on the insistence of the auditor, Mr. Huckvale. Apparently, and I wish this to be completely clear, there is no question of any problem with the funds, misappropriation or such a thing and I would like this to be clearly understood. The auditor intervened because, according to him, the management of the funds in the Human Resources Research Council, did not coincide with established government practice. This is not a new thing, it has been more or less discussed since November and finally, in view of the fact that March 31st is the end of the fiscal year, we resolved the situation by returning, on the auditor's suggestion, the money that was in the account back to General Revenue of the province.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary to the hon. minister. Can you advise the House whether or not the provincial auditor secured an Order in Council authorizing him to transfer the trust funds from the Human Resources Research Council to General Revenue?

MISS HUNLEY:

I cannot answer that explicitly. There is an Order in Council but I am not completely clear whether it transferred the funds to the General Revenue or not.

MR. NOTLEY:

A question then either to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio or to the Provincial Treasurer: would you be prepared to table that Order in Council on Wednesday, when we reconvene next week?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, my colleagues are correct. Orders in Council are all available for examination of the members. Secondly, when you have examined this one if there is any further information that we could provide you with, we would be happy to do so.

MR. NOTLEY:

I have a last supplementary on this question to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio. I understand that the Human Resources Research Council had some contractual commitments which these trust funds were to be used to finish. Would the hon. minister advise the House how the Human Resources Research Council is to complete their contractual commitment now that these funds have been transferred to General Revenue?

21-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

MISS HUNLEY:

There are two things involved here. One concerns estimates, which I will be happy to deal with at estimates time, on the winding up of some of the commitments. Part of the commitments will be taken care of by the transfer of funds from the Human Resources Development Authority into Human Resources Research Council in order to pay some salaries which would be affected, as well as some other details. I would be happy to table the information after the estimates, if you are still not clear as to what actually happened.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member please advise the House of reduction of funds used for the Human Resources Research Council, since the Human Resources Research Council is being phased out with a considerable saving for the government, the government intends to divert some of these funds for new service programs rather than research, per se?

MISS HUNLEY:

Actually the estimates, Mr. Speaker, call for a vote to wind up the affairs of the Human Resources Research Council. The estimates, when they are discussed, will also contain information as to how some of the studies are going to be continued or successfully wound up.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, and then the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell.

Public Housing

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. What is the government's policy in regard to suggestions made over the past four years, that the Calgary Housing Authority could save cost by subsidizing rents or actually contracting to rent and then sub-letting private accommodation for public housing applicants?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that policy or possible policy has been discussed in the public arena on many occasions and it has been discussed informally with respect to certain applications for public housing developments by the Board of Directors of the Alberta Housing Corporation. I subsequently discussed the matter, searching for ideas and direction with some of the government members, and as a result of that, a private members resolution has been placed on the Order Paper which will bring the matter before the whole House, so I believe the hon. member is referring specifically to that resolution that embodies that policy. At that time we will be looking for the comments from all members of the House.

Grants to Local Groups Performing Abroad

MR. GFUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. Sir, recently I made reference to an invitation that was extended to the Lethbridge and southern Alberta group, known as the Anne Campbell Singers, who have been invited to travel to Britain to compete in a world competition of amateur choirs. In response to my request for assistance for them, have you made a decision as to what assistance, if any, your

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-11

department would be prepared to make to this group, having in mind their budget which has been made available to you?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, the Anne Campbell Singers along with the Edmonton Youth Orchestra and I think the Medicine Hat Teen Tones are some of the groups that have been invited to compete in Europe -- the Edmonton Youth Orchestra, for instance, for Canada, and the Anne Campbell Singers for Alberta, and I think that all of us in Alberta are very proud of having the invitation issued to them.

The Government of Alberta, therefore, has decided that, to help these singers to compete in Europe, we would provide them with 10% of the actual travel costs of their trip to Europe.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, and then the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Peace River

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of the Environment. The question concerns the consideration being given in the province of British Columbia to the construction of further dams on the Peace River. Now my question is. Will such further dams have downstream effects in Alberta, and if so, what does the hon. minister intend to do about it?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that any additional dam on the Peace River will in fact affect Alberta, but the effect is not really known at this time. It could be detrimental or helpful, I am inclined to think that an additional dam would just provide additional flow regulation to that resulting from the Bennett Dam, and its result may in fact be beneficial rather than detrimental.

However, I would like to suggest at this time that I have had correspondence with the hon. Mr. Williston from British Columbia who is the Minister of Lands and Forests and Water Resources. We will be getting together to discuss some of these problems, particularly the management of rivers that cross our border. We expect to get together to discuss these matters within the next several weeks.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary to the hon. minister. Mr. Speaker, if I could direct my supplementary question to the hon. Premier on this issue of the dam, because he showed great concern for it last year, realizing the statement that he made that we were responsible for the environment of this particular area. My question is, is he aware of the very heavy snowfall in the delta this year? According to the native people in the area, one real sign of a flood to come is the fact that the buffalo have already started to move to higher ground. I was wondering if he planned to contact the Premier of British Columbia and inform him of the conditions, and while he does that, I wonder if he would ask Mr. Bennett to hold his water until the flood condition is over in the delta.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the short precise question, certainly it is a very desirable situation that nature has come to the rescue

21-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

of the people in that part of Alberta to overcome the very serious mistakes of the previous administration.

Federal - Provincial - Municipal Relationships

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier. In view of the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs' stated opposition to municipalities dealing directly with the federal government, how does the Premier view Mayor Dent's direct negotiations with federal ministries?

MR. LUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think our position has been made absolutely clear in a document tabled in this House a few days ago. Perhaps the hon. member might read it.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Since municipalities are legally agencies of the provincial government, should Mayor Sykes of Calgary, and Mayor Dent of Edmonton obtain clearance from your office before dealing directly with federal ministries?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, we would hope they always would, and in most cases they do. Nevertheless, many times, if they are meeting in Ottawa and wish to speak to anybody at all, I certainly have no objection if they want to speak to anybody representing them in the federal government. I think every Canadian has that right whether he is mayor or not.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary to the hon. Premier, Mr. Speaker. In negotiating with Ottawa on matters directly affecting the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, who is the senior spokesman for Alberta - the mayors, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, or the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the hon. member has been listening during the course of debates earlier in the House. One of the things that was made clear is that the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs is responsible for the co-ordination and monitoring of the variety of federal-provincial contacts which are carried on between Ottawa and Alberta. Nevertheless, the responsibility for municipal affairs is clearly in the hands of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. He, I might say, conducts them very well.

Village Lake Louise

MR. CLARK:

I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Is the government prepared to announce its position on the Village Lake Louise project today?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker.

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-13

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Given the interest of hon. members of the Assembly, then is the hon. minister prepared to outline the alternatives which the Cabinet is now viewing, and explain why the announcement of these alternatives was made outside this Legislature, in light of the fact that this matter has been brought to the Legislature on many occasions during this session?

MR. GETTY:

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the matter. He referred to a statement outside of the House in his second request, and there was no such statement made. We have already discussed briefly in the House, as a matter of fact today, what might happen with the news media. One of my good friends in the gallery and I were discussing Village Lake Louise. One of the things he said was this: with the letters that were tabled in the House yesterday, isn't it clear that the government can only say in black and white - yes or no, regarding the Village Lake Louise project? And I said no, that is not so at all. It would appear to me there are a great number of alternatives that could be considered and I am sure will be considered.

You may have been lead astray by the newspaper article, and you have been in government long enough yourself to be a little more alert than that, I would suggest. Therefore, you should reread that story and you would realize that it was a discussion. If you have it in your hand you will see that the Alberta government 'may', or 'would consider' - that is the kind of thing. These were a series of alternatives that might be considered by the Alberta government.

MR. GETTY:

Certainly it was not a statement, and I would not commit the courtesy to the House of doing that outside, without doing it inside.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. When does the hon. minister plan to meet with the federal minister, Mr. Chretien, to discuss this particular proposal?

MR. GETTY:

Well, if you have an opportunity to read the letter which was tabled in the House yesterday, it said that as soon as the assessment of some six or seven departments of the Alberta government has been made and presented to cabinet, we will, on a government to government basis, talk to Mr. Chretien. And so it will be as soon as that assessment is made.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this a supplementary?

MR. CLARK:

I hope ... [interjections] ... I appreciate your enthusiasm.

In light of the government's open mind, then, on this particular project, Mr. Speaker, would the government entertain submissions and representations from individuals and groups across the province before the government decides on its final position on this matter? Or will the government be making a unilateral decision?

21-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, isn't that exactly what the government has said in this House many times -- that they were taking a listening position, that they wanted to hear all the views from as many people as possible before they would make their assessment? Therefore, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we said we would do, and we followed through and we are doing that. I can assure the hon. member that there are many submissions and many letters and many representations by Albertans which the government is receiving and considering.

MR. SPEAKER:

That was the last supplementary, was it not? I am attempting to arrange, as far as I can remember, the speaking order for three members in a row. I wonder if hon. members would try this system for a while. It seems to me that it is undignified for a member's right to speak to depend on the reflexes in his haunches. With this in mind, would the hon. Member for Little Bow be next, and then the hon. Member for Camrose, and then the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crownest.

Social Services

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, thank you. A question to the hon. Premier, Mr. Speaker. In your reply yesterday, you indicated to me that you accepted, as a government, the principle of universality of social service benefits as exemplified in the benefits to senior citizens. My question then is, has the government any plans for a provincial program of universal family allowance benefits to take place in the coming year?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, not at this time.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the government preparing plans, in order to make their submission to the federal government on this particular item?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, yes we are.

Bashaw Auction Market

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Was the Fitzgerald bankruptcy of Lacombe in any way responsible for the collapse of the Bashaw Auction Market?

DR. HERNER:

Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge. We have done some investigation in regard to that, and we cannot find any tie-up between the two occurrences.

MR. STROMBERG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the hon. minister give assurance that the farmers in my constituency will be able to collect their monies over and above what the bond will cover? And is the minister giving consideration to raising the amount of the bond?

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-15

DR. HCFNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is the assurance fund that will be available once the dust has settled, so to speak, so that the producers will be covered. As I announced previously in the House, we are giving very serious consideration to an improvement in this matter, where the bonds the dealers have to post will be substantially larger, and we are trying to make some arrangement with the dealers themselves, so that they could, in a joint way, have something to say about posting these bonds.

Inflation

MR. CFRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a very simple and easy question to the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. This question, Mr. Minister, is in view of the fact that many ideas are now in the processes of being hatched by the 48 ministers without portfolio on your side of the Legislature, and some of them could well be cracked as a result of the forces of inflation, which could conceivably get very much out of control at this time. My question, Mr. Speaker, is: has the government enunciated any policy or made any proposals to Ottawa in regard to suggesting some method of bringing this under control?

MR. GETTY:

One of the things we have discarded, Mr. Speaker, would be any Social Credit monetary theory.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona, followed by the hon. Member for Athabasca, and the hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

MR. CFRAIN:

Further to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. member now suggesting that his government has no policy whatsoever on this important matter?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member were able to express an important matter, I would respond to it. But I did not get one. Really, if there is an important matter you are trying to express, please do.

MR. CFRAIN:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker. This is a matter that is of concern to all Canadians, the matter of inflation. It is one that could well have such an economic impact on our society that it should be properly treated.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please state the question.

MR. CFRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I am coming around to that very rapidly. I cannot hear you. I have closed off my earphone at this time. Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. member is, has his government formulated any policy or made any recommendations to Ottawa on the subject of inflation?

21-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, now I see what he is getting at. Actually, in almost all policy matters that we consider, and which we discuss with Ottawa, the Executive Council is aware of the problem of inflation. It becomes a part of the policy in our consideration, yes. I should also point out that one of the things that the hon. Provincial Treasurer was able to do, was to meet with Dr. Young, who, as you know, was responsible in this area for Ottawa. Perhaps he could also pass on to you some of the text of their considerations.

MR. MINIELLY:

Mr. Speaker, I had quite extensive discussions regarding the problems of inflation. Without speaking too long on the subject, I would say that Dr. Young basically advised us that he had a lot to do, and the Canadian people had a lot to do with setting up the American plan to control inflation in the United States. They have drawn up contingency plans with respect to inflation. Inflation varies from year to year. This is what he was indicating to me in discussions. He outlined that basically the plans they would have are similar in the event of inflation and they feel if at any time the plan required implementation, it is set to go in the country. We are all concerned about inflation. Our government is concerned about inflation. I indicated to Dr. John Young that we were concerned about this, and we would be watching it with interest in Alberta, and be working with Ottawa with respect to this problem. We were happy that the federal government was working through Dr. John Young and the Prices and Incomes Commission in this regard to have contingency plans available for implementation the minute they feel they should do so. We are happy to see that.

Motor Vehicle Registrations

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways. I know a number of people will be out driving in their cars this weekend. Some of them, like myself, have not had the opportunity of obtaining their new 1972 licence plates. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Highways whether there is an extension to the deadline for the obtaining and affixing of 1972 licence plates to motor vehicles.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is an extension to April 30th.

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the registered motorists lists that will not be available, has the hon. minister had any further contact from the association responsible for the War Amps?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have had contact with the War Amps on this particular program. I will be meeting with them at a future date to discuss the topic in further depth.

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-17

Slave Lake Flakeboard Plant

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Has any assignment been made of the poplar timber quota in the Slave Lake Area? How will this assignment be made or on what basis? I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the announcement the hon. minister made several days ago regarding a poplar timber quota which was being made available in the Lesser Slave Lake area for the purposes of establishing a flakeboard plant in that area.

MR. WARRACK:

On Friday of last week, Mr. Speaker, I did make that announcement and I welcome the question as a follow up in terms of the need for further explanation to the members of this House as to the nature of this particular matter. The announcement was made on Friday of last week that we could be accepting requests for proposals for the development of a forest supply area primarily poplar or as often called, aspen in the Slave Lake area. The closing date for these proposals will be April 30, so that we have not made any assignment as yet and we won't be making any assignment until all of the applications that have come forward by April 30th can be assessed, can also be submitted to a public hearing whereupon the proposals that we have on hand will be fully assessed and a decision made.

I might take the opportunity at the same time to point out that following a timber policy that was established in recent years, in terms of management area agreements, that include a competitive situation by public advertisement for forest supply areas that come available, and also that, if successful in a proposal in this area, it will help to rationalize the industry and provide a market in the nature of a flake board plant, a chip market for other saw log operations that are operating in that area now, so that this will be a benefit not only for income and employment in that area, but also a benefit to the individual operators operating in that area at this time.

I will take the final opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to mention that since this would be a week ago tomorrow that the announcement was made, -- and I think is an extremely important announcement in the province, and particularly to that area, -- it has been a disappointment to me that the gentleman opposite representing that area has not reviewed the matter with me in terms of additional information.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker...

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member from Drayton Valley followed by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin Leduc.

21-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

Environmental Effects of Pipelines

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to address my question to the hon. Minister of Environment. What environmental studies in the pipeline have been carried out or are being carried out by your department, and if they are being carried out, will the studies be available to the members of this House?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, this has been an area of concern and to my knowledge no study has been done on the environmental impact of pipelining in Alberta. We had some months ago considered this as an area of hearings and investigations by the environmental conservation authority. But since then, because of the fact that the load on the conservation authority is very heavy at this time, I have included in the budget an appropriation for monies for conducting a study in this area by private industry. So in the next several months it is my intention to announce a study by private industry into the environmental impact of pipelining in Alberta.

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-19

Organized Crime in Alberta

MR. HENDERSON:

I would like to address a question to the hon. Attorney General. Could the Attorney General inform the House as to whether organized crime has or has not penetrated the province of Alberta?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the remarks I made the other night were so apparently ununderstandable by the hon. member. After what I defined that I meant by organized crime in that talk, I very, very, clearly said that in that form it was here in Alberta now, and I can't be any clearer than that.

MR. LUDWIG

In view of the discussion that took place in the House today about the hon. Member from Calgary McCall demanding that he explain where it is in particular, would the hon. Attorney General tell us where this is in particular?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member from Smoky River followed by the hon. Member for Vegreville.

MR. FAHRAN:

As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Attorney General if it is a citizen's duty or is it an offence to withhold information on criminal activities from the police?

MR. SPEAKER:

Your question is not in order since it is one requesting a legal opinion.

The hon. Member for Smoky River followed by the hon. Member for Vegreville, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and then the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Tourist Information Centres

MR. J. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Tourism. It is in regard to the tourist information centres which have been set up throughout Alberta. When will they open and who will staff them?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, we have 14 teepees that will be opened on the 14th of May. We have an additional three information centres, one at Port MacLeod, one at Banff, one at Jasper. We have representatives in five Canadian Government Travel Bureau offices in the United States. These will be operated by staff members or Albertans from the areas where these are located. I should tell all the hon. members that the program is being funded this year under the STEP program and if any of your constituents would like to apply for a job they must be between 18 and 24 years of age. They must be Albertans or resident here for six months. They must pass an obvious test.

They will go through a week of training prior to being placed in these information centres and the centres will close immediately following the Labour Day weekend in September. We have one in

21-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

Saskatchewan, several in BC and the balance in Alberta except for one we operate in St. Marys, Montana. This year, for the benefit of the south people, we are operating one at Port Macleod. This is a new innovation, it is not one we constructed ourselves but we will be operating it. So they will be operated by Albertans as far as can be done by the people that live in the areas and understand it.

MR. J. MILLER:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Approximately how many students will this provide employment for?

MR. DCWLING:

Mr. Speaker, approximately 120 and I should mention that in addition we have eight mobile units that we also operate. These attend the Stampede in Calgary, the Klondike Days in Edmonton and in various parts of the province, so there are additional staff members required for those.

MR. DRAIN:

A supplementary to the hon. minister. He did not mention Frank, Alberta. Is he also going to man that point?

MR. DCWLING:

(Not recorded) ... was an information centre in Frank.

MR. DRAIN:

A matter of information Mr. minister, there is one built there and it has not thus far been manned and my question would be, would the minister consider doing that?

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-21

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, we will consider any good proposal from the hon. member.

CMHC and the Alberta Housing Corporation

MR. EATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs with regard to procedures in the application for loans under the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and Alberta Housing Corporation. It seems that a person must first apply to the Central Mortgage Corporation and if he is refused then he may make application to the Alberta Housing Corporation. My constituents have brought to my attention that they have applied to the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and they were rejected, and they cannot go to the Alberta Housing Corporation. Is there an indication that anything will be done to have this rectified?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, as you know this is a fairly new program commenced slightly less than a year ago. The aim, I think, of the program is to try and make mortgage funds available to persons who would be ineligible for funds from other lending agencies. So in this regard, the present way the regulations stand is that a person must be refused by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation plus one other lending agency before they can apply to Alberta Housing. You can see the difficulties in some instances wherein a person who knows they are not eligible still has to go through this exercise about getting a refusal. We are presently examining the regulations and the objectives of that program, as well as a method of funding to try and make some desirable improvements.

MR. BATHUK:

The biggest problem here is that if the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation would make a rejection at once then it would give these applicants a chance to apply to the Alberta Housing Corporation, but this way they cannot go because they have no rejection and they have no approval.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Television Cameras in the Legislative Chamber

MR. STRICK:

Mr. Speaker, I am directing my question to the hon. Premier. I should maybe try to get the information from you, but I cannot ask you a question so my question is: am I correct in my understanding that the operation or permitting of TV into the Legislature was to be at no cost to us?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well I think perhaps I can answer that, Mr. Speaker. I believe I said, when this motion was introduced, that the government would not be spending any monies for the acquisition of equipment or buying time on commercial channels and that kind of thing. Certainly it is my understanding that the operation is one of allowing such corporations as wish to come in to do so. I do believe, though, that there was the provision of an existing camera that one of the

21-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

government branches had, but there was certainly no payment of money for a studio camera or anything like that.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, then my further supplementary question is: am I to understand that the operation of the TV cameras today is being taken care of by some other group, or are they government cameras?

MR. HYNEMAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the suggestion is has the government organised or in any way arranged the financing of the cameras today, I certainly would say, no, not at all. I will find out what the details are, but today, in my view as far as the government is concerned, has been no different than any other day.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, if I just might make a point, and I certainly do not intend to make a speech. I am not complaining, but what I am concerned about is what the terms of reference are for the operation of the cameras, if they are, in fact, government cameras. Of course I recognise the operators and so I take it they are government cameras, and I would be interested in knowing how the operation is handled when we have government cameras taking the pictures in the House.

MR. HYNEMAN:

I think that is a fair question, Mr. Speaker I will certainly look into it and provide the House with information on those points.

MR. SPEAKER:

We have time for just one more question from the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Native Land Claims - Grande Cache

MR. DIXON:

I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Reports have it that the Alberta Government is presently negotiating with the native people of Grande Cache regarding settlement of native land claims in that area, and I was wondering if the hon. minister could enlighten the House as to what stage the negotiations are at and are they dealing just with the Metis or with other people -- for example, the people that live in the town, the town officials, the management of the town, and the people that have investments there?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, it is quite true that one of the very urgent matters that was left over from earlier days was the matter of land tenure, not for the Indian people in that area, if I might respectfully correct you, but the Metis people in that area. The problem of land tenure dates back to the transfer of land to the national park at Jasper in, I think, 1911 and the subsequent removal of people from the Jasper area to the Grande Cache general area. And they have lived there ever since with no settlement at all in terms of land tenure. We have worked very hard on resolving this problem on a back and forth basis, in terms of proposals and comments that have come to us not only from the Metis Association and the local Metis people and the legal people that are representing them, but also from people in the surrounding area, including the town of Grande Cache and the company that is involved in the Grande Cache

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-23

area. We have done a consensus of these ideas and suggestions and there has been a follow-up on the proposals that had for a very long time been lying before this government, prior to this fall. These have been followed up in terms of a concrete suggestion to the people there, and they have made a counter-suggestion, and we are working on this process right now. I might say, Mr. Speaker, we feel and they feel that we are making progress.

MR. DIXON:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Is the decision going to be made behind closed doors, or will the final decision be made by the Legislature? And will there be open meetings in order that the people you mention can attend, because apparently there is a lot of choice recreational land, from what the people tell me there, and they are quite concerned that the negotiations be open to them before any final decision is made.

DR. WARRACK:

Well there has been a good deal of opportunity, Mr. Speaker, for the reflection of views over a very long period of time, including the last six and a half months. These viewpoints have been coming forward to us from a variety of sources, and I am sure include all of the major interests involved. In the final analysis this will be a government decision, but at the same time based upon the viewpoints of the people primarily involved and anyone else who wants to express them, including the hon. member.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

DR. EACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I wish permission of the House to table letters requested in oral questioning by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View concerning the Edmonton Court House cafeteria.

QUESTIONS

DR. HENDER:

Mr. Speaker, in regard to Question 156. There are some serious doubts that the government holds in relation to the propriety of the first part of the question in relation to the confidentiality of documents, and I would ask the hon. member to seriously consider withdrawing and restructuring the question, so that he can get the necessary information that he requires, but at the same time, an individual's confidential documents are protected.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member wish to follow that suggestion?

MR. MCILROY:

Mr. Speaker, I shall restructure the question in a different form.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

157. Mr. Ho Lem proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Wilson:

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

21-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

1. How many housing units did the Alberta Housing Corporation financially participate in, in 1970 and 1971?
2. How many housing units, built with Alberta Housing Corporation assistance, are presently unoccupied?
3. Names of managing authorities and number of vacant units in their respective portfolio with Alberta Housing Corporation financial participation, and approximate length of time they have been vacant?
4. How many vacant units are rental and how many for sale?

MR. HC LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I move Motion for a Return 157 left standing under my name.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to comment on Motion for a Return No. 157.

I am afraid that in the way it is worded, it would be almost impossible to supply the information requested. I do not know if it is purposely worded in that way, or if the hon. member just does not have an understanding of the programs of the Alberta Housing Corporation. There are many hundreds of units that are involved with the direct lending program of the AHC, both for new homes and home improvements. There are a number of other programs in which the corporation is involved, involving public housing, senior citizens' accommodation, community residences and staff housing, and these add up to in excess of several thousand housing units. Also, those are further broken down with respect to a capital participation and financial operating subsidies, so if we were to take the motion the way it is worded, I am afraid it would be almost physically impossible to get that information.

I am suggesting that perhaps the hon. member may wish to withdraw it and consider whether or not he meant the lending program or the public housing program, or whatever it is he is attempting to find out. In this form we would not be able to vote for proceeding with it.

MR. HC LEM:

Mr. Speaker, in the way of explanation of my question to the hon. minister, I know that there are several methods in which the Alberta Housing Corporation does operate, sometimes in conjunction with other authorities on a federal level. However, I am interested in finding out the number of unoccupied homes built with Alberta Housing Corporation participation in the way of rentals, as well as homes that are mortgaged through Alberta Housing.

MR. SPEAKER:

This is, of course, a motion and it is debatable. I am sorry I did not hear what the hon. member said.

MR. HC LEM:

Perhaps I can consult with the hon. minister and resubmit the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-25

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

MR. HENDERSON:

The hon. members know, on a point of order, that normally today at 4:30 we would spend the last part of the day on private members' bills. With the fact that we are adjourning early and the time is getting on, I wonder if the hon. members would consider that we simply dispense with the half hour that would be available today for the private public bill, in view of the fact that the seconder will not even have an opportunity to present his views on the motion, and his reasons for seconding the motion, because it will drop to the end of the Order Paper and possibly not come up again. I would be quite prepared to forego debate of my bill in order to let the seconder have an opportunity to state his views on this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree then?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I want to get into the debate on the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc's bill. I wonder if the House would also agree that it stays on top of the Order Paper?

MR. HENDERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. That bill does not come up this afternoon. It automatically will stay there, because it won't come up.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Motion No. 1. Moved by Mr. Notley, seconded by Mr. Wilson: Be it resolved that this Legislative Assembly oppose the Village Lake Louise Project.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislative Assembly, in moving Resolution No. 1 standing in my name on the Order Paper, I want to take just a moment to say a word of thanks to the hon. Member for Calgary Bow for his willingness to second this motion. As he will point out in his seconding speech a little later, his views and my views do not coincide exactly on this subject. But I think that it is important, Mr. Speaker, that the Legislature come to grips with an issue that is demanding a great deal of public interest from one end of this province to the other. One of the things that must surely concern most of us as legislators, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that many of our most articulate and able young people have grown cynical about the ability of parliamentary government to cope with some of the really vexing problems that face us today. As a consequence, it is important that this Legislature not sidestep a hot political issue like Lake Louise, but instead come to grips with it. Because the

21-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

hon. Member for Calgary Bow has made this possible, I think that we all owe him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, while this may come as a surprise to many, my first reaction to the proposed Village Lake Louise is not one of opposition because of the foreign ownership issue, although I intend to raise that a little later on. But as a person who has had the opportunity of travelling this province from one end to another, and as a person who has become indeed a partisan of this province - and no one who has travelled this province can be anything other than a booster for the great beauty of Alberta - nowhere, anywhere in Alberta, can you find a site which can surpass Lake Louise in scenic majesty. As a consequence, I must confess that my initial reaction was, I think, like the reaction of many Albertans, an emotional reaction, a reaction stemming from a great deal of pride in this really beautiful scenic area. I say this without any apology, because I believe, as I mentioned, that my views in this respect and my initial reaction was one which is shared by thousands of Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, let me be a little more specific in introducing this resolution. I believe in the first place, the project Lake Louise is clearly inconsistent with the purpose of our national parks system. I have read over many of the briefs that were presented to the parks board hearings in Calgary. Over and over again, section 4 of The National Parks Act would be cited, and I intend to read section 4 into the Legislative record of this province. And I quote: "The parks are dedicated to the people of Canada for their benefit, education, and enjoyment, and such parks shall be maintained and made use of, so as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Now, Mr. Speaker, no matter how impressed one might initially be with the proposed Village Lake Louise complex, a complex which will provide bars, gourmet restaurants, discotheques, theatres, concert halls, this really is not consistent with section 4 of the National Parks Act. It is not consistent with the enjoyment of the beauty of our national parks in their native state. Such a project would be an attraction in itself, and while none of us have any objections to these types of developments in the city cores of our two major cities, or spreading out in the other communities of our province, surely it is inconsistent to have this kind of development in the middle of one of the most beautiful national parks in the world. I want to quote from Galvin Henderson, the executive director of the National Provincial Parks Association of Canada. He states:

"In this atmosphere, an intimate relationship between visitors and the natural environment would not be encouraged. The development would be an attraction in its own right, and it would be contrary to national parks policies."

It must be noted at this time, Mr. Speaker, that such a development, owned and controlled as it is by foreign capital, would not be permitted in an American park. The foreign ownership would not be the determining reason, but American parks' policy would preclude such a development south of the border and rightly so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the second reason that I cite in support of this legislation opposing Lake Louise, is the precedent that such a development would set. I think we have to realize that the promoters of this scheme, if they are successful, are likely to do very well indeed from it. In the first place, they can cash in on the fame of Lake Louise, the fame of our national parks. In the second place, they can take advantage of the thousands, and indeed, hundreds of thousands of dollars that we spend federally and provincially each year quite properly to advertise and promote the beauties of our national parks. So consequently, developing a complex of this nature makes a good deal of business sense. If project Lake Louise is successful, we are going to be opening the door for this kind of development right across the country. It is the kind of precedent,

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-27

Mr. Speaker, which in my view, would clearly imperil all the other national parks of Canada.

But there is a third reason that I think is important as well. We have yet to find out what the impact of such a giant complex would be on the small ski operations in this province. I recall several weeks ago asking the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in charge of Tourism whether or not a study had been commissioned. It is my understanding that he said that one was commissioned. But I think that it is very important that we find out first what the impact of Village Lake Louise will be on these operations which are at least controlled by, Canadians. As most of them operate on a very very small margin, if you take 4% or 5% of the clientele away from them, that drop in usage could be fatal.

Some, of course, say, no, this is not true. Project Lake Louise will bring in so many more tourists, it is likely to boost the entire ski business in the province, and it will help the small operators just as much as the promoters of Village Lake Louise. I am not sure of that, Mr. Speaker. I do not think any of us know for sure, because we do not, as yet, have a clear-cut study to evaluate the impact of this kind of venture. Suffice it to say, however, if we look at the trend of North American business we see an economy littered with unsuccessful small operators who have been run out of business by giant corporations. We can, therefore, take small consolation from the trends elsewhere in the North American business community, that Lake Louise will not, in fact, hurt and seriously injure the smaller operators.

Another point which I think is vitally important is the question raised by the environmentalists, which I suppose some members of this Legislature tend to disregard but which I think it is very important, when they asked, "What are the ecological effects of such a development?" The promoters themselves acknowledge there has not been a proper ecological study. We do not have sufficient information from the federal government. I think the province should be demanding, in no uncertain terms, that there should be a proper ecological study commissioned to determine what the impact of this kind of development will have on the very fragile alpine terrain and on the flora and fauna surrounding the Lake Louise area.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the government of this province can raise its voice very loudly when it chooses to do so. I submit to this Legislature that this government should be raising its voice equally loudly on the question of demanding from the federal government a full scale ecological study to determine what the impact of project Lake Louise will be.

There are still other questions that have to be examined in this issue. First of all, who will use the project? It must be admitted that some dormitory space is going to be provided for the young. But what about the average Canadian with a family? He cannot stay in dormitories, and the rates which will undoubtedly be the prevailing motel rates in the area, of \$20 to \$30 a night, are clearly beyond the reach of the low income Canadian, or even most middle-income Canadians. The leader of the Liberal party in Alberta describes the project as nothing more than a pleasure complex for the jet set. I do not often agree with the leader of the Liberal party in Alberta but in this case, to use a term currently in vogue among our younger generation, I think he is 'right on'. I think, quite clearly, project Lake Louise, at least as envisaged, will not be the kind of recreational complex which will be available to the average Canadian.

Mr. Speaker, who will control Village Lake Louise? Here we come to the very important question of foreign ownership. The company will be owned 50% by Imperial Oil, which we all know is controlled by Standard Oil of New Jersey, and Lake Louise Lifts, a company which is 33% foreign owned. Our Premier has already stated that in his view,

21-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

foreign ownership is a red herring. He is entitled to his opinion; we are all entitled to our opinions, but I think it should be noted that in the copies of briefs that were sent to me, and I have received a large number of them, and in the many letters that have come to my attention, including many letters from people who do not support the political party I represent, over and over again, the issue of ownership was raised.

Mr. Speaker, foreign ownership is an issue in the minds of the people of Alberta, whether or not it is an issue in the view of the government of Alberta. Well, Mr. Speaker, we know who will control the project if it is developed; ultimately, Standard Oil will exercise control.

Who will finance Project Lake Louise? I intend to read excerpts from one of the briefs which I received, a preliminary financial study of Project Lake Louise prepared by the M. K. Moriarity, & Associates Ltd., Consulting Engineers in the City of Calgary. They have examined the financial basis of Project Lake Louise. I intend to quote from certain parts of their submission.

First of all, the federal government is going to be making available to the promoters land that will be worth in the neighbourhood of some \$3 million. Secondly, the municipal services provided by the Government of Canada are estimated by the people who prepared this brief to be worth another \$3 million. Now in the third place, as we all know, Canadians are presumably going to have an opportunity to invest in this project by purchasing the various units. There are dormitory units, studio units, one-bedroom units, two-bedroom units and three bedroom units. According to the submission of this firm of consulting engineers, using the prices that they understand to be cited by the promoters of Village Lake Louise, there will be, and again I want to read this into the record of our province, 133 three bedroom units valued at \$30,000 per unit, 485 two bedroom units valued at \$25,000 per unit, 415 one bedroom units, valued at \$20,000 per unit and 231 studio units, valued at \$15,000 per unit. The total comes to \$27,790,000: in short, add that to the \$6 million advanced by the government of Canada, and you find, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Canada in one way or another will be putting up a very large portion of the money necessary to finance this project.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is just another example of clever foreign promoters using our own money to finance the takeover of our own country. Some may say, foreign ownership is a red herring. Nothing in my view more clearly illustrates the bankruptcy of our present policies than the fact that one of the most beautiful sites anywhere in the world must be developed by foreign capital. Surely when we consider our Canadian identity, if this is to be developed -- I maintain it should not be developed, but even if it were to be developed, surely at the very least it should be developed by Canadians for Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, let me bring this back to the Legislative Assembly today. What is the government's stand on this matter? Well, I read the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs' letter yesterday, and I must congratulate him. I think in terms of political fence sitting and obfuscation it would do justice to the late McKenzie King. It was certainly a letter of unparalleled quality in political fence sitting. Mr. Speaker, it did not really shed any light on where the government really stands in this matter.

And the position is really quite interesting, intriguing if you look back over the last five or six weeks. Just before the Legislature opened, the Minister in charge of Tourism said that he was neutral about the project. Then the Minister of Industry said that he privately favoured it. Then we had the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs saying that the government was taking a

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-29

listening position. Then we had the Premier saying that he didn't think that the government should make a submission to a federal board even though the government has made a great deal of public protest about the National Energy Board. But notwithstanding that, we now have a new position being submitted. And it is simply this -- government to government negotiations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that one point be made quite clearly here about this 'government to government discussion'. I remember ten days ago when we were discussing DREE in this Legislature, and the hon. minister returning from Ottawa got up in the Legislature and said that he did not intend to reveal to the Legislative Assembly the details of the discussion over DREE; and if he recollects I rose and I said I could understand the delay to a certain extent because I realized the intricate negotiations involved. But I understand it, Mr. Speaker, because at least we know where the government stands on the value judgment of whether DREE is or is not a good thing. We know where they stand, they have made that abundantly clear over and over again. But, Mr. Speaker, on the question.

MR. GETTY:

A point of order here so the hon. member does not mislead the House. I said that I was not prepared to make the government's stand with DREE and the things I discussed with Mr. Marchand available to the House yet, not that I would not make them available to the House. I think it should be clear so that he does not mislead the members.

MR. NCTLEY:

Did I want to suggest that the hon. minister was not, in fact, going to make that available to the Legislature? I submit that the minister is unduly touchy on this question. Even though some.

MR. GETTY:

The minister and every member - well it is a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would submit that it should be a point of privilege or it is not any point at all.

MR. GETTY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister will be touchy and every member should be touchy when any member stands up and tries to distort what happens in the House. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the rookie member should remember that he has to stand up to the things he says in here and not shoot from the hip without knowing what he's talking about.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is my submission that the word the hon. member must not distort is unparliamentary and the hon. minister should apologize - The statement is unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister, as I understood it, was merely giving counsel and not saying that anyone had distorted anything.

21-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

MR. NCTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, on replying to the point of privilege before proceeding with my remarks. I am really quite surprised at the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. What I said in the course of my remarks was I think fairly straightforward, whether he understood or not. I did not suggest that he would not report to the House in due course. What I said was that I understood there were certain problems which are intricate, but at least we knew where they stood on the general issue. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is fairly straightforward, and again I say that I find it rather surprising that the hon. minister is so touchy on this issue. I suggest that, as a rookie member to a seasoned pro - you should harden up a bit my hon. friend!

Mr. Speaker, we know the government's value judgment on DREE, but we don't know what value judgment they have made on Project Lake Louise, and I submit that for a government which is incessantly talking about being an open government, a government which before the last provincial election said that it would lay its cards on the table so that the people of this province would know where they stand on the issues of the day, they have an obligation to at least acquaint the people of Alberta with their philosophical position on this issue. We are not asking them to discuss all the details, but we have a right to know what their value judgment is on Lake Louise.

DR. FAPROSKI:

I do not think that the members have to discuss philosophy. The people of Alberta want facts.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. This is not a point of privilege.

MR. NCTLEY:

I will go on without replying to the last point. I think that it is hardly necessary to do that.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that this government has an obligation to clearly state to the people of Alberta where it stands on Project Lake Louise and whether the 48 members on the other side of this House realize it or not, Mr. Speaker, the people of Alberta recognize that this government has an obligation to state where it stands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a word ...

MR. KCZIAK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, . . . I believe the motion as presented is that this Legislative Assembly oppose the proposed Village Lake Louise Project, whereas I understand the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview to be debating a motion of what the government's policy on this subject should be, and whether it should be disclosed to the House.

MR. NCTLEY:

The resolution I submitted permits the widest possible discussion of an issue and surely, Mr. Speaker, as part of that issue the people of this province and the members of this Assembly have a right to know where the government stands, and any suggestion that this kind of discussion is out of order is, in itself, out of order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a few remarks to the members of the Legislative Assembly, and in particular to the hon. members on the government side. Mr. Speaker, in a previous debate we were treated to quite a speech from the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, a

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-31

speech that was frequently entertaining and even occasionally accurate. Mr. Speaker, in that speech the members of the opposition were given a great deal of gratuitous advice. Well, I am sure the hon. members across the way will appreciate a member of the opposition giving them some advice, because prior to the last election we were told that the Conservative party was a new kind of political organization, one that would put people before party. Mr. Speaker, we were told over and over again that the Conservative party had candidates who would stand up for what their constituents want, regardless of whether the cabinet liked it or not. They would put their constituency interests first.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been around politics long enough to know that it is perhaps not possible to expect that the hon. members across the way would vote against the government, either on the budget or on the Speech from the Throne, or on any major question where the fate of the government itself rests. But Project Lake Louise is a different matter; it is a matter of fundamental importance to thousands of Albertans. But the fate of the government is not at stake. However Mr. Speaker, the credibility of all that was said about people before party, all that was said about members being independent enough to stand up and speak for their own constituents, that credibility will be determined in large measure by whether or not the members of the government who are not on the front bench will look upon this issue, not from a purely partisan stand, not slavishly following a party line, but by taking an independent position in this Legislature.

MR. BATHURST:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we had a good example this afternoon when the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands spoke against the motion by the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, again with all due respect to the point of order, the gentleman was raising a question relating to another issue in this Legislature. I am talking about the resolution under discussion at the moment and, of course, the point of order is clearly out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

May I mention to hon. members that points of order and I quote: "should not be used to engage in the debate, and each member is entitled to speak only once on the debate."

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I think that the people of Alberta will be watching very closely on this issue. They will be watching the members who are sitting on the backbenches of the government's side of the House, and rightly so. Well, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to say that I am sure all of us recognize that this is an issue that has aroused a great deal of public interest. As I have gone through the province, and in my own constituency, for example, I am surprised at how many people have approached me, surprised at how many people have written and phoned. I am surprised at the number of petitions that are circulating around the province. And indeed in my own constituency, may I say that one of the people who I am most pleased about being a convert to this issue is the campaign manager for my Conservative opponent in the last election, and may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he shows much greater prudence in his choice of issues than he does in his choice of parties.

But, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I recollect one of the most impressive speeches given by the former leader of the Conservative

21-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

Party, John Diefentaker. It was given at the first major challenge to his leadership. He made a great address, and he concluded his remarks by saying, "You know where I stand, now I have a right to know where you stand." Well to paraphrase that speech, Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear from the submissions, the phone calls, the letters, the petitions -- that we know where the people of Alberta stand on Village Lake Louise; now they have a right to know where we stand.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, very early in this session, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, Mr. Notley, mentioned his was a self-contained caucus with complete unanimity amongst its members. In fact, he is so self-contained that he had to call on this maverick to second his motion.

No, Mr. Speaker, I have not joined the New Democrat Party. There are several valid reasons, one of which is a desire not to cause a division in their caucus, sir. Mr. Speaker, I am seconding this motion because the hon. member is a duly elected representative of his constituency and has a job to do, the same as all other members. In fact, I feel that he should have equal rights and privileges, along with all other members of this Legislature. Because he is the only elected member of his party, I felt that democracy would have been thwarted had he not been allowed to present his motion for the lack of a seconder as the rules require.

When it became obvious that the Lougheed government had not made arrangements to assure Mr. Notley equal rights and privileges as a member, in spite of the proposed Bill of Rights and all of its connotations, I agreed to second the motion as an accommodation and a courtesy. We on this side of the House have a sense of fair play

MR. MINIELLY:

Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. That is not a correct statement the hon. member has made, that our government would not have seconded a motion of the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member did not say that I understood him to say that no provision had been made, and if the hon. minister would like to give a contrary point of view perhaps he could do so in the course of debate.

MR. WILSON:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

We on this side of the House have a sense of fair play and are interested in preserving democracy as it has been traditionally known in Alberta.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this motion should be debated in this Legislature as Lake Louise is in Alberta, and this is an issue where all politicians should stand up and be counted. Several times the hon. the Premier and some of his Cabinet ministers have declined, when asked to clearly state whether or not they were for or opposed to the Village Lake Louise proposed project. In fact, we have heard conflicting opinions from Lougheed team members.

This is the time for leadership in Alberta. Our citizens want to know what the facts and alternatives are. They want leadership, not waffling. Hopefully during this debate the Lougheed government's position will be flushed out.

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-33

Mr. Speaker, keeping in mind the fact that our national parks are among the most sacred of Canadian lands, how does the government reconcile its willingness to call an election on constitutional issues, yet laze in the weeds waiting for the federal government to tell them what to do on Village Lake Louise?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to summarize briefly the history of this issue. In April 1971 hearings on provisional master plans for the four mountain parks of Banff, Jasper, Yoho, and Kootenay were held at Calgary, Edmonton, and Vancouver. Some 3,500 pages were presented, 700 pages of verbatim transcript, and 333 written briefs. It was considered desirable at the time, and it remains desirable today, that the public be acquainted with certain tentative decisions which have a direct, or indirect, bearing on conceptual proposals for the Lake Louise area of Banff National Park. The general policy of our national parks is based on Section 4 of the National Parks Act which states:

"The parks are dedicated to the people of Canada for their benefit, education, and enjoyment, and such parks shall be maintained and made use of so as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations".

The mandate of the National and Historic Parks Branch is therefore a dual one. It must respect the needs of Canadians to enjoy the environment of the national parks, while at the same time, it must protect and preserve them for the enjoyment of future generations.

These parks are part of Canada's national heritage and every care must be given to ensure that they are regulated so that a sensitiveness exists towards the complexities and beauties of nature as well as economic demands. There is a need for more ecological studies and inventories. The federal government agrees, and a National Parks Inventory Program, now well under way, is being accorded high priority. Ecological impact studies are being intensified and accelerated, not only in connection with proposed developments, but also directed toward the capacity of various zones, wildlife habitats, specific sites, and natural features to withstand usage.

One of the strongest impressions, again, from the public hearings, is the public concern for the preservation of the natural features of our parks. The National Parks Planning Process is a five class zoning system. The public hearing supported the principle of zoning; however, there was considerable criticism of specific zoning proposals contained in the provisional master plans for the mountain parks. It was claimed that zoning was based on existing proposed developments rather than on ecological principles.

At the Mountain Parks Hearings, the subject of roads emerged as a major concern. Public consensus was that little, if any more, road construction is required in this 8,000 square mile complex, that preservation of wilderness is reason enough for not building new roads. Roads to remote areas can often destroy the very features they were intended to make accessible.

At the Mountain Park Hearings, suggestions were heard that facilities for services, food, and shelter should be located outside park boundaries where practical. In principle, the federal department agrees. An Alberta citizen who participated in the hearings, argues:

"Visitor accommodation in the Canmore area will become increasingly adequate if a limitation is put on building in the park, although it is recognized that as it is necessary, Banff townsite must adjust without enlarging. Lake Louise is a visitor's centre, is necessary but this should not spread beyond the lower valley".

Another citizen further states:

21-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

"The department should work with the governments of the Province of Alberta and British Columbia to take the pressure off the parks by encouraging development outside the park."

It should also work with the Government of the Province of Alberta and the Department of Transport to relocate the airport as soon as possible outside the park, as this will be necessary when the Trans Canada Highway is twinned into Banff.

The commercial development, as now proposed, by Village Lake Louise Ltd. tends to destroy the very principles of our national parks. As one of my constituents argues,

"Townsites should not provide extra entertainment and services common to urban living throughout Canada. Delicatessens, too numerous curio stores, specialized clothing or drygood stores, are examples of services considered over and above minimum requirements. One Calgarian notes: "It is well-known that there are many potential ski areas outside the national parks which have only to be developed. The reason these areas are not developed is that potential developers are not subsidized by the government as they are in national parks."

The federal department has said they would welcome and co-operate in the development of visitor service facilities outside national parks. To achieve optimum development on the periphery of the parks, effective regional planning and priorities, along with close co-operation between federal, provincial, and other government agencies will be required. Now is the time for leadership from the provincial government, not the time for waiting and listening. There is a need for the provincial government to come forward with a clear-cut policy and action, to assist the citizens of Alberta and all of Canada, which would satisfy the various concerns and result in increased trade and commerce and revenues to the provincial treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to present some arguments for, and criticisms of, the Village Lake Louise Ltd. proposal. Improvements are needed in the existing facilities of the village of Lake Louise. Visitors to the Banff park are growing at a rate of more than 5% per year. People are disappointed in the parks, largely because of overcrowding in Banff. According to park officials, only 7% of 13 million park users in Canada last year were seeking a wilderness experience. The rest were concerned with recreational and family outings. This does not rule out the need for preserving wilderness areas in Canada, but instead stresses the need for developing recreational facilities in Canada, including improving present facilities within our national parks.

The Canadian Ski Association president, Gavin Young, submitted a brief which states in part:

"Let us, by all means, preserve our natural wilderness areas. But at the same time, let us use a minute portion of the area to develop fitness and recreational outlets for Canadians."

Action must be taken to prevent the creation of two mountain metropolises at Banff and Jasper. The prospect of travelling through a subway to go skiing is not overly appealing. Part of this action requires improving the facilities in the lower Lake Louise village area. But part of this action also requires developing recreational facilities outside the park boundaries -- in the Canmore Corridor, for example. If we do not, the prospects are very unpleasant. John Gordon, senior assistant deputy in charge of the National and Historic Parks Branch of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development says,

"The alternatives as we see them would be as we see them would be growing pressures, for the continued growth of the two existing townsites, or for ribbon development of service facilities, scattered throughout the park, plus, of course,

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-35

increased traffic by visitors, forced to come in long distances."

Solutions must be found to the increasing demands for recreational facilities. This demand results from changing attitudes towards work and increasing leisure time. Solutions must be found to satisfy the resulting public demand for recreational facilities. But at the same time, and I stress, the principles of our national parks must be upheld and we must maintain Section 4 of The National Park Act, which has been previously cited.

The proposal of the Village Lake Louise Ltd, can be criticized in several respects, with regard to existing national parks policy. As one citizen states,

"The proposed resort complex of the upper village is a grave threat to Banff National Park. Condominium units for the affluent," and I quote, "nightclubs, discotheques, specialty shops, for examples, have no place in a national park. They combine to make the complex an attraction in itself, which is specifically contrary to national parks policy. Certainly we have need of recreational facilities, and a ski resort of international standard and appeal would be a boon to Canada, but such developments must be located outside our national parks."

There is, as well, a strong public feeling that The National Parks Act and the national parks policy become meaningless when big business ventures attain a higher degree of priority and influence than the importance of maintaining the value of an irreplaceable natural heritage.

There generally seems to be an air of uncertainty concerning the economic studies that have been carried out with respect to the Village Lake Louise Ltd. proposal. We are advised by an official of that organization that extensive economic studies have been carried out. But, unfortunately, they are not available to us. On the economics of the Village Lake Louise proposal, all we know is that land rental will be a reasonable percentage of the company's overall gross income. We might ask, reasonable to whom? We just don't know.

A user charge will be imposed to amortise the Crown's investment in municipal services. Other levies, relative to necessary education, health and other services are anticipated.

The proposal of Village Lake Louise Limited can be criticized in several respects with regard to existing national park policy. We are not certain that the best arrangement is being worked out for the average Canadian. We do know that the proposal is beneficial for the proposing companies. As have been previously stated in this House, Mr. Merton T. Moriarity of the firm M. T. Moriarity and Associates, said his study of the project shows that nearly \$28 million will be raised through sale of condominiums. Federal subsidies to the project will be at least \$6 million, he claims, including land worth about \$3 million, and municipal services worth about another \$3 million. One of the most attractive features of the plan for a developer is that the federal government has guaranteed the developers monopoly control of the area, he says.

Similarly, as mentioned earlier, there is a need for further ecological studies of the Village Lake Louise proposal. These studies should be readily accessible to the public. On this topic, Gerald Wilkins, a Calgary biologist claims:

"There is no evidence that ecological studies on the project have been carried out."

Further, Mr. Speaker, in a brief presented by the National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada, they state,

"The impact of many persons on fragile alpine areas is not well considered in the plans. In general, unreasonable carrying

21-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

capacities are suggested for the natural environment. For example, Small Mud Lake, less than a mile from the Upper Village, is seen as a promising potential fishing area. No mention is made of its carrying capacity for fishing or even human visitation."

Mr. Speaker, the advantages of a smaller development are obvious. Many of the specific details of the Village Lake Louise limited proposal, that have so stirred public condemnation could be omitted; discotheques, night clubs, gourmet restaurants, managed units, all could be excluded from the national parks, and justly so.

It can be reasonably argued that certain outdoor recreational activities are not inconsistent with the park's basic reason for existence, so long as they make but marginal ecological and aesthetic inroads. The improvement of present recreational facilities is both needed and desired, but certain considerations are of vital importance. The discussion on Village Lake Louise must focus on several criteria. For example, an editorial in the *Albertan* on March 8th, raises some important questions. Will the planned expansion of ski slopes on Mt. Whitehorn encroach on territory which deserves to be preserved, either on its own merits, or because clearing it will have an adverse effect on a large surrounding territory? Does the projected visitor and resident population pose a serious ecological threat? Are some of the contemplated commercial facilities appropriate to a national park setting, however desirable they need be from the standpoints of revenue production and visitor usage? Do the accommodation plans ensure, so far as it is possible to do so, that people of lesser means will not find rentals prohibitive?

Mr. Speaker, essentially, my position on Lake Louise, and I think the position of all reasonable Albertans, is that:

1. There is a need to improve aesthetic and service value of present recreational facilities in the existing lower Lake Louise Village.
2. There is a need for natural park preservation in terms of the ecology and in terms of the principles of the national parks concept.
3. There is a need for studies of the ecological effects of the proposals, the economic implications, and the feasibility of alternative recreational developments outside park boundaries.

There is a need for leadership from the Lougheed government. It is time this government showed the people of Alberta that it can be dynamic. It is time that it indicated its concern for the desires of the people of Alberta.

Okay, Mr. Speaker, what are we going to do for Alberta skiers and others seeking recreational facilities? Here is what I would do.

- 1) develop a conceptual masterplan for the province indicating guidelines for development outside the boundaries of national parks.
- 2) promote and assist private enterprise, recreational development outside the national parks.

These are the steps to achieve these goals. 1) call for proposals stating objectives desired. 2) publish guidelines to be observed in the attainment of these objectives. 3) set a target date for achieving the objectives. 4) invite respondents to participate in small parts of the overall concept. 5) make available to all interested respondents all studies and research obtainable. 6) evaluate all responses and award contracts.

Mr. Speaker, in this way the Canmore corridor and environment could be used as a pilot project to provide the necessary recreational facilities and at the same time, take the pressure off our national parks. On this principle, the government can retain

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-37

ownership for Albertans by issuing long term leases as well as give preference to Alberta and Canadian investors.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this is an effective and practical method of organizing our diverse resources for the creative attainment of a desired objective in the best interests of all Albertans and Canadians.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I only want to participate for a short period of time regarding this resolution, because of some comments made about the government and how it fulfills its responsibilities. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if the members were paying attention they would have seen that we have had two members now take some time to tell us that they did not know what they were talking about. Because what they have done is come up with a series of questions, a series of uncertainties, and a series of statements that they just don't know. And yet, I think probably for some reason known only to them, they have passed a resolution that says, "Be it resolved that this Legislative Assembly oppose the proposed Village Lake Louise project." Now, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that they are prepared to oppose blindly. And I was wondering when either one of them got up and spoke, whether or not they would in fact, give some reason. The hon. Member from Spirit River-Fairview touched briefly on the foreign investment matter which he himself said was not an important point, nevertheless the two of them have now stood up and told us that they don't know why they are opposing, but they wish someone would find out.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are certain responsibilities about government and some of the members on the other side I am sure have found this out from past experience. But one of the things you do not do, is do as the hon. Member from Spirit River-Fairview did, that is to make up your mind and oppose, and then say, since our party has gone before that hearing and said we don't like it. Then we have read the briefs, then we have tried to find out what it was all about. Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously a government has a responsibility not to oppose blindly, but the government responsibility surely is to assess the matter, surely is to hear the way the people of the province would like to express themselves. We have had today the hon. Member for Olds - Didsbury ask, before the government takes a stand and before it goes to Ottawa would it be prepared to hear submissions, would we agree to hear submissions? Well, certainly and we have said all along. But surely when he is saying that, he is at the same time saying, would you please oppose the project, because that does not make sense at all. To me the responsibility obviously is to look into the matter, to consider all the aspects of it. And when they are asking where does the government of Alberta stand? They have had it expressed to them many times that in fulfilling your responsibilities you must take the time to assess it. The hon. member may talk about policy in one sentence, but policy obviously is going to be built upon complete consideration of all the matters involved. He might figure that a Cabinet can sit down and just say, "Well, are we for or against it, fellows?" It appears to be politically expedient to be against it, as I suspect the hon. Member for Spirit River - Fairview's reaction was. They were against it blindly. Because he said seven times he does not know what it is all about, he was not sure what the answers were, nevertheless he wants to oppose it. Also, Mr. Speaker, I think that perhaps the government had a responsibility to hear this debate, to hear the members of the Assembly. That is one possibility. Surely all of the members who have asked for a government position are eager now to stand up and tell us how they would like to influence that decision, tell us where they stand, what the arguments are - not just ask questions, but what their reactions are to it. And we hope they will, Mr. Speaker. It should be very helpful to the government.

21-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

Mr. Speaker, the question about provincial parks and how they are worked into the federal park system is a very good point. It should be pointed out that it is very unfortunate that since 1935 - that long Mr. Speaker - they have been totally incapable in this province under the previous administration of coming up with a policy which formulates the manner in which the provincial parks can be co-ordinated with the federal parks in Alberta. That is not our fault, Mr. Speaker, nevertheless though they were totally incapable of doing it, now one of their newly elected members says let's have that decision in five months, when it took them, Lord knows how long, not even to be able to come up with one.

Mr. Speaker, I find it very easy to reject the arguments. I find it very easy to reject this resolution, because certainly this government does not intend to oppose anything blindly. But rather we intend to look, consider, hear Albertans' opinions, have the ministers responsible who have taken Cabinet responsibility in the areas, do an assessment, use the capabilities of their departments, and then make a considered decision which we will be proud to stand behind.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Smoky River has the floor.

MR. MOORE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I enter this debate, Mr. Speaker, with some concern about the motives of the hon. mover of this resolution and the seconder. It appears to me that the hon. Member for Spirit River - Fairview is taking his usual negative position, a position that he has taken with respect to other developments in this province, and I refer to the hog processing plant in northern Alberta, the rape seed crushing plant in northern Alberta, and finally a development in Banff National Park. I think he is being quite consistent with other members of his political faith in displaying a rather negative attitude without, as the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud has said, any real positive suggestion as to the problems that exist with our national parks.

Another point I would like to touch on, Mr. Speaker, before I give the thoughts of a backbencher from this side of House, is a statement by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow with respect to why he had to second this motion. Certainly the rights of the hon. Member for Spirit River - Fairview, with respect to introducing motions into this House are no different from anyone else's. Any member of this House may second a motion of any other member, and I understand also, as the rules progress in this House, we could in fact forego the need for a seconder for the hon. Mr. Notley's motion with unanimous leave of the House, and that has certainly never been turned down to this point in time by this side of the House.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Mr. Getty pointed out a number of times during the question period some weeks ago, there is a much larger issue at stake here than just the development of Village Lake Louise, and that is the development of a total national parks policy which we just simply do not have in this country. A policy which I think it would be safe to say, in the view of the government of Alberta, is one that has to be developed with federal officials in connection with the people and the Government of Alberta. That is exactly what the purpose of the hearings were in the City of Calgary and that is why the government is presently reviewing all of those submissions.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to give a few of my thoughts with respect to Banff and Jasper National Parks. We must decide if those national

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-39

parks should, in fact, be wilderness areas with strict limits on the number of people who may visit them, or if we should be allowing limited development of accommodation and recreational facilities with some strict environmental controls. If a decision is made to keep our parks as total wilderness areas, then I submit that we have some other pretty serious problems to consider. We will have to make a number of changes in the existing parks policy, if there is one, recognising that those accommodations, facilities and camp grounds are presently overloaded, as the Member for Calgary Bow mentioned, during the peak summer tourist season. We will have to consider limiting the number of people who enter our national parks in Alberta, and perhaps we will be in a situation where we are going to have to say to the general public, you can enter and you may not. I suggest to you that that is something that has to be determined before we can suggest that those parks are going to be wilderness areas and there will be no more development.

One of the biggest disgraces, perhaps, we have in our national parks in Alberta right at the moment is the manner in which people are jammed into a place like Tunnel Mountain camp ground in Banff National Park, and I have been there on many occasions. Surely, in my opinion, we have a responsibility to extend the accommodation in this area or alternately limit the number of people who can visit the parks. If we insist that no more development takes place, then the existing accommodations, not only through lack of competition but other factors as well, will be priced, in my opinion, out of reach of the average Albertan. The parks could then become an area -- and I am sure the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview would not support that kind of thing -- for the rich only, and those less fortunate people would have to look elsewhere in Alberta to spend their leisure time.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there are some problems on the other side of the coin too. We cannot allow uncontrolled development of a commercial nature that does not, in fact, provide a recreational outlet for the average Albertan. The Village Lake Louise development could, of course, create a strong demand for similar development in other parts of Canada, as well as in other parts of Banff and Jasper National Parks.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, that further developments in these parks have both a positive and a negative side, and it is that responsibility to determine both the positive and the negative side, and to come up with some alternate arrangements with respect to recreational facilities in those parks that this government is presently undertaking. Being strictly opposed to further development, as I mentioned before, in my view it is a completely negative attitude which does not really do anything to solve the problem.

Certainly, in my view the representatives in this Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker, have an obligation to the people in Alberta who elected them, to take a stand on issues of this nature that are positive in solving the problems, and not just to be negatively opposed to anything that is suggested.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I see we have about four minutes so my comments will be very brief.

I would firstly like to say, Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept the arguments of the government of wanting to wait and listen to take a stand on the thing. It is an emotional issue and I do not think any

21-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

amount of logic is going to change the arguments that basically relate to it. I can understand why they want to sit on the fence and in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the remarks of the previous speaker, because certainly it is an issue in which there has been a great deal of emotion injected, and very little, I think, rationale or common sense.

In the first instance, insofar as the Alberta interest is concerned, it has been suggested that we should hold national hearings on the subject with the federal government. I suggest that they should not. This subject is of vital interest to the people of Alberta. We have in Alberta the highest -- I think 70% or more of the total national park acreages is in the province of Alberta. And the whole Rocky Mountain trench from the border to the B.C. boundary where the mountain structure peters out into the Peace River plain country, is all in the Alberta mountains, which we share with B.C. Nonetheless it is a particular issue to Albertans and it should be settled in Alberta.

Certainly I would have to stand in my place and say on the question of foreign investment, it is a red herring, it has nothing whatever to do with conservation. While I have every respect for the views of those who favour conservation and no more development -- they are certainly entitled to their opinions. But to throw out the suggestion that the investment and where the money comes from should be a factor in making the decision -- I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we start running this country and this Legislature on the basis of logic such as that, and we will have an economy and a country that would make Cuba look democratic and prosperous. It just simply would not be appropriate to do so. The foreign capital is not a factor in it.

Certainly I, for one, do not share the view that the national park should be wilderness area; I cannot take too much credence in the remarks of the biologists I hear talking, that nobody should use the national parks because somebody is going to trample on the flowers. I do not think the national parks were set up as a nature preserve for the interested biologists and entomologists of the province, but I respect their interest in it, they are there for the benefit and enjoyment of the public. As the previous speaker has said, if the people of this province, in particular, are going to enjoy the mountains, there have to be facilities there for them to use.

Now I am not suggesting that all the development that is going into this Lake Louise with the condominiums -- in fact I haven't studied it to quite that extent, but I do know, just as every other member knows here, that the accommodation situation is not good in either one of the national parks and it is getting worse. And the question is whether we want development or whether we do not want to see development in there, and I think if it comes right down to a fundamental question, I would have to stand up and say, it is in the best interests of the people of the province to favour a continuation of development in the parks. But let's not get off onto the red herrings about foreign investment. It is emotionally popular, but as I say, if we make decisions on that basis, we had better forget about tar sands development, we had better forget about building gas plants, we had better forget about a lot of other things that foreign capital has done for this province.

Now one of the arguments that the mover of the motion brought out was competition of small operators, and this I suggest is another red herring. I would like to suggest to the mover of the resolution, if he thinks these provide too much competition I am going to Marmot Basin with my family this weekend to go skiing, and my only concern is whether I can get on the tow three times a day or only two times a day, and if you go down to Lake Louise or Sunshine, you are going to find the same thing. And these recreational facilities are not competing with the smaller operations to which the hon. member

March 30th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

21-41

refers; they simply do not have the conditions at Red Deer or out at Devon where I live to talk about competing with the national parks. I am not too sure that the snow conditions exist outside the park that are really conducive to ski development.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that as the debate proceeds in this House on this particular subject that we should try to look at it on an individual basis, let each member state his views pro or con. I would like to close by making a suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that since the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has stated that he thinks it is a good thing to have the subject debated -- we on this side think it would be a good thing to have it debated too. I would like to suggest, as a closing remark, that the hon. members of the House consider leaving this subject at the top of the order paper until the resolution is disposed of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc made a motion.

MR. HENDERSON:

Seconded by the hon. Mr. Clark.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is not in order and the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc would need unanimous consent to change the rules and make a motion while another motion is being discussed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I should perhaps not have made that invitation. We have not adjourned the debate yet.

MR. HENDERSON:

...the opportunity of leaving the subject at the top of the order paper. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am in the unfortunate position of having heard that motion previously. The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill has asked leave to adjourn debate. Do you all agree?

MR. HENDERSON:

We are waiting for a decision on the suggestion I made before I closed off the debate by asking leave to adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House wish to unanimously wipe the slate clean and start over again?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

21-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 30th 1972

MR. FARRAN:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc has a lot of friends around here who figure that I should be kind and concede, Mr. Speaker. So I withdraw the motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc has asked leave to adjourn the debate. Do you all agree?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Education wishes to amend the clock. Do you all agree?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until next Wednesday, April 5th at 2:30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Education moves that the House stand adjourned until next Wednesday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock. Do you all agree?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until next Wednesday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 5:00 p.m.]