

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Friday, April 14th, 1972

(The House met at 2:30 pm.)

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a point of privilege. Before stating my point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read section 1081 of Beauchesne. It reads as follows:

"Anything which may be considered a contempt of court by a tribunal is a breach of privilege if perpetrated against parliament such as wilful disobedience to or open disrespect of the valid rules, orders, or process or the dignity and authority of the House, whether by disorderly, contemptuous or insolent language or behaviour or any other disturbing conduct or by a mere failure to obey its orders."

On February 16, 1972, an Order in Council 220/72 was passed and signed by the hon. the Premier as Chairman of the Executive Council. It reads as follows:

Approved and Ordered,	O.C. 220/72
(Signed)	Edmonton,
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR	February 16, 1972.

Upon the recommendation of the Honourable the President of the Executive Council, dated February 2, 1972, the Executive Council advises that the Lieutenant Governor in Council, pursuant to section 14 of The Legislative Assembly Act, do order as follows:

1. The following Members of the Legislative Assembly are hereby appointed to serve on the MLA TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURE:

Marvin Moore - Co-Chairman  
James Miller - Co-Chairman  
Gordon Stromberg  
Rudolph Zander  
John Batiuk  
Allison Fluker  
Frank Appleby  
Donald Hansen  
William Furdy  
Leslie Young  
Julian Kozlak  
Ronald Gitter  
Catherine Chichak  
Jack Cookson

29-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

---

2. This Order is effective November 10, 1971.

(Signed)  
Peter Lougheed  
CHAIRMAN

Mr. Speaker, I now turn to section 14 of The Legislative Assembly Act, and it reads as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a member of the Legislative Assembly serving on a commission or committee, appointed either by the Legislative Assembly or by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council."

I would now like to turn to the rules, orders, and forms of proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of the Alberta Legislature, and I would like to read rule 52-1:

"No special committee may, without leave of the Assembly consist of more than 11 members. Such leave shall not be moved for without notice, and in the case of members proposed to be added or substituted after the first appointment of the committee, a new notice shall be given including the names of the members proposed to be added or substituted."

Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention again to two points. The Order in Council sets up a committee of 14 members. The rules of our Assembly just make the point that it says anything more than eleven must be determined by the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, whereas the hon. the Premier has committed a breach of privilege of this Assembly, I would like to propose the following motion, seconded by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

"Be it resolved that the disregard of the rules of the Legislative Assembly by the hon. the Premier in appointing an MLA task force on agriculture be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to determine what action should be taken by this Assembly."

DR. HCFNER:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to suggest to you, Sir, that...

MR. STRCM:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order. It is my understanding that you, as the Speaker, according to Beauchesne, must first make a ruling if this action is in order.

DR. HCFNER:

Mr. Speaker, surely I can rise on a point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition continues to flout the rules of this House except when they apply to other people, and I rise on that point of order now to make a number of points. First of all that, in fact,....

MR. HENDERSON:

A point of order...

DR. HCFNER:

I'm on a point of order.

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-3

MR. HENDEFSCH:

The Chair should rule as to whether...

DR. HOFNER:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I'm speaking to the point of order before the House....

MR. SPEAKER:

The point of order before the House is whether or not the Speaker should now make some kind of ruling with regard to the point of privilege that has been raised, preparatory, perhaps, to it being debated. That point of order as to whether I should now make a ruling seems to me as a proper question for debate.

DR. HOFNER:

Again, they are trying to muzzle me, Mr. Speaker, in relation to having some say as to whether or not this is, in fact, a proper point of privilege.... In fairness, I...

MR. SPEAKER:

If the matter as to whether or not this is a proper point of privilege is going to be debated, then it should be debated under the ordinary procedure where each member speaks once and for all. But as I understand it, before it can be debated there must be a ruling by the Speaker as to whether or not there is prima facie a point of privilege. If the House or anyone in the House disagrees with that position, that's a point of order and I take the position that only that point of order may now be discussed, and not the merits of the point of privilege.

DR. HOFNER:

Fine, Mr. Speaker, and I agree with you that the procedure should be that once the member makes his point of privilege, then the Speaker should rule on whether or not there is a prima facie case of privilege, and then, Mr. Speaker, the motion should be made, because if we do it in any other way, the motion does nothing but clutter up the question of Your Honour's decision in relation to whether or not there is a point of privilege. I'm not discussing the essence of whether or not the Leader of the Opposition, in fact, has a point of privilege. I am discussing on a point of order how this House operates in relation to these questions of privilege, whether they're frivolous or otherwise. And the situation still remains that, in fact, the motion is out of order, because until you decide whether or not there is a case of privilege, it can't be made. And therefore I would like to suggest, Sir, that in fact the motion be ruled out of order, that you take under consideration the question of whether or not there has been a breach of privilege, and that you report back to this House when you have made that decision.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, Beauchesne sets out very clearly that it must be determined first whether it is, or whether it is not, a point of privilege. Whether the motion is made before or after does not in any way infringe on the right of the Speaker to declare it a prima facie case of privilege, or whether it is not. I would therefore suggest that the proper procedure at this time is for the Speaker to determine whether it is a point of privilege or whether it is not a point of privilege.

29-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, I would like to suggest two things. First of all, that the question of whether or not it is prima facie, a question of privilege, depends upon whether or not commissions, boards, tribunals or committees, as the term may be used by the Executive Council, are committees as defined by the rules of Beauchesne.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. Is the hon. member debating the point of privilege? The point of privilege, as I understand it, is not yet before the House for debate. The only point before the House at the moment is whether the motion may be made at all before it has been submitted to the speaker to decide whether prima facie there is a question of privilege. I am not certain whether it may be made at all, but I suggest to the House for its consideration that the proper procedure and a practical dealing with the matter could be achieved if the House were to agree that the motion or purported motion which has been submitted by the hon. Leader of the Opposition might now be treated as notice. Then, upon my having had a chance to deal with the point, I can report to the House as to whether I find there to be a prima facie case of privilege.

I might mention to the House that this same procedure was followed a week or so ago when a point of privilege arose out of something alleged to have been said by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall. I would suggest that we follow the same procedure now, and may I also suggest, since I would value the opinions which might come from both sides of the House, that the material which the hon. Leader of the Opposition used in making his motion -- or should I say -- in giving notice of it, might be made available to the hon. Government House Leader, as well as to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. STICOM:

I will have to get the additional copies, but I will certainly be pleased to make that available.

DR. HCFNER:

We would be quite pleased to agree with that procedure, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do I take it that we have the agreement of the House that the matter which has been raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition may be accepted as notice of a motion which may be brought in for debate following a ruling of the Speaker as to whether there is a prima facie case of privilege?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 58:

The Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Act

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being Bill No. 58, The Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Act. This bill, Mr. Speaker, is necessary to provide the legislative framework for the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. It provides for the responsibilities and duties of the minister and the

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-5

department, and for certain controls over agreements signed by the Government of Alberta with other governments outside of the borders of our province.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 56 was introduced and read a first time]

Bill No. 48: The Livestock Brand Inspection Amendment Act, 1972

MR. J. MILLER:

I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 48 being The Livestock Brand Inspection Amendment Act, 1972. This bill has been made necessary to rectify some of the problems which presented themselves from an administrative standpoint in the actual brand-reading of cattle and to overcome legal complications which have arisen by virtue of the wording of the present Act.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 48 was introduced and read for the first time.]

DR. HCFNER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move seconded by the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, that this Bill No. 48, The Livestock Brand Inspection Amendment Act, 1972 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Orders and Bills.

Bill No. 51: The Litter Act

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

MR. YORKO:

I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 51 being The Litter Act. Mr. Speaker, there are three main areas of concern that are encompassed in this Act. First, the control of litter on land, secondly the control of litter on water and ice, and thirdly, the control of unsightly property which is visible from the highway. The Act has umbrella features, which brings under one piece of legislation and under one central point, overall responsibility and co-ordination for litter control. The legislative authority for litter control now resides within The Highway Traffic Act, The Public Highways Development Act, and The Public Lands Act. And these are being incorporated into the Act, and the regulatory responsibilities will subsequently be farmed out back to the appropriate departments. There will be no change or interference with the present powers of the municipality to make bylaws respecting regulations of unsightly premises under The Municipal Government Act. However, this Act permits the Minister of the Environment to issue clean-up orders to municipalities to effect performance.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 51 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 55: The Universities Amendment Act

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being Bill No. 55, The Universities Amendment Act, 1972. The purpose of this Act, Mr. Speaker, is to cure what could be a technical defect in the existing academic pension plan as it relates to The Income Tax Act. The existing plan may be subject to the payment of income tax on income it earns unless the assets of the plan are transferred to trustees. And therefore, if this is done, the plan will then be exempt from income tax.

29-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 55 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. FCSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Yurko that Bill No. 55 being The Universities Act Amendment Act, 1972 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

Bill No. 41: The Clean Air Amendment Act, 1972

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 41, being The Clean Air Amendment Act 1972. This act defines with regard to air pollution the role of the director of standards and approvals and the director of pollution control. It contains procedures with regard to obtaining a permit to construct a plant, and the subsequent obtaining of a license to operate the plant. The act further expands the authority of the minister to make regulations in order to more effectively control air pollution at the source. This permits the establishment of source standards for all industries in Alberta. These regulations include a provision for certification of visible smoke readers. This is necessary in order to make smoke pollution regulations enforceable. The act also expands on the regulations which may be made by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The other amendments are more minor and of a clarification or corrective nature.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 41 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education that The Clean Air Amendment Act, being Bill No. 41, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in introducing to you and to the Assembly some 75 Grade VIII and IX students of the Parkdale Elementary and Junior High School, which is in my Edmonton Norwood constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Stambough, Mr. Pysyk and Mrs. Sekora. I would ask that the students and the teachers rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. STEMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me tremendous pleasure to introduce to you and to this Assembly from my constituency 22 students from the Round Hill School. These students are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Ilnicki and their school bus driver Mr. Baniuk who has driven classes up here for a good number of years. May I ask them to rise, please, and be recognized by the House.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, may I introduce to you and to the House 23 members of the Grade IX class from Glenwood School with their teachers Mrs. Olsen, Mr. Tolman, their bus drivers Mr. and Mrs. Layton. These

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-7

students have driven some 340 miles to see the Legislature in action and some other points of interest around the city. I would ask them to stand and be recognized.

DR. MCCORMICK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 26 Grade IX students from Bluffton and their teacher Mr. Keith MacDonald and bus driver Mike Donovan. This is the first group this year that has come from my constituency and I am very pleased that they had the interest and desire to come and watch our democratic process. They are seated in the Public Gallery and I would like them now to stand and be recognized by the Legislature.

#### FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker I would like to table a Return which was requested in a Motion for a Return by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, sessional paper 137.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to lay on the table the first annual report of the Environment Conservation Authority. I just want to indicate that this is the first annual report of this authority and I want to indicate to the House that in my estimation the authority has indeed done a creditable job during the past year.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and the hon. Member for Calgary McCall, and if we don't forget it by then, the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewill and the hon. Member for Whitecourt.

#### Operation of Private Cemeteries

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Attorney General. It is regarding, Mr. Attorney General, the operation and the legislation regarding privately owned cemeteries in the province of Alberta. What I would like to know is, what protection is there to the public to ensure perpetual care to these cemeteries in the event that the private concern finds themselves in financial difficulties and cannot carry on?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the hon. member for giving me some advance notice of this question. The protection is set out in The Cemeteries Act and essentially it provides that in the case of every sale a certain sum of money should be set aside and placed in a trust fund for the purposes of perpetual care of the cemetery should that need arise. The audited statements are submitted by the operators of the cemeteries to the Securities Commission and the monies are held in trust, either by the Public Trustee or by a trust company, and in the event there is a need for use to be made of them the director of the Securities Commission -- I

29-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

believe it is -- is empowered to apply to the Minister of Health for an order using them for that purpose.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the event that this trust fund is not sufficient to carry on, as a general rule, with a couple of exceptions -- you know people are usually dead for quite a long while -- what is the right amount of money that should be set up to make sure that there is perpetual care? And would the government take over if necessary -- [laughter] -- I am serious, take over and make sure that there is perpetual care?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, that is a question we would have to answer should that occasion ever arise.

Law School at U of Calgary

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Attorney General. Has he received any representations from Calgary or elsewhere seeking support for the establishment of a law school in the University of Calgary?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have had some correspondence but it was of a personal nature, in the sense that it was to me personally and not as the Attorney General. At least I don't recall receiving any communications from people in Calgary about that other than, as I say, some personal acquaintances.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, did I understand that the hon. Attorney General had written or had received correspondence concerning the issue?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, as I say, I don't recall receiving anything but correspondence of a personal nature, but I would be perfectly happy to have the files looked at again and if there is any such correspondence let the hon. member know about it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Attorney General check as to whether the Pre-Law Society has made any representation to him concerning this issue?

MR. SPEAKER:

As you heard, the hon. Attorney General has already indicated he is going to look among his files. I would think a further question on that point would be superfluous.

MR. LEITCH:

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. member earlier talked of correspondence and then he changed the word to representation. There was some communication, oral communication, with my office from the Pre-Law organization.



April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-9

---

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Attorney General. Is he prepared to give his support to the establishment of a law school in Calgary?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know that it's a matter of the Attorney General giving his support or not. I think it's a question of the government giving its support, and that is something that requires some consideration and I am sure will be considered and perhaps will change from time to time.

MR. FCSTER:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could make a comment or two on this question since it falls within the realm, I think, of advanced education. I say that as a member of the legal profession, Mr. Speaker. I have received, Mr. Speaker, a good deal of correspondence from interested students at the University of Calgary, including representatives of the Pre-law Society and other sectors concerning a law school in Calgary. I can report to the House, Mr. Speaker, that the matter of a law school for the University of Calgary is presently before the Academic Planning Committee of the Universities' Commission. I expect that they will have dealt with this matter in the course of the next six to eight weeks, at which time they will report to me on their findings, as I have expressed to them my sincere interest in this matter. I've also, Mr. Speaker, had a meeting with the Pre-Law Society students from the University of Calgary about two weeks ago, discussing in general terms the academic and the economic feasibility of such a thing. But I think it only appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that we await the report of the committee of the Universities' Commission before dealing with this matter further.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary to the hon. minister. Did you endorse the establishment of a law school, or were you opposed to it in Calgary?

MR. FCSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am not that naive about politics that I would be prepared to stand and say I support or do not support the establishment of any new faculty at any college or university in this province. I'm finding, Mr. Speaker, that the matter of new faculties at any college or university is one that requires a great deal of study and consideration, and I'm quite prepared to have the Universities' Commission deal with it, and when it arrives on my desk, I will then be prepared to deal with it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister table any correspondence which is not of a personal nature concerning this matter which he received on this issue?

MR. HO IEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the invitation that was extended by the Board of Governors of the University of Calgary inviting interested citizens as well as other groups of citizens to express their views on certain programs that should be implemented at the university, do you intend to make representation on May 5th at this meeting?

29-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

---

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure to what my hon. friend is referring. I think, sir, you may be referring to a series of ads which have been placed by the Senates of various universities across this province requesting submissions to the senate on how they might put their best foot forward to the public. That is not the matter of the Board of Governors, Mr. Speaker, that is the Senate endeavouring to conduct a proper public relations in the university community. I think, though, that to answer your question, it would be highly inappropriate for the Minister of Advanced Education to go to these institutions making representations to them as to what programs I would like to see them conducting. I think it's the other way around.

Oil and Gas Royalties

MR. NCTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Can the hon. minister advise the House if all the oil and gas leases sold by the government contain a clause that the royalties do not exceed 1/6 of the gross value, notwithstanding periodic reviews of royalties by this Legislature?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say on that question that this matter will be dealt with very shortly, and he'll get a detailed answer on it.

MR. LOUGHIE:

Mr. Speaker, if I could just add to that. Perhaps that's a matter that requires a specific statement and we'd be pleased to do that the first of next week for the hon. member and for the public generally.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell is still next, followed by the hon. Member for Whitecourt.

MR. HO LEM:

Sir. . .

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this a supplemental?

MR. HO LEM:

No, I follow according to your list. Did I not follow the hon. member. . .

MR. SPEAKER:

Sorry, I thought your supplemental was after your turn.

MR. HO LEM:

Thank you. Do I have the floor, sir?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes, please proceed.

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-11

Organized Crime

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. the Attorney General. Do you recall, Sir, my question of two weeks ago, wherein I asked the hon. Attorney General the question regarding organized crime coming into Alberta? More specifically, the question was, and I read from the Hansard transcript:

"Mr. Ho Ler: Perhaps you may be able to answer this simple question? Are there any screenings being done on the prospective buyers of Alberta companies at the present time?

"Mr. Leitch: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are scre."

My question today, sir, is to the hon. Attorney General. In view of the concern expressed that our province is ripe for Mafia cash -- this account was given in the Journal today by Mr. Cal Hill, vice-president of the International Intelligence and former RCMP intelligence officer, -- my question is, does the Attorney General intend to step-up the program of screenings into mob activities and mob money possibly coming into the province?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, when I answered the hon. member's question a couple of weeks ago, when he talked about screening, what I had in mind was the type of control that is exercised over the transfer of shares, for example, in the trust companies and other financial institutions. I wasn't intending to imply, as I am sure the hon. member was fully aware, that there was some form of body examining the colour of the money that came into the province to buy businesses, because that certainly was not what I intended to convey by that answer. We don't have any such body, and at the present moment there are no plans for one.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Referring to the same article, will the hon. Attorney General ask this RCMP source to name names?

MR. LEITCH:

I am at a loss as to what the hon. member means by his question.

MR. HO LEM:

The article in today's. . .

HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order.

MR. HO LEM:

. . . I am asking a question. Have you not read the article?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member, I think, is including a considerable amount of innuendo in his question in view of what happened previously in the House. I must agree that the question is out of order under the circumstances.

29-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

Provincial Planning Act

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. The hon. minister will recall that a couple of months ago I had a meeting in the town of Fort Saskatchewan with the Town Council there, with regard to difficulties they were having with The Provincial Planning Act and certain recommendations for amendment were made. My question to the hon. minister is: what steps is he taking to develop a new Planning Act or to evaluate the recommendations such as are made by the town of Fort Saskatchewan?

MR. FUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, as a result of representations made to me by the hon. member and several others received from various sources throughout the province, I have taken tentative plans to introduce a completely new Planning Act into the spring session of 1973. On this basis I am aware of many of the presentations that have been made to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. I keep in touch with his office at all times and I've been in very close touch with members of his department in order that this policy might be developed.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in charge of Tourism. Further to your statement yesterday in which you indicated you had been working on a provincial parks master plan since September 11, when do you expect to have this master plan completed?

MR. DCWLING:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that since it's such a massive problem and a massive job that it won't be finished until the end of this year. However, I do expect that shortly after the session is completed this year, depending of course on when that comes, that I will have some initial presentation made by the people that are working on this policy.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. You further indicated that you had the responsibility for developing a policy position for provincial parks. Could you advise when that will be completed?

MR. DCWLING:

I would suggest that it would come at the same time.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and a final supplementary. Will the private sector who have several applications before the government waiting for approval be able to wait until the end of the year, or will they take their capital and talents elsewhere?

MR. DCWLING:

Well, I would suggest that I'm not in a position to judge what the private sector will do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, followed by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, then the hon. Member for Edmonton

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-13

Jasper Place, and the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway and then the hon. Member for Drumheller.

McIntyre-Porcupine and ARR Losses

MR. FARFAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have just one question and one supplementary only for the hon. Minister of Industry. Did you notice, Mr. Minister, in yesterday's paper that McIntyre-Porcupine lost \$7 million in their coal operations last year?

MR. FEACOCK:

What's the question?

MR. FARFAN:

Well, I'll roll the two together then, if that's the way you want it. Did you notice in yesterday's paper that McIntyre-Porcupine lost \$7 million in their Alberta coal operations during the last year, and is it true that the Alberta Resources Railway is also in desperate financial shape, and is there any immediate hope for improvement?

MR. FEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the seriousness of the question, I would ask this House's indulgence for a little latitude in answering it. McIntyre-Porcupine is unquestionably in serious trouble. This affects the community of some 3,000 people. They are now in the process of attempting to renegotiate their contract in Japan, and it can have serious and very detrimental effects on the future of not only the community, which is most important, but also on the ARR to which the hon. Member from North Hill alluded.

In answer to the situation and the seriousness of the ARR, we are faced, for the House's information, on a contract on which the capital that's incurred by the accounting system of the Canadian National Railway are picked up by the Alberta government. These are very substantial and amount to well over \$1 million. We're in the process of negotiating these with the accounting and engineering services and we hope, if we can, to renegotiate this expensive cost. Because of the capital cost loading charges which amount to some \$7.5 million a year, we are also in serious problem there. And because of the tonnage of the railroad -- basically it's 100% at this time made up of tonnage taken out of McIntyre-Porcupine to the CNR main track -- it is indeed a serious situation. For the House's information we have a team of accounting, engineering and research programs going on to see what can be done in order to help this situation and relieve it. Thank you.

Swanson Lumber Mill

MR. ECUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Premier, in the absence of the hon. Minister of Labour. Is your government aware of the impending closure of Swanson Lumber Mill at the Sweet Grass landing site near Fort Chipewyan, and the impact that this will have on the community of Fort Chipewyan, both from the employment point of view and the economic point of view, because of the fact that about 80 to 90% of the lumber mill employees live in Fort Chipewyan?

MR. LOUGHFEED:

Mr. Speaker, yes, I am familiar with the circumstances the hon. member alludes to, and of course, am personally familiar with the

29-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

operation. However, in terms of the exact contemporary information, I do not have it available at the moment. I would like to take the question as notice, and with the hon. Minister of Labour, I will report back to the hon. member at the first of the week.

MR. ECUVIER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that this is being done -- and probably the supplementary should go to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs -- in view of the fact that Swanson Lumber is closing down because the federal government will not renew their contract for timber within Wood Buffalo Park, and in view of the fact of a resolution which was passed, I believe last year or the year before, about negotiating to get Wood Buffalo Park back for Alberta -- or parts of it -- is the government still pursuing these negotiations with the federal government?

Employment in Fort Chipewyan

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, we have not to date carried out any negotiations regarding the Wood Buffalo National Park. However, I consider the move by the federal government, which is having an effect on the labour force in Fort Chipewyan, as a relatively serious one. Together with the Premier and the hon. Minister of Labour, we will consider what actions we can take to help alleviate the situation.

MR. YURKIC:

If I might add some information in connection with the unemployment in Fort Chipewyan, the government, of course, has recognized this problem now for some months, and in this regard the Department of the Environment has opened up a water resources office in Fort Chipewyan, which is intended to employ some 15 to 20 local people and train them for water resource measurements, and we will take a look to see if there are additional possibilities in this regard for that area.

MR. ECUVIER:

One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that Swanson Lumber has been able to obtain some timber in the Embarras Portage area, and in view of the fact that there is no road connecting Fort Chipewyan to Embarras Portage, and in view of the fact that there is an airstrip there, will you consider flying the people from Fort Chipewyan to Embarras so they can live in Fort Chipewyan and work at Embarras Portage in the mill?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, as I recall, the hon. member raised this very good point when he was speaking in one of the earlier debates in the Legislative Assembly. At the time, we took account of it and considered it to be a pretty reasonable suggestion. It is being investigated, and we will report back to the hon. member as soon as possible, as to the feasibility of it.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. He indicated that staff was being maintained in that area, or brought into that area in relation to water resources. Is that additional staff to what we already have in water resources, or is it some that have been transferred from other points to Fort Chipewyan?

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-15

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I indicated that approximately 15 to 20 local people would be hired and trained for the tasks that the water resources division would be doing in that area. I might also say that several people from the water resources division will be transferred from Edmonton to that area, and these are people who have been or are on the staff with respect to the Department of the Environment for some time.

MR. RUSTE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is then that there are additional numbers being employed?

ASTA Conference

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Education, and arises out of press reports recently. I am wondering if the hon. minister has received a request that this government or his department be represented at a conference called by the Alberta School Trustees' Association, the Association of School Boards in the province, which will take place in June in Calgary, for the purpose, I understand, to enable that body to explore new ways of financing elementary and secondary education?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No, Mr. Speaker, as a minister, I haven't received any request that the government be directly involved in the meeting or in planning the meeting. I understand that it is to look into the questions of educational finance as they would appear next year and in the years ahead. I spoke just two days ago, with Mr. Harald Gundersen, the President of the ASTA, and he mentioned to me the fact that this was going ahead.

Education Finance Committee

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Education. Does the Minister of Education have a committee presently looking at means of financing the I to XII system in Alberta, following the completion of the three-year program that you are now in?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, we do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK:

Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate the various bodies which are represented on the committee?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, the advisory committee to the minister on school finance, Mr. Speaker, is looking into this and addressing its mind to that subject. There is representation by the major groups in education, and, of course, also the task force on municipal-provincial relations is looking into this subject very directly, and that together with other sources will be reviewed before a final decision is made.

29-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

---

MR. CIAFK:

One last supplementary question. Does the Alberta Home and School Association have representation on that committee?

MR. HYNIMAN:

I don't believe they do on the minister's committee at this time, but I am in very close contact with them frequently on this matter.

#### Education Costs

MR. ASHTON:

I have a supplementary question Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education concerning the cost of education. I understand the County of Strathcona has requested that they be able to increase their taxes would be beyond the 6% guideline without a plebiscite. Do you intend to make an exception with respect to the County of Strathcona?

MR. HYNIMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I believe it was about four weeks ago that I had a very useful meeting with the trustees from the Strathcona area and the superintendent, and at that point it did seem to me that it was somewhat premature to make final decisions insofar as the trustees had not gone into their budget in detail and set priorities. I haven't heard from them since that time, but I certainly can say that unless very exceptional circumstances are shown, there would not be any consideration given to relief either in the manner of allowing extra supplementary requisition power or grants.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In view of having met with the Wainwright School Divisional Board, would you reconsider what their representation was at the time.

MR. HYNIMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I did meet with the Wainwright Board following the defeat by a very close margin -- I believe 53 votes -- of their initial plebiscite for some \$125,000. I see that they have decided to go again for a plebiscite and as I expressed to them at that time the results of the first plebiscite in effect, the highest educational cost of that area, the electors had said what they feel was the situation, they refused, admittedly by a small margin, to agree to extra financing and apparently the board is now going to go through this procedure again.

#### New AHIC Building

DR. FAFCSKI:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Public Works. Did this administration or your department initiate a decision to build an expensive additional administrative building for the Alberta Hospital Insurance Commission located in my constituency in Edmonton?

DR. EACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, this was initiated by the Department of Health and Social Development during the time of the previous administration.

DR. FAFCSKI:

I have a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would you have considered this a priority need in view of the needs in other areas, and what is the projected cost for this building?



April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-17

DR. BACKUS:

This would not primarily be my problem to consider it a priority need, as normally the Department of Public Works is here to satisfy the client departments and it is those departments that determine the priorities as far as their requests are concerned.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, am I next.

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes.

Equalization Grants

MR. TAYLOR:

May I have the floor? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the hon. the Provincial Treasurer? Has the provincial government made any representations to the Canadian government on Bill C8 which will establish the calculations for the equalization grants for the next five years?

MR. MINIELY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think that I have said a couple of times in the House and also in information tabled with respect to the hon. Premiers' representations at the First Ministers' Conference last fall what we had to say with respect to that bill. I think that clarifies the matter.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, did the government consider asking the Canadian government to remove a source of revenue, oil revenues, on the basis that it is a depleting asset?

MR. LUCCHIE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to that. I really do presume that is a matter that the hon. member has overlooked and not intended to be a question to raise debate. The matter is very specifically dealt with in the schedule which is attached to the budget speech with my notes and remarks to the First Ministers' meeting. But to assure the hon. member we certainly did, and I think the hon. member is well aware that is not a new matter in Alberta; it has been stressed on a number of occasions by the previous administration, and by ours, as a very important part of a reassessment of the equalization formula, not just at the First Ministers' meeting, but at the meeting of continuing officials, by the Provincial Treasurer at the finance meeting, and on almost every occasion when we've had an opportunity to do so. We have tried to stress that it really is an approach at the moment by the federal government that is clearly discriminatory towards the government of the Province of Alberta and its people. We object very, very strongly to it and will continue to do so.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did the Canadian government have some logical reason for insisting that a depleting asset from that be kept as a source of revenue in these calculations?

29-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

---

MR. LUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I regretfully have to answer that, and in my view they did not have any logical reason.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

New District Agriculturalists

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has any consideration been given to placing a district agriculturalist in the town of Drayton Valley, since these farmers are certainly far removed from the services that are now in existence on the farthest end of the counties that they live in?

DR. HCFNER:

Mr. Speaker, yes, we've been having a look at the entire country west of the 5th meridian in relation to the availability of counselling and other agricultural services in that area and we intend to locate a permanent district agriculturalist in the town of Drayton Valley, and an additional one in the town of Rimbey so that those people west of the 5th will be better looked after in agricultural matters.

Beverage Container Amendment Act

MR. CCCPER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of the Environment. My question is in respect to Bill No. 26, which has not yet been proclaimed, titled The Beverage Container Amendment Act, 1972, which provides for refunds on liquor and wine bottles. There are no bottle depots in my area and my question is where should these liquor and wine bottles be delivered in order to obtain the refunds - that is when the act is proclaimed? The question, Mr. Minister arises from the fact that there have been numerous bottle drives by young peoples' organizations in my area since the disappearance of the winter snows.

MR. SPEAKER:

May I suggest that perhaps, if the hon. member and the hon. minister would agree, that this might be brought up under second reading of the bill that was mentioned by the hon. member.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Youth Zoning

MR. FAFFAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Does the government plan to take action over requests from many local governments over the past two years to set a final deadline to specific youth zonings allowed by the previous government despite local objection?

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-19

MR. FUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, we currently have under consideration legislation which would put a reasonable time limitation on that kind of development, and I hope to introduce that into this session of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didstury, followed by the hon. Member for Taber-Warner, the hon. Member for Lacombe, the hon. Member for Lethbridge West and the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Fairview.

Task Force on Urbanization

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, and ask him if he or the government or the Cabinet are holding meetings with the mayors of the cities of Alberta in May to consider the future of the Task Force on Urbanization?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, we hope to have a May meeting of the board of directors of the Task Force on Urbanization and the Future. And it's also my hope to have a round table discussion with all the mayors of Alberta as a follow-up to our very excellent meeting that we had last fall. And as the pressures of this session decrease a little I hope to get that meeting organized.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. As a result of this meeting, will the hon. minister consider seriously the representation from mayors with regard to the carrying on of the task force that they had originally agreed to over a year and a half ago?

MR. FUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I have commented on the government's stated intent to carry on the work of that task force so many times that I wonder how many times I have to repeat it in order to get the point across. The thing is going to be continued for another two years, in a way in which we think will be dramatically more efficient than the experimental method proposed. Now we consider the work extremely important. We have assured the mayors that the work will be carried on, and I don't know why some people have so much trouble getting that through their skulls.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, might I say ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this a further question?

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The department is going to continue on the work of the whole task force with one person established in the Department of Municipal Affairs. Is that correct?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the department is not going to do the work. Mr. Frank Marlin has been appointed for a two year period as permanent

29-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

---

co-ordinator of research. He has the authority to hire an assistant and a secretary to help him with his daily administrative work and he also has the authority and the understanding that he will hire private consultants from the private sector to carry out whatever studies he sees necessary. And it seems to me like an extremely logical and efficient and free enterprise way of doing things.

SOME HCN. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Canadian Sugar Market

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Is the hon. Minister of Agriculture, in his search for additional markets, considering ways and means of obtaining a greater share of the Canadian sugar market for Alberta, when we consider 85% of this market is imported into Canada?

DR. HCFNER:

Mr. Speaker we are having a look at the potential for all agricultural products. I can say to the House and to the hon. gentleman that we have met with the sugar refiners and producers in that area and have heard their representations. One of the things that would improve the market for sugar made from sugar beets in Alberta, would be an improved and expanded processed food industry in Alberta. My colleague in Industry and I are working on that proposition. We have also -- and the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has worked with me -- made representation to the Federal Tariff Board in relation to the hearings that have been held on sugar, generally, in more recent months, and the recommendations of the Tariff Board which are very detrimental to the sugar industry in Alberta. We have been in close touch with the companies that are involved, and have made representations in support of their brief to the National Tariff Commission.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lacombe followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview and I regret that I should have recognized the hon. Member for Calgary Millican much sooner than I did.

Hcg Processing and Marketing

MR. CCKSCN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I hesitate to raise the question with regard to North American Integrated Food Processors again, but in view of the statement that some of the smaller packing plants in Manitoba and Saskatchewan are thriving in anticipation of this development in southern Alberta, could the hon. minister advise at what stage negotiations are at this time?

DR. HCFNER:

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it -- and I reviewed the situation with my department this morning -- so far North American Integrated Food Processors have not finalized their application to DREE for grants to establish their processing facility in southern Alberta as yet. I understand that is in the process and will be done very shortly. In addition to that, some of our hcg people have had detailed discussions with the head of North American Integrated Food Processors in relation to what they intend to do. As I understand the situation at the moment, the principals are buying from

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-21

processors who are willing to process in Saskatchewan and Manitoba to fill orders that they already have. I understand that the first shipment of hogs from a Saskatoon plant is going into the export market very shortly.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel any shipment of hogs out of western Canada into the export market is generally good for the producers in Alberta and we would encourage that sort of thing. I can't report further to the House in relation to the stability of the North American Integrated Food Processors as yet, but we are looking at the suggestion that both the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview made in relation to perhaps having someone to go to the Philippines and investigate on the spot. I'm sure all will appreciate that this can be only done after having some preparatory work with both the Department of External Affairs and with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, and we're looking at that at the present time.

MR. STRICK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the one asked by the hon. Member for Lacombe. Would the hon. Minister of Agriculture feel that if they are filling markets or potential markets that they have from Saskatchewan and Manitoba, that we are in fact losing markets that should have been available to Alberta?

DR. HCFNER:

Well, no, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows well that in red meats we're on a North American market, and as a matter of fact, any expansion of market helps us here. Certainly we'd like to get as much expansion as we possibly can in Alberta without lowering the cost to our producers. But it is a North American market, and certainly a western Canadian market, and the pricing mechanism is related to that generally. I might say to the hon. gentleman that, as far as I'm aware, we're not yet sure where the first shipment is going, but it looks as if that particular shipment is going to the United States.

MR. RUSIE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Are we not in an international market, rather than in a North American market?

DR. HCFNER:

Well, of course, we're in an international market, Mr. Speaker, but the pricing mechanism for red meats in Alberta is directly related to the North American market as the hon. gentleman should know.

#### Slave Lake Construction Project

MR. MCILROY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to either the hon. Minister of Industry or the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in charge of Northern Development. Has the government received any representation from individuals or groups regarding the supposed use of U.S. equipment and lumber at Slave Lake in the construction of the Alberta Hardwoods Ltd. sawmill?

MR. FRASER:

Mr. Speaker, I haven't.

29-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

MR. ALAIF:

Mr. Speaker, neither have I.

The Sexual Sterilization Repeal Act

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier and it regards Bill No. 34 that is before the House at the present time, The Sexual Sterilization Repeal Act, 1972. Because of the concern that has been expressed by parents and guardians of the people who will be affected under this bill, plus the professional staff, is it the government's intention to proceed to pass this bill in its present form in this session, or are they considering holding up the bill until the fall session or later, in order that these people can have a better chance to express their views to the government before the bill is passed?

MR. LOUGHREE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the notice that was given to me by the hon. member on this important question. It is our intention to certainly give an opportunity to people who are specifically interested and the public generally to make submissions on the bill and that was one reason it was introduced early in the session. As to when it would be passed depends generally on the degree of representations that we receive. I do think that there is one important matter here to be aware of, because the hon. member alluded to it in his question with regard to the concern of parents, and that is that the legal advice that we have with regard to the act is that the repeal of the act would not in any way forestall the parents authorizing the sterilization of children who are mentally defective, and that such parental consent would be deemed to be a voluntary sterilization. But we do feel very, very strongly about the bill, because the bill in its present form, in our view, deals with the matter of the government or an agency of government making that particular decision in any case. But the matter raised by the hon. member is certainly well taken, and if there is any need to specifically assure that that matter need be dealt with, say, by an amendment in the repealing act or in some other provision of legislation, we will obtain submissions on that score.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the answer from the hon. the Premier but, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask him if he wouldn't mind enlarging on the other item, where the professional people thought if this bill was passed it would affect them in the future as far as the Bill of Rights and other Human Rights legislation that may be brought in.

MR. LOUGHREE:

Mr. Speaker, without getting into a debate, I would reject that entirely. I would reject it because I think it is exactly the opposite. I think the bill in its present form is most offensive with regard to the Bill of Rights, and in fact, that is one of the reasons it was introduced early. It is a very disturbing bill as far as I am concerned personally, and we feel strongly about it. But there is the one matter that I mentioned in answer to the first question that deals with the question of parents being in a position to, in some way or another, create a voluntary sterilization under those particular circumstances. We are looking into that. We would welcome submissions on that point, but on that point alone. We are aware that there could possibly be an exception on the general point. We feel, as I mentioned, very, very strongly that the bill is offensive and at odds with the proposed Bill of Rights.

April 14th 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

29-23

MR. SPEAKER:

I am afraid we have slightly exceeded the time allotted for the question period.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

DR. WARFACK:

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to further draw to the attention of all MLA's of the Assembly that the Department of Lands and Forests does wish to have the opportunity to put forward the scope of responsibilities, the policies related to those scopes of responsibilities followed at the present time, as well as problems that we have in the Department of Lands and Forests, division by division, to all of the MLA's for their response, suggestions, and so forth, and that I have organized these sessions to be on four consecutive Mondays beginning April 24th. These are on Mondays rather than Wednesdays or Fridays to avoid conflict with the Public Accounts Committee, and although I recognize that there will no doubt be some other time conflicts, this is no doubt a thing that will be unavoidable in any case. These then will run from April 24th through May 15th and I am quite sure we will still be here on that date, so I would invite the hon. members' response so that we might plan accordingly to have these sessions and make them as productive as we possibly can.

MR. HYLMAN:

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

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

Department of the Environment (cont.)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Appropriation No. 2901 Minister's Office

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, I have a few more remarks to make, but I believe before I continue I would like to clear up this question of a moratorium on water studies, which was brought up by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and which will be appearing as a Motion for Return on the Order Paper.

I would like to suggest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the hon. Minister of Agriculture during the latter part of 1968 did, in fact, have a report produced called Water Diversion Proposals of North America, prepared for the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers. I believe it was in British Columbia, or Vancouver at that time. I would like to suggest that, under some of these

29-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

articles, the benefits to Canada and Alberta are indicated and some of the major diversions within Alberta are listed. And also suggest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that there are, in the back of this report, a series of maps indicating diversions, all produced by the Department of Agriculture -- not by some other firm in some other country, but all produced by the Department of Agriculture -- not by some other firm in some other country, but all produced by the Department of Agriculture, the Water Resources Division, Development Planning Branch. Basically, I would like to suggest that it is a review of the proposals that had been established up to that time. Nevertheless, it is a government compilation and a government study presented to an organization outside this province by a member of government. At that time, I believe the hon. Mr. Ruste was the representative to the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers. This was asked to be tabled yesterday, and I'm prepared to table it. However, there is, I believe, a Motion for a Return, requesting all documents during the last ten years in this regard, and it can be tabled at that time.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, again, the question that I have to raise, of course, is whether or not at any time the previous government have suggested that they were preparing for the export of water. When I look at the use of the word moratorium my understanding is that what you have done as the present minister is to declare a moratorium on any studies or move to export water. And I suggest that I haven't had an opportunity to review the report that you are referring to, but if it is simply a review of the various proposals that have been made for diversion of water, then I simply say that there have been scores of these over the years, and if you want to go back and examine the record, I'm sure that the hon. minister will find that these studies have been made in various ways -- some in depth, some with very, very little consideration other than that they were using topography maps that indicated there was a possibility of water flowing to the south. But to suggest that there has to be a moratorium on the studies because it is related to export, as a decision by the previous government, I say it is not in accordance with the facts as they are. I can only state again, as I did the other night when we were discussing it that never at any time -- and I say at any time -- did we suggest that there should be export. In fact, to the contrary, I made public statements from time to time, that I did not, nor did the government, support any consideration for export. When we start looking at the possibility of surplus of water, then, of course, we get into a number of definitions as to what is truly surplus. My view is that water really does not turn up as surplus until it finally runs into the ocean and is no longer useable by any of the jurisdictions to which it happens to run through.

I am afraid that the hon. minister has been confused by expressions of opinion by various individuals, including federal government people, who have suggested that there was a need of studying the subject so that they could give consideration to the export of water. And if he wants to be really thinning it down, he will find that it was one of his fellow Conservatives, a former Minister of Agriculture, the hon. Alvin Hamilton, who did quite a bit of talking about the possibility of using this one as a valuable resource that could, in fact, bring a great deal of revenue to the Dominion of Canada or to the provinces. So I suggest that to state that there is a moratorium because of decisions we made is really not in accordance with the facts.

MR. YURKC:

Mr. Chairman, I must reiterate I'm not the least bit confused. And secondly, the statements that this government made are very accurate and very correct. The statement made in the form of a news



April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-25

release was that the fact that the government would put a moratorium on all studies made by any department or agency of government, and this I suggest to you is a study.

The question that the hon. Leader of the Opposition was asking me in the last few days, was whether there was a study to justify a moratorium. I have to reiterate that at no time have I intimated that that policy, of any kind -- I don't know what their policy was -- but I said over and over again that this government when it came into being, was very specific in its policy, and it put it before the people of Alberta at the earliest opportunity.

If I might be permitted to continue, I was going to say something about water use charges brought up by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, but he isn't in the House, so I'll skip that. I was going to say something on engineering studies, which he brought up, but again he isn't in the House, so I'll skip that. He also indicated a need for studies in connection with the hydro-potential of the Peace River; I will skip that.

MR. FENDERSON:

I have returned.

MR. YURKO:

Well, he has lost his chance. He is going to have to ask me again.

MR. FENDERSON:

I believe the hon. minister is declining an opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

It appears that if you had stayed out a little longer, you would have lost your chance, Mr. Member.

MR. YURKO:

I would like to respond to a request for clarification put to me by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, in connection with the lost jobs in the Canmore mines. I would like to read, very briefly, the information I have received.

(1) Layoffs of about 30 people are related only to the drop in sales, and this includes all layoffs.

(2) About 15 men laid off are from the strip areas.

(3) Layoffs are temporary, but recent sales trips to Japan and Europe are not promising.

(4) The remaining men and equipment from the strip area will be spending approximately 80% of their time on reclaiming abandoned sites.

(5) If coal sales remain down for the balance of the year, approximately 75% of the abandoned sites will be reclaimed.

(6) This does not include the Georgetown mine which still has coal deposits remaining.

(7) If the company were not required by the government to reclaim, another eight or nine men would have been laid off.

There were other matters raised by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, but, again, he is not in the House. If he wishes me to pursue them later I will.

29-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

---

There were a number of questions referred to me by the hon. Member for Okotoks, and I would like to respond very briefly in connection with some. I would like to suggest that we are combining The Ground Water Act with The Water Resources Act so that there will be an integrated approach to water management in this regard.

I would also like to suggest that we are giving some consideration to licensing well drillers; perhaps an association could be formed in connection with the well drillers. They have been in contact with me on several occasions.

I would also like to suggest that seismic operations will be included in the new Land Surface Conservation Act. The hon. Member for Okotoks asked me some specific questions regarding the relationship between the Department of the Environment and other departments of government, and how we are, in fact, maintaining a degree of surveillance over some of the functions of the other departments in connection with environmental matters. I would like to clear that up quickly. We have established a committee of Natural Resources and the Environment at the cabinet minister level. This includes some of the key ministers associated with resource development. This committee oversees broad policy in this area, as well as some of the programs are generally cleared through this committee, so we have a constant contact between the various ministers involved basically in resource and physical resource development.

I would also like to suggest that we have referral committees now in connection with resource development and my department is certainly represented on the referral committees that are established. More referral committees will be established in connection with The Land Surface Conservation Act. I would like to suggest that whenever road building will be done through sensitive areas, like the Kananaskis corridor or the Kananaskis area, we will be doing environmental impact studies. Wherever there is a critical consideration of environmental requirements then the department will do an environmental impact study and feed this information into the Department of Highways.

I would also like to suggest that the Natural Resource Committee of deputy ministers established under the Department of the Environment is becoming more active and it will be used for cross coordination to a large degree. I would also like to suggest that the Conservation and Utilization Committee is very active in this regard. I think there are 15 or 16 or 17 members on this committee and many, many matters of total development are being referred to this committee. The consensus from this committee is then given to the various departments of government that are, in fact, involved.

I would also like to suggest to the hon. member, that we have under the Department of Environment Act, Section 12, which permits the Minister of the Environment, with the concurrence of the Lieutenant Governor in Council to negate any action that has been taken by any other department in connection with the environment. This is an over-riding, over-seeing type of clause in the Act, and permits the Lieutenant Governor in Council, basically, with the advice of the Minister of the Environment, to retrace its steps when insufficient collaboration has resulted between departments of government. And I would like to suggest that in this regard we have already acted, and we re-routed a pipeline not very many weeks ago.

The hon. Member from Calgary Bow made some timely remarks and I have had occasion to meet with him during the session on the problem and I won't deal with his remarks in depth at this point, however if he wishes to pursue them later on I will certainly be pleased to respond. The hon. Member from Lesser Slave Lake made some remarks and I recognize the problems in his area, I have had delegations from his area laying before me some of the major problems associated with farming areas in a flooded plain. This is indeed a difficult problem;

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-27

the whole matter of Lesser Slave Lake is a difficult problem. We will be giving our attention to this matter in the future, but before we give undivided attention to any specific problem, there is a need to establish some overall policy in connection with cost-sharing, and also devise methods of raising money to, in fact, undertake some of these major projects. And I do want to suggest that the number of projects that have been investigated, and are really required to be done in connection with water management and water resource improvement in Alberta are really legion in number, and there is a desperate need to find money in some way to undertake some of these programs. It is very difficult in the case of setting priorities by a government to indicate for example that water resource management in certain areas has a higher priority than mental health. So that the amount of actual physical construction that we undertake often has to take a secondary role or priority to other more needy areas of concern. In this regard, we feel that we really have to examine the idea of water use fees. However, in examining the idea of water use fees, I must suggest that the initiative that was taken by the former minister is certainly not in accord with my thinking. As a matter of fact the establishment of water use fees for domestic use is something that I reject. And I reject it totally in that I believe that this is a matter for municipal government concern, where it has been for some time. And more of our investigations in this area are associated with provincial water use fees in connection with industrial use and other uses.

I was very interested in some of the remarks made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway. I certainly agree that he's thinking ahead, perhaps a little further ahead than my time, but I recognize that what he said he said in all seriousness, because I recognize that many young people indeed are saying this today. And what they are really saying is that perhaps the approaches of the past must be revised and we must have new approaches for the future.

In connection with the remarks made by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall - I take his remarks to heart. We are, of course, or will be considering where this area of jurisdiction lies within government and this will be given more attention in the future.

I was impressed by some of the remarks and questions posed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didstury -- he isn't in the House either -- but I recognize some of the problems that exist in his constituency in connection with flood problems. He has been in to see us and we've had one meeting with him and his people. I recognize the problems of the smaller centres in connection with water and sewage disposal. We particularly recognize the conflicts that are beginning to arise in connection with the use of ground water where one person's use disturbs somebody else's use, and where, in one case, tapping of a water aquifer resulted in the severe detriment to somebody else's well. There are obviously some legal precedents that will be set in this area before too long. In connection with his remarks in regard to location of industry, this again, I think is well placed at this time.

The hon. Member for Innisfail made some excellent remarks and I take his remarks to heart. One remark he made -- I'm sure my department took under advisement immediately -- in connection with the laggon on the edge of a large creek.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway made again, as he did the other day, some timely remarks and I'm sure that he and I will have some discussions in the future on these matters.

The hon. Member for Brayton Valley also made some timely remarks. He asked me some specific questions, particularly in connection with the Pembina River dam. I would like to suggest that this matter hasn't entered my mind in one way or another for the last several months. It is a matter that I don't necessarily consider as

29-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

having any priority at this time because there are other more pressing matters.

I believe that those are basically the general remarks made. I must also say that the hon. member, Mr. Graham Harle, made some very timely remarks in connection with his area. I think, Mr. Chairman, that's all for this time and I would be glad to answer any questions in connection with the estimates.

MR. EAFTON:

I have one question to the hon. minister. I didn't mean that I felt now was the time to start negotiating on the Lesser Slave Lake area with the federal government on a cost-sharing program. I didn't mean that it was your responsibility wholly.

MR. STROM:

The hon. minister referred to a number of studies. They haven't been given in a chronological order, but he does refer to them here in his opening remarks. Apparently, as I understand it, they are dealing with "urbanization and resource development and so forth" is the way you expressed it. Then you go on and you say: "As a result it will be noted that my department has instigated a large number of studies." They are dealing with it, as I understand it, with urbanization problems and resource development and so on.

My question is, do you have a list of the studies? Are they available to us? How many do they number? I don't necessarily need an outline of them.

MR. YURKO:

I would like to read very quickly some of the new studies we have undertaken in connection with the department. However, I have them listed here and I can table them if you wish?

MR. STROM:

Maybe you could go over some of them at the present time.

MR. YURKO:

Some of the new studies are:

A Noise Study in the City of Calgary  
An Odour Study in the City of Calgary  
A Noise Study in the City of Edmonton  
An Odour Study in the City of Edmonton  
Emission and Source Inventory Studies  
Athabasca Tar Sands Study  
Productivity of Alberta Lakes -- this is still to be awarded;  
Quality Classification, A Stream Study -- this is to be awarded;  
Municipal Water Quality Survey -- this is to be awarded;  
Municipal Water Corrosion Study -- this is still to be awarded;  
Separation of Surface and Sub-surface Flow -- to be awarded;  
River Engineering Research -- to be awarded;  
Water Survey Canada  
Operation and Maintenance Hydrometric Station -- this is in connection with the federal government;  
Water Survey Canada Installation Hydrometric Station -- this is again in connection with the federal government.

I also have, as I indicated earlier in connection with water resources, a pretty extensive document listing all the work we have done. It would take me some time to go through this if you wish. However, I indicated that I can make this available which really

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-29

documents much of the work done or being done in the Water Resources Division.

MR. STROM:

Are all of these studies being farmed out to private concerns?

MR. YORKE:

No, a very large number of these studies, of course, are being done by the Division of Water Resources. Most of these studies that I read, the earlier studies, are in fact being farmed and we have as a policy matter before us -- we have adopted this policy -- that wherever possible we will engage private industries to do the studies for us.

MR. STROM:

What money will be directly involved in the studies? Just a ball park figure.

MR. YORKE:

I haven't added it up but it will be in the order of, perhaps, a half a million or a million dollars, in this region somewhere.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister also mentioned that the government was going to take advantage of The Canada Water Act and I believe, if I recall correctly, that it was related to the Red Deer River basin. I may be wrong in that but it was my understanding that this was maybe one area that you were looking at.

I would like to have just a brief outline of the projects you have in mind and maybe there are some dollars and cents in there that you might outline to us as well.

MR. YORKE:

We, of course, recognize the existence of The Canada Water Act -- have recognized it from the beginning -- and have discussed at some length the approach that we would make towards The Canada Water Act and the type of posture that we might adopt as an Alberta Government with respect to the desire by Canada to get involved in a big way in river basin management. We recognize also that there is a real desire on the part of Canada to inject itself into the management of water resources, particularly watershed management in the headwaters of most of our rivers. In this regard we felt it was necessary for us to adopt the approach with the federal government that we knew exactly what we wanted before we made an approach to the federal government. We had adopted a policy which would place development on a river basin basis. Now in regard to that, then it was necessary to attempt to crystalize in our minds the type of structure that we would want to regulate river basin development, and we have been thinking in connection with a commission which would represent the people from the basin itself.

In this regard, before approaching the federal government, we first of all recognized that we had to choose a trial case, and we looked at our river basins -- the Old Man, the Bow River, the Red Deer River, the North Saskatchewan, and so forth, and we decided that the most critical need for an examination of the basin in total at this particular point in time, was the Red Deer River basin. We then established it as the top priority in connection with devising, first of all, within our government, an overall management scheme, and then approaching the federal government to determine how they could, in fact, cooperate in managing this scheme, what contributions would be

29-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

---

involved, what type of contributions, what type of management and regulatory set-up could be set up and so forth.

Our first task, in connection with the Red Deer River basin, was to define what we thought was necessary for these various alternatives within this basin that have been studied that could be used in a negotiating process with the federal government. The department, the Water Resources Division, has basically completed this examination of the Red Deer River basin and one item in it, of course, was the listing of all studies that were done in this regard.

The second aspect of this would be what we would consider to be necessary in connection with the total river basin development plan. One of the first things we recognize was needed in this basin was flow regulation, because at this time, to my recollection, there is no flow regulation in the Red Deer River, and the flows fluctuate very badly. The second thing, of course, that was necessary was a recognition of the amount of DCD material that is being put into this river from various sources. A third thing was an examination of the flood possibilities within the basin itself and what could, in fact, be done.

So in this light the division has set together a report which I'm not prepared to table as yet, but nevertheless we expect to table it before too long, a report attempting to identify all the requirements of developing this basin and the total basin concept. And then we expect to go to the federal government and indicate to them what our concerns are, what our plans are, and see if we can determine what type of a deal we could get or establish with the federal government. Now it is on the basis of our negotiations with the federal government in connection with this river basin -- it is the basis of this negotiation on this river bed or on this watershed -- that will establish what, in fact, we do with the rest of our water basins. I don't know if I'm clear enough at this time.

MR. STICM:

That is good enough, I didn't expect to get it in total detail. You didn't deal with any amounts of money and I can appreciate why now, too, because you haven't reached that point in time as yet.

In the matter of inter-basin diversion, I am clear on your statements that you have made, but I just raise it in this light. Am I as an Albertan denied water that happens to be in a basin outside an area in which I live? Or do I have any right to it, and can I expect that at some time, maybe a diversion would be logical if it was determined there was a surplus in the basin in which it originates?

MR. YURKC:

Mr. Chairman, I really wouldn't want to undertake to answer the philosophical question posed -- which may be more than a philosophical question, it's a practical question, as a matter of fact, in the future.

MR. STICM:

If I may point out -- ask a southerner living in the Palliser triangle -- it can be very well a practical question. Or if I were living in the constituency of the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen, it becomes a practical problem very, very early and I suggest, at the moment, there is no solution if there is a shortage of water in the Red Deer river basin.

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-31

MR. YORKE:

Well, let me suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we have tried to establish priorities and as I indicated earlier in my talk, these priorities that we have tried to establish, first of all is (a) that there is a need to develop the basin on a watershed basin concept, first, so that efficiencies can be effected where needed. I have to suggest that in the area of irrigation water usage varies all the way from, I believe, about one acre foot per acre up to as high as something like three or even higher, and I don't want to be kept to these figures because they are just out of my head at the present time.

And we recognize that there is a need for efficiency of use in a lot of our water basins. We also recognize that we need a basic use and demand study, not only an immediate use and demand study, but a projected use and demand study. We also recognize that there is a case of priority of monies. All the diversion schemes that I have seen involve vast sums of monies and there is no point in suggesting that there is going to be a diversion in any way, shape, or form, until such time as some money is available, and some method of raising funds is determined or found.

Secondly, I want to suggest that I indicated earlier in this House that we considered that use classification of water bodies was a provincial responsibility. I also said to this House that the changing of use classification was a provincial responsibility. I suggest to you that when you consider whether or not one basin deserves water or should have water from another basin, then you are involving yourself in the area of changing use classifications, because one basin might want that water for aesthetics, for fishing, for hydro-electric, for industry, and another basin may want it for irrigation. It is a case of devising a formula to accommodate one basin versus the other one, and to suggest at this time that we have devised a formula would simply be premature. We have not devised a formula. I suggest to you that we must reconcile ourselves and address ourselves to all these problems that I have mentioned -- a half a dozen or so -- before we can even think of diversion from one basin to another. As a result, I can only predict what I hope will happen in my time, in my administration, and I don't envision any diversions from one basin to another occurring in my time, because of the fact that there are so many other major problems to solve in connection with management on the river basin concept itself.

I do also want to suggest that it is easy enough to say that 87% of our water goes north. I pointed out to the hon. member that the population shift was northward. You will also notice that industry has a higher classification than irrigation. You will also notice that with respect to the gross national product, if you examine the gross national product in Alberta, you will find the relationship of agriculture to industry. You will also note that most of the future energy resources of this province are in the northern half of the province. The wealth in the Athabasca tar sands is immense indeed and much of this water will be needed for the development of these resources. You will also remember that the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc indicated a great need and an urgency to develop the Peace River waterway as a hydro-electric potential. And if you are going to develop this as a hydro-electric potential, then every acre foot of water flowing through that river is needed for generating electricity or some other purpose. Industry -- we have in the northern part of the province a vast iron ore reserve which is going to require something like 60,000 gallons per minute of water per ton of steel. We also have our timber resources in the north. The timber resources suggest, for example, pulp and paper mills on the Athabasca River. When we put these two mills on the Athabasca River there won't be any excess water or surplus water.

So there are many, many problems involved before one can even dream of suggesting that water will be diverted from one basin to the other, though I don't preclude the idea that perhaps one little

29-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

tributary from one major waterway could be used as a storage reservoir for flow regulation in another river basin, for the simple reason that perhaps there are no available sites for impounding water in the river basin that in fact you are working on.

MR. STICM:

Mr. Chairman, certainly the only point that I would make on it is that if the department is going ahead with a development plan, irrespective of any consideration to diversions, whether in fact that is a short-sighted view.

And I suggest that a basin could be developed by itself and in such a manner that it does not take diversion into consideration. All I'm saying is that I think at this point in time it would be very wise to give consideration to a plan that does consider the possibility, if down the road this is decided. I don't intend to pursue it further. I think the hon. minister and I could get aside some evening and have a very interesting discussion on this matter.

MR. YURKC:

That would all depend on what you said, hon. Leader. We recognize that diversion can be carried out by means other than gravity diversions. And as a matter of fact, diversions, if considered to be other than the form of gravity, can be carried out almost any place within two basins, so that we can't be tied up forever in a gravity diversion scheme. I suggest to you that the gravity diversion scheme, in connection with the Saskatchewan-Nelson River Basin study, has been devised. It's on the table, we know it exists and we know many of the aspects of it.

MR. FENCEFICH:

Mr. Chairman....

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I believe Mr. Barton has been trying to get the floor.

MR. BARTON:

I would just like a little bit of clarification on the production study of Alberta lakes. I have some 30 lakes, and I was wondering in what area and what type of production study you were going into -- economics, fishing or lands and forest. Or was I wrong in assuming that you are going into a productive study of Alberta lakes? Could you elaborate on this?

MR. FAFFAN:

Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.....We're still on general discussion...or No. 1?

MR. YURKC:

In the area of lake management we first of all recognize that we need a policy of cost-sharing, and this is probably the first step that we must take in establishing any kind of a program in lake stabilization or lake rehabilitation, the formula of cost-sharing between the provincial government -- I won't say the provincial government -- the two senior levels of government lumped in one sum, and the junior level of government and any local initiative in connection with owners along that lake. In this area we have given much thought and much study and we have, to date, compiled a complete listing of virtually all the lakes in Alberta, and listed them according to various characteristics, one of the most important being shoreline ownership, and not only shoreline ownership, but associated



April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-33

with that depth of ownership from the shoreline. The policy that we're attempting to establish in this area will be related to shoreline ownership. If a lake is 100% owned by the people of Alberta -- all the property around is 100% owned -- then any work on that lake will be 100% input from the provincial government, obviously. We'll declare it as a lake in the public interest. If it's owned to a large degree by private property owners, it's not fair to the rest of Alberta to, in fact, put total government input into the management of that lake. So our policy will be related to the one very basic idea of shoreline ownership and depth of shoreline ownership.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I'm sorry, Mr. Henderson, but Mr. French has gotten up about three times before you. I'll give you your turn next.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, I just have one question for the hon. minister. Excluding ground water, what percentage of our water would you anticipate that we're using today?

MR. YORKE:

One hundred percent, Mr. Chairman. If you classify it according to all its uses, the last one being aesthetics, then, in fact, we use 100% of our surface waters.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid the hon. minister misunderstood my question. In view of the fact that there's considerable water today flowing into the Arctic Ocean and the Hudson Bay, would you consider that this is serving a useful purpose today?

MR. YORKE:

You see, hon. member, you asked me what percentage was used. And I suggest to you that when I put down all 12 uses, which go all the way from domestic use to aesthetics -- somebody likes to see that beautiful river flowing at its full flow. Or if you consider it for growth of fish, or for other uses, then I suggest to you that we are using 100% of our water. If you want to ask me what percent is used for irrigation, that is something else, what percent is used for industrial use, that is something else. But, in all honesty I say to you that Alberta is using 100% of its surface waters today, and there is no surplus in this province when consideration is given to all the uses.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, maybe that would be very useful to me if we could start with the six priorities, and give me a percentage for each one.

MR. YORKE:

I think you might put that on as a Motion for Return. It is a very difficult thing to identify, but we could. In some of our studies I think we have identified how much is being used for certain classifications.

29-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

---

MR. FENDEESON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment firstly on the comments the hon. minister just made. I certainly concur with his description of analysis, or explanation of water uses that he just gave the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

I would also like to support the hon. minister in the absolute necessity of getting a cost-shared policy established before the government embarks on a program of stabilization. In my view, it would be a misuse of the taxpayer's money to spend substantial sums of public funds stabilizing water levels on a lake where the shoreline is all privately owned. Because I can't see any return for the public. In my mind, there has to be a clear establishment of return to the public collectively from such investment, and certainly a province-wide study of this question is highly desirable, in fact, absolutely necessary, if a sensible policy is to be established.

I would like the hon. minister, however, as a matter of definition -- it is easy to talk about inter-basin and intra-basin diversions -- but it would help me out in understanding the hon. minister's thinking if he would outline to the House very briefly whether he considers the North and South Saskatchewan Rivers as a single basin, because they are common, or whether he calls them two basins. It is a matter of definition as to where one changes, so far as the Alberta situation is concerned specifically -- from 'intra' to 'inter'.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, we consider the North Saskatchewan basin and the South Saskatchewan basin as two very distinctly different basins within Alberta. They perhaps join somewhere down the line, but then all the basins join in the oceans in one way or another. However, I do want to make it very clear what we mean by 'intra-basin' diversions, as against 'inter-basin' diversions.

Intra-basin diversions mean taking water out of a river, stabilizing a lake, and the discharge coming back to that river, much like, for example, the possibility of stabilizing Cooking Lake, a program that was studied. But it doesn't irretrievably or irreversibly take water out of a basin. That water comes back into the basin, either through ground water or through surface run-off back into the basin.

MR. FENDEESON:

I understand the point; I was not debating, I just wanted clarification, for theoretically, as the hon. minister has pointed out, one can stretch the intra-basin far enough so there is no inter-basin. I just wanted it clear for future reference. Thank you.

MR. NUTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the hon. minister. I was out just at the beginning of the estimates. I think he was dealing in part with this question, but I wanted some clarification of the \$250,000 spent for special environmental and ecological studies in Appropriation No. 2902. Just as I came in, I think I caught you saying that this would be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder, Mr. Nuttley, if we can, seeing you are asking a specific, get through No. 2901, and then No. 2902, please?

Appropriation No. 2901 agreed to

43,990

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-35

Appropriation No. 2902 General Administration.

MR. NCTIEY:

Fair enough. I am not quite sure of your answer on that, Mr. Minister. But I think I understood you to say that in the main these studies would be farmed out to private consultants. Is that correct?

MR. YOEKO:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, our policy is to farm out as many studies and to distribute the work associated with these studies over the broadest possible spectrum of the consulting world. In connection with the \$250,000 in Appropriation 2902, we visualize there a number of studies, all of which haven't been totally defined. As yet this is the area where we have provided some additional money for studies that we recognize we might need, but we haven't as yet totally defined.

However, we have defined some, and we recognize that we are going to do this in the area a major study on the environmental impact of pipelines. We recognize that we are going to do a study in this regard on the environmental impact of road building, particularly the road being built into the Kananaskis area. We are going to do an environmental impact study in this regard. We are going to do a study in connection with possibly the growth or the sustenance of fish in the Big Horn Reservoir. We may be doing some lake beautification studies in this area. And I simply want to suggest that the amount of money that we have in there really isn't very large for the work that we have to do. Personally, I would like to have seen it doubled at least.

MR. NCTIEY:

A supplementary, Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't disagree with the Minister's observation that \$250,000 is sufficient, but I wonder on what basis the contracts for consulting will be awarded? I would also like to know whether it is possible for groups that are not profit-making concerns, but let's say environmental control groups, whether or not they would be considered for any of these studies? Thirdly, whether or not the universities, which could provide a lot of very knowledgeable people, would not also be considered? And fourthly, to what extent is the department itself going to commission some of these studies directly under the department?

MR. YOEKO:

I think I will answer the third question first. We advertise all these studies, and we advertise them fairly extensively. And we are not the least bit adverse to a university or even, in fact, the Alberta Research Council approaching us with respect to the fact that they have the disciplines and the necessary equipment to do a study. We have given a contract to the University of Calgary in connection with either the noise or colour study, I forget which one in Calgary, because they put in a very detailed proposal. We met with them, we discussed their proposal with them, we gauged their capability, and we felt that they were adequate to do the task.

In connection with the Tar Sands study, a consortium was established to do this study, and the consortium included private plus public input. As a matter of fact, the Alberta Research Council is a part of that consortium. So we are extremely open-minded in who does the studies. As a matter of fact, I would like to suggest that the Alberta Fish and Game Association will, I believe, be funded under this appropriation in connection with their mercury study. We will be supplying some money to them -- not all of their requirements, but some. We envision that organizations like STOP, and the ECO Centre from Calgary will be approaching us in connection with doing some studies, and they will be given every opportunity,

29-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

---

just like everybody else. I do want to suggest that we try not to exclude anybody to begin with, but we do have a fairly involved procedure of rating in connection with competence, in connection with equipment and so forth. And it is my intent, at every possible point, to distribute the load over the widest spectrum, as I indicated earlier, and I am not sure that any one company has received more than one study up to this point.

DR. NCTIEY:

A supplementary to that. It would be a fair assessment, Mr. Minister, then to say that in general the allocating of these studies would be on the basis of the RFP concept, the Request for Proposals Concept, which the former government has talked about with respect to health and social development?

MR. YURKC:

I do want to suggest that in general that is correct, but there may be some minor studies which don't involve too much money, or if somebody came to us with a proposal, an excellent proposal for example, that we would consider in a case like that. He initiated the thing, it was his initiative that brought him to us and suggested the program. In a case like this we probably wouldn't go out for a general approach to the industry or the public at all. We would simply fund him and ask him to do the study.

MR. DRAIN:

In the case of a study report being adverse, then what? Is this the end of it, or is there a reconciliation to try and meet something half way, or is this the end? For instance, you mention that there is a study of the environmental impact on building a road into the Kananaskis, so presumably that this is being done, or at least the land is being cleared, so hence it's a fact that this is being done. You say now that you're studying this despite the fact that the road is going ahead, so what I'm wondering about is - if you now receive, as a result of your study, a report that says this is adverse - then what, do you then stop this? What happens?

MR. YURKC:

Let me explain to you what the procedure might be here. Member, if we did have an environmental impact study. Let's consider the road up into the Kananaskis. The report could say one of two things. First of all it could say this is an environmentally sensitive area and the road should be built in a certain manner; the grade should be a certain thing, certain types of grasses should be used to seed the sides of the road, certain type of curve. There could be many conditions and they might say to us - the road should be built under these conditions. We would then take these conditions and go over and see the Department of Highways and indicate to them that that road, if approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, should be built under these conditions.

The second thing that the report could say to us is that the road should not be built, because in fact it will have a major adverse effect upon the area in total. Being only one department of government, the hon. Minister of Highways might have approval from Cabinet to build that road and I would come back to him and say; "Well, Mr. Minister you shouldn't build that road". And he would say; "Well I'm going to build the road." And I would say; "Alright, Mr. Minister, I have under my act section 12 which says that the department can override your decision if in fact I can convince the Lieutenant-Governor in Council." And I'm simply suggesting to you that the mechanism is there. I'm not going to suggest that the mechanism is going to be used every second day, but wherever there is a very specific environmental reason and environmental cause, the

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-37

legislation provides that, in fact, the minister can take that case up before the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and convince the Lieutenant-Governor in Council that that particular department is wrong in what it wants to do and as a result the project may in fact be stopped. Or the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may say there are overriding reasons to environmental matters, and the road goes ahead. I've just tried to put before you various hypothetical cases. But I do want to suggest to you that the machinery is available for action within government.

MR. BENCIT:

Mr. Minister, you made several references this afternoon to the Kananaskis road, and then just now you said that that's a hypothetical case. But I was wondering if your department did make any studies, in fact, on the Kananaskis road going south of Seebe before it was cleared this winter?

MR. YURKO:

We have a study program for this year.

MR. BENCIT:

That's after the clearing?

MR. YURKO:

That's right. It's after the clearing, but the study may very well indicate the slope of the shoulders and the type of grass to be used and many, many factors.

MR. RUSTIE:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the hon. minister -- earlier in the discussion he brought to our attention the actual figures for the costs and the money expended on the Brazeau and the Big Horn, and earlier when he promised that information I requested if he would bring us up to date on some of the benefits of the expenditure of these monies. Could he do that now?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, ...

MR. FAFFAN:

On a point of order, are we still on No. 2?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes.

MR. YURKO:

The benefits are of course several, one of them being greater profits to Calgary Power. And I am sure the hon. gentleman recognizes that this, in fact, is a benefit to a certain specific limited number of stockholders. And I for one am not always interested in making profit for certain companies by the expenditure of public funds. However, I must continue and indicate that there have been many advantages to the public from these projects. It has resulted, in fact, in cheaper power for the City of Calgary; it has resulted in cheaper power for a number of communities served by Calgary Power, at the expense of the taxpayers in general. It has resulted in an increase in flow in the North Saskatchewan River and, as a result, all it has done has resulted in a delay of the

29-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

installation of adequate treatment facilities in the City of Edmonton.

I don't buy the idea of dilution being used as a solution to pollution. As a matter of fact I can suggest to you that various figures have been tossed about. But 100 pounds of COD discharged into the river is equivalent to something like \$100,000 to a quarter of a million dollars. So when you give somebody the opportunity to put in 100 pounds of COD material into a river stream, that is equivalent to a lot of money indeed. And if a new industry comes in and you give them this type of thing then you are really, to some degree, subsidizing that industry.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes, Mr. Barton?

MR. BARTON:

I am not going to talk -- just on the two appropriations, 2902 and 2910 -- and I don't know anything about what is going on here. However, I notice 132.8% -- I guess this is a change -- and yet, actually, there is only \$27,000 difference. And in 2910 there is actually a decrease with a 66.7% change. Could I have an explanation?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, hon. gentleman. I think you are comparing them to the estimates of last year. But the percentage increase or decrease is based on the actual spent last year. You must recognize that the department only came into being last year -- I believe in May -- and it really didn't get going until some months later, so we did not spend all the money that was allocated last year.

MR. FUSIE:

One further question to the hon. minister. Were there any flood control benefits?

MR. YURKO:

I can't recall offhand what the frequency of flooding is in the North Saskatchewan River basin. I am not too sure that the incidence is very high. I would just like to put to you, sir, that if the incidence is very high under present conditions that, in fact, the incidence of flooding can be increased with a large reservoir by virtue of a dam break, and the actual calculations can be shown to indicate an increase in the possibility of flood rather than a decrease. At this point in time I wouldn't want to suggest to you what way the situation would go in connection with the Big Horn Dam. I suspect it may decrease it but not necessarily. You try and tell that to the Stony Indians who are going to live downstream from the Big Horn dam and they'll suggest to you that the incidence of possibility of flooding is going to be up for them rather than down.

MR. FENNELSON:

I think, Mr. Chairman, that really he shouldn't be confusing possibility with probability. I notice he avoided using the latter term.

MR. FUSIE:

One other question on this vote that I would like to direct to the hon. minister. He mentioned earlier that he was going to meet with his counterpart in B.C., the hon. Mr. Williston. Would he care

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-39

to indicate at this time some of the top priorities he is going to discuss with him?

MR. YURKO:

I have indicated publically that we are meeting on April 22nd and it is really an exploratory meeting. We are going to be exploring various possibilities, the possibility of continued co-operation, the possibility of continued discussion, the type of structure we might set up for negotiation of certain matters and so forth. I don't doubt for one minute there won't be exploring of various possibilities, the possibility of continued cooperation, the possibility of continued discussion, the type of structure that we might set up for negotiations of certain matters and so forth. There won't be anything very specific discussed, this is initially an exploratory meeting, though I feel quite certain we'll be touching on perhaps such things as the appointment of the Peace, regulation of the Peace, perhaps the type of structure that we might find it advisable to set up in connection with management of the entire northern flowing water bodies. There may be many areas that we will be exploring but basically it's an exploratory meeting.

Appropriation No. 2902 agreed to \$523,700

~~Appropriation No. 2910~~, Research Division 303,380

[Agreed to without debate.]

~~Appropriation No. 2911~~, Information Services Division

Materials & Supplies

MR. FUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, on this one, would the hon. Minister make available to all members of the Assembly the news releases and information brochures? From time to time reports come out that are available to the public, and as well there is a clipping service that is available. If we could have copies of these I think this would help the members in understanding the news media reports on the actual things that are taking place within the department.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, we'd be very pleased to release or to prepare a package for each member of what, in fact, we have done during the last seven months. We have put out a "Name the Lake" contest, which resulted in a little brochure. We have brochures on air pollution, on water pollution and waste disposal. We are putting together a kit for schools. We have a whole series of news releases; we'll gladly compile them for each member in the House if they wish. I'll certainly do what the hon. member suggested.

MR. FUSTE:

What I suggested, Mr. Minister, was on an ongoing basis on what periodically comes out. I was thinking of the press clipping service of which copies could be made, so we would be aware of the reaction and the things that are going on, not only in Alberta, but in other places in this whole field.

MR. YURKO:

Yes, I think that is an excellent suggestion, as a matter of fact, and we'll make sure that we distribute these to every member of the House.

29-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

---

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, just what is involved, just what does this mean? Does this mean that we're going to get copies of clippings from every newspaper in North America having to do with environment?

MR. YERK:

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that that part has to be excluded. What we do originate as a department, we can certainly supply. But if you want to ask us to review all type of literature and provide this information, then this is just cut of the question, and my remarks were directly aimed at what the department puts out as original material -- a news release, a pamphlet, a brochure, this sort of thing.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Chairman, on the point that the hon. minister raised, I feel that there is a clipping service that is not on the international scale or anything like that, but is pretty well on a provincial scale. There are pertinent clippings that relate to the field of the department and I think it would be interesting and beneficial to the members of this Legislative Assembly to have copies of that.

MR. YERK:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to leave that on this basis. If any member from this House wants to approach the department on an individual basis in connection with being put on the list for clipping services, I think we would be very pleased to accommodate him. But there is no point in just simply saying on a blanket-wide basis we're going to supply this information to 75 members. If anybody wants to approach us in this regard, I'm sure we'll accommodate them.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I notice that there is an environmental library. Is this being built or set up in the department? I'm wondering if we're getting into the danger of having a library in every department. It seems to me that the idea of having a central library should include all material, and while every department may want certain books that they have themselves, I think if we decentralize library services too much, we are simply going to mean the eventual elimination of a central library. I would like to see some consideration given towards setting up sections for environment, for agriculture, for highways, in our present library, rather than setting these aside in every department where only a limited number of people can then have the benefit of it.

MR. YERK:

I think the hon. Member for Drumheller has a good point, but I would like to make a plea at this point in time for continuing the library within the department and then perhaps sometime in the future, transferring it to a central library. There are a number of very good reasons for this. We, of course, are first of all a new department and this whole area of the environment is, to a large degree, a new area. We get our information from sources from which the general library doesn't extract the information. We also document material which a normal library wouldn't necessarily document, and I would simply suggest to the hon. member that his suggestion is very well founded. But I would like to suggest that we continue to give very serious consideration to the suggestion that was on the present basis, and at some point in the future then made.



April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-41

MR. HENDEFSCH:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say I have to support the hon. minister's proposition in this matter that the central library on this area's technical endeavour -- I just don't think it would function effectively at all. Quite frankly, we made a start on this last year.

Appropriation No. 2911 agreed to

\$104,770

Appropriation No. 2920 Water Resources Division

Salaries

MR. FUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, one of the lakes that is not in my constituency but one that has created a lot of interest over the past several sessions as I recall, is the one relating to Gull Lake. I was wondering if the hon. minister would elaborate on his plans for that at this time?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, there are no monies in the departmental appropriations for any work on Gull Lake this year. Money in the appropriations basically for work on one lake only and that is Cold Lake in the Wetaskiwin area, which was started some time ago and are continuing this work. But until such time as we establish a provincial-wide equitable policy on lake stabilization, we will not undertake any additional stabilization or rehabilitation of any other lake.

MR. EUCKWELL:

Mr. Minister, this water resource division, is this the personnel used in irrigation supervision?

MR. YURKO:

Basically, this is the managerial, administrative, clerical, and planning staff of branch heads and so forth within the Edmonton division. The irrigation services come under another appropriation which we will come to later on.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, there are just three points I would like to mention in connection with water resources that affect the Drumheller-Gleichen constituency. The first one is in connection with the Red Deer River. For many years now it has been the hopes of the people that there be some type of dam built at the headwaters of the Red Deer in order to do away with the periodic floods which bring turmoil and expense and misery to scores and scores of people. This has been considered, and I would like to know what the department is doing in connection with the headwaters of the Red Deer, particularly in regard to the control of floods. It would have other benefits as well, but particularly in connection with the control of floods.

The second item I would like to mention involves the Bow River basin. In the Hussar area there is a crying need for some type of dam. We have Crowfoot Dam there which is a potential dam, which I understand is part of the overall Bow River Basin study. The hon. Member for Little Bow the other day, as well as some of the hon. members for Calgary, mentioned the importance of having more recreational areas close to the City of Calgary or closer to the City of Calgary. This is certainly a tremendous opportunity if Crowfoot Dam could be developed. It could become an attractive recreational facility, an area within a reasonable distance of Calgary, and as

29-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

well serve quite a large population in the Standard, Hussar, Gleichen, Cluny areas.

The third point I'd like to mention is the matter of making use of dams for reservoirs, with the idea of preserving or conserving water for municipal supply. A number of municipalities in this province are having very serious difficulty in getting a water supply. I believe that every dollar spent for reservoirs that help to preserve or conserve the water, store the water for municipal water supplies, is very, very well spent. To many of these there are probably alternatives, but I agree that we do need an overall policy in the province to assist municipalities to store water for municipal purposes. I'm thinking particularly right now of the village of Standard where there are several alternatives, and the only thing that's holding it back is some financial assistance from one of the senior governments. I'd certainly appreciate it greatly if the hon. minister will give consideration to this matter of working out a policy, if at all possible, in which some financial assistance is given towards creating dams, primarily for the storing of water for municipal purposes.

MR. YURKOC:

Mr. Chairman, the points raised by the hon. member are all well taken in the area of control of floods. We recognize that this can be a problem on the Red Deer River. Sundre, I believe, has had some difficulty in this regard, but here again, it's a case of priorities, and during the coming year we've identified the Paddle River as the area of major input. What areas we identify for next year, I don't know at this point, but I suggest to you that there are a number of areas and I've had delegations and representations from many places and I sympathize with all their problems and the hon. Minister of Agriculture has mentioned earlier in this debate about the advisability of consideration being given to setting up a Disaster Act. We had considered for some time a sort of umbrella disaster insurance. This is being investigated in a number of ways. However, I do want to suggest that it is a case of priorities. We hope to be able to do as much work as we can in the area of flood control, but it is related to the availability of funds, and there are many demands on the budget. But I do say again that this is why we consider it so vital to initiate some type of water use fee on a provincial basis so some of this very critical work can be done. My personal belief is until we get into this area to some degree that those who benefit from water works actually in an indirect way pay for it. We really aren't going to get too much done in this area. I have to suggest that the record in Alberta over the last number of years in connection with work done in management, from a standpoint of flood and bank stabilization and lake level stabilization has really been very, very minimal. It had been our hope that we could transfer from a studying phase into an implementation phase, and this is why we're going to attempt to do everything on a river basin basis and manage things on a river basin basis, but we recognize that two things were before us -- the need to establish some real policies in this area, cost-sharing and so forth, and the need to determine some methods for providing funds. And these we are working on.

The second point -- the Bow River -- I recognize that this is certainly a desirable project, but it is a project that involves massive funds. I think the last estimate was \$89 or \$90 million and if we could find \$90 million somewhere I'd gladly put in the project. But it doesn't come that easily and it will be part of the total Bow River management plan. If we can get the irrigation rehabilitation program out of the way, then, in fact, we can enter into the second stage of negotiation with the federal government in connection with establishing through The Canada Water Act a secondary management plan for the whole Bow River basin. But we must get the initial stage out of the way first, and that is the irrigation rehabilitation program.

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-43

The third area that the hon. member has mentioned -- dams for reservoirs -- I certainly appreciate... a secondary plant for the whole Bow River basin. But we must get the initial stage out of the way first, and that is the irrigation rehabilitation program.

The third area the hon. minister has mentioned -- dams for reservoirs -- I certainly appreciate the need for this. This is what is being done in connection with Wetaskiwin and Cold Lake. I was visited by the hon. Member for Camrose in connection with Dried Meat Lake. Several delegations came up to see me in connection with enhancing the water supply of the various towns. I do want to suggest that we have a program under very active consideration with the federal government in this regard, which in our case, is being pinpointed exclusively towards the enhancement of water supply facilities for the towns and the agricultural centres of Alberta.

I hope we will be successful in completing this negotiation before very long. This will go a long way to solving the water problems of many of the towns of Alberta.

I want to suggest that we made an estimate of the amount of money required for solving some of the immediate problems of the towns in connection with water supplies, and the estimate was at the order of \$13 million, for solving just some of the immediate problems associated with water supply to the various towns and centres of Alberta.

MR. FUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, a further question. He mentioned the Paddle, and the work that is going on there. Is there a federal contribution towards that now, and if so, what percentage?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, there is no federal contribution to the work we are doing on the Paddle River at all.

MR. FUSTE:

None of the incentive programs or winter works or any of that?

MR. YURKO:

No. It is possible that we could subsequently investigate whether, in fact, there may be a qualification in connection with some program. But we undertook the program as totally a provincial undertaking.

MR. HENDERSON:

I would like to ask the hon. minister very briefly -- are you not now continuing to place a fairly high priority on at least the technical and economic evaluation of the reservoir prospects on headwaters of the Red Deer? There is a high priority on those studies still.

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Chairman, I heard mention this afternoon of nearly every river in the province of Alberta, except the Sturgeon River, and for the information of the hon. minister, Mr. Chairman, there has been 65 engineering studies done on this river basin and no action taken as yet.

The former government, in a news release that we had in the St. Albert paper, mentioned that in 1972 a start would be made to clean

29-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

up the Sturgeon River. I wonder if the hon. minister has any money earmarked for this project.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge, we don't have any money in the budget in connection with a physical undertaking of the Sturgeon River, but we have under very active consideration, a policy with respect to some type of assistance for sewage disposal plants for growing towns. When we resolve a policy in this regard, this will make it possible to have St. Albert undertake its massive sewage disposal program, estimated at over \$4 million at this time. This, in connection with the fact that the federal government has allocated \$10 million through CMHC funds for sewage disposal plants and facilities in Alberta, will make this project possible, and this will relieve much of the load on the Sturgeon, from the standpoint of dump or pollution.

However, I recognize that the Sturgeon is a basin that does need some considerable input, considerable management in the future. In connection with the Alberta Water Management Plan, which we hope to release later on this year, I think one of the first areas we are studying from a total standpoint with respect to use, with respect to drainage and with respect to every other conceivable watershed problem, this area is one of the first areas we are studying.

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Chairman, I see from the figures in the program which was released by the Water Resources Branch of the former government, that the complete project to do a job on the Sturgeon River was in the vicinity of \$150 million and I realize that this is a considerable amount of money, but a start for the dredging or the clean-up of the Sturgeon would possibly be a considerable amount to stop the flooding which occurred last year in the rainy season; we had two different rainy seasons; there was a tremendous amount of land that was never able to be seeded.

MR. EARTON:

Mr. Chairman, of all the basins, I will talk about the East and West Prairies. Is there anything going to be done on the situation in the East and West Prairies?

MR. YURKO:

I think, Mr. Chairman, we have a program going on there and has been going on last year under our winter works program.

MR. EARTON:

Well, our real problem is the silting. I would suggest that you move it up one more priority to control the silting and maybe in the form of a rock bed in the new channeling. In my travels last fall, I watched the program very closely. I noticed where the pipeline companies have crossed it, they have built the crossing with gravel and a fairly substantial amount of rock base in it. It does seem to hold the silting down to that stage. If there was a series of that on it, I am no expert, but it might work out.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well.

Appropriation No. 2920 agreed to

\$1,289,800

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA EANSARD

29-45

MR. FUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, just one more question, and I think that at this time of the year we are faced from time to time with floods on certain areas. Has the minister any indication of any areas this year where we might be faced with any flood conditions to any extent?

MR. YURKO:

Black Diamond, I think is one that already had a flood earlier this year. About five homes were inundated to some degree. The hon. Member for Highwood brought it to my attention. I think FMO was involved and offered assistance. In the north country...[Interjections]...that is right, I haven't heard any -- that is right, none that we know. I beg your pardon?

MR. FUSTE:

Is there any forecast of any anticipated floods at the present time?

MR. YURKO:

Any forecasts? None.

MR. EAFICN:

Mr. Chairman, there was some concern about the Swan River, but the hon. Minister of Agriculture has assured us that it wasn't going to flood this year -- so I am quite happy.

MR. EENDESCN:

I would like to make a comment on the subject of land management in relation to these drainage basin management problems. It is increasingly evident, and the environmental study of the Sturgeon Basin brought this out very dramatically, along with my limited experience with this problem, the East and West Prairie River, that certain land management is going to be a critical factor. In all those areas watershed requires a far greater degree of emphasis than has been the case in the past, and I was wondering if the minister really was placing higher priorities on this aspect of the problem as well. It is not just the water -- it has to be watershed management.

MR. YURKO:

Yes, we are placing a high priority on watershed management. This is the basis of our entire program, and this will include siltation and what is the word, well, you know what I mean, hon. member.

MR. EAFICN:

Is there anything being done on the head waters of the Swan that your department is acknowledging?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, I think I would have to take that under advisement and report back. It just skips my memory whether or not we are doing anything on the head waters of the Swan except perhaps, studying the matter.

[Interjection from the Member's Gallery]

MR. EAFICN:

You missed your signal.

29-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

---

MR. YUEKOC:

Well, we are.

MR. EAFICN:

Supplementary, is it in the form of a holding area?

MR. YUEKOC:

In all honesty, I would like to get the details for the hon. member.

MR. EAFICN:

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I think you will receive that later, Mr. Barton. Yes, Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR:

I am certainly pleased that the hon. minister is getting help from upstairs.

MR. YUEKOC:

It's the only practical thing to do when you have this many programs, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure than nobody would expect anybody to remember these number of programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I think the Chairman will take a cue from that too and get some help from there.

Appropriation No. 2930 Pollution Control Division.

MR. DIXON:

I would like to have the hon. minister bring us up-to-date on the order of noise surveys, in the City of Calgary in particular, and of course while he's on his feet we might as well touch on the Edmonton situation as well.

However, one of the other questions I would like to ask the hon. minister - recently the United States government has given the Atomic Energy Commission permission to carry out two separate atomic underground tests as an experiment to evaluate whether this method would be successful in unlocking gas and oil supplies that are underground. In Alberta, the hon. minister will be aware, some years ago Atlantic Richfield Oil Company were interested in setting off an atomic blast in the Athabasca Tar Sands. My question; if this company decided tomorrow to go into this type of experiment would he favour it or what plans would he have? What direction would he give a company that was interested in doing this type of an experiment? Because it is coming around as a fact; as I pointed out, the government of the United States have two permits issued there and if they are successful I am sure that they will go forward with the experiment that they mentioned a few years ago. And I was wondering if there would be cooperation between his department and the federal department when it comes to atomic blasts or anything along that particular line?

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-47

MR. YOFFCO:

I'm fairly familiar with the United States program in this regard - it was called Project Plow Share - and one of the detonations was called Project Gas Fuggy which was fairly successful in the Colorado shales. It's certainly to be recognized as a method of production of hydrocarbons from the earth and shales. You asked me sort of a conjectural question in a way -- what would we do if some company applied to the government for permission to undertake the same type of program in Alberta -- I would simply suggest to you that the government would take it under consideration, perhaps establish a multi-disciplinary committee of experts, bring in input from outside, attempt to review the American information, attempt to review the type of formations the experiments up to this far were done. But I would suggest to you very strongly, at this point in time, that it would be premature to think of the application of this type of technology for releasing oil in our tar sands because we have surface methods, which can in fact, extract this material at fairly reasonable costs. We recognize that there's room for some 40 or 50 plants on the surface basis. Now when it comes to in situ underground mining, subsequently in connection with our tar sands, some of our deep line tar sands, then we would examine the situation in its entirety. But I suggest to you that there is much, much information still to be got and that's associated with the radioactivity of the hydrocarbons, the degree to which the activity is induced under certain types of formations, the types of cavities created in certain types of formations and this information is simply not available in all type of formations, particularly not in the type of formations that we have in Alberta. And I suggest to you again that we would consider it as a government, but certainly not as a short term project, but as an extremely long term project. In connection with your other question, hon. member, I would perhaps suggest that you give us a few days and I will have the department put together a complete report on just where we are at in connection with the colour and noise surveys being done in Calgary and Edmonton.

MR. DIXON:

Supplementary question, Mr. Chairman. I had a complaint from a truck driver who was stopped because of the noise and the policeman who was handing out the ticket said, "Well just a moment, sir, I can't finish talking to you -- I can't hear -- until this plane overhead goes by." My question to the hon. minister; What regulations do we have regarding noise from aircraft?

MR. YOFFCO:

Mr. Chairman, at this time, of course, any regulation that exists, or any bylaw that exists, is strictly municipal in Calgary and Edmonton. The province has no regulations except in the area of industrial noise, which comes under the Department of Health. We have undertaken the noise survey in Calgary and Edmonton to establish a base level of noise. There are several kinds of noises, depending on frequency, and the level of noise damage is not only in relation to frequency, but duration. And an aircraft flying over is of very short duration. If you had aircraft flying over all day, one right after the other, then that's a noise level of a long duration and can be very detrimental.

We are attempting to define and determine a background noise level in the city in general, with peaks and valleys as they occur, for several reasons; (a) to establish in the cities, as it is today, a base line for future comparison. Are the noise levels going up or down, what is happening to them? On this base line level we will, of course, have superimposed periodic peaks from an aircraft going over, from a truck going by, from a blowout, and a few other things you see. But this base line thing is extremely important, whether it goes up, down, and so forth. (b) To determine whether or not legislation on the provincial level is necessary at some future point in time. This legislative may take an entirely different form from

29-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

---

what the municipalities have in the form of a by-law. They may take the form whereby noise suppressors are required on certain types of trucks; where noise suppressors are required in other areas. They may indicate the need for noise barriers along major arterial roads in the form of shrubs and trees and hedges, which are remarkable for deadening noise. They may take the form of barricades or concrete abutments which are being used in the United States. Some of the major freeways in the United States are submerged -- they are not built on ground level, they are submerged -- for the very reason that if you submerge the major artery then noise is deflected and then noise is absorbed in the banks and you can have houses off the very edge of the throughway and hardly have any effect on the people at all.

I do want to suggest to you -- I have given a speech -- and I hope to see the day when highway engineers in designing a major thoroughfare not only design that piece of tarmac and so forth but line that boulevard with noise suppression material, and I mean particularly shrubs and trees which are absolutely remarkable in lowering noise. They break up the sound wave and defuse it and you have a totally different effect.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Minister, as a final supplemental, have there been any studies made -- I don't imagine you have made them in your department -- anywhere in North America on the type of surface on a highway as far as noise is concerned?

MR. YURKIC:

Oh, very definitely so.

Operation of Mobile Equipment

MR. YOUNG:

I have been waiting and waiting and waiting for this opportunity. I just want to stress to the hon. minister in connection with this appropriation as I believe it deals with noise. I had some questions, he has answered them all. I would appreciate a copy of that report but I would like to stress that this not be overlooked. We have a very serious situation in my constituency -- I have got noise level readings and a whole lot of other data, in fact I've got a fifteen minute speech here that I will not give in the interest of noise here ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. YOUNG:

... provided the matter is not overlooked. For the information of members there was a sub-committee on noise pollution, a technical sub-committee No. 14 of The Alberta Advisory Committee on Pollution Control which reported in 1970 and which has produced a model, proposed a municipal bylaw and which has also stressed that municipal bylaws will not be adequate in dealing with this particular problem.

So, I commend the hon. minister for his action in this regard and stress to him, the hope that it will not be overlooked.

Furnishings and Equipment

MR. CLARKE:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just ask the hon. minister if he would



April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-49

comment on this question of relationship between the Energy Resources Conservation Board and the Department of the Environment.

MR. YURKO:

Yes, this was an item that was given a considerable amount of thought by the Committee on Natural Resources and Environment. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons the committee was set up initially was to resolve this basic question and then it found itself solving all sorts of problems.

The basic policy resolution was that the Department of the Environment would have primary and overall responsibility with respect to pollution control and environmental management. As a result, however, the Department of the Environment, could through legislation, farm out certain of its responsibilities. It would not, under any circumstances, farm out its responsibility to establish standards, and to approve plants of any kind under the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act. Nevertheless it would farm out the ways and means of controlling, measuring, and regulating to various departments and various agents, or in the energy industries, the oil and gas conservation board will have almost an exclusive responsibility in the area of ways and means. And we have had many, many meetings with the oil and gas conservation board, and have established a concept that the oil and gas conservation board will really be used as the window to the industry -- the industry will come to one place only -- to the oil and gas conservation board, the Energy Resources Conservation Board. However, in connection with proposals, in connection with establishing standards, in connection with giving out of contracts for construction, licenses for operation -- this information will come from the department and will be funnelled through the Conservation Board. And we have changes that are going to be made in the Hydro and Electric Energy Act in this regard, in The Oil and Gas Conservation Act in this regard, which will reflect this association, in the -- oh, what's the other one, in The Energy Resources Conservation Board Act itself. So this is basically taken care of and I must indicate to you that it took a terrific amount of negotiation and meetings and correspondence and discussion by telephone and so forth to resolve the matter -- but it is resolved.

MR. CLARKE:

Mr. Chairman, hopefully, just one more question, and I appreciate the remarks the hon. minister has made. But from the standpoint of a person who has a well on their land, and they have a complaint, is that complaint lodged with the Energy Resources Conservation Board, and then if there is no satisfaction there, then with The Department of the Environment?

MR. YURKO:

Well, to some degree it depends on the off-site aspects also. If it's an off-site effect, then they can approach us directly and we'll undertake the responsibility -- we have the responsibility of reaction almost immediately. If it's an on-site effect -- then the Oil and Gas Conservation Board. So in most of these matters we'd really both be involved.

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Chairman, the Question Period was so hectic today with members of both sides vying for TV time, I never got a chance to ask a very important question on the environment. If it's all right with Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the hon. Minister of the Environment -- there was an oil spill a couple of days ago in my area and I was wondering if the hon. minister himself has taken a look at the

29-50

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 14th 1972

situation or if his department has, and just exactly what the score is on it now, as far as the Sturgeon River and Big Lake is concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder, Mr. Jarvis if you and the hon. minister could take it and then report to us on Monday.

MR. YURKO:

I can answer that very quickly. 75 to 100 barrels were spilt into Carrot Creek which runs into Big Lake. The oil was from a transfer line, ANACC was responsible. Four straw booms were placed to catch the oil which was skimmed and trucked away, but there will probably be a very thin oil film on Big Lake. We are investigating the matter further, and I will have a complete report within the next few days.

Appropriation No. 2930 agreed to \$1,226,120

~~Appropriation No. 2940~~ Interdepartmental Planning Division 672,360

[Agreed to without debate.]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Would the Assembly wish to just continue these three more votes? Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

The following were agreed to without debate:

<del>Appropriation No. 2941</del>	Surface Reclamation Council	232,600
<del>Appropriation No. 2945</del>	Environment Conservation Authority	287,970
<del>Appropriation No. 2950</del>	Environmental Standards and Approvals Division	

~~Salaries~~

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, are we on 2950? I'm wondering if the committee would agree to holding it over till the next sitting. We've gone to the end of it, but we would appreciate it if we could hold it over until the end.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report progress and be leave to sit again.

MR. STROM:

Can we just finish 2950 and bring it down to the end? I'd be happy to have 2950 finished so we would be just dealing with the total appropriation.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Fine. We'll finish off 2950, and hold the final vote on the total amount.

April 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

29-51

---

MR. HYLMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise to report progress and beg leave to sit again.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 5:30 PM]

