

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, April 13th, 1972

(The House met at 2:30 pm.)

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of this Assembly, 52 Junior High School students of Radway. They are accompanied by their principal Mr. Dafne, Mrs. Letwin, and Mr. Small. Thirty of them are seated in the members' gallery, 22 in the public gallery. Would you please rise and be recognized?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, today I am delighted to introduce to you and to all members of the House some 60 bright-eyed and enthusiastic Grade Fours from Parkview School in my constituency, accompanied by Mrs. Chostner, and Mrs. Gerstlinger. They are in the members' gallery and I would ask that they rise and be recognized by the Assembly at this time.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, it is a very great pleasure for me to be able to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of the Assembly some 54 Junior High students from Rycroft, Alberta. They are accompanied by three teachers, Sister Barton, Mrs. Uhryn, Mr. Rappel, and their bus driver Mr. Englebreton. They are in the public gallery. I would ask them to rise and be acknowledged by the members of the Legislature.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the return in answer to Question No. 140, requested by the hon. Member for Lloydminster and amended by the hon. Member for Wainwright. One of the difficulties in the amendment was the amount of correspondence that should be rightfully tabled in relation to the question. We have gone over it all and I have only tabled one piece of correspondence that had directly to do with Kinsella. If the hon. member wanted additional correspondence, if he felt it would be worthwhile, we can go back over to the morgue and find additional.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to the Question No. 170 on today's Order Paper.

28-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

MP. SPEAKER:

I wonder if the hon. minister would care to postpone the tabling until this item has been called?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the correspondence between my department and the Glenbow Alberta Institute regarding a proposed \$8 million grant for that Institute for the museum as requested by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Provincial Parks Development

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in charge of Tourism. In light of the many recent suggestions calling for a Provincial Parks master plan, and more recently, the explicit statements of Mr. Don Hayes, the new director of the Alberta Government Travel Bureau, is the government taking any action in this regard?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we had that under way, I think, on the 11th of September. I was given the responsibility for developing a policy for parks development in the Province of Alberta by the provincial government as they relate to the total province and, of course, to the national parks located within our borders. In addition to that, the Minister of Lands and Forests has appointed a committee to study the problem in total. If he wishes to add something, he might find it necessary.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, it's very tempting to make a speech at this point, but I'll confine myself to reaction to some of the extremely positive things that were a part of what's reported on the interview with Mr. Hayes from the paper yesterday. We're in the process of formulating, if not for the first time ever, certainly the first time in a very long time, a Provincial Parks policy for this province in terms of a public policy of what people want from their parks system, in contrast to operating policy, which is the day-to-day kind of operation for which the people in the public service are responsible under direction of the government. We are doing these things, and I'd very much like to assure the hon. member that this parks policy review is under way, and I appreciate his asking the question so that I have the opportunity to make that assurance.

Tourist Facilities

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister responsible for Tourism. Does the government put a high priority on private enterprise involvement in their plans for tourist development?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are having a very close look at this. We have invited submissions from anybody who comes in, indicating their interest in developing tourist facilities throughout the entire province, whether they relate to the development of camping sites, campgrounds, or small park developments of their own in a private way. There are perhaps six of these of some major consequence

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-3

presently on my desk, and other smaller ones, and we're looking at them all very carefully. But of course, as you must realize, there is no way that we can make a major decision as to which ones will proceed until such time as our policy has truly been developed, and it takes some considerable time.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. These submissions that were invited -- were they advertised in the newspapers?

MR. DOWLING:

No, Mr. Speaker, there has been no advertising for submissions. We have just accepted any submissions from the private sector from anyone who feels an interest in this area and are interested enough to make one. But we have not advertised any area for development -- this government has not, I should say.

MR. BENOIT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. There are some advertisements going out asking for tenders for food concessions, particularly I think for Chain Lakes park. Is this going to be a policy of the government to have food concessions in many of the parks this summer?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, this is an item of rather minor operating policy. We have concessions in a very large number of lakes, particularly those that are frequented by a lot of people per day, or a lot of people per weekend, so that it is a private enterprise, economic operation to have the concession. We do lease these concessions in a large number of the parks in Alberta that fit those characteristics I've so described, and Chain Lakes no doubt is one of them. This, indeed, will be an ongoing part of our operating policy in parks.

Interest on T-4 Slips

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Attorney General. It's further to a question raised several weeks ago by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek. The question is, does the government plan any legislation limiting the amount of interest allowed when discounting T-4 slips? It is my understanding that there are sometimes charges as high as 50% in discounting some of these T-4 slips.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the question of interest rates is a matter that falls within the federal jurisdiction, and is not something that the provincial government has the authority to legislate on.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. Can the Attorney General advise the House whether the firms are complying with Section 2, part 2 of The Credit and Loans Agreement Act? By way of explanation, that's the act that forces disclosure of actual interest charged.

28-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

MR. LEITCH:

The question of disclosure is a different matter, and I'm not sure I followed the hon. member's question -- that is, the first part of it.

MR. NOTLEY:

In complying with that particular section, are you able to advise the House whether these firms are complying with that section?

MR. LEITCH:

That is something I will have to check into, Mr. Speaker.

Edmonton Telephones Boundaries

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Telephones. Could he advise the House if any study is being conducted to determine the loss which AGT will suffer as a result of permitting Edmonton Telephones to expand to its natural boundaries and beyond?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is drawing a number of conclusions before any settlement is made, and I would not want to respond to that type of questioning. If he wants to be specific and put a question that I can deal with at this time, I would be only too pleased to reply to it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary. In view of the hon. minister's reply, am I right in coming to the conclusion that the hon. Premier's promise has now been withdrawn?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification for about the third time for the hon. member, there was a Telephone Mediation committee, which is a technical committee that was struck in August. They deliberated during the months of August, September, October and November. They tabled their report on December 1st to both parties to the dispute. In January there was another committee set up; there was a Legislative committee, three members of City Council, three members of this Executive Council, and they are in the process of a series of weekly meetings, and will be concluding an agreement on the total problems between the two systems. Hopefully, negotiations will be completed in the near future, but I would not wish to make any statements at this time that would prejudice the negotiations that have taken place up to this date. I must say, both sides have been extremely fair and we wouldn't want to get anything out of hand at this time.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary. When does the hon. minister anticipate that we might get some information to the Assembly with regard to this committee's findings? Will it be this year?

MR. WERRY:

I would anticipate that this committee will be able to come to a conclusion within the next two months. There are a number of very technical and financial implications of the recommendations that are contained in the Mediation Committee report that have to be dealt with in order to conclude the whole report, Mr. Speaker.

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-5

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, further supplementary. Will this report, when it is brought down, will it be brought to the Assembly or will it be made public?

MR. WERRY:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it will be made public, because there are two parties to the dispute, it will be brought to the government's attention for approval and ratification, and it will also have to be raised in City Council for their ratification. So certainly, it will be public.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary. When this report is brought down, and if there are changes going to have to be made, the question, I think, the hon. member was asking is, will the Legislature be making decisions, or will the Executive Council be making decisions if there is a problem?

MR. WERRY:

The Executive Council will be making the decision, depending, of course, when the report comes down. I would like to outline the procedure for the hon. member's benefit. The two parties will come to, hopefully, an agreement. Now, that doesn't say that the City Council is going to agree with it, or it doesn't say that the Executive Council is going to agree with it. Once the two parties come to a conclusion, then both respective bodies will have to take it back to their counterparts. At that point, it may be that there may be some further negotiations. It will be Executive Council and possibly there may be some legislation that will be required. But that will probably be brought in in the fall session.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, will the hon. minister advise the House whether this negotiating committee is negotiating boundaries?

MR. WERRY:

Included in the Mediation Committee report, I believe there are some 13 recommendations with boundaries. We are dealing with the whole 13.

MR. LUDWIG:

A further supplementary. How can the commission be negotiating boundaries without having some idea as to the cost to AGT in the event of a settlement?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is in the nature of argument and I would suggest that if there are further questions on the topic, the scope of it now appears to be such that perhaps the questions ought to be put on the Order Paper.

The hon. member for Wainwright, followed by the hon. member for Lethbridge West, the hon. Member for Spirit River - Fairview, and then the hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

28-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

Crop Damage by Migratory Birds

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Further to earlier questioning in this Assembly concerning the announcement by the hon. Jack Davis, Federal Minister of the Environment, indicating that the federal government would pay for half the costs of damage done to crops by migratory birds, my question is, can the hon. minister now inform members of this Assembly what is involved in this program, such as what might be the cost to Alberta, and what benefits would we accrue, when will the program start, and will all parts of the province be covered?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to say I'm delighted that the former Minister of Lands and Forests is now asking the Lands and Forests Minister this question, rather than the Minister of Agriculture.

We have been in contact with the federal government on a two-way communication basis for some weeks now on this matter of crop depredation, and it is now at the status where the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, the hon. Jack Davis, has come forward with the position that he feels that there should be federal government financial participation in this program. And my understanding is, and this is my understanding as of yesterday, that in contrast to the newscast that I also heard, that that final decision has not been made by Executive Council at the federal level. But in any case, the Wildlife Damage Fund that we have has a distribution of benefits across the entirety of Alberta that has wildlife damage to crops, either in terms of livestock claims or in terms of duck claims to crop damage itself. We also run the lure crop program and a minor amount of veterinary fees that are paid out of the wildlife damage fund. And this is equally accessible wherever damage does occur across Alberta, we are hoping with additional participation of the federal government to be able to financially increase the magnitude and coverage of the program, and do that on a shared-cost basis inasmuch as migratory birds are in fact, under the purview of the federal government.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister and I might mention that I believe that as the individual representative in this area, I will ask questions to any minister that I choose, so... But the supplementary question is, have any recent representations been made to Mr. Davis in this field?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, at the meeting you asked the Minister of Agriculture about, where the Minister of Lands and Forests was invited to go to Winnipeg, March 24th, that was on 48 hours notice by telephone. It wasn't possible for me to go but those representations were developed on behalf of the province by our staff and presented March 24th, in Winnipeg.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to this. Would it be in order to ask for those recommendations, or is this premature at this time?

DR. WARRACK:

I think it would be fair to respond that these were recommendations on the general basis of federal financial

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-7

participation in the program inasmuch as the migratory birds of Canada are under the federal purview and then we as a province, are part of that.

MLAs' Expenses

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer who is in charge of the purse-strings. Are you or your department giving serious or active consideration to upgrading the MLAs' living and travelling expenses in an effort to bring them out of the dark ages and into the realm of 20th century thinking?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, it isn't on our government agenda at the present time, and we would accept a motion from you if you wish to present one.

MR. GRUENWALD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are you concerned about the political implications of putting this forward from your side?

[No answer]

A supplementary then, do you feel that they are now adequate?

Would you be prepared to second a motion to this effect, if I should make it?

[No answer]

Municipal Councils' Term of Office

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, it's a pretty hard act to follow, but I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Does the government plan any changes in the three-year term of office for municipal councils in this province?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government received any representation from municipal officials on this question?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I can't recall any specifically dealing with that, unless there's some resolution contained in the thick book of resolutions received from the two associations. There may be a resolution referring to that in there, but that would be the only one I could recall.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government given any consideration to evaluating the workability of this system?

28-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

MR. RUSSELL:

No, the matter hasn't been given any consideration, Mr. Speaker.

Welfare Taxis

MR. ZANDER:

I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development regarding the article in the Edmonton Journal on April 11th. If these figures are correct, sir, do the three months average paid by Alberta taxpayers for those people on social allowance using cab service in the City of Edmonton amount to \$3,201.56 a day? Is this figure correct?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think I should thank the hon. member for bringing that question up because the newspaper coverage of it a few days ago, in fact, did have a misprint in it. The reference, if I remember correctly -- I'm almost 100% certain I'm right on this; if I'm not I'll be clarifying it later -- but I think the newspaper indicated the amount spent per day, when, in fact, it was the amount spent per month on taxis. Therefore if any hon. members were distressed in any way at what appeared to be an unwarranted amount of expenditure that would be the explanation for it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican and the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking and then the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Motorcyclists' Insurance

MR. FARRAN:

A question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Attorney General. Have you anything more to report on insurance rates for motorcyclists under 16 years of age who are not allowed to carry a passenger? The subject was raised by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest and myself about three or four days ago.

MR. LEITCH:

Nothing further, Mr. Speaker, except that I have members from my department and the insurance board looking into it. I have had some preliminary information from them. There now appears to be a possibility that this might be a requirement of the existing legislation and if that's so we will have to consider the need for an amendment. Incidentally there has been some litigation over it that was just recently decided also.

Canmore Mine Shut-Down

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question, actually two questions; I'll have to ask a supplementary question after I've asked a question of the Minister of the Environment. I would also like to question the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. On Monday last I brought the serious situation of the Canmore Mine shut-down, as far as the strip mining operations were concerned, and the hon. minister at that time in answer to one of my questions said that all the men being laid off would be employed in the reclamation area of the mine for at least a number of months in order that they could continue working while the mining operation was shut down. But apparently there are only going to be seven of the men actually hired and they

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-9

have laid off the other 25 men, and I wondered if the hon. minister had given any consideration to maybe finding reclamation work, not only in the strip mining operation but in other mining operations that have gone on in the Canmore-Banff area?

MR. YUPKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think if the record is examined it will be noted that what I said is that all the equipment, from my discussion with the manager of the mine, all the equipment that was used for strip mining would be transferred to reclamation and it was by assumption that I indicated that the men would be transferred and be used in this connection with the equipment. However, it must be recognized that in shutting down the mine, coal movement also stops and there are men apparently being laid off in other areas associated with the shipment of the coal and stock piling, and so forth. I do not have any more to report at this time on the layoffs and what, in fact, can be done, but I am looking into this area and perhaps the hon. Minister of Industry may also want to report on the matter.

MR. DIXON:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Industry. Is he planning to get in touch with the mining operation, not only as to the matter of the unemployment, but the fact of the problem the company is running into with the transportation of the coal to Vancouver, plus the marketing conditions in Japan?

MR. PEACOCK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will.

Livestock Loans

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Do we have a second dairy development loan plan in addition to the one for which regulations were issued yesterday?

DR. HORNER:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOPER:

Supplemental, Mr. Speaker, is there not a plan with a maximum loan of \$16,000 -- \$10,000 for stock, \$6,000 for equipment for dairy farms available?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the \$10,000 for livestock loans is available for either dairy cattle or beef cattle, and in addition to that \$10,000 for the cattle, the dairy policy sets out a program to make another \$6,000 available for milk houses, other dairy equipment, or sewer and water, in relation to upgrading the operation.

MR. COOPER:

Another supplemental, Mr. Speaker, is the dairy portion of this loan then applicable to all parts of Alberta?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the dairy portion of the Livestock Cattle Loan is applicable to all of Alberta without regard to area.

28-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Unemployed Employables

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Social Development. Has the government adopted a policy of cutting off all unemployed employables from public welfare as of June 1st?

MP. CRAWFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if there is a specific instance to which the hon. member's question might be related, to assist me in what he is getting at, but there has been no such policy adopted.

MP. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, is the government considering such a policy? Perhaps you may not want to answer that, and in order to assist you I may say that one of my constituents received the information from what he says was a reliable source, that he was going to be cut off on June 1st. If such a policy is to take effect, I would think some warning should be given to them so they can make a special effort, because otherwise the dependents will suffer, and I would suggest that that be carefully thought of and some advance notice be given if such a policy is going to be adopted.

MP. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would thank the hon. member for drawing this specific instance to my attention, but I think that in a sense, the question answers itself, that it appears to relate to an individual case. Now in respect to policy as a whole, the question of unemployed employables is very much under review by myself in regard to bringing forward a policy for consideration by the government, and in due course announcement of it. But no policy of the sort described and no effective date for the establishment of the policy has been established.

Proposed Sherwood Park Hospital

DP. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, and I would like to know, hon. minister, at what stage of development the plans are for the new hospital that is proposed for the Sherwood Park, southeast Edmonton area?

MP. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I've had a number of meetings with interested people including members of the medical profession on one occasion since last fall -- by that I mean members of the medical profession who practise in Sherwood Park and are particularly concerned about the manner in which their patients can best be served. I have had the assistance of the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell in receiving these representations and in exploring the situation, and all I can say is that the matter is still under review. It's a subject which is not easily resolved. I know the people I spoke to understand that and I know the hon. Member for Clover Bar understands it too, because I was at a meeting with him long before the last election when this matter was discussed publicly at a meeting involving members of the Legislature from the area, members of City Council.

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-11

I don't want to go on too long, but I know that the hon. member will recall that one of the difficulties is that for the metropolitan area there is really no shortage of beds. Therefore an extension of that particular type of facility, that is an active treatment hospital as such, is something that one would proceed towards with great reluctance. Because of the large population growth that has occurred in the area of Sherwood Park and the entitlement of the citizens to services which are equivalent to what other residents of the province might expect to have, there is a desire to fill the need for some health facility and it's this type of thing that's still under review at the present time.

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, along the same lines. Have there been any studies on the same problem in northeast Edmonton where there is a large new development -- or a large new area?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any specific study that may have been at the stage where it was completed and reported to me by the Hospital Services Commission. I would expect that sort of question to be part of their ongoing review. If there is a report which is not present to my mind at the moment, I would be glad to consider making it available to the hon. member if it is at the stage where it should be made available.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo.

Acting Ministers

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the hon. the Premier. Would he make available to us a list of the acting ministers. I'm thinking now of today -- we have the Minister of Labour who is absent -- and in such a question then we would know, so we could direct it to the acting one.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to do so. As the hon. member is well aware, of course, it is a public document as an Order-in-Council. The acting Minister of Labour is the hon. Mr. Foster -- pardon me -- the hon. Mr. Leitch, and then the hon. Mr. Foster.

AGT Rates

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I would like to direct to the hon. Minister of Telephones which arises as the result of the 60th Annual Report filed in the Legislature by the hon. minister.

With respect to the financial review in talking of terms of the future operating expenses, it is stated in the report that to meet your future demands, hon. minister, the commission's 1972 construction program will be in excess of \$80 million, necessitating further substantial capital borrowing. In the face of high debt service charges and the continuing increase in the cost of labour and materials, it appears evident that existing revenues will not indefinitely be sufficient....

28-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please ask the question.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Minister, does this indicate that AGT will need increased rates this year?

MR. WERRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Public Utilities Board has set AGT's rate of return at 5.9 and last year the rate of return was 6.1 and there were indications at the time of the annual report that expenses were accelerating at a more rapid rate than revenue, but very delightful experiences occurred during the last three months in that the revenue -- and it is all in the long-distance area -- has increased \$1,666,000 over the budgeted revenue for that same period for the three months, and also the expenses have decreased during the budgeted period by \$286,000 which means at this time that the A.G.T. is operating at \$1,900,000 ahead of the anticipated profits for the calendar year. With those figures there would clearly be no rate application made this year.

Senior Citizens' High-Rise

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Yesterday our hon. Premier had the honour to open up a new high-rise senior citizens' apartment in Edmonton. What is the projected date of full capacity of this apartment, and how will the advertising take place to let people know about this accommodation?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the project is being administered by the Edmonton Metropolitan Foundation and persons interested in moving in should contact their office. I am told that they are working on a program of moving eight families per day, which is the capacity of the elevators as far as moving in eight households of furniture per day. So it will take in excess of a month to get it completely filled.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What are the age requirements in order to apply?

MR. RUSSELL:

Sixty-five years.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary. In the case of man and wife -- do they both have to be 65?

MR. RUSSELL:

I don't believe so, Mr. Speaker, but that is a detail I could check and report back.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-13

Steel Plant for Alberta

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry. Is it the policy of the government to promote a steel plant for Alberta, and has the government an independent study or report in this regard?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we are always interested in steel in Alberta. As far as the study is concerned for the information of the House, there has been one completed by the Acres Company.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister consider tabling one or more copies of that report?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we would.

AHC Housing Project at Vermilion

MR. NOTLEY:

I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. The question deals with housing. Can the hon. minister advise the House whether any investigation has been commissioned by the government to examine the charges made by a member of the advisory board in Fort Vermilion, that a 20-unit public housing program built under the Alberta Housing Corporation will create an instant ghetto and represents a misuse of public funds?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I received the letter that I think the hon. member is referring to, and I have brought it to the attention of the director of the Alberta Housing Corporation. The letter was received fairly recently and I believe that is where the matter stands at the moment.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, to the hon. minister. Can the hon. minister advise the house whether the Alberta Housing Corporation called formal tenders for the construction of this 20-unit public housing venture?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to check the records. The standard procedure of the corporation is to call for tenders on all its projects. I don't know when that project was tendered, but it would just be a question of either the member himself directly checking that with the corporation director, or I could do it for him.

MR. NOTLEY:

Just a clarification on that last answer. Mr. Minister, I would ask you to table that information if you could. A supplementary question. Could the hon. minister advise the House why, with units costing \$16,000 apiece, the cement footings were poured directly into frozen ground in mid-January? The construction does not provide for indoor plumbing. The units are to be heated by propane, when local residents claim that oil would be less expensive. I wonder if the

28-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

hon. minister would comment on those charges again, which were made by one of the local advisory board members who resigned in protest?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, I think the question contains a fair degree of hypothetical conjecture on the part of the member, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, I'd be willing and quite agreeable to tabling the answer I get to the letter I referred to, and also to check on the tendering procedures that were followed. And if there's something more he wishes after having seen those, I'll be glad to follow it up.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Member for Sedgwick....Is this a supplemental?

Financing of Air Strips

MR. TAYLOR:

Yes, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry? Is the government giving consideration to a policy of financial assistance for airstrips for towns where they do not qualify for federal assistance?

MR. PEACOCK:

That's a good point, Mr. Speaker. We haven't considered this in the past seven months.

MR. TAYLOR:

Would the hon. minister take it under consideration and give it some study?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we would.

Pollution Regulations

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of the Environment. My question concerns feed lot operators. Many of these operators are situated on rivers and streams and this is particularly true in my constituency. I would appreciate your position on the following statement which was given by a pollution officer from North Dakota recently. He states:

"The run-off from feed lot operations is recognized as a potential pollutant to surface and underground waters. This run-off has been found to contain many times the oxygen-demanding materials and bacterial pollutants commonly found in untreated municipal sewage."

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I'd like to say that the statement has some substance behind it. I would like to take about 30 seconds to indicate what we're doing in this area. We recognize that this is an area of concern. We recognize that some of the feed lots are equivalent to cities of 10,000 people or more. We have to have a base from where to start in this area, and we have established as a government program this summer a complete inventory of all feed lots in the province. We will be using summer students in this regard, and all feed lots will be surveyed in connection with location,

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-15

proximity to streams, the total number of animals being handled, the amount of refuse being generated, and so forth. We hope that by the end of this summer we will have accomplished point 1, we believe, in our program, which will be a complete documentation of what the situation in Alberta is in this area.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the hon. Minister of the Environment had close consultation with his colleague, the hon. Minister of Agriculture on this project, before you get involved in it, because with the programs the Department of Agriculture is doing, unless there's close co-operation between you, there are going to be all sorts of problems.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Deputy Premier never fails to express his point of view and his position to me, and I know his position quite well in this regard.

MR. CLARK:

Has he expressed it yet?

MR. YURKO:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MEMBER:

Can he afford it?

MR. BUCKWELL:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister having a revision of the regulations regarding feed lots? Is it being made at this time?

MR. YURKO:

No, Mr. Speaker. There is no immediate contemplation to revise regulations under the Department of Health at this time. I think what I indicated is that we have to know what the situation is in this regard. And this is our first step in the program. We're going to attempt to establish exactly what the situation is in Alberta with respect to the number of feed lots, their size, the amount of refuse generated, the disposal facilities available, what the general situations are with respect to topography, this sort of thing. So until we establish what the background data is, we have no basis for changing regulations, or for that matter forming or establishing new regulations in this area. We simply must find what the situation is.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. I take the minister at his word, but I also have information that there is a study being made on feed lot regulations.

MR. YURKO:

Certainly, we are studying these all the time. I simply indicated there was no immediate intent to change any of the regulations that exist. If we do change the regulations subsequently, the change will be based on data, which will be generated this summer. There simply is no point in changing regulations unless you know what you are changing them for; unless you have information to base them on. This is what we hope to do

28-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

this summer: to establish this body of information, which will give us direction in this area.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. The information I had, Mr. Minister, was that the regulations are being revised at this present time. We are not talking about how many feed lots we have. The regulations I understand -- I just ask you the question -- are they being revised?

MR. YURKO:

The existing regulations are under the Department of Health and Social Development. Perhaps the hon. minister can advise as to just what state he has his regulations in at this particular time.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the regulations are, in fact, under review at the present time.

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplemental, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if either one of the hon. ministers could advise the House as to whether they are contemplating transferring this responsibility into the Department of the Environment, where it probably really belongs.

MR. YUPKO:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development and I will be having a number of discussions in this area. The other related area, of course, is land-fill sites, and the regulations associated with land-fill sites. So there are areas in which we, as ministers, do discuss on periodic occasion, as to where the responsibility should lie.

MR. HENDERSON:

Further supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. minister not aware that I was trying to cue him that I was supporting him in this particular exercise?

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can we have the assurance of the hon. minister that the students involved in this study or survey will have an agricultural background, so they know what is being done?

HON. MEMBERS:

Here, here!

MR. YURKO:

I recognize the hon. member's interest in agriculture. I have to suggest my background is also in agriculture. I hope we can, in fact, use students. But we will be trying to use students throughout the province on a regional representation basis. We will do the best we can in this area and I hope most of them are agriculture students.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, I would like to answer several questions that were asked of me several days ago. I think it is time I did present an answer to the House. The first question was asked of me by the hon. Member for Drumheller. His question was, "Is there anything being done about the heavy pollution, particularly at

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-17

night, from the CPOG gas well near Hussar?" This is, of course, an area of responsibility of the Energy Resources Conservation Board, and they have been active in this area. The Board advised that they have investigated the smoke complaint from Mrs. Jensen, who resides in the area. They found a faulty treater, and the company has shut down the battery and are in the process of repairing the treater. Hopefully, the problem will be eliminated.

I would also like to answer the question that was posed to me by several individuals in connection with the contribution of monies by the former government to the Big Horn Dam project, as well as the Brazeau project. First of all, in connection with the Big Horn Dam, the contributions by the government to this project were as follows: (a) The costs associated with....

MR. FENDERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we are into the hon. minister's estimates this evening. Could this not be dealt with then, because I am sure it is going to come up again? We hear, continually coming from the front benches on the other side of the House, that a matter such as this should be brought up in estimates. So, I think the hon. minister should set the pattern himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. YURKO:

This question was asked in the Question Period, and I felt it necessary to answer it in the Question Period. I'm easy, I can answer it anytime I choose. I thought perhaps I might answer it tomorrow on television. However, I had second thoughts in this regard and I felt it would be more appropriate to answer the question today.

MR. STROM:

We would like to have the answer now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. YURKO:

The cost associated.....

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the House agree to a slight extension of the Question Period to hear the answer?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Laughter and conversation.]

MR. YURKO:

I think perhaps if I might be permitted I will continue to give the answer to the question.

28-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

MR. HENDERSON:

This is quite serious. The Question Period has run out; this could be done tonight following Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER:

In the absence of unanimous agreement, the Question Period is required to end at 3:21.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

MR. YURKO:

With your leave, if I might be permitted I would like to give an answer to a question that was asked of me some time ago, and this question concerns...

MR. HENDERSON:

Does this have to be the answer too?

MR. SPEAKER:

We have provision for this in the rules.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Big Horn Project, the cost associated with re-routing highway 11 was \$2,208,000. The costs in connection with the Big Horn respecting the clearing of the reservoir were \$5,075,000 of which to date payment of \$4,302,577.52 have been made. It is anticipated that the government will be committed to expend the entire \$5,075,000 in this area, making a total of \$8,453,291.93 for the Big Horn project.

In connection with the Brazeau project, the government has committed itself to a maximum straight grant of \$14,546,000. It wasn't necessary to extend itself to this degree and the actual payment made for the Brazeau development was \$13,254,983.70. In addition to this expenditure, the clearing of the reservoir subsequently amounted to \$174,681.80, and this is still continuing and will be continuing for some time. The total contribution by the government to the Brazeau project thus far has been \$13,429,665.50, so that the total contribution with respect to the two projects is \$21,882,957.43.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. minister would be prepared to table the information that he has for us?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. minister wish to answer the question as to tabling?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table it. However I would like to retype it if I may; there are a lot of my own figures on here. However I will table it as is if you wish. It is up to you.

MR. STROM:

[Nods agreement]

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-19

MR. YURKO:

OK.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, with your leave I would respond to an undertaking taken earlier this week. I believe this is the time.

Earlier in the week I was asked about some equipment located on Pibbco Flats by the hon. member for Olds-Didsbury.

In the Department of Lands and Forests, forestry division, we are organized into 11 units, each of which is called a forest. Two of those forests are near this particular location, the Bow and the Clearwater Rocky forests, and I have asked them both to check carefully and they are not able to find any such equipment. So I do report to the House on that matter now and also ask the hon. member that if he does have any additional and firmer information that I could use, I would appreciate it.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'll check with the sources involved and be in contact with the hon. minister.

DR. HOFNER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short announcement on behalf of both myself and the hon. Minister of Industry with regard to a major distillery, announcing plans for the construction of a distillery in southern Alberta and the International Distilleries will be constructing the distillery in Lethbridge. Outside of the fact that this will provide 50 permanent jobs once it's completed in September 1973, we are pleased in the Department of Agriculture because it will be a major stimulus to grain and corn growing in southern Alberta, and it is anticipated that this user will use from 400,000 to 800,000 bushels of either corn or rye produced in southern Alberta.

QUESTIONS

MR. PURDY:

I move, seconded by Mr. Ashton, that Question 169 standing in my name be made a Motion for a Return.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

169. An Order of the Assembly was therefore issued for a Return showing:

1. What will be the total cost of the fish hatchery in Calgary now under construction?
2. What date will the hatchery go into production?
3. What will be the capacity of this plant per year?
4. Will this meet the total requirements of the province and if so, for how long?
5. Will the fish be available to private enterprise?
6. Why was the fish hatchery built in the City of Calgary?
7. Has Alberta any other ideal location for such a plant without great expense to Albertans?

28-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

170. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question, which was answered as indicated by Mr. Miniely:

What is the total amount of money paid to each of the members of each of the MLA Caucus Committees (Task Forces) between September 9, 1971 and March 31, 1972?

Answer:

1. Amount paid to caucus committees: Nil

2. Amounts paid to MLA Task Forces:

A. MLA Task Force on Provincial-Municipal Financing

Honorarium or fees Nil

Travel expenses:

John Batiuk	\$ 207.25	
Clifford Doan	\$ 345.35	
Roy Farran	\$ 596.05	
Dr. Don McCrimmon	\$ 272.20	
Rusty Zander	\$ 214.81	\$1,635.66

B. MLA Task Force on Needs, Opportunities, and Responsibilities of the Individual

Honorarium or fees Nil

Travel expenses:

Dr. Ken Faproski	\$2,120.68	
Peter Trynchy	\$ 95.20	\$2,215.88

C. MLA Task Force on New Incentives for Albertans

Honorarium or fees Nil

Travel expenses Nil

D. MLA Task Force on Manpower Training and Retraining

Honorarium or fees Nil

Travel expenses:

Cal Lee	\$ 216.10	
Bill Purdy	\$ 103.00	\$ 319.10

E. MLA Task Force on Decentralization of Government Operations

Honorarium of fees Nil

Travel expenses:

Frank Appleby	\$ 202.00	
Allison Fluker	\$ 228.40	
Don Hansen	\$ 263.60	
James Miller	\$ 164.40	
Gordon Stromberg	\$ 84.65	\$ 943.05

F. MLA Task Force on Agriculture

Honorarium or fees Nil

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-21

Travel expenses:			
Frank Appleby	\$	123.00	
James Miller	\$	260.60	
Marvin Moore	\$	408.60	
Bill Purdy	\$	85.05	\$ 877.25
GRAND TOTAL			\$5,990.94

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order relating to the change in the first question to become an Order for Return, would it be proper then for amendments to be made to that when it comes before the House again?

MR. SPEAKER:

I would assume that it would be dealt with the same as any other Order for Return and be an ordinary motion, at least before it becomes an order.

171. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following questions, which were answered as indicated by Mr. Russell:

1. Does the government plan to pay municipal taxes to the municipality in which property owned by the Province of Alberta is located on the same basis as other tax payers rather than as a grant in lieu of taxes?
2. Does the government plan to remove the right to requisition any monies by any taxing authority from any municipality except for monies used for municipal purposes within the boundaries of the municipality being requisitioned?

Answer:

1. For the past approximately two years, a Federal-Provincial committee of the Continuing Committee of Officials on Federal-Provincial Conferences has been considering the matter of reciprocal taxation and is to report to the Finance Ministers' meetings in the near future. In the meantime, in anticipation of the report, the Government has the matter under consideration.
2. This matter is under consideration in the Task Force on Provincial-Municipal Financing.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to accept Question 172 as a Motion for a Return, but I wonder if the hon. member would clarify item no. 2, as it presently reads: "Are the people of Alberta paying directly or indirectly for any part of the study?" I wonder if the hon. member means, rather than the people of Alberta, the Alberta government? And we are a little concerned with the word 'indirectly' there, for some of the payments that might be made by the Alberta government to some of the people involved in the Gas Arctic project involving gasoline and so forth.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments. I certainly meant the Alberta government and secondly, regarding 'indirectly', I thought perhaps through Alberta Gas Trunk or some agency of the government.

172. An Order of the Assembly was therefore issued for a Return showing:

28-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

1. Does the Alberta Government have any direct or indirect representatives on the Gas Arctic Systems Study Group?
2. Are the people of Alberta paying directly or indirectly for any part of the study?
3. What are the boundaries of the area being studied?
4. Does the Alberta Government have representatives on the Environment Protection Board?
5. Who are the members of the Environment Protection Board?
6. Who appointed the Environment Protection Board?

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

173. Mr. D. Miller proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Henderson:

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

Copies of all orders and approvals issued by the Department of the Environment since September 10, 1971 relating to the control or elimination of air, water and land pollution.

MR. YURKO:

May I make just one comment in connection with this motion, Mr. Speaker? I think if the hon. member wants the complete story he might also request orders issued by the Energy Resources Conservation Board in this area. However I leave this up to him.

MR. D. MILLER:

Yes, I'll move this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there a seconder for the amendment, and might we receive a copy?

MR. HENDERSON:

I was somewhat enthralled by the propaganda of the Oil and Gas Conservation Board, and the Energy Board. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't want a copy of that at all, I'm not interested in the Energy Board, it's the Department of Environment that we're asking for.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the mover and the seconder like to come to some agreement as to the form the motion should take?

MR. D. MILLER:

Just the motion as is in 173.

174. Mr. Benoit proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark:

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

Copies of all correspondence, contracts, orders, advertisements, memorandums and replies pertaining to the clearing, preparation and construction of Highway No. 940 south of Seebe along the

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-23

general course of the Kananaskis Forestry Road, from the Department of Highways and Transport since March 9th and from all other departments since November 1st, 1971.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, while I am speaking to this motion, if I may, I would like to raise a question with regard to the nature of an Order for a Return and your opinion, either today or at an early convenient date, as regards the wording. This will be recognized as similar to another Motion for Return made on March 21st, I believe, No. 136, and it asked for all correspondence and I just assumed that would refer to all departments. Must one name the departments in his Order for a Return from which he expects Orders for Return or does an Order for Return from the Assembly include automatically all departments?

MR. SPEAKER:

I don't think it is possible to make a general rule with regard to this except to say that the more specific the motion the more likely it is to get the desired information, and if the hon. member has certain specific departments in mind, perhaps he could mention those, or if he wishes to ask a question of the government as to which departments are involved he might do it in that way.

MR. COEITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to table the information from the date of March 9th. If there is any, it would, of course, exclude the memorandums that are circulating between the departments.

[The next item of business was called.]

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder if we might just revert to the last Motion for a Return. I don't know if the House is clear as the state in which this was left. Has the motion been agreed to as it stands on the Order Paper?

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, if I may, the motion now reads "from the Department of Highways and Transport since March 9th" because I have that information up to March 9th on that particular request. Then it goes on to say "from all other departments since November 1, 1971" pertaining to this matter, and I am hoping that that covers all the departments wherever there is information. Is that satisfactory as a Motion for a Return?

MR. SPEAKER:

If there is any objection to the clarity or lack of it on the government side, perhaps we could hear some comment.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I think to be absolutely clear, as the hon. Minister of Highways pointed out, interdepartmental memorandums would not be tabled, and I think it should also be pointed out to the hon. member that the concurrence of the other party is required in regard to tabling the correspondence. Subject to those two . . .

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that is not the general fact of the matter. Unless it is covered by regulation to that extent, or the information is listed as privileged from the other party, it

28-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

doesn't require the consent of the other party to table the correspondence. We don't argue about the interdepartmental memorandums, but to make a blanket statement such as that is simply not acceptable.

DR. HORNER:

It may not have been acceptable to the former government, but this government has some concern for the confidentiality of documents and personal civil rights.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Ah, go on now!

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it from the slight misunderstanding, or perhaps the irregularity in procedure which we have had here, we may take it that this motion has not yet been voted on, and unless the House wishes to agree that the return may be made, subject to the conditions which have been expressed by the hon. Deputy Premier, the matter will have to be debated and perhaps the motion will have to be amended.

Does the House agree to Motion 174 as it stands on the Order Paper, subject to the conditions which have been stated by the hon. Deputy Premier?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I declare the 'ayes' to have it.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Stromberg proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. King.

Be it resolved that signs be erected by the Government of the Province of Alberta to commemorate any ethnic group or community that has played a significant part in the early settlement of Alberta.

And that selection of ethnic groups to be commemorated and suitable sites for such signs should be based on research carried out on such topics as:

- (a) The distribution of ethnic settlement
- (b) The histories of ethnic groups in Alberta.
- (c) A survey of ethnic sites and buildings in selected areas.
- (d) The location and adequacy of signs already installed.

And that in deciding what signs should be erected and where they ought to be located, due consideration be given to the views and recommendations of:

- (a) Representatives of the ethnic societies or organizations be commemorated.
- (b) The Historic Sites Advisory Committee appointed pursuant to the Alberta Heritage Act.
- (c) The Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, what a wonderful story and opportunity we have to tell to the people of Alberta, to the people of Canada, and to the

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-25

people of the world. Over 50 ethnic groups have contributed so much to the building of the Province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, may I read to this Assembly the roll-call of the ethnic groups that make up Alberta's population: American, Arabian, Australian, Austrian, Belgian, Negro, British, Caribbean, West Indian, Chinese, Yugoslavian, Czechoslovakian, Danish, Doukhobor, Dutch, Estonian, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Hutterite, Icelandic, Indian, East Indian, and of course -- our Irish, Italian, Japanese, Jewish, Latvian, Lithuanian, Mennonite, Metis, Norwegian, Mormon, Philippino, Polish, Portuguese, Roumanian, Russian, Scottish, Slovenian, South African, Spanish, Swiss, Turkish, Ukrainian, Welsh, and our Swedes.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, may I add an addition. I understand we have some Tibetans down in southern Alberta.

MR. STRCMBERG:

I shall add that, Mr. Speaker, to my list.

MR. DRAIN:

What about the Icelanders?

MR. STROMBERG:

I did -- Yes -- we have some living in the Rose constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I myself would find it especially interesting to know the story of the Negro community that has farmed at Amber Valley near Athabasca for approximately the last 40 years. Where did they come from? Were they run-away slaves? I'm sure that the hon. Minister of Tourism, and the people of Grand Cache and especially the tourists of Alberta, would find the history of the native Albertans of Grande Cache fascinating. How many people are aware that they are Iroquois who came out with the Northwest Trading Company somewhere around the year of 1800, and had the good wisdom to refuse to become Treaty Indians. Mr. Henry Stelfox of Rocky Mountain House relates the story of Chief On-The-Other-Side-Of-The-Rock, who on his deathbed made his people promise that as long as those mountains stood in the west, they would never accept the white man's five dollar promise.

Mr. Speaker, may I mention the Metis people in my own constituency whose ancestors, through the advent of the surveyors' chain, and the rebellion of the Red River Valley, came west and settled on the few river lots that are available in Alberta. The hon. Member for Lac La Biche, no doubt, can inform this House of the 250 Arabic people living in his constituency that were originally fur traders and peddlers in the days of the Northwest Territories.

I myself, have found it fascinating about the Jewish settlement north of Drumheller that was founded in 1906 by a large group of homesteaders. Some of this great history, Mr. Speaker, of our province, has not always been happy. I think back to the people of Japanese ancestry who lived in Alberta and who are descendants of, or are, those who were forcibly evicted from British Columbia during the last war. How such a drastic measure as forceful as relocation was permitted in our times is certainly something not to be proud of. I think of our native Albertans, who are forced to be kept on so-called reserves, or those good and kind people, the Hutterites.

In Alberta, we are aware there is a great variety of people living in an area. Some have different skin colours or speak different languages, or go to different churches. These differences

28-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

can, and have at times, been the basis of suspicion and have produced cleavages in a community. However, they can provide the basis for a strong and vital community. In such a community each person or group can learn from the others, not merely by tolerating them, but by attempting to understand what makes them behave as they do. It is a rich human experience to try and empathize with another human being and see the world through his eyes.

Mr. Speaker, the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism reports being impressed by the fact that so little is known about the cultural groups other than the British and the French in Canadian society. These groups have been significant in growing elements in the society for a century. They have contributed and are contributing in a variety of ways to the "cultural enrichment of Canada," in the words of the terms of reference of the Royal Commission, but their histories and their roles in Canadian life have not yet been fully recognized by these scholars or the general public. The cultural groups in question were among the first settlers of the prairie provinces and still constitute a large proportion of the population of the prairies.

According to a '61 census, whereas 26% of the total Canadian population had ethnic origins other than British or French, close to 50% of the population of the three prairie provinces had such origins. Public attitudes towards ethnic divisions can have some impact on its maintainance, since a climate favourable to this diversity will discourage people from hiding from their ethnic origins.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that more and more people will come to realize that ethnic groups can help us prevent the depersonalization of a mass society which technology, mass communications, and urbanization threatens to create. Hopefully, more people will come to realize that ethnic substructures can give second and third and future generations of Canadians a feeling of taking part in tradition with human experiences in various parts of the world and different periods of time.

Mr. Speaker, the story of immigration, of people uprooting themselves and trying to make their way into entirely new circumstances, and the story of the struggle of minority groups for survival are among the most profound dramas in human history. The history of the ethnic groups of Alberta has been a history of discrimination and rejection. It has also been a history of opportunity and acceptance.

Mr. Speaker, I would wish to draw to your attention that the citizens of the Rose city of Alberta, at one time had on the west entrance to their fair city, on Highway 13, a Department of Highways sign commemorating those Norsemen who first settled and farmed that virgin country, and who, over the years have brought recognition to the Rose constituency by their feats in district, province, and the Olympics in cross-country skiing, and ski-jumping. But, Mr. Speaker, a former Minister of Highways for this Assembly must have taken a dim view of the history and accomplishment of these Norsemen, for he ordered the beautiful sign removed and destroyed, over the pleas and the wrath of an aroused citizenry. Over the years, no amount of letters from the City Council, Chamber of Commerce, or concerned citizens could make the czar of highways change his mind. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member for Drumheller would throw his wholehearted support behind this bill, I am sure he could salvage some of his good name in the Rose constituency.

MR. KING:

Пане Господарю! Мені є дуже приємно підтримати цей внесок.

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-27

Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to second this motion today.

MR. SPEAKER:

I regret that I am unable to deal with the hon. member's point of order.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, 'a rose by any other name' -- and I understand that the first line of that was your title -- and assume that it would hold in the Assembly as well as the other name. I had thought that perhaps you were as well versed in languages as you are in many other aspects of life.

I'm pleased to have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to second this resolution. I'm particularly pleased to have the opportunity to speak to it in English, because the attempt to learn a little bit of Ukrainian was enjoyable in that I managed it, but trying, in that it took me so long to do it. I represent what I know is a very cosmopolitan constituency in the province, and may indeed be the most cosmopolitan constituency. According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 30% of the population of Edmonton Highlands is of Anglo-Saxon origin, 30% is of Ukrainian origin, 20% is of Italian origin, and 20% is of mixed other ethnic origins, among which the Dominion Bureau of Statistics lists Portuguese, Greek, Chinese, German, and Polish particularly.

I have listed Anglo-Saxon as an ethnic community because I think that in some very real respects it is and should be treated in the same category as the others which I have listed. I'd like to come back to that a little more fully a little later on in my remarks.

I would like to say that in addition to representing what I think is perhaps the most cosmopolitan constituency in the province, in my own family I feel that I represent something of the nature of the province. My mother is Irish and my father is English, and I would like to report that that's a much, much happier combination on this side of the ocean than it is on the other side of the ocean. My mother-in-law is Italian, and my father-in-law is French. Both my wife, myself and my son are Canadians. I was married in Venice, and I didn't even leave the province to be married in Venice because there's a large community of Italian people -- in fact the community in which my wife was raised -- 125 miles northeast of Edmonton. I'd like to return to that community a little bit later in my remarks, as well.

Aside from the urban ethnic communities which are represented in my constituency, there are a number of viable, rural ethnic communities, of which the Italian community around Lac La Biche, Hylo, and Venice would be one. There's a Japanese community of fairly significant size in southern Alberta. There are, in addition, the French communities, Scandinavian, Dutch, Greek, and others.

I have subscribed, and I don't know how widely it is held any longer, to the view that Canada and Alberta is a mosaic and not a melting pot, although I think that is subject to some modification in the light of the events of the last eight or ten years. The implications of this, though, I think, are frequently not appreciated. In relation to many of the other countries of the world, Canada, as a cultural and an economic and social entity, is vastly greater than most others. In terms of many of the other communities of the world, we are isolated on the east by the Atlantic Ocean and on the west, of course, by the Pacific. Until recently -- I think it would not be unfair to say, until my generation took to the road -- travel around the world was an opportunity that was taken advantage of by a relatively small proportion of the population. In a situation such as that, it is particularly important, I think, that

28-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

the people of Alberta and Canada should appreciate the ethnic and cultural communities that exist within our boundaries, and should respect them as a microcosm of the communities which we may not have an opportunity to know, if we have to rely upon travel to far corners of the world to know them. I have not been to Europe, South America, or Asia, and yet, I think, having lived among the cultural communities that are represented in Alberta, I have some better appreciation of the cultures of other parts of the world.

I like very much holupchee and perohe. I have even learned to call them holupchee and perohe, rather than cabbage rolls and dumplings...[Interruption from the Floor]...I'm sorry I didn't hear that; it would probably have been very informative.

Prior to my marriage to my wife I very much enjoyed spaghetti. I might add, subsequent to my marriage, appreciation of it has increased -- that otherwise might have been a particularly disastrous faux pas.

Similarly, I have learned to appreciate the contributions that have been made to this province, in terms of the clothing we wear, the music we appreciate, the art we appreciate, the festivals we celebrate, and our tolerance of a variety of different religious views. For all of these reasons, and because the fact of cultural difference has been significant to our history, it should be recognized and respected.

I might say that going through an educational system gives you some appreciation of historical events which have brought us to where we are today. The recognition of the cultural differences provides an opportunity to make some of this historical development both very real to us and very personal.

Two years ago, when the War Measures Act was introduced by the federal government, I think many people can appreciate, many people heard at the time that I was violently opposed to it. I think similarly, that many people in southern Alberta, around Taber or Lethbridge, must have had strong feelings about it, and appreciation of the significance of that act of history at that time was gained in my case by virtue of the fact that a relative of mine was interned during the second world war because of his Italian birth, because of the fact that he was not at that time a Canadian citizen, and because he lived in an identifiable community which was not similar to that of all of the other communities surrounding it. It is something which since then, has occasioned a great deal of hilarity, both in the family and in the community. The whole substance of what happened to a man by virtue of his cultural difference has taught me some very important lessons. I would like to take a brief moment to describe to you the area around Lac La Biche in the early 30's prior to the Second World War.

There was a large Italian population, aliens who were not citizens of Canada. They had left their homeland and had only recently arrived in Canada. They were almost universally poorly educated and they felt homesick for their native country. They got letters in the early thirties from Italy saying that great things were happening in the country, that organization of the government was much improved and that, for example, the trains were running on time. They felt that this was a remarkable thing, they wanted an opportunity to meet together themselves and to enjoy their social life, to play bocci on a Sunday afternoon, and to eat spaghetti that the wives cooked under the trees; and so they formed a fascist club. They had a great big Italian flag brought over from Italy which they would string up among the trees every Sunday afternoon while they engaged in their recreation and in their eating and their drinking. They had no idea whatsoever, what fascism was, aside from a very few who were politically active, one of whom was an uncle who was very, very active in the Social Credit party -- no, that really has no

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-29

partisan reference at all. His activity in that party as a matter of fact, educated him very well to some of the precepts of democracy -- he in fact, was the only person in the community who refused to join the fascist club because he knew what the term meant in Italy, and he had some idea of what the possible consequences of it might be for Europe. And he refused to join. He was ridiculed for not joining the fascist club.

When war was declared it was required by the federal government that all of the aliens in the country report at periodic intervals to the RCMP. The Italian community, in point of fact, is centered about 15 miles southwest of Lac La Biche, and it was required then that all of the Italians in the community in Hyle, and Venice go once a month to Lac La Biche to be registered with the RCMP officer. There were no roads, there was no vehicular transportation, they had to walk along the railway tracks, 15 miles into town and then 15 miles back out, and they found that with the particular officer in Lac La Biche at that time, who had particular feelings about the war, that he would frequently say to them, "I'm sorry, I can't register you today, come back tomorrow", so they would make a 30-mile trip in futility and be required to come back perhaps a second time or a third time in a month.

My uncle was a very close friend and political associate of the then Attorney General, who is now a provincial judge. He got in contact with him and suggested that instead of being required to report to the RCMP, aliens should have an opportunity to report to the postmaster in communities, because of course, the postmaster is also a federal officer. This got back to the RCMP officer, who took it as a personal slur upon his integrity and upon his enforcement of the law, and on information of the RCMP officer, with no substantiating evidence whatsoever, the uncle was reported as a fascist supporter and a possible enemy to the country. He was interned in Calgary for six weeks before he was transferred to a camp in Ontario. During the time that he was in Calgary -- he was interned at Sarcee -- he attempted by letter to communicate with his family, his relatives, lawyers, and the Attorney General of the Province of Alberta, and not one communication got through. After six weeks in Calgary he was transferred to Ontario where he spent an additional 4 1/2 months before, on the personal intervention of the Attorney General of the Province of Alberta, he was released.

Now, I am sorry to have taken so long about it. As I say, everybody up there was vastly amused that the only person who refused to join the fascist club was interned from that community. They laugh about it even today. Even my uncle laughs about it because it was an education for him.

For me, it made very, very real, some of the circumstances and some of the feelings of the serious condition of our history that existed prior to my birth, and it also made very real to me, some of the implications, some of the possible implications of the implementation of the War Measures Act two years ago. I think that for the Japanese in southern Alberta, for anybody who has been close to the Hutterites and has experienced one side or the other of the question of religious tolerance or intolerance, that the present and continued existence of cultural minorities in this province can play a very, very important role in our understanding of how we got to where we are today and how we can build on the strengths that have been contributed by so many different kinds of people to this province to make it a greater place for ourselves tomorrow and for our children in the future. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I look at a resolution of this nature and the material that is available and I am reminded of the title song to that successful movie "Love Story".

28-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

[sings a few bars of the title song, "Where do I begin"]

And that's ..

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Can you sing some more?

MR. KOZIAK:

More later. Right now, after my star pupil butchered the language, I felt that I should redeem it somewhat.

Я думаю, що чи не Тарас Шевченко написав: „Колеса крутяться — літа минаються”. І наші колеса в справі багатомовності та багатокультурності крутяться й крутилися вже через довгий час, а ми все ще на тому самому місці.

And now a few kind words about the opposition!

MR. SPEAKER:

It's doubtful whether any unkindness mentioned by the hon. member will appear in Hansard.

MR. KOZIAK:

A translation of my remarks, sir, I quoted from, I think it was Taras Shevchenko who wrote the lines: "The wheels turn and the years pass." And I think that we have been spinning our wheels on multi-culturalism without getting anywhere for a long time. I think this whole resolution touches on the matter of multi-culturalism quite strongly. Time won't permit me to deal with the resolution and with the matter properly, however, I feel that comments that I can make today can perhaps be a springboard for further debate during the estimates presented by the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation and perhaps in other areas of debate.

As a matter of background, I think the hon. Member for Camrose has brought this out, that every person in this province is a member of some ethnic group. The largest group, if I can put it that way, would be the British group which has less than 45% of the population of the Province of Alberta and the British group, again, is divided up into sub-groups, the Irish - both north and south; Scotch, English, Welsh, the Isle of Man, Guernsey, Jersey and so on.

Now there are no Liberals in the House, and that's with a capital L, I think I can take the opportunity of quoting from one Liberal who held the office of Prime Minister of Canada sometime ago. Sir Wilfrid Laurier gave us these words:

"I have visited in England one of those models of Gothic architecture which the hand of genius, guided by an unerring faith, has molded into a harmonious whole. This cathedral is made of marble, oak, and granite. It is the image of the nation I would like to see Canada become. For here I want the marble to remain the marble; the granite to remain the granite; the oak to remain the oak; and out of all these elements I would build a nation great among the nations of the world."

A more recent Prime Minister of this country, of the same political affiliation, on October 9th, 1971 gave us these words:

"In the quarter century since 1945, another change has taken place. Canada's population distribution has now become so balanced as to deny to any one racial or linguistic component an absolute majority. Every single person in Canada is now a member of a minority group. Linguistically our origins are one-

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-31

third French, one-third English, and one-third neither. We have no alternative but to be tolerant of one another's differences. Beyond the threshold of tolerance however, we have countless opportunities to benefit from the richness and the variety of a Canadian life which is the result of this broad mix. The fabric of Canadian society is as resilient as it is colourful. It is a multi-cultural society; it offers to every Canadian the opportunity to fulfill his own cultural instinct and to share those from other sources. This mosaic pattern, and the moderation which it includes and encourages, makes Canada a very special place.

But, Mr. Speaker, the pressures of conformity and uniformity under these pressures less and less is the granite, granite; is the oak, oak; and is the marble, marble. Instead we are moving too rapidly in the direction of that one great big pot of Cream of Wheat. This problem has been recognized, Mr. Speaker, in the United States of America. The April 10th issue of the Time Magazine on page 67, dealing with education, raises this very problem, and we find the Americans, a group which rapidly forced its way into integration of its schools, now feels that this may be a mistake. They find that there are now developments which as they say --

"The intent is to break up the impersonal mob scene that many schools have become and to give students choice -- even if it sometimes means letting them choose racial separation. In Berkley, California, it is said, and I quote from Time, 'Instead of trying to submerge diversity Berkley is now trying to encourage it, replacing the image of a melting pot with that of a mosaic.' "

An earlier issue of Time, I am not sure, it was probably about a month or two ago, I recall reading A Search For Peace or something to that effect -- or Search for Solitude -- where Time correspondents were sent throughout the United States to see if they could break away from this lack of law and order, this feeling of anarchy that you almost get in the States, and they found that they were more likely to find communities in which they could find solitude -- in which there was peace and quiet, in which there was law and order -- in those communities where cultural and ethnic ties were strong, where they hadn't been deteriorated and where the Cream of Wheat philosophy hadn't taken over.

This matter has been under the consideration of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada in a final report which was tabled in both Houses on the 16th of March of this year. Some of the recommendations, and I refer particularly to Recommendations 27 and 28 as they appear on page 96 of the report indicate that the following are their recommendations:

27. The preamble to the constitution should formally recognize that Canada is a multi-cultural country.

28. The Constitution should explicitly recognize the right of Provincial Legislatures to confer equivalent status with the English and French languages on other languages. Federal financial assistance to support the teaching or use of other languages would be appropriate.

And in the preamble to the constitution itself they recommend the following as the third preamble to the new constitution for this country.

Preamble 3. To develop Canada as a bilingual and multi-cultural country in which all of its citizens, male and female, young and old, native peoples and Metis, and all groups from every ethnic origin feel equally at home.

28-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

Permit me now, for just a moment, to restrict my comments to that ethnic group of which I am proud to be a member, the Ukrainians. These people came to this country and broke millions and millions of acres of land. Land that is now being used to produce some of the finest grains in the world. This land wasn't broken with caterpillars, with machinery and equipment, this land was broken with hard back-breaking work -- with the hands of the male and female members of the family.

They worked in the laying of the railroad, miles and miles of railroad, and in maintaining those railroads.

But the real test, and I quote from a submission, a brief submitted to this government, I should say, to the former government in June of 1971 by The Ukrainian Professional Businessman's Club of Edmonton, page 5, point 15.

"The real test, however, of loyalty and devoted citizenship is brought out when a country finds itself in a crisis or at war. Canadians of Ukrainian origin stood the test in World Wars I and II. About ten thousand were enlisted in the Canadian military forces during the First World War. One of them was Philip Konowall, who was awarded the Victoria Cross. Approximately 40 thousand volunteered for service in every branch of Canada's forces in World War II. This represents the highest per capita participation of any ethnic group in Canada."

I think, Mr. Speaker, just from those brief facts that I have presented, no one will deny that these people have as much right to feel at home in this country as any other ethnic group making this country its home.

This, of course, I refer in my comments now to the preamble that was suggested -- the third preamble to the new constitution of Canada, where all ethnic groups would feel equally at home. Now, 'feeling equally at home' is a difficult phrase to define. How do you and I feel at home? When I walk into my own house, what is it that makes me feel at home? Familiar faces, familiar people? True. Perhaps it's a picture on the wall of my wife, perhaps it's a picture on the wall of my grandfather, perhaps it's my coat of arms, perhaps it's the song on the piano that comes from my homeland. Things that make us feel at home are the things that we feel natural with, that remind us of our past. And that brings us to this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

I think that the hon. members of this House, if they honestly looked at this Province of Alberta, if they honestly looked at the City of Edmonton, and the City of Calgary, the major cities, and some of the major towns, if they took a look at names that were affixed to subdivision plans, the names that were affixed to roads, the names that were given to buildings, the names that were given to towns, areas, highways, what have you, you find that predominantly these names are Anglo Saxon. There are, of course, a few Swedish names, Malmo, Lendrum -- I live in Malmo. However, the majority are Londonderrys, Holyroods, Terwilliger, Glengarry, etc. etc. etc. Odessa, Halychyna, Bukovina, are not here, and these are the things that make you feel at home in your own country, Mr. Speaker. These are the things that perhaps may be denied certain ethnic groups making this country their home.

When I first looked at this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I felt that perhaps it was merely tokenism. But looking at the resolution and particularly the basis on which the signs would perhaps be graded and placed, item (d) is the one that excites me, for it requires the Government of the Province of Alberta to study the histories of ethnic groups in Alberta, something which is sorely needed and which has not been done. We can start here with this resolution and in conjunction with the Cultural Heritage Conference to be held in June

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-33

of this year, the 16th, 17th and 18th of that month, under the auspices of The Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation, and perhaps we can study the contribution of the various ethnic groups to the development of this province, and from that develop a provincial multi-cultural policy. Now, some of you may sit back and say, is this necessary? Do you need a multi-cultural policy? We have groups today that are formed to save our parks, we have

groups that are formed to save our environment; we have groups that are formed to save our natural resources, to save our buffalo, to save our whooping cranes. But what about people? People are not merely physical beings, Mr. Speaker, they have a soul. I think that there are groups that should be formed to save that soul. Not in the religious sense, Mr. Speaker, but in the cultural sense. A policy which would be directed at uniformity and conformity, a melting pot policy, Mr. Speaker, is a policy which destroys, it doesn't create. To my mind it is like taking a group of people, some of whom play violins, some of whom play pianos, some of whom play accordions, the odd one beats the drum, two or three blow their horns -- and saying, if you want music you've got to play the piano. No more drums, no more horns, no more violins, just piano. I think, looking at it in that light, Mr. Speaker, you will agree that a policy which pursues conformity, destroys.

Our position here, Mr. Speaker, in this Assembly, is that if we, by doing nothing, permit the beauties, the cultures, the knowledge, the arts of these various ethnic groups to be lost to us forever, then we are as much responsible for this, Mr. Speaker, as was Pilate when he washed his hands when probably the most important decision that he ever had to make came before him, and he refused to make it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BATHURST:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the initiator and the seconder of this resolution because it is with ethnic groups that we are dealing. I have an item which goes along with them -- it is just a little bit of a different nature. I have in my possession an article by a radio announcer Eddy Keen that was aired on CHED on Friday, March 17th at 2:30 and 5:30 p.m. Some of this material -- and a good portion of it is misleading -- so I would like to straighten some of the things out. There are 75 members in this House and when they go to their constituencies they may be asked about it. I think there are things here that they should know. However, this item that was released on March 17th:

"Good afternoon. For years I have wondered about the happiness and sociability of the good people living around Vegreville, Hairy Hill, Lamont, Willingdon, and Mundare. If you have ever been to a three-day Ukrainian wedding, you will know what I am talking about. But apart from that, the hospitality of the people in this area is a legend, and now the secret is out. The early Slavic homesteaders brought with them a plant called sheemya. It was used for making their own cooking oil. The leaves were used for flav curing, and some of the homesteaders actually preserved the whole plant for a winter supply of vegetables. The Basilian Fathers at Mundare apparently grew the plant to make their own cooking oil, and many people used the stuff to settle stomach disorders and other ailments. All in all, the plant known as sheemya brought an effervescent atmosphere to the people east of Edmonton. After years of using the plant, strange things started happening about three years ago. Young people were sneaking into the large fields stealing some of the stalks and smoking it. Soon the RCMP were out prowling around and lo and behold, the sustenance of the whole district for generations, the plant used for flavouring, for medicine, for cooking oil, turned out to be -- what else but marijuana, pure and strong. For generations farmers in the area

28-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

were getting slightly stoned on their cooking oil, as some people proved by taking the stuff undiluted. When they asked the natives about it, the standard reply was, it is good for your stomach. Now police are making frequent trips to this happy area to burn crops. They ordered the farmers to stop raising it. Pensioners growing it in their backyards have had the plants torn up, often mystified as to why a plant that they have used for many years suddenly becomes a hazard. I would think university researchers, interested in this marijuana question, would find fruitful research material out Vegreville way, where the happiness at weddings may be due to the oil on the salad, rather than the brew in the barn. It would be a shame if we ruined the good nature of these fine country folk by burning their crops. Good afternoon."

Mr. Speaker, when I first read this, I had found this to be very amusing. I read it again, and it confused me a little. Then again, when I read it a third time, I became really perturbed and I think that there are many other people who would be perturbed when such garbage goes around and it's being put out on the air. Particularly there are things here that are definitely wrong and misleading, and I would like to straighten the certain areas.

In a sentence here, "If you have ever been to a three-day Ukrainian wedding, you will know what I'm talking about." I would like to bring to the attention of the House that I attend about 15 to 20 Ukrainian weddings every year, and none of them last for more than from 6:00 until midnight. Usually the marriage takes place late in the afternoon, between 6:00 and 7:00 and there is a reception; there is dancing until midnight, but I've never yet seen an invitation for a three-day wedding.

DR. BUCK:

John, you're slowing down.

MR. BATIUK:

"The early Slavic homesteaders brought with them a plant called sheemya." Now, Mr. Speaker, sheemya is not a plant. That is the tiny seeds or fruit of a plant, which in Ukrainian is Konoplee, or in English, the hemp. So here again, this is wrong. "And some of the homesteaders actually preserved the whole plant for a winter supply of vegetables." Well, there is no vegetable at all with this plant. It's a plant that grows six feet tall and the stems are thin and it has little berries with which you could make cooking oil, known in Ukrainian as sheemya. "After years of using the plants, strange things have started happening about three years ago." Here is another misleading statement, because over many years now, there has been no problem with it at all. These settlers have used that for cooking oil, but shortly after the second World War, the RCMP did come out to check on and order crops of poppy or this hemp to be destroyed, not for the fact that the farmers were using it as marijuana or anything. The farmers were using it in good faith. But the thing is that some people were coming in to steal it, as it's mentioned here. Well, I'm sure it's not the farm people who were stealing it. It could be people like Eddie Keen coming into the district, and I would like to mention that it's very possible because I have found out that Eddie Keen used to spend a good portion of the time out in that area during his younger courting days.

Now here again, "Soon the RCMP were prowling around the field." Well, they haven't done that for many years now and I have found that out. "For generations farmers in the area were getting slightly stoned on their cooking oil." Mr. Speaker, in my former presentation on the debate on the Speech from the Throne, I mentioned that William Eleniak was the first Ukrainian immigrant to Canada, who came back in 1881. He farmed and he worked very hard and he lived to the

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-35

age of 96. Now if marijuana would have been stoning him, I don't think he would have ever lived that long. Further, "for generations," somebody would think there was about 15 or 20 generations. It's only 70 some years since the first Ukrainian immigrants came to Canada, so there couldn't have been "many generations."

"Police are making frequent trips to this happy community to burn crops." This I have found out from the Sergeant -- and he has been in the area for quite a while -- and he said he's never heard anything about that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many of the members who were at the Holiday Inn last night, saw the performance by the Ukrainian dancers; some of these children are the offspring of people who come from this area. If they or their parents had been affected by marijuana I am sure they would not have the activity and vigour they expressed yesterday.

I would also like to mention that many times you hear about Ukrainian jokes. One little incident was brought to me. It was translated that it was a Ukrainian incident. However, when I looked into it, it wasn't. It could even have been a relative of Eddie Keen, because it involved George and Michael Keen, farmers in the Tofield area. It could have been Ed's father and uncle or maybe some relative or somebody else. However, at one time these two brothers brought their two horses to the Blackfoot community grazing pasture. Before they let them loose, one of them said, "You know, we are going to have a hard time recognizing which horse is which, they are so identical. They are the same size and so forth. What could we do after a whole summer to get the right horse back? They looked around and couldn't see any variance in the horses, so they decided that one of the brothers should clip the mane, and the other, the tail. Then they would know which horse belongs to whom.

However, after the horses were there for the whole summer, I guess, after the fine, warm and moist summer, the horses on pasture did put on a lot of weight. When the fellows came in the fall to pick up their horses, the mane on the horse that had it clipped had grown just as long as the other one; the other horse's tail grew, and both horses had tails down to the ground.

Here, another problem erupted. Which horse belonged to whom? As they looked at these horses, they couldn't settle it. However, the manager of this grazing community pasture saw they were having a problem. He came and said, "I see you fellows have a problem. Maybe I can help you." One of them said, "You know, we each have a horse. I clipped the mane of my horse, he clipped the tail of his horse. During the summer they grew and we don't know which horse is ours. The mouths are just as big, the feet, you look at them, we can't identify the horses".

The owner said, "Well, the way it sounds, those horses are so identical, they must be of equal value. So why don't you take the black one, and let your brother take the white one?"

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, I would like to say that when a radio announcer is going to put such garbage over the air, I just wonder, when he was presenting this, if this is not the results of a trip. Thank you.

MR. DRAIN:

Am I correct, sir, that we are now going on private bills?

MR. SPEAKER:

That is correct.

28-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

MP. DRAIN:

I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MP. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member have leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT ORDERS
(Second Readings)

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Could I raise one point for the information of the House? Bill No. 201 has been photostatted and has just been passed around, too late to discuss today, I think. We have assurance that Bill No. 202 will be photostatted if it is not printed by Wednesday of next week. I thought I should give this explanation to the House. It is perfectly satisfactory to go ahead with No. 203.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Earlier in the day I was asked to table a document listing these figures. I understand, according to the Rules, if you read from a document, that document is tableable in the House. On reconsideration, even though this is a departmental memorandum, I feel since I have read from it, I should table the document as it is. As a result, I think I would like, at this time, to table this document.

MR. STROM:

We are not questioning this. It's whatever the hon. minister wants to do; we just wanted the information that he was giving us more than anything else.

Bill No. 203: The Family Homes Expropriation Act

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move second reading of Bill No. 203, The Family Homes Expropriation Act. As I have stated briefly when I moved first reading of the bill, that the bill was dealing with the issue of expropriation of family homes. Although in recent years the trend has been to award people whose homes are being expropriated more and more, there is a lot of concern and anxiety about what happens to people whose homes will be expropriated. There is a lot of misunderstanding and a lot of concern about this issue and I believe for that reason, this bill that I introduced is not only timely, it is just and it is also realistic. I believe that the cities that have expanded so rapidly in recent years, have been doing a lot of re-routing, a lot of expropriation for freeways and speedways, and have affected a great number of family homes. It is time that this issue was clarified and that their minds were put at rest, so that whether they can afford it or not, if they are expropriated, they will be relocated in similar or better circumstances. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this attitude is in keeping with any human rights attitude that is being put forth in this day.

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-37

To give you the intent of the bill, I will read Section 8 which does cover -- it is a general section and I am not referring to any specific section, but the section does set out the intent of the bill and I would like to read it into the record.

"The intent and purpose of this Act is that where it is decided to expropriate a family home, the owner shall receive such compensation as will insure that the family unit is in no worse position as a result of the expropriation; it being recognized that strict market value is not in all cases a true compensation to a family unit which is dispossessed, since it may not provide equivalent accommodation; but the protection given by this act is not to extend to any person in whose case the property or his interest in it is fairly to be looked upon as a money asset or investment and not a family home; and this Act shall be interpreted by arbitrators or assessors under any Act, and by the Court broadly in the spirit of the foregoing."

It is quite all-inclusive. I have referred numerous copies of this bill to lay people who called me back and said that they were pleased with it and that they understood it. Now the position that I am in, as a private member moving a public bill, I would have no objection at all, if when it is processed, and if it is passed, that it does become government legislation no matter who introduces it, I will have no objection to any procedure which the government may choose in having this bill processed from now on. I would appreciate it very much if the hon. members would support this bill and that this bill be passed, be given second reading and be permitted to go to committee to be debated clause by clause. I urge the hon. members to support this bill and give it the consideration that it deserves. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to see a prominent Social Creditor coming to his senses at last after all these years, but the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View said that he had introduced a timely bill. In my opinion it is too late, if anything, and not really timely -- it is long overdue. The principle was well set out in the platform of the Progressive Conservative party last year and we have declared our intent of moving along these lines in principle and at last doing something about this outstanding grievance which has existed for many, many years.

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View must at long last have heard of the many cases of hardship in his own area, where access to the new Langevin Bridge was involved, land acquisition along 16th Avenue, but in these cases he's largely locking the stable door after the horse has bolted, and there will be no remedy for these people who have suffered under the old legislation of the last government.

So I agree in principle with the bill, but I must argue against hasty legislation, such as this, which is not being considered in detail. It should have been considered in detail last year because it's not just as simple as you put it together in this particular bill, because you are now contemplating giving relief to one area and perpetuating the hardship in many others. The principle is right I know from my own area the controversy of a proposed freeway on 24th Avenue northwest and northeast might never have occurred if it had been a policy in Alberta to give a home for a home on expropriation, instead of to confine the local authorities to the unreasonable situation of only being able to compensate for actual market value without regard to other consideration. The same sort of controversy now exists on 16th Avenue in Calgary for much the same reason. The people oppose it because they know they won't get a fair deal on expropriation. Money would have solved much of this problem and would have eased many, many wounds.

28-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

In the urban renewal area in Calgary we have an outstanding case with one Mr. Baldwin, whose property was expropriated by the city for fair market value, but no consideration could be given to the fact that the man had two tenants and was forced to leave his home of many years standing and that the final compensation he received was not sufficient to replace the property, either in terms of revenue-producing assets or in terms even of replacement of a house of similar space. Because the fair market value of a house that was built in 1910 is nowhere near the cost of buying a new house of equivalent size to replace it in 1970.

We've had the same situation in Calgary over efforts by the Calgary Exhibition and Stampede Board to expand into the Victoria Park area north of the Stampede Grounds. They have been hampered in their desires to expand because they do not even have expropriation powers, but if expropriation powers had existed, if the city had done it for them, there was no way that proper compensation could be paid.

The home for home principle in expropriation has existed in Ontario for many, many years, so the last government cannot say that it didn't have a lead from another province that it could have followed. The principle on expropriation of only paying market value on the forced acquisition of property should be that no one should be any the worse off from the government action, a government action that has been forced on them. In my opinion they should actually be better off because of the forced invasion of property rights.

The situation at the moment is that the local authority usually gives 75% of its low cash offer and the balance of the market value sum that is finally assessed by the Local Authorities Board is not paid until many months later when the hearing is held. On the payment of 75% they can insist upon entry onto the property.

Now the proposal of this rather hastily conceived bill before us doesn't take into account the whole controversial area of tenants on long-term leases. The bill specifically in this wording excludes landlords. Now perhaps the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View doesn't know that in his own area, for instance, there are many revenue-producing properties, there are duplexes and fourplexes and there are older homes that contain one or two suites.

If these properties are still to be expropriated under the old rules, then there will be no compensation for the loss of revenue and, of course, there is no compensation for tenants who don't have long term leases.

We had a case in Calgary very recently in the urban renewal area where, for tax purposes, the principals of a company had put their building in the name of their wives and they hadn't been wise enough or well advised enough by their lawyers, to convert it into a long term lease for their wives. The city came along and expropriated the building on behalf of the urban renewal partnership and they suddenly found there was no compensation for their own tenancy at all. So they couldn't get any money for the moving of their business or the rewiring or any of the tenant improvements they carried out. The case was even further aggravated by the fact that they had pleaded for time to enter into some sort of a lease to straighten up the affair, in the name of common justice, and the city, while the negotiations with the lawyer were actually proceeding, suddenly filed their expropriation order cutting off that particular method of recourse. There were allegations then that the city solicitor had acted in an unethical fashion but after some wrangling it was decided that he had acted in the best interests of the government, but he certainly hadn't acted in the best interests of the party whose property was forcibly expropriated.

Then we have the strange case under the existing legislation -- which had been allowed, of course, by the last government -- that

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-39

people who suffer injurious affection are in a position where they can probably claim greater damages from the courts than the people whose property is actually seized through expropriation. I don't know why they use the term 'injurious affection', it's one of those fractured English terms that lawyers like to use. I believe that really it should only apply to breach of promise actions for affection, for what they really mean is injurious affect, but the common legal jargon calls it injurious affection. In this case, of course, they don't go to any so-called neutral arbiter like The Local Authorities Board in the case of damages arising from the proximity of say a highway, a freeway, a bridge, or something like that, they have a full right to go to the courts and claim damages. And as I point out these damages are probably far in excess of anything someone receives for the forcible taking of the whole of his property by the government authorities.

Because of the deficiencies of this law, the fact that this law of only confining compensation to fair market value has existed for so long in Alberta, the local governments have received a bad name which they ill deserve. This situation has been forced on them by the legislation of the senior government but the static is all taken at the local government level. It has meant, because of the resistance to probably necessary roads and other structures, because of the resistance to these very necessary things, they haven't been able to proceed. The resistance has come because of the just and understandable attitude of the people that they are not prepared to be pushed out of their homes and they can't buy another one for the price they received through the expropriation.

Now the trouble with the bill as presented by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, apart from the fact that the subject is raised too late, is that it doesn't cover all the angles. It is not just as simple as saying "look we'll have a home for a home" concept for single family residence development. You must remember that dwellings and other forms of property are not all alike. It's not enough to give relief to one category of agreed people and not take into account the others. It is a very, very complex subject and it has got to be studied in great detail before the legislation comes in. It should have been studied years ago. I congratulate the hon. member for introducing the bill but I don't think this is the right bill in that it doesn't go far enough and it hasn't been thought out carefully enough. It should have been considered over the last two years and perhaps introduced before August 30th, 1971. Thank-you.

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, Bill 203 which has been introduced to this House by the hon. Mr. Ludwig -- I find that I am completely in agreement with the principle behind the bill; however I have a few comments to make in connection with the whole area of expropriation.

In my somewhat limited experience with the matter of expropriation, I have found that a lot of harsh feelings develop between people who are involved on one side and the expropriating body. And a lot of these harsh feelings develop, not only because of the fact of expropriation, but it's the fact of the complete lack of respect for the rights of citizens -- you know the old saying, "a man's home is his castle". Look at what you'll find in the big cities or any areas where you have expropriating authorities working. Let's take for example the City of Edmonton. A freeway system planned which may go right through the heart of Edmonton Strathcona. The Planning department of the City of Edmonton is put to work to plan these freeways, to plan approaches to a new bridge system. They spend hundreds of thousands of dollars preparing these plans, and they bring them to the point where really the cost that has gone into the preparation of the plans refutes any changes, and then they say, Mr. Citizen, we're going to build a road through your house. Now

28-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

this is the first time that the person who owns the home hears of even the suggestion that his home is going to be expropriated or that a road will be passing right through his lot. Had the City of Edmonton approached the citizens in the area where they were planning this development, or if any expropriating authority that's planning proceedings of this nature would do this in advance of their going into substantial plans, then perhaps the people who would be affected could make representations to the expropriating body, representations which that body could look at and perhaps change their mind.

As we have seen in Toronto with the Spadina Freeway, as we have seen in Edmonton with the Mackinnon Ravine Freeway, these things don't necessarily have to be proceeded with; they can be stopped. And the wise thing would be to have the representations of the citizens affected made before the plans proceed to the point where it's irreversible. And I think that any discussion on expropriation and any legislation, any new remedial legislation on the matter of expropriation should take this point into account. It should require the expropriating body to make known to the people who would be affected by the expropriation procedures that that is the intention of that expropriating body, and then the people would have the opportunity to make representations as to why that area shouldn't be proceeded with, why their home shouldn't be expropriated. Perhaps if this were available and if after a proper hearing expropriation was still found to be necessary, perhaps we would find less of it. We would perhaps find more areas where people would come to agreement, where the build-up of this feeling of anger, of hate, would be dissipated. That's the first comment I have to make, Mr. Speaker.

The other comment, of course, is with respect to details of the bill. I feel that Clause 3 perhaps does not go far enough. It relates to the building and out-buildings and one and a half acres of land. I know in Edmonton Strathcona, that there are homes which are 60 to 70 years old, and they've got beautiful lots with beautiful trees -- trees that grow higher than the ceiling of this Assembly -- trees that took years and years to grow; they have trees that bear fruit, plums, crabapples, apples. These trees are irreplaceable and in determining the value the owner of that home places on his home and surrounding area, this is very important -- it is the value of the trees, the value of the hedges, the value of the gardens which may have taken years and years to develop. So I think that the bill does not go far enough in that area.

There is possibly another problem that must be considered in the whole matter of expropriation and in the matter of the way we compensate those whose homes have been expropriated, particularly in the area of the family home. We can all envisage the situation where we have an elderly couple living in a home which they have lived in perhaps for 50 or 60 years. It may be that on the open market that home may only bring \$12,000, \$14,000, \$16,000. However, to replace that home because of all of the particular facilities that they have -- say the nearness to shopping facilities, the nearness to public transportation, the nearness to hospitals, etc. -- you may find that the expropriating authority may have to purchase a home for this couple at approximately \$30,000. So we have a differential of -- somewhere between \$18,000, \$16,000, \$14,000. That is fine. However what happens if that elderly couple passes away the year after? What we have done is we have made the heirs rich. We haven't really accomplished what we have intended to do. Perhaps what we should be looking at is a situation whereby we take and we purchase a home, or the expropriating authority is required to purchase a home, for the people whose home is being expropriated of a sufficient stature to be able to recompense them for what they had in all terms -- in all their facilities. Whatever the difference between the market values of the home that is being expropriated and the home that had to be purchased, perhaps that difference can be caveated so that the people involved, the people whose homes have been expropriated have the

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-41

benefit of the new home, but this benefit, then, is not passed onto their heirs. We can see the problems that exist here. If this is a young family, perhaps this is a ridiculous suggestion. But these are the problems that exist and this is why the matter is now under the study of the Alberta Law Research and Reform Commission.

I understand from an answer that the hon. Attorney General gave to me on a question which I posed some weeks ago in this House, that the report of this commission will be brought to this House, or at least to the Attorney General, before the end of this year, in which event proper remedial legislation could then be prepared and presented to the spring session. And, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I agree with the principle of the act, I commend the person who presented it to this House for bringing it to the House, however, I don't feel that we can properly deal with it during this session until the report of the commission has been presented to the Attorney General. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I feel, for many years, that this type of bill, or the intent of the bill has been long in coming. I am really surprised that the hon. member who has been a member of the past government, did not long before this time advise his Cabinet that this is a bill that is necessary. To expropriate land for the public good is something that I have seen done so often, and I abhor the fact, on thinking back, how some of these things were carried out under the government of the hon. member that now proposes it.

Let me only cite a few of these, Mr. Speaker. I think I recall the moving of Highway No. 16, or widening of Highway No. 16, and I do recall -- I think the hon. minister at that time will recall the house that is not too far located at the Twig-In Corner where the crippled children's camp is now located on the south side of the highway -- if I recall the figure at that time, a very substantial nice house had to be moved, and the total compensation -- I stand to be corrected -- was approximately \$2,000. It had to be moved back. Now any house that is picked up off its foundation where it has been built, no matter whether you move it five feet or whether you move it ten feet or whether you move it 200 feet, the loss of moving that house is substantial to the homeowner. I believe that when we expropriate land for the public good, if the public wants to use the right of way -- whether it's a street, whether it's a roadway, whether it's a pipeline, or whatever method it is to taking of the surface -- I think he should be compensated on the basis, not of the value that's there at that time, it's the remaining value after the house has been placed, or the pipeline, or something. That must be the consideration.

These two urban members that have mentioned the expropriation in the urban areas -- I grant you it is serious here. It is serious in the rural areas. When we consider -- and I won't mention the name, but if you care to, I will -- and I recall the well-site that was to be drilled and I'll tell you where the location is. It is about three and a half miles west of the town of Drayton Valley. The hon. Member for Drumheller I think will recall back in 1961 when you were the Minister of Highways that I appeared on behalf of that family. I appealed to the that time Premier of the province, now Senator Manning. I was escorted out of his office. Now, when we consider a well-site is moveable...[Laughter from the Floor]...It is moveable. It can be directionally drilled. But yet, this house had to be moved to make way for a drilling site. Not only that. Just four years later, the same house was again in trouble because it had to be moved for a pipeline right of way. Now in all sincerity, when we expropriate land or we're going to take land from anybody, I don't think that any compensation should be based on the value as you look at it. I think it should be based on the value after the thing has

28-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

been completed. Those are the only values that I can see that are true and effective.

I recall another one, back in the same year of 1961, where a family living approximately one mile west of Rocky Rapids and three-quarters of a mile south had a drilling rig move into it's yard. That's expropriation. The fences were cut, the well was a producer so they put in a battery site. I believe the press will remember it, because it was also in the Edmonton Journal. The cattle were out in the swath and the road was right along side of the steps of the house. As you stepped out of the house, you stepped on the roadway. Now, gentlemen, I think when we look at the basis of expropriation, I'll have to agree with the hon. member that a piecemeal approach to the problem is not the answer. The answer must be in total. I will agree that we should wait until the study is completed and perhaps then we can make a better assessment of what direction we should take.

I had the same incident happen in my case; and if the hon. members on the opposite side who were in government at that time -- at least some of them -- how would you feel to have your land expropriated by a pipeline right of way. In November 19, 1965, I walked with my lawyer to the office, and we were told to go back to the courthouse because the hearing was there. When we ascertained from the clerk of the courthouse, we were told to go back because the hearing was back there. So we walked back and forth and when we ended up back in the same building again, they said the hearing was over. We had had our hearing. And in fact, I got a letter to that effect that said I'd had my first hearing, and I would be notified by registered mail when the second meeting was going to be. Well, gentlemen, if you don't believe me you go out there and pick that phone up. I'll give you the location of the pipeline. That land is located on the southeast of Section 35 in Township 49, Range 6. It will be seven years this November 19th and I've never had the second hearing yet.

You people were the government. You can't have a minor approach to a subject that is so large and encompasses such an area until you take it in total. There is no other way; whether it is highway expropriation or whether it is a street widening in the City of Edmonton, or whether it is merely forcing a person to move his home. You are infringing on the rights of the people. If it is in the interest of the public good and welfare, then I think we have to be prepared to pay for it. We have to accept that responsibility.

I know you have had it under consideration for 36 years and you've not done anything about it. Now, you are coming in with a mediocre bill that approaches part of the subject but does not take care of the total. When we look at expropriation we have to look at expropriation in every case. If it is for the public good, and must be for the public good, then certainly, we should compensate the people, whether they are senior citizens or young people just starting up. The whole thing is so abhorrent to me that you can have one group of people give you compensation even before a drilling rig moves in, or if a house is moved. Let's wait until it is over; then let's assess the problem.

In the case of the house the hon. Member for Drumheller had moved, that house has no basement under it today because it got out of whack in moving it. The \$2,000 he received for it could not even put the basement in. Yet, he was forced to do this. There are other things that enter into compensation for expropriation. I believe we should leave this matter until we have had the research that has been carried out. When it is completed, I believe, in this fall sitting, maybe we can draw up some type of regulations or bring in a bill that would cover at least the major portions of expropriation in the province of Alberta. I think, that until we have that study before us, we cannot make a proper decision, and I would suggest, Mr.

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-43

Speaker, this bill is a little premature, in the fact that it is not complete until it encompasses all expropriation, not only homes. You can't pick out one subject. Until that happens, Mr. Speaker, we can only leave this; it has waited 36 years; it can wait for another three or four months, until this study is complete. When that study is complete, then, let's draw up an Act whereby the people from whom we expropriate land, buildings, or whatever it is, they will be properly compensated.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few thoughts to the mover of this motion, whom I wish to commend for coming forward to this Assembly with the problem, which I know, many of us are very concerned about.

I am sure any of us who have seen the problems that are created by expropriation procedures, know full well the heartache and the problems that are created, not only by the homeowner as is limited by this bill, which is the criticism already levied toward it, but anyone who is, in a commercial sense, the owner of property, when the 'big brother', the government, comes down and lays the heavy stick, and says to them, "in the name of the public good, we wish to make a move and expropriate your property." I think, when we have legislation of this nature, which allows the government to move under the excuse of the public good, we are striking at one of the most basic and the most important freedoms we enjoy in this society, and that is the freedom to own property, and the freedom to live as we wish in the privacy of our homes, or the freedom to enjoy the business that we happen to have worked on for many years, and the businesses we have developed. It is when we talk in terms of that powerful stroke of expropriation, we come to an area which is indeed a very complex problem, a problem which has been started in this legislation to be counteracted; but I believe, and would propose, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation it has already been suggested, and I say this respectfully to the hon. Member from Calgary Mountain View that there is a lot further that we must go in order to deal with this problem in its true perspective. I would think that this bill should first of all forget about the term 'The Family Homes Expropriation Act'. It should be expanded to deal in the areas that have already been brought to the attention of the hon. member. But more important I am concerned over the hang-up of the bill from the point of view of the concern over merely the family home. Why not any home? Why all of the difficulties that are being created by definition in the bill from the point of view of concern of what is the family home? What is the family? I fear that the bill is creating more problems than it will solve from the point of view of the judge who has a difficult enough problem to assess the proper valuation on a home to home basis which is indeed an intangible, difficult problem. But he also now must determine what is the family unit, and do we in fact have a family unit under the schedule which has been attached to this bill?

For example in Calgary Buffalo, in the downtown portion, I found to my surprise, during the past election campaign, that we have many hippie houses. We have a number of homes there where people are living in a communal way together, and have for some time. And in some situations, I don't know whether or not they do own this home, does that mean then that they are deprived any rights under this act because they do not come within the definition proposed from the point of view of a family unit? I note in section 4 to the schedule, that we talk in terms of when considering whether a family unit other than a natural family unit exists, the arbitrators or assessors subject to appeal to the Supreme Court, may recognize any combination of persons living together as a family unit. Surely now our courts must then decide whether hippies living together in a communal sense are in fact living together as a family unit. Certainly the courts must decide then whether or not people who are living together

28-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

common-law, and possibly have not done so for a period of time, are living together as a family unit. Why after all should we have the hang-up of the family unit or the family home? If the mover of this Bill is serious with his proposal, why not any home that is expropriated? Why not any individual group of people, or any person who has an interest in property, should be compensated on a home to home basis, whether he has lived in that home for a minute, whether he has lived in that home for a lengthy period of time which seems to be the concern of the hon. mover of the Bill, as to setting out the rights of the person who has lived within the home.

For example, as the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill says, "What about a 35 year old man married to a 65 year old woman, is that a family unit?" I think in talking from the point of view, and of course, that is indeed true, and this must be considered. But may I suggest that....

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order.....

MR. GHITTER:

I think that might take a sociologist to deal with that one. But may I suggest to the mover of this bill that it, in fact, should go back to the drawing board from the point of view: let's move away from this concern with the family home, let us talk in terms of any home, any right to property, be it a communal settlement, be it a common-law relationship, or be it a family relationship. So that any person who has an interest in a piece of property that is being expropriated by the government under the guise or need of the public good, should in fact be compensated on a fair home to home basis.

So on that basis, if I may suggest, I think although this bill has made a start, I think we need to go much further, and I think it has been most useful that this bill be presented to this Legislative Assembly so that we could put our minds to the issue, because indeed it is an issue and an important issue. But may I suggest that we must go a lot further. May I support the view of the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona, the hon. Member for Drayton Valley, from the point of view that it must go a lot further. On that basis if we could then possibly have another bill, another time, and another year from the hon. member, it may be appropriate, and I'm sure we'll be pleased to consider it again.

[Interjection]

MR. GHITTER:

Pardon me, is that a question?

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, this bill seems to have one great sin - it came from the wrong side of the House before the other side was ready. I'm always much impressed with speakers who speak as if further comment were irrelevant and impertinent if not unwise. We've certainly had our share of those. I'm also surprised that after seven months the 'now' government hasn't straightened out some of these inequities that have been waiting for years. However I do want to point out seriously two or three things. The whole business of expropriation has grown up over the years. Many governments have been in power in many places. I haven't noticed that the Conservatives have done any better about it in the last 36 years in other provinces than the government has done here. To me it doesn't matter that it's late, except that the later it is the sooner we ought to do these things. Now as far as this bill not being complete enough, there is some immediate necessity for this bill -- if it only

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-45

goes this far, then at least it will remove some of the inequities. Any day is one day to late for somebody, perhaps whose home is being removed already by expropriation procedures. Now there has been lots of opportunity for amendment - nobody has proposed any amendment - everybody says just to shelve this until we think up the right act, and maybe that's alright. But I can see no reason that this bill could not be passed now, that it could not be very beneficial and if by fall this bill needs amending, or if it needs rewriting, that's fine or if there could be additional bills which serve a better purpose that's alright. Now there are some reasons for confining this to the family farm in . . . [Interjection]

MR. HINMAN:

Yes, well maybe this is a farm - if all they have is the window box. At any rate - in the experience that I've had, and some of it was in Drayton Valley - the expropriations were not as unjust as sometimes you would make it appear. It was very evident in all the areas where expropriations were going to be necessary that some people anticipating them, bought homes, bought land for no other purpose than that they knew they would get more compensation for a pipeline, or for the moving of a house, then the whole piece of land cost. And I don't think that excludes anybody in those areas. But there is difference between somebody who owns a house, simply bought it a little while ago with the idea of renting it, hoping for considerable gain in value because there might be some development. One of the things that I myself have worried about is how slow the governments have been to recognize that we should have had many, many years ago, a Land Accumulation Act, which left it to the municipality to take over all lands which could be developed, at a fair price, and if the owner wanted to keep it then he had to bare the assessment on that land which it should bear in relation to the growth around it. The amount of money that has been made by speculators because a city expands, a new industry comes, a road has to be moved, is tremendous, and perhaps one of the sins of Social Credit government was doing away with the unearned increment tax. Certainly we have permitted a great deal of speculation - we now have lots so that it's difficult in any one of the towns or cities to get a lot under \$5,000, and you just can't justify this thing. So I say that when you say family home there was reason if the family dwelt in it; if the family is going to have to search for another home or be in the street; that's quite different from the man who bought it on the speculative basis, who can be compensated fairly according to true value, and if he is as wise as he thought he was, find some other piece of property that he can purchase. So I object to the argument that this bill needs to be set over. I submit that there is reason to pass it now, that if it doesn't do enough good it will do a lot of good, and it will be a credit to the government on the other side of the House, as well as to the members on this side. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. YCUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I have some concerns with this bill. First of all I would like to say that I have a concern in my constituency. You probably have been aware of the headlines the Mackinnon Freeway has been getting and now that the freeway isn't going ahead this year part of the problem which concerned me immediately has at least been put off for a year. That freeway was going to run through the end of my constituency. It involved the complete destruction of a neighbourhood and I don't know how one would have placed a value on those houses. This bill would certainly have helped in that area -- pardon me, I should have said the concept in this bill would certainly have helped -- and I am 100% for a bill which would include this type of concept. I have another portion in my constituency, a portion which is seven blocks long where all of the people along one street are facing removal of their homes. They don't know when, and they don't know what they are going to be compensated for, but they know it is coming eventually. I have another portion of the

28-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

constituency which is in the order, I believe, of 13 blocks and at least seven of those will, again, have expropriation along the full length of that avenue. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a real interest in this particular bill and this particular subject. I would like to emphasize, again, that I favour the particular concept here but I can see much wrong with this particular piece of legislation.

The other day the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, I believe it was Calgary Bow, asked a question with respect to, two kinds of justice or two systems of justice. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if this bill were to go through as it now stands, in fact we would have introduced two kinds of justice and I, for the life of me, have some trouble understanding how a man, learned in the law, could propose such a piece of legislation. In Section No. 8 of this bill there is an attempt to distinguish between a family property owned, or described as family home, and other property and to distinguish in terms of treatment. As I recollect from campaigning through that particular area in my constituency, some homes -- 75% of them probably -- are owned by the families living in them. The others are rented. Now I can't understand how any court, or any system of justice, could argue that because the property in the one case is used by a family who are living there, that this family should be treated differently than a family who owns another house and isn't living in it, but is going to lose it. I don't know how an assessor, or an evaluator, or a court, would be able to place a value on the compensation to one owner differently, and on a completely different criteria, than would have to be applied in the case of the other owner. I just don't understand how that could be developed. So I am not in favour of this particular piece of legislation and if the hon. members will mention an amendment to it, want an amendment, I think it would be fairly easy to come up with one -- but I think that there needs to be a lot more thought in this bill, to other aspects as well -- I am not a lawyer and I haven't studied it closely, but it would seem to me that in the schedule, for instance, and the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo has mentioned some problems here, there would be all sorts of entanglements.

Mr. Speaker, in summation, my position is that I favour the concept as outlined in this bill, however, I favour waiting until we have had a report and a much more thorough drafting of the legislation. I would submit that waiting that length of time and getting good legislation, will not delay any benefits which might accrue from the enactment of this bill. I would submit that if this bill goes through as it stands now, court action will delay any benefits as long as any delay that will occur by waiting for a better and a more complete draft of a bill.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this bill because it is a bill that has affected my particular constituency in Calgary. It was in my constituency that one man was forcibly evicted from his home -- I was very close to the situation -- as a matter of fact it upset the gentleman so, that he ended up in hospital the day he was evicted -- so it comes very close to home -- the emotionalism and the problems that are faced by people who lose their homes by way of eviction. There is a certain amount of public sympathy, in particular to these people, when the expropriation is for a building -- sometimes you wonder whether you can justify evicting people for it. Of course, in the City of Calgary, in the particular area that I'm speaking of, a great deal of urban renewal went on, as the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill is well aware. I feel that we should attempt now whether you agree with this bill or you don't -- I still feel it is a good bill in the sense that we're making a step in the right direction, to try and find a solution to homes that are expropriated from people who have lived in them for many years.

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-47

Now, I've got to be honest with the hon. Member for Calgary Ruffalo, I can't get to concerned with somebody who has just moved into the area for a short period of time. In most cases -- I think the hon. member mentioned the hippie commune -- but I think you will find his constituency is no different than mine, we're both in a similar type of area. Most of this type of people are renting, rather than owners, so they aren't faced with the same problem. But I feel very strongly about the fact that we do need a bill such as this and I am sure that we may have to make special legislation for people who have lived in a home for a number of years.

I was most interested in what the hon. Member for Drayton Valley had to say because I could understand his concern, because I think that was part of his program and platform when he was running for the LeBoef Party back a few years ago. As a matter of fact, the hon. member can do me a favour, and maybe some of the other members of the House if they can give me the address of where Mr. LeBoef is living, as there are a number of people whom he took advantage of who are looking for him. He told them he was going to look after their oil rights and they turned them over to him. I understand he has left the province, so maybe the concern that he had for the people that were involved with expropriation, maybe he'll just be as concerned for the people that lost some money in that unfortunate situation.

Getting back however, to the expropriation. The hon. Member for Cardston touched on many of the items that I had in mind, but I still feel that hon. members should give serious consideration to supporting this bill. It's going to be a difficult bill whenever it is passed, whether it's today or anytime else, to put in legislation that's going to satisfy everyone. I think we should make a step forward to protect those people who are evicted through expropriation and their property taken away, if they have lived on that property for a reasonable length of time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I endorse this bill at the present time.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one very brief comment to add to the previous speaker, that if the hon. Member for Drayton Valley knows where Mr. LeBoef is, he might also know where Mr. Holt is, he's the chap who ran on this Surface Rights Expropriation ticket in 1963, otherwise known as the Unity League.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member speaking about the principle of this bill?

MR. HENDERSON:

I'm speaking of the principle of the bill.

MR. HENDERSON:

He might also be able to tell us where Mr. Holt is who ran in my constituency in '63 -- I think there is a warrant out for his arrest for having failed to file his election expenses for 1963.

DR. HERNER:

Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to speak very long on this bill, but after the remarks of the hon. Member for Calgary Millican and a contribution from the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc which are bordering on imputing motives, and are very close to being completely unparliamentary....well if the hon. members want to act that way, it is fine...

28-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The fact I brought up can be verified, the point I brought up can be verified by checking with the Clerk of this Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER:

Come to the point of order.

MR. HENDERSON:

I suggest that it is a vital point of order that the hon. member that is speaking is completely out of order himself.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Order, order.

MR. HENDERSON:

It is a fact of record that the Clerk of this Legislature has.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order involves a breach of the rules of the House. If the hon. member wishes to point out a point of order, we will deal with it.

DR. HCFNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc again is out of order because if he would sit and listen for a moment and just appreciate that there are other arguments to be made in any discussion instead of closing his mind to it, that he would know all about it. All right, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Deputy Premier begs leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House wish to call it 5:30 p.m.?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until 8:00 this evening.

[The House rose at 5:30 p.m.]

* * * * *
* * * * *

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-49

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

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of Supply for consideration of the Estimates.

[The motion was agreed to without debate or dissent.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

Department of Environment

Appropriation No. 2901 Minister's Office

Salaries

MR. PUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, I don't think I could let this go without saying a word or two. The hon. minister. . .

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Mr. D. Miller adjourned the debate.

MR. PUSTE:

Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you Mr. Taylor. Mr. Miller please proceed.

MR. D. MILLER:

Gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, there is a bill introduced in this session of the Legislature which will allow the hon. minister to investigate methods of raising funds for major control programs involving air, water pollution, watershed management, surface reclamation, and environmental protection. The hon. minister will be permitted as well to prepare a long-range plan of items affecting the environment. This is a welcome announcement to all areas of the province, when 87% of all the watershed in Alberta runs north into the Arctic Ocean, and with very few controls. A greater part of this flow could be diverted east and south for use on the thirsty soil as has been done previously and as was outlined many years ago. The result would be increasing production as well as land values, strengthening the family farm, making more people self sustaining, providing more jobs and opportunities, and increasing rural population.

Let us not overlook other assets which many dislike to think about, which is a very valuable asset to Albertans with all this surplus water. I am referring to the sale of water to our southern neighbours. Demands will come whether we like it or not and we must give consideration to it. In a recent visit to the United States, I was in a group and they were joking about the need for water and another Canadian with me -- a relative -- said, you had better be

28-50

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

nice to us or we will shut off your water. So even the lay members who are not engaged in politics -- and this was a woman by the way who made this remark -- she knows their need and the only place they can get it is from Canada. These are in the talking stages and hinting stages now, so would it not be best for us to plan with our own long-range plans that have been set up, and set up controls and divert water where it is needed in Alberta now. We will be better prepared and it will be less expensive when the time comes to deal with our neighbours on the desert -- on the desert you might say because they will need water.

Water is a major asset any time in all countries, and is needed for the people, for industry -- industry cannot be attracted unless there is water, and plenty of it. The countries which are semi-arid, where rainfall can be supplemented by irrigation -- and we have plenty of this land to the east of us as well as south.

Because of the large potential of water development in Alberta which is possible and necessary for general use, to wade in, pollution and pollution abatement, industry and surface use, water should be held back and not allowed to run to waste above the levels needed for downstream purity. We should thank Providence for men of faith in Alberta, for their vision of its future and possibilities, and for their determination to overcome obstacles and turn the arid prairies into gardens of beauty and production, alive with growth and thriving industry. And now, after 60 years, Alberta is only a fraction of what it can be. North of the 49th parallel, we are growing vegetables and grains of all kinds, and in abundance, superior in quality to our southern neighbours. The best wheat in the world is grown here, and it is not uncommon for barley to yield, on irrigated land, 110 bushels to the acre.

Because of the availability of water, the production of sugar beets is a major industry in southern Alberta. It is important for crop rotation, profitable, and can be expanded, which means jobs for the unemployed. I only wish the hon. Minister of Agriculture was here tonight. He likely knows quite a bit about this, but I just want to refresh his memory. Only 15% of the Canadian sugar production is produced in Canada. To you who are new here, I'm sure this must be startling. While 85% of our sugar needs are brought to Canada from abroad, this should be a challenge to the new government and the request for a larger share of the Canadian sugar market.

Sugar beet factories in eastern Canada remain closed while we import sugar from Cuba and similar countries like Cuba. Successful beet production is permitted in Manitoba and Alberta only on a limited scale while unemployment continues to increase. We could produce our total need in sugar for Canada without subsidy, if Canada would be willing to establish a sugar policy for all of Canada and not wait for the low ebb and then cash in at a sale price. They should make their bid for sugar at the beginning of the season or the year before like other democratic countries do.

I am pleased to learn that the hon. minister is considering providing a higher level of purity in the air we breathe. Some of the projections experts make are frightening. In the wake of a missile attack, if it were announced, on one of our large cities, they suggest, or they predict, or they envision, on the first alert, all owners of automobiles would take to the road and perhaps likely head for the mountains. With all these thousands of automobiles racing on the highway, they say the effect on the atmosphere would be worse than if we had stayed home because of the pollution from carbon monoxide. As frightening as this sounds, this is not the greatest killer that we have now. There are more people dying every year in increasing amounts from cancer and related illnesses than any other disease or any other pollution that we have, even from alcohol, even from people killed on the highways. There's more people killed from lung cancer from smoking tobacco, first or second handed. I'm

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-51

wondering and waiting for the hon. minister to announce some plans to combat this issue on a program to reduce such pollution and improve the air for non-smokers in confined areas, and especially in buses. The ecology is improving with less litter of cans and bottles lying around. Now, let us turn our attention to the air and make sure it is less polluted. Thank you.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Chairman, I note that you are probably falling into the same error that I would fall into if I were chairing this -- you are trying to run it like a school board meeting. That won't work; it is too efficient and too simple -- it just wouldn't be accepted around here.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thanks a lot, friend!

MR. GRUENWALD:

For the hon. minister, regarding this environment, I have just a very few comments and a question that I would like to put to him. I am convinced we are going to solve our environmental problems, including that of pollution and all that goes with it, either on a united basis, or we aren't going to solve it at all. There is no way that we can take any one level of government and point to them and say they must handle the situation. Nor can we go that to industry. I think it has to be handled on a total co-operative basis from all levels of government, because in this area, there is no free ride for anyone, I would submit.

One of the problems we have, and we have them right in our own city, is upstream pollution. If the city or the industry, or whatever the case may be, the town, it doesn't make any difference how big they are, if they are not correcting their pollution problems, if their water treatment plants are not efficient and doing the job, certainly the one down below is going to have to pay twice as much to get the job done. We can only pass this along to the next fellow for just so long until you get into real trouble.

I am sure that particular problem is very apparent. Our engineers in Lethbridge have indicated that this right now is a problem. We don't only want to handle this on a provincial basis; we don't want to handle it only on a national basis -- and the hon. minister isn't paying any attention to me, by the way -- but we must handle it on an international basis.

Yesterday the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview was indicating the President of the United States was saying that they were spending millions of dollars, maybe even billions on pollution. This is right; this is the only way it can be handled; it cannot be handled by an isolated area. Until we decide that we are going to do this same type of thing on a total involvement basis, I would say that we are going to have continuous problems with water pollution.

So, my question to you, Mr. Minister, is really what initiative is your department and the government taking to bring about this total involvement, not only in dollars and in manpower but in management? This is what we have to know. Also, in making sure, of course, that every community, regardless of the size, is going to do their part to keep their water treatment plants, so that they can do the job in their area so the whole job will be effectively done for all people.

28-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to participate in this particular vote with respect to the Department of the Environment. I must say at the outset, I certainly listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. minister yesterday, when he dealt at length with the activities of his department. I should also say that I always enjoyed the hon. minister, even when he was in the opposition, because he certainly handles his information very well in the House.

Mr. Chairman, representing a constituency in east central Alberta, I must say that from time to time I live in an area that has experienced a shortage of water during recurring cycles. When we go back into history we find that every now and then we run into one of these cycles where we are shorter of water than we are at other times, though I must say that during the last few years we have enjoyed what may be considered as above normal precipitation.

However, I well recall about ten years ago when it was so dry that it was necessary to ship in feed from northern Alberta to southern Alberta. Our ranchers bought hay wherever they could find it. As a matter of fact, many of our ranchers even drove into the north country and put up hay and then shipped it back into our area. Possibly some of the members from northern Alberta will remember the time some ten years ago when we certainly required feed from other parts of the province just to sustain the cattle in our particular district. I recognize the time the Department of Agriculture played a very prominent part in moving this feed from northern Alberta to southern Alberta. I also well remember that, at the time, the provincial and the federal government shared in the costs of moving this feed from one point to another point. I also well recall at the time that many of our ranchers were forced to sell part of their cattle; in many cases they only sustained what could be considered really their breeding stock. They parted with their cattle, and the only reason I'm giving this information, Mr. Chairman, is that when we experience a dry period, especially in the ranching country, the effects of such a condition are spread over many years.

And I also want to emphasize that when we go back in history, it's quite evident that history has a habit of repeating itself. Now, when you talk to old-timers in the district, and I'm speaking of people who have lived in the district for 40, 50 and 60 years, they will certainly tell you that we've had dry periods in the past, and we will certainly have dry periods in the future. There's certainly a real need for looking at the question of stock watering in east-central Alberta.

And now, Mr. Speaker, when we look at a map of major rivers in the province. It's not my intention to go into a great deal of detail and mention all the various rivers, but they have two things in common, one is that most of our major rivers flow into either the Arctic Ocean or the Hudson Bay. And knowing the dry condition that we experience in central Alberta, when I stand on the banks of some of these major rivers and I see this water flowing to the Arctic Ocean or the Hudson Bay, I ask myself, "Why is it not possible to harness part of this water instead of it going to waste, when we could be using some of this water in some of the areas in the province where we have water deficiencies?"

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I say that water is the most valuable asset that we have, and we should do everything that we can to obtain the maximum benefit from every drop. I'm even prepared to go farther and say that we must protect our watershed on the eastern slopes of the Rockies, to ensure that future generations will benefit from good water management. So we have a situation in central Alberta, especially east-central Alberta, where we need water for a number of various uses.

I was very pleased when the hon. minister indicated yesterday that he has recognized a number of priorities. I remember that his

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-53

first priority was domestic; his second priority was municipal; his third priority was industrial; his fourth priority was irrigation; and his fifth was power and other uses. In other words, it would appear to me that he has placed the highest priority for water which is directly connected to what's necessary to human life. The second priority is for use where there is no substitute for water, and his lowest priority is for uses of water where there are substitutes. I certainly agree with the hon. minister. There should be no question that what is necessary to human life should certainly be our highest priority.

In this connection, we have a number of towns in east-central Alberta that use surface water for their domestic supply. This water is impounded in dams; the water is then treated with various chemicals, including chlorine, before being released for human consumption. And I might say that we live in constant fear year after year that there will not be sufficient run-off water to replenish the previous year's consumption. Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, this particular year we had an abundance of snow and from the information that I have been able to receive we had little or no run-off this year. And yet when I came up, a matter of six weeks ago, we had an abundance of snow in the area and yet this particular year we had little or no run-off in our dams or dug-outs.

This is one of the reasons that we feel that there is a great need for water in our area. I should also say that our people have been waiting for many years for some type of development in east-central Alberta. I recognize that we've had many proposals over a number of years. One of these proposals was known as PRIMP, Prairie Rivers Improvement Management Evaluation. I also recognize that the new government has indicated that they are not prepared to proceed with PRIME. However, I was very pleased when the hon. minister in his talk yesterday referred to an agreement that has been reached between the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, I believe, to apportion certain waters for use in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. I fully recognize that water flows into Saskatchewan and Manitoba from the Province of Alberta and I also understand that for many years that there has been a portion of water which has been allotted from the Red Deer, and I really hope that the new government has indicated, although it's not prepared to proceed with PRIME, I trust that we have reserved allotment of water from the Red Deer for the use of our people.

Mr. Chairman, as I stand in my place tonight I speak for the residents in central Alberta, recognizing that we do have a deficiency in water. When we look at all the water that's flowing without restriction to the Arctic and to the Hudson Bay, we certainly recognize that water is available. And all that I'm asking is that we harness part of this water that is going to waste and make it available in east-central Alberta. Here water is urgently needed for domestic and municipal supply, and of course for stock watering which will stabilize the agricultural industry.

I have already mentioned, Mr. Chairman, that it takes many years for our people to recover from the losses they sustain during any particular drought. And I say, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister are we going to sit idly by and wait for another drought before we take some action? We have some of the finest rangeland in western Canada. This grass is of little use unless there is sufficient moisture. Grass and feed are essential to the cattle industry and I think we also recognize that to be successful in the cattle industry you must plan on a long-term basis.

There is also another priority for water, which I don't remember the hon. minister mentioning in his talk yesterday, and I refer to recreation. Now that we have more time for leisure there is an increasing demand for recreation facilities. In the Hanna-Oyen constituency we have a number of places where water has been

28-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

impounded for recreational purposes. I refer to Fox Lake, which is about two miles northwest of Hanna, where the water is impounded and it's serving a very useful purpose. Local organizations and individuals have supplied picnic tables, barbeques and other facilities for the use of the public. And during the summer months many people take advantage of the outdoor recreation facilities in this particular area. We also have the Blood Indian Reservoir about 20 miles south of Youngstown, which has achieved considerable publicity as one of the better fishing areas for rainbow trout.

I should point out that one of the problems we encounter in providing water for recreation is that of evaporation. During a normal summer it is estimated there is a loss of some two feet of water through evaporation, thus it becomes necessary to provide a scheme to supplement water through evaporation.

Mr. Chairman, we have talked for many years about the Red Deer diversion plan. At one time we talked about the Red Deer plan for irrigation. Today we refer to this plan as one for stock watering. We realize that we're far enough north that we do not have sufficient frost-free days for the specialized crops. However we do have a number of small irrigation plots in various parts of the special areas that have been providing feed for a number of years.

So now in summary, I have established the need for diverting water to east-central Alberta. Water is flowing to the Arctic Ocean and to the Hudson Bay which is certainly available. Surely the time has come after all these years of study and, incidentally, study after study, where we can take some positive action and get on with the job of providing water in east-central Alberta where there is a water deficiency. I fully recognize the new government has said they are not going to proceed with PRIME. I now say to the government, if you are not going to proceed with PRIME, have you a better plan for providing water in east-central Alberta where there is a water deficiency?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer briefly to some comments the hon. minister made last year when he was in the opposition. Some of his remarks have bothered me now for a year. These remarks were made on April 1st -- I don't know if there is any particular significance with the date, I don't know whether he was attempting to fool me or not, but it certainly bothered me -- and this being the 13th of April I don't know if it is an unlucky day or not, but I think the hon. minister will remember his remarks last year. It's not my intention to read his very lengthy speech, I think it was about an hour and a half, and I certainly wouldn't be able to read it in any case ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Recycle it!

MR. FRENCH:

But I think the hon. minister will remember he advocated -- maybe I should just read some parts to see what he did say:

"We recognize that the population in Alberta is moving north and moving very rapidly in a northern direction. As a matter of fact the geographical centre is now, I believe, some 30 miles south of Edmonton. There is little doubt that the people must be moved to run the wheels of industry, which must be located geographically where it enjoys the maximum of advantages."

Do I hear somebody saying "agreed"?

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-55

AN HON. MEMBER:

I disagree.

MP. FRENCH:

Oh, well then, I will be able to continue. Then the hon. member at the time, the hon. minister today, went on to say:

"There is little doubt the people must be moved to run the wheels of industry, which must be located geographically where it enjoys the maximum advantages. Southern Alberta need concentrate on the type of industrial base which is not necessarily tied to massive water requirements like steel production in the north."

Now I could go on and on, Mr. Chairman, but it is not my intention to do so, except that I have always attempted to represent . . .

AN. HON. MEMBER:

Go ahead and read it.

MP. FRENCH:

If the hon. members would like me to read it I would be prepared to read the whole hour and a half, but what has bothered me is that I have always attempted to represent the people of my constituency. I feel I know these people, and this bothers me when the hon. minister is informing me that to solve our problem of a water deficiency in east-central Alberta that we now must move the people from the south to the north. I well recall in 1935 and 1936, 1937, and 1938, after a period of dry conditions in east-central Alberta, that it was necessary to move many of the people from our area to northern Alberta, where many of them live today.

So I would like the hon. minister to confirm he has changed his opinion as to the remarks he made about a year ago and confirm these statements because really, as far as our people are concerned, they are quite happy to live in east-central Alberta; they are quite happy to remain, and I am sure if we are not able to provide water for them I think it is going to be a disservice to ask these people to move from, say, southern Alberta to northern Alberta. Looking at the map -- I picked a little place on the map tonight -- and I would like to refer to Keg River. And I am just wondering if we are now going to have to ask our people to move from our area up to Keg River in case we can't get some water to provide for the water deficiencies in east-central Alberta. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HARLE:

I share with the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen the concern regarding water in east-central Alberta. Apparently it is a subject which hasn't received too much attention in the past and yet I think it is of great importance to the agricultural area. The Stettler constituency which I represent happens to have at its southern end, part of the country which is familiar to the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if we couldn't think in terms of an inventory of water in this area. An inventory of water which is not flowing and yet which is tremendously important to the stock-carrying capacity of this particular area. When I think of the various schemes which have been attempted by the farmers in this particular area to try to improve the situation with regard to irrigating flood areas for pasture and being able to drain the water off these areas, it seems that the individual farmers are not able to look after the various matters which are needed in order to have a successful scheme. PFRA will in fact spend money on the engineering of the

28-56

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

scheme, but my experience tends to show that PFRA are only involved in the matter of engineering and the physical work of developing dams, developing floodways, and yet most of the waters in these particular areas happen to flow in fairly well-defined channels, and they invariably affect downstream, if you like, owners. And in this area it virtually becomes impossible for individual farmers and ranchers to develop schemes which will in fact encourage hay and pasture requirements.

There is also in my area a noticeable increase in the development of bush land which apparently has extended from the wooded areas. Buffalo Lake happens to be, I think historically, on the edge of what was in the early days, the wooded country. And the Metis and the Indian people would arrive at Buffalo Lake and Tail Creek and there was a settlement in the early days of some 2,000 people in this area. And I understand that they went out from there to hunt the buffalo. If that was the case, then the area immediately east and south of Buffalo Lake was an area that did not have very much in the way of trees. Such is not the case today. There has been an expansion south and east of bush from the area of Buffalo Lake. And because now we have the machinery in order to cut this brush, we have seen over the past two, three and five years, this area has been almost denuded of bush and broken up. And what will happen when we reach these dry periods that are being referred to by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen? I think we need some control of bush clearing and some method whereby we can encourage brush patches in order to stop soil drifting and greater evaporation of water. The development of the Red Deer River diversion is extremely important in my area, especially as it affects Buffalo Lake, and the question is, is that development to be for recreational purposes or for irrigation? I hope that it will be developed for recreational purposes and for the purposes of the environment of the area, because I don't think our soils sufficient, in sufficient acreage, to justify an irrigation scheme.

And what is to happen to Sullivan Lake and these other areas, of natural water areas which are developed by water from a large area eventually seeping down and creating lakes? It doesn't drain into anything else. So this is an area which is really recreation for the ducks and geese in the flyway from northern Canada down to the south at certain times of the year. I also will be extremely interested in what plans and what future plans the department will have regarding the Red Deer diversion and Buffalo Lake. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Chairman, my constituency is another of the rural constituencies, and you might describe it as the "Wide Open Spaces". Truly it is the land of elbow room. The largest town has a population of under 1,100. There is little danger of smog in my constituency, and if you hate smog you might try moving to Coronation, Consort, Alliance, or even Loughheed. These are towns in my constituency. Once in awhile you see a big black smoke coming from an oilfield off in the distance, but even this is quite rare nowadays. On occasion smoke from a major forest fire in the north will come drifting down, but in a few days it is gone and it really doesn't cause too much discomfort. Our towns complain quite a lot about feedlots bordering their centres and sometimes if the wind is blowing just right you get a whiff of the feedlots. Cut our way we refer to this as the "green smell" because cattle means the green stuff that goes into your hip pocket. You cannot have cattle without the odours which are connected with them.

Noise is not a problem in our constituency. In fact, there are noises that I would love to hear again. I would love to hear the sound of the coyote, but the poison bait and the Ski-doo's have taken care of this note. Missing is the sound of the steam engine; our new diesel engines have a much more sophisticated sound, but they don't

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-57

seem to move the grain any faster. And of course, the neighing of the horses in the field -- I am not interested in returning to the horse and buggy days, however many of these very beautiful sounds have been replaced. I do sympathize with the urban people as far as the noise is concerned. It is true, on the farm we go to bed feeling tired, but we wake up feeling fine. In the city you go to bed feeling fine, but you wake up feeling tired. I am sure that it is the noise that is doing it. I have been up here for the session for five or six weeks, and it is noise all day and most of the night. I can surely understand people from the city moving out to small acreages. They are doing it because of the noise. I am sure it is not for taxes because I don't believe the taxes in Edmonton are that high. I vote for a short session because of the noise, Mr. Chairman.

I do see a problem on the horizon in our rural constituencies. We have dozens of feedlots and many of these are situated on the banks of the Battle River and on other creeks and streams. Pollution control from feedlots requires a system which prevents feedlot runoffs from entering watercourses or streams, or treats the waste before releasing it to the stream, or returns the waste to the land, or a combination of these methods. Sooner or later, we will be looking at feedlot pollution legislation. The intercepting, transporting, impounding, and disposing of surface runoff from livestock feedlots is facing us in the near future.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I have spoken for close to five minutes and I think that is sufficient. Thank you.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, in rising to take part in the debate on the remarks made by the hon. minister -- they say here I have three minutes so I am not going to take too long -- I would like to say though that I appreciated his general remarks, the outline that he has given. I was rather interested to look in the first report of the Department of the Environment, and I would like to quote from it. "To the best of our knowledge, it was the first Department of the Environment in Canada and therefore it is an honour to submit to you its first Annual Report." I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is an indication of the leadership given by the Social Credit government in this field. Another thing I would like to commend on the Annual Report is that it's an annual report. It's for the year ending December 31, 1971, as is the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture. We've received another report, I think Lands and Forests, but by the time that we've received it, it's already one year old, so I commend them for this.

Now during the discussion of the minister, he mentioned something about growing pains, about being cranky at times, sometimes off base. And I was happy to see today that he supplied us with figures that corrected impressions that were left earlier in the session relative to some of the expenditures. There was one thing, though, that he didn't do and I hope he will do it a little later. I think that I asked for the beneficial aspects created by the money put into the two projects.

Now certainly in taking over the Department of the Environment, I compare this much as the watching of the construction of the new Court House in Edmonton. There was a long time there you didn't see too much. The foundation was being laid. And as the building came up -- and for this particular Court House -- it goes out all ways and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the legislative process that has taken place over the last two years has laid the foundation for what the Department of the Environment can do. And certainly in this umbrella, and in working with other departments rather than taking everything into that department, it can serve a very useful purpose and certainly the department will have a very important part to play in the life of Alberta and Albertans, yes, and western Canada and on

28-58

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

a national basis. I would submit that the work of the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers which it was previously known as, and now changed to Environmental Ministers, I believe, also have an important part. Now legislation provided for the Environment Conservation Authority by the Social Credit government, and certainly in the hearings held by this authority, there was provision for much public participation. I think this is good, and I hope that he carries this on.

Then we follow with The Department of the Environment Act. This Mr. Chairman, was based in consultation as a result of some of the things that went on in The Canada Water Act. I suggest that The Water Resources Act that we were going to have rewritten here was delayed because of The Canada Water Act and the implications from that. Legislation is already provided for The Clean Air Act, The Clean Water Act, The Water Resources Act, of course, the Alberta Environment Research Trust, and others. So I submit that the foundation, and a good foundation, has been laid by the Social Credit government, and that the minister now has the opportunity to work and build on this for the benefit of us all.

I'm not going to say too much more about what the minister said. I'm sure that the contributions by hon. members on both sides of the Assembly have been very interesting, and I'm sure the hon. minister has taken them in and listened to them for further discussion.

I'm rather interested in the words, 'new directions' and 'new thrust'. And I suppose being one who has worked with motors, I trust the bearings don't burn out. Also, the minister referred to smoke regulations to follow Ontario's lead for certified smoke readers. I hope they don't follow Ontario's lead when it comes to deficit financing. I would like to also acknowledge my appreciation to the minister that he acknowledged in his talk that there was good done in the past. Certainly the field of co-operation with Saskatchewan, with Manitoba, and the agreements on the distribution of water, the sharing of water and the Water Resources Division agreements are relatively good. I'd like to point out to the minister that I hope he comes down sometime to see the work that was done by the Water Resources Division, with the Ribstone Flats Projects Association in my area. Certainly there's room for more work in that area, but to date, there's been a lot of good work done there. I was also interested in his comment that the intentions were good, but they were misguided. Might I just suggest that it isn't what's proposed that counts, it's what's actually done, and we will be watching that with a great deal of interest.

I do have one concern, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to express at this time, and that is that as far as I understood the Department of the Environment was one that worked with other departments in the areas that were of vital interest to the departments. I'm referring to the transfer of The Agricultural Chemicals Act to the Department of the Environment. I feel that this should have been left with the Department of Agriculture and that those committees that were established in the future could certainly see that the working of The Agriculture Chemicals Act could complement the work of the Department of the Environment. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I just want to intimate that I intend to follow the estimates closely and what happens after that. Thank you.

MR. HENDERSON:

I would like to make a few brief comments, Mr. Chairman. May I first say that I have some rather partisan advice I want to give the minister, but I will reserve that for another occasion. I can't resist pointing out that so far as the minister's comments about misguided decisions of the past government, I hope that the minister, if his political career lasts long enough, still has the same

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-59

feelings of infallibility ten years from now on this particular subject.

Really, Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to get into a partisan exercise on it but I think it would be fitting in this particular Legislature, now that the election is behind us, that somebody should, I feel, pay a word of tribute to the works that Dr. J. Donovan Ross did in this particular area over the years. When Dr. Ross, who no longer sits in this House, became concerned about this problem, a great many people -- and this goes back many years in this province -- thought that he was a little bit of a crackpot. I think it can be truthfully said, Mr. Chairman, that because of the convictions of Dr. J. Donovan Ross, Alberta does enjoy a much better position in this regard insofar as foresight in pollution management is concerned.

I would be the first to admit there remains much to be done; there is a lot of room for improvement. But I don't think anyone with any particular degree of objectivity could really suggest in sincerity that the problem was ignored by the previous administration. I certainly, personally, don't make any claims to having made any other significant contributions other than for initiating the establishment of the department that the hon. minister now is in charge of.

There are a number of items that came to my attention, Mr. Chairman, during the brief time I was minister of the new department, on which I would like to comment. I think they are matters that the government should be looking to so far as public policy is concerned. I notice, for example, the hon. minister made the suggestion that the government was looking at providing some form of financial assistance for municipalities on sewage disposal.

I realize the municipalities put a lot of pressure on government for financial assistance. I would sincerely hope, and I am sure the hon. minister and the new government will look very closely at this issue before they yield to those pressures. In my mind, were the government unnecessarily -- and it is difficult to judge where necessity comes in -- but were the government unnecessarily to come up with a program of provincially sharing in the costs of pollution control measures because of pressure by some of the larger municipalities -- in my brief experience -- the bigger the city, the bigger the political pressure, and the less the taxpayers in the big communities figure they should be paying for the cost of these services.

I personally have no sympathy, regardless which side of the House I sit on, for the views of some of the municipalities in basically trying to avoid their own responsibilities. The responsibility as far as sewage treatment is concerned, is locally created. When one starts using provincial funds to finance these services on a province-wide basis, unless the province does all of it, in my mind, all they do is encourage the local authority to sit on their hands and do nothing, and apply the political pressure in hopes that the politicians in this Assembly will be forced in to take the political lumps for collecting the taxes to do their homework.

While this is part of the political game, I don't think it really encourages the local authorities to face up to responsibilities which are basically within their jurisdiction. It may well be, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to the question of tertiary sewage treatment and the extreme costs that are involved there, that some form of provincial financial assistance other than direct participation, other than just financing, is now the case, may be justified.

But even there, I wonder whether the province should move too hastily in this direction. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, when the

28-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

question of decentralization of industry throughout the province, I think experience has proven that simply trying to use taxation measures as a basis for doing this, just won't work. I think it is bad enough when it is applied nationally with so many contradictions that the federal government has created with using tax incentives in selected areas to promote industry, let alone trying to talk about applying such a principle locally. I just don't think it's going to sell in Red Deer, for example, if the government should decide in order to make it more attractive to move industry to Vegreville or wherever you want to name, that they are going to grant special tax concessions in that direction. I just don't see it working because I think basically our province is too small a community.

But I do think, Mr. Chairman, that in this area of environmental control that the government does have the weapon that it needs indirectly, to bring about the same objective without tinkering with the tax structure. Whether it is the air or the water or the land in any given area, of course the pollution relates to an over abundance or an excessive concentration of a given material in that particular vicinity. This is why we have the problems with the air in our larger centres. So I see the problem of pollution control and the measures that can be applied there to maintain adequate environmental standards, as a very powerful indirect tool to bring about the decentralization where such de-centralization is possible. This isn't always possible, because in most cases we're a resource-based province, and industry goes where the resource is. You don't develop an oilfield in Rainbow Lake; if it is there, you find it there, you have to build the gas lines there, so there are limitations in this.

But the one gets into the field of secondary manufacturing where there is any pollution potential. I feel that in this area of pollution control regulation, which can be applied across the board without discrimination, but just the bare physical factors involved, will encourage municipalities to move elsewhere, to de-centralize. For example, if somebody came along and wanted to build a pulp mill on the North Saskatchewan River near Edmonton, there's no question about it, the cost of pollution control measures on the river would be far more severe in order to maintain the quality of this river than it happens to be in building the comparable plant for example, up in the Grande Prairie area, because the system in the North Saskatchewan is already heavily loaded. It only has a limited capability.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, there is a very potent weapon, politically and economically in this area of pollution control management through which government, as a matter of policy can achieve de-centralization of industry within certain limitations. But, it's still there, the possibility is there. In my mind, this provides a far more logical way of achieving the government's announced intentions, and I don't disagree with the objectives, although I have some scepticism as to how they're going to accomplish it. I'd like to suggest, and help them along, and I think this is one tool that can be used far more effectively with far fewer political pitfalls and with a far greater degree of public acceptance than the question of tinkering with the tax structure within the province.

Now, this is going to be hard on the established centers if one pursues it, but again, the government today has announced its intentions of trying to level off or slow up the rate of centralization in our one or two or three large communities in the province. We hope that, Mr. Chairman, the government, before they rush into any program, which involves direct financial participation in sewage treatment facilities in the municipalities, and I realize the pressures that are there to do this, that they will look very closely at the basic principles involved before they make any decisions in this regard.

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-61

Another subject I'd like to comment on, Mr. Chairman, is the question of water user charges. I must confess that not too many years ago, I wasn't particularly unamenable to the suggestion. But, when one looks at the demands that are going to be placed on our water resources in the province, and the financial situation that all levels of government find themselves in, if we are going to carry out the programs which I think are in the public interest, there has to be some revenues forthcoming to finance this. I personally cannot see how it can be avoided much longer, the question of water user finance charges. And, it was this conviction that led me in the case of Cold Lake, which hopefully will improve the water supply for the City of Wetaskiwin to try to set a precedent in making such an arrangement with the municipality that some contribution would be required. I felt very strongly when I tackled the thing in my own constituency while I was minister that no one could accuse me of favoritism or not being prepared to face the realities of the situation.

I am convinced on the basis of that small exercise that the principle is acceptable, and I also suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the government needs some sort of a filtering device to screen out the frivolous requests, because the way it is now, the provincial government pays the full cost - the sky's the limit - let's pump water here, let's pump water there, let's dig drainage ditches this way and that way. And without any local financial participation why not have it everybody's getting into the act, it's the same thing as hospitals and nursing homes - it's a good deal, if they get one, we want one and on the argument goes. I think some form of local contribution on a capital basis as well as nominal usage charges will help to put the matter in its proper perspective with the local politicians as to how badly their community really needs these particular services - their needs to improve and expand.

I also would like to comment on a third subject, Mr. Chairman, and that's the question of engineering studies that are carried out within the departments for the municipalities. Shortly after we set up the new department I had a two or three day meeting with all the senior staff -- people from around the province -- and listened to their presentations as to all the projects they had under way, all the studies they had under way, and what they saw their problems were throughout the province. It came through to me very loud and clear that within the water resources division there was enough engineering studies done and work done in the province, to keep capital programs going for ten years without spending another nickel on local water studies. Part of the problem comes back to local participation because at the present time the cost of engineering service to the local authority from the division are not chargeable and are not shareable with the local authorities. So it's an extremely easy thing to ask the water resources division of the provincial government to do a survey on this and do a survey on that. Of course the engineers are just like any other creatures when they can find things to delve into and what not they have an unlimited capability to absorb public funds. But I'm convinced of two things, Mr. Chairman, relating to the new department that the government policy in this area should be re-examined and I think it's in the public interest to re-examine it. I feel the cost of engineering services that are provided to the municipalities -- and I must say in my own mind -- even within the irrigation business -- I think there should be some element of local contribution for the engineering end of it, for the capital end of it and for the operational end of it.

The last subject on which I would like to comment, Mr. Chairman, concerns the future of the development of the hydro potential on the Peace River, notwithstanding the exercise that we went through within the last year or so on this subject. I don't think anyone can deny the tremendous potential that exists for hydro on the Peace River. There are engineering problems that will have to be resolved, but when one realizes that -- I've forgotten the figure, but it's well

28-62

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

over half of the water in Alberta, it's a higher figure than that -- maybe the hon. minister recalls it -- flows through the Peace River, somewhere around 80%. There is a tremendous potential on the Peace River for hydro and I think that for two reasons the government should actively pursue this development and I don't want to get into an argument over the means of pursuing it, but in principle it should be pursued. Because if the government of the day is dedicated to a policy of decentralization of industry, one thing very clearly that I think will help achieve this and make northern Alberta more attractive for industrial development is a source of cheap power. I can't say how cheap it would be, but certainly the Peace River does offer a significant hydro potential.

I think there's a second reason. We hear a lot of talk about conservation of our natural resources, our oil, gas and coal. I can't be personally concerned in my life time or within the next two or three decades about oil and coal in the province, because of the tar sands and substantial coal deposits. There's a lot of pressure being placed on gas reserves, and there's a lot of pressure to use natural gas within the province for power generation because it's a cleaner fuel and less source of pollution. But it still can't stand up to the benefits of hydro, which are a renewable resource, it's a non-polluting resource and while there are some environmental changes forthcoming from it, but I don't think anyone in his right mind could call it pollution. And for my money, the environment in that sense, so far as the ecology of a river, they are changing continuously anyhow, including the Athabasca Delta. So I would hope that part of the studies that the department will be placing a high priority on is to determine as precisely as possible what the hydro potential of the Peace River is, and certainly this one main site that the hon. minister is aware of north of Lake Athabasca has some real attractions, particularly as far as northern development is concerned. With that, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes, Mr. Farran?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, well, well, to coin a word from the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I would like to say a few words in rebuttal. One of the reasons I ran for provincial office was that I thought many of the problems we face on a local government level could only be solved on the higher level of the senior government. Another consideration that inspired me to do this was that I thought the previous government had a basic philosophy that they could control the so-called escalating costs by what they thought was local accountability. In other words, they put an arbitrary restriction on provincial contributions to programs to help people, leaving the large balance to the lot of the local government, thinking that the local government, with its very inadequate base of property tax, would be bound, therefore, to control the escalating costs. And I can see where this philosophy came from. It came from the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc. Local accountability -- let them pay ...

MR. HENDERSON:

I really can't take credit for it, I was minister of the department for about four months. So I really must decline the -- while I support it I can't really take the credit for it ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Thank goodness for that!

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-63

MR. FARRAN:

He said no direct grants for sewage treatment plants. No, let the local government pay and then perhaps they won't ask for these plants so often -- they won't want their secondary treatment plants or the tertiary treatment plants because they can't afford it. He said no direct grants -- let them look after their own backhouse -- that was the words of the last government. Let them pay for it themselves, and yet these are the people that contribute to provincial revenue.

MR. HENDERSON:

It's your toilet!

MR. FARRAN:

Your toilet! What do you do, do you have a special one up here in Edmonton? Well, I don't believe the people of Alberta will accept this, that everything has to be paid through property tax. I believe that sewage disposal is properly a problem for the whole province, for all the people of the province, and to say there should be no direct grants ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Miller -- do you have a question?

MR. D. MILLER:

Yes, I wonder if the hon. member would entertain a question?

MR. FARRAN:

Not for a moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Just wait then.

MR. FARRAN:

I'll give it to you in a minute. I'm just getting onto this philosophy of let 'em look after their own backhouse.

No direct grants, well, if you don't believe the local governments are in the same swim and on the same team as the provincial government then you've got no right to be here. The provincial revenue should be part of the same pot. The responsibilities for all the people of Alberta should be part of the same pot -- you should split them down the middle -- say, "these responsibilities and these revenues will be allotted to local government; these responsibilities and these revenues allotted to the provincial government." But to think of them as two antagonistic governments is completely wrong and this is why the people were turned off with this sort of attitude. No direct grants for sewage disposal. Well, the people of Lethbridge won't buy that; the people of Cochrane won't buy that; the people of Calgary won't buy it; nobody in the province will buy it.

Do we give them too much? If you give them too much they will spend too much. You don't regard them as grownups at all. Father knows best because he sits up here in Edmonton. It's wrong, basically wrong in principle. Now I'll entertain the question.

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you. How much, hon. member, do you think the Town of Taber should pay for the sewerage from Lethbridge for the last 50 years?

28-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

MR. FAREAN:

Well I know the City of Lethbridge has had a problem with the high cost of a sewage disposal plant and they should have had some assistance from the last government.

MR. HENDERSON:

Since the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill made some comments, and I think this is a legitimate subject for debate and I appreciate his sentiments, but I would only say, that one remark I don't appreciate I don't think it's any prerogative for the hon. Member for North Hill to decide whether I have the right to sit in here, I think that is my constituents' right. But beyond that, I accept the fact that it is a legitimate subject for debate. But I reject the suggestion that property taxes carry it, because in most places user taxes are carrying it. This is a user charge and if Calgary chooses to finance it through property, that is their way of doing it, but the majority of communities, they finance out of user charges, the ones that are using it are paying for it, and I cannot accept the philosophy...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down, Henderson!

MR. HENDERSON:

...that the farmer living out in the rural areas or the people in the small towns or villages that have paid to put the facilities in themselves have two bits worth of responsibility to clean up a mess that the citizens of Calgary created and the City of Lethbridge. And as a member in the House from Lethbridge, when I was the minister, came in and said: "why should we clean the mess up? We've finished with the water, we don't need it." And quite frankly I have no sympathy for the expenses in the City of Calgary. The City of Calgary got into the bind they are in because they kept procrastinating and procrastinating, and when one looks at the investment that the citizens of Calgary have as compared to the citizens of Edmonton on a per capita basis, they are roughly the same. But Edmonton, because it started years ago, ends up with a much more return on its money than the City of Calgary, and when a Calgary city politician stands up and says it's horrible to expect the citizens of Calgary to clean up the effluent from their own toilet, I as a taxpayer, and the community I live in, have had to pay up there, and the farmer who has to pay to put his own cesspools and all these facilities in, I suggest that the principle isn't sound....

MR. COCKSON:

What's the question?

MR. HENDERSON:

It isn't a question -- I said I was going to offer a comment. It's a debate. And so I appreciate the fact the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill is entitled to his opinion. I can see why he feels so strongly about it having been a party to those that procrastinated on the subject. But I think it's a very fitting subject for debate as a matter of public policy -- indeed it is -- but for the Government of the Province of Alberta to use provincial funds to pay for responsibilities that should be paid by the user citizens in the community that use the facilities, I still suggest is unsound, because it encourages the municipality to do nothing until the problem gets bad enough that the provincial government and the provincial politicians will collect the money to do their work for them and take the public liabilities that go with it.

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-65

MR. FARRAN:

Well, Mr. Chairman, let me say that that sort of attitude, the Cities of Calgary and Edmonton, have a legitimate case for saying, "let us be autonomists, what does the province do for us anyway? We've got 60 or 70% of the people -- you go and leave us." It cost the City of Calgary \$17 million...

MR. HENDERSON:

That's peanuts.

MR. FARRAN:

It isn't peanuts! While you boasted...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder if these two gentlemen would complete their debate to permit the hon. minister to...go ahead.

MR. FARRAN:

The Cities of Calgary and Edmonton have the highest debt load of any cities in Canada, they have a very high level of property tax. The benefits have just not been passed on to the people. And if you don't believe that the province has any business in contributing to a people thing like sewage disposal, saying that it should be on a user basis, what are you going to do -- measure it by the ton? Put a gauge on the toilet?

MR. HENDERSON:

That's a real progressive attitude.

MRS. CHICHAK:

I think I'll act as a catalyst in sweetening the air a bit here.

I think it is with humour that we can listen to the debate that has been going on this evening, but also with some interest. I'll not review the many areas of the Department of the Environment that have been dealt with and commented on yesterday and today. But there is an area that I'd like to draw some attention to and express my view.

In reading the report of the Environment Conservation Authority and the department, I think we have to agree that perhaps this is one of the finest reports because of the direction which the government intends to take in the area of environment. I noted with interest the priorities that have been set with respect to water in the province and its usages, and particularly I want to draw attention to the last point that was set in priorities, and that is "other uses." I think that the term "other uses" is very broad and many interpretations can be applied to it. But in that term of "other uses" there might also be construed the sale or exportation of our water. No doubt, as we have heard in the past years and currently here, there are some experts of the opinion that water is of great abundance and that a very small percentage will be used and is being used, and that certainly we can count dollars with respect to what we can gain out of the sale of water. I wonder if it is only the dollars that need to be counted here, or whether the future, the increase in population, the development of the entire province, the areas that require so much irrigation, whether these should not take precedence over the dollars. And so I just want to bring attention to our hon. minister -- and I am certain that he has had this in mind -- but in any event that he consider whether some type of legislation can be brought about that future governments, or over-zealous

28-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

authority people, do not turn the tables, where in the future they may consider that we can indeed sell water and that the dollar be the almighty ruling hand. This is the point I just would like to draw to the attention of our hon. minister, and perhaps he can make some comment in that area. Thank you.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in particular, as far as pollution of industry is concerned, in the industrial field; I should say, because I do represent a constituency that has a very high ratio of industry in it. However, I can't get up on my feet without answering my hon. friend for Calgary North Hill. He may be surprised because I am going to give him a little credit in the fact that I feel our City of Calgary was in the forefront, whoever paid for it, in the pollution and in the cleaning up of, in particular, of the sewage system within our city. We brought it to a second stage -- as required under the law -- a lot sooner than many other places throughout the province. Of course, we did get a lot of assistance from the federal government as well with a write-off of certain loans they gave us in our city.

But I don't agree with the hon. member when he talks about this government not being interested in this type of assistance, because there is no province in Canada that started earlier than the former government did in the field of modern sewage and water systems within our province. We had a more diversified and greater system throughout our province than in any other place in Canada at a much earlier date. It was done through the encouragement of loans and grants to our municipalities in the early days, and I am pleased to say that the present government is going to carry on a similar program.

One thing I would like to point out -- and it was brought up earlier today -- is that I feel that the former government did a lot towards ensuring the growth of the great capital City of Edmonton. We heard a lot about the talk of the money they loaned to Calgary Power, but basically -- and I am sure the hon. Minister of the Environment will be the first to agree with me -- that basically the Big Horn Dam and the Brazeau Dam were for the control of water which helped the City of Edmonton with its low river flow during winter months.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to add something to that. Whereas it helped the City of Edmonton in connection with sewage control because of river base and management, it nevertheless also helped Calgary to get much lower power rates and maintain low power rates. Because one of the largest blocs of power that is used from Calgary Power in the province, in fact, is in the City of Calgary.

MR. HENDERSON:

Agreed.

MR. DIXON:

I am pleased to hear the hon. minister say that because it is a double blessing. I am not against any assistance. All I am trying to point out is, in contradiction to what the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill was saying, that the government -- the former government that is -- wasn't interested in assisting our larger cities in pollution control as far as the sewage is concerned. I can remember well in this House a few years ago residents of the City of North Battleford were here with samples of the terrible water conditions down the river from Edmonton prior to the former government going into an agreement with Calgary Power to ensure that Edmonton does

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-67

have a good flow of water through our City of Edmonton. And I'm pleased that it happened and I give full credit to whoever thought of the idea.

However, Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned, I really got up on my feet to speak basically of my concern and the growing concern of some people, in particular those in industry, of government's over-reacting to pollution control. And as I mentioned, in my particular constituency of Calgary-Millican, it has the greatest concentration of labour intensive industry in Alberta. Packing houses and fertilizer plants, foundries, steel plants, and one in particular I'd like to speak about is our rendering plants that we have in our City of Calgary. They have become larger because the public are demanding a lot more boneless meat than they used to order; they're asking for leaner, fat-free meat which means a greater amount of the by-products of the meat industry will be rendered, and so that is one industry that does cause a great deal of concern within my own constituency, and in particular, in the community in my constituency known as the Ogden-Millican area.

As I mentioned earlier in the House, I congratulated the minister for the co-operation that he has given us in this area, and I'm sure with the co-operation of the industry and of government and of the people concerned, we will be able to meet this problem. Of course, we won't know for sure whether it is completely controlled until the warm weather arrives, because that is the time when meat plants are the hardest to control -- with the warm weather and the still air in the summer evenings. However, as I mentioned, I give credit where credit is due. The minister knows of the situation, and the company is doing everything in co-operation with the minister's department to overcome this.

I'd like to speak for just a moment of the concern I mentioned earlier, that both the federal and provincial governments naturally are anxious to set standards for industry to carry out as far as pollution is concerned. These costs will naturally end up being paid for by the consumer. There will be suggestions and temptations, too, by governments for subsidization of pollution abatement. Now, this scheme, however, would transfer the cost of abatement from the ultimate resource user to the taxpayer, and I wonder whether that is a sound situation, regardless of the extent to which he patronizes the polluting industries. This scheme will reward some industries and the people concerned for doing what many of them would have done anyway. They also tend to discourage the search for more effective methods of tackling the problem, and all I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that any assistance that we may give should be well thought out so that we don't encourage industries who aren't as interested in pollution control as those who have already done a good job. We shouldn't, in other words, let them be lax on the job of pollution control.

The philosophy that the polluter can pay and pass on the cost to the consumer is a very important subject I'd like to touch on. However, this particular philosophy betrays a dangerous misunderstanding of the competitive realities of the marketplace. Manufacturers in Alberta and the rest of Canada are faced with a wide range of products being imported into Canada from overseas at prices below those of Canadian manufacturers. Therefore, it is not always possible for Canadian manufacturers to raise their prices in order to recover the increased costs by governments forcing increased pollution controls far above those enforced on the industries that are exporting to our country.

As I stated earlier, the government's primary responsibility is to mobilize the fight against pollution, measure its extent and set standards, determine how those standards might be enforced most economically and ensure that they are enforced. Government cost should involve itself in research programs and the heavy capital

28-68

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

expenditures for clean-up in the public sector. This is what we were talking about in the earlier part of my talk -- clean-up as far as our sewage programs are concerned, as they affect our rivers in Alberta.

An oversell on pollution control can bring on a backlash from the public in such a situation. The issue I speak about, of course, is the jobs versus pollution control. The other day when the hon. minister was speaking in the House, I couldn't see the logic in his argument that he was trying to tell the House that there have been more jobs created by pollution control than have been lost by pollution control. Perhaps he would enlarge a bit on that for my benefit. I just couldn't see his logic. Maybe I am wrong and maybe he is right.

MR. YURKO:

Maybe you are wrong.

MR. DIXON:

I think I understood him correctly, but maybe I didn't. But I notice he did make a mistake in the Canmore job situation because he said they were all going to be employed -- although he denied it today -- they were all going to be employed in the strip mine on reclamation . . .

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, I can't accept that because I think he should read the record on what I said, hon. member. I think he had better read it very carefully.

MR. DIXON:

I will read it very carefully. I have an order in for the Hansard, but it hasn't come to my desk yet. In any case, it is insignificant you and I arguing about it. I think the greatest concern we both have is to get them back on the job, either in the reclamation area or in the actual mining itself.

We have heard a lot tonight about the export of water. The argument I heard from this side of the House, was for the new government to take an active program in diverting water from the northern part of our province to the eastern part of the province, in the area where we can increase production to a great extent by the use of water that is really not being used at the present time in our northern areas.

There has been some talk in this House, too, about being opposed to the export of water. I wonder sometimes, if we shouldn't consider looking at our power situation, and maybe building a plant earlier than when we need it, and use some of our water and export the electricity if we are not going to export the water. In that way, we can recuperate some of the capital costs of the power dam, so that when we do need the power in Alberta, the consumers of Alberta will be afforded a cheaper rate, because a lot of the capital cost will have been paid by other people than Albertans if we have these plants built ahead of time.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I do want to say, in my own constituency of Calgary and in the industry in particular, we are most anxious to co-operate with the hon. minister and his government in pollution control. At the same time, I can't think of a situation that needs more commonsense applied to it than the rules as they apply to pollution. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-69

MR. FENOIT:

Mr. Chairman, just a couple of observations and a question that I would like to ask the hon. minister. First of all, I would like to say that while I know that some hon. members in the House don't always appreciate the hon. Minister of the Environment's philosophy and his philosophical approach, I, for one, do. And I can't think of any department in the government that needs a person with a philosophical approach any more than the Department of the Environment does.

I would like some time to talk to the hon. minister in private for a while about his philosophy of the primary source of pollution, and the need for environmental control of the source of pollution as well, because I believe firmly, that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

I have one thought that I want to express, and that has to do with drilling operations. Both the drilling operations in conjunction with water wells, and that of the seismic operators. In our legislation we have very little by way of control for water well drillers. This has been a problem that hasn't been too easy to deal with. What controls there are are mostly under regulations, with little or no provisions for control or penalties for people who violate the regulations. It leaves almost totally unprotected the people who call in water well drillers. If they happen to be unscrupulous types, they can do things that are quite injurious to our environment and our health. For that reason, I hope that the Department of the Environment, through the Water Resources Division, will take a good close look at our Ground Water Act and other acts similar, that would have control of the water well drillers. I say this because in the area where we live where there are many new subdivisions, and residences going in, there is a lot of water well drilling going on, because this is the only source or supply of water that many of these places have.

The other aspect of the drilling that I'm concerned with is the seismic operations, and while I appreciate that most of these are initiated from the Department of Mines and Minerals, I believe that it is the responsibility of the Department of the Environment, somehow to keep a close surveillance on this, because in the virgin areas the seismic operators have first to cut lines in order to make roads through which they go to operate.

Then, in the areas that are already developed, where the seismic operators go along the roadside, and drill their holes and do their blasting and whatever other type of operation they are concerned with, this is the one that they've used most commonly up to this point. They have a tendency to have quite an adverse effect on the existing water supplies of the peoples in the areas, and again, the more densely populated areas. I believe that we could take a good long look at this whole operation. There was a time when every company had to have its own seismic reports. I think that day has gone by long since, with our sophisticated equipment and method of reporting, I don't think that we need to go up and down the road a half a dozen times by a half a dozen different companies and jeopardize the whole countryside's water supply and leave the ditches full of holes and this sort of thing. I must admit that the operations are being fairly closely watched, but there is still much to be desired. So, with that thought in mind, I'll just leave the ideas I mentioned with the hon. minister because of our concern particularly in our more densely populated area with regard to the various types of drilling.

Now, hon. minister, my concern is how the Department becomes involved with other departments so far as supervising the environmental activities of the other departments. The question is whether the department becomes involved with other departments,

28-70

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

voluntarily and automatically, or whether the other departments have to request the information and the assistance of the Department of the Environment. For instance in the Department of Lands and Forests, if a timber berth is leased or a sawmill permit is granted, this is going to have an effect upon the ecology and the environment of the area. Does the Department of the Environment just automatically come into play and take research and study the impact that it will have on the environment, or does the Department of Lands and Forests have to request the Department of the Environment to enter in?

Likewise, I'm thinking of Highways and Transport. If they have to go into new virgin territory, they will be opening up new lines and lands and they'll have an effect upon the animals, the whole bit. If the Department of Mines and Minerals lets out a prospector's permit for seismic operations somewhere, this can upset the ecology and the environment of the area. Is the department just voluntarily automatically becoming involved each time these things take place or do the other departments have to request the Department of the Environment to come in on this type of thing?

MR. WILSON:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am certainly amused at the comments coming from my hon. friend the Member for Calgary North Hill when he was up boasting about the money that he spent when he was on Calgary's City Council for sewage treatment. He boasted about spending \$17 million, which works out to about \$42.00 per capita and he was proud of that! The City of Lethbridge spent about \$100.00 per capita, and Blairmore about \$105.00, so I don't think that's any great accomplishment.

However, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that there's a great deal to be gained from trying to lay blame in the past. I now think that we should look to the future and try and determine what needs to be done and how best it can be done and how best it may be financed.

I also would like to correct one other statement that was made earlier this evening. Not all of the sewage treatment in Calgary is secondary. The Fish Creek sewage works in Calgary is a primary treatment plant only. I'm just wondering how many of the hon. members know what consists of primary sewage treatment. To begin with there's a rag picker, then there's some settling tanks where the solids sink to the bottom and there's a scum skimmer on the top and then the liquid effluent goes directly into the river with no treatment whatsoever. The solids are fermented, and then they are spread out on gravel beds to dry out and then they are hauled off to the dump with no bacteria in the solids. But the liquid effluent is dumped straight into the river with no treatment whatsoever and I don't think that that is adequate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that there's considerable to be done in sewage treatment standards throughout the province, and considerable to be done in treatment of sewage. I would just like to remind the hon. members on the other side of the House that you are now the government, it is now your responsibility and we're most anxious to know what you plan to do about it.

MR. FARRAN:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. WILSON:

Sure.

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-71

MR. FARRAN:

The question is this - do you feel ashamed that the City of Calgary received no assistance from the last government for sewage disposal? They received a little bit in the form of a 25% forgiveness clause from CMHC on two-thirds of the loan. Do you feel ashamed that the province didn't help them at all?

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, I don't feel ashamed about it at all. If the communities of Lethbridge and Blairmore and the others who put it in at a much higher per capita cost could do the job, then I say the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill should have done a better job when he was on Calgary City Council.

MR. FARRAN:

The City of Lethbridge had to bear this burden - what about the people of Lethbridge? If you don't care about the people of Calgary what about Lethbridge?

MR. WILSON:

I don't hear any complaints.

MR. DIXON:

I just wanted to clarify a point with the hon. Minister of the Environment. I finally got the copy of Hansard I asked for and I won't read all your answer, it's about half way down, this is your statement Mr. Minister;

"However I'm not that concerned about people being laid off because they indicated to me that they are going to be using their entire equipment and supposedly their man power in connection with reclamation of areas that they have now strip mined, so they are going to advance their reclamation procedure."

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, I know exactly what I said, and the word 'supposedly' qualifies what I said. In my discussion with the manager he indicated to me that they were going to use all their equipment on reclamation for reclamation purposes and I suggest to you that I said supposedly the men that ran that equipment will be used in reclamation, but you must recognize that in association with this coal operation there are subsequent jobs associated with loading coal on boxcars and handling it, stockpiling it, and so forth, that has nothing to do with the reclamation. So I just suggest that you read the statement in its full implications.

MR. BARTON:

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the hon. Minister of Environment. We met two months ago on several problems. One was the Lesser Slave Lake problem and I'll go into a little bit longer and detailed explanation of Lesser Slave Lake. It is Alberta's largest lake; it is a very clear lake, I think it is up in the 90% pure -- I'm taking it off the top, I used to know -- but we have 30 odd streams and rivers flow into it with one outlet. We have a diversion which is the Heart River diversion, that's flowing silt, the East and West Prairie, the Driftpile, the Swan are highly fast-moving rivers. They come from altitudes of around 3,000 or 4,000 feet in a very short period of time; they carry a lot of silt. The farmers have been allowed to farm right up to the edge and the banks are falling away. In essence the whole lake -- at certain stages there are, if I can remember the biologists' exact figure -- 20 tons of silt per hour going into the lake.

28-72

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

And there are no major industries, other than the forestry industry and I would like to pass this information on the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. I feel when they let timber berths, or leases, or whatever it is, that they shouldn't be allowed to travel up the tributaries toward the timber. They should be forced to go in in a manner that doesn't affect the water -- they build a road and it washes down, then they build her up again and it gets washed down. I think this is one area we have to look at very closely, that when you are letting timber out you let it out so that there are other means than a watershed to get to it. I think that as it is a large lake, in the proposal we worked out in 1968 and 1969 -- I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs isn't here -- we hoped that we would get around \$2 million on a partnership basis to help clarify some of the problems.

Some of the problems are going to be hard problems for a government to decide, whether they are farmland or whether they should be left aside for recreation or whether they should be left aside for water fowl, because in certain areas, the Buffalo Bay area that is susceptible to flooding, is six feet below the lake level. So regardless of how much irrigation, straightening out or dredging you do, you are not going to solve the problem. I think this government in order to save that lake -- and I say you have got ten years -- there are 52 miles of sand beach and it is one of the nicest recreational packages. There is hunting, fishing, it's unlimited. I don't think there's a lake in Alberta or even in western Canada, other than maybe the Okanagan, which is only two degrees warmer than Lesser Slave Lake in the tourist season. We are going to have to look at this lake now in order to provide a future so that it will survive as a recreational area. They have heard a lot of stories and a lot of promises that the fishing will be maintained and upgraded, but I don't think, with all the biological studies you can do on that lake, you're going to have to look at the fact that it is the silting problem that is causing the whitefish to change their adaptation in food and compete with other sources and, therefore, they are not growing.

I would like to make a little quote from an editorial on July 29, 1972: "Dr. Horner says that all kinds of studies have been made in these areas and action is needed now." And I say that the 'now' government should get down and do some concrete studies. I notice the hon. Minister of Environment said they were looking at all lakes. I would recommend they look at the studies and we would appreciate some action. Thank you.

MR. KING:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to take a somewhat different tack at this particular point in discussing the Department of the Environment.

It seems to me that the Department of the Environment, either in Alberta or in any other jurisdiction, is primarily a palliative. It seems analogous to me to the aspirins which I take when I have a cold that treat the symptoms, which I appreciate very much, and yet do not treat the causes. It seems analogous to me to my memories of my relationship with my mother when I was five or six years old and left my pants, my shirt, my socks, and my shoes at any point in the yard or in the house and she followed around after me and picked them up. I think that the primary concern that many people expressed today, relative to the environment and to many environmental problems, is begging the question.

I'm a layman and I would be interested in the comments of other members of the Assembly, but it seems to me that pollution is a function of the interrelationship between the population, that is the size of the population, and the demands which the population has for energy, the sophistication of those demands, and the rate at which the demands for energy grow. It has been stated that 30% of the

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-73

population of the world annually consumes 90% of the resources which are produced in that year; that the remaining 70% of the world, that is that part of the world which we call the underdeveloped or the developing section, consumes annually 10% of our resources.

The Club of Rome, a group of scientists primarily operating in Europe has only recently published a book entitled "The Limits of Growth". Their method of attack, if such it could be termed, was to take a sophisticated socio-economic model that had been developed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and attempt to postulate as many as possible of the variations that might be achieved in that socio-economic model to see whether or not there was any possible way, in which in the computer use of the model, they could prevent the destruction of the model as it existed. And the conclusion which they arrived at, was that regardless of what might be done by the resources of the intelligence or the material of the human race, by approximately 2220, at which time I would be 75 years old and my son would be 52, there would inevitably be starvation and disease which would be impossible to control, and war as the result of the preceding two factors; --

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is that all?

MR. KING:

I appreciate the assistance -- that the only possible avoidance of this lay, not only in limiting the size of the population of the earth, but in reducing it; that we cannot under any circumstances conceivable hope to give to three billion people, which is the present population of the planet, a standard of living comparable to that which is enjoyed in Western Europe, let alone in Canada or the United States. In other words, it is not China or India which are over-populated, but rather in terms of the demands on resources, it is North America and Western Europe. And I think that if there can be a recognition of this problem, it has to come more from the developed world, more from those areas of the world which are fortunate, than from those areas of the world which, while they have a large population, are sustaining that population on a very small proportion of the total resources of the world. I would like to suggest that if we are considering the question of the environment in any long-term or comprehensive way; if we are desirous of taking the lead in this particular area of concern, there are six specific things which might be done by any provincial government. There are an additional number of things which should be done by the federal government, and I will restrict myself at the present time to making six suggestions for the consideration of a provincial Legislature.

The first is that there should be increased financial aid for families who adopt, including those who adopt children from outside of this jurisdiction or outside of Canada.

The second is that there should be some form of taxation or some form of establishing, in relation to the income tax which is collected in this province, that there would be tax exemptions only for the first child born to a family, not for additional children if they are adopted into the family, but only for one child born naturally to the family.

The third is that there should be compensatory taxation in Alberta to eliminate the benefits of the family allowance.

The fourth is that there should be established, on a comprehensive and widespread basis, family planning clinics throughout the province which would include, as a part of their program, assistance to single people without any discrimination.

28-74

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

The fifth is that the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission should pay for vasectomies and hysterectomies.

The sixth is. . . I am sorry if I offended your sensitivities.

AN HON. MEMBER:

King, you're okay, you don't have to worry. You can still work.

MR. KING:

The sixth suggestion is -- I smile sometimes too, when I hear other people saying this, yet it is something that I think should be very carefully considered -- and the sixth is that I would suggest that such operations should be arbitrarily defined for purposes of income tax returns, as charitable donations. . . [laughter]. . . I am serious. Or alternately that some other form should be discovered and implemented for providing a tax advantage to the people who give free consent to the performance of such operations, say within five years of the time of the performance of the operation.

Those are six things, all of which could be implemented by a provincial Legislature, and all of which I suggest should be seriously considered by any jurisdiction in North America, whether this or any other province or any state or the federal government. If we are indeed serious about what I think is the root cause of many of the symptoms which we spend much time in this Legislature decrying, hoping would go away and indeed legislating for their elimination, not realizing that if indeed we can legislate for the elimination of one of the symptoms, the problem is only going to find expression in some other symptom of the same cause.

It concerns me greatly in this regard that there seems to be a myopic dedication to the concept that improvement is measured solely in terms of quantitative increase, that there is very little attention paid, or at least has been heretofore, to, for example, an increase in the gross national product which is wrought by an improvement in the quality of life of the country, rather than an increase in the quantitative production of the industry of the country. It seems patently clear to me, in spite of my limited knowledge of economics -- or maybe because of it -- that money, time, and other resources spent on removing smog from the air, or on cleaning up rivers or lakes, is as much a contributor to our gross national product, to any other measurement of social welfare that you may care to define, as is an increase of 50,000 units in the production of cars which roll off the assembly line, dedicated to the proposition that they should be ready for the scrap yard in three years, in order that at that time the consumer can purchase another one. I have reached the point in my own personal life, where I am convinced that if I become any bigger physically, it will be to my disadvantage, not my advantage, and I trust, therefore, that if any growth continues to take place in my personality, it will be in my mind and in my spirit, and not in my girth. . . [Laughter]. . . Thank you for the moral support. I think that the analogy is one which should be considered by society as well.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Chairman, I too am surprised at the statements made by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, although I am not going to get as excited as my colleague from Calgary Bow. I'll try and contain my emotions, and it's not too easy to do.

Regarding the statement that the government is not doing anything towards contributions to the sewage problem in Calgary, this statement is utterly untrue because I recall a few years ago that the government was very much concerned over this problem and they were concerned over the lack of action by the Calgary City Council at that

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-75

time to a point where they had suggested that they withhold the municipal grants until, indeed, there was something done in this area. I think that that was a good lesson for the council of that day, and as a consequence, we went on to the secondary treatments.

In the area of a statement which was made regarding the users' pay policy, I certainly do not agree with this principle, because when you consider that the bulk of the provincial revenues comes from the larger metropolitan centres such as Calgary and Edmonton, it is only fair that the province look after and assist the cities in this problem. Now, as an example, I think a lot of our grants and subsidies are given to various areas, not only to the cities but indeed to the smaller centres. For instance, the recreational grants given on a per capita basis, I'm sure is much higher to the smaller centres than the amount that is given to the cities.

DR. HOFNER:

Oh, come on!

MR. HO LEM:

Yes, it is. If you just consider the amount of covered rinks, for instance, you would say that in areas like St. Albert, Sherwood Park, and various other smaller centres, they have their covered rinks, whereas in Calgary, on a per capita basis, we feel that we're short changed. There's no doubt about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

What is it, Mr. Schmid?

MR. SCHMID:

I think this calls for a correction, if possible. Some people in the cities may have the wrong information.

MR. HO LEM:

I wonder if we can hold the question until afterwards, Mr. Schmid. I didn't interrupt him when he gave his talk, so I'm just merely asking for the same privilege.

Now, regarding my constituency, the Calgary McCall constituency, this area is on the east side of Calgary. Our prevailing winds are from the west to the east. The flow of the water is from the west to the east, and naturally when our breezes come over all the way from Calgary down to my area, oftentimes we get the smell of the stockyards, we get the smell of the oil refineries and this is a serious thing. I know we can't change our prevailing winds. But certainly we should legislate regulations whereby we could control where these developments should be. And this is a serious thing.

DR. HOFNER:

We're going to move the refineries!

MR. HO LEM:

In my constituency, for instance, we have a sanitary landfill right in the heart of my constituency. A few years ago -- I think that you were on council then, the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill -- we had designated that a sanitary landfill be in each quadrant of the city, one for the north, one for the west, one for the north-east and so on. But why, I wonder, do we always have it end up in the Calgary McCall constituency? We had one already completed in Nose Creek, which is in the Calgary McCall constituency. After that was done we moved over and here our city council is telling us, "Oh no,

28-76

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

you're going to get a recreational park which is going to cost \$1.5 million to build." We were delighted to hear about this, but what do you know. It's a continuation of an existing sanitary landfill and they want to fill it up and then give it to the Calgary McCall area as a recreational development, which could take 20 years or more.

So these are the things that concern me and my constituents. Certainly the federal government, as a father of the legislative bodies in this province should give some measure of protection and assurance to the citizens of Alberta. We talk about our water pollution. We know that any fish caught in my area is not fit to eat, but upstream, west of Calgary, that is very good, that is the place to fish. This gives you an example of just how badly our water is polluted.

I am just wondering, having heard the initial comments by the hon. minister regarding his programs of antipollution and various other programs, certainly, to me, that he has spoken in generalities. He hasn't pinpointed the problem. Why isn't there legislation to prevent these things such as sanitary landfills being located right in the heart of the residential areas? What are we going to do about the water upstream from Calgary? The water that flows from Banff, Canmore, Morley and so on before it gets to Calgary. I think these are points for serious consideration and certainly are of a great concern to all people of Calgary, not only to Calgary McCall.

I feel that the government should have anti-pollution air control regarding the Calgary area because Calgary is situated in a valley, and the air in that area does not move readily. We can see the airflow above, like from CFCN hill, you can see the airflow right over Calgary, but underneath that level, you see the smog. Certainly, because of this, we should give consideration to relocation of some of our industries in proper locations.

I would expect that the provincial government give serious consideration to these points.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, there are five points I would like to raise in the course of the general comments. My friend, (I think, my friend) the hon. Minister of Highways has difficulty comprehending my five points. I should say to the hon. minister at this time that there may be several sections to each of the five points.

Dealing with the first point, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that in the course of the comments, the hon. minister would spend some time commenting with regard to the Red Deer River. I'm sure several members in the House will be interested in what plans the government has, or may have, for the future, as far as the Red Deer River is concerned. As far as my constituency is concerned, we are primarily concerned with the area in Sundre and west of Sundre, with the flood problems we do have in that area particularly. Certainly, not yearly, and I would be less than fair if I didn't say that Water Resources have been very helpful in the past in this particular area. I would ask the hon. minister if he could make some comments in this area some time in the course of his estimates.

The second matter deals with a matter that Mr. Henderson, the former Minister of the Environment, had given some thought to, but really, we hadn't come to grips with it over a period of several years. It is the problem of water problems for smaller centres. It seems to me likely at this time when the government is introducing legislation -- \$50 million for rural development for the province -- that this would be an appropriate time for the Water Resources Branch for the Department of the Environment, and hopefully, for the Department of Industry and Commerce and other departments that should be involved, to really look at this question of water supply as far

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-77

as rural centres are concerned. I can think of one or two areas in my own constituency, Olds-Didsbury who have had these problems, and the problems are in fairly good shape at this time. One of the problems we do have in the area between Calgary and Red Deer is, that from time to time, one of the centres, whether they are in my constituency or someone else's, has a problem with water. I suppose if this were to happen, and all the centres had the problem at the same time, likely, some very serious consideration would be given to something like a large pipeline, or something like that down from Red Deer and Calgary or out of the Red Deer River. The problem is that Olds has the problem and a few years later Bowden has the problem and a few years later Airdrie has the problem and Didsbury has the problem and we sometimes get involved in rather stop-gap methods. So, I would ask the Ministers responsible that some rather serious consideration be given to this matter of water problems in smaller centers. The Research Council and the Water Resources Branch certainly have been helpful in the past but with the -- I think the common word is the thrust -- as far as rural development is concerned, this would be, I think, perhaps an opportune time to look into this area.

The second point: I'd like the hon. minister to give us some comments on the cooperation between the pollution control division in his Department and its relationship with the Energy Resources Conservation Board. About two to three years ago, major responsibilities for pollution control in the oil industry gas industry, went to the Gas Conservation Board. I think it's fair to say that in our area generally we've had some improvement in some of the problems, that doesn't mean that we still don't have some. If I remember correctly, in some of the hon. minister's comments over the course of the last few months, he has given the indication that the Department of Environment may well again assume more of those responsibilities and perhaps less of those responsibilities for pollution control would be left with the Energy Resources Conservation Board.

And, if this is done, we're getting back to the problem of who, in fact, do people go to? You have two or three agencies that are dealing with this question of pollution control and pollution management. The fourth point that I'd like to raise is the matter of co-operation between government departments. I fully appreciate that it's difficult to get cooperation with the various government departments involved, but unless the Department of the Environment can do this, and we had I think a bit of an example this afternoon, when the point that the hon. member for Sedgewick-Coronation raised of relationships between the various departments. Certainly Agriculture has needed to have a real input, but Lands and Forests and several other departments? I'd like the Hon. Minister to spend just a few moments, if he would at some time in the estimates, on this matter of co-ordination, co-operation between departments. The last and the fifth point, Mr. Chairman, deals with the matter of Regional Planning Commissions. If we're going to be successful in this matter of world development, then it's very important that Regional Planning Commissions give a great deal more thought to where industry is going to be located in rural areas than we've done in the past.

I think all of us can cite some situations where we have seed cleaning plants, feed mills, right in the midst of smaller centers, and this causes some real problems. And, of course, coupled with that problem, with more interest in the matter of environment and pollution is the question of grain elevators right in the midst of towns and if in fact these grain elevators are close to residential areas at all, there are certainly some increasing problems there. So, I really would appreciate the Hon. Minister making some comment on the matter of Regional Planning Commissions and how, in fact, the Regional Planning Commissions are fitting in meshing, or what's being done in that particular area.

28-78

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

MR. DOAN:

I didn't come prepared to say anything on this subject at all, but listening to the discussion has just brought a couple of points to my mind that I'd like to take that many minutes to get off my chest. In the first place, I feel that our hon. minister's got a very ambitious program, as is indicated by what he has before us here in this report. In listening to the discussion tonight, though, I must say that at some times it sounded more like an argument. I think the feeling was that whether or not the government should give money to the cities and towns for lagoons, unless I mistook the hon. member for Leduc, I understood him to say that he wouldn't be in favor of the government branching out to give farmers the same chance at water facilities as is given in town. I can't go along with this, I think all rural members should have equal opportunity with those in the cities. If we're going to try and keep the people on farms, this is one way that we should probably be doing it.

I had a couple of instances right in my own constituency that I would like to bring before the minister for more or less an opinion. We have one small town there with only about 400 people, but I noticed that their lagoon is located right on the edge of quite a large creek, mouth of the City of Red Deer, which is called Waskasoo Creek. It originates about 20 miles back in the country, and it really concerns me that the health authorities do not seem concerned that this lagoon is running over into the creek most of the time, I am sure. And in the same way, the large airport at Penhold, which is a dominion set-up, also have their facilities right on the edge of the same creek. And in the course of the winter, when the creek is frozen up, you can see the coloured liquid flowing down on the ice north of the City of Red Deer. This is within four or five miles of the City of Red Deer, and yet they don't seem concerned about this. There is nothing polluted about this water once it comes through this plant, it is supposed to be healthy. But I am a little hard to convince on this.

The only other thing I wanted to bring to the attention of the minister, is that there is an oil company east of Red Deer pumping water at the present time out of the Red Deer River. I have a letter on this but I forgot the amount of water. It is a tremendous amount, 75 million gallons a year -- or something to this effect -- out of the river into an oil well. Probably some understand what the purpose of this is; I am not prepared to say what it is for, but I believe they have an objective in doing this. These are just a couple or three points that I thought I would like to bring before the minister in order to hear him explain it if he would at some time.

DR. PAFROSKI:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments for about three minutes to clarify a few points, if I may. Firstly, I would like to congratulate the Minister of Environment for his concise overview of the department. I feel the allocations and the various appropriations are appropriate. I am sure they will be reviewed in more detail later on; and I would like to indicate quite clearly that I have complete confidence in this man to carry out this job of maintaining or improving the environment.

I would like to turn for a minute to the statement made by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill. Yesterday when he commented about the environment he seemed not too greatly concerned, and apparently believes that this world, in fact, is not on a collision course. Well, I'm not disappointed in the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, because he typifies the casual attitude that most of us really take about pollution, despite the fact world authorities have given us the facts. There are those who state this is a matter of opinion, and we won't evaluate them any further. We don't believe

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-79

them, and we close our eyes and go on in our merry way. I don't take this attitude, and I would hope that the hon. Minister of Environment will not take this attitude, and I am confident that he will not. I hope that he will take the time to evaluate some of those facts, and possibly come back to this House in a few months, perhaps within a year, and tell us in fact, whether these world authorities are on-beam or off-beam. But the fact remains, hon. members of this Assembly, that statistics show us, and the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands has again repeated those items that I mentioned to you before, that over population and the voluminous amount of pollution in this world has put us on a collision course in 30 to 50 years with possible destruction of our life-supporting system. Unless we reverse this - and there is hope - and again commenting to the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, there is hope and I sincerely mean that. But this hope cannot be just hope, sitting down and saying let's do nothing and everything will work out. We must act on this one and that hope is only two or three items and that is control over population by equalizing the deathrate and the birth rate - not only in Alberta - but in the rest of the world, and control pollution by outlawing polluting items, and also controlling and not over-using the nonrenewable resources -- which are exhaustable.

Yes, it's true this problem is not as great in Canada, not as great in Alberta, and the question I would ask - should we wait until we reach the stage of London, Los Angeles, New York and so forth? The answer is quite simple - no. Should we be pace setters and trend setters to reverse the so-called "doom", which I believe is a real probability. If it isn't we'll know in a few months, if the hon. minister gives us that report. I think yes we can, we should take steps as pace setters and trend setters to reverse this doom because we in Alberta and Canada have a special privilege because we are not in the same state as other highly polluting underdeveloped countries. Do we have confidence in our hon. minister? Yes, absolutely, but he needs our support. Should we panic? No, I don't think we should panic, this is a waste of time and certainly a waste of energy and we haven't got that much resource as it is. But I think it is important to act in conjunction with the federal authorities, as it has been mentioned by the hon. member opposite, to influence world authorities everywhere to control pollution, overpopulation, and act now with a very intensive public relations action program. Thank you.

MR. ZANDER:

I know, Mr. Chairman, we have spent something like four and a half hours and we haven't even passed the first appropriation in the environment budget, but there are two questions I want to ask the hon. minister and these are, since the former government had purchased this considerable amount of land in the Pembina area, if he proposes to go ahead with the dam on the Pembina River and secondly, the amount of land that was purchased in the Saskatchewan River valley? That was the proposed site of the other dam on the North Saskatchewan River. I wonder if he could enlighten us on those two projects?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes, Mr. Russell?

MR. RUSSELL:

I have been listening with a great deal of interest to some of the comments that have been made concerning the provincial government's role with respect to municipal pollution control

28-80

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

measures, specifically sewage treatment facilities. I would just like to take a couple of moments to correct some of the statements that have been made tonight and also to draw to the attention of the members a program the government has been carrying on since before the last election, and is being carried on now, in which direct provincial funds are involved.

I was rather surprised to hear the comments of the hon. Member for Calgary McCall with respect to the situation over the years with the City of Calgary sewage treatment facilities. Certainly he was an alderman on Calgary City Council for several years. He knows the record, and I'm not going to through that debate again or the involvement of the Big Horn Dam dollars by the provincial government with respect to Edmonton's pollution control situation as to the North Saskatchewan River. The correspondence and the reports can be tabled and I think they speak for themselves.

I was rather pleased to hear the comments from the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury because he finally brought the matter of regional development into the debate. I think this is extremely important that we consider this as Albertans. That is what we are as members of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. The control of pollution or the enhancement of a clean environment doesn't stop at political boundaries. I know Calgary has wrestled with the problem of picking up the raw sewage that the town of Banff has dumped in the Bow River and, in turn, has been charged with the responsibility of trying to get reasonably clean water out of its southern city limits.

The hon. Member for Taber-Warner spoke of Taber's problem with respect to the city of Lethbridge. I think so long as we maintain a small-minded or narrow-visioned partisan view, based on municipal political boundaries, we are not going to approach the problem of a clean environment or pollution control in a meaningful manner for the citizens of this province.

I really couldn't believe my ears when the hon. Member for Calgary Bow spoke, I thought, in rather surprising terms with respect to the dollar per capita load on various municipalities for sewage treatment facilities. If I followed his argument, what he was saying was if Lethbridge could afford \$100 per capita then gol-darn-it Calgary could too, and every other municipality throughout the province. We know if there is going to be adequate sewage treatment systems in the province and all our municipalities that because of size and population density some municipalities will never be able to afford them and they will have to have some kind of help. The hon. member is also well aware, because of his direct involvement in the land development business in Calgary, and as a past member of the Calgary Planning Advisory Commission, just what the municipal debt per capita is and our metropolitan areas ability to carry these major capital works projects. On that basis alone, particularly when I look at the last annexation application that was before the local authorities board, and the reasons that were given for that application, and how it related back to land costs and the cost of housing and because of the hon. member's involvement in that, I really found his statements rather startling. I think our federal minister responsible for this problem, at the present time, Mr. Jack Davis, has enunciated a policy to which we certainly as Albertans can all subscribe. That is we want to keep our country clean and it's going to cost us money and will be as clean as we're willing to make the bill, Mr. Chairman.

In closing I just want to mention three specific examples where provincial funds are directly involved on a straight grant basis to municipal governments in order to try and achieve substantial improvement in sewage treatment facilities. The first program -- and this was started by the previous government -- was in the hamlet of Midlandvale just outside of Drumheller. The hon. Member for Drumheller, I'm sure knows of the history of Midlandvale, how it grew

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-81

up and developed in rather a haphazard fashion and reached the stage where its sewage treatment facilities constituted a health problem. There was no way that the citizens, by themselves, could have supported that sewage collection or distribution system. But by co-operation between Midlandvale and the citizens there and the city of Drumheller and the provincial government, a good collection system is going in and it will be a big improvement for the citizens of that area. We're presently right in the midst of doing another one for west Edson and there will be a substantial direct provincial cash contribution through the funds of the Alberta Housing Corporation, to that project. The Department of Municipal Affairs is putting money, time and effort into that project to try and convince the inhabitants involved that this is good program, that this will help them overcome a serious health problem. They are arranging public meetings, they are writing an information brochure and we're doing all we can to try and encourage the go-ahead on that development. The third scheme of that kind will occur in the hon. member, Mr. Drain's constituency down in the Crowsnest area and he knows of the need down there. So there are areas where we're going to have to get involved in a provincial government basis whether we want to or not. But surely as members of the Alberta Legislature it should be our desire and our duty to do that - and I say let's get on with it.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify a couple of points for the benefit of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. I introduced comparison statistics on per capita costs of sewage treatment because I felt the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill made an issue of the fact that it was a large sum that Calgary had expended on this particular project. In regard to your comments about private land developers, I would like to suggest that the per capita debt in Calgary is lower than Edmonton's simply because the City of Calgary permitted private developers to do the land development, and in turn paid for the sewage and water services and other city services on an acreage assessment basis.

MR. RUSSELL:

Well we know the background. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder. . .

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Chairman, I have a question. What is the per capita debt of Calgary?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Possibly that could be obtained for you, Mr. Drain. Yes, Mr. Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I was going to make some comments at the end of the vote in connection with the points raised by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Now that he has raised it, I think I should make a comment, a very short one.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Please do.

28-82

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you. I agree entirely with the hon. minister in regard to the necessity of assisting some municipalities with water and sewage. The work that has been done in Newcastle by the previous government, the work that is presently being done in Midlandvale that was started by the previous government, and being continued by the present government, was based on cleaning up a health hazard and is going to benefit, I think, the entire people, or the entire population of Alberta insofar as there will not be an epidemic.

I would also like to say that while water has been supplied to the hamlet of Rosedale, a similar situation exists there in regard to the sewage system. The water has alleviated the danger to some degree, but the sewage there is a very severe problem as probably in a number of other hamlets of that nature. What I wanted to say is; we will be interviewing the hon. minister for some additional assistance in connection with that particular hamlet in fairness with other places throughout Alberta, also some assistance in connection with their water. The point I wanted to raise at this time is I think this policy is good. That is why we formed into a province, that is why we formed into a nation, so that the stronger could help the weaker, and I think there is a responsibility for this type of assistance. I commend the government for assuming those responsibilities it has accepted in connection with water and sewers in my own constituency.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Before the hon. Minister of the Environment replies, I have two little notes here that I wanted to, if I may have the privilege, to announce, and this is to the hockey fans. New York Rangers beat Montreal Canadiens 3-2. Something more serious, I have a note here: "Mr. Chairman, I have to get up early to get my spring planting done before the daily session at the rate we are going." I won't say who sent that to me. Mr. Yurko.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, or Mr. Chairman, I will try to talk as fast as I can to answer some of the questions that have been asked. I wouldn't want to suggest at this time that we have all the answers, but certainly we look forward to suggestions and observations. Many suggestions have been made and many questions have been asked, many concerns have been expressed, and I am not sure that I will be able to answer them all quickly tonight, but if I don't, then the various people can ask me again during the appropriation.

I was rather tickled when the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation indicated that over in his area, he had some green stuff, or perhaps a green whiff. I can remember another name for that stuff. I would like to indicate a little story about Harry Truman, who was speaking at a grand convention in Kansas City one time, and Mrs. Truman and a friend were in the audience. Truman in his speech said: "I grew up on a farm, and one thing I know, farming means manure, manure, manure, and more manure." At this time Mrs. Truman's friend whispered to her; "Bess, why on earth don't you get Harry to say fertilizer?" "Good lord, Helen," replied Mrs. Truman, "you have no idea how many years it has taken me to get him to say manure."

I want to suggest that many things have been said and perhaps the first point I'd like to cover very quickly, is in answer to something said by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, in connection with hysteria. And I want to suggest that I know something about hysteria, but hysteria is prevalent on the two extreme ends of the scale. There isn't hysteria at one end of the scale only; there is every bit as much hysteria at the other end of the scale, and let me suggest to you that hysteria at the other end of the scale has generally got more power and facilities to get its point across.

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-83

I want to suggest also that in this area of hysteria or extremism this area doesn't really bother me very much. What does bother me is the matter and the manner in which the news media treat this type of extremism. For I want to suggest to you that if this extremism had no foundation to it, then in fact the news media would simply neglect treating this extremism in any way, shape or form. But nevertheless, the news media do not ignore this extremism; they give it front page headlines and they give it front page headlines very often. And the question I keep asking myself is -- why? Why is it that the news media give the extremist point of view and the headlines that they do? The only conclusion that I can come to, and I have not been able to decipher in my own mind any other conclusion, is that they obviously feel the people want to hear about this extremist viewpoint or else they wouldn't report it. I wish there would be some members, or perhaps the news media might advise me, that there is, in fact, another reason other than the only reason I know of, and that is that the people of the province and the people of this country and the people of the world in fact, want to hear this extreme view. And I would say that if there is need for responsibility in this area, then the responsibility must be on the part of the news media rather than the part that is out on the extreme left end of the scale, because I suggest to you that in the few months that I have been in government I have also felt the power of the extremists on the right end of the scale also. And I suggest that there is considerable power associated with this extreme viewpoint. What we need is a balanced viewpoint and what we try to get in every possible way, is a formula to balance one against the other and to come out with a rational management viewpoint in this area. A viewpoint that is not necessarily entirely dedicated to preservation, but a viewpoint that is concerned with management and with conservation and in the odd area only, preservation, associated perhaps with a wilderness area, or perhaps some little area that we might want to set aside in the province so that future generations can look at it and say, "this is what this land was like when my grandfather or great grandfathers found it."

Now, the second area I'd like to talk about very, very quickly is in connection with the hon. member for Taber-Warner who indicated something about export of water. And I want to suggest that this government put forth a stand at the earliest opportunity in this regard. And to dramatize this stand we said that we would put a moratorium on all studies done in connection with the export of water. Now we didn't necessarily take this stand to suggest that the previous government had some other type of a stand. I must in all honesty say that I have never heard the previous government suggest that they had that...

MR. STRON:

Mr. Chairman, may I just read the statement that the hon. minister made, and I mentioned it to him before the session started this evening because I was very concerned about it. I wish to read it just so that we can have complete clarification on it. And the words that you used were:

"That the Government of Alberta has placed a moratorium on the use of provincial government funds for use either in part or in total for funding studies that involve the diversion of Alberta surface waters for export beyond the Canadian borders."

Mr. Chairman, my concern was that I have never been aware of any studies that we had initiated or that were underway while we were in office, and I was very anxious to have the minister advise me if he was aware of any. But it was, because he has stated it here, because my understanding of declaring a moratorium on something is something that is cut off at that point and there are no longer any studies being carried out.

28-84

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

MR. YURKO:

Well, there was an indication that some people in government agencies were advocating very strongly the export of water from Alberta. Whether or not they were associated directly...

MR. HENDERSON:

Who, who, who, who, who, who, who?

MR. YURKO:

Professor Laycock from the University of Alberta talks over and over and over about the export of water from the Province of Alberta...

MR. CLARK:

Ah, come on.

MR. YURKO:

...and I want to suggest to you that this was...

MR. CLARK:

It was probably the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. YURKO:

...this was the way of this government dramatizing in no uncertain terms its stand. Now the government also wanted to suggest...

MR. STRONACH:

I wonder if the hon. minister will just permit me to ask him another question? Because I was involved with the development of water in this province for a number of years, can he recall ever having heard me suggest that there should be export? Can he ever recall having read anything that reported me as having said it? I would be interested in knowing it, because I chose every occasion that came up for me to state that I was opposed to it and that there was no way that we would consider export. I did think, Mr. Chairman, that at that time, I was speaking for the government, inasmuch as I was responsible for the administration.

MR. YURKO:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe at any time I had intimated that the previous government had a policy that indicated the export of water. But I do want to suggest that some members of that party have, in fact, indicated or talked about -- and the hon. Member for Taber-Warner did this afternoon. We wanted to put our stand on the line in no uncertain terms, because the government of Canada had, in fact, given on certain occasions the impression that, in fact, it favoured a major study which may lead to export of water from the country of Canada. So we wanted to put our stand in no uncertain terms, and this is a stand that has been taken in the United States -- a moratorium on all studies has been taken in the United States in connection with the shipment of water from the north-western states to the south-western states. And they have declared a ten year moratorium on all studies. And there's a specific reason for this...

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-85

MR. STRCM:

For clarification again, I ask the hon. minister: does he agree, then that the former government, never as a policy advocated the export of water?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, I said that at no time did we intimate or did I intimate that, in fact, the former government had this type of a policy. And if they had, only they know. I don't know, and I never have attempted to intimate or say that, in fact, they had a policy of this type. I think that's as accurately as I can answer the question. I have never sat in their caucuses. I don't know what they discussed in their caucuses.

MR. STRCM:

Mr. Chairman, I have to raise the point again. I'm simply asking him whether or not there has been any time that our government advocated the export of water. And then the hon. minister starts talking about what we might have discussed in caucus or what we might have discussed somewhere else. I suggest that all I am saying, never at any time was there any suggestion by our government when we were in power that there should be export of water. And I simply have to get it on the record, because I want it clearly understood that if that is what the hon. minister is now indicating, there is no difference.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, again I want to suggest that I don't know what their policies were...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Neither do they!

MR. YURKO:

And I simply say over and over again that I have never intimated nor ever have I said that that government had a policy which favoured the export of water. I simply don't know. Now how can I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition's point and he indicates that I should agree with this statement at this point in time. Well, how can I agree with his statement, because I simply don't know what their policies were?

MR. STRCM:

May I just ask another question, please?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, sit down.

MR. STRCM:

The point that I want to raise...

AN HON. MEMBER:

You already raised it.

MR. STRCM:

...is the hon. minister suggesting that there was no policy? I asked him what was it that he suggested he cancelled out just shortly after taking over power. Yes, and if that wasn't a concept and a policy statement, then I don't know what a policy statement is.

28-86

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Fine, continue Mr. Minister.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, I have a report in front of me called Water Diversion Proposals of North America where the proposals were reviewed and it was put out by the Department of Water Resources of the previous government in 1968. I say, again, I don't know what the policies of the previous government were, and I never at any time intimated, that in fact they had a policy in this area, whether they supported it, or didn't support it, this is for them to clear before the people of Alberta, not for me to suggest that they didn't have a policy -- because I really don't know. The only thing I say, Mr. Chairman, is that I at no time have intimated in any way, or for that matter said in any way, that they had a policy either one way or the other.

MR. HENDERSON:

I wonder if I could just ask the hon. minister to table the report, I would like to look at it because the brief time I was minister I asked this question very specifically....

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Minister is this not a report that has been tabled yet?

MR. YURKO:

I don't believe so Mr. Chairman but as I have indicated today that the rules of the House suggest when a document has been referred to, that, in fact, it be tabled and I am prepared to table the report.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well.

MR. HENDERSON:

I would like to have it specific because the brief time I was minister in the new department I specifically tried to get them ask this question whether any such studies had been conducted and was given assurance of this so I would like to see...

MR. YURKO:

The reviews of the proposals have been made virtually in North America. In other words you were examining the proposition, and that's all I have said.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Carry on Mr. Minister.

MR. YURKO:

As I said, Mr. Chairman, the government of the day felt it was necessary to put its policy on the line in no uncertain terms at the earliest opportunity in this regard. And this we did.

In connection with the hon. Mr. Gruenwald's question, he indicated something about total involvement, and all I can say, is, the government took a major step in this direction by appointing me to the portfolio.

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-87

In connection with the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen with some of the remarks he suggested, I would like to suggest that we recognize the need for water management on the river basin bases. We recognize that there are two things that are of extreme importance in any program that the government establishes. The first is priorities. The second is, (sorry three things) -- concept. The third is money. The government must establish its priorities in connection or relation to the funds that are available. I do want to suggest that we are looking at all these areas. We are looking at the areas of priorities and I had mentioned earlier that in connection, or in relation to the Canada Water Act and total river basin development, that the government has singled out the Red Deer River basin as the top priority for total river basin development; that is the Red Deer River watershed. I also indicated, if the member remembers correctly, that we have established the need within our organization or government, the establishment of an overall examination, or perhaps you might say proposal, or concept or understanding of what might be required in connection with developing the Red Deer River basin. The only time we will approach the federal government to determine what type of input they can have, or will have, in this type of total basin management concept is after we have resolved in our own minds, and in connection with our own government what in fact we would like to see in a total river development concept in this basin.

Now when we do this with the Red Deer River we will then attempt to extend this type of program if possible, if the conditions are favourable and we recognize that the federal government wants to project itself in every possible way into the management of water in Canada and particularly into the area of management of the head waters in the Canadian watersheds. We feel that it's necessary to move very slowly, and very carefully in this area and this is why we feel that it's necessary for us to establish in our own minds exactly what we think the overall development of a watershed basin should be before we, in fact, approach the federal government. And I want to reiterate again that in connection with this approach we have singled out the Red Deer River basin as the top priority. We have also indicated, and I've said this on several occasions, that there is need for local input and we are examining the type of structure that might be set up to provide the necessary local input for watershed basin input in connection with basin management on an overall basis.

Now that same point was brought up by several people and I won't reiterate it again, but I do want to indicate that we recognize the need for total water basin development in this area. I do want to suggest again that as far as you mentioning PRIME and diversion of water from the north to the south we consider this, again, a case of priorities and the first priority is to manage each basin in its total context. Until this is done, and secondly until a water use and demand study is made -- and there has been no water use and demand study made -- that the idea of even thinking of diverting water from the north to the south is simply unsound.

I want to suggest that the Saskatchewan-Nelson River study which studied the water supply, the availability of water in western Canada, the three provinces, is going to be completed this year. The study also delineated certain possibilities of bringing water from the north to the south, not only from northern Alberta to the south but from northern Saskatchewan to the south and from northern Manitoba. The governments that undertook this study indicated in no uncertain terms, and it will be in the very front of the report, that the study will in no way commit any government to any action indicated in that report. Secondly that nothing in that report could be construed that this, in fact, was government policy of any province.

28-88

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

MR. STROM:

I wonder if I could just raise a point for clarification. When the hon. minister talks about water use, for what period of time are you thinking?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, I was going to suggest something about the studies that will be made, or are being considered in this area. Water use ...

MR. STROM:

Just a point of clarification then in my question. I realize that when the Saskatchewan-Nelson group started their work the federal government people, particularly, were most anxious to include a use factor. I took the stand at that time that we were not interested in discussing use, because I don't think it would be in the best interests of Albertans to relate it to use, and I am wondering now that we are maybe going to be faced with a determination of use - for what period of time are we looking? Are we thinking in terms of the next 10 years, the next 20 years, or what are we looking at?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is a little ahead of the game. I was going to indicate what is being contemplated but nevertheless any use and demand studies that will be done will be related to today's uses and today's demands and I'm sure they will be related to a period into the future and the actual number of years I couldn't really say. This will be in the terms of reference of the studies, when in fact they are done. I want to suggest, that at the conference we've indicated that water use and demand studies should really be provincial matters and in the area of provincial jurisdiction. I've also indicated that the federal government feels very strongly about water use, demand and quality studies, having engaged a company to examine the existing information in each of the provinces, at this point in time. We of course are beginning our own studies in this regard, but the federal government feels that this will be a matter that will be brought up before the Prairie Provinces Water Board and that sometime in the future we may, in fact, do a joint study. However, I do want to suggest very strongly at this time that we consider that this is a matter for provincial jurisdiction because it can effect the growth and the development of different parts of Alberta in a major way.

I want to indicate that the hon. Member for Drumheller has made some worthwhile suggestions. He indicated that we should examine the forest warden movement and the forest guard movement in relation to urban areas. We will certainly look at this in connection with the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. He also indicated there should be severe penalties and no backsliding, and I am not in disagreement with his statement in this regard. He also indicated that the emphasis should be on prevention and this is the crux of our whole program in this area.

I do want to cover a few other matters. The first matter that I wish to cover -- well I was going to comment on what the hon. Member for Wainwright said, but his was basically a political speech and he forgets that not very much was done in this area until after 1969. He also forgets it was the opposition the opposition at that time that had on the Order Paper a resolution indicating the establishment or consolidation into a department of this area of concern and he also, I am sure, recognizes that the government was pretty sorely pressed in taking some action in this field during the last several years. However I don't intend to get political.

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-89

MR. RUSTE:

He stated it was a fact. Would the hon. minister say it was a factual speech?

MR. YURKO:

Just slightly. I would like to make some comments in connection with the form minister's remarks as I feel that he does deserve answers to some of his queries. My answer will, of course, take into consideration the matters that were brought up by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. I would like to suggest that I have taken the stand and I say this in all honesty that I am trying to convince government and we are considering a policy whereby there will be no grants to industry for pollution control. I recognize, in this regard, we are saddled with a very difficult contract made by the previous government in connection with the Procter and Gamble plant. Not only did they commit themselves in this regard but they committed governments into the future -- well into the future -- and they committed governments really on the lack of the proper basis to commit any government in this regard. They indicated the province of Alberta was more stringent in its pollution requirements with respect to pulp mills but did not recognize the general movement in connection with Canada as a whole in North America. Now we are caught in the box whereby Canada, as a whole, has established standards for pulp mills which are as stringent as ours and the reason for their action in this regard has disappeared, even before the plant has come on stream. Nevertheless I want to suggest that we are saddled with a very unfavourable contract which, in fact, commits us to doubling the capacity of that plant at sometime in the future, perhaps ten or fifteen years hence. It is a contract, I must indicate, that causes me considerable discomfort.

I would also like to say that I have publicly said -- and it can be brought into this House -- and I will say it in this House -- that we will generally treat municipalities in the same manner as industries in connection with grants for pollution control. I am talking about direct grants for pollution control and I advisedly use the word 'general'. There may be exceptional circumstances as the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has indicated, where it is necessary to possibly prevent an epidemic or necessary for some other reasons for the government to take a direct active role. I do want to also suggest that we have under consideration, policies in this regard and that we have examined in detail the debenture load on the various towns and cities and municipalities in this province, that are related directly to pollution control facilities and trunk line sewers. We recognize a major spread running all the way from, I believe something like \$20 per capita, up to as much as -- and I want to get some assurance here that I won't be pinned down on this figure -- but up to as high as \$350 or \$400 per capita. I want to suggest that we are attempting to evolve a policy in this regard, a policy as I indicated in my earlier speech, that would be equitable to all Albertans, and that one Albertan wouldn't necessarily be treated differently than another Albertan. We also recognize that there is a difference between a sewage system, in connection with a municipality or a town, and the growth of an industry. When an industry is constructed, it puts in a sewage facility adequate for the task at hand. It only makes it bigger when it expands the plant again. When a municipality puts in a sewage disposal system, it is requested to put in that system so that it is adequate in capacity for 20 years hence. As a result, at the initial point in time, when that system is installed, the people may be asked to carry a debenture load not in relation to the benefits that they receive. The system itself is not operating at capacity, it is operating substantially below capacity. It is our intent -- and we are examining very closely -- to see if we can evolve a policy which, in fact, might even out the cost, and instead of very high at the beginning, gradually going down as the town expands, or the city expands, to evening out these costs by, in fact, providing money on a loan basis under very generous terms which will then be returnable. I suggest that we are looking

28-90

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 13th 1972

at this type of a policy and it is not a policy that is yet a government policy -- it hasn't been resolved. But I suggest very strongly that we are looking at this type of a policy.

We also recognize very strongly that if some of our towns are to grow, if some of our towns are to be sustained, if some of our towns are to have industry, before industry can come into these towns, we must have a sewage and water facilities. We in fact are looking at both of these areas very strongly.

But in all cases we will be trying to develop a policy that will be equitable. I suggest again that in connection with sewage disposal policy, the base line that might be established can vary anywhere from \$100 per capita to \$150 to \$200, depending on where you want to establish it will determine the number of communities that can receive help. I do suggest that the big, big cities have a relatively low debenture carrying load at this particular time. The advantage they have is in connection with size. I also want to suggest at this point in time, that the figure that has been given to me, is the fact that \$150 per capita is basically equivalent to what is being born by those people that install a septic tank. So the per capita carrying capacity of a farmer with a septic tank with four children, if a base level of \$150 was adopted, would not be much different than if you establish the same base level for a town.

I want to make it very specific that these are the areas that we are exploring. It is this type of examination that we are making, and this is not government policy at this point in time.

Now I want to make it very specific that these are the areas that we're exploring. It is this type of examination that we are making and this is not the government policy at this point in time.

Now I think, Mr. Chairman, that I might adjourn debate at this time and pick up tomorrow.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report its progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Its been moved by the hon. minister that we report. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain estimates, and reports some progress and begs leave to sit again, and I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Votes and Proceedings will record that Mr. Diachuk reported and not Mr. Cooper as has happened in the last two days.

April 13th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

28-91

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before we adjourn does the House wish to give the Committee leave to sit again?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the report and the request for leave, do you all agree.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Government House Leader has moved that the House adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 11:03 p.m.]

